TO: Robert Alm

Attached is the White House press release on the individuals announced Friday for the Native Hawaiians Study Commission.

FROM: Judi Diamond
Legislative Affairs (Senate)
107 EW, x-7054
The President today announced his intention to appoint the following individuals as members of the Native Hawaiians Study Commission. The President intends to designate Kina'u Boyd Kamali'i as Chairman and Stephen P. Shipley as Vice Chairman. In addition, he announced that he is calling for the first meeting to be held on September 23, 1981.

**KINA'U BOYD KAMALI'I** is Minority Leader of the Hawaii House of Representatives. She was elected to the House of Representatives in 1974. She served as State Chairman of the Reagan-Bush Campaign in Hawaii in 1980. Mrs. Kamali'i was born October 24, 1930, in Honolulu, Hawaii.

**STEPHEN P. SHIPLEY** is Executive Assistant to the Secretary of the Interior. Previously, he was Vice President of the Mountain States Legal Foundation in Denver, Colorado, and Assistant Manager of the Bonneville Power Administration, Department of Energy. Mr. Shipley was born June 27, 1945, in Jackson, Wyoming.

**WINONA K. D. BEAMER** is currently retired from Kamehameha Schools in Hawaii. She is a Hawaiian Scholar of music and dance with an extensive background in the composition of Hawaiian music (contemporary and ancient). Mrs. Beamer was born August 15, 1923, in Honolulu, Hawaii.

**H. RODGER BETTS** is Corporation Counsel for the County of Maui. Previously he was General Counsel of the Community Services Administration and an aide to Senator Hiram Fong (R-Hawaii). Mr. Betts was born July 18, 1924, in Waipahu, Oahu, Hawaii.

**CAROL E. DINKINS** is currently Assistant Attorney General, Land and Natural Resources Division, Department of Justice. Prior to her present post, she was Principal Associate and Adjunct Assistant Professor of Law at the University of Houston. Mrs. Dinkins was born November 9, 1945, in Corpus Christi, Texas.

**JAMES C. HANDLEY** is Special Assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture. Previously he was Assistant Director of the Office of Personnel, Governor's Office, State of Illinois. Mr. Handley was born December 28, 1943, in Tuscola, Illinois.
DIANE K. MORALES is Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy, Territorial and International Affairs, Department of the Interior. Previously she worked with a marketing firm in Houston, Texas. Miss Morales was born July 11, 1946, in Houston, Texas.

GLENN R. SCHLEEDDE is Executive Associate Director, Office of Management and Budget. Prior to this position, he was Senior Vice President of the National Coal Association. Mr. Schleede was born June 12, 1933, in Lyons, New York.

###
PRESS STATEMENT
2 April 1981
"The Native Hawaiian Study Commission"

House Minority Leader
KINA‘U BOYD KAMALI‘I

I am very happy and honored to announce that the Native Hawaiian Study Commission is to be reconstituted later this month. I learned about this exciting development in a discussion with the White House this morning and have been assured that the President will name the nine commissioners in the next few weeks.

I don’t have any details about who will be named or the exact timing of the appointments, but the significance of the Native Hawaiian Study Commission has been asserted by the White House, and the Commission will begin its work soon.

I am, as you can guess, very excited by this news. After the near-tragedy of this past Monday, good news from the White House is doubly reassuring.

President Reagan is recovering from his wound very quickly and with little difficulty — and that’s very good news, too.
DIANE MORALES APPOINTED INTERIOR DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY

Secretary of the Interior James Watt today announced the appointment of Diane Morales, a senior associate of a Houston, Texas design and management firm, to be Deputy Assistant Secretary of Interior for Territorial and International Affairs.

"Diane Morales has a strong background in business management and community relations that will make her very effective in her new position," Watt said, "we are delighted to have her join us at Interior."

Ms. Morales comes to her new position from Houston where she was a senior associate and Manager of Marketing Services for 3D/International. From 1971 to 1980 she had held several executive positions with Neiman-Marcus in Dallas.

She had also been a public relations representative for a major Houston photography firm, Gittings Neiman-Marcus and an account executive with the advertising and public relations firm of Goodwin, Dannenbaum, Littman & Wingfield, Inc.

Ms. Morales was a member of the Government Relations Committee of the Houston Chamber of Commerce and the fiscal management task force studying the city budget. She was elected to the board of the Inter-American Chamber of Commerce and a member of the Corporate Community Task Force on the Houston Clean City Commission.

While in Dallas she was the 1980 President of the Downtown Women's Republican Club and a board member of the Dallas County Republican Women's Council and the Dallas County Men's Republican Club.

Born July 11, 1946 in Houston, Ms. Morales received a BA degree in 1968 from the University of Texas at Austin in romance languages and education.
STATEMENT OF DONALD R. WRIGHT

RE: JR 155

Hilo, Hawaii

February 11, 1976

My name is Donald R. Wright. I am an Alaska Native.

My experience includes representing the Alaska Natives as an Area Vice President to the National Congress of American Indians for eight years; charter member of the National Tribal Chairmans Association; President of the Alaska Federation of Natives, Coordinator and Chief Spokesman for Alaska Natives during and through the final negotiated passage of the Alaska Native Land Claims Settlement Act of 1971.

I am testifying as an interested American citizen.

I vigorously and positively oppose the creation of a commission to study the Hawaiian land claims issue. The Congress of the United States and the President of the United States have violated the laws of nations willfully, maliciously and without the knowledge of the American people whom they represent. Whether the act of overthrowing the Hawaiian Monarchy was done in 1893 or today, it is still the sole constitutional responsibility of the same President and Congress. The only thing
that has changed is the flesh and blood personification in the individuals of our American governing body.

I am extremely familiar with all of the work done by commissions, by the Bureau of Indian Affairs and other politically motivated organizations. The Committees of Congress, such as the sub and full Committees on Interior Affairs in the House of Representatives and the sub and full Committees in the Senate are not political in makeup. They are bipartisan with both the Democrats and Republicans fully represented. Having spent two years in Washington working with those Committee members in Congress, I believe that the direct congressional approach is more effective and certainly would be more effective in the case of the Hawaiian land claims than the establishment of a commission of any type.

Indigenous people have dealt honorably in assisting the "civilized" peoples of the world to form a free nation which today is the United States since foreigners have touched the soil of North America and these Islands.

The Hawaiian claim is very clear. The facts were presented to the President and the Congress of the United States in 1893,
and again now.

It is time, in keeping with the spirit of '76, that our Congress and its Committees complete their unfinished task with honor, respect, patience and timeliness. The Hawaiian people have shown these traits for eighty-four years. The Honorable Chairman has made it clear that these hearings will be a part of the record for any bills introduced in Congress. Congress has more than enough information to begin Committee drafting.

The Hawaiian Native leadership is sophisticated and intelligent and able to state their case in testimony to any interested Committee of the United States House of Representatives or the United States Senate at any time or place including Washington, D. C. that they are afforded the opportunity.

It is my firm belief that the least that should be done at this point in time is the introduction of the bill or bills of the Hawaiian people into the House of Representatives and the Senate during this session of Congress to bring to the immediate attention of all Americans during this bicentennial year a problem that has waited eighty-four years.
January 30, 1976

Daniel K. Inouye  
U.S. Senator  
Capitol Investment Bldg.  
239 Merchant Street  
Suite 602  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Statement by: Herman G. P. Lemke, C.P.A.

Honorable Senator Dan Inouye:

I would like to thank you for this opportunity to help the Hawaiian Aborigines.

Hawaiians have been helped by the Congress, thru the Hawaiian Homes Commission by making land available, but this was to help only those with 50% or more Hawaiian. As you know, land by itself, especially when a good part of the land is not arable, has not borne much fruit. What this land needs is funds for roads, reservoirs and utilities; otherwise, the land is worthless.

This latest venture to now help Hawaiians, of a broader group with less Hawaiian blood, is commendable because whether you are a pure blood or just a sixteenth Hawaiian - you are still a Hawaiian with all the problems that aborigines seem to inherit. Possibly its the way we were raised; happy-go-lucky, passive and full of Aloha. It is hard to change to a serious, aggressive, lack-of-Aloha type person.

The statistics will also show that the prison population and the poor of Hawaii have been unusually large amongst the Hawaiians. In general, they have not adjusted to the western way of life. They did not know how to hold on to their lands and their ability to become business oriented never matured sufficiently.

The suggestion to fund the Hawaiians with a billion dollar corporation, similar to what has been done for the Alaska Eskimo, is an act that may be a partial solution to the problem. I understand Alaskan Eskimos have priorities on federal and state jobs in Alaska. This appeals to me because what a person needs is a job, rather than just money or land. Possibly this fund can help employ more part Hawaiians for this purpose; but a fund to run a public welfare program can be short-lived.
I comment here, not really knowing what the procedure to help Hawaiians thru this generous offer will be, but anything is better than nothing.

The suggestion of a corporation funded with a large amount of money, plus possible land can no doubt be of help to the plight of the poor Hawaiian who today seems lost in a group of Islands he once controlled completely just two centuries ago.

This inquiry on your part is commendable. Hawaii was forcefully taken by citizens of the United States. It could have been left alone just as Great Britain, Germany, France, Japan and Russia had left these Islands to struggle by themselves. However, it was the American businessman who was fearful of losing his investments here in Hawaii which promoted the take over. Whatever you can now do to help those who thought they inherited their land - the part Hawaiian Aborigine - will be sincerely appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,

Herman G. P. Lemke

Background:

Certified Public Accountant
Past Chairman, Honolulu City Council
Trustee, St. Louis-Chaninade Education Center
Trustee, Mark-Robinson Trusts
Past President, Hawaiian Civic Club of Honolulu
Chairman Johnston, Honorable members of the committee. Aloha No!

I am Jeremiah Kaluna, a resident of Kauai, and am representing the ALOHA Association concerning S.J. Resolution 155, which establishes the Hawaiian Aboriginal Claims Settlement Study Commission.

The Aloha Association is not in favor of the resolution as introduced by our Senator Dan Inouye.

But, if this subcommittee would change some of the provisions in the resolution concerning the makeup of the 11 member commission and its length of time to complete its study, then the ALOHA Association would support the Resolution.

As you probably know, the ALOHA Association tried in June 1974 to introduce a Hawaiian Native Claim Bill into both houses of Congress, but was successful only in the House. At that time we were assured by Senator Henry Jackson that he would send a subcommittee to Hawaii to hold public hearings concerning our Hawaiian Native Claims Bill.

The U.S. House Hearings on the Native Claims Bill were held a year ago, February 1975. As stated in the testimonies at the House Hearings, the Native Claims Bill needed much revisions and stronger emphasis on Hawaiian lands, dominion rights and payment for all the wrongs and injury imposed on the Hawaiians since 1893.

The past year, the ALOHA Association accepted the challenge of its Hawaiian members, and has prepared a Senate version of its Hawaiian Natives Claims Bill. Much research, work, meetings and confrontations with the Hawaiian people was done to insure as uniform and united front as possible.

This Senate version is called the Hawaiian Aboriginals Claims Settlement Bill and encompasses the true Mana'o, inner most and deepest feelings, of the Hawaiian Makaainana, or grassroots people. In fact, the ALOHA Association asked Senator Dan Inouye to hold off a previously scheduled hearing so that we could complete our task.

So, please, bear with us today as you listen to our people. Our true feelings are contained in our Senate Bill.

But, because we respect the recommendations of our Senator Dan Inouye, that the Resolution has a better chance to resolve our Hawaiian Aboriginals Claims and injustices than our Hawaiian Aboriginal Claims Settlement Bill, the ALOHA Association Board voted to support the Resolution with the following recommendations:

1. The six commission members appointed by the President of the United States from recommendations of the Governor of Hawaii be Aboriginal Hawaiians.

2. That the Commission complete its final report for Congress in 12 months, instead of 24 months as contained in the Resolution.
Now that we have addressed ourselves directly to the Resolution, the ALOHA Association would like to submit an alternative to the Resolution concerning a Hawaiian Aboriginal Claims Study Commission.

Chairman Johnston, may I introduce Mr. John Agard, who will chair the panel presentation for ALOHA.

Thank you,

Jeremiah Kaluna
The Honorable Bennett Johnston, Chairman
and Members of the Senate Interior Committee

Aloha.

My name is Richard Lyman and like many other people of Hawaii
I am blessed with mixed ethnic background. I am of Hawaiian
ancestry with Indian ancestry dating back for 150 years in
Hawaii. Presently I am one of five trustees of the Kamehameha
Schools/Bishop Estate established by the Will of the late
Princess Bernice Pauahi Bishop almost 90 years ago while the
Kingdom of Hawaii was in existence. However, I do not act as
a trustee in this particular instance but as an individual
who has been intimately concerned with the problems of Hawaiians
for my whole lifetime.

As we in Hawaii pause now to observe the Bicentennial Anniversary
of our country it is fitting that we reflect on our past history
as Hawaiians and our future as American citizens -- and we are
proud to be both.

Allegations have been made time and again and will be repeated
over and over again that representatives of the United States
acting without the authority or knowledge of the Congress or
the President of the United States acted to overthrow the
lawful government of the then Hawaiian Monarchy, with no compensation
to the aboriginal people of Hawaii. Efforts for reparation have
been made in the past but to no avail.

For many years following the overthrow of the lawful government
of Hawaii the native Hawaiians were considered to be of an inferior
race and not in the same class as the newcomers who come here from
the mainland United States, and who expected that we should be
people in their own image and to think and act as they did.

During the past 80 years native Hawaiians have become more aware
and impatient of things that happened in 1893. Over the years
no significant action has been taken by our government; however,
I view this commission as an expression on the part of our
United States government of today to collect the facts and make
an honest effort to redress any and all wrongs made to the
indigenous native Hawaiian people when the Kingdom was overthrown,
thus giving the Hawaiian people equal treatment that has been
accorded other aboriginal people in these United States today.

In two years, in 1978, this State will celebrate its 200th
Anniversary since the recorded discovery of these islands by
Captain James Cooke of the British Royal Navy which opened the
gates for immigration into these islands and the drastic decline
in the native population of Hawaii as the result of immigration.

For the reasons stated above I support and endorse the Resolution
establishing the Hawaiian Aboriginal Claims Settlement Study
Commission with the belief that in the next two years "hooponopono"
(coming together to right a wrong) will prevail and our motto "In
God We Trust" and our State belief that "The Life of the Land is
Perpetuated in Righteousness" are as valid today as they were before.

Richard Lyman, Jr.
P. O. Box 3466
Honolulu, Hawaii 96801
Ph. 531-1684
The Honorable Bennett Johnston, Chairman
and Members of the Senate Interior Committee

Aloha.

My name is Richard Lyman and like many other people of Hawaii I am blessed with mixed ethnic background. I am of Hawaiian ancestry with Indian ancestry dating back for 150 years in Hawaii. Presently I am one of five trustees of the Kamehameha Schools/Bishop Estate established by the Will of the late Princess Bernice Pauahi Bishop almost 90 years ago while the Kingdom of Hawaii was in existence. However, I do not act as a trustee in this particular instance but as an individual who has been intimately concerned with the problems of Hawaiians for my whole lifetime.

As we in Hawaii pause now to observe the Bicentennial Anniversary of our country it is fitting that we reflect on our past history as Hawaiians and our future as American citizens -- and we are proud to be both.

Allegations have been made time and again and will be repeated over and over again that representatives of the United States acting without the authority or knowledge of the Congress or the President of the United States acted to overthrow the lawful government of the then Hawaiian Monarchy, with no compensation to the aboriginal people of Hawaii. Efforts for reparation have been made in the past but to no avail.

For many years following the overthrow of the lawful government
of Hawaii the native Hawaiians were considered to be of an inferior race and not in the same class as the newcomers who come here from the mainland United States, and who expected that we should be people in their own image and to think and act as they did.

During the past 80 years native Hawaiians have become more aware and impatient of things that happened in 1893. Over the years no significant action has been taken by our government; however, I view this commission as an expression on the part of our United States government of today to collect the facts and make an honest effort to redress any and all wrongs made to the indigenous native Hawaiian people when the Kingdom was overthrown, thus giving the Hawaiian people equal treatment that has been accorded other aboriginal people in these United States today.

In two years, in 1978, this State will celebrate its 200th Anniversary since the recorded discovery of these islands by Captain James Cooke of the British Royal Navy which opened the gates for immigration into these islands and the drastic decline in the native population of Hawaii as the result of immigration.

For the reasons stated above I support and endorse the Resolution establishing the Hawaiian Aboriginal Claims Settlement Study Commission with the belief that in the next two years "hoonopono" (coming together to right a wrong) will prevail and our motto "In God We Trust" and our State belief that "The Life of the Land is Perpetuated in Righteousness" are as valid today as they were before.

Richard Lyman, Jr.
P. O. Box 3466
Public Statement to Subcommittee on Territories of the Interior and
Insular Affairs Committee of the U. S. Senate by Dawn Kahala Wasson.

I have carefully examined the report of the hearings which the
subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the Committee on Interior and In-
sular Affairs of the House of Representatives held in Hawaii in February
of last year.

In all of the testimony given at that time none so articulately
expressed the feelings of the Hawaiian people over the loss of their
lands than that given by Mr. John Dominis Holt.

I would like to enlarge on some of the matters which Mr. Holt
put to you so that there is no doubt in this subcommittee's mind of
the profound effect that the forcible acquisition of these islands and
the resultant loss of land has had upon us Hawaiians.

Land was the central part of our lives, the very foundation of
our culture, the pivotal point of our whole way of life.

The loss of our lands, the forcible overthrow of our Monarch
by a small group of downtown businessmen aided, abetted and support-
ed by the U. S. Commissioner here was the final price we Hawaiians
paid for contact with America.

What were in effect illegal actions by the U. S. Government
in 1893 resulted in addition to everything else in the loss of our
sense of integrity, our national identity and many of those other
crucial psychological elements which sustain a people's essential
sense of worth. In this sense, we Hawaiians share a common heri-
tage with the Third World people who were colonized by foreign powers.
The lasting impact of foreign misrule, exploitation, conquest and
subjection of us was what happened to our minds.

Long have we Hawaiians endured our deprivation and our hurt. Only now are we beginning to really understand what happened to our minds.

The public myth notwithstanding, the so called "aloha spirit" has already turned sour. Where there was unfettered love, there is now hate in our hearts. I am not here to ask, to beg the U. S. for reparations, I am here to demand compensation - small compensation - for great and irreparable injuries done to Hawaiians by America.

A new generation of our people now small in numbers maybe are unprepared to live on their knees any longer. They are learning that they might have to die on their feet if they are to live with themselves. I speak to you as a Hawaiian mother with intent on trying to make you see and understand how I feel - and there are many who share my anger and my feelings so that you will not go away seduced by some of the carefully contrived stage managed hospitality which has been put on for you.

There are two other substantive areas to which I wish to draw your attention:

1) The ALOHA Associations two Claims Bill contain a provision whereby "the Hawaiian Aboriginal Corporation shall pay for obligations incurred by ALOHA, not to exceed 2.5 million dollars."

In a press statement issued on February 7, 1976 (a copy of which is attached to this statement) I have disclosed the failure of the ALOHA Association to abide by its by-laws in the matter of having its accounts audited.
The ALOHA Association should be entitled to reimbursement for legitimate expenses incurred but any reimbursement of any money expended by the ALOHA Association should be contingent upon all of its accounts being audited by a qualified auditor acceptable to the Congress. Such a stipulation must, in the public interest, be written into, and made part of any clause providing for reimbursement.

2) a. I have great difficulty in accepting the principle of having an appointed II-member commission.
   Too often in the past have Hawaiians been sold out by appointed commissions.
   There are great problems in finding a satisfactory means by which the members of the Commission would be selected.
   But it seems that a Commission will once again be foisted on us. Mr. Inouye is apparently insistent on a Commission. Very reluctantly do I accept the need for a Commission.
   b. I believe that all members of the Commission should be Hawaiian "aboriginals."
      I disagree strongly that the Governor of Hawaii and the President should appoint all of the members of the Commission.
      I see no reason why either should be involved in the appointed process at all.
      I have heard no good reasons why the ALOHA Association should have the automatic right to representation on the Commission and I most strongly disagree with 6 members of the Commission being chosen from ALOHA's Board of Directors.
      We should look as far afield within the Hawaiian "aboriginal" community as possible for suitable members of the Commission.
      I think persons like Dr. George Mills, Pinky Thompson, and Judge Richardson and others who have comparable value and who come from the same or similar class within the Hawaiian community should be considered for membership on the Commission but it would be a great and tragic error to limit the commission to such people.
      We must have as broad a cross section of the Hawaiian "aboriginal" community on the Commission including equal representation for the sexes. All of this calls, for the wisdom of Solomon.
      I believe that the most competent organization of Hawaii-
an "aboriginals" which can ensure fair representation on the Commission to be the Coalition of Hawaiian Organizations.

Mrs. Dawn Kahala Wasson
55-570 Kamehameha Hwy.,
Laie, Hawaii  96762

February 5, 1976
STATEMENT OF REV. DARROW AIONA, INSTRUCTOR, LEEWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE

My name is Rev. Darrow Louis Kanakanui Aiona of 50 percent Hawaiian blood, born and raised here in Hawaii. My early upbringing of 25 years was spent in our home on the Waimanalo Hawaiian Homestead in a dilapidated cottage across the street from the blue Pacific Ocean. I am a product of the rehabilitation program for Hawaiians brought forth by the U.S. Congress in the Hawaiian Homestead Act of 1920. I have been educated in Hawaii, New Zealand, and California. I am an Episcopal priest, an instructor at Leeward Community College, Vice President of the organization called The Hawaiians and an elected member of the Hawaii State Board of Education.

There has been much written about the Hawaiians. It must be said that most of this is myth. Therefore, in order to understand our problems, it is necessary to recount some of our history.

Before the Caucasians came to these islands in 1778, we Hawaiians, like those of other island areas in the Pacific, had developed a culture peculiar to ourselves and to our extremely isolated location. Life in such communities was highly localized and stabilized through custom, since the means of livelihood were the resources of land and sea immediately at hand--those of a subsistence economy. The incentives to work and to exchange labor and goods were various and chiefly noneconomic, in the narrow sense. They arose from tradition, from a sense of obligation coming out of one's position in a system of status relationships, especially those of kinship, and from religious considerations and moral motivations of many kinds.

Inherent in this kind of community is an intricate web of obligations and expectations binding all people together, in which mutual hospitality and generosity are central and guiding principles, so deeply rooted in the mores that not only would
one question them, but they need not be "taught." The ready sharing of one's substance in a subsistence economy was not only natural but essential for the survival of the group, and even the stranger was shown generosity. So completely taken for granted was this mutuality in living--of sharing one's abundance with anyone who lacked, and of expecting to be invited to share another's abundance in case of one's own need--that observers and historians, both native and foreigners, on the whole, neglected even to mention it in their published accounts as an organizing principle of life. But caucasians, from the early explorers to modern-day tourists, have been overwhelmed by the spontaneous generosity of the Hawaiians.

Due to isolation, the Hawaiians became susceptible to stimulus of new mores. We were primed for the headlong and disastrous epoch of imitating American mores into which, led by our Alii, we plunged. Studies of modern Hawaii reveal quite clearly, however, that many of the traditional values of Hawaiian culture, sometimes in disguised form, still persist and figure importantly in life today. This can be better seen in the sharp contrast between the Hawaiians and most of the immigrant groups with respect to the role of mutuality and reciprocity as controlling principles of life.

If there is any basis for characterizing the Hawaiians, ancient or modern, as a simple folk, it is a consequence of a life organization centered exclusively or predominantly around the principles appropriate to the family and primary-group relations. If we descendants of aboriginal Hawaiians are unique, among the peoples of Hawaii, it is in fact that so many of us have refused to concern ourselves with the task of combining and reconciling the conflicting roles of calculating tradesmen and obliging kinsmen. Aloha is a quality found in our primary-group experiences, and is the means by which man acquires the capacities that we think are most truly human--of entering imaginatively into the experience of others and thus learning to
be compassionate, sensitive, and loving. We are therefore a noncompetitive, family-centered, life-enjoying people.

How to reconcile the dominant emphasis on the competitive "success psychology" of the West with our central values of mutuality and sharing in the Hawaiian communal tradition is, however, a dilemma to which no satisfactory solution has yet been found. The acceptance of the basic values of the traditional Hawaiian culture brings disfavor from the larger community for violating its canons, whereas conformity to these canons involves an inevitable loss of self and communal integrity. For the immigrant peasants and their children, the prior experience within a trading economy and the incorporation of some of its requirements within their traditional culture made the tension between the old and the new far less acute.

The problems in our communities sometimes become hopelessly complicated between the American standards of private property, individual enterprise, and foresight in budgetary planning, and the Hawaiian traditions of generosity, especially as they relate to property and sex.

The composite record of the Hawaiians, judged by Western criteria, is similarly ambivalent. The proportion of illegitimate births, for example, has been roughly twice as high among the Hawaiians during the 1960s as in the entire population of the State, and among the full Hawaiians it has been between three or four times as high as among the part-Hawaiians. Similarly, recent studies of juvenile and adult delinquency, as defined by Western law, indicate a wholly disproportionate share originating among the Hawaiians. In the early 1960's, 45 percent of all children under the care of the Honolulu Juvenile Court were Hawaiians, most of the boys for crimes against property and the girls for sex offenses. Just a few years later—1964, 57 percent of all the male inmates and 48 percent of the female inmates from
the entire State at the Youth Correctional Facility were of Hawaiian ancestry. Whereas, all the Hawaiian youngsters of a comparable age constituted only 21 percent of the total population. At about the same time, 42 percent of the adult inmates of Hawaii's correctional facilities were of Hawaiian ancestry, which was more than three times the Hawaiian proportion of the adult population.

The records reveal, on the other hand, that the rate of mental breakdown, as measured by the admissions to the State Hospital, is especially low among Hawaiians, as compared with other ethnic groups. It has been suggested that the Hawaiians tend to act out their aggressions rather than to turn them inwards. Similarly our suicide rate is low.

Our problem might be stated in summary as a conflict growing out of contact with the foreigners and their civilization. Hawaiian Aloha, with its hospitality and generosity toward both kinfolk and strangers, so greatly extolled a "Christian virtue" to be preserved and encouraged, is the basis for reproof and punishment when applied too freely with respect to private property and sex. Western civilization as a whole, of course, reflects the same inherent ambiguity between its peasant tradition of mutual aid and helpfulness and the competitive and individualistic incentives which modern mass society has so greatly intensified. But the net result to our Hawaiian people has been 100 years of negative reinforcement in terms of self-image.

The other part of the Hawaiian dilemma is the loss of any distinctive ethnic heritage by so many of our people. With a mounting proportion each year of persons with only a fraction of Polynesian blood in their veins, the probability of their preserving an authentic Hawaiian culture seems likely to diminish and the sense of what is Hawaiian tends to become less and less distinct. Quite understandably many of us who retain a consciousness of ourselves as Hawaiians, regardless of other
group identifications, feel a distinct loss in self-esteem as a result of what we see happening to us.

Another important source of increasing despondency has been the loss by many Hawaiians of title to their lands--our one certain source of livelihood. The old Kuleana's large blocks of land, were never subdivided. No one person owned them or had a single interest in them. There was no concept in old Hawaii of private property. But the pressure during the first half of the 19th century by American and European settlers resulted in the subdividing of land titles in Hawaii at a much earlier date--1846--than elsewhere in the Pacific and at a time when the natives were wholly unprepared to deal with land in terms of buying and selling. The discovery by the close of the century that the ownership and control of most of the best agricultural lands had shifted into the hands of caucasians through a system legalized by a native administration only intensified their dismay at having been misguided by their Alii--ruling class--and betrayed by those they had befriended. Many Hawaiians have felt that the Alii failed us. They did not provide the leadership that was needed during a period of social upheaval and change.

The net results of the above are: Delinquency and low social rating, continuing ineffectiveness of governmental agencies set up to "rehabilitate" the Hawaiians, and inadequate justice.

Hawaii's radical young nationalist movement, which began in the summer of 1970 exhibited a strident, exaggerated version of a concern expressed by Hawaiians of all ages and ideologies. The movement was based not only upon a powerful new sense of cultural identity and of economic deprivation but also upon a grade ecological anxiety that may be typical of threatened islanders. By focusing on Hawaii's severe land problems, the various organizations within this new movement have been making an important third world analysis of the states' power structure. The
nationalist movement continues to grow in numbers and identity.

One such organization, Kokua Hawaii, had been active in pioneering ethnic studies programs and community study groups in Hawaiian land problems. By re-evaluating the events of Hawaiian history and reawakening interest in the rich cultural heritage, its members have begun creating a new historical consciousness essential to any people's struggle for decolonization. In the school year of 1971-72, some 1,000 students signed up for the University of Hawaii's ethnic studies programs--triple the enrollment of the previous year, many of them in Hawaiian language and culture. And the Department of Education has resumed teaching Hawaiian in the State's public schools. Finally, we have had the development of various Hawaiian organizations--The Hawaiians, Home Rule, the Congress of Hawaiian People, and finally the organization called ALOHA--Association of Aboriginal Lands of Hawaiian Ancestry. The ALOHA group has spearheaded the Hawaiian people's attempt to ask for land reparations for the Hawaiian people. Out of all this has come from Congress, our honored Senator Daniel Inouye's concern for the plight of our aboriginal people.

So I come before this honored body to lend my voice to a growing chorus of Hawaiians and Hawaiians-at-heart, pleading our cause before you. I ask you, as our Alii Liliuokalani once did before your honorable body the Congress, to bring justice to our land. I ask you to hear our voices and help us to initiate the process which we hope will bring about a reversal of many problems dealing with Hawaiian people. In the past the successive governments set out to assimilate Hawaiian culture into a transplanted one. Thankfully, the policies failed because something loosely referred to as a Hawaiianess-expressions of a feeling of Hawaiian identity survived.

Now, we seek to launch an experiment, seeking to promote actively the development of more than one culture in the land. In the case of Hawaiianess, this direc-
tion springs from the resilience of Hawaiian things, guilt on the part of newcomers for attempts to unsuccessfully suffocate these things, and a recognition that people with security of identity in one culture are more easily able to integrate with another.

Especially for our younger Hawaiians, the conscious promotion of Hawaiian things could mean some steps back into a Hawaiian world to compensate for movements over several generations into a western-defined society. I believe the Hawaiians have already clarified the thought that we want to retain our identity and we want to be able to enjoy those good things which have been given by western culture. But we also want to retain the values that have been part of our culture and which we believe are good in present circumstances. It's not just a question of wanting to be militant or wanting to set up separate things in order to live out our lives in a vacuum of separateness. I am constantly reminded of the number of non-Hawaiians who know better than I do what is good for me, a Hawaiian. It is about time we were allowed to think for ourselves and to say which things we want and why we want them. I no longer want to be a foreigner in my own land. Thank you for allowing me to help point out to you our Hawaiian direction. Education, after all is a direction, not a destination.
My name is Myron B. Thompson, and I am a Trustee of the Kamehameha Schools/Bernice Pauahi Bishop Estate. In addition I am a member of a Native American minority group, the Hawaiians.

Thus I am representative of a heritage, very proud of its past; very distressed by its present; very concerned about its future. For while it is true that some of the fellow inheritors of our great heritage have succeeded in our enterprising society as lawyers, as physicians, as businessmen, as artists, as other professionals, as people—far too many have not.

It really doesn’t matter at which index of social and economic deprivation one looks— we Hawaiians are far too heavily represented there in terms of our numbers. Too many are on welfare, too many are in prison, too many young are catalogued as delinquents, too many have great educational deficiencies, too many exist at poverty’s edge in the middle of hopelessness. (Please see Appendix-I for details.)

And there is a great and terrible irony at the center of all this. For you see at one time the Hawaiians owned all of the land on which the modern prosperous economy of Hawaii has been built.

And our loss was to a large degree the gain of the
GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES, ALBEIT AN UNLAWFUL GAIN. FOR REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES, ACTING WITHOUT THE AUTHORITY OR KNOWLEDGE OF THE CONGRESS OR PRESIDENT, ASSISTED IN THE OVERTHROW OF OUR LAWFUL GOVERNMENT. THIS IN A FEW YEARS LED TO ANNEXATION WHICH IN TURN LED TO THE UNITED STATES ACQUIRING GREAT ACREAGE THAT HAD BEEN THE PROPERTY OF THE HAWAIIAN PEOPLE.

WE ASKED FOR REDRESS BACK IN 1893. THUS FAR THERE HAS BEEN NO RESPONSE. IN EIGHTY-TWO YEARS ONE WOULD THINK THAT EVEN A COMMITTEE MIGHT BE ABLE TO WRITE A REPORT. THUS YOU WILL UNDERSTAND THAT WE MAY BE A BIT IMPATIENT.

HOWEVER, I AM AWARE THAT THERE WELL MAY BE PRESENT MEMBERS OF CONGRESS UNAWARE OF THIS UNHAPPY BLIGHT ON THE NATION'S HISTORICAL RECORD. FOR THIS REASON I ENDORSE THE RESOLUTION YOU HAVE INTRODUCED CALLING FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE HAWAIIAN ABORIGINAL CLAIMS SETTLEMENT STUDY COMMISSION.

BUT I WOULD URGE THAT THE COMMISSION NOT TARRY IN ITS WORK. REDRESS IS LONG OVERDUE. UNLESS IT COMES WITH SOME SPEED IT WILL BE DIFFICULT FOR US TO CONTINUE TO BELIEVE THAT UA MAU KE EA O KA AINA I KA PONO -- THE LIFE OF THE LAND IS PERPETUATED IN RIGHTEOUSNESS.

MYRON B. THOMPSON
P. O. BOX 3466
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96801
PHONE 531-1684
APPENDIX-I

Recent Partial Socio-Economic Data Relative to the Hawaiian and Part-Hawaiian Population in Hawaii

1. Hawaiian Population

In 1853, of 73,137 persons inhabiting the Hawaiian Islands, 70,036 or 95.8% were pure Hawaiians. An additional 983 were part-Hawaiians for a total of 71,019 Hawaiians.

In 1970, if we are to use the U.S. Census count, there are only 71,274 or only 55 more Hawaiians in the count.

However, in 1972, the Hawaii Health Surveillance Program Survey provided us with a count of 142,154 part Hawaiians and 8,173 pure Hawaiians for a total of 150,337 Hawaiians out of a state population of 787,051 people. While this figure is based on percentage application to the universe from a sampling, it appears to be valid due to the adequate size of the sample (21,924 persons) and the "acceptable" criteria established for ethnic identification, i.e., self and visual determinations.

The wide range of the estimated Hawaiian population, from 9.3% to 19.1% confirms the need for a more complete and reliable study.

2. Hawaiians on Welfare

In March 1974, 26,532 adults and children assisted by public welfare in Hawaii were of Hawaiian or part-Hawaiian descent (this figure represents only an extrapolation of 14,4929 "not reported" category).

Each Hawaiian received an average of $88.75 or a total equivalent of $18,705,060 for money payments on a yearly basis.

In addition, medical care expenses totalled an estimated $10,040,000.

Thus, it is believed that the grand total of money and medical payments for part-Hawaiians and Hawaiians totalled $28,745,060 for the 1973-1974 fiscal year.

This was 27.6% of $104,025,080 spent by the Department for all public assistance recipients during 1973-74.

No administrative costs or staff salaries are included in the above figures.
3. Hawaiians Involved in the Criminal Justice System

On Oahu, the principal and most populated island, 23,983 persons were arrested in 1974 for all categories of criminal offenses. 2,367 or 9.9% of them were Hawaiians and part-Hawaiians (2,121 adults and 246 juveniles).

In 1973, the following numbers of Hawaiians were incarcerated:

- 203 or 49.5% of 409 adults incarcerated were Hawaiian or part-Hawaiian.

- 33 or 53% of 53 boys committed to juvenile correctional facilities were Hawaiian or part-Hawaiian.

- 37 or 54% of 69 girls committed were part-Hawaiians.

- Of 22 boys incarcerated for committing crimes against persons, 14 or 63.6% were part-Hawaiians.

- Of 152 boys incarcerated for committing crimes against property, 80 or 52.6% were Hawaiians.

- Of 4 girls incarcerated for committing crimes against the person, 3 or 75% were part-Hawaiians.

- Of 22 girls incarcerated for committing crimes against property, 12 or 54.5% were part-Hawaiians.

The contrast of the low arrest rate and the high incarceration rate may indicate that Hawaiians and part-Hawaiians who clash with society's laws do so in more violent, serious, or repeated offenses (felonies). It also may indicate prejudicial treatment on the part of the courts.

Of 509 persons listed on parole in the State of Hawaii, 218 or 42.8% are Hawaiians (15 Hawaiians, 203 part-Hawaiians).

4. Hawaiians in Education

Estimates several years ago by the Liliuokalani Trust survey indicate that while 30% of the children in school were of Hawaiian extraction, only 5% of the graduating students are Hawaiian or part-Hawaiian.
Even allowing for a large margin of error for lack of more precise figures, it is evident that an alarmingly large number of Hawaiian and part-Hawaiian children are dropping out of school. The large percentage of Hawaiians and part-Hawaiians is no doubt accentuated by the fact that many, if not most, of the affluent families send their children to private schools -- and Hawaiian families are generally not included in this group to any significant degree. A review of the ethnic breakdown in the University system reveals that for the 1970-71 school year, only 4.4% of the student body at the Manoa Campus (Honolulu) and 8.4% in Hilo were Hawaiians. This is a matter of serious concern and is indicative of difficulty that the Hawaiian has had in adjusting to the educational system as a way to prepare for a more significant role in our society.

5. Hawaiians in Public Housing

37% or 1,994 of the 5,407 public housing units available in the State are occupied by Hawaiian and part-Hawaiian families. This means that of 18,898 persons living in public housing, the largest racial group, 6,979 persons, is of some Hawaiian extraction. Of public welfare recipients in public housing, Hawaiians and part-Hawaiians are the largest racial group (35.77%).

6. Hawaiian Ownership of Land

From the Great Mahele of 1848, Hawaiian ownership of land has moved from 100% to 1.4% in Hawaiian Home Lands and perhaps even less in private ownership outside of the major estates.

"The Great Mahele" instituted the concept and system of private land ownership in Hawaii and divided the lands between the King, the Chiefs, government, and the common people. For the first time, land became a commodity which could be bought and sold.
FOR RELEASE: April 13, 1981

PRESIDENT REAGAN EXCEEDED HIS CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY IN DISMISSING NATIVE HAWAIIANS STUDY COMMISSION MEMBERS, GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE DECLARES

Honolulu, Hawaii--In a report provided at the request of Sen. Spark Matsunaga (D-Hawaii), the General Accounting Office (GAO), the investigative arm of the Congress, has found that President Ronald Reagan did not have the authority to dismiss the nine-member Native Hawaiians Study Commission. The GAO further stated that the President has no authority over the activities of the Commission. The finding is based on the GAO's opinion that the Study Commission's functions are exclusively legislative and not executive.

Matsunaga said that he would consult with Sen. Inouye and Congressmen Akaka and Hefetel as to what action the Hawaii Congressional delegation would wish to take in the light of the GAO report. Matsunaga suggested several alternative actions which could be taken: First, the President could be presented with the report and requested to recall his letters of termination sent to Commission members earlier appointed by President Carter, and reconstitute the Commission; second, the Congressional delegation could in the alternative inform the President that no challenge of his authority to dismiss the Commissioners would be raised, if he would proceed expeditiously to appoint new Commissioners to get the Commission in operation. If the latter alternative was pursued, the Carter appointees would be asked to submit courtesy resignations to remove any cloud of illegality of the new Commission.

Matsunaga had asked the GAO to investigate the dismissal of the nine commissioners appointed by former President Jimmy Carter shortly after they were fired in early March. In its ten-page report, the GAO said:

"An examination of the pertinent provisions of the Native Hawaiians Study Commission shows that, except for its selection, the Commission is independent of control or influence by the President and that its function is essentially as an aid to the legislative power in that it is to gather information and make recommendations to the Congress.

"Your remarks on the floor of the Senate during consideration of (the amendment providing for a Native Hawaiians Study Commission) clearly support the view that the essential purpose of the Native Hawaiians Study Commission is to provide the Congress with information which would provide a basis for taking appropriate action with regard to Native Hawaiians..."
"Since the Native Hawaiians Study Commission's duties and responsibilities are to aid the Congress by providing information on the needs and concerns of Native Hawaiians and to make recommendations thereon and since (the law) does not provide the President with the authority to direct the action of the Commissioners, it appears that the Commissioners are not 'purely executive officers' such as those over whom the President would enjoy an unrestricted power of removal."

Article II of the U. S. Constitution gives Congress authority to create federal offices and to establish a method of appointment, but the Constitution is silent regarding the President's power to remove civil officers. In Myers v. United States, a 1903 case, the Supreme Court held that as Chief Executive the President had the power to remove administrative officers. Since then, however, this power has been restricted, although no general rule has been established. In Humphrey's Executor v. United States (1935), the Court considered the President's removal, for political reasons, of a member of the Federal Trade Commission. The law creating the Federal Trade Commission provided for appointment of the Commissioners by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. It also provided that Commissioners could be removed for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office. In its decision, the Court stated that it was the congressional intent to create a body which would be independent of executive authority and free to exercise its judgment without the "hinderance" of any other official or department of the government. The Court found that in making reports and investigations for the Congress, the Federal Trade Commission acts like a legislative agency, and under its authority to act as a master in chancery, it acts like an agency of the judiciary. The Court stated that Congress clearly had the authority to create quasi-legislative or quasi-judicial agencies to discharge duties independent of executive control, and to forbid the removal of commissioners except for cause.

In Weiner v. United States (1958), the Court considered the President's removal, for political reasons, of a member of the War Claims Commission established by the War Claims Act of 1948. In view of the legislative establishment of the War Claims Commission as an adjudicatory body "not subject to review by any other official of the United States or by any other Court..." the Supreme Court held that the Constitution did not give the President authority to remove any of the Commissioners on the basis that he desired his own appointees to serve and that such power could not be implied simply because the War Claims Act was silent on the matter of removal.

The GAO also cited one of its own opinions, issued in 1979, in which it held that the National Commission on Air Quality was a legislative rather than an executive branch agency, despite the fact that 7 of its 11 members were appointed by the President. The basis of the 1979 decision was the fact that the Air Quality Commission's reporting and advisory responsibilities were exclusively to Congress and it had no regulatory or executive powers.

The President's dismissal of the original commissioners and his failure to re-establish the Native Hawaiians Study Commission has thwarted the purpose of the law which was enacted in December 1980, Matsunaga said.
FOR RELEASE: June 4, 1981

MATSUNAGA BLASTS PRESIDENTIAL AIDE WHO SAYS NATIVE HAWAIIANS STUDY COMMISSION "RIDICULOUS" AND HE'S "IN NO HURRY TO FILL IT"

Washington, D.C. -- Sen. Spark Matsunaga (D-Hawaii) reacted angrily today to press reports that a high-ranking Presidential aide said last night that the Native Hawaiians Study Commission is "ridiculous" and that he "is in no hurry to fill it."

According to today's Washington Post, White House Personnel Director E. Pendleton James made the remarks to a group of prominent Republicans attending a Hoover Institution reception in the Nation's capital last night.

"Thousands of positions on federal advisory boards and commissions remain unfilled," James was quoted as saying. "They run from the substantive to the ridiculous--you know, the Advisory Committee on Native Hawaiians. I'm in no hurry to fill that one. Unless you want a trip to Hawaii."

"It appears now that the White House has no intentions of naming replacements for the Commissioners who were appointed by President Carter and fired by President Reagan," Matsunaga angrily surmised. "I was willing to wait for President Reagan's appointments, but this calls for new strategy."

Last month, Matsunaga released a report prepared by the General Accounting Office, the investigative arm of Congress, which indicated that President Reagan may have exceeded his constitutional authority in firing the nine Native Hawaiian Study Commission members who were appointed by former President Carter in January.

"At the time," said Matsunaga, "I was warned by other leading political figures in Hawaii that I should not take any further action on that report or try to bring it to President Reagan's attention, because he was about to appoint a new commission. I was told that the new appointments would be made by May 1, 1981.

"Obviously, the individuals who claimed that were being misled down the political primrose path," said the Hawaii Democratic Senator. "As far as the Native Hawaiians are concerned, the White House action is just another broken promise.

"I think that the other three members of the congressional delegation will now join me in taking action to assure the reappointment of a Native Hawaiians Study Commission," he said.

-more-
Matsunaga was the first member of Congress to introduce a Native Hawaiian Claims Settlement Act in 1974. In 1977, he joined Sen. Daniel K. Inouye (D-Hawaii) in introducing legislation providing for a study of the claims issue. That measure was passed by the Senate but failed to pass the House during the 95th Congress. Last year, the entire Hawaii congressional delegation backed a revised study commission bill providing for a study of Native Hawaiian needs and concerns. Matsunaga, as a member of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, attached the bill as an amendment to legislation providing for the establishment of Kalaupapa National Historical Park, referred to his Committee and it again passed the Senate unanimously. This time, the House agreed to accept the Senate-passed amendment and the measure was signed into law in late December 1980. In January, the nine-member study commission was appointed by President Jimmy Carter, and funds for the initial operating expenses of the Commission were allocated by the Senate from its contingent fund. On March 12, 1981, President Reagan dismissed the study commission members.

The General Accounting Office report, which Matsunaga received in April, said that since the commission's functions apparently are exclusively legislative, the President does not have an unrestricted right to fire the commissioners.

"The study which Congress authorized is not 'ridiculous,'" said Matsunaga. "It would explore issues arising from the 1893 overthrow of the Hawaiian kingdom by foreigners assisted by American Armed Forces and it would help Congress determine whether Native Hawaiians should be compensated in some way for the loss of their lands and government. Similar studies were conducted prior to the enactment of the Alaskan Native Claims Settlement Act, and the claims of American Indians have also been studied. The Hawaiians are the only aboriginal people in this country whose claims have not been redressed or at least considered.

"Moreover," pointed out Matsunaga, "provisions in the law providing for the study relative to compensation of the nine commissioners are 'standard' and applicable to numerous federal commissions and advisory boards.

"To describe the commission's mission in Hawaii as a 'junket,' as the White House previously did, is a slap in the face to all the people of Hawaii, not just the Native Hawaiians," said Matsunaga. "To suggest that unqualified people be appointed to this important commission just so they can go to Hawaii is an insult."
MATSUNAGA REQUESTS FUNDS FOR THE NATIVE HAWAIANS STUDY COMMISSION

Washington, D.C.--Sen. Spark Matsunaga (D-Hawaii) today asked the Senate Appropriations Committee to provide funds for the Native Hawaiians Study Commission.

In a letter addressed to Appropriations Committee Chairman Mark O. Hatfield (R-Ore.) and the members of the Committee, Matsunaga said that initial operating funds for the study commission could be included in a Continuing Appropriations Resolution for Fiscal Year 1982 which is now awaiting the Committee's consideration.

"Continuing Resolutions" are frequently passed by Congress at the end of a fiscal year when action is still pending on major appropriations bills. In this case, the Resolution would allow federal departments and agencies to continue spending at the Fiscal Year 1982 level until new appropriations for Fiscal Year 1982 are passed by Congress and signed into law by the President. None of the thirteen major appropriations bills for Fiscal Year 1982 have been enacted, although Fiscal Year 1982 starts on October 1, Matsunaga observed.

Matsunaga said that he expects that the Native Hawaiians Study Commission will need at least $1 million for its two-year study.

"An initial appropriation of $100,000 in the Continuing Resolution would enable the Commission to equip an office and begin hiring a staff," said the Hawaii lawmaker. "Additional funds will be sought in the First Supplemental Appropriations Bill for Fiscal Year 1982 and during the Fiscal Year 1983 appropriations process," he added.

Matsunaga is the outgoing chairman of a similar study commission established to examine proposals for a National Peace Academy.

"On the basis of my experience, I think that it is critically important for the Commission to hire a good staff and to set up its administrative procedures right at the beginning," he said. "I believe that the Appropriations Committee will agree and that initial operating funds for the Commission will be appropriated by Congress."
Under the authorizing legislation, the Native Hawaiians Study Commission is required to publish a draft report within one year after the date of its first meeting. The Commission's final report, which by law must be published nine months after the draft, will be submitted to the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources and the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

"The clock starts running as soon as the Commission holds its first meeting," said Matsunaga, who is a member of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee and was a principal sponsor of the legislation providing for establishment of the study commission.

Following submission of its final report to Congress, the study commission has a 60-day termination period. During this period and after the Commission disbands, its members may be called to testify before the two congressional committees on the study commission's recommendations.
WASHINGTON, D.C.—The Native Hawaiians Study Commission would be authorized to accept gifts and volunteer services under legislation introduced today by Sen. Spark M. Matsunaga (D-Hawaii), with Sen. Daniel K. Inouye (D-Hawaii) as cosponsor.

Matsunaga, the principal sponsor of the 1980 law which established the Study Commission, said that his bill would enable the Commission to accept offers of rent-free office space in Hawaii and to accept the services of volunteers, pending the appointment of a paid staff.

"The Commission was advised that without such legislation, acceptance of volunteer services and other contributions in cash and in kind would be a violation of the federal Anti-Deficiency Act," explained the Hawaii lawmaker.

The bill is not a substitute for a regular appropriation, Matsunaga emphasized, but it would enable the Commission to carry out its legislated responsibilities with the assistance of the private sector, until such time as federal funds are appropriated.

Under the law, the Commission is required to publish a draft report within one year after its first meeting— which was held on September 23, 1981.

"It is the fervent hope of the Hawaii congressional delegation, the members of the Native Hawaiians Study Commission, and the people of Hawaii that an adequate appropriation will be provided for the Commission in the near future," said Matsunaga in a Senate floor speech. "The enactment of the Native Hawaiians Study Commission Act was eagerly awaited by the people of Hawaii for many years. This is the first time that the federal government has agreed to examine the needs and concerns of the Hawaiian people since the overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy in 1893. There is great interest in the Commission's activities, and, needless to say, the prospect of further delays in this long overdue study is most disappointing."

The Native Hawaiians Study Commission was established by Congress under the provisions of Public Law 96-565, enacted on December 20, 1980. The law provides for the appointment of a
nine-member study commission, mandated by Congress to examine the culture, needs and concerns of Native Hawaiians. The Commission would then report its findings to Congress and make recommendations with respect to any new legislation or amendments to existing law which might be required to meet the needs of Native Hawaiians.

In January of this year, a nine-member study commission was appointed by President Carter, but the commissioners were dismissed by President Reagan in March. It was not until September of this year that a new commission was appointed by President Reagan, after the Fiscal Year 1982 appropriations bill for the Interior Department was well on its way to final passage. To date, the Administration has not requested funds for the Commission's operations. In November, Commission Chairman Kina'u Kamali'i asked Matsunaga to introduce legislation which would permit the Commission to accept contributions of money and service.

-30-