[Roll No. 996]

AYES—291

Abercrombie	Gonzalez	Napolitano
Ackerman	Gordon	Neal (MA)
Alexander	Green, Al	Oberstar
Allen	Green, Gene	Obey
Altmire	Grijalva	Olver
Andrews	Gutierrez	Ortiz
Arcuri	Hall (NY)	Pallone
Baca	Hare	Pascrell
Bachus	Harman	Pastor
Baird	Hastert	Payne
Baldwin	Hastings (FL)	Perlmutter
Barrett (SC)	Hayes	Peterson (MN)
Barrow	Herseth Sandlin	Peterson (PA)
Bean	Higgins	Pickering
Becerra	Hill	Platts
Berkley	Hinchey	Poe
Berman	Hinojosa	Pomeroy
Berry	Hirono	Porter
Biggert	Hobson	Price (NC)
Bishop (GA)	Hodes	Pryce (OH)
Bishop (NY)	Holden	Rahall
Blumenauer	Holt	Ramstad
Bonner	Honda	Rangel
Bono	Hooley	Regula
Boren	Hoyer	Reichert
Boswell	Inglis (SC)	Reynolds
Boucher	Inslee	Richardson
Boustany	Israel	Rodriguez
Boyd (FL)	Jackson (IL)	Rogers (AL)
Boyda (KS)	Jackson-Lee (TX)	Rogers (KY)
Brady (PA)	Jefferson	Roskam
Brady (TX)	Johnson (GA)	Rothman
Braley (IA)	Johnson (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Brown (SC)	Jones (OH)	Ruppersberger
Brown, Corrine	Kagen	Rush
Burgess	Kanjorski	Ryan (OH)
Butterfield	Kaptur	Salazar
Cantor	Kennedy	Sánchez, Linda T.
Capito	Kildee	Sanchez, Loretta
Capps	Kilpatrick	Sarbanes
Capuano	Kind	Saxton
Cardoza	King (NY)	Schakowsky
Carnahan	Kirk	Schiff
Carney	Klein (FL)	Schwartz
Castle	Knollenberg	Scott (GA)
Castor	Kucinich	Scott (VA)
Chandler	LaHood	Serrano
Clarke	Lampson	Sestak
Clay	Langevin	Shays
Cleaver	Lantos	Sherman
Clyburn	Larsen (WA)	Shimkus
Cohen	Larson (CT)	Shuler
Conyers	Latham	Shuster
Costa	LaTourette	Sires
Costello	Lee	Skelton
Courtney	Levin	Slaughter
Cramer	Lewis (GA)	Smith (NJ)
Crowley	Lipinski	Smith (WA)
Cuellar	LoBiondo	Solis
Cummings	Loebsack	Souder
Davis (AL)	Lofgren, Zoe	Space
Davis (IL)	Lowey	Spratt
Davis, David	Lynch	Stark
Davis, Lincoln	Mahoney (FL)	Stupak
Davis, Tom	Maloney (NY)	Sutton
DeFazio	Markey	Tanner
DeGette	Marshall	Tauscher
Delahunt	Matheson	Taylor
DeLauro	Matsui	Terry
Dent	McCarthy (NY)	Thompson (CA)
Dicks	McCollum (MN)	Thompson (MS)
Dingell	McCrery	Tierney
Doggett	McDermott	Towns
Donnelly	McGovern	Tsongas
Doyle	McHugh	Turner
Edwards	McIntyre	Udall (CO)
Ehlers	McNerney	Udall (NM)
Ellison	McNulty	Upton
Ellsworth	Meek (FL)	Van Hollen
Emanuel	Meeks (NY)	Velázquez
Engel	Melancon	Visclosky
English (PA)	Michaud	Walsh (NY)
Eshoo	Miller (MI)	Walz (MN)
Etheridge	Miller (NC)	Wamp
Farr	Miller, George	Wasserman Schultz
Fattah	Mitchell	Waters
Ferguson	Mollohan	Watson
Filner	Moore (KS)	Watt
Fortenberry	Moore (WI)	Waxman
Fossella	Moran (VA)	Weiner
Frank (MA)	Murphy (CT)	Welch (VT)
Frelinghuysen	Murphy, Patrick	Weller
Gerlach	Murphy, Tim	Wexler
Giffords	Murtha	Wicker
Gilchrest	Nadler	Wilson (NM)
Gillibrand	Wolf	Wu
Wilson (SC)	Woolsey	Yarmuth

NOES—122

Aderholt	Forbes	Miller, Gary
Akin	Foxx	Moran (KS)
Bachmann	Franks (AZ)	Musgrave
Baker	Gallegly	Myrick
Bartlett (MD)	Garrett (NJ)	Neugebauer
Barton (TX)	Gohmert	Nunes
Bilirakis	Goode	Paul
Bishop (UT)	Goodlatte	Pearce
Blackburn	Granger	Pence
Blunt	Graves	Petri
Boehner	Hall (TX)	Pitts
Boozman	Hastings (WA)	Price (GA)
Broun (GA)	Heller	Putnam
Brown-Waite, Ginny	Hensarling	Radanovich
Buchanan	Herger	Rehberg
Burton (IN)	Hoekstra	Renzi
Buyer	Hulshof	Rogers (MI)
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Rohrabacher
Camp (MI)	Jones (NC)	Ros-Lehtinen
Campbell (CA)	Jordan	Royce
Cannon	Keller	Ryan (WI)
Carter	King (IA)	Sali
Chabot	Kingston	Schmidt
Coble	Kline (MN)	Sensenbrenner
Cole (OK)	Kuhl (NY)	Sessions
Conaway	Lamborn	Shadegg
Crenshaw	Lewis (KY)	Simpson
Cubin	Linder	Smith (NE)
Davis (KY)	Lucas	Smith (TX)
Deal (GA)	Lungren, Daniel E.	Stearns
Diaz-Balart, L.	Mack	Sullivan
Diaz-Balart, M.	Manzullo	Tancredo
Doolittle	McCarthy (CA)	Thornberry
Drake	McCaul (TX)	Tiahrt
Dreier	McCotter	Tiberi
Duncan	McHenry	Walberg
Emerson	McKeon	Walden (OR)
Everett	McMorris Rodgers	Weldon (FL)
Fallin	Mica	Westmoreland
Feeney	Miller (FL)	Whitfield
Flake		Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—19

Bilbray	Issa	Shea-Porter
Carson	Jindal	Snyder
Cooper	Johnson, E. B.	Wilson (OH)
Culberson	Lewis (CA)	Wynn
Davis (CA)	Marchant	Young (AK)
Gingrey	Reyes	
Hunter	Ross	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised they have 2 minutes to record their vote.

□ 1208

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 505, NATIVE HAWAIIAN GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION ACT OF 2007

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 764 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 764

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 505) to express the policy of the United States regarding the United States relationship with Native Hawaiians and to provide a process for the recognition by the United States of the Native Hawaiian governing entity. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions of the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, and any amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources; (2) the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules, if offered by Representative Flake of Arizona or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order (except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI) or demand for division of the question, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for ten minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. During consideration of H.R. 505 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLUMENAUER). The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Washington, my good friend, Representative HASTINGS. All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous materials into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 764 provides a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 505, the Native Hawaiian Government Reorganization Act of 2007. The resolution provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. The rule makes in order an amendment offered by Representative FLAKE of Arizona. This was the only amendment submitted to the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to speak for long about this legislation other than to express my sincere hope that this body will move forward expeditiously with its passage. Our Nation is greater because of its vast diversity and the living narrative of all those who contribute to it. However, make no mistake, our government has treated a number of cultural communities in a less than favorable manner.

Mr. Speaker, we are not here to debate the particulars of our Nation's dealings with Native Hawaiians. However, it is only right that all indigenous people should have a right to determine how they should interact with our government.

As my good friend from Hawaii, Representative NEIL ABERCROMBIE, mentioned in the Rules Committee, the current system of land tenure for Native Hawaiians is organized under the Office of Hawaiian Affairs. This State agency does not meet the needs of Native Hawaiians in the most effective manner as it is currently arranged. What the community demands and needs is an entity in which the Native Hawaiians can be effectively engaged. Rightfully, this legislation will give Native Hawaiians an opportunity to create such an entity and empower themselves with self-determination.

I do want to make note of my concern that there are some in this body who are seeking to create controversy where none exists. Contrary to what some say today, this bill does not allow gaming on Native Hawaiian lands, nor does it lay the groundwork for gaming. On the contrary, it takes the necessary steps to put Native Hawaiians on the necessary path to control their destiny.

Additionally, similar legislation has passed the House in the 106th Congress and was reported out of the Natural Resources Committee in both the 107th and 109th Congresses. Unfortunately, the measure was never taken any further until today.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides the appropriate framework for debate on this bipartisan legislation, which is the culmination of many years of negotiation. I have been in this body, and I have seen NEIL ABERCROMBIE, and now MAZIE HIRONO, and before, Patsy Mink, work actively on this particular legislation.

The lack of amendments submitted to the Rules Committee for this legislation is a testament to years of bipartisan collaboration. It is only right that we bring this legislation to the full floor today in this manner.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend and namesake from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

□ 1215

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the underlying legislation, offered in good faith by my friend and colleague from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE), would create a process, and I want to emphasize ''process,'' because that is what this is, for establishing and recognizing a Native Hawaiian government entity that would be empowered to act on behalf of its members with the State and Federal Government.

However, Mr. Speaker, as the Wall Street Journal noted in 2005, the practical effect of granting this status to self-identified Native Hawaiians would be to allow this new class of American citizens to declare, and I quote again from the Wall Street Journal, ''complete legal and territorial independence from the United States and the establishment of a Hawaiian nation-state.''

Mr. Speaker, before this statement is dismissed out of hand as a completely unbelievable statement dreamed up by the editorial board of the Wall Street Journal, I should mention that they were not the ones that were making this claim. They were merely reporting on a statement made by the State Office of Hawaiian Affairs, which first acknowledged this fact.

In addition, a recent statement made by the U.S. Civil Rights Commission raised concerns that this legislation, and, again, I quote from the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, ''would discriminate on the basis of race or national origin and further subdivide American people into discrete subgroups according to various degrees of privilege.''

Despite the best efforts of this legislation's advocates to compare Native Americans with Native American tribes who govern reservations and often live on them, this legislation would make it possible for our next-door neighbors in Hawaii to suddenly coexist under different legal regimes, a clear violation of the 14th amendment of the Constitution's equal protection clause.

Mr. Speaker, because this legislation would grant broad governmental powers to a racially defined group, to include all living descendants. The new Native Hawaiians created by this bill would need no geographic, political or cultural connection to Hawaii, much less a physical connection to a distinct Native Hawaiian community. As the Federal courts have recently explained, this is problematic. Again, I quote the Federal courts: ''The history of the indigenous Hawaiians is fundamentally different from that of indigenous groups in federally recognized Indian tribes in the continental United States.''

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this legislation raises significant constitutional concerns, which have been raised on other bills this year, namely, H.R. 8345, the Hawaiian Ownership Act of 2007, which the House considered in March of this year. The Hawaiian Township Act initially failed under suspension of the rules because 162 Members of the House recognized, and in 2000, the Supreme Court ruled in Rice v. Cayetano, that the current configuration of Justices would likely strike down the Federal benefits flowing to Native Americans as an unconstitutional racial set-aside, if given the chance.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that there are legitimate constitutional concerns that must be addressed in the underlying Native Hawaiian Government Reorganization Act. I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, that the rule makes in order an amendment to be offered by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona that would attempt to address the constitutional concerns and ensure the underlying legislation complies with the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment of the United States Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to my friend, the distinguished gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), who is an original sponsor of this measure.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule. I thank Chairman SLAUGHTER and Vice Chair MCGOVERN for the rule which fairly gives the only amendment to be filed due consideration pursuant to House rules. I disagree with the amendment because it, if adopted, unnecessarily creates confusion where none exists.

The Native Hawaiian Government Reorganization bill is a good one, the result of over 6 years of fine-tuning and negotiations, including significant compromises with the Department of Justice, Department of the Interior, and the Office of Management and Budget to conceive a law that should be approved by all persons concerned with the welfare of Native Hawaiians.

This bill is supported by the Republican Governor of the State of Hawaii, the Hawaii State legislature, the American Bar Association, the National Congress of American Indians, the National Education Association, the NAACP, League of United Latin American Citizens, and dozens of other civil rights, professional associations and unions.

I will enter into the RECORD a list of all supporters of this measure, as well as letters of support from the Governor of the State of Hawaii, Linda Lingle; the American Bar Association; National Congress of American Indians; and the Japanese American Citizens League, and thank them for their wholehearted support.

Mr. Speaker, let me close by quoting a sentence from the letter from the National Congress of American Indians, which is of particular relevance to the proposed amendment to be offered. ''To invoke the equal protection or due process clause of the Constitution in this context, as some of the legislation's critics attempt to do, is a perversion of what those clauses were intended to do. Those submitting this argument are using the very cornerstones of justice and fairness in our democracy to deny equal protection to one group of indigenous people.''

Mr. Speaker, I urge this body to adopt the rule so we may get on to the merits of this important legislation that will at long last afford the Native Hawaiian people self-determination and self-governance long given to other indigenous people of the United States but denied to Native Hawaiians.

S. 310/H.R. 505: NATIVE HAWAIIAN GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION ACT—TO EXPRESS THE POLICY OF THE U.S. REGARDING THE U.S. RELATIONSHIP WITH NATIVE HAWAIIANS AND TO PROVIDE A PROCESS FOR THE RECOGNITION BY THE U.S. OF THE NATIVE HAWAIIAN GOVERNING ENTITY

STANDING TOGETHER FOR JUSTICE

The following groups, entities and individuals from around the islands and across the Nation have pledged their support for Native Hawaiian self-determination through federal legislation extending a process of official recognition to Native Hawaiians as the indigenous people of Hawai'i, similar to the existing federal policy available to American Indians and Alaska Natives:

Hawai'i organizations & entities

Alu Like, Inc.; Alan M. Arakawa, Mayor, County of Maui; Association of Hawaiian Civic Clubs; Council for Native Hawaiian Advancement; Daughters and Sons of Hawaiian Warriors—Māmakakaua; Hale O Na Ali'i O Hawai'i; Hawaii Carpenters Union; Hawaii Government Employees Association (HGEA); Hawaii State AFL–CIO; Hawai'i State Legislature; and Hawai'i State Teachers' Association.

Hawaiian Homes Commission; Hui Hānai; Hui Kākoʻo ʻĀina Hoʻopulapula; I Mua Group; International Longshore and Warehouse Union (ILWU); Japanese American Citizens League (Honolulu Chapter); Kamehameha Schools; Kamehameha Schools Alumni Association (KSAA); Koʻolaupoko Hawaiian Civic Club; and Kualoa-Heeia Hawaiian Civic Club.

Linda Lingle, Governor, State of Hawai'i; Nānakuli Housing Corporation; National Association of Social Workers (Hawaii Chapter); Native Hawaiian Chamber of Commerce; Native Hawaiian Economic Alliance; Office of Hawaiian Affairs; Royal Order of Kamehameha 1; and State Council of Hawaiian Homestead Associations.

National, regional & international entities

Affiliated Tribes of Northwest Indians (ATNI)—Established in 1953, ATNI represents and advocates for regional, national and specific Tribal concerns. It is comprised of 54 Northwest Tribal governments from Oregon, Idaho, Washington, southeast Alaska, northern California and western Montana.

Alaska Federation of Natives (AFN)—AFN is the largest statewide Native organization in Alaska. It represents over 200 Alaska Native villages, corporations, and associations. AFN's mission is to enhance and promote the cultural, economic, and political voice of the entire Alaska Native community.

American Bar Association (ABA)—The American Bar Association is the largest voluntary professional association in the world. With more than 400,000 members, the ABA provides law school accreditation, continuing legal education, information about the law, programs to assist lawyers and judges in their work, and initiatives to improve the legal system for the public.

Association of Asian Pacific Community Health Organizations (AAPCHO)—AAPCHO is a national association representing community health organizations dedicated to promoting advocacy, collaboration and leadership that improves the health status and access of Asian Americans, Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders within the United States, its territories and freely associated states, primarily through member community health clinics.

Governors' Interstate Indian Council (GIIC)—Represents 21 state Indian Affairs agencies and organizations.

Inter Tribal Council of Arizona (ITCA)—Established in 1952, ITCA is comprised of 19 member tribes and provides a united voice for tribal governments located in the State of Arizona.

Japanese American Citizens League (JACL—National)—JACL is the Nation's oldest and largest Asian Pacific American civil rights organization, with over 24,000 members in 23 states.

Leadership Conference on Civil Rights (LCCR)—LCCR consists of more than 180 national organizations, representing persons of color, women, children, labor unions, individuals with disabilities, older Americans, major religious groups, gays and lesbians and civil liberties and human rights groups.

League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC—National)—With approximately 115,000 members throughout the United States and Puerto Rico, LULAC is the largest and oldest Hispanic organization in the United States.

League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC—California).

Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund (MALDEF)—MALDEF is the leading nonprofit Latino litigation, advocacy and educational outreach institution in the U.S.

Asian American Justice Center (AAJC)—AAJC, formerly the National Asian Pacific American Legal Consortium, is one of the Nation's leading experts on issues of importance to the Asian American community including: affirmative action, anti-Asian violence prevention/race relations, census, immigrant rights, language access, and voting rights.

National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP)—The NAACP is the Nation's oldest and largest civil rights organization. Its half-million adult and youth members throughout the United States and the world are the premier advocates for civil rights in their communities while conducting voter mobilization and monitoring equal opportunity in the public and private sectors.

National Association of Social Workers (NASW)—The National Association of Social Workers represents over 150,000 social workers in the U.S.

National Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans (NCAPA)—NCAPA is a coalition of the Nation's leading Asian Pacific American organizations. It represents the interests of the greater APA community and provides a national voice on APA issues.

National Coalition for Asian Pacific American Community Development (National CAPACD)—National CAPACD's mission is to enhance the capacity and ability of community based organizations to conduct community development activities for the Asian and Pacific Islander American communities.

National Congress of American Indians (NCAI)—NCAI is the Nation's oldest and largest American Indian and Alaska Native organization that represents over 250 member tribes.

National Council of La Raza (NCLR)—NCLR is the largest constituency-based national Hispanic organization, serving all Hispanic nationality groups in all regions of the country. NCLR has over 270 formal affiliates who together serve 40 states, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia—and a broader network of more than 30,000 groups and individuals nationwide—reaching more than three and a half million Hispanics annually.

National Indian Education Association (NIEA)—Established in 1969, NIEA is the largest national Indian organization of American Indian, Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian educators, administrators, parents and students in the United States, providing a forum to discuss and act upon issues affecting the education of indigenous people.

National Organization of Pacific Islanders in America (NOPIA)—NOPIA is dedicated to ensuring the protection of rights and fair treatment of all Pacific Islander Americans through legislative and policy initiatives at all levels of government.

Organization of Chinese Americans (OCA)—OCA is dedicated to securing the rights of Chinese American and Asian American citizens and permanent residents through legislative and policy initiatives at all levels of the government. OCA aims to embrace the hopes and aspirations of the nearly 2 million citizens and residents of Chinese ancestry in the United States as well as to better the lives of the 10 million Asian Americans across the country.

Tribal Education Departments National Assembly (TEDNA)—A membership organization for the Education Departments of American Indian and Alaska Native Tribes.

United South and Eastern Tribes (USET)—USET is an inter-tribal organization that collectively represents its 24 federally recognized member Tribes at the regional and national level. USET is dedicated to promoting Indian leadership, improving the quality of life for American Indians, and protecting Indian rights and natural resources on tribal lands.

Virginia Indian Tribal Alliance For Life (VITAL)—An independent public organization, established to support Virginia Indian Initiatives by funding lobbyist and bipartisan political campaigns which support the needs of Virginia Indians in education, healthcare and economic development.

Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Public Lands Authority—Established by the Constitution of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands to manage and dispose of the public lands for the benefit of the people of the Commonwealth who are of Northern Marianas descent.

National Federation of Filipino American Associations—Hawaii Pacific Region 12 (NaFFAA—HPR 12)—NaFFAA was established in 1997 to promote the welfare and well-being of all Filipinos and Filipino Americans throughout the U.S., and Region 12 is Hawai'i, Guam and Commonwealth of Northern Mariana Islands.

Individual Supporters: Joe Shirley, President, Navajo Nation.

Introducers of S. 310 on 1/17/07: Senator Daniel K. Akaka and Senator Daniel K. Inouye.

S. 310 Co-Sponsors: Senator Maria Cantwell on 1/17/07, Senator Norm Coleman on 1/17/07, Senator Byron L. Dorgan on 1/17/07, Senator Lisa Murkowski on 1/17/07, Senator Gordon H. Smith on 1/17/07, Senator Ted Stevens on 1/17/07, and Senator Christopher J. Dodd on 1/17/07.

Introducers of H.R. 505 on 1/17/07: Representative Neil Abercrombie and Representative Mazie Hirono.

H.R. 505 Co-Sponsors: Delegate Madeleine Z. Bordallo on 2/27/07, Delegate Eni Faleomavaega on 2/27/07, and Representative James P. Moran on 2/27/07.

NATIONAL CONGRESS OF AMERICAN INDIANS,
Washington, DC, October 22, 2007.

Re Support H.R. 505—Native Hawaiian Government Reorganization Act of 2007.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: I am writing on behalf of the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI), the nation's oldest and largest organization of tribal governments, to express our strong support of H.R. 505, the Native Hawaiian Government Reorganization Act of 2007. As this matter has made its way through Congress, the NCAI member tribes have consistently passed resolutions supporting the Native Hawaiian right to self-determination (attached). NCAI and the tribal nations we represent continue to support

Native Hawaiian people in their efforts towards a path to self-determination, and we urge you to do the same by voting in favor of H.R. 505.

H.R. 505 would reaffirm the Native Hawaiian right to self-governance and enable the creation of a process that will lead to self-determination and economic self-sufficiency for Native Hawaiian people. Like all of the nation's indigenous peoples, Native Hawaiians lived on their homelands and governed their own affairs before the first contact with Europeans until the overthrow of the Native Hawaiian government in 1893. Since that time, Native Hawaiians have continued to suffer more than a century of injustice, including neglect and abuse of Native Hawaiian entitlements and civil rights, by the United States.

Like all of the indigenous peoples of the United States, Native Hawaiians deserve the right to determine their own future. The purpose of self-determination is not simply for its own sake. Rather, it is what enables indigenous people to maintain their culture, language, and identity. This is a purpose that all American citizens can support. Congress has consistently supported Native Hawaiian recognition through numerous programs intended to benefit Native Hawaiians along with the other indigenous peoples of the United States. Furthermore, it is a purpose that was recently affirmed by the United Nations in the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, which passed with overwhelming support.

Some critics have misstated the effect of H.R. 505. Let me be clear that this bill, like all legislation impacting tribal governments, concerns U.S. policy toward and relationship with the nation's sovereign, indigenous peoples and is not race-based legislation. The unique legal and political relationship that indigenous Hawaiians have with the United States is like that of all Native Americans and is based on our status as aboriginal people with pre-existing governments with whom the U.S. entered treaties and other agreements. It is this historical, political reality that provides the foundation for the unique relationship that has always existed—and continues to exist today—between the United States and the indigenous people whose homelands fall within the borders of what is now the United States.

The argument that recognition of a Native Hawaiian governing entity would establish a race-based government is antithetical to the very foundation of the United States government's relationship with the indigenous peoples who have inhabited this land from time immemorial—a relationship that has long been recognized by Congress, the federal courts, and the Executive branch. Those making this argument are suggesting that Native Hawaiians should, and indeed must, be treated differently from the other indigenous peoples residing in what is now the United States.

The Native Hawaiian Government Reorganization Act would establish parity for Native Hawaiians with the other indigenous peoples of America. To invoke the equal protection or due process clauses of the Constitution in this context, as some of the legislation's critics attempt to do, is a perversion of what those clauses were intended to do. Those submitting this argument are using the very cornerstones of justice and fairness in our democracy to deny equal treatment to one group of indigenous people.

The Native Hawaiian Government Reorganization Act is consistent with this country's longstanding commitment to preserving the right of indigenous people to continue to exist as peoples. Passage of the bill is a matter of fundamental fairness and will rectify an injustice that has existed for far too long. Its enactment will set Native Hawaiians on the path toward self-determination and self-governance, as is their inherent right. I urge you to support H.R. 505. Please contact myself or Virginia Davis, vdavis@ncai.org or 202–466–7767 with any questions. As always, I thank you for your leadership on this important issue.

Sincerely,

JOE GARCIA,
President.

THE NATIONAL CONGRESS OF AMERICAN INDIANS: RESOLUTION #PHX–03–004

TITLE: SUPPORT FEDERAL LEGISLATION CALLING FOR RECOGNITION OF THE HAWAIIAN NATION AND RETURN OF LAND TO THE HAWAIIAN NATION

Whereas, we, the members of the National Congress of American Indians of the United States, invoking the divine blessing of the Creator upon our efforts and purposes, in order to preserve for ourselves and our descendants the inherent sovereign rights of our Indian nations, rights secured under Indian treaties and agreements with the United States, and all other rights and benefits to which we are entitled under the laws and Constitution of the United States, to enlighten the public toward a better understanding of the Indian people and their way of life, to preserve Indian cultural values, and otherwise promote the health, safety and welfare of the Indian people, do hereby establish and submit the following resolution; and

Whereas, the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI) was established in 1944 and is the oldest and largest national organization of American Indian and Alaska Native tribal governments; and

Whereas, the federal policy affords all Native Americans and Alaska Natives the right to be self-governing within a defined land base; and

Whereas, there is a need for self-government; and

Whereas, the NCAI at its 56th annual session adopted Resolution #99–042, at its 57th annual session adopted Resolution #00–032 and at it 58th annual session adopted Resolution #SPO–01–087, all of which support the sovereign rights of native Hawaiians and recognizes the need to develop a true government-to-government relationship with the Hawaiian nation; and

Whereas, NCAI also adopted the same resolution that the Hawaiian Nation's goal is federal recognition as a sovereign indigenous nation with inherent rights to self-determination and self-governance.

Now therefore be it resolved, that the NCAI does hereby support federal legislation calling for recognition of the Hawaiian nation, a self-determined entity created by and for native Hawaiians and their descendants in furtherance of a true government-to-government relationship; and

Be it further resolved, that the NCAI further supports the return of land to the Hawaiian Nation; and

Be it further resolved, that this resolution shall be the policy of the NCAI until it is withdrawn or modified by subsequent resolution; and that a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Hawaii state legislature, the Governor of the state of Hawaii, the Hawaii congressional delegation, the Congress of the United States of America, the Secretary of the Department of the Interior, the Attorney General of the United States, the Secretary of State, the President of the United States and the Trustees of the Office of Hawaiian Affairs; and

Be it finally resolved, that this resolution shall be the policy of NCAI until it is withdrawn or modified by subsequent resolution.

CERTIFICATION

The foregoing resolution was adopted at the 2003 Mid-Year Session of the National Congress of American Indians, held at the Sheraton Wild Horse Pass Gila River Indian Community, in Phoenix, Arizona on June 18, 2003 with a quorum present.

TEX HALL,
President.

Attest: Juana Majel.

Adopted by the General Assembly during the 2003 Mid-Year Session of the National Congress of American Indians, held at the Sheraton Wild Horse Pass Gila River Indian Community, in Phoenix, Arizona on June 18, 2003.

EXECUTIVE CHAMBERS,
Honolulu, Hawaii, October 23, 2007.

Re H.R. 505—Native Hawaiian Government Reorganization Act of 2007.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House, Canon House Office Building, Washington DC.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
House Minority Leader, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI AND HOUSE MINORITY LEADER BOEHNER: I am writing to you to express my very strong and unqualified support for the Native Hawaiian Government Reorganization Act of 2007, H.R. 505, often referred to as the ''Akaka Bill.'' Enactment of this important bill is just and fair and will help to preserve the language, identity, and culture of Native Hawaiians.

I am very pleased that the bill will likely be considered this week on the House floor, as this bill has the bipartisan support of almost every elected official in Hawaii, the strong support of Hawaii's business community, and most importantly, the strong support of Hawaii's people.

H.R. 505 would afford Native Hawaiians a long overdue measure of justice by providing them with the means to reorganize a formal self-governing entity. That entity would allow them to regain a portion of the self-determination taken from them over a century ago. This country's other native peoples, including American Indians and Alaska Natives, have been allowed to exercise some form of self-governance for decades. Native Hawaiians, therefore, are not asking for ''preferential'' status, but rather the same treatment all other of America's native peoples have received.

The bill does not create ''racial'' distinctions, but rather affords participation in the Native Hawaiian Governing Entity to those who are descendants of the indigenous people of the Hawaiian Islands, a criterion Congress has long characterized as being non-racial. Indeed, Congress has already recognized Native Hawaiians to a large degree, by repeatedly singling out Native Hawaiians for special treatment, by acknowledging a ''special relationship'' with Native Hawaiians, and by stating that ''the political status of Native Hawaiians is comparable to that of American Indians.'' This bill formalizes that status by providing Native Hawaiians with an actual limited self-governing entity.

H.R. 505 is surely constitutional, as the United States Supreme Court has consistently upheld the special status of indigenous peoples and defers to Congress's near plenary authority to decide which native peoples to recognize.

I began this letter by stating my unqualified support for H.R. 505. I conclude by respectfully asking for you to support this important measure as well. I thank you in advance for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

LINDA LINGLE,
Governor.

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION,
GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS OFFICE,
Washington, DC, October 23, 2007.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the American Bar Association, I urge your support for the Native Hawaiian Government Reorganization Act of 2007, H.R. 505, introduced by Representative Neil Abercrombie (D–HI).

The ABA, as the national voice of the legal profession, has a long standing interest in the legal issues concerning America's native and indigenous peoples. Over the past twenty years, our House of Delegates has adopted numerous policies supporting self-determination and self-governance for American Indians and Alaska Natives. In 2006, we adopted policy supporting the right of Native Hawaiians to seek federal recognition of a native governing entity within the United States similar to that which American Indians and Alaska Natives possess under the Constitution.

The ABA supports H.R. 505. It is a conservative measure drafted to provide an ordered process that would lead to renewed self-determination for the Native Hawaiians. The goal is the creation of a political entity within U.S. borders developed by the indigenous Hawaiian people to serve, maintain and support their unique cultural and civic needs, including advocacy on their behalf on the federal and state level.

This would represent a return to self-determination for the Hawaiian people and a renewal of federal support for their unique history. For 1,000 years prior to the overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy, the people who we now know as the Native Hawaiians lived under an organized political framework governed by the rule of law. This kingdom had a written constitution and was recognized by the U.S. Government as a sovereign nation. Congress ratified treaty agreements with it and recognized its representatives.

In 1893, U.S. agents acting without official sanction orchestrated a coup against this sovereign state and overthrew Hawaii's last queen. Acknowledging this crime and the continuing effect it had on Queen Liliuokalani's subjects, Congress chose to intercede by taking a managerial posture towards the kingdom's assets and accepting a fiduciary duty to the Native Hawaiians and their progeny. This was the beginning of a unique relationship between Congress and the Hawaiian people. In 1993, the destruction of the Hawaiian nation's last government was acknowledged with regret in U.S. law (Public Law 103–150, also known as the Apology Resolution). H.R. 505 would allow the Hawaiian people the right to govern their own destiny by replacing the Congressional mandate with Native Hawaiian governance within the state of Hawaii.

Opponents of this legislation claim that allowing Native Hawaiians the right to self governance would imperil the constitutional rights of non-Native Hawaiians to equal protection under the law. They point to the former Kingdom's wealth and claim that self-determination will create a system of benefits disadvantaging those who are not of Native Hawaiian heritage. However, Native Hawaiians, in seeking rights and privileges that other indigenous people of the United States enjoy under our system of law, are not compromising the rights of others but exercising their own rights to property, to self-determination and to be recognized as an indigenous people by Congress.

The right of Native Hawaiians to use of the property held in trust for them and the right to govern those assets is not in conflict with the Equal Protection Clause since it rests on independent constitutional authority regarding the rights of native nations contained within the text of Articles I and II of the Constitution. The constitutional framers recognized the existence of native nations within the United States that predated our own democracy and created a system for federal recognition of indigenous nations within our then expanding borders. The framers empowered Congress through the Indian Commerce Clause and the Treaty Clause to maintain relations between the U.S. federal government and the governments of these native nations. Our courts have upheld Congress' power to recognize indigenous nations and have specifically recognized that this power includes the power to re-recognize nations whose recognition has been compromised in the historical past. Thus, the Native Hawaiians have the right to be recognized by this body, this right is not in conflict with the rights of others, and this recognition may be renewed despite historical lapses.

I urge you to support the rights of Native Hawaiians to self-determination by voting for H.R. 505 and against any weakening amendments.

Sincerely,

DENISE A. CARDMAN,
Acting Director.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this act. Having great familiarity with the peoples of the Hawaiian Islands and with Native Hawaiians, I understand their concerns that we should have codified a stronger statement of what their rights are as indigenous peoples.

This is really about making sure that language and culture and history are preserved. It also is consistent with the law which created the admission of Hawaii to this Union. I think the date, Mr. ABERCROMBIE could correct me if I am wrong, it was August 21, 1959. That was an important date for this Nation, because it is a day that we embraced not only Hawaii but Alaska. It was a day that we embraced the potential of this country to extend its reach and embrace peoples of many different cultures.

This act is an act that needs to be passed so that we can keep unfolding the real purpose and quality of America.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I reserve my time,

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased at this time to yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE), the sponsor who has labored with this legislation actively in several Congresses, who is from the Committee on Natural Resources, and the author of this bill.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as this is a discussion on the rule and not necessarily on the bill itself, I would like to confine my remarks, at least in this initial phase of dealing with the issue, on some of the points raised by my good friend and colleague Mr. HASTINGS. I am appreciative of the points that he raised, because I think they are in need of not so much refutation but perhaps clarification.

It is easy to understand why those who are not necessarily familiar, and I am not speaking about Mr. HASTINGS personally, I am talking about the references that he cited in his commentary, it is easy to understand why people who are not familiar with a little bit of the history of Hawaii could come to some of the conclusions or make some of the observations that they have. Absent the context within which this bill is coming forward, it is understandable. That context then is what I want to establish, so that it becomes clear.

I certainly don't want to get in an argument with the editorial board of the Wall Street Journal either, and they are making some quotations there about complete territorial independence.

Well, I think what is being referred to there, and what the likelihood of the reference is, is that there was in fact not territorial in the sense of annexation of territory, like the Philippines or Hawaii or Puerto Rico or that kind of thing that occurred during the kind of ''imperial phase'' of the United States, but there was in fact territorial independence, because Hawaii was a kingdom. It is one of the things that kind of gets lost in the shuffle, and that is one of the reasons we are here today, Mr. Speaker.

The United States of America has in fact had, over a 175-year period leading up to the overthrow of the kingdom in 1893, a series of treaties and conventions; 1826, 1842, 1849, 1875, 1887, dealing with commerce, dealing with trade, dealing with various recognitions. The Kingdom of Hawaii had treaties and conventions with other nations, as well as the United States.

So as a result of that history, we have a succession of land claims and assets that have come from the time of the kingdom to the shotgun republic that occurred after the overthrow of the kingdom and the annexation of the United States into the territory, and into finally becoming a State, as was indicated, in 1959. We are in fact the last State to enter the Union, along with Alaska in 1959.

I bring this up simply to point out that far from subdividing the American people, as was cited by my good friend, quite the contrary; it incorporates the politics as well as the historical reality of this land secession and the assets associated with it, because this land generates income.

Basically what this is about, Mr. Speaker, is land and other assets, including money, and who controls it. When this land came in, it wasn't worth anything. The Wall Street Journal did not comment, I am certain, on the ceded lands. They are called ''ceded lands'' because they were ceded from the kingdom to the succeeding governmental entities. They could care less,

the Wall Street Journal, about these lands when they were worth nothing, when they were not seen to be able to be marketed.

But let me explain now, and I ask my good friend as I look at him now with a smile on my face, we are talking about land in Hawaii? You are talking big bucks. You are talking money here. That is what this is about is land and money and who controls it. And this land has, from the time of the kingdom, resided with the Native Hawaiians. That is who is to be the beneficiary.

That takes me to the point, Mr. Speaker, of the entry into the Union. The Admissions Act requires us, requires us, the Admissions Act of 1959 requires us to utilize those lands and assets for the benefit of Native Hawaiians. That is in the Admissions Act.

□ 1230

We are not here on the floor today because we didn't have anything better to do in Hawaii than to try to bring this to the Federal Government. On the contrary, the Admissions Act requires us to make certain that these lands are utilized for the benefit of Native Hawaiians. The reason we have the bill here is that in order to accomplish that, we need to get a governing entity that can come to the Department of the Interior for approval in order to be able to conduct the affairs, similarly to, parallel to what now happens with Native Americans in the so-called lower 48 in the mainland of the United States and with various Alaska Natives and corporations and other entities that have been set up in Alaska.

This is a history of indigenous people. They are different from other indigenous people because they were a kingdom, and we would not have the 2 million acres we are talking about had those acres not been associated with an indigenous people. They are not imaginary, they are real.

Finally, let me say with Rice v. Cayetano, Governor Cayetano, the first Filipino American to be elected Governor, that issue was settled on a question of voting procedures and had nothing whatsoever to do with programs for Native Hawaiians.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate my friend from Hawaii's clarification on this, and I just want to point out a couple of things in my opening remarks.

I emphasized that this is a process which I think acknowledges the fact that there is a history that goes back to when Hawaii was a kingdom, and so I acknowledge that point. But I simply raise those issues because those issues I think are important when we talk about the United States as a whole, as a government under laws and everybody being treated equal, and these are questions that I think need to be addressed.

I appreciate very, very much my friend's clarification on this. The point that this is a process and the point that there is some lineage going back from a State to a territory to a kingdom probably has some viability to it.

But there are always unintended laws when we write national laws that appeal to one State or one set of people. That is what we have to be cautious about. That is why I simply raise these concerns. The issue is before us. We have a rule and we have made in order an amendment that deals with the 14th amendment. I think that is important to be discussed, and I doubt if this issue will be completely decided here today.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I am the last speaker, and I will reserve my time until the gentleman closes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I will be asking Members to oppose the previous question so that I may amend the rule to have Speaker PELOSI, in consultation with Republican Leader BOEHNER, immediately appoint conferees to H.R. 2642, the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Appropriations Act for 2008.

Two days ago a number of news publications, including Roll Call, reported that the Democrat leadership intends to play political games and hold off on sending any appropriations bills to President Bush so that they can use an upcoming anticipated veto of the Labor-HHS appropriations bill to serve as ''an extension of their successful public relations campaign on the State Children's Health Insurance Program.'' Roll Call is the one that made that observation on October 22, 2007.

While the House Democrat leadership plays politics on this issue, however, our Nation's veterans are paying the price. The Senate has already done its work and appointed conferees for this bill. And for every day that House Democrats allow the veterans funding bill to languish without conferees for their only political advantage, our Nation's veterans lose $18.5 million, money that could be used for veterans housing, veterans health care, and other important veterans support activities.

On October 18, American Legion National Commander Marty Conaster, five national vice commanders and all 55 Legion national executive committee members sent Speaker PELOSI a letter pleading with her to put partisanship aside and provide this funding for the troops.

Mr. Speaker, I include a copy of the letter for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Indianapolis, IN, October 18, 2007.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI: Today ends the Fall meeting of The American Legion's National Executive Committee, at The American Legion's National Headquarters in Indianapolis, Indiana. The National Executive Committee consists of an elected leader from each of The American Legion's 55 Departments (50 States, the District of Columbia and four foreign countries). In accordance with The American Legion's National Constitution and By-laws, the National Executive Committee serves as The American Legion's governing body.

The National Commander Marty Conatser briefed The National Executive Committee on an array of issues to include the status of the VA budget for FY 2008. The fiscal activities of the 110th Congress—the FY 2007 Continuing Resolution, the Budget Resolution for FY 2008, and the passage of the Military Construction, Veterans' Affairs and Related Agencies Appropriations for FY 2008 were reviewed.

However, in trying to grasp why such a bipartisan bill, which passed overwhelmingly in both chambers, still hasn't moved in over a month is rather difficult, especially since the President has already said he would not veto the bill, even though it exceeds his recommendations. Understanding why the appropriations process has come to a complete halt is difficult. What is preventing the appointment of conferees, the Conference Committee, or passage of a Conference Report?

We are now in the new fiscal year with no idea when the Mil Con-VA appropriations will be passed. If history repeats itself, this standoff may last well into the second quarter of the fiscal year. This uncertainty is disturbing to not only The American Legion and other veterans' and military service organizations, but to every veteran who is dependent on VA for timely access to quality health care, earned benefits, and other services provided by a grateful nation.

Madam Speaker, the newest generation of wartime veterans are reporting to VA medical facilities every day as troops are returning from deployments to Iraq and Afghanistan. Some will be determined to be service-connected disabled because of medical conditions incurred or aggravated while on active-duty. Others may very well have invisible scars that need attention as soon as possible. As VA welcomes new patients, the existing patient population cannot be ignored nor should their health care be rationed due to limited available resources. There are veterans dependent on VA as their life-support system.

The American Legion represents 2.6 million wartime veterans, but also speaks for the 24 million veterans of the United States Armed Forces and their families.

Please continue the appropriations process—name conferees, convene the Conference Committee, and pass the Conference Report.

Sincerely,

Marty Conatser, National Commander; Thomas L. Burns, Jr. (DE), National Vice Commander; Randall A. Fisher (KY), National Vice Commander; David A. Korth (WI), National Vice Commander; James L. Van Horn (AK), National Executive Committeeman; Ross Rogers (AK), National Executive Committeeman; Peggy G. Dettori (AK), National Vice Commander; Donald Hayden (MN), National Vice Commander; Floyd W. Turner (AL), National Executive Committeeman; Julius Maklary (AZ), National Executive Committeeman; James W. Hackney (CA), National Executive Committeeman.

Jeff Luginbuel (CO), National Executive Committeeman; John J. Jackson (DE), National Executive Committeeman; Robert J. Proctor (FL), National Executive Committeeman; Ray Hendrix (GA), National Executive Committeeman; Cleve Rice (ID), National Executive Committeeman; W. Darrell Hansel

(IN), National Executive Committeeman; David O. Warnken (KS), National Executive Committeeman; Charles D. Aucoin (LA), National Executive Committeeman; Dr. Gordon B. Browning (MD), National Executive Committeeman; Richard W. Anderson (CT), National Executive Committeeman; Paul H. _____, for Walter W. Norris (DC), National Executive Committeeman; William E. Marshall (France), National Executive Committeeman; Andrew W. Johnson (HI), National Executive Committeeman; Kenneth J. Trumbull (IL), National Executive Committeeman; Michael E. Wanser (IA), National Executive Committeeman; Randall Coffman (KY), National Executive Committeeman; Robert A. Owen (ME), National Executive Committeeman; James F. Army (MA), National Executive Committeeman.

John E. Hayes (Mexico), National Executive Committeeman; Virgil V. Persing (MN), National Executive Committeeman; David N. Voyles (MO), National Executive Committeeman; Michael J. Landkamer (NE), National Executive Committeeman; John E. Neylon (NH), National Executive Committeeman; Bruce Jorgensen (NM), National Executive Committeeman; Jerry L. Hedrick (NC), National Executive Committeeman; Carl W. Swisher (OH), National Executive Committeeman; Charles E. Schmidt (OR), National Executive Committeeman; Gerald N. Dennis (MI), National Executive Committeeman; Charles E. Langley (MS), National Executive Committeeman; Bob O. Beals (MT), National Executive Committeeman; Ron Gutzman (NV), National Executive Committeeman; William A. Rakestraw, Jr. (NJ), National Executive Committeeman; Paul Mitras (NY), National Executive Committeeman; Curtis O. Twete (ND), National Executive Committeeman; Bobby J. Longenbaugh (OK), National Executive Committeeman; Alfred Pirolli (PA), National Executive Committeeman.

William J. Kelly (Philippines), National Executive Committeeman; Ernest Gerundio (RI), National Executive Committeeman; Paul A. Evenson (SD), National Executive Committeeman; Ronald G. Cherry (TX), National Executive Committeeman; Leslie V. Howe (VT), National Executive Committeeman; William F. Schrier (WA), National Executive Committeeman; Arthur D. Herbison (WI), National Executive Committeeman; Carlos Orria-Medina (PR), National Executive Committeeman; Billy W. Bell (SC), National Executive Committeeman; Jennings B. Loring (TN), National Executive Committeeman; William E. Christoffersen (UT), National Executive Committeeman; Rob R. Gordon, Jr. (VA), National Executive Committeeman; William W. Kile (WV), National Executive Committeeman; _____, for Irvin A. Quick (WY), National Executive Committeeman.

Mr. Speaker, on that same day, the commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, General Lisicki, also urged Speaker PELOSI and the Democrat leadership to put partisanship aside for the benefit of our Nation's veterans and troops. These pleas from the American Legion and the VFW fall on the heels of multiple requests from Republican Members of this House to both Speaker PELOSI and Democrat Majority Leader Senator REID, urging them to end their PR campaign and begin conference work on the Veterans appropriations bill.

Unfortunately, it appears as though all of these commonsense requests have fallen on deaf ears and our Nation's veterans are being forced to pay the price for continued Democrat partisanship and lack of leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD these two letters so everyone watching today's debate across the country can see the efforts that have been made by the Republican Party to end this impasse on the important issue of providing adequate funding for those who have sacrificed so much on behalf of the country.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, September 17, 2007.

OFFICE OF THE SPEAKER,
U.S. Capitol,
Washington, DC.

MADAM SPEAKER: We write to urge you in the strongest possible terms to reach a prompt agreement on the conference report on the FY2008 Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Appropriations Act (H.R. 2642). Few issues are more important than adequate funding for our Nation's veterans. The leadership in the House cannot allow this critically important funding to fall victim to the usual partisan wrangling which occurs all too often in Washington.

Veterans should not be used as tools for political bargaining and gamesmanship. Both the House and Senate passed the FY08 MilCon-Veterans appropriations with overwhelming majorities because our commitment to veterans rises above partisan squabbling. Tragedies such as the recent revelations at Walter Reed Army Medical Center must never be repeated. The findings of insufficient care at Walter Reed and other facilities should be seen by Congress as a mandate to finish the work and live up to the promises we have made to our veterans.

After decades of flat funding, total VA budget rose from $48 billion in FY 2001 to approximately $70 billion in FY 2006, a 46 percent increase. This year, the House voted to increase funding by $6 billion over FY07, one of the largest in the 77 year history of the Department of Veterans Affairs. Both the Senate and House versions received overwhelming majority support passing by a vote of 409–2 in the House and 92–1 in the Senate.

Earlier in the year, the new Majority agreed they would continue the trend of significant increases in veterans funding begun by the Republican Congress. We ask you to honor that agreement and see that the commitment we made to our veterans is honored.

We must never forget the sacrifice of our veterans. As members of Congress, we have a solemn obligation to fulfill our promises to them. We ask for you to look past the heightened partisanship of our times and unite us on this issue by making it a first priority to quickly bring a stand alone Veterans appropriations bill through conference so the Congress may present the President with a bill by October 1, 2007.

We stand ready to assist you in reaching this goal.

Sincerely,

Stevan Pearce; Steve Buyer; Don Young; Greg Walden; Marilyn N. Musgrave; Ron Lewis; Jim Saxton; _____; Thomas Price; Tim Walberg; Mary Fallin; John Kline; Ginny Brown-Waite; David Obey; Tom Tancredo; John L. Mica; Mark Souder; Louie Gohmert; Rick Renzi; Mario Diaz-Balart; Jean Schmidt; Gus M. Bilirakis; Adrian Smith; Pete Sessions; Paul Ryan; Dana Rohrabacher; Spencer Bachus; K. Michael Conaway; Tom Feeney; J. Randy Forbes; Jon C. Porter; John Shimkus; Jim Gerlach; Mike Ferguson; Mary Bono; Dean Heller; Jeff Miller; Sue Myrick; Geoff Davis; Thelma Drake; Steve King; Jeb Hensarling; Barbara Cubin; Scott Garrett.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, October 4, 2007.

OFFICE OF THE SENATE MAJORITY LEADER,
U.S. Capitol,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER REID: We write today to ask you to keep the Senate in session the week of October 8, to help pass this years' veterans appropriations. Now that we are already into the new fiscal year, it is imperative that the House and Senate reach a prompt agreement on the conference report on the FY2008 Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Appropriations Act (H.R. 2642).

It is unfortunate the Senate has been unable to act upon many of its Constitutionally mandated appropriations bills. While the House continues to wait upon the Senate to complete its work, we call upon you to quickly move veterans appropriations through conference so a final version of the bill may be passed and presented to the President. We believe that veterans issues rise above the partisan divisions of Washington which is evident by the passage of the FY08 MilCon-Veterans appropriations with overwhelming majorities in both Houses, 501–3 combined.

The Senate cannot allow this critically important funding to continue to fall victim to the usual partisan wrangling which occurs all too often in Washington. If tragedies such as the recent revelations at Walter Reed Army Medical Center are to be diverted in the future, we must pass veterans funding now. From FY 2001 the total VA budget rose from $48 billion to approximately $70 billion in FY 2006, a 46 percent increase. This year, the House voted to increase funding by $6 billion dollars over FY07, one of the largest in the 77 year history of the Department of Veterans Affairs. Because we have asked so much of our brave men and women in uniform during the War on Terror we must uphold our commitment to veterans upon their return home.

Earlier in the year, the new Majority agreed they would continue the trend of significant increases in veterans funding begun by the Republican Congress. We ask you to honor that agreement and see the commitment we made to our veterans is upheld.

We must never forget the sacrifice of our veterans. As members of Congress, we have a solemn obligation to fulfill our promises to them. We ask you to look past the heightened partisanship of our times and unite us on this issue by making it a first priority to bring a stand-alone veterans appropriations bill through conference so the Congress may present the President with a bill no later than October 12, 2007.

Sincerely,

Stevan Pearce; Duncan Hunter; Don Young; Jim Sensenbrenner; Wally Herger; Jim Saxton; John Kline; Geoff Davis; Tom Tancredo; Louie Gohmert; Ginny Brown-Waite; Doug Lamborn; Darrell Issa; John T. Doolittle; Lincoln Diaz-Balart; Jeff Miller; Scott Garrett; Paul Ryan; Adrian Smith; K. Michael Conaway; Michele Bachmann; Tim Welberg; Jean Schmidt; Dan Burton; Phil English; Randy Kuhl; Greg Walden; Jo Ann Davis; Jim Moran; Thomas Price; John R. Carter; Tom Feeney;

Phil Gingrey; Vito Fossella; Gary G. Miller; Jim Gerlach; Jeb Hensarling; Pete Sessions; Mark Souder; Randy Neugebauer; John E. Peterson; Trent Franks; Gus M. Bilirakis; Wayne T. Gilchrest; Timothy H. Bishop; Michael T. McCaul; Thelma Drake.

I ask all of my colleagues to vote against the previous question so we can put partisanship aside and move this important legislation forward.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the amendment and extraneous material appear in the RECORD just prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this bill is about the right to live. It is about empowering Native Hawaiians to own their destiny and choose how to manage their livelihood. This bill is not about gaming. In fact, it expressly is prohibited in this bill.

Instead, the bill is about providing an opportunity to effectively reorganize the Native Hawaiian government to better meet the needs of Native Hawaiians.

The underlying legislation enjoys the support of Hawaii's Republican Governor Linda Lingle, the business community in Hawaii, the National Congress of American Indians, the Alaska Federation of Natives, and Hawaii's entire congressional delegation.

Mr. Speaker, the Native Hawaiian Government Reorganization Act has received immense bipartisan support year after year. It is now time that we fulfill the duty of this Congress and serve Native Hawaiians just as they have served and contributed to the vibrant and diverse culture that is America.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on the rule, the previous question, and on final passage of the bill.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS of Washington is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 764 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 3. The House disagrees to the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 2642, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, and agrees to the conference requested by the Senate thereon. The Speaker shall appoint conferees immediately, but may declare a recess under clause 12(a) of rule I for the purpose of consulting the Minority Leader prior to such appointment. The motion to instruct conferees otherwise in order pending the appointment of conferees instead shall be in order only at a time designated by the Speaker in the legislative schedule within two additional legislative days after adoption of this resolution.

(The information contained herein was provided by Democratic Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 109th Congress.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Democratic majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, (VI, 308–311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

Because the vote today may look bad for the Democratic majority they will say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution—[and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.'' But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the definition of the previous question used in the Floor Procedures Manual published by the Rules Committee in the 109th Congress, (page 56). Here's how the Rules Committee described the rule using information from Congressional Quarterly's ''American Congressional Dictionary'': ''If the previous question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business.''

Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled ''Amending Special Rules'' states: ''a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.'' (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.''

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Democratic majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 218, nays 175, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 997]

YEAS—218

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pearce
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NAYS—175

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Deal (GA)
Dent
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pence
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—39

Barton (TX)
Bilbray
Blackburn
Bono
Buyer
Carson
Cooper
Culberson
Davis (CA)
Davis, Tom
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dingell
Forbes
Garrett (NJ)
Giffords
Hastert
Holt
Hunter
Issa
Jindal
Johnson, E. B.
Kirk
Lamborn
Lewis (CA)
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
McCotter
Payne
Peterson (PA)
Reyes
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Shea-Porter
Smith (NJ)
Wasserman Schultz
Wilson (OH)
Wynn
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1301

Mr. BUCHANAN changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ changed her vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 217, noes 179, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 998]

AYES—217

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—179

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Deal (GA)
Dent
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—36

Barton (TX)
Bilbray
Blackburn
Buyer
Carson
Cooper
Culberson
Davis (CA)
Davis, Tom
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dingell
Forbes
Garrett (NJ)
Giffords
Hastert
Hunter
Issa
Jindal
Johnson, E. B.
Kirk
Lewis (CA)
Mahoney (FL)
McCotter
Payne
Peterson (PA)
Reyes
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Shea-Porter
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Wasserman Schultz
Wilson (OH)
Wynn
Young (AK)

□ 1311

Mr. SHAYS and Mr. HERGER changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 1483, CELEBRATING AMERICA'S HERITAGE ACT

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections in the engrossment of H.R. 1483, to include corrections in spelling, punctuation, section numbering and