1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	HAWAII ADVISORY COMMITTEE
7	UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS
8	
9	HAWAIIAN HOMES UPDATE FORUM
10	
11	
12	SEPTEMBER 6, 1988
13	ILIKAI HOTEL
14	HONOEULU, HAWAII
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	BEFORE DAMPICIA A MILLER DDD CD CM CCD #2

BEFORE: PATRICIA A. MILLER, RPR, CP-CM, CSR #275

	1	<u>APPEARANCES</u>		
	2			
	3	HAWAII ADVISORY COMMITTEE UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS:		
	5		BARRY SHAIN MARION SAUNDERS	
	6	ACTING STAFF DIRECTOR:	SUSAN J. PRADO	
	7	STAFF:	JOHN DULLES	
	8			
	9			
	10			
	11			
	12			
	13			
	14	-		
	15			
	16			
	17			
	18			
	19			
	20			
	21			
	22			
	23			
	2 4			
	25			

1	INDEX	
2		PAGE
	Opening Statement By Charles Maxwell	4
3		
4	Administration of Hawaiian Homes Program Ilima A. Piianaia, Chairperson	7
5	Hawaiian Homes Commission	/
6	State Government Panel	
7	Louis Hao, Chairman Office of Hawaiian Affairs	53
8	Linda Delaney, Lands Officer	
	Officie of Hawaiian Affairs	61
9	Clarence Ching, Trustee	61
10	Office of Hawaiian Affairs	01
11	Taral and Dalina Tanana Danal	
12	<u>Legal and Policy Issues Panel</u> Mahealani Ing, Executive Director	65
13	Native Hawaiian Legal Corporation	
14	Alan Murakami, Attorney Native Hawaiian Legal -Corporation	72
	Native nawarian negar corporation	
15	Community Perspectives Panel	
16	Masaru Oshiro, Executive Director Alu Like, Inc.	101
17		
18	Sonny Kaniho	105
19	Mililani B. Trask, Kia'aina Ka Lahui Hawaii	120
20	Unscheduled Presentations	
21	Kawaipuna Prejean Alice Moha Akita Zenger	148
22	Henry E. Smith, Jr.	153 157
23		
2 4		
25		

1.2

MR. MAXWELL: Aloha. This meeting of the Hawaii Advisory Committee to the United States

Commission on Civil Rights will now come to order.

The purpose of this meeting is to update an earlier advisory committee report, Breach of Trust? Native Hawaiian Homelands, released in 1980. Recent developments relating to the implementation, management, and enforcement of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act will be addressed.

The advisory committee has invited officials of the Hawaiian Homes Commission, the Office of Hawaiian Affairs, and community and legal organizations to provide information and perspectives on the status of the homeland trust.

I am Charles Kaulaeuhi Maxwell, chairman of the Native Issues Subcommittee and vice chair of this advisory committee. The advisory committee receives information and makes recommendations to the commission in areas which the committee or any of its subcommittees is authorized to study.

Other members of the committee in attendance during the meeting will be Emmet Cahill, Alfred Lardizabal, Helen Nagtalon Miller, Barry Shain, and Donnis Thompson.

Also with us today is staff member John

1 2 office in Los Angeles. 3 4 5 6 the Office of the Staff Director. 7 8 9 10 Commission on Civil Rights. 11 12 13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Dulles from the commission's western regional

We're pleased to have with us the acting staff director from Washington, the U.S. Commission, Susan J. Prado, and also Jim Cory from

This consultation is being held pursuant to federal laws applicable to state advisory committees and regulations promulgated by the U.S.

The Commission on Civil Rights is an independent agency of the United States Government established by Congress in 1957 and directed to:

Investigate complaints alleging that citizens are being deprived of their right to vote by reason of their race, color, religion, sex, age, handicap, or national origin, or by reason of fraudulent practices;

To study and collect information concerning legal developments constituting discrimination or denial of equal protection of the laws under the Constitution because of race, color, religion, sex, age, handicap, or national origin, or in the administration of justice;

To appraise federal laws and policies

with respect to discrimination or denial of equal protection of the laws;

And to serve as a national clearinghouse for information about discrimination;

And submit reports, findings, and recommendations to the President and to Congress.

I would like to emphasize that this is a consultation and not an adversary proceeding.

Individuals have been invited to come and share with the committee information to the subject of today's inquiry. Each person who will participate has voluntarily agreed to meet with this committee.

Since this is a public meeting, the press and radio and television stations, as well as individuals, are welcome. Persons meeting with the committee, however, may specifically request that they not be televised. In this case, we will comply with their wishes.

We are concerned that no defamatory
material be presented at this meeting. In the
unlikely event that this situation should develop,
it will be necessary for me to call this to the
attention of the person making these statements and
request that they desist in their action. Such
information will be stricken from the record, if

necessary. If the comments a person is offering, however, are of sufficient importance, the committee will hear the information. In that event, the person against who allegations are made will have ample opportunity to respond by making statements before the committee or submitting written statements, if they desire.

Every effort has been made to invite persons who are knowledgeable in the area to be dealt with here today. In addition, we have allocated time between four and five p.m. to hear from anyone who wishes to share information with the committee about the issues under consideration. At that time, each person or organization will have five minutes to speak to the committee and may submit additional information in writing. Those wishing to participate in the open session must contact commission staff before four p.m. this afternoon.

We'll start with the witnesses now.

Before we do, I would like to remind everyone that whenever you speak, please, whoever you're representing, your name, and especially if your name is Hawaiian, please pronounce it correctly so our staff reporter can get it down. And this is

our reporter here, Patricia Miller. She will be 1 2 taking notes for today's hearing. MR. DULLES: Mr. Chairman, I just want to 3 4 let everybody know there is parking validation. Ιt 5 There is a stamp on the registration 6 table. If you stamp your own ticket, that might 7 save you some money in parking tickets. 8 And don't forget to register so we have a 9 full list of everybody attending. Thank you. 10 MR. MAXWELL: Also, if you have prepared 11 statements, would you, please, pass it out to our 12 staff, and he will distribute it to us. 13 For the people just coming in again, if 14 you want to speak, there is a sign-up sheet in the 15 back. 16 Now I would like to call upon the 17 Administration of Hawaiian Homes Program, Ilima A. 18 Piianaia, chairperson of the Hawaiian Homes Commission. 19 20 You want your staff up there with you? 21 No? 22 MS. PIIANAIA: Afterwards, if I need 23 them. 24 Thank you, Vice Chairman Maxwell. I have 25 submitted written testimony, and I would like to

read the first portion of my written testimony, although you have it before you.

I thank you for the opportunity to testify on the matter of recent developments relating to the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended.

I am Ilima A. Piianaia, chairman of the Hawaiian Homes Commission.

The agency I head is charged with the responsibility of administering the provisions of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, which law was enacted by the United States Congress in 1921. Upon statehood, as a compact between the State of Hawaii and the United States of America, and as a condition of admission, Hawaii adopted the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act as a provision of its Constitution and assumed the responsibility of administering the lands set aside for native Hawaiians. Native Hawaiians was defined as persons with 50 percent or more Hawaiian blood.

Over the years, native Hawaiians and others have voiced numerous concerns about the administration and direction of the Hawaiian Homes program. In 1980, many of the concerns were articulated in a civil suit filed by the Hou

Hawaiians in federal court. The U.S. Department of the Interior requested that an administrative mechanism be established to address these concerns. The Governor of the State of Hawaii and the United States Secretary of the Interior formed a Federal-State Task Force in July 1982, composed of federal, state, and community representatives for this purpose.

The task force first met in September

1982 and conducted research and analysis of a wide

range of issues with department staff support.

Their draft report was widely disseminated and

discussed at community meetings statewide. The

final report of the task force was accepted by the

State of Hawaii and the United States Department of

the Interior in August 1983.

I would like to point out that the task force report was preceded by the breach of trust report. And my remarks are really directed to the task force report and, as a result, include the issues that were raised in the breach of trust report.

MR. MAXWELL: So noted.

MS. PIIANAIA: The task force report identified key areas of management and program

concerns as well as a total of 134 specific 1 recommendations to address those concerns. 2 Since 1983, there has been tremendous 3 progress in resolving the concerns identified in 4 5 the report. Some of the key accomplishments 6 include: 7 Implementation of the acceleration 8 program whereby over 2,500 lots were leased during 9 a two-year period; 10 Securing congressional consents to amendments to the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act 11 from 1959 to 1985, including an amendment of the 12 13 blood quantum requirement from 50 percent to 25 14 percent for qualified successors to homestead 15 leases; Adoption of the State right-to-sue 16 17 legislation at the state level; Clean financial audits since 1985; 18 19 Return of Hawaiian homelands disposed 20 through governors' executive orders and 21 proclamations to county and state agencies; 22 Initiation of negotiations with state and 23 county agencies on compensation for use of lands; 24 Initiation of administrative negotiations 25 to resolve land discrepancies with other state

departments;

Aggressively seeking the return or compensation for lands acquired by federal agencies through improper dispositions;

Implementation of the Federal Housing Administration's mortgage insurance program for homestead lessees;

Development of increased and new resources to support the homestead development programs including: state general funds to support department operations; federal grant-in-aid through the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, subject to final approval by the President; increase in income through the department's general leasing program of 33 percent over the past five years, from \$1.8 million to over \$2.4 million per year;

Implementation of a statewide capital improvement program which identifies and prioritizes the department's proposed capital investment projects for the next 10 years;

And increased funds available for the implementation of CIP projects from an average of less than \$1 million per year to over \$10 million in 1987 and 1988. This latter expenditure will

result in the development of almost 300 homestead lots by 1989 to 1990.

While much has been accomplished, there is still much to do. At the same time, the progress made over the past five years has created new issues, problems, and areas of concern.

For example, when the department's acceleration program started in 1984, the waiting list for homestead awards included approximately 8,000 applications. Despite awarding a total of 2,541 lots during the three-year period, the number of applications for homesteads increased from 8,000 to over 17,000 today. This, in turn, has created additional demands on the department in carrying out its homesteading program.

With the tremendous increase in the number of applications for homestead leases, as well as the need and commitment to provide improvements for approximately 2,000 lots, more than ever before the department is looking for new ways to meet the needs of its native Hawaiian beneficiaries.

We must continue to work with other government agencies on the federal, state, and county levels, the private sector, and the

beneficiaries, to begin to fulfill our existing commitments as well as provide additional land for award. This requires increased use of resources outside the department, including such programs as the Federal Housing Administration's mortgage insurance program and greater beneficiary participation in the financing of the improvements.

1.0

The department's financial resources must also be increased through the continued development of commercial and industrial lands. Our human resources can be used in a more effective manner, and we are committed to continued staff development.

The department has land holdings on the five major islands. However, they are concentrated in a few primarily rural areas. Furthermore, the readily developable lands are already in homestead use. It is and will become more difficult and costly to meet the demand for homesteads with our traditional programs.

In acknowledgment of this challenging and changing environment, the department has identified fundamental issues which will shape and guide our future. These issues are a combination both of the past problems and concerns identified by the task

force and the new constraints and opportunities brought on by this changing environment.

Issues of primary concern include:

First, management of land and water resources. The primary asset of the department is its land and its related resources including water. We will continue to provide for their effective management, from both a financial and resource perspective.

Secondly, beneficiary profile. In order to better serve native Hawaiians, we must understand who they are. This, in turn, will allow us to better identify programs and services to best meet the overall needs and demands of native Hawaiians under the terms and requirements of the act.

Thirdly, land development and award. The department is committed to providing improvements for approximately 2,000 leased lots. In addition, the current waiting lists exceed 17,000 applications. We will fulfill our commitment to existing lessees with unimproved lots. At the same time, we will continue to lease additional homestead lots.

Fourthly, financial resources. There

must be a sound financial foundation both for our current and future operations. This requires a financial plan and implementation strategy to determine our financial needs and the means of securing those resources. If this is not done, the program direction will be defined by financial constraints rather than strategic intent.

Fifth, organization and staff
development. Human resources are as essential as
financial resources in accomplishing our strategic
intent. Only through the most effective use and
motivation of our people will we continue to move
forward. We must consider organizational and
operational shifts as well as continue to train and
develop staff to adapt to this changing
environment.

And, sixth, community relations. In order to establish good working relations with the community at large, the legislature, other agencies, and the beneficiaries, we must establish ourselves as an action-oriented, reliable agency whose word is good. Without this credibility, our ability to work with others will be severely limited.

Out of these six issues, the department

has identified six goals which we are striving towards. To meet the changing needs of the native Hawaiians, we will need to continue to grow and evolve.

The department's goals are: first, to effectively manage the trust's land, water, and related resources; secondly, to develop and provide programs and services that best meet the overall needs of native Hawaiians; thirdly, to develop and deliver land for award on an ongoing basis; fourth, to effectively develop and manage financial resources; fifth, to effectively manage the department's human resources; and, sixth, to establish better relationships with the native Hawaiian community, governmental agencies, individual homestead communities, and the community at large.

We will continue to implement the recommendations of the task force and, at the same time, adjust to the changing needs, constraints, and opportunities the past five years have brought.

The department's goals reflect this duality of the future connected with the past. It is from this duality that we will continue implementing the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act.

Attached for your review is a report on 1 2 the status of implementation of the Federal-State 3 Task Force Report. This report, as I noted earlier, addresses specific questions identified by 4 5 this Hawaii Advisory Committee, as well. 6 I would like to point out that the 7 progress report attached to this testimony follows the sections of the Federal-State Task Force Report 8 9 and updates you on what has been accomplished. Ιt 10 is self-explanatory. It is also 12 pages long. And I will submit that for the record. 11 12 There are also attachments that I would 13 like to point out following this. 14 The first attachment is the President's 15 statement dated October 27, 1986. 16 MR. MAXWELL: Excuse me. Ilima, what 17 page is that on? 18 MS. PIIANAIA: Okay. It is following --19 it is an unnumbered page. If you go through the 20 task force, following page 12, there is a sheet 21 saying "Attachments." 22 Okay. Got it. Thank you. MR. MAXWELL: 23 MS. PIIANAIA: Attachment A is the 24 President's message, and it is dated October 27, 1986. And it was the message when President Reagan 25

1 signed House Joint Resolution 17 into law. 2 We have attached this because I think, as 3 a Hawaii Advisory Committee to the U.S. Civil 4 Rights Commission, you will find the President's 5 statement to be quite interesting. The second attachment really directly 6 7 connects back to your trust report. These are the 8 qualification procedures and application procedures 9 for Hawaiian homestead applications. 10 approximately four pages long. 11 And the final attachment, Attachment C, 12 is a preliminary financial report for the 13 department for the fiscal year that ended on 14 June 30th, 1988. 15 MR. MAXWELL: Okay. I can understand --16 we just had it now. So it is going to be hard. 17 But maybe we have questions. 18 But before I go into questioning, I would 19 like to inform whoever walked in, please put your 20 name on the sign-up sheet. And if you want to speak, there is another pad for that also. 21 22 Okay. Are you completed? 23 MS. PIIANAIA: That completes my 24 testimony.

RALPH ROSENBERG COURT REPORTERS, INC. (808)524-2090

Okay. Any questions from

MR. MAXWELL:

25

the panel members?

MR. LARDIZABAL: Not at this time.

MR. DULLES: I'll have some after you finish.

MR. MAXWELL: Okay. Because of the fact that, okay, the way I look at this is that all of these recommendations that have been corrected we've just been given, but all that we had was the Federal and State Task Force findings, and maybe I can ask you some questions pertaining to that.

MS. PIIANAIA: Sure.

MR. MAXWELL: And you can answer, and then you can show us what page to find the information on.

One thing that interests me -- and I guess a lot of Hawaiians -- is that the executive orders that have been made illegally, are we being compensated for that or has the land been returned? And, if so, can you show us some example here?

MS. PIIANAIA: I would like to refer you to page 6 of the progress report, under the major heading of "Land Transfers" at the bottom of the page. And this follows a task force report, which the first section was on general financing recommendations. And this goes from page 6,

really, through page 9.

Essentially, in summary, the executive orders and governors' proclamations, which were illegal conveyances, these have all been rescinded except for those covering federal lands.

We are in court, the State of Hawaii has sued the United States government, Department of Navy, for illegal occupation and use of our lands at Lualualei.

We are currently negotiating with other agencies for compensation. It's quite complex. For instance, when things like, say, Keaukaha Elementary School was established on the Big Island, at that time, it was primarily to service the homestead community. As the community has grown, non-Hawaiians are going to the school. So we are trying to work out the school problems. We have worked out some of the school problems and are still in negotiations for either compensation, land exchanges.

MR. MAXWELL: Land exchange comparable to the value?

MS. PIIANAIA: Yes. The act requires that land exchanges can only be on a per-value basis.

MR. MAXWELL: Any question on that?

Anybody?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Okay. Another point of interest that I have specifically dealing for like from Maui, we have, you know, in Kahikinui, we have this whole 15,000 acres that are leased to a non-Hawaiian. Okay. Not too many Hawaiians can lease 15,000 acres. And I posed this question way back in the breach of trust, and I would like to know if that has been solved. And I don't think so on Maui. I'm speaking about access to the ocean that has been blocked on the entire area of this coast in Kahikinui. And I am talking about the native Hawaiians that can use the natural resources, hunting, fishing, and there were old trails that led down to the ocean, and presently it has been closed the last five years. Those rights-of-way to the ocean have been closed. I know on other properties that Hawaiian Homes owns there's the same problem.

MS. PIIANAIA: Most of the lands that were leased out, such as Kahikinui, were leased out prior to the department having control of its own lands. Up until about 1965, lands that were not used for homestead purposes were actually managed

by the Department of Land and Natural Resources.

It took major legislation to return the lands to
the management of the commission, the Hawaiian
Homes Commission.

The department has looked at use of lands or access rights by native Hawaiians. At the present time, we have not come to any overall program for that. The ahupua'a that you refer to, Kahikinui, is probably our most remote ahupua'a. At this point in time, it is one of four tracts of land out of 34 that we do not have a plan prepared for.

MR. MAXWELL: Well, I would seriously suggest that after I guess we had the hearings in 1978 I had posed this question. I think Mrs. Miller was chairing that hearing. See, the reason why I think it is very important that Hawaiians, now that you have control of this land, that you have the right, as administrator, to open up the access to the ocean because that's where the Hawaiians get their resource from. Also, let them hunt; let them harvest.

See, what is happening now, the people that run this ranch are using it as a private estate, and you have to -- excuse the term -- kiss

1 okole to even go on the property, and that is not 2 correct. Something has to be done right away in establishing -- you know, the Hawaiian Homes 3 4 offices on each island can hold the key. But we 5 should retain our right to access to the ocean. 6 That is number one. And then we should let the 7 Hawaiians harvest the resources from the ocean and 8 give them that access. If they cannot lease the land, you know, I think that should be done. 9 10 MS. PIIANAIA: What I would like to do, 11 Mr. Maxwell, is to follow up in more detail in 12 writing to you on that. 13 MR. MAXWELL: Okay. 14 THE WITNESS: Particularly the Kahikinui and other tracts that have access to the shoreline, 15 16 and to recap some of the efforts that have been 17 made, and also any kind of legal problems that 18 might be obstacles. 19 MR. MAXWELL: I'm not coming to you as an 20 adversary kind of thing 21 MS. PIIANAIA: Right. 22 MR. MAXWELL: And I understand that you 23 inherited a political football and you inherited a 24 bag of worms that not only one woman with her staff 25 can solve, but the fact of the matter is still that

our people are suffering. Our people are suffering from not having the opportunity to enjoy what was rightfully theirs. So that's why I'm concerned and a lot of the members are concerned, as to when are we going to, you know, stop having to have these hearings, when do we get down and cut bait, so to speak.

Questions?

MS. SAUNDERS: I have a question on the succession. You have changed it so that the lessee has time to designate a successor, and the commission cannot come in. But I don't understand how long that period is and when the commission versus the lessee designates a successor.

MS. PIIANAIA: Okay. Mrs. Saunders, the law was amended in 1986 or consented to by the U.S. Congress in 1986, to allow children and spouses of one-quarter blood to succeed to the leasehold interest.

We have required and have audited, or are in the process still, I think, of auditing all our files to make sure that successors either to the leasehold interest or to the appraised value of the improvements, if there is no qualified successor.

We have instructed everyone that they are to fill

out a designation form.

There are cases where lessees do not fill out their designation forms or there are problems with documentation of blood quantum. In those cases, we then go to the process of the commission designating a successor. So, basically, the commission designation of a successor is the last step. But we still have those cases where no one has been designated by the lessee to either succeed to the leasehold interest or to receive the appraised value of the improvements on the land.

Does that answer your question?

MS. SAUNDERS: My problem is one of timing because, as I understand it, it used to be that there was a very fast reversion from the lessee to the commission. And I'm interested in how long the lessee has to designate or when the commission would step in and say there is no designation.

MS. PIIANAIA: If there is no designation --

MS. SAUNDERS: Within a year, two years, 10 years?

MS. PIIANAIA: It will be within a year.

At this point, we're -- Mr. Lardizabal and I are in

this race to see who has the smallest department in 1 2 state government, and I just won the race. Mr. Lardizabal has a few more people than I do. 3 I 4 mean he can create the positions, right. 5 We have a backlog, and that backlog is 6 due to lack of staff resources and also the need to 7 hire appraisers. We have just instituted a 8 procedure so that we now have appraisers who can go 9 in and appraise the improvements on every island. 10 Prior to this, the counties were handling 11 appraisals for us. So we have just gone through 12 that transition. 13 But it is, as best as possible, done 14 within a year, which, for the commission to 15 designate a successor, we're required to advertise 16 in the newspaper four times, and that is about a 17 four-month period. So, after that, everything else, all the processing is done after that. 18 19 MS. SAUNDERS: Thank you. 20 MR. MAXWELL: John. 21 MR. DULLES: I have two or three quick 22 questions. This was a monumental task force 23 report. I commend you because I know you were 24 directly involved in its preparation. And it is

RALPH ROSENBERG COURT REPORTERS, INC. (808)524-2090

voluminous and contains many, many findings and

25

recommendations. It appears to me that this issue has been well studied; and, as the chairman suggests, maybe some action is necessary in some areas that have not been met. But I commend you for your work on that.

I wanted to ask you, however: You mention in your response that this report was accepted by the Department of Interior and by the State. Is that all they were supposed to do? Was there not some obligation on the part of the Federal Government or the State to respond in some detail to what measures might be undertaken or what plan of action might be initiated to address many of these excellent findings and recommendations? Is that all we have: They have accepted the report?

MS. PIIANAIA: Essentially, yes. The task force was created and jointly appointed by, at that time, Secretary Watt and Governor Ariyoshi.

The task force recommendations did not carry the weight that was hoped that they would carry.

The State has pulled through in many of the major recommendations of the task force report.

The United States Department of the Interior has -- how do I politely say this -- they have not

followed through with the recommendations to the extent that the State has on its side. We are still -- well, what the Secretary of the Interior has done basically has expedited land exchange reviews as well as assisted us with the consent to amendments to the process. We now have a person in the Secretary's Office or out of the Secretary's Office to whom we can make contact with. And earlier this year we did send up a package of amendments, and they have worked very quickly on those.

But with a change of administration coming up, it is unclear whether that relationship will still exist. And it will be up to us to make sure that the Department of Interior continues the relationship and improves the relationship with our department.

MR. DULLES: Thank you.

One of the things that I noticed on page 66 of the task force report on information and access, it says, "Beneficiaries are the primary group needing access to information about the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act and DHHL programs." And it also says, "Beneficiaries feel they do not have ready access to information." And I'm just

wondering, because there was a concept of an ombudsman and also of some advocacy function within your department that would actually assist people in at least getting current information about the status of their claims and also helping them in an advocacy fashion, will it take more resources? Or is this being done? Or how have you been able to address this particular finding from the task force report?

2.2

MS. PIIANAIA: First of all, let me say that we are not fantastic on information, and that is an area that organizationally we need to improve. We have one information specialist within the department. That person's primary responsibility is to put together and get out our departmental newsletter, which has a circulation of about 15,000.

In this year's budget, we have put in money -- I believe it is about \$50,000 -- to actually beef up our information program and access for the beneficiaries. Tied into this also is the need for computerization. Computerization for all state agencies is essentially centralized in the Department of Budget and Finance. So it is an area that we are very concerned with. The staff, the

entire staff, is very concerned with this. And it is one of our major projects or programs that we want to establish in this fiscal year.

In terms of an advocacy role, that is not a simple thing for the department to set up. And the reason why it is not a simple thing is because the commission is actually in the role of trustee. And to have an advocate may not be the answer, and it may be in conflict for anyone working within the department if it turns into an adversarial relationship.

I don't think there is a need for an advocate. There may be at this point, but eventually, looking towards a situation that is better managed and better organized and more efficient, we would hope that we wouldn't need an ombudsman, but basically you would know who to call in the department.

I think also I need to point out the level of resources we need to respond, especially if you look at our 5,000-plus or close to 6,000 actual lessees and then another 17,000 applications. We're now dealing with the universe of constituency of at least 12,000 people with a permanent staff of only 98.

1 MR. DULLES: Are you satisfied, however, 2 that at least now there is a full accounting for 3 all 200,000 acres with respect to the transfers, 4 the previously illegal leases, and exchanges of 5 I mean, has that pretty well been resolved 6 to your satisfaction, the accounting of the land itself? 7 8 MS. PIIANAIA: Vice Chairman Maxwell said 9 that he's glad to see a lot of things resolved. 10 Many things are not resolved. We have our 11 checklist of things we need to resolve. We have 12 identified, to the best of our ability, what 13 happened to the lands. There are major areas, and 14 I believe it's in the progress report. Let me 15 just --MR. MAXWELL: Addendum 6, page 6, "Land 16 17 Transfer"? 18 MS. PIIANAIA: No. It is on page 10, 19 "Land Inventory Discrepancies." 20 We have completed internally land tenure 21 reports for a number of areas. That's in the 22 second bullet there. We have other areas that we 23 still need to complete our land tenure reports on. So the bottom line answer to your 24

RALPH ROSENBERG COURT REPORTERS, INC. (808)524-2090

question, Mr. Dulles, is that no, I am not

25

satisfied yet that we have resolved the land inventory. It will still take additional work, which means going through survey records. It is very tedious work. We have one person assigned full time to that in terms of looking at the historical record and surveys and recordations, et cetera.

MR. DULLES: And, finally, you met with us earlier in August and shared with us some of your very, what appeared to be, innovative and exciting ideas for maximizing benefits under the homelands program. And I wondered if maybe you could share these or at least some of these ideas that you are moving forward along in terms of new initiatives just briefly.

MS. PIIANAIA: I don't know where to start. There are many things that we're trying to work up in terms of initiatives.

I think the largest problem -- and it's reflected in my testimony -- is that we have this duality of moving into the future, but we also have 67 years of past history that have created many problems. We need to really take a look at how to step into the 21st century.

It's interesting because our landholding

is the fourth largest in the State of Hawaii, but when you look at the usability of lands, particularly when you look at the number of applications we have for homestead leases, it's going to require innovation. We need to maximize the use of land for homesteading, while at the same time, unless there is a drastic change that I cannot foresee in the near future, we also have to generate income.

We are looking at a number of ways of lessening the financial burden on the department and the commission. I think a major program that's been very — we are beginning to see it really work right now is the FHA financing. We are trying to move out into new ways of financing.

We're looking at different ways of providing entitlements. And this is all very preliminary. And I will mention this because we have discussed it very briefly. There are areas where we do not have any land. I think the Island of Maui particularly is an area where we do not have land holdings and where there is a need for residential leases, for instance.

We would like to look into what the definition of a beneficiary entitlement is. It may

make more sense for us, for instance — and this is really at this point just a preliminary idea — it may make more sense for us to find a way of financing somebody's down payment for residential lot and house. At this time, it costs us between thirty and forty thousand dollars to develop a residential lot, depending on where it is. It's very expensive. If we can provide the down payment for a fee simple lot, it may be more cost effective, and it may be a quicker way of getting people their entitlement than our present operation, which is still a little faster than it was previously.

We also need to start looking at -- in places like Oahu, we need to face some of the realities and look at what kind of density homestead lots should come in and whether they should actually be, say, a garden apartment for a young couple starting out and how to deal with the life cycle.

One of the things that happens with a 99-year lease is that the homestead lessee is essentially tied to one area for three to four generations. And in this day and age, most people are more mobile than they were in the past. So

ways of looking at the exchanges between native Hawaiians, say if somebody has a job on Maui and needs to move over there, how to set up that kind of process so that we can lessen the dependency of the native Hawaiian beneficiary on us and make it possible for native Hawaiians to determine their own destinies in that way.

I think we really are looking at ways to decrease the dependency of native Hawaiian beneficiaries upon the department. The program was set up as a highly dependent program. I think in August, when I met with you, I informed you that for a long time a homestead lessee could not even go on a two-week vacation without permission from the commission. If you look at that historically, that is a very colonial way of treating native Hawaiians.

MR. DULLES: Thank you.

MR. MAXWELL: Ilima, we have several agencies that could work for the betterment of our people, if it is managed correctly: Hawaiian Homes, OHA. OHA is an agency that receives moneys directly from Section 5F. That is the enabling act or the Statehood Act. In fact, I think one of the qualifications is 50 percent Hawaiian that's

connected up to the Hawaiian Homes Act in 1920.

Has there been any kind of correlation between OHA and Hawaiian Homes pertaining to funding from the Section 5F moneys for 50-percent Hawaiians?

MS. PIIANAIA: At the present time, there is one program, and that's self-help housing, which is actually an ANA grant. I have been in discussions with the chairman, I guess the recently former chairman of the Office of Hawaiian Affairs, as well as its administrator. There is an organization, the Hawaiian Services Institute and Agencies, and we will be reconvening to discuss how all the different institutions and agencies can begin to pool resources and really complement each other, because when you look at the various agencies and institutions, our resources are relatively large.

MR. MAXWELL: Right.

MS. PIIANAIA: But in terms of OHA specifically, we are in discussions. At one time, there was a proposed memorandum of agreement between Alu Like, the Office of Hawaiian Affairs, and Hawaiian Home Lands, which has not been consummated. But in my discussions with some of

the OHA board members, they would like to begin to look at that memorandum of agreement again.

MR. MAXWELL: Right, because it only stands to reason that the recipients of the Hawaiian Homes Act would automatically qualify for Section 5F moneys. So if that moneys could be used to help to open up areas for the 50 percent Hawaiians, it only stands to reason that both agencies should really get together.

MS. PIIANAIA: I agree. Yes.

MR. LARDIZABAL: Ilima, I read your report here, and I thank you for that. You have a tremendous burden to implement. My question is -- and I want to at least let the public know it takes a lot of resources to accomplish what I guess many people want. I can't find in my mind how you can accomplish what I think the public wants in terms of the Hawaiians, 17,000 backlogged, with limited resources.

So my questions are these: One, can you identify what is the ideal situation for your department and the resources, financial, CIP operations, your resources, any legal authority you don't have now that prevents you from doing certain things, departmental cooperation with different

agencies, and even the counties, maybe, and the U.S. Government, and any legislation that you need.

I'm familiar with the department. It is very small. And the task at hand is tremendous. I see financing as a key thing for you. Where can we get those kind of financing and so forth?

MS. PIIANAIA: Let me respond. And I don't mean this facetiously, but we are going to get it wherever we can.

Our major source of funding has been through the executive budget and the legislature. We are going through a transition. I'm taking the department through transition where we need to be programmatic, and we can no longer say that we don't have the money so we can't do anything.

We have been trying to turn that around to say this is what we have to do; and when we know what we really have to do and what our priorities are, then we can identify how much it is going to cost us and how to go after the money. We will be working on, in this year, a financial strategy. Essentially the department has not had a financial plan or a financial strategy.

We will continue to go to the legislature for funding. We will continue to generate revenues

1 from general leasing our land. We will --2 MR. LARDIZABAL: Let me ask you a 3 question, if I may interrupt. You have an 4 operational budget of \$1 million, roughly, 5 900,000-plus for 98 people. That has been pretty 6 much steady during the last --7 MS. PIIANAIA: No, Al, this is the first 8 time. This fiscal year is the first time the 9 department has ever had any general funds for our 10 operations. We have been the only department in 11 the state government that had to cover the costs of 12 our own operations. So a lot of the revenues that we generated through general leasing went to 13 14 operational costs. 15 I have informed my fellow agencies, as 16 well as the legislature, that they're going to hear 17 from me every year until we get the other half of 18 our permanent positions general funded. This is 19 only half of our permanent positions. 20 MR. LARDIZABAL: How about in terms of 21 CIP? 22 MS. PIIANAIA: In CIP, we have, for this 23 biennium right now, about \$22 million. And that 24 was a substantial increase from previous bienniums.

RALPH ROSENBERG COURT REPORTERS, INC. (808)524-2090

The increase was due primarily to acceleration and

25

the need to make improvements. But \$22 million does not go far. We will be going in and asking for more.

We will also be looking at joint venturing. We can joint venture. So we will be looking at that. We need to look at all sorts of ways to find resources to pay development costs for lots.

We are also working with the counties very closely in terms of looking at existing standards and whether we should construct according to their standards or to lesser standards, which we can. But that, again, is complex because the counties are required to maintain our roadways. And you come into the health and safety question and whether, if we don't use the county standards, say, for roadway engineering, then does the commission have to adopt its own health and safety standards, which my initial thinking on it is yes, my initial consultations.

I'm not sure if I am answering your question, Al.

MR. LARDIZABAL: Well, I am trying to see how, I think, these agencies can assist or be of help in getting what needs to be done. Apparently,

there is a feeling that much needs to be done. But they also must see the opposite of the coin, it does take resources. And are these resources within your grasp and control? If they're not, who is in control, state agency that you can work with?

2.4

MS. PIIANAIA: All of the agencies that we have worked with, the key agencies being, of course, your department, Personnel Services, Budget and Finance, Accounting and General Services, Land and Natural Resources, have all been extremely cooperative. Because we are a state agency, we still have to go through some of the state processes.

As you know, Al, there's been a move to do away with your department and Budget and Finance and all the hang-up agencies. But we are moving towards that, and we're also looking at, as you say, legislation. But essentially we have many amendments to the act that we have not been able to even implement yet. We are looking through the different processes that we have to go through as a state agency.

MR. SHAIN: As a follow-up to that Ilima, do you see that possibly another structure aside from being a state agency could make DHHL more

effective?

I don't know if that has been asked.

MS. PIIANAIA: No, it hasn't been.

If you go back to the Federal-State Task Force, the task force report, one of the recommendations was to really --

MR. MAXWELL: Wait one moment. Can you repeat that, Barry, into the mike, please.

MR. SHAIN: What I asked was, under the current structure of being a state agency, has there been any research done or have you thought of possibly another structure, because, as Al said, you have 17,000 backlogged and one-quarter -- 80 percent of the land hasn't been given away, et cetera, et cetera. I was wondering if you have looked into possibly another structure, like a 501(c)(3) or setting up a corporation that would still be funded by the legislature, of course, but it would have the availability of other resources and maybe a little bit more independent?

MS. PIIANAIA: The Federal-State Task

Force report recommended that the department and

commission look into the authority model. We have

essentially -- or at that time, we had two existing

authorities: Hawaii Housing Authority and Hawaii

Community Development Authority. And as you know, these authorities have bonding capacities and everything else.

The department has not pursued this recommendation basically because it went into acceleration following the task force report. We have discussed, in-house, other structures. Since I have been on the job, we have not pursued other structures. We're still talking about it.

We know we have to make an organizational shift. Whether to shift to a corporate type of structure or an authority structure is not clear to us yet. Again, this is something that we will be looking at in the next two to three years.

I think what needs to be really clear is that, since we're trustees on behalf of the State of Hawaii, how do you still administer the trust on behalf of the State without necessarily going through all of the bureaucratic processes of state government.

MR. MAXWELL: Okay. Ilima, are you aware of -- last week, I think, they had hearings on Molokai, the congressional hearings held by Senator Inouye. And on the front page of the Maui News -- I will give you a copy -- there was "Homesteaders

45 air grievances." One of the persons there is Bill Char, who I have worked with before. This is an example -- and Senator Inouye -- which I really don't appreciate his comments -- he said that if you want to check into the Hawaiian Homes, good or bad, you know, we'll check. That's what it is all about. I think can improve. But, I mean, if these people are so

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that's what we're all about, trying to check how we dissatisfied, you know -- are you aware of the comments that they made about water, about this and I'm not asking you to be specific.

MS. PIIANAIA: I am generally aware.

MR. MAXWELL: Okay.

MS. PIIANAIA: I was not at that meeting.

MR. MAXWELL: Apparently, there is so much problem, so much hurt, that they have to go to a congressional hearing like this. It is not even the subject matter. You know, it is about reparations and about health and welfare.

So some things really have to happen. That is what I mean. I mean that is what I'm trying to urge. Something has to happen to help our people. It is just too long, you know, for them to be all upset like this. And a congressman, a senator, threatens them that, you know, all the bad going to come out. What bad is there? There was a lot of bad that happened, but, you know, our people have to go on, and this is our act.

Any other comments?

MS. MILLER: Yes.

MR. MAXWELL: Helen.

MS. MILLER: I think I'm interested from the standpoint of being a member of the SAC Committee, State Advisory Committee, and having put out a report several years ago -- I think it was 1980 -- in which the citizens complained that they were being deprived of their right to property under the HHCA and that they were not receiving equal protection of the law.

So I wondered, after hearing your report and knowing that there are other people in the audience today that are very much concerned with the issues of the Hawaiian community, what would you consider of highest priority in making sure that the rights of the Hawaiian people are not abrogated?

I have heard so many things this morning and in your report and also having read the report that certainly there has been action on the part of

your office and some other organizations interested in the Hawaiian problem.

What would you consider the most basic thing that could be done so that the people who have complained to us in 1980 would say, you can stop complaining for us now because our rights are not being violated?

MS. PIIANAIA: Let me address that in two parts. In terms of of the Civil Rights Commission and as the advisory committee, my understanding is you have specific areas to look into. There is a point at which the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act and the U.S. Civil Rights Act may intersect. I'm not clear on that. I know that In section 1983 of the Civil Rights Act there is an intersection. Basically, that is one answer, is that we have to follow the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act. And within that is guaranteed anyone's constitutional rights to due process, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera,

Our job, as trustee on behalf of the State of Hawaii, is to ensure that the act is administered, Hawaiian Homes Commission Act is administered as it is set forth. There will continue to be complaints, I'm sure, long after I'm

gone. There are still going to be many things to resolve.

I think that the most basic thing that we have to do as trustees is to create the wherewithal, the resources to make sure that the intent and purpose of the act, which is essentially homesteading, can be accomplished. And until we go out and develop those resources by hook or by -- by hook or by hook -- it is going to be very, very difficult for us to carry out our job to satisfy not only us, as trustees, but the Hawaiian community and everyone else in the State of Hawaii.

I'm not sure if that answers your
question, but that's --

MS. MILLER: Partly, but it gives a clue to some of the other questions I had in mind.

MR. MAXWELL: Okay. Any more?
Yes.

MR. SHAIN: Yeah. The congressional act, 1920 or 1921, gave a blood quantum of 50 percent. I think as we start looking ahead more and more toward the future, especially with inheritance, even inheritance of a lease, if you continue in that way, we're going to see more people put off their land or put off the land. Has the commission

looked at that at all?

MS. PIIANAIA: Yes. I will differ from your observation. There are more and more native Hawaiians; that is, 50 percent Hawaiians in the population. It is my understanding that the largest age cohort or the largest group of native Hawaiians are still under the age of 18. So we will have a plentiful supply, a plentiful, a large population of native Hawaiians.

In terms of dislocation from the land, that was the primary purpose, to prevent dislocation was the primary purpose of the one-fourth blood successorship. And we have had very few dislocations from the land since that amendment was consented to by Congress.

We will need to monitor whether that one-fourth successorship amendment is working as it is intended to. At this point, it appears to be working quite well.

MR. MAXWELL: Thank you.

Any more questions?

MS. MILLER: One more. If nothing more is done than what is in the report, would you say that the rights of the Hawaiian people have not been abrogated?

MS. PIIANAIA: If nothing more is done than --

MS. MILLER: Than what has been reported. You know, after all, there are limits expressed in the report, that you have done this and that, but there are difficulties because of money or not being able to get certain laws passed and so forth. But let's say things were left there. Would you say then that the Hawaiian Homes Commission has done its job to ensure equal rights for the Hawaiian people?

MS. PIIANAIA: That's a very, very difficult question. It is a deep question, and I'm not sure I can answer it at this point. It would take a lot more reflection on my part. I will say that within our responsibilities in carrying out the act and in administering the act, we do our best to make sure that the rights of beneficiaries are not abrogated. And this is in keeping with constitutional provisions, as I said earlier.

What is very significant is that beneficiaries, groups of beneficiaries, can sue us if they think that we are breaching our trust responsibilities, and I'm not so sure if our trust responsibilities and breach of trust is the same as

1 the civil rights or the rights that you're talking 2 I'm not sure if they're synonymous. 3 MS. MILLER: I guess the reason I ask 4 that question is because it is a law that there 5 were lands set aside for the Hawaiians. We can't 6 do anything but follow it. I quess that's why my 7 question was based on that. 8 MS. PIIANAIA: Let me answer that 9 question this way: If I am violating this law, which has been subject to interpretations, then I 10 11 should not be sitting in the chair I'm sitting in. MS. MILLER: And then the other question 12 13 is, do you think the Federal Government has done 14 all it could to enable the state commission to do 15 its work? 16 MS. PIIANAIA: No. 17 MR. SHAIN: Expand. MR. MAXWELL: I'm going to have to allow 18 19 one more question from you, and then we're going to 20 have to move on, because we have other witnesses 21 MS. SAUNDERS: Mine isn't a question. 22 Mine is just a note. I note that the country of 23 Norway has just granted the Samers or the Lapps, their native population, their own parliament. And 24 25 this is to be, in effect, a state within a state,

and they are to address the concerns and needs and problems of the Samers. And it seems to me there is a parallel here. And the Scandinavian countries seem to be so far ahead of us. I'm intrigued by this model.

MR. MAXWELL: You know, I'm going to have to thank you. But this is a really broad subject that just an hour of conversation with you, you know, and my recommendation later is to the committee that we have another one of these held on the Island of Molokai, where there is a lot of people that's affected. Maybe we can get some other kind of testimony from them. But I would like to express our thanks to you for sitting here and informing us of what's been happening. You have been very informative to us.

Thank you.

MS. PIIANAIA: Thank you. And I would like to extend my mahalo for allowing us this opportunity, and also to let you know that myself and my staff are available for you any time you like.

MR. MAXWELL: Thank you.

Just an added thing. Some of the questions that we pose, maybe you can get back,

like you said, in writing to us when you can. 1 2 MS. PIIANAIA: Yes. 3 MR. MAXWELL: Thank you. 4 MS. PIIANAIA: Thank you very much. 5 MR. MAXWELL: I would like to call now 6 Moses Keale, Office of Hawaiian Affairs, or Rod 7 Burgess. I would like the record to show this is 8 9 Trustee Louis Hao, who is the Chairman of the 10 Office of Hawaiian Affairs. 11 MR. DULLES: Mr. Chairman, may I just 12 acknowledge that we have present with us from 13 Washington the acting staff director of the United 14 States Commission on Civil Rights, Susan J. Prado, 15 and we are very honored and pleased that she could 16 join us today. 17 MR. MAXWELL: Also, I would like to 18 mention the fact that there are sign-up sheets in 19 the back. Whoever came in late can sign up if they 20 want to speak. They will have the time afforded 21 them between four and five this afternoon. 22 MR. HAO: Aloha. I have with me Trustee 23 Clarence Ching, also. 24 My name is Lois Hao, Chairman and Trustee 25 from Molokai for the Office of Hawaiian Affairs.

1 | Aloha.

MR. MAXWELL: Aloha.

MR. HAO: Thank you for the opportunity to present the comments of the Office of Hawaiian Affairs regarding recent developments toward the implementation, management, and enforcement of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act.

It has been eight years since the Civil Rights Commission published the proceedings of a similar forum on the Hawaiian Home Lands. It may interest you to note that the Office of Hawaiian Affairs did not testify at your initial forum because we were not yet fully established.

That report's title asked the fundamental question of whether a breach of trust had occurred in the administration and implementation of the Hawaiian Homes program. Based on the findings of the report, the answer to the question was clearly yes.

Since 1980, however, remarkable progress has been made to review and to repair the Hawaiian Homes trust.

Highlights to the repair process have included a Solicitor General's report to the congressionally-established Native Hawaiians Study

Commission and the creation of the Joint

Federal-State Task Force on Hawaiian Home Lands.

And their reports were published in 1983. The

Office of Hawaiian Affairs, OHA, took an active and responsible role in each of those reports. In fact, OHA helped fund and one of our trustees served as a member of the task force.

Let me now begin by summarizing the advances which have occurred in the last eight years:

One, acting in response to the task force, former Governor George Ariyoshi canceled a series of territorial and state gubernatorial executive orders which illegally set aside 28,000 acres of trust lands for nonbeneficiary use.

Secondly, in response to the issue of trust lands used for airports which could not be returned, cash payment for back rent and a land exchange were negotiated.

Third, in response to the needs of the then 3,000 qualified beneficiaries on the waiting list -- some of whom had waited for 30 years -- the department initiated an accelerated awards program, assigning raw lands to eligible native Hawaiians.

Fourth, as required by the State

Constitution, the administrative costs of the department were included and funded in Governor Waihee's first executive budget approved in 1987.

Fifth, along with administrative costs, a significant commitment of \$27 million in capital improvements money was also authorized for this biennium.

Sixth, last Friday, the first FHA-backed home mortgage was signed by a Hawaiian Homes awardee.

And, seventh, the federal budget, for the first time in 50 years, includes an appropriation of \$1.3 million for Hawaiian Homes infrastructure, a small but symbolic acknowledgment of responsibility.

As impressive as these gains are, however, each step forward has also meant a new question raised, a possible breach deepened. And that is the sadness of the Hawaiian Homes program; that progress always walks with a shadow of doubt.

First, the response to illegal set-asides was imperfectly implemented by the Department of Hawaiian Homes. Almost immediately after the lands were returned to the control of the department, revocable leases were approved to continue most of

those lands under the administration of county parks. No rent was negotiated, save the maintenance costs of public use enjoyment.

We continue to question whether such an arrangement is consistent with the fiduciary responsibilities of the state and the commission.

Also deeply troubling were efforts to pursue the return of Lualualei lands from the Federal Government. Without addressing the merits of the case, the Court ruled that the statute of limitations had run, and that the case was dismissed. The Lualualei lands were addressed in the Task Force Report of 1983. Now, how could there be such a delay in filing suit?

Second, the land exchange negotiated between the State and the department to replace Hilo Airport holdings for income-producing property at Shafter Flats raised two significant issues.

Most important to OHA, Shafter Flats were ceded lands subject to the native Hawaiian trust established for our office. As a result of that exchange, OHA has lost \$58,000 a year in trust revenues. Thus, one Hawaiian trust was repaired by harming another.

In addition, the entire premise of

exchanging lands for income rather than the fulfillment of DHHL trust purposes is open to possible suit. While it may not now seem a primary concern, the seriousness of this concern will grow with time.

In particular, the department has announced plans to pursue income production which are not linked to revocable leases and uses. The development of Kawaihai Harbor and surrounding trust lands for commercial purposes effectively removes these lands from explicit beneficiary enjoyment through stated trust objectives. There shall be no homesteading, no ranching, farming, or pasture land use will be possible.

Further, this curtailment of useful trust lands comes just as there is an explosion in eligibile beneficiary interests. Spurred by the announcement of the acceleration program, the 1980 waiting list of 3,000 has now expanded to more than 17,000 families.

Ironically, this use of trust lands for income purposes comes just as state and federal sources are demonstrating a willingness to meet their obligations to the program. The public will, to continue and to increase this funding could well

be sapped, or even broken, by the easier and longstanding but dubious practice that the program should pay for itself.

Of course, the program has some public beneficiary dimension which outweighs the native Hawaiian interest. This possibility is present in the Kaulana Boat Ramp project, Hawaii County annoucements of building and irradiation plant on homelands, and the continued inability to use large tracts of Kauai homestead lands because of Barking Sands military buffer zones.

The problems are complex. Their resolution will not be easy. But every effort should be expended to find solutions which do not create additional, sometimes deeper, harms to the Hawaiian Homelands trust and native Hawaiian beneficiaries.

Among other issues which continue to have adverse implications for the success of the Hawaiian Homes program are the deteriorating condition and inaccessibility of genealogical records needed to establish eligibility; difficulties with the successorship provisions allowing a one-quarter Hawaiian spouse or children to inherit the award; and the unconscionable wait

1

2

3

4

6

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

which continues for so many qualified beneficiaries while non-Hawaiians enjoy leases.

We are confident that, in the course of this forum, these and other concerns will be raised and addressed in detail.

It is not our intent to simply point fingers at the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands, the State, or the Federal Government. As stated at the beginning of this presentation, there has been significant progress toward fulfilling the letter and the spirit of the Hawaiian Homes trust.

Further, OHA, again, affirms its commitment to full cooperation with and assistance to the department and trust beneficiaries in further improving the programs and the intent of the Hawaiian Homelands.

On behalf of OHA, I would also like to express our gratitude to you for the interest and the commitment which you have displayed in calling this meeting, especially for your dedication in seeking a follow-up to what proved to be a critical report and element in our continuing quest for fair and effective management of the Hawaiian Homelands Trust.

Mahalo.

are received from OHA from Section 5F, would it not impact the recipients of the Hawaiian Homes? And if so, how can these two agencies get together to implement more land? Because one agency has funding, one agency has land. That is the theory that I'm talking about.

MS. DELANEY: I think what we need to do first is to try to separate out. You describe the 5F trust, which is a description of the trust constraints. Both the trust moneys that OHA derives, as well as the Hawaiian Home Lands, are described in section 5B of the Admissions Act. And then it is those lands that are addressed in our State Constitution, and that's what finally creates the OHA trust. It is consistent with the 5F trust, but they are not precisely the same thing.

MR. MAXWELL: Wait. Let me clarify. I don't mean the lands that creates the moneys derived; I'm talking about moneys that are derived from the lands, these three classifications, and the betterment of native Hawaiians is one. The moneys, itself, what I am saying is that OHA has the moneys that derive from this Section 5F. Could it be used for Hawaiian Homes recipients?

MS. DELANEY: It could and it has been.

As was stated in the testimony, OHA put up \$50,000 for the Joint Federal-State Task Force. There have been other examples.

If you are talking about merging the two trusts, I think it would require a constitutional amendment.

MR. MAXWELL: No. It was just, my question was one has a land base, one has a money base or a source of a money base, Section 5F, if they could come together. You know, the next question in my mind would be, the Section 5F moneys, is that earmarked or does the OHA trustees have -- can specify what it would be used for? This is my train of question --

MS. DELANEY: Uh-huh.

MR. MAXWELL: -- is that, again, Ilima states that financial, money is the problem to implement the grading and this and that of the land. They have a lot of land. OHA has an area that could get money.

MS. DELANEY: OHA does not have a lot of money. The trust revenues for the Office of Hawaiian Affairs was equal to about 1.4 million a year. That is right now the same amount which DHHL is receiving, I believe, in administrative costs.

1 people. 2 We're going to take a short recess. 3 (Brief recess taken) 4 MR. MAXWELL: Okay. The next panel that 5 has been invited to testify is the Legal and Policy 6 Issues, Mehealani Ing, Executive Director of the 7 Native Hawaiian Legal Corporation, and I believe Alan Murakami, attorney, Native Hawaiian Legal 8 9 Corporation. 10 MS. ING: Aloha. 11 MR. MAXWELL: Aloha 12 MS. ING: You know, I never get used to 13 speaking in public. 14 Good afternoon and aloha, members of the 15 U.S. Commission --16 MR. MAXWELL: Aloha. 17 MS. ING: Aloha, Commission on Civil Rights, Hawaii Advisory Committee, thank you for 18 19 this opportunity to present testimony on the 20 Hawaiian Homes program. 21 I'm Mahealani Ing. I was introduced. 22 And I am the Executive Director of the Native 23 Hawaiian Legal Corporation, a five-attorney, non-profit, public interest law firm which has as 24 25 its mission the defense, protection, and assertion

of native Hawaiian land and traditional rights.

I began my work in this area 18 years ago and, in 1975, spent several years working exclusively on Hawaiian Homes legal problems as a research assistant with the Legal Aid Society of Hawaii. The problems we faced then are by and large the same problems we confront now.

Charlie, I have to take a little aside.

I remember 15,000 acres at Kahikinui 15 years ago.

I think our lease is to Elmer Cravalho; is it not?

MR. MAXWELL: That's right.

MS. MAHEALANI: So a lot of things have stayed the same.

Our litigation director, Alan Murakami, will be presenting, in a more detailed and analytical fashion, the status of the program as our agency views it today. Alan is the person chiefly responsible for overseeing the day-to-day legal work relating to Hawaiian Homes problems in our office. He has over 10 years of experience on this and other islands.

Before hearing from Alan, however, I would like to place that program within a larger context which describes Hawaiian concerns today.

As you may know, the Hawaiian government undertook

a great land division in 1848. The net result of that legal manipulation relentlessly engineered by American businessmen and finally acceded to by the Hawaiian government was to push tens of thousands Hawaiians off of their lands. The remedy held out during this period, the Kuleana Act of 1950, was a wretched failure. Seventy-four percent of all adult males and their families were dislocated from the land. Unhealthful conditions created by the ghettos which resulted further exacerbated the problem of an already diseased and dying population.

In 1893, sovereignty over all land not privately held -- and, of course, most privately held land at that time was in the hands of non-natives -- was wrested away from the Hawaiian people by these same business interests. They imprisoned our queen on trumped-up charges after taking over her government and gave Hawaii's land to the United States. As Kina'u Kamalii'i, former chair of the Native Hawaiian Study Commission, put it just recently at a hearing before the Senate Select Committee on Indian Affairs, the U.S. stole Hawaii from Hawaiians.

The Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, passed

almost 30 years after the U.S. takeover, held out a promise of land repatriation to mitigate the injustices done to our people. You and I are here today because the Hawaiian Homes program, with its 67-year history of neglect, has failed in its mission. If Hawaiians show any vitality as a people today, it is in spite of this program, not because of it.

The long history of abuse, neglect, mismanagement, and uninspired leadership have brought our people to the point where we are no longer willing to put up with more of the same in the future. We now believe to take control of our own affairs, to eventually remove this program from state control, is the only answer.

In a recent conference on native Hawaiian rights coordinated by my organization, conferees who elected to meet an extra day developed principles embodied in five points which they believed must be included in any strategy designed to heal our nation. These principles, which we and many other native groups have proposed be incorporated into federal legislation, include:

(1) An apology by the United States government to native Hawaiians and their government

for the U.S. role in the coup of 1893;

2.0

- (2) A substantial land and natural resource base comprised of a reformed Hawaiian Homes program, a fair share of the ceded lands trust, the return of Kaho'olawe, and other appropriate lands;
- (3) Recognition of the native Hawaiian government with sovereign authority over territory within the land base;
- (4) Guarantees of (a) substantial beach access, (b) fishing, hunting, and gathering rights, and (c) protections for native Hawaiian religious practices and historic sites.

And, finally, an appropriate cash payment.

We are certain that comprehensive reform federal and state legislation must be adopted embodying the five objectives I have just related. We are not certain of the specific means that would best achieve these critical objectives but have organized ourselves and are working with those who support our goals.

And this includes our senator, who is the chair of the U.S. Senate Select Committee on Indian Affairs.

There is no principled argument that

Hawaiian natives cannot assume sovereign powers

within the federal constitutional system. There is

constitutional authority for Congress to deal on a

nation-to-nation basis with aboriginal peoples

within the continental United States.

As an historical and equitable matter and as a matter of justice, there are important aspects in which Hawaiian natives have the strongest claims to sovereignty of any indigenous groups in the United States, the chief one being that we exercised full sovereign authority a relatively short time ago in history. The sovereign authority exercised was not as a "dosmestic dependent nation," as Indian tribes on the mainland, but as a complete international sovereign. It made treaties with numerous nations and acted as a sovereign in the full international sense. Had there been a United Nations at the time, the Kingdom of Hawaii would have been a full participating member in it.

For those who believe Hawaiian sovereignty is radical and extreme, we say this: Sovereignty is admittedly a dream, but it is beautiful and dignified, an idea which has inspired peoples and nations since the beginning of time.

It is an idea embraced even in our own times by the United States Supreme Court in its decisions relating to Indians and other native Americans; an idea we believe is worthy of our highest commitment. Radical and extreme was the wholesale theft of a nation and its land perpetuated by American annexationists. They and they alone were radical and extreme.

In summary, we believe in a comprehensive approach providing for restoration of Hawaiian lands, including Hawaiian Homes trust lands, and sovereignty. We believe this is the appropriate basis on which to proceed. We believe ultimately the only objective that will really work is restoration of a full government-to-government relationship between the United States and the Hawaiian nation.

Before I entertain any questions, I would like to have Alan continue with our presentation.

MR. MAXWELL: Sure. Mahalo.

MR. MURAKAMI: Good afternoon, members of the Hawaii Advisory Committee. My name is Alan Murakami, and I am distributing my written testimony to you in the hopes that I can adequately summarize it in my oral testimony.

I wanted to say initially that we are very grateful for this opportunity to appear before you. The interest that you have demonstrated is particularly heartening to us because of the vast problems that confront this program.

I think that every forum and every avenue that we have to seek improvements to this program is going to be of immeasurable benefits to the native Hawaiian beneficiaries. So I would urge you to continue this follow-up activity. I realize this is now the second session that you have convened in the last eight or nine years. And we think more of this is necessary for a thorough follow-through on all the various recommendations made.

And I wanted to say as a side light there have been many studies and recommendations made.

And I think the time really is ripe for action.

The recommendations are on paper. They're in black and white. Numerous hearings have been held. This is now the stage for implementing the many, many, many concerns about this program and how they may be properly addressed.

I wanted to initially also say that we believe that this commission should go statewide.

The bulk of the Hawaiian Home Lands are on the neighbor islands. We have received requests to present testimony on behalf of others who could not make it. We tried as much as we could to get people to come here to Honolulu, but it remains a simple fact that a lot of the homesteaders that are experiencing the problems of which you are concerned do live on the neighbor islands; and that is where, if it is at all possible, this commission should go to listen to these concerns.

1.5

2.0

Finally, I'm going to make my comments conditional and provide a caveat on the basis of what has been expressed earlier by Mahealani Ing. We believe that long-term solution to a lot of these problems really lies on who ultimately is responsible for administering this program. And the State and the Federal Government have had 68 years to try and properly administer the trust responsibilities that are identified in the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act. And I think, by all accounts, the performance record has been pretty miserable.

To basically outline what I hope to say today -- there are many things that have to be covered -- but I think I can summarize what this

its part in this whole picture of dealing with the problems of the Hawaiian Homes program, and I summarize them under my general recommendations.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The first one is to determine why the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands has not yet contracted to conduct a management audit, as has been clearly recommended in the task force report. I think that, if the audit is conducted, a lot of the detailed concerns and problems that have been raised and will be raised before you today and have been raised before in the past will be properly addressed and reported on by a qualified audit team. And this would go a long way to address the many, many problems dealing with administration of the program, the land inventory, problems with the responsiveness of the staff to concerns of beneficiaries, the understaffing, as has been outlined by the director earlier, and how that creates problems in administration of the program, et cetera.

Second, to determine why the

Federal-State Task Force has not yet been

reconvened to evaluate the progress on the

implementation of its many recommendations. That

was the last recommendation made by the task force in its report. And that was a very important one. It was supposed to have been done within a year, to begin the assessment process of how far along both the state and federal governments had gone to implement their recommendations or its recommendations.

Three, advise the U.S. Congress on the need for and the U.S. responsibility to provide additional financial resources to fund the many infrastructural improvements needed to make this program meaningful. It is very clear from the task force that the state alone cannot do the job. And it has been a nagging question as to how much the U.S. is going to put forth to rectify the problems it contributed to during its initial, let's see, 40 years of administration of the program and, as I will outline later, it's illegal uses of trust lands as a trustee of this program.

Fourth is to advise the U.S. Justice

Department on the need to initiate legal actions

where necessary on behalf of native Hawaiians to

enforce the act. That is provided for clearly in

the Admission Act, upon which Hawaii became a state

admitted to the union. But that discretionary

right has never been exercised. I don't think there is any clearer examples than Hawaiian Home problems that have cried out for the need for litigation to address the many, many concerns that have been raised in the past. All the previous court actions that have been litigated in the courts, both federal and state, have come out of beneficiary actions initiated by beneficiaries at their cost and at much expense and time to them.

In October of 1980, you issued a report entitled <u>Breach of Trust? Native Hawaiian</u>

<u>Homelands</u>. And in that report, the former and late Georgianna Padeken relates that some 25,000 acres, comprising about 12 and a half percent of the original 200,000 acres set aside for the program, were then leased to 2,997 eligible beneficiaries. At the time, in contrast, 122,000 acres, or 61 percent, were being utilized by non-beneficiaries. The waiting list consisted of about 6,300 people.

Since then, the task force has been convened and recommendations made. In its 1987 annual report, the Hawaiian Homes Department reveals that since -- well, as of 1987, some 5,800 beneficiaries have received lot awards. However, you must keep in mind that only about 3,700 of

these are actually utilizing the land or residing on the land. The rest of these awards which resulted from the acceleration program from some years back -- I believe it was between 1985 and 1987 -- resulted in unimproved lots being granted to some 2,000 plus awardees. Many of these people, aside from, perhaps, growing some small plots of vegetables on the property or putting a few cattle on the property, have not been able to occupy or possess the property because of the lack of infrastructural improvements and, in fact, have probably been, in effect, prevented from living on the land because the department has required compliance with county regulations in terms of building and other code requirements.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

As a result, the beneficiary count on the land has actually gone up from about 3,000 to about 3,700 people during the past nine years. And they currently occupy about 32,713 acres. This is only about 17.5 percent of all the land in the inventory.

I have to condition that statement because I have used 187,413 acres as the base for the inventory as opposed to 200,000 acres. That, apparently, is a figure that the department is

working with under the Kaeo report. But, again, the land inventory is not clearly reconciled, as has been testified before. And we're not exactly sure, but I use that figure as a conservative estimate.

Again, about 61 percent, again based on the 187,000 acres, or about 97,000 acres, are being used by non-native Hawaiians on general leases and other types of conveyances by the the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands and the Department of Land and Natural Resources. And, perhaps, most glaringly, some 17,000 eligible beneficiaries wait for their lot awards statewide.

This record reflects severe institutional problems confronting the program. In the 68 years, only a relatively handful of beneficiaries have actually gotten land, and that continues to be the case nine years after your current -- your last session with the public.

More than four times than the amount of those who have settled on the lease lots wait for land. Of those waiting, some have waited for over 36 years.

Clearly, there have been some notable gains. The governor has canceled some 16 executive

orders and 8 proclamations which were illegally issued, and this resulted in about 27,835 acres returning to the program.

During the '85 period, 1985 through '87, the department conducted an acceleration program primarily to issue raw lands to some 2,000-plus awardees. They currently are working with about a \$22 million budget to fund capital improvements for these lands. However, that amount will probably only address about 480 lots and an additional, I believe it is, 620 lots for design of infrastructural improvements.

So you can see that a lot of the problems confronting the program still remain. And the commission needs to continue monitoring this series of problems to determine how effective the response has been to the various recommendations made to rectify these concerns.

Illegal land transfers, I have mentioned briefly the progress made in returning some of the lands. However, I think certain issues remain outstanding in terms of the illegal uses of land. A couple of instances I have cited here include the Hawaiian Homes Commission's continued arrangement with the City and County of Honolulu, for example,

.

to operate city parks at Waimanalo and Makapu'u

Beaches at nominal compensation. This arrangement

was attacked in the task force report, and there

was a recommendation that at least fair market rent

be obtained if these lands were continued for use

as parks by the City and County of Honolulu.

However, in a series of transactions, the department and the commission has allowed these arrangements to continue, purportedly under the justification that the beach parks serve native Hawaiian beneficiaries. My response is basically that that is an issue that really has not been resolved by the commission as to the conditions under which they will allow nominal consideration to be the rent charged for the use of trust lands.

I'm not exactly sure, but I think the consideration that was charged is either a dollar or ten dollars per year -- a dollar. So we're really getting nothing for the use of these lands.

But the issue that really hasn't been confronted is to what extent will such arrangements be allowed to continue if, in fact, native Hawaiians are using lands. On the one hand, there is the argument used by the department; but, on the other hand, lands that are used for parks are used

by native Hawaiians wherever they are across the State of Hawaii. So why should Hawaiian Homes suffer the burden of not receiving income from those lands as any other landowner would obviously get if their lands were condemned or leased to the City and County of Honolulu. The mere fact that native Hawaiians use these lands as parks does not justify the fact that Hawaiian Homes Commission allows these lands to be used at nominal consideration. Hawaiian Homes should treat these lands as any other private or public landowner would do; and either charge fair market rent, or, if the lands are condemned for use as parks, they should get adequate consideration for the condemnation of these lands and, perhaps, an exchange of lands of, again, fair market rent, of equal value.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, in addition, the use of the airport lands was condemned in the task force report. And since then, the department has undergone a land exchange which has been approved by the Department of Interior, allowing the transfer of some 245 acres of airport and other lands for some 13.8 acres of income-generating commercial-industrial lands at Shafter Flats. The object of this

transfer has been clearly and openly to acquire
lands to generate income for the Hawaiian Homes
Department. Now, this raises another issue because
one of the recommendations of the task force was
the Hawaiian Homes Commission should determine as a
matter of policy the type of replacement lands
needed for its programs, and I emphasize that.
Once a policy for replacement lands has been
established, the policy should not be altered, even
at the department administration's change.

Now, this recommendation is designed to get the department to identify as a matter of policy what kind of lands will they get back for the lands that have been utilized for airports, parks, schools, et cetera. Do they need lands for homesteading? Do they need lands for income generation? That is the issue that is before the department and the commission that has yet to be resolved. What I think needs to be pointed out, however, is that the legislature and the Con Con has spoken to this issue clearly in 1978, when it mandated to the legislature to sufficiently fund the administration and operating budget of the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands. So that it pays for the administration and operating costs of that

department through its general funds rather than from the general leased revenues that the commission generates from its leasing of lands to non-native Hawaiians.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The problem that the commission and the Constitutional Convention pointed out was that if you put Hawaiian Homes in the business of leasing its lands to generate revenues to pay for its administrative costs, then it would be in a basic conflict of interest because it would be attempting to generate income to pay for its costs and, at the same time, to have to balance the need to issue lands to Hawaiians, which has been the fundamental problem of this program. So, in my mind, I think there is an inherent conflict with the Constitutional Convention here if, in fact, lands are designated for income generation in the land exchanges being sought and consummated by the department. And that issue needs to be clearly addressed and either repudiated or somehow justified in light of the Constitutional Convention -- constitutional amendment passed in 1978.

Finally, as was pointed out by OHA, the Shafter Flats lands are ceded lands or were ceded lands, depending on how you look at it. Some

people consider that still ceded lands. If, in fact, OHA is to receive its fair entitlement to the 20 percent of the revenues from the ceded lands trust, where is the replacement money coming from to compensate OHA?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The task force recommended that, if ceded lands are involved in pending land exchanges, that OHA be consulted and there be coordination with OHA so there would not be a loss of revenues to the native Hawaiian beneficiaries. Native Hawaiian beneficiaries get money from the ceded lands trust and should be getting lands, and some of them are, from the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act. needs to be a reconciliation if, in fact, lands are exchanged which involve ceded lands. That did not occur in the Shafter Flats exchange, and OHA lost, by some views, by some people's views, a relatively small sum, \$52,000, but it established a principle whereby OHA would not be consulted whenever such land exchanges affect the ceded land revenues to the Office of Hawaiian Affairs. And that is a dangerous precedent.

Management and administration concerns, there are many issues involved here. I have outlined some of them, mentioning the need and the

recommendation by the task force to computerize certain department records, to computerize the wait list, to computerize the need to summarize the demand for land by the people on the wait list, so there will be better retrieval of this information and better ability of the department to summarize it.

Apparently, there is some move to do that now, although it has not happened over the last nine years, and that has hampered the program.

MR. MAXWELL: Excuse me, Alan. If you can, since you submitted your report, because I am sure there will be questions for you, and I have got to control the time here because we have other people waiting --

MR. MURAKAMI: I will speed this part up.

I think this part has been a mixed record. The department has made some strides to improve their management and administration.

However, as it translates into the field, I think I can personally attest that there has been, at times, interminable delays in getting responses to beneficiary requests for help and information. And that may be related to the lack of computerization. It may be related to the lack of staffing, but it

remains a major problem. And there have been months and sometimes years before there have been responses to beneficiary requests for help and assistance, and I think that remains a very large problem confronting the department.

I want to put in a plug for this commission to inquire into why waiting lists are not made public. This issue has been raised by my office. We asked formally for a list to be made public. The House of Representatives of the State Legislature passed a resolution requesting that the wait list be made public. The task force issued a recommendation that such list be made public. And, to date, the department has not made those lists public, citing reasons of privacy and the need for an attorney general opinion to resolve that issue. We have not gotten a response from that yet.

We have been asked by people on Molokai to raise the issue of what's been known as third-party agreements. This issue has arisen on Molokai because of the sanctioning of the third-party agreements by the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands. Some people believe that these TPA's, as they are called, amount to subleases, which are barred by Section 208 of the

1 But it has raised problems and issues that act. 2 the commission and the department must resolve. 3 The basic problem that has been cited is that the TPA's have been used to allow non-native Hawaiians 5 to utilize Hawaiian Home Lands to benefit private enterprises that have competed with homesteader 6 7 farmers that would otherwise be able to compete in 8 the marketplace. But because of the use of TPA's 9 and the larger amounts of land that have been 10 controlled under TPA's, people have lost the 11 ability to compete in the marketplace as farmers. 12 I have a set of testimony from Martin 13 Kahae, who has testified before the Senate Select Committee on Indian Affairs and other bodies to 14 15 outline this problem --16

MR. MAXWELL: We will accept it into the record.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MURAKAMI: -- for the detail on this problem.

Program resources, that remains a problem. I think we have already addressed that.

Illegal land uses that continue, we have mentioned the Lualualei case. That is up on the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals on the issue of whether the State is barred from raising that issue

because it did not file its lawsuit early enough.

1 4

I did want to mention, however, that we have cited here the recommendation of the task force that the United States and the State cancel all leases to the United States for uses of trust lands at nominal consideration. The two primary examples that remain unresolved as of yet is the 295-acre parcel at Pohakuloa being used as a military training ground and the 25-acre parcel at Kekaha being used by the Navy as storage facilities. These leases continue to operate under DLNR management and, contrary to the task force report, has not been canceled. There have not been renegotiations made to get fair market rent for these parcels. And they continue to be used in breach of the trust established by Congress.

Finally, under the right to sue, the task force recommended right-to-sue legislation by both the state and federal governments. The State has responded by passing a right-to-sue bill. However, it has made it a prospective bill only and has limited damages to out-of-pocket costs, which is very minor compared to other potential costs that could be obtained if more general damages were allowed.

7[.]

In connection with that bill, the governor is under a duty to propose a package to address all retroactive problems and damages involving the Hawaiian Homes program back until statehood by the legislative session in 1991. And we are raising this as a point of concern because we believe that action must be taken immediately by all those involved to assist and promote this package so that an effective remedy can be presented to the legislature for the various past abuses and damage that has occurred as a result of the improper management of the department by previous administrations.

In contrast, the U.S. has yet to act on any right-to-sue litigation. And that remains an open agenda. We believe this commission should play a role in recommending that such legislation be enacted promptly.

In conclusion, I think it is fair to say that the many actions taken by the task force to make recommendations have been met with mixed results. However, substantial problems persist in all areas addressed by the task force and, to some extent, by this commission in its 1980 report.

Those who are beneficiaries remain

impatient. Clearly, more progress could have occurred with a broader commitment by the United States and the State, had it been made during the interim period. This situation demands that the task force needs to be reconvened to assess progress on implementing its recommendations. At the very least, administrators should commission a management audit to address the detailed issues and problems raised.

its coverage by going to homestead communities on the neighbor islands where the bulk of the trust lands are. Accessibility to this body is one additional and sure way to assure your timely consideration of these problems and issues will receive the attention they deserve.

Thank you very much.

MR. MAXWELL: Thank you.

Any brief questions?

MR. DULLES: Just one brief question. It appears to me that many of these issues really need to be brought to the attention of the legislature in Hawaii. Is there an oversight committee of the legislature that reviews, monitors, and directs the work of the Home Lands Department? And are these

the kind of issues that are brought before the legislative process in the State of Hawaii? Just a brief --

MR. MURAKAMI: I don't believe there is a specific committee that monitors and directs changes to the program. Whatever legislative oversight occurs, occurs as a result of review of bills and budget items brought to a committee that includes Hawaiian concerns. It is not a special committee set up just for Hawaiian Homes program.

MR. MAXWELL: You see, if I can interrupt, actually, because it is a federal mandate and the Justice Department, the Department of Interior is the one that has the final say. But I was going to recommend, you know, when you asked the question, that these testimony should really go to the Hawaiian Homes, to Ilima, you know, so she has a record because I see she is writing down stuff like that. So could you see she gets a copy of this?

MR. DULLES: She will be provided with all of the documents, as well as a copy of the transcript of the proceeding, absolutely.

MR. MAXWELL: Your recommendations will be taken into consideration because it is really

valuable.

more

this

ould

some

οf

u,

Go ahead.

MR. SHAIN: This goes to either one of
you. As you see it now, Hawaiian Home Lands is
controlled by the State under a federal mandate or
somewhere in that order. Do you see the
possibility of -- I guess you're highly critical of
the system as it is now, to say the least -- a fix
within the system as it stands right now? I mean
DHHL and --

MS. ING: One of the things that has always bothered me is that the past as well as current administrations have taken the attitude that they would cooperate with county building codes. As a result, as Ilima has pointed out, the cost for infrastructure improvements is \$40,000 per house site. Our people say that they don't need to live in compliance with city building codes. And we do know that domestic dependent nations on the mainland adopt their own standards. I think that that would go a far way to making true acceleration of awards.

The concern that I heard from past -MR. SHAIN: Can I interrupt for a second?

MS. ING: Yes

resent

RALPH ROSENBERG COURT REPORTERS, INC. (808)524-2090

MS. ING: No. Not under the present system.

MR. MURAKAMI: I think what we're trying to say is that I think conceivably a fix is possible, but realistically is what we are here to talk about. And what we have realistically seen in 68 years is about -- well, at best, 6,000 people, maybe 5,800 people who are native Hawaiians placed on the land. And there are well over 17,000 people on the wait list.

I think a management audit might bring this out, but if they trace the history of how many people were settled on the land and how soon, you will see a large period of time during which very few people were placed on the land after the initial burst of activity when the act was passed in 1920, '21.

And what we are saying here is that if

Hawaiians are given self-determination and are able

to become -- take charge of their own affairs, that

it is much more realistic that things will happen.

Currently, under this system, the State has accepted as a compact or contract with the United States that it will faithfully administer the Hawaiian Homes program. But what we have seen

too often in the past, at least, has been a conflict of interest. The State has its interest as a whole. The Hawaiian Homes program has an interest in particular. And you may have a piece of land where the State needs a facility. And the governor has issued executive orders granting permission to use the land illegally. That kind of practice can continue in terms of funding. continue in terms of other kinds of programs needed 10 to assist native Hawaiians to settle on these 11 lands, where there is going to be inherent 12 conflicts between what the State wants and what 13 native Hawaiians want under this program. 14 that's what we are trying to bring out. There is 15 an inherent conflict here that we think has to be fundamentally addressed in a major and bold way. 16 Otherwise, we will continue to have these problems. 17

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And yes, it is conceivable we could determine a fix, but we're going to be locked into this mode of trying to get that fix improved and made more efficient and somehow made better. So if we are willing to do that, that's fine, but I think past history has discouraged a lot of Hawaiians, and I think justifiably so.

MR. SHAIN: A few more questions.

1 |

MR. MAXWELL: Go ahead

MR. SHAIN: It's going to sound like a Carl Sagan question. But I have got this list of organizations and also the Hawaiian civic clubs and all the rest. You know, who speaks for the Hawaiians? I mean, I hear OHA saying this; I hear Ilima saying this; I hear you saying this. And I understand, you know; I come from an ethnic community where you put six of us in a room and there are 14 opinions coming out the other door. But who speaks for the Hawaiians? Who says, we want sovereignty? Who says, we want to continue. Do you see a united front coming? I mean who represents who?

MS. ING: That is a very difficult question. We talk to one another.

Let me talk about my experience with the creation of the Office of Hawaiian Affairs. I worked as a voter registrar, and I am convinced that 60,000 or 70,000 people who registered to vote for Office of Hawaiian Affairs did so because it held out this promise of self-determination. I think where we differ is as to the mechanism, how to implement. But the dream is there, and we share it, and we know it. And I can talk to the

so-called radicals or the Office of Hawaiian

Affairs or Ilima. I think, as Hawaiians, we dream

of one thing. And if our voices are discordant, it

is simply because we are disoriented as to the "how

to," but we know what we want, and that is my

answer.

MR. MAXWELL: You know, Barry, let me add to Mahealani's answer. The only time that the Hawaiians were ever united was when Kamehameha conquered all the islands. He spoke as one. That's fact. Presently we speak with many tongues, but all of the same language that come out from our tongues, it's the same. We're asking for help, the same thing like they have done for the last — right after the overthrow, help in respect that the lands have been taken away. The only lands that are available are the Hawaiian Homelands, and this is why there is so much interest in the Hawaiian Home Lands land.

But my question to you, which I would like you to answer, is: From all of this -- I know you answered him -- but from all of these problems, how can we fix? You know, there are so many wrongs. But if there is one thing in your mind that you could think about that would immediately

-- when I say immediately, I mean in five years or so, you know -- help our people at least to have some hope to see a light in the tunnel? What would the overriding thing be to fix up the Hawaiian Homes Act?

MS. ING: You know, I personally hate to say money, but I really do believe that one barrier to putting people on our land is money. I mean, they're talking infrastructure. They're talking about, you know, putting in water because you can't support an agricultural activity on marginal land without water. So I guess if we had tons of money.

MR. MAXWELL: Well, if we did have that and if it was managed -- see, the reason I ask that question -- and I got to tell you about the Alaskans, the Eskimos, they are having the same problem. They had a lot of money. But it wasn't administered through the right way. Like you say, why should we have the modern day infrastructure? Some people want to live like how it was before, maybe roads and, you know, down by the beach is the most perfect place.

But, see, the reason why there was such a demand at that time because the Hawaiians thought, when it first was implemented, that this was a

1	solve-all to their problems in 1920. But if you
2	notice, the 40 acres that was given to them, they
3	lived on half an acre, and they leased out 39 of
4	that. And that wasn't rehabilitating the Hawaiian
5	people. That just made them into a western concept
6	of rehabilitation.
7	MS. ING: They leased the 35 acres out
8	because there was no water
9	MR. MAXWELL: Right.
10	MS. ING: to support the farming. It
11	is just a built-in failure.
12	MR. MAXWELL: But now, why there is so
13	much interest is because land is so valuable in
14	Hawaii. Even the land that cannot get water is
15	valuable. And that is why our people, our youth,
16	are signing up for applications.
17	Any more comments?
18	MR. SHAIN: Charlie, one last question.
19	MR. MAXWELL: Go ahead.
20	MR. SHAIN: Are you happy with the
21	current blood quantum as defined under Hawaiian
22	Home Lands right now?
23	SPEAKER: Can't hear you.
24	MR. MAXWELL: Sorry.
25	MS. ING: My personal

1 MR. MAXWELL: Could you repeat his 2 question. They can't hear you. 3 MS. ING: Are we happy with the blood 4 quantum as defined under the current statutes? 5 I speak as a person who has an interest 6 in this question. I am not a qualified native 7 Hawaiian under the program. But I still think, 8 even if I were, that I would be opposed to this 9 artificial definition which divides our people. 10 When Georgianna went up to Congress and 11 lobbied to have the successorship quantum lowered 12 to a quarter Hawaiian, I did not realize at the 13 time that this successorship quarter blood 14 requirement only applied to children and -- is this 15 siblings? 16 MR. MAXWELL: Spouse. 17 MS. ING: Spouse. Okay. We have the ludicrous situation in our office now, on a very 18 19 immediate, real level, where grandchildren are 20 being adopted by their -- what? Yeah, children are 21 being adopted by their grandparents so that they 22 can succeed in trying to circumvent this law. 23 I'm opposed to it. I'm unhappy about it, but it is

MR. MAXWELL: And just for the records, I

RALPH ROSENBERG COURT REPORTERS, INC. (808)524-2090

24

25

not an agency position.

might add that Ilima verified this on Maui when she 1 2 was at a meeting. The one-half quantum is not the 3 liking of Prince Kuhio. He wanted 1/32. This was 4 an animal of the Congress at that time. At that time, they said that is how a native Hawaiian shall 5 6 be noted, is half or 50 percent. So sometime or 7 another we are going to find out if that 50 percent is going to be a decisive issue amongst our people. 8 It already is. 9 10 MS. ING: We have the situation where 11 families, you know -- I mean the program is to 12 bring harmony and promote family. And just the opposite result, which is a child who does not have 13 14 the requisite quantum is evicted, as happened with 15 Doug Silva in Waimanalo. 16 MR. MAXWELL: Mahealai, I'm going to have 17 to cut this short now because we have to get done at five, and there is a lot of people more. 18 19 Thank you so much for both of your 20 testimonies. 21 I would like to call up now Mr. Masaru 22 Oshiro, Community Perspectives Panel, from Alu 23 Like, and Maria Kaina. 24 MR. OSHIRO: My name is Masaru Oshiro. 25 MR. MAXWELL: Excuse me. Is Maria Kaina

here with you?

MR. OSHIRO: I have not seen her.

MR. MAXWELL: Okay. Thank you.

MR. OSHIRO: My name is Masaru Oshiro. I am the Chief Executive Officer of Alu Like, and I appreciate the opportunity to present our testimony before the Hawaii Advisory Committee of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission.

The full text of my testimony is in your hands. I will try to, whereever possible, cut short some of the background information.

MR. MAXWELL: Thank you.

MR. OSHIRO: Alu Like is a private,
non-profit, community-based, statewide organization
whose chief purpose is to enable native Hawaiian
social and economic excellence. Our programs
include employment and training, vocational
education, and library services. We also offer the
Hawaii Computer Training Center, a cooperative
effort with the IBM Corporation and several other
business enterprises. We also provide an
ex-offender program and a Native Hawaiian Business
Development Center. In addition to these areas,
Alu Like currently maintains the most comprehensive
data on native Hawaiians to date and maintains a

capacity to advocate, plan, and seek alternative ways to address many of the needs of the Hawaiian people.

I will move onto the bottom of page 2, last paragraph. We would like to share Alu Like's experience with the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands since your last forum. We are, in addition to the Hawaiian Homes Commission, a member of the organization called the Hawaiian Service Institutions and Agencies, a group of organization heads that meet periodically to discuss ways in which the duplication of services can be avoided and the pooling of limited resources can best be maximized.

In 1978, prior to your first meeting, the Alu Like was able to secure administration for Hawaiian native American funds for a demonstration pilot project that assisted homesteaders at Panaewa with the clearing of their lands for planting.

In 1982, Alu Like invited Mr. Ray Combs,
Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs, to the
Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, to come
to Hawaii to assess our housing needs. As a result
of his work and the close cooperation of the
Department of Hawaiian Home Lands and other

agencies, homesteaders are now eligible for Federal
Housing Administration loan assistance.

In 1984, the former Department of
Hawaiian Homes director, Georgianna Padeken,
initiated a memorandum of agreement with Alu Like,
the University of Hawaii Cancer Research Center,
and the Department of Health that developed a
genealogical data bank that included the
computerization of invaluable post-1941 cancer
data. As a result, since 1986, Alu Like has been
able to assist close to 100 people in verifying
their genealogical records necessary for Department
of Hawaiian Home Lands homestead applications.

Alu Like has also provided testimony on right-to-sue legislation. Governor Waihee has signed a bill that now provides a process on such litigation. Our island representatives on Hawaii, Maui, and Molokai indicate that they have not received a complaint from homesteaders on the matter of their civil rights being infringed upon.

An unprecedented number of land awards have been made by the department since 1980 during the Georgianna Padeken administration. We also understand that for the first time in the department's history federal funds have been

1 appropriated for the improvement of infrastructure 2 on homestead lands. 3 Mrs. Rubin's, our previous CEO, testimony on the first public forum focused on our 1975 Needs 4 Assessment of Native Hawaiians. I am happy to 5 6 provide updated compendiums on profiles of native Hawaiians, as well as those on the health-related 7 8 issues. Three copies of the studies were presented to your staff, and it is in their possessions. 9 10 We continue to look forward to a close 11 cooperation between Alu Like and the Department of 12 Hawaiian Home Lands. It has been a fruitful and 13 beneficial relationship undergirded by our 14 philosophy of mutual respect and trust that is 15 embodied in our mandate. Thank you for the opportunity to testify. 16 17 MR. MAXWELL: Okay. Any questions? 18 Thank you, Mr. Oshiro. 19 MR. OSHIRO: Thank you. 20 MR. MAXWELL: Again, let me ask if Maria 21 Kaina is here. 22 If not, I would like to call up Sonny 23 And I would like to recognize the 24 chairman of the federal task force, Ki'nau Kamalii, 25 in the back.

1 MS. KAMALII: I wasn't the chairman of the federal task force. I was chairman of the 2 3 Native Hawaiian Study Commission. 4 MR. MAXWELL: That's correct. Sorry. 5 Chairman of the Native Hawaiian Study Commission, 6 Ki'nau Kamalii. 7 MR. KANIHO: Mr. Chairman, excuse me. 8 have asked Alan to speak for me. I get hard time 9 speaking. 10 MR. MAXWELL: Gee, Sonny, I didn't know the last time when it was hard for you to speak. 11 12 Okay. Go ahead, Alan. 13 MR. MURAKAMI: Actually, I am only doing 14 this in the interest of time. Maybe I can speak 15 faster. 16 Sonny has asked me to present this 17 testimony on behalf of the Aged Hawaiians. This is 18 a client group I represent in Waimea. They consist of members on the 1952 Waimea wait list, pastoral 19 20 wait list, I should say, residents of Waimea who 21 have been waiting for pastoral lots for the last 36 22 years. 23 Basically, what I wanted to cover here 24 was a story of how these elder Hawaiians have not 25 been able to get on pastoral lease awards.

Without going into a lot of detail on the history, I think what I should say is that the Waimea lands were opened up as a result of the efforts of the pioneers who are still on, in large part, the 1952 Waimea pastoral waiting list. It was through their petition and applications that initially got the lands in Waimea opened up to

homesteading.

And this 1952 wait list, which consisted of, at the time, 187 individuals, sought to get native Hawaiians on the land. Following their application, some 48 individuals did get lease awards, and the lease was followed to that extent.

However, subsequent to that initial batch of awards, there were actions taken by the commission which resulted in the cancellation purportedly of that list and a reconstituting of two or three subsequent wait lists, which were in part followed to award lease lots to individuals in Waimea irrespective of the remaining people on the 1952 wait list.

Now, in our review of the records of the time, there were apparently actions taken by the commissions which purportedly resulted in the cancellation of the list. However, the major

problem with that attempt was that they failed to notify any of these eligible beneficiaries that such actions were pending. And people continued to wait on this list, not knowing that other people were being granted lease awards before people on this wait list ahead of them.

You know, that kind of brings out the problem of the making the wait list public.

Because the wait lists were not public, people could not really understand what was happening because the commission and the department controlled the records at the time. And people were getting awards ahead of people on this wait list.

Now, Sonny took this cause up some years ago and, in 1974, after repeatedly trying to get the wait list, found it in the State Archives. And he waged a 10-year battle at that time to get the list reinstated so that the commission would simply follow the picking order that was set up by this initial list. And it was not, in fact, until after an Inspector General report was issued in 1982, for which Sonny presented testimony and evidence of the illegal cancellation of this list, that the department — the commission finally decided to

reinstate the list in 1984.

Now, since that time, large portions of Puukapu, the area in question, have remained in the possession and control of Parker Ranch under revocable permits.

As far back as 1953, an attorney general opinion issued by the State rendered an opinion saying that once homestead lands had been withdrawn from the management and control of the Commissioner of Public Lands or the Department of Land and Natural Resources, as it later came to be known, that land had to be used specifically for . homesteading and not be allowed to be used by non-native Hawaiians for other purposes.

Because of this position, Sonny has been trying to get clarification as to why these revocable permits are still being allowed when some 109 individuals remain on the 1952 wait list, waiting for their pastoral lease awards.

In conjunction with this effort, we have submitted a petition to the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands, seeking to get the next person in line awarded a pastoral lease lot in the order presented in the 1952 wait list. I understand that that beneficiary is actually second in line because the

person ahead of him was succeeded by his spouse when he died. However, the petition is currently before the department, and we are seeking to have an immediate award of a pastoral lot to Mr. James Akiona, who we believed at the time to be the first

person on the wait list.

This battle to have additional awards made out of the remaining lands at Puukapu has been a longstanding one. There is evidence that, since 1953, the Waimea Hawaiian Civic Club has continuously urged the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands and the Governor to investigate the problem and to rectify the failure to make lease awards for pastoral lots to native Hawaiians in the Waimea area.

Accordingly, the Aged Hawaiians and Humuula applicants, whose problems will be addressed by Sonny later, urge this commission to investigate why the State of Hawaii has not revoked the permits to Parker Ranch and immediately award the Puukapu and other trust lands in Waimea to those on the 1952 wait list. These awards should be for lots sufficiently large enough to allow a lessee the opportunity to commercially ranch and to become economically self-sufficient. As part of

your investigation, we urge you to determine the amount of compensation that the State should pay to those in the 1952 waiting list and their successors. We also urge you to recommend initiation of a breach-of-trust lawsuit by the U.S. Department of Justice against the Hawaiian Homes Commission to compel the immediate award of these lands to these beneficiaries if prompt action is not taken.

Secondly, there have been problems with getting people on the land because of lack of funds and resources to make infrastructural improvements on these lands. One of the reasons that has been utilized by the commission in the past is that such lands could not be awarded because there was no money for the improvements. In fact, the legislature turned the department down — the department's request down — for additional moneys to develop these lots in a previous session. As a result, they have withheld making awards, even though the lots have been subdivided and mapped out on the latest tax maps for the Puukapu area.

So, additionally, the Aged Hawaiians urge you to investigate why the Hawaiian Homes

Commission refuses to lease their available lands

1	in and around Waimea when there are lands available
2	for homesteading. We recommend that you urge the
3	Department of Interior to seek sufficient
4	appropriations for the Hawaiian Homes Commission to
5	allow it to irrigate the pastoral and agricultural
6	lands in Waimea so that the Hawaiian Homes
7	Commission can maximize the number of awards in the
8	Waimea area. Without this assistance, the
9	commission may not be able to meet the current
10	demands of pastoral lots by the hundreds of
11	eligible beneficiaries under various waiting lists
12	in Waimea and elsewhere in the State.
13	So at this point I would like to turn
14	over the microphone to Sonny to address the
15	problems of the Humuula applicants.
16	MR. MAXWELL: Go ahead.
17	MR. KANIHO: Before I start my testimony,
18	may I please introduce a person who has been on the
19	list for 40 years? May I have the privilege?
20	MR. MAXWELL: Sure.
21	Mrs. Aveiro, will you stand.
22	She has been on the list for 40 years.
23	MR. MAXWELL: Repeat her name again in
24	the mike so the reporter can hear.
25	MR. KANIHO: Helen Aveiro.

Okay. I will be starting on Humuula 1 2 lease. Page 5, I will begin there. MR. MAXWELL: Talk into the mike. 3 MR. KANIHO: Turn to page 5. There is no 4 numbers on that. Count from there. I will start, 5 it is headed under "Humuula." 6 7 Humuula is 33,000 acres of area of Hawaiian Home Lands located on the slope of Mauna 8 The list terminated in 1974. Then went 9 10 ahead, the Humuula applicants went ahead and 11 questioned the department about what they were 12 going to do with the land, but there was no reply. 13 But, anyway, in '75, the applicants applied for the 14 land. 15 When they applied for the land in '75, in 16 '76, they were able to address their concern to get 17 portion of Humuula land. But, in the process, they 18 denied the Humuula applicants to use the land for 19 homestead because the money is needed for the 20 department. 21 And let me say this: There is not a 22 language in the act that mandates the commission to 23 lease their land for revenue purpose. But that is 24 one of them.

But, however, we keep on continue to go

RALPH ROSENBERG COURT REPORTERS, INC. (808)524-2090

25

after the commission. It is sad to hear what they 1 2 say. 3 Charlie, excuse me. 4 MR. MAXWELL: No problem. Take your 5 time. 6 MR. KANIHO: What I want to do to you 7 now, I want to point to you about what their 8 comment is. And, now, you go under item 22 on your 9 exhibits. That's a hard thing to say that they say that the land leased to non-Hawaiians is the best 10 11 interest and in the best trust for the native 12 Hawaiian. There, I cannot say, you know, say 13 whether that is language for department, who 14 supposed to put native Hawaiians on the land. 15 Actually, the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands has only one job. It's to put Hawaiians on 16 17 Hawaiian Homes land. And if they run out of 18 applications, then they get the number two job, 19 they can lease the land to non-native Hawaiians. 20 The list, the waiting list is a 21 mandation. There is native Hawaiians in the State. 22 And the commission -- the department's job is to --23 if there is no list, then they're supposed to go up 24 there and encourage if there are any more

RALPH ROSENBERG COURT REPORTERS, INC. (808)524-2090

That's their duty. It is only put

25

Hawaiians.

native Hawaiians on Hawaiian Homes land.

But to make things short, with the Humuula lease, they applied it, and they still get, that land is needed. So that is the issue here; that we went to them and begged them under Section 207(a). And when you read under 207(a), all those lands set aside under the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act are all qualified for homestead purpose. So you can see that somewhere along the line they are not giving their sole obligation to exercise the act.

And also, in 1978, we wrote a letter to Governor Waihee to have the Attorney General to investigate our allegations, our allegations about non-Hawaiians using Hawaiian Homes land that was set aside for homestead purpose in 1951.

The commission, at this speaking, are still violating the trust duty. However, that was a year ago. We have not get any answer from the governor's office, whether the AG is investigating the allegation. But, however, all our letters to the governor was answered. The letters are beautiful in their answering, but the results is not there. But I'm hopeful it will answer. But after this day, we will remind him and see. And

I'm sure that your organization will get a copy of 1 2 the governor's letter. 3 MR. MAXWELL: Sonny, if I can tell you, 4 you see, because of all of the information, if you 5 could have your mana'o come out from within, and 6 whatever your statements is, is submitted here, 7 we're going to receive it. So just to save time, 8 if you bring out your mana'o from what you feel. 9 Go ahead. Just from your memory. 10 MR. KANIHO: Everything is there. What I 11 wanted to see is that the public gets this information, too. 12 13 MR. MAXWELL: Right. 14 MR. KANIHO: It is very important to 15 them. 16 And recommendation of the Humuula 17 applicants, we urge you to investigate the 18 continuing problem posed by the conflict in 19 interest caused by the Hawaiian Homes Commission's: 20 (1)Failure to have sufficient funds for 21 its administration and operating budgets from the 22 legislature; 23 (2) Misunderstanding of its trust duty 24 to award lands to native Hawaiians irrespective of 25 its urge to general lease trust lands to generate

revenues for the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands.

If you find that this problem continues to pose an obstacle to the award of lands to beneficiaries, we urge you to recommend legal action by the U.S. Department of Justice to require the Hawaiian Homes Commission to award land to the Humuula applicants. When we say Humuula applicants, we are not only saying we want for all those who has applied for Hawaiian Homes land be accommodated. Then, again, we are going to run into trouble. Land can only be set aside for whatever the act calls for.

Right now we have only three programs:
housing, farm, and ranching. But we try to get the
other one in because they reserving these lands for
non-Hawaiians to get into business. But Hawaiians
are not allowed to get in those kind of business:
commercial and industrial.

And we are going back to the legislature.

Hopefully, we can work with the Department of

Hawaiian Homes. We have offered ourself. Our door
has always been open.

MR. MAXWELL: Great.

MR. KANIHO: Thank you.

MR. MAXWELL: Any questions?

1

Thank you, Sonny.

2

You had a question? Sorry.

3

MR. DULLES: Yeah. I wanted to find out

4 5 here -- and maybe Al can answer the question -specifically what the federal interest, the federal

6

jurisdiction is here. And I know, Charlie, you

7

know the answer. But just for the record, I know

8

there has been some intercession on the part of the Department of Interior. Now we are hearing mention

9 10

of the Department of Justice in a potential

11

lawsuit. Specifically, jurisdictionally, what is

12

the federal interest? I would just like to have

13

that on the record, Mr. Chairman.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MURAKAMI: In the view of the Native Hawaiian Legal Corporation, the United States retains co-trusteeship relationship with the native Hawaiian beneficiaries. That co-trusteeship surfaces in the act in terms of the Department of Interior's role in approving all land exchanges and Congress' retention of powers to approve or ratify any changes to the act that may result in a diminution of benefits to native Hawaiians. And it manifests itself in the power of the United States to sue on behalf of native Hawaiian beneficiaries as contained in Section 5F of the Admission Act.

1 MR. DULLES: Thank you very much. 2 MR. MAXWELL: Thank you. 3 Sonny. 4 MR. KANIHO: One more thing. About the 5 conclusion of the task force report, we need the 6 task force back again. That's one of the most 7 important issues on the task force; that they 8 reconvene every year to see how the progress has 9 been done. But because the governor and the 10 Department of Interior did not implement that portion of the recommendation, I think that's why 11 we kind of fall down. But if they did, you would 12 13 have a better report than ours. 14 MR. MAXWELL: Okay. Well, with this 15 body, we can recommend to the Department of 16 Interior to see that, you know, this might come 17 forth. 18 Thank you. 19 Okay. I would like to call on John 20 before I call the next -- you wanted after this 21 next witness; right? 22 MR. DULLES: Yes. Just go ahead. 23 MR. MAXWELL: I would like to call upon 24 Mililani B. Trask, the Kia'aina, Governor for the 25 Ka Lahui Hawaii, the Hawaiian nation.

MS. TRASK: Aloha, everyone, and thank you for allowing me to come and testify.

I do want to say that I did get a little copy of the letter that you folks had sent to Sonny, and that is when I then wrote and asked for the honor to be here to address you folks.

I have for your purview several copies of my testimony and also a letter that I'm sending to the Honolulu Advertiser, the editor of the Advertiser, which I am providing you a copy of it because I am suggesting at the close of that letter that the Civil Rights Commission initiate immediate investigation of the Office of Hawaiian Affairs and the State Attorney General's Office relating to breach-of-trust questions for the ceded land revenues, what has basically been bantered about in the press this week.

Again, aloha.

Pursuant to Article VI, Provision 6 of the Constitution of Ka Lahui Hawaii, I am pleased to present this testimony to you on behalf of the Hawaiian community and the members of Ka Lahui.

At the present time, we have 2,500 members who are registered members, and we are currently conducting workshops throughout the State

with an ANA grant in conjunction with the Native
Hawaiian Legal Corporation. Our goal is
self-determination and self-governance.

Among the members of Ka Lahui currently registered, we have Hawaiian homesteaders on the Island of Hawaii from Keaukaha, Panaewa, Waimea, and Kalae, which is South Point. We also have Ka Lahui members on Molokai from the Hawaiian Homesteaders Association of Hoolehua, Kaunakakai, Kalama'ula, Kapa'akea, and Oneali'i. On the Island of Oahu, our membership includes homesteaders from Waianae, Nanakuli, Waimanalo, Papakolea. And on Maui, we have Ka Lahui registered members from Kula and Central Maui. On Kauai, our membership is located in Anahola. All of these persons are Hawaiian homesteaders. They are either lessees or persons waiting on the list.

In 1982, I was appointed a commissioner of the Federal-State Task Force on Hawaiian Home Lands. Our charge was to investigate the Hawaiian Home Lands trust and to make recommendations to the Governor of the State of Hawaii and the U.S. Secretary of Interior for changes in the management of the trust. Our report was issued in August of 1983. And, in 1987, I was elected to be kia'aina

of Ka Lahui for a two-year term.

Since your last inquiry in 1980, the following pertinent events have occurred:

In 1982, the Native Hawaiian Study

Commission heard and recorded hundreds of

complaints relating to the Hawaiian Home Lands.

This was done as part of the testimony on

reparations. I think, if you will go through some

of that testimony, you will see there filed already

on the Senate congressional record the story of

many individual homesteaders and homestead

associations who presented testimony.

In 1983, the Federal-State Task Force
Report was issued. Since that time, in my
estimation, we have had virtually no compliance by
either the state and the federal government.

The Department of Hawaiian Home Lands, as an agency, did, however, take care of, I think, two matters. One was they consolidated their counts. That was accomplished by Georgianna Padeken in the legislative session of 1984. We had over 15 individual financial accounts. And it was a fiscal mess. So those accounts were consolidated.

And the following year, in 1985, they did balance their books. And that, I think, needs to

be mentioned.

When we started out the Federal-State

Task Force on Hawaiian Home Lands, we actually

convened in 1982. Six months prior to our

convening, the Washington office of the Solicitor

General sent a panel of CPA's down from Washington

to investigate the fiscal situation of the

department. And after six months, they issued a

very brief one-paragraph report saying that the

condition of the books were inauditable. And that

cost 50,000 in federal taxpayers' dollars and six

months. So I think that was a major accomplishment

that Georgianna was able to accomplish that before

she died in 1985.

Nevertheless, there were 133
recommendations in the Federal-State Task Force
Report of Hawaiian Home Lands, and my count is 131
ignored and two addressed by the department under a previous administration.

If you take a look at the Federal-State

Task Force Report and the backup papers to it,

documented extensive breach of trust. I don't

think there is any other way of saying that other

than that. It documented extensive breach of

trust. A recommendation for one year follow-up was

in writing in that report. That recommendation was not followed.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

In 1986, we have Hawaiians, native Hawaiians on the waiting list, arrested and beaten, prosecuted for trespassing on Hawaiian Home Waimanalo land currently used by the County for free. It is very interesting to note that because we had a report called Waimanalo Planning Issues. That was a report done by the Department of Planning, the DERP at the U of H. And they documented critical overcrowding needs in the Hawaiian homestead community in Waimanalo. That report documents two-bedroom homes with 21 people living in it. That report documents that the reason why Waimanalo has abandoned cars parked in the Hawaiian homestead community is because pet families are using those cars so that their children can sleep in them at night. That is a planning document issued by DERP at the University of Hawaii.

Despite that fact, the Waimanalo Hawaiian Home Lands are leased to the County. The act provides that where there is a clear need for removal of Hawaiian Home Lands from public uses in order to meet the needs of the beneficiaries, that

the department has an obligation to do so. They have failed to do that and just, I think, a year and a half ago renewed the lease again with the County. The County is not paying any rent. They go through a very tortured formula in the lease. It is sort of comical, but what it comes down to is they will pay rent some day based on the formula, but there is no date set for when they have to start paying the rent.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In 1986, Ka Ohana O Kalae from South Point shut down South Point Hawaiian Homelands, the access road, in order to stop the use of Hawaiian Home Lands by persons who were not Hawaiians and who were proceeding with commercial interests. They were also protesting leasing of 2,000-plus acres to a Japanese non-beneficiary named Mr. Yamagata. He has had those 2,000 acres for several years. In addition, he has total use and control of the whole water supply, the whole water The native Hawaiian homesteaders, system of Kalae. we have some on waiting lists there for as long as 30 years. We have had some raw land given out. These people are being limited to 25- to 100-acre awards when Mr. Yamagata, who is not a Hawaiian, is allowed to have a lease for 2,000 acres.

Mr. Yamagata has a very large heard of cattle.

Native beneficiaries there are going to be limited to three head of cattle.

Demonstrations by the Ka Ohana O Kalae continued in 1978, in 1987, and they are also set again for this year, 1988.

In 1987, homesteader Doug Silva was evicted by the tactical squad, HPD. Heavily armed units were dispatched to the Waimanalo Homestead Community without any notice to the community. OHA objected strenuously, but nothing was done about it.

I think that this instance right here is probably the most disturbing to me. There is virtually no precedent in eviction law to call in a heavily armed tactical unit. You know, if you're a landlord and you want to evict someone, you go down to the district court, file your papers, and the sheriff goes out.

with regards to Doug Silva, there was a van dispatched with 12 people. They were armed with submachine guns. They were armed with fragment grenades. No warning was given to the community. No attempt was made to vacate the homes of people surrounding his lot. There were children

coming and going on their bicycles when that tactical unit, which was armed, pulled into that Hawaiian homestead community. I consider just that to be, in and of itself, the most egregious violation of civil rights on this entire chronology. But it is dangerous because it raises the specter of armed confrontation in our community, and that we would like to avoid.

In 1987, the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands, the Governor, and the Department of Interior approved a land swap for Hilo Airport and other airports in the State on Hawaiian Home Lands. The Office of Hawaiian Affairs was not consulted. We have a specific recommendation in the Federal-State Task Force on this point. OHA was ignored, and the total amount of revenues lost to OHA was about \$55,000 annually.

In 1987, after five years of carrying the stand-to-sue legislation -- pursuant to a Federal-State Task Force recommendation is why we carried it -- we were disappointed to see the state legislature passing legislation, with the advice of the Governor and the Office of Hawaiian Affairs, which gives Hawaiians standing to sue in state court but which prevents the Court from awarding

any native Hawaiian either infrastructure moneys or their land awards.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Understand what happened with the bill. The Federal-State Task Force Report says Hawaiians have entitlements, they have entitlements to their land awards, they're supposed to get off their list and get their individual awards. And, number two, the act provides that beneficiaries get not only their award, but water in amounts necessary to either do residential or pastoral uses. When the act guarantees availability of water, it involves infrastructure to bring the water to the lot. is implied in the law. The law would not propose that you would give someone, you know, an award of land and then three buckets of water. What is suggested is that they must bring the water to the lot and make it available. You know, that's the reason for the recommendation in the Federal-State Task Force Report.

It comes out in '83. Five years we carry the legislation. The bill comes out saying that Hawaiian homesteaders and their associations can sue; but if they sue and win, all land awards and moneys for infrastructure must be paid either to the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands or the Office

1 | of Hawaiian Affairs.

I can't think of a single family in the 17,500 plus that have waited for their land awards that would go to court, litigate, pay the expense, and be happy to see their land awards turned over to Moki Keale. That was not the intent of the recommendation.

Subsequent to that fiasco, in 1987,

Senator Daniel Inouye notified Civil Rights for

Hawaiians in writing that he would not introduce

standing-to-sue legislation in the federal Congress

because he had been requested by the Governor and

by the Office of Hawaiian Affairs not to proceed

with that. I have a copy of that letter signed by

the senator if you would like to see it.

The Hawaiian Homes report indicated that there should be standing to sue legislation not only in the state level, but also in the federal level. We have not been able to move Dan Inouye on this point since 1983. And we now have a letter dated March of 1988 saying that he will not be proceeding on it in 1989, either.

In 1988, the Paheehee Ridge Association, who are Hawaiian Homesteaders on Oahu with raw land, they formed an association. They went to the

1 department requesting moneys for infrastructure. 2 They were told that they were not a priority. They then worked with Senator James Aki 3 4 to write legislation. They went into the 5 legislature to lobby for some money. Their bill was killed at a hearing in the Senate because the 6 7 chair of the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands, 8 Ilima Piianaia, showed up to testify against it. 9 It is apparent that efforts made by Hawaiian 10 homesteaders to circumvent having to deal with the 11 department are going to be stopped in the 12 legislature by the department itself. 13 1988, we have Sonny Kaniho, a member of Ka Lahui and also a native Hawaiian homesteader, 14 15 being sentenced to jail for trespassing on Hawaiian 16 Home Lands currently leased to Parker Ranch. 17 Everyone in the Hawaiian community is outraged and 18 upset with this. 19 MR. MAXWELL: Let me interrupt you. 20 The statement you made about this is how 21 we got to run the hearing, federal hearing, you 22 mentioned Ilima Piianaia. 23 MS. TRASK: Yeah. 24 MR. MAXWELL: The record will be made 25 available, if you want to answer that.

1

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. DULLES: We would appreciate it if you would refrain from naming individuals in terms of allegations of misconduct.

MS. TRASK: You know, I am requesting that there be a federal investigation. The civil rights violations against the native people are egregious. We have not had this opportunity for eight years.

And at this time and for the record, I feel that it is my responsibility to name people. I did so with Senator Inouye, and I was advised by Senator Inouye that each and every egregious violation of individual Hawaiian homesteaders should be brought to the attention of this commission and that you folks should be requested to take down by affidavit that testimony. And, consequently, you know, I am proceeding. We may not see you for another eight years. And we need to make the record. You know, as an attorney, I feel that that is the appropriate way. I am not here to say that somebody testified against the Paheehee Ridge Association. It is a matter of legislative record. I have the testimony in writing.

MR. MAXWELL: It is only because of the

1 fashion that we are -- as an umbrella, the federal 2 umbrella as an advisory committee, we are just 3 asking you, if it is that important, then we will allow it. Right? And then we will have to have 4 5 equal time alloted. 6 MR. DULLES: Well, thus far, I think the committee has been attentive to the testimony. 7 think it is relevant and important. It was just 8 9 when we got to the situation where an individual 10 was named by name. We have to be careful in terms 11 of protecting --12 MS. TRASK: You know, I welcome any 13 comment from Ilima at any time. 14 MR. MAXWELL: Yeah, but this hearing is 15 not for that kind of confrontation. 16 MS. TRASK: You know, I am making the 17 record, Charlie. 18 MR. MAXWELL: Wait. As the chair, I have 19 to advise you of this. Because of our federal 20 constraints, we have to advise you of this. And I 21 am saying I will afford her the appropriate time to 22 answer anything, either in writing or in person. 23 MS. TRASK: I would like to hear the 24 response. 25 MR. DULLES: You are on the record.

1

MR. MAXWELL: So continue.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 25

MS. TRASK: Okay. Where we are in 1988, we have approximately 17,500 families awaiting settlement. About 450 of these people have been given lots with the infrastructure in it. We have about 2,100 who received raw land awards and about 14,850 who are remaining on waiting lists.

I do want to say, with regard to the raw land awards, that it was appropriate for the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands to award those lands. That was one of the things in the step-by-step solution that was proposed. DHHL was to award raw lands and to expedite that. And then there was a financial package, 25 million per year from the state and federal government for four years. This was then to supply infrastructure money. That is where I think the plan broke down in the first step.

We also had in 1988 -- and this was just this past month -- we had the first Hawaiian homesteader to receive a federal loan and to have that approved, and her home has now been built with FHA moneys. She is on this island, on Oahu.

We also had Senator Inouye coming through -- the Senate Select Committee has received and

documented testimonies from native Hawaiians here, also on the Island of Kauai and Molokai, relating to Hawaiian homestead breach of trust. And you probably will want to contact his aid, Lerni MacGregor or Pat Zell to get copies of that testimony, but he received that.

There has been virtually no implementation of the recommendations of the Federal-State Task Force on the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act published in August '83. Only a handful of the 133 recommendations have been followed.

The waiting list since that time has doubled. The Governor's Office, the Office of Hawaiian Affairs, the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands, and the legislature have failed to implement any comprehensive plan to provide for affordable housing to native Hawaiian homesteaders on waiting lists, although in 1987 the State appropriated \$180 million for affordable public housing. There is no avenue for legal redress either in the state or the federal court for judicial review.

Subsequent to the publication of the task force report, the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands proceeded with land exchanges. The State Office of

Hawaiian Affairs was made to pay. Despite a clear directive in the task force to proceed with negotiations on the Lualualei lands on Oahu, over 2,000 acres, the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands delayed taking any legal action. When the matter was finally raised, the Court ruled that the statute of limitation had expired. Consequently, the legal standing for over 10,000 acres of Lualualei land is that it has been lost in perpetuity to the trust. We do not have any legal redress. We cannot appeal that thing. No legal action has been instituted by the Department of Justice or the State to remedy

No legal action has been instituted by the Department of Justice or the State to remedy the existing breach of trust problems. The department has failed to initiate any legal or legislative action to collect back rentals owed for past illegal uses. And we had several recommendations in the task force report on that point.

The situation is one which requires the immediate and prompt attention of the United States Commission on Civil Rights.

We hereby request that the Western

Regional Division initiate an inquiry to receive

and document sworn testimony and affidavits from

Hawaiians statewide who have been aggrieved by the state and federal Government's inattention to these matters. We respectfully submit that this panel request the United States Commission on Civil Rights to conduct an investigation of the state and federal governments' collusion and commingling of trust assets. It is apparent that neither the State nor the United States Department of Justice nor the Senate Select Committee on Indian Affairs will take any action on these egregious violations of civil rights.

2.3

Senator Inouye has indicated that he would be interested in conducting an investigation of the situation, but that he, for the present time, will be deferring to the State.

In 1982, we requested that the Department of Justice conduct an investigation. I have a letter from them saying that they were proceeding with an investigation. For six years we have not received any report on that.

I think that, you know, one of the things that you should know is that when we did the Federal-State Task Force on Hawaiian Home Lands, we utilized the exhibits to your own publication.

Your 1980 publication on breach of trust is

basically what got the feds down here, that letter from Mr. Moniz, indicating that despite what the various departments said, the Federal Government stood in a trust relationship to the native people.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You know, my feeling is is that if you are looking for a clear statement on jurisdiction, it really is in that appendix. There is a section that you might want to look at also on the breach-of-trust question in the Federal-State Task Force Report itself. You know, we had a pretty extensive inquiry made, but the bottom line is that the federal administrative position, the federal legal position, at least that that was in the amicus curiae brief on the Keokaha case are not in agreement. You're going to find that there is a conflict. You're going to have federal administrative agencies, such as what you're seeing in that Department of Interior letter, saying clearly we have a trust obligation. You have got the amicus curiae brief in the federal court ruling saying that we have a tangential secondary supervisory role. But regardless of how you would characterize the federal legal responsibility, I don't think that it distracts in any way from the fact that there is serious civil rights violations

here and that they have been ongoing for, you know, 30 years.

We are really at a point, when you have the tactical squad coming out to the Hawaiian Homes community, when you have Hawaiian homesteaders standing with Livai Kaaua at Makapuu taking up the gun, you are in a situation where there is a risk of armed resistance and violence. I really consider that we are there. We would like very much to avoid that here, but we can't -- we can't send any more letters to the Senate Select Committee. We can't send any more letters to the Department of Justice saying, will you investigate that?

If the best that you folks can do after this herring is to send a letter to the Department of Justice, don't waste your time. I have got a whole file full of letters, starting with '82, and I have got their responses saying they're investigating it. The thing is, as Sonny said, we got the letters back from the Governor, we got letters from Inouye, we got letters from Department of Justice, but we do not have a full-blown investigation of the problem. And it is something that needs to go, in my estimation, directly to the

United States Commission on Civil Rights. It has to go there; and, if necessary, someone has to be appointed who is independent because there is federal involvement here. There is federal approvement of illegal land exchanges.

So your federal and your state government, your attorney general, and your Department of Justice, frankly, are in a conflict. So we need to bring it to the attention of the Civil Rights Commission, the National Civil Rights Commission, and ask that there be some impartial investigator appointed.

In Indian cases, in such things as this, what has happened is you have an investigator appointed. You have a reporter that goes with them, and a notary, and they go out to each of the Indian villages, and they take testimony homesteader by homesteader, and they make affidavits, so that you can deal with that, you can have a record of that.

But we just are not in a position anymore to send letters asking for an investigation. And, you know, I feel strangely because the end of my testimony is asking you for an investigation. But I really think it has to go up to the National

Civil Rights Commission and we have to get a 1 2 response and we need some group that is unbiased and that is not going to be influenced by who the 3 4 next Democratic or Republican governor or president 5 is. We haven't been able to move Department of 6 Justice since your last report, and we have all 7 sent letters, all of us in this room. You know, if there is any questions, I 8 can take them. If there is any request you folks 9 10 have for follow-up information, Senator Inouye's 11 letters, all the memorandums we have sent out, the letter for the investigation to the Department of 12 13 Justice, all of it, I have. 14 MR. MAXWELL: Could you give our staff 15 your address or get his address where you could 16 send all those letters because then we can 17 substantiate all the letters that you sent. 18 MS. TRASK: Sure. These things were also filed in my testimony before Senator Inouye. 19 20 they are part of his congressional record now, 21 those responses, but we can certainly do that. 2.2 MR. MAXWELL: We will take a very brief 23 recess. 24 (Brief recess taken) 25 MR. MAXWELL: Okay. Let me resume the

consultation.

And, Mililani, you're still up.

You left off. You had more to say?

MS. TRASK: No. I'm pau.

MR. MAXWELL: Okay. Questions?

Yes, Barry.

MR. LARDIZABAL: Mililani, for my own edification, I need your help in trying to identify specifically any civil rights violation as you see it as an attorney. There are a lot of operational problems, so forth. Sift, if you can, for me, best you can.

MS. TRASK: I think maybe the best way of looking at the thing is in general terms, in general categories. What we have here is we have a compact for admission between the State and the Federal Government, the provisions of which guarantee in certain individuals of native blood entitlements to land and the ability to get water.

What we have, generally speaking, is we have a long history of territorial mismanagement and then state mismanagement. The statistics, I think, the general statistics will speak for themselves. An estimated 30,000 individuals waiting, a current list of 17,000 waiting, with the

vast bulk of the lands, when we sat down to take a look at the investigation, well over 50 percent of the lands being utilized for state, federal, county, and private purposes, persons who are not beneficiaries. That, in my estimation, is a violation of these people's civil rights.

When you view that in the context of the legal fact that they cannot get legal redress, you do not have standing as a native Hawaiian to go into the Federal District Court as Indians do under their own statute, you are not able to enter the federal court at all to get redress as an individual. Then even with the State legislation passing, you're able to litigate, you're able to sue, but you are not able to recover. So you are not able to be made whole, either with your land award or otherwise.

I think that there is additional civil rights violations that have to be looked at when you see what you have as civil rights -- nonviolent expressions of civil rights. I think Doug Silva is probably a very good example. You have somebody here, a Hawaiian homesteader, regardless of the facts, given notice, asked to vacate the property. He does not. Rather than utilize what is the

standard legal procedure at the request of the department, tactical SWAT team is brought in.

Absolutely no precedent for that. You know, I think these -- when you look at it, there is one set of problems dealing with the act, and then there are additional problems that speak to the State's response. I think that those are two ways of classifying the civil rights violations.

But another thing I think is that it is not just -- it is very difficult to point the finger and say this is the state party violating civil rights or this is the federal party. And I am sure you are aware that under the 1983 action there is a provision for 1985 action, and that is conspiracy on the part of the many parties involved.

And, in this case, I would certainly include the State Attorney General, who for five years in a row testified against affording native Hawaiians the right to receive access or redress in the state courts. You know, there is some concern. Who is really violating civil rights when a federal agency is on Hawaiian Home Lands, a state agency is refusing to evict them.

MR. MAXWELL: Mililani, I am going to

have to cut you off right there because I am going 1 2 to have to allow him another question. And that 3 will be the last because we have got to move on. 4 Go ahead, Barry. MR. SHAIN: Okay. 5 6 MR. MAXWELL: Into the mike. 7 MR. SHAIN: I can see from your 8 testimony, you said the current system isn't 9 working. 10 MS. TRASK: Right. 11 MR. SHAIN: So a similar question that I 12 asked another group. 13 MS. TRASK: Uh-huh 14 MR. SHAIN: What do you see as a fix for 15 this? 16 MS. TRASK: I think the first thing is 17 return to the recommendations of the Federal-State Task Force. I think that those things need to be 18 19 implemented. Unfortunately, 100 million from the 20 feds and the State are not going to do it. 21 million from each was requested when we had 8,000 22 on the waiting list. We now have double that 23 amount. So we are going to need the double money. 24 But I think the key to this thing is the 25 recommendation speaking to, number one, prototype

models for housing and, number two, an authority.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I mean, as long as we stick with the current form of administration, I don't care how many departments you create within the divisions you create or how you blow them down, you are not going to resolve this problem until you empower the administrative agency with the kind of power it needs to go out there and say to the County, get off of these lands, we're going to build some homes. Give them the capital and give them the power of an authority. And that is why we recommended that the department structure be changed, even if it is temporary, even if it is 10 years or 15 years. But we need an authority. You know, we need something like the Tennessee Valley Authority to get in there and get the job done in 10 years.

MR. MAXWELL: Okay.

MS. PRADO: Just briefly, you mentioned earlier that Senator Inouye had referred you to the commission. Was that verbally, in the course of your testimony, or in writing?

THE WITNESS: No. What happened was I testified on Oahu, and then he went to Molokai and Kauai. And thereafter he returned, and I had a

follow-up meeting with Lerni MacGregor, who is his staff aid. That was last week Wednesday. And she was saying that the Senator was very concerned with what he heard. He wanted to go out there and call for a full-blown federal investigation. But there had not been the quality of data, evidence, affidavits, and testimony submitted to his senate select committee so he could move on it.

He did get some testimony, a handful of people on Molokai and a handful of people on Kauai. But in order to justify a full-blown Senate investigation, the Senate Select Committee on Indian Affairs, you would need to have testimony from many more beneficiaries, and you would need to have it right down to the specifics of it in affidavit form.

Consequently, what came out of that was the suggestion that perhaps the Civil Rights

Commission could go out there and take that type of testimony, facilitate the making of those types of affidavits, and then a recommendation to the national and to the Senate select committee might have a chance of flying.

But, you know, he's basically where you are. We have got a report that is dated 1983,

1	virtually no follow-up, and a handful of
2	testimonies taken on one island. Not sufficient to
3	justify major federal investigation. But if the
4	request goes up to your superiors and we can get an
5	investigation going that will bring it to an
6	affidavit, personal statement, take it statewide, I
7	think we will lay the foundation for it.
8	MS. PRADO: That was the suggestion of an
9	aid, it wasn't Senator Inouye?
10	MS. TRASK: It was her communication to
11	me from the Senator. He was gone. He did not stay
12	around longer. But I take Lerni's representation
13	that it is true.
14	MR. MAXWELL: Okay. Thank you, Mililani.
15	MS. TRASK: Thank you, folks.
16	MR. MAXWELL: And now I would like to
17	call upon Kawaipuna Prejean.
18	Before I do that, John, you want to
19	announce
20	MR. DULLES: Just briefly, I would like
21	to advise that we will keep the record open of this
22	meeting for one week, so that anyone that wants to
23	submit supplemental information or submit a written
2 4	statement should send it to my office in
25	Los Angeles. And because of the pressures of time,

1 I would request that that be submitted to our 2 office no later than the 14th of this month. realize that is not a lot of time. 3 4 I will be available directly after the 5 meeting to talk with anyone who wishes to submit 6 comments and give you my mailing address. wanted to let you know that that opportunity would 7 8 be afforded. 9 We will now hear from individual 10 presenters, and we will allocate approximately five 11 minutes per speaker. And please refrain from 12 making any derogatory or defamatory information against specific individuals. And speak to the 13 14 general problem, as you see it, of the issues under 15 consideration.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MAXWELL: Kawaipuna Prejean, he don't know any defamatory language.

MR. PREJEAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, for this opportunity to provide testimony on a very important topic here, civil rights.

We are concerned also that this commission not be whitewashed by the right-wingers of America and the Republican Party that I know

have been trying to do away with the civil rights of very hard fought battles from the Blacks and the Indian people and many other minorities in the United States.

You have heard very glaring testimony as far as the flagrant disregard of trusts, the breach of trust, and again, as pointed out by Mililani Trask, this has been used in many testimonies referring to that 1980 booklet that was put out.

Yet, again, there is many people that have died waiting for Hawaiian Home Lands. And being one that was an advocate back in 1980 to file suit against the Federal District Court in United States District of Columbia, again, which was dismissed without prejudice, with the idea of setting up the Federal-State Task Force.

The 134 recommendations just scratched the surface. If they were doing this many things that needed recommendations to fix up, we're just concerned how many they were doing right.

And, of course, not to get into a finger-pointing session with the people at the department, because many of them, this is how they feed their families, and the concern that we have is those families that were, again, uprooted in the

most mean manner at Waimanalo. After talking to Georgianna Padeken, who said that she was actually charging the County a dollar for lease of the land, and we say, we'll give her a hundred percent increase and offered her \$2, and she said no because the County was also kicking in the right to maintain those properties.

We look at the collection of the back rents, because of that Federal-State Task Force, it forced Governor Ariyoshi, who is now the head of the Democratic Party, but at that time was the governor, forcing him to give up the illegally held lands by the 16 executive orders. There is arrearages counting in the millions of dollars, and I would suggest you put a moratorium on the State of Hawaii for that \$400 million they claim to be in surplus. The only reason they have a surplus is because they have been cheating the first people of this land and this state.

I would like to see this task force take on the challenge and expect us to be there involved with you and not behind you, but in a circle of friendship and peace and cooperation, to effect this particular commission with the mandate to do some work and not be frightened by all the

bureaucrats that you come against telling us that we should take our story elsewhere.

We have already been to Washington. Last week, I delivered a resolution to Inouye's office, as well as the Senate Select Committee on Indian Affairs, regarding the coup d'etat of 1893, a lot of people don't parallel the loss of nationhood with the loss of self-esteem and also our way of curing our ills, not to be dictated to in a paternalistic fashion or continued to fall under some supposed trust that never had ever worked to the welfare of the people it's supposed to be protecting.

I would say also to go after vigorously the much military land that is being misused and abused and take away all the special privileges that is given to non-native people that have used more lands than Hawaiian Homes.

When I got involved with Hawaiian Homes, there were less than 2,000 people on the waiting list. And, of course, you know, the things that we're concerned about is the people that have died waiting. There should be some accelerated program and urgent recommendation that, in fact, the elders be taken care of first and the young people, and

come up with some creative programs that will, in 1 2 fact, instill pride, the sense of justice, and fair play with the first people of this land because we 3 4 have yet to see, after 95 years of the coup d'etat 5 inspired by U.S. Government, that any type of justice has really prevailed in favor of the 6 7 indigenous people of this land. 8 We look forward, you know, in our 9 lifetime to seeing some of these injustices 10 remedied and provide relief, more instead of 11 telling us how many people have cheated us and 12 expect us to sit here and continue to share aloha 13 with you. 14 I hope, in fact, this commission turns 15 into something that is going to be active oriented. 16 and let us know in any way that we can be of 17 assistance in facilitating the achievement of justice and fair play for the people of Hawaii. 18 19 Mahalo. 20 MR. MAXWELL: Thank you. 21 Any questions? 22 Alice Moha Akita Zenger, from Kekaha 23 Homestead, leasing Kapaa. 24 MS. ZENGER: Kekaha. 25 MR. MAXWELL: Oh, Kekaha.

MS. ZENGER: Aloha.

MR. MAXWELL: Aloha.

MS. ZENGER: My name is Alice Moha Akita Zenger. I am second generation lessee on Hawaiian Home Lands. First generation died waiting. My mother waited for 28 years for water on her land. She literally died waiting over a quarter of a century. That was really uncalled-for.

It is now 33 years. I am the lessee, and I am still waiting, thank you, for the necessary water that I need to conduct a viable business, ranching. I have 191.6 acres, and I can only raise 28 heads.

Breach of trust? This voice calls out
yes, yes, yes, breach of trust. And why? Because
the powers to be in the Department of Hawaiian Home
Lands are not acting exclusively for the
beneficiaries. There is a definite conflict of
interest, a definite conflict of interest: When
Kekaha Sugar Company, American Factors, can dictate
what happens to all that water that comes down by
the ditch that they only pay \$55,208.88 a year;
when the Act of 1920 specifically spells out that,
as a lessee, I am entitled to surplus water, and I
do not have adequate water to even flush my toilet,

I do not have adequate water for my troughs for my animals.

And I go to the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands, just as my mother did, and plead and write testimony and give testimony, and I write to Governor Ariyoshi, and I send carbon copies to my legislators who represent me from Kauai, and I write to Governor Waihee, and I talk with the powers to be in the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands. And all this time, through two generations, 33 years and eight months, and zero is their track record in helping us, zero.

In fact, Georgianna Padeken, I respect her, she truly tried to help us, and they did pass that we would get, through the commission, commissioners' action, that we would get six inches of water from the ditch to feed into two four-inch pipes for my neighbor and myself so that we can conduct a viable business. And that was in 1983.

It is now 1988 and no action. You have heard from others. A lot of waha, as the Hawaiians say, a lot of mouth, a lot of talking. But the bottom line is zero track record by way of action. Their track record is zero in my case. It was zero in my mother's case. It is zero for my neighbor's

case. And if you will come to Kauai, you will hear again and again and again the zero track record of the powers to be who are supposed to be acting exclusively for the native Hawaiians.

I plead with you, please come to Kauai and hear the many voices who cry out and get no help.

The slap across the face came on July 26th. On May 24 of this year, I gave testimony to remind the commissioners of my situation. They said that in July, on July 26th, they would try to come up with a resolution. By the time July rolled around, they had changed the meeting from my island to the Big Island. And I checked, would they address my water problem? Yes, they were going to be. I sent in a letter to be sure I was on the agenda. Voila. When I walked in, I was handed rescind paper number one. They had approved giving me six inches of water. Now they were going to rescind all of that. That was the kind of action they were going to take.

Help? Zero. Shove your face in the dirt? Yes, siree. They are now going to rescind it. And I spoke up, and I said, I feel -- and I am not a lawyer -- that legally and morally you have a

responsibility of informing the lessees who are 1 2 going to be directly affected by your action prior 3 to taking it up. They did not feel that was 4 necessary. 5 Excuse me. Can you confine MR. MAXWELL: 6 your, because --7 MS. ZENGER: Yes. 8 That was rescinding number one. 9 deferred. Rescinding action number two, August 10 29th of last month. And I said, hey, this 11 rescinding is a little different from rescinding 12 number one. Oh, yes, we had to have them look at it legally. Prior to my going to the meeting, I 13 14 went to see an attorney. 15 Someone asked, who speaks for the 16 Hawaiians? Who speaks for the Hawaiians, someone 17 asked. Well, let me tell you. It is not the 18 Department of Hawaiian Home Lands. 19 MR. MAXWELL: Excuse me, Alice. 20 going to have to cut you short. But if you can 21 submit to us whatever information you have, letters 22 that you have sent, please give it to our staff. 23 And the only reason I have to do this -- and I

RALPH ROSENBERG COURT REPORTERS, INC. (808)524-2090

Federal Register we have to end at certain time, we

really hate to -- but because it is under the

24

25

have to.

Thank you.

The next party up is Henry Smith, Anahola Hawaiian Homes Association.

State your name and who you represent.

MR. SMITH: Aloha, board members.

My name is Henry E. Smith, Jr. I'm the president of Anahola Hawaiian Homes Association, and I would appreciate if the committee here would somewhere, somehow come to Kauai and listen to the testimonies of the people on the Island of Kauai.

And there is many concerns, but what I would like to see, something addressed of what Mahealani Ing talked about about funding. That's the main purpose of moving our Hawaiian Homes program. It cannot move with zero.

I have seen many homes built there on the Island of Kauai by the Federal Government blood grant. Now, how does the Hawaiian get that? I know I can go outside on fee simple land. I have got family that got blood grants, but if you live on Hawaiian Homes, they don't seem to qualify for this. I would like to find out why we can't get a blood grant -- and I'm talking statewide. If they could, the Federal Government could come up with

six, seven, eight hundred million dollars and give us that blood grant, we sure can build homes and infrastructure because it just gave 800 million to build that highway there.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

And in my life, 30 years has been spent overseas, and I have been around the world. see a lot of our moneys that's being spent overseas, but we need it here in the State of Hawaii. So that's one of my main concerns, is how do we get funding? The County is broke. The State is broke. So how does a Hawaiian get something like a blood grant or something in that nature and, yet, make it feasible for this Hawaiian instead of giving all of the restrictions? Maybe some way it could be geared up where the Hawaiians could get it without getting, you know, 10 cosigners. need something like that to help us there statewide, not only on Kauai.

And another thing that I would like to bring up, that there is some things in the act that I would like to see amended. Like they say, well, if you have a mercantile license, you can't get a loan. So something like that should be amended because that is what would benefit. As long as it is something that benefits the Hawaiian, that way

we can receive some type of help by having it amended where the Hawaiians can get into business, can be productive in some way, somehow, and get into this type of funding.

That's all I have to say.

Thank you.

MR. MAXWELL: Thank you so much.

Okay. We have a few minutes more, and I would like to take it up by thanking everybody for coming out here to testify. And if you can understand what our advisory capacity is, that, like I mentioned before, we are here to gather information and make our report available to the Federal Commission on Civil Rights. And then we have to wait and truly -- if we can show them an overriding desire to have something done to the situation of the Hawaiian Homes Act and whether there is definite violations of the trust, then they'll act on it.

But you got to remember that this takes months and months and months for the report even to come back before we have this kind of okay to move further.

So with that in mind, I would like to thank you again for all coming, for the panel here,

1	We	would	like	to	thank	eve	ryb	ody.			
2			And	the	meet	ing	is	now	ad j	journe	ed.
3			(The	e me	eting	adj	our	ned	at	5:00	p.m.)
4											
5											
6											
7											
8											
9											
10											
11											
12											
13											
14											
15											
16											
17											
18											
19											
20											
21											
22											
23											
24											
25	:										

1	CERTIFICATE
2	
3	I, PATRICIA A. MILLER, RPR, CP-CM, CSR
4	#275, do hereby certify that:
5	On September 6, 1988, at 1:00 p.m., the
6	proceedings contained herein were taken down by me
7	in machine shorthand and were thereafter reduced to
8	typewriting under my supervision; that the
9	foregoing represents, to the best of my ability, a
10	true and correct transcript of the proceedings had
11	in the foregoing matter.
12	I further certify tht I am not of
13	counsel for any of the parties hereto, nor in any
14	way interested in the outcome of the cause named in
15	the caption.
16	Dated this 7th day of September, 1988,
17	in Wailuku, Maui, Hawaii.
18	
19	
20	
21.	Potricia a Meller
22	PATRICIA A. MILLER RPR, CP-CM, CSR #275
23	MIN, CI-CH, CDR #2/3
24	

25