ORIGINAL

1	UNIGHAL
2	
3	HAWAI'I STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
4	to the
5	UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS
6	BRIEFING
7	
8	
9	Commencing at 8:30 a.m.
10	Thursday, March 23, 2006
11	. Waikiki Beach Marriott Hotel
12	Milo I
13	2552 Kalakaua Avenue
14	Honolulu, Hawai'i
15	
16	*****
17	
18	-
19	•
20	
21	
22	Reported by Holly M. Hackett, RPR, CSR #130
23	Certified Shorthand Reporter
24	
25	

APPEARANCES

2

1

3 Hawai'i State Advisory Committee

- 4 David M. Forman, Chairperson Honolulu
- 5 M. Nalani Fujimori Honolulu
- 6 David H. Helela Kapa'a
- 7 Faye Kennedy Honolulu
- 8 | Kahu Charles Maxwell Maui (via speakerphone)
- 9 Kaulana Park Honolulu
- 10 | Oswald Stender Kailua

1,1	BRIEFING PANEL .	PAGE
12	State of Hawai'i Attorney General Mark Bennett	6
13	William Hoshijo Executive Director Hawai'i Civil Rights Commission	28
14	Gary Smith Executive Director, Hawai'i Disability Rights Center	46
16 17	Jennifer Rose Domestic Violence Clearinghouse and Legal Hotline	62
18	Alphonso Braggs President, NAACP - Hawai'i	83
19 20	Lois Perrin ACLU of Hawai'i	100
21	Kat Brady Coordinator, Community Alliance on Prisons	111
22	Jo-Ann M. Adams, Law Office of Jo-Ann M. Adams	139
23		
24	Also Present: William Woods-Bateman	164
25		

March 23, 2006

MR. FORMAN: Good morning. This briefing meeting of the Hawai'i Advisory Committee will now come to order. I just wanted to note that we are amending the agenda to accommodate some of our invited speakers who have some conflicts. Any objections from the SAC members?

MS. FUJIMORI: No.

MR. FORMAN: Okay. Thank you. Any objections from the SAC members? Okay. Hearing none, I'm David Forman, Chairperson of the Hawai'i Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

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

1) 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.

MR. MAXWELL: David, I'm getting a lot of static. I cannot hear nothing.

MR. FORMAN: Okay. Let's see if we can make some adjustments to the phone so that SAC Member Maxwell can hear us.

MR. PILLA: (making sound adjustments.) How's that?

MR. MAXWELL: Yeah, okay. It stopped.

MR. PILLA: It may come on intermittently.

MR. MAXWELL: If you got water close by you can pour water on it. That helps. (Laughter)

MR. FORMAN: I was about ready to kick it. All right.

I'll continue. I'm just doing kind of the introductory

remarks, Uncle Charley. You're familiar with these having been

our Chairperson in the past and read them many times.

MR. MAXWELL: Yep.

. 23

- MR. FORMAN: The second purpose: 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.
- 3) Appraise federal laws and policies with respect to discrimination or denial of equal protection of the laws.
- 4) Serve as a national clearinghouse for information about discrimination. And
- 5) Submit reports, findings and recommendations to the president and congress.

Advisory committees were established in each state and the District of Columbia in accordance with enabling legislation and the Federal Advisory Committee Act to advise the commission on matters pertaining to discrimination or denials of equal protection of the laws because of race,

color, religion, sex, national origin, age, handicap or in the administration of justice, and to aid the commission in its statutory obligation to serve as a national clearinghouse for information on those subjects.

9.

The purpose of the meeting today is to obtain information on the status of civil rights in Hawai'i. Based upon the information collected at this meeting a summary will be prepared for the use of the advisory committee and submission to the United States Commission on Civil Rights.

Other members of the Hawai'i Advisory Committee are:

Vice-Chairperson Faye Kennedy, Allen Ai, Robin Danner, M.

Nalani Fujimori, David Helela, Charles Maxwell, Alan Murakami,

Kaulana Park, Kealoha Pisciotta, Oswald Stender and Jackie

Young.

Also present with us today is Thomas V. Pilla of the commission's western regional office is Los Angeles. Please seek Mr. Pilla out if you require assistance.

This meeting is being held pursuant to federal rules applicable to state advisory committees and regulations promulgated by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. All requests regarding these provisions should be directed to commission staff.

I would like to emphasize that this is a briefing meeting and not an adversarial proceeding. Individuals have been invited to come and share with the committee information

relevant to the subject of today's inquiry. Each person who will participate has voluntarily agreed to meet with the committee.

The record of this meeting will remain open for a period of thirty days following its conclusion. The committee welcomes additional written statements and exhibits for inclusion in the record.

These items should be submitted to the Western Regional Office of the United States Commission on Civil Rights, 300 North Los Angeles Street, Suite 2010, Los Angeles, California, 90012. Commission staff should be able to assist you in the process for submitting information.

Let's proceed with Attorney General Mark Bennett.

Please state your name and spell it for the record.

MR. BENNETT: Mark Bennett, M-a-r-k B-e-n-n-e-t-t.

MR. FORMAN: Thank you, Attorney General Bennett.

MR. BENNETT: We'll, I'd like to first thank you very much for inviting me to speak to you today on a subject that I consider to be of paramount importance to our state and that is S147 in the United States Senate locally known as the Akaka Bill.

And while I am certain that the audience here is very familiar with the bill, what I'd like to do is state some things that I think are very basic. And I apologize if I go over some of these basic things, things that are those that

everyone is familiar with.

One has to start, as one often does, with the constitution of the United States. The framers of the constitution provided among the many powers of the Congress of the United States the power to regulate commerce among the Indian nations, with and among the Indian nations. This provision of the United States Constitution has come to be known as the Indian Commerce Clause.

Over the last 200 years but especially in the last hundred years the Supreme Court of the United States has said that what the framers intended is that the congress has nigh on plenary power to determine what constitutes an Indian tribe, to recognize an Indian tribe, to cease recognition of an Indian tribe, to recognize again an Indian tribe that it once recognized and ceased recognition of and to determine how it is going to conduct its relationships with those Indian tribes, whether it's going to treat them on a nation-to-nation basis or on some other basis.

Part of what the Congress has done with regard to

Indian tribes is it has provided special benefits to Indian

tribes, although I'm sure that characterization at least in a

philosophical sense could be disputed, but in a legal sense

benefits that are not available in some circumstances to other

groups has directed legislation both remedial and otherwise

for the benefit of Indian tribes.

And has made provisions that, for example, some types of jobs or some types of programs in the federal government can only be given to Indian tribes, native Americans.

These programs have come under challenge in the courts. And one of the primary challenges of these programs has been a claim that Indians, that native Americans are a race. And that programs that benefit native Americans are a racial preference by the Congress and are illegal under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution unless they can be justified by what the courts have called strict scrutiny.

The Supreme Court in the primary case in this area, is a case called Morton v. Montary, rejected that claim. And it went back to the framers. And it said looking at the Indian Commerce Clause the framers intended that the way the congress chooses to treat with the Indian nations is political. And it is a political decision by congress as to how to deal with the Indian nations under the Indian Commerce Clause. And benefits that are provided are political not racial in nature.

And that in determining whether benefits can be provided to Indians that you only apply what's called the rational basis test. Is the distinction rationally related to a permissible objective. You don't have to have intermediate or higher scrutiny. You don't have to have strict scrutiny.

And in the, I believe it's the 1970s although it might have been in the late '60s, the congress made a determination

that even though native Alaskans were not the same as American Indians or native Americans, that it was going to choose, as they were the indigenous people of Alaska, it was going to treat them in much the same way that it had decided to treat American Indians.

And there has never been a successful challenge to congress's determination to treat native Alaskans like native Americans who are Indians, even though it is clear that they are not, that there are significant types of differences. And that one can look at the differences of racial or cultural but it's an accepted historical fact that they are not the same.

A similar type of challenge was made to the congress's attempt early last century to treat the Pueblos of the Southwest like American Indians. The Supreme Court said the Pueblos are not like other native Americans. They don't generally organize in tribes. There are many other types of distinctions. But like native Americans they are a native people of the United States.

And if the congress chooses to treat them like other Indian tribes, we the Supreme Court are not going to say to our coequal branch of government, "You don't have the authority to do this. Reasonable people could differ. We might decide something else, but we believe that you at Congress have the plenary power to decide that you're going to treat Pueblos like other American Indian tribes."

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

And the same rational applied to the congress's decision to treat native Alaskans like other native Americans.

So what we are faced with factually is Congress has afforded explicit recognition to hundreds of Indian tribes in the continental United States. Congress has afforded explicit recognition under the Indian Commerce Clause to native Alaskans.

The only native group in the United States as a people that congress has not extended formal recognition to is native Hawaiians. Although congress has passed more than a hundred statutes in which it has either said explicitly or recognized implicitly that native Hawaiians as the native people of the Hawaiian archipelago that they are entitled to legally treat. native Hawaiians in the same way that they treat other native peoples in the United States.

Whether we're dealing with education or other types of issues, the congress has spoken in terms of benefits that it's provided and in terms of findings in historical acts. But it has not specifically afforded the type of specific and explicit recognition to native Hawaiians that it has to other groups.

As I think everyone in this room is aware there are many programs that benefit native Hawaiians. Indeed, part of the compact that admitted Hawai'i as a state to the United States needs required Hawai'i to take over management of the

Hawaiian Homes Programs from the congress; for the state of Hawai'i to replace the United States as the trustee.

And Section 5-F of the Admissions Act requires the state specifically to use some of the proceeds from ceded lands to benefit native Hawaiians. So this was a part of the very compact that made Hawai'i a state.

Yet all of these programs, federal and state, whether the Office of Hawaiian Affairs established by our constitution, the native Hawaiian Homes program established by the congress in 1920 and made a part of our constitution, all of these programs are under attack by those who claim that programs that benefit native Hawaiians are racial benefits and are illegal under the Fourteenth Amendment to the constitution.

And that the only way they can survive a legalistic challenge is if the state can demonstrate a compelling state interest for or the federal government to demonstrate a compelling state interest.

As a practical matter, while it is conceivable that there are some case out there providing a racial distinction that has been upheld by a court where the test has been compelling state interest, I'm not familiar with one.

And in a seminal case in front of the Supreme Court, either a year or two years ago, involving California where they segregated prisoners based on race upon admission to

prison because they presented with a belief there was compelling empirical evidence that when they were mixing certain racial groups in certain types of prisons in California people were killing each other. And that it was necessary to separate certain racial groups in prison.

The Supreme Court said, "No, we accept this empirical statement but that's not a compelling enough state interest to justify it. And what you're doing is illegal."

And what I take from that case as a practical matter is that it would be very hard for anyone to make out a case for a compelling state interest that would satisfy the Supreme Court if they were to find that a distinction or a preference was racial rather than political.

That gets us to what the primary purpose from my perspective is of the Akaka Bill. What basically the Akaka Bill does is it sets out explicitly that the congress of the United States finds that it has the power under the Indian Commerce Clause to afford recognition to native Hawaiians in the same way it has afforded recognition to native Americans and to native Alaskans. That is the vast majority of what the bill does.

What the bill also does, however, is that it sets up a process for native Hawaiians to organize, for a role of eligible voters to be certified, and for the Department of the Interior basically to allow an election to be conducted among

native Hawaiians to establish an organic governing document and membership criteria in the native Hawaiian governing entity.

And once that process concludes, at that point and is recognized by the Department of the Interior, at that point the bill contemplates specific negotiations between the native Hawaiian governing entity, the state of Hawai'i and the United States which will discuss what the limits of the powers will be of the native Hawaiian governing entity; what assets the native Hawaiian governing entity will receive such as land or money, what type of criminal and civil jurisdiction the native Hawaiian governing entity will have and matters like that.

But it affords immediate recognition. It makes a statement that congress is exercising its power under the Indian Commerce Clause. And it sets up a process for tribe/governmental negotiations that will ultimately have to be ratified by the State Legislature and the congress. That is in essence what the Akaka Bill does.

My guess is, since becoming Attorney General three years ago, I have been involved in numerous discussions on the subject of whether the Akaka Bill would be constitutional or not.

I have been in many debates on the subject of people claiming that the Akaka Bill is not within the power of congress because congress does not have power under the Indian

Commerce Clause to afford recognition to native Hawaiians in the same way it's afforded recognition to other native groups in the United States.

Although I accept the good faith of some of the people with whom I have debated on this subject, I believe fully and firmly that that position asserted by opponents of the Akaka Bill is baseless and is wholly without legal merit.

I believe that if this bill were passed and it is challenged, which it almost certainly will be, and it will get to the Supreme Court of the United States, that the Supreme Court of the United States would say that, "That while we might not decide that it makes good policy sense to recognize native Hawaiians like other native peoples, the congress has the plenary power under the Indian Commerce Clause to do this; we as a court have never denied congress this power. And there are easily enough historical and other reasons why we are going to say the congress of the United States has this power."

Part of what we submitted or what was submitted to the United States Civil Rights Commission on this and what we have submitted to the congress is not only my briefing paper as to my legal conclusion on this issue but a briefing paper of what I would describe as one of the foremost conservative legal scholars in the country Viet Dinh, who was the previous head of the Office of Legal Counsel in the Department of Justice,

now a professor at Georgetown and also works in private practice. And he has concluded as well that the clear answer to the question of whether the Akaka Bill is constitutional is: Yes. Congress has this plenary power. And the Supreme Court is not going to for the first time in the history or our nation essentially deny to congress the ability to decide what constitutes a native people with whom they can deal under the Indian Commerce Clause of the United States.

I also believe that the Akaka Bill is both fair and just and wise. There is no justification for treating the native peoples of Hawai'i basically as second class citizens among the native peoples of our country.

Why should the congress afford recognition to hundreds of native American Indian groups, to native Alaskans, but decide not to afford that same recognition, that same legal protection and the same umbrella of Morton v. Montary to native Hawaiians?

If one wants to discuss history, one need only look at the logbooks of members of the crew of Captain Cook when they first came to the Hawaiian archipelago. They believed that the people they were dealing with were Indians. They were contemporaries of the framers of the constitution.

Anyone who believes that those who framed our constitution would not have believed that native Hawaiians occupied generally the same status constitutionally as

American Indian tribes just are not students of history, 18th Century or otherwise.

So whether people want to look at it on an historical basis or on an equal footing basis or on a fairness and justice basis, there is simply no basis for denying native Hawaiians the type of recognition that other native groups in the country have had.

Two questions that have been passed on to me that people have raised that I think, quite frankly, are complete red herrings, not that it's being passed on to me. These are questions that are being raised. But these are red herrings.

Some have claimed that by passing the Akaka Bill, quote, "The flood gates will open for all other so-called native groups." People have talked about Hispanic Americans. Or in a reductio ad absurdum argument they've talked about Italian Americans.

And the fact is none of these groups historically are indigenous peoples of the regions where they now reside. And that is what the congress has to look at in deciding whether a group qualifies to be recognized under the Indian Commerce Clause.

And if there are American Indian groups that have been in a particular place for 500 or a thousand years, the congress has the power to recognize them.

Quite frankly, if we're simply talking, as some people

are, about immigrants from other countries after the founding of the United States, congress has no power to recognize them as Indian tribes under the Indian Commerce Clause. And those who suggest that the quote, unquote "flood gates will be opened" are putting forth what in my view is a nonsensical argument.

One question that was put to me is some have claimed that the Akaka Bill would further complicate the already complex native Indian Tribe Laws that are quote, "ripe for reform."

The Akaka Bill has the support of all of the major native American and native Alaskan organizations, the full 100 percent support because it is just and fair.

The fact that, in essence, there is one more group that is being added to the hundreds of groups that congress recognizes as native tribes, the suggestion that that will somehow complicate the already complex native Indian tribe laws again is just absolute nonsense.

There is no question that there are significant problems. And that is clearly an understatement in the way the Department of Interior has dealt with its trust responsibilities. And one need only read some of the decisions in the Kovell case, whatever one's perspective, to know that there have been no serious problems. But the suggestion that the Akaka Bill will somehow add to the

problems is just completely untrue.

I have spent hours in negotiations with individuals of the Department of Justice, the Department of the Interior and even the Department of Defense on proposed amendments to the Akaka Bill to satisfy practical concerns of the federal government regarding the operation of the bill.

And if the bill reaches the floor those amendments which have been approved by Senators Akaka and Inouye and the other co-sponsors of the bill will be incorporated in the bill but they relate to practical concerns regarding the operations of the bill.

The passage of the Akaka Bill will not in any way complicate an already complicated regulatory system. So to me the issues that are raised, can I guarantee that the Akaka Bill will be held to be constitutional? No, I can't guarantee that any court is going to do anything.

But what I can say is that the legal arguments that I have seen demonstrate to me quite clearly that the Akaka Bill will survive constitutional challenge. It doesn't violate the Fifth Amendment; the state programs that benefit native Hawaiians, don't now, but certainly wouldn't violate the Fourteenth Amendment in the light of the Akaka Bill.

And to the extent that this group has any ability to support the passage of the Akaka Bill I would respectfully ask you to do it. And I'm available for maybe 10 or 15 minutes

for questions you may have. I do have a 10:00 hearing, an argument that I have to make in federal court.

MR. FORMAN: Thank you very much, Attorney General Bennett. Before opening it up for questions from the SAC members, just because there seem to be -- well, let me start this way.

I understand that you, and I appreciate that you had made efforts to appear before the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. I've read the submissions that you made and found them to be very compelling. I hope that the commissioners will actually read them.

One of the things that I wanted to do really quickly because there seems to be some confusion at the commission : level about the prior reports that our committee has issued on this subject.

The Chairperson has referred to a 1991 report on reconciliation and Rice v. Cayetano. Obviously that report was in 2001 following the Rice v. Cayetano decision. But in 1991 this committee issued recommendations including immediate recognition of the political status of native Hawaiians. SAC members Charley Maxwell and Faye Kennedy were on that committee.

I wanted to ask you one quick question. As a member of a Republican administration there was some exchange at the commission level where Noe Kalipi was testifying and referred

to the bipartisan support for this bill. And one of the commissioners had said in response to that comment, "This seems to me it doesn't pass the laugh test. Everybody knows that any time a bill is before congress that seems politically problematic to foes because he could be labeled as racially insensitive, then the Republican for good historical reason, I agree, runs for cover and the Democrat, of course likely raise entitlement. So you've got something that's called bipartisan. I think many Republicans on the Hill would welcome a strong statement against this bill on the part of the commission."

I was wondering if you would address -- you've talked about and dismissed the arguments about race-based entitlement. There's clearly bipartisan support here in Hawai'i. I'm wondering if you could comment on that as well as your efforts to discuss this issue with Republicans on the Hill.

MR. BENNETT: Absolutely. I mean I do have to say that I think that whoever made that comment, to me it's irrelevant. But Noe Kalipi's statement is an absolutely true statement. In Hawai'i the Legislature as recently as I believe last year passed a resolution supporting the passage of the Akaka Bill. There was one dissenting vote -- or one no vote in the entire 76-person Legislature.

There are numerous Republican senators who are

co-sponsoring the Akaka Bill including Senator Murkowski,
Senator Stevens and others. The bill has the full support of
one of the leading Republicans in the Senate, John McCain. It
it hadn't it wouldn't have been passed out of his committee.
In order to get to the floor it had to pass out of Senator
McCain's committee.

I myself have had discussions Senator McCain on this bill. And I've had discussions with numerous Republican senators on this bill who I believe will fully support it when it comes to the floor of the congress.

But the point is as a practical matter if the bill doesn't have Republican support, all one has to do is count to 50 in the current makeup of the United States Senate to know if there are no Republicans that support this bill it can't pass.

Not only do we believe that there are easily enough Republicans who will support this bill so that it will pass, there are easily enough Republicans to support a cloture motion so that there will be 60 votes in support of cloture.

And the final point that I would like to mention is that although I have only been involved in this for three years, the person who I have seen make the most vigorous efforts supporting this bill has been Republican Governor Linda Lingle.

I have been in dozens of meetings with Governor Lingle

and elected office holders of both parties, but primarily Republicans, that include not only many senators but the Speaker of the House of Representatives and others. She has spent more time supporting this bill than perhaps any other project that she supports in her three years as governor.

So it has the full support of Republicans in the state of Hawai'i. And it has easily enough Republican support in Washington. So that the support for the bill can be called clearly bipartisan.

The proof, of course, will be when the bill comes up for a vote. So anything other than that people can say anything. And my experiences in Washington is that people often do say anything. But the proof of the pudding will be when the bill comes up for a vote. And I am confident that when it does the way people's votes can and will demonstrate that in fact the bill has bipartisan support.

MR. FORMAN: I'd also like to acknowledge that when I mentioned the 1991 report that SAC member Oswald Stender was also on the committee at that time.

I'd like to start with Kahu Charles Maxwell since he's on the phone and I wouldn't be able to see his hand, give him an opportunity to ask a question of the attorney general before he has to leave.

MR. MAXWELL: Okay, thank you, David. Hi, Mark.

MR. BENNETT: Hi.

MR. MAXWELL: I completely agree with your chronology.

But my question only is when do you think the bill will come up for a vote? Which I think that is important. And, shouldn't there be more essence of informing? You know, because the people of Hawai'i, the Hawaiians don't seem to realize the importance of recognition.

4.

And to me no matter how the bill was changed and being involved with the Alaskan Native Claims Bill, and it's been in existence for 31 years and it's been changed 31 times, amended, so, you know, that's not important to me. The importance is recognition.

So about when do you think it might come up, the bill, or vote?

MR. BENNETT: I have gotten to the point where I put no credence in anything that anybody tells me on the schedule for this bill. With the caveat that I put no credence in these reports that I've heard and that I do not vouch for them in the least, the latest that I've heard is that it's going to get a vote before Memorial Day.

On your second issue I would like to very much commend the efforts of the Office of Hawaiian Affairs for doing everything possible to inform native Hawaiians, their constituency, as to the provisions of the bill and why support is so important.

And I think that both the Office of Hawaiian Affairs

and the Department of Hawaiian Homelands have recognized the importance of this bill and the importance of letting their constituents know what it provides and why it's important.

So I truly don't believe any efforts have been spared to try to inform people in Hawai'i and native Hawaiians as to what the provisions of the bill are.

MR. FORMAN: I believe the attorney general has about five minutes or so left. Any other questions from the SAC members in attendance today? Uncle Charley, do you have any additional questions?

MR. MAXWELL: No, that's it.

MR. FORMAN: One follow-up question. One of the experts that the commission had appear before the committee made this statement: "The Office of Hawaiian Affairs administers a huge public trust that in theory benefits all Hawaiians" -- I think what she meant by that was citizens of the state of Hawai'i -- "but for reasons that are both historical and political in practice provides benefits exclusively for ethnic Hawaiians."

You had mentioned the compact and the obligations the state has to fulfill and the Section 5F of the Admissions Act.

Could you say a little bit to help educate the commissioners about that.

MR. BENNETT: The fact the statement that you just read is factually wrong. That while Section 5F of the Admissions

Act provides that ceded lands are as a whole to be used for the

benefit of all the people of Hawai'i including but not limited to certain purposes which include benefiting native Hawaiians, the Office of Hawaiian Affairs, and I certainly would welcome Trustee Stender's comments, was set up by the Constitutional Convention of 1978 to benefit native Hawaiians.

So our constitution and laws provide that that is the mission of the Office of Hawaiian Affairs. And I would hasten to add that there has been no court that has ever found that that mission of the Office of Hawaiian Affairs somehow violates either Hawai'i law, the Hawai'i constitution or the Fourteenth Amendment. But as I said in my initial presentation those challenges exist today and continue.

MR. FORMAN: One other thing that was mentioned at the hearing before the commission, several commissioners made statements to the effect that, "We can't right every wrong." I think you addressed that in your statements earlier about the fairness and justice of this bill.

But had you been at that briefing how would you have responded to that question?

MR. BENNETT: What I would have said I suppose that's that tautology. And I suppose in the abstract metaphysical sense I agree with it. It is historically recognized although the same people who make those statements deny that there was any wrong committed to the native Hawaiian people, a claim which I find outrageous both in a moral sense and in an

historical sense.

There was a grave wrong done to native Hawaiians. And this is a wrong that can in part not be righted by the Akaka Bill, but some of the harm that was caused by this wrong can be ameliorated by the Akaka Bill.

So whether one can right every wrong or not, this is a situation where we can do something that furthers right and justice. There is a vehicle for doing it, and we ought to do it. I would say to whoever made that statement it is irrelevant to this issue.

I might say something else if I were in a private meeting. (Laughter) But this is a fair and just step for the congress to take. I think in Hawai'i we would say it is pono. It is something that ought to be done.

MR. FORMAN: I take it it's fair to assume that your response to the question, "Is it good for our country is also a hard "Yes".

MR. BENNETT: It absolutely is. I mean, again, the Indian Commerce Clause is not some new invention of the 21st Century. It is part of the compact that governs our nation. That the country, whatever one's political perspective is no one can deny that this country has a shameful record in its treatment of all of our native peoples. I mean that is just an undeniable historical fact.

To say that we shouldn't take the step that the Akaka

Bill does as one step toward ameliorating or helping to overcome some of the injustice caused by the shameful treatment of native people, those who say we shouldn't do it because you can't right every wrong is just nonsense.

And it is good for the country. Righting wrongs, taking steps to promote justice where there's a history of injustice is good for our country. And it is something that makes our country does stand out as a beacon to the world. We are not perfect. The history of our treatment of native peoples demonstrates that as much as anything.

But we recognize in this country when we have acted in a way we shouldn't. The Civil Rights Bills of the '60s were long in coming but they came. This is long in coming but it too ought to come.

MR. FORMAN: Thank you very much, Attorney General
Bennett. We certainly appreciate your taking time out of your
schedule. I recognize that you need to get to federal court.

MR. BENNETT: Well, I apologize for having to cut this short. I would like to be able to stay and take more questions of this hearing. The Hawai'i State Hospital came up relatively recently. I didn't have the ability to tell Judge Ezra, "Waitfor me." (Laughter) Even if I had that ability it would not be a smart move. (Laughter)

MR. FORMAN: Thank you very much.

MR. BENNETT: Thank you very much.

MR. FORMAN: At this point we're going to shift gears a little bit and hear from William Hoshijo, Executive Director of the Hawai'i Civil Rights Commission. Bill, if I could ask you to come up and assume the seat here in front of the microphone. And also, again, there's coffee and water here. If anybody in attendance would like to step up I'm sure the speaker wouldn't mind.

You can take your time when you're ready to begin.

Yes, if you could provide a copy to the court reporter. I'll

let Tom Pilla from the western regional office distribute them

to the commissioners. Uncle Charley, Tom has assured me he'll

mail out a copy to you.

MR. MAXWELL: Oh, thank you so much.

MR. HOSHIJO: Hi, Uncle Charley. How are you?

MR. MAXWELL: Oh, pretty good.

.23

MR. FORMAN: You can go ahead, Mr. Hoshijo.

MR. HOSHIJO: Chair Forman, members of the committee, good morning. My name is Bill Hoshijo. I currently serve as the executive director of the Hawai'i Civil Rights Commission and will talk this morning about some of the civil rights issues that the HCRC is facing.

However, it is my understanding that I have also been asked t address civil rights issues in Hawai'i more generally, with an overview that might frame some of the more specific presentations to follow.

美数据示证

To the extent that my remarks are broader than the positions of the HCRC, they reflect my individual perspective, informed by my work in the civil rights arena, but not any official position of the HCRC.

That being said, I will address the civil rights issues and challenges that we face in Hawai'i and put them in context of the broader civil rights discourse and debate taking place at the national level as best I can.

Whenever I make a presentation on civil rights, I always point out that Hawai'i has a proud civil rights history, our own civil rights movement that paralleled the civil rights movement on the mainland continent.

In the interest of time in my written testimony from .

the bottom of Page 1 through Page 2 I recount some of that
history and I won't read it.

MR. FORMAN: We have a little bit of flexibility. So whatever you feel is appropriate. We have your testimony. We will certainly take a look at it. But don't feel so constrained by that 10 minutes that we cut you short.

MR. HOSHIJO: Maybe I will go through some of it. I know that for many of you, given your commitment to civil rights that this is an old history.

But Hawai'i has a history of race and ancestry-based segregation dating back to the Kingdom of Hawai'i, when American plantation owners brought in foreign laborers as

contract laborers. Segregated plantation camps and ethnic wage schedules were the rule.

Typically haole workers were paid the highest followed by Hawaiians, Portuguese, Chinese, Japanese, and Filipinos.

Through World War II the private sector was segregated along the lines similar to those imposed on the plantations.

Schools, neighborhoods, private clubs were also segregated along racial and ethnic lines.

Much of our civil rights movement was directly tied to the progress of organized labor and the ILWU, who in efforts to organize plantation workers won important victories securing: the right to vote, the right to assemble and associate, the right to trial by jury of peers, the right to free speech and due process.

These hard one rights which we now take for granted, have benefited all of Hawai'i's people. As a result, we moved from a segregated, oligarchic plantation society to a more integrated and democratic society, but there's much yet to be done before we achieve a just society.

This historical tradition continues. Our fair employment law predated Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. We were the first state to ratify the Equal Rights Amendment. And we have an ERA provision in our state constitution.

Hawai'i was the first state to recognize women's right

to choose. And to our credit and consternation the first to address the issue of same-sex marriage seriously.

Our history reflects our values. We value fairness and equal opportunity. Discrimination prevents us from fully developing our greatest resource: Our people. Discrimination diminishes productivity and hurts workplace morale. And discrimination takes a heavy toll on those who suffer its impact. It affects their opportunity to perform and succeed. And it can literally consume and destroy lives. So it's a real human cost.

I'd like to touch on just a handful of issues that I see as civil rights issues based here in Hawai'i. First,

Native Hawaiian rights, sovereignty, self-governance and recognition, challenges to Hawaiian programs and institutions.

The Hawai'i Civil Rights Commission filed an amicus brief in the *Doe v. Kamehameha Schools* case in support of the Kamehameha Schools' petition for rehearing en banc. In this petition we presented two basic arguments.

First, that programs meant to benefit Hawaiians are based on a political classification, not a racial classification so do not violate civil rights law prohibitions against racial discrimination.

Second, that Hawaiian rights issues are not civil rights issues within the framework applied by the courts, particularly the courts in Rice v. Kamehameha Schools case.

They're not issues of individual rights and equality under law, but rather the inherent right of indigenous peoples

to self-determination.

.11

As such, a mechanical application of civil rights standards to restorative programs meant to benefit Hawaiians is inappropriate.

Reconciliation of civil rights law and theory with

Hawaiian rights is perhaps the most important challenge that

we face today in Hawai'i, one that we must address in order to

move forward and establish a just society.

Federal vs. state standards. Our state civil rights laws provide greater protection than federal laws in many respects, consistent with a constitutional mandate, state constitutional mandate, that no person shall be denied the enjoyment of their civil rights or be discriminated against in the exercise thereof because of race, religion, sex, or ancestry.

Stronger state protection of civil rights has been recognized in both, in a couple of different areas, both in Hawai'i constitutional rights where our courts have recognized stronger protection of due process rights and the rights against unlawful search and seizure.

And also in our statutory civil rights protections where we have stronger protections than federal law against sexual harassment, pregnancy discrimination and disability

discrimination as well as additional protected bases, including sexual orientation which are not included or covered under federal law.

5.

In several of these areas the Legislature and the courts have been urged to adopt the weaker federal standards, in effect adopting those minimal standards as our state standards. They're being urged to make, in essence, the floor the ceiling.

One of the areas where we have greater protections is in our state civil rights protections against discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation. The Legislature has expressed its public policy against discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation in the purpose and intent provision of Chapter 368 Hawaii Revised Statutes which is the enabling legislation for the Hawai'i Civil Rights Commission.

Presently, sexual orientation is a protected basis in our employment discrimination law and fair housing law. The protection against sexual orientation discrimination should be extended to our state public accommodations law. And there is a bill, House Bill 1715, which is currently moving in the Legislature this year.

Another issue that has been around for a while is language discrimination as it relates to immigrant rights.

Under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and Executive Order 13166 issued on August 11, 2000, all recipients of

federal funding are required to take reasonable steps to ensure meaningful access to their programs for persons of limited English proficiency. Denial of access to services based on language is prohibited national origin discrimination.

The issue of language access for persons of limited English proficiency is not new in Hawai'i, but very little has been done to effectively address the issue in the past 25+ years.

Again, there is a bill, House Bill 2778, which is currently moving through the Legislature, which would make an affirmative commitment of funds and resources to plan, develop and implement meaningful access to services for limited English proficiency persons in Hawai'i.

Just have a couple more issues that I wanted to touch on. Incarceration has a disproportionate and devastating impact on the Hawaiian community.

In 2004 Native Hawaiians, defined as part or full Hawaiian, comprised over 41 percent of the state prison population, while they comprise 28 percent of the state population.

Broken down by gender, Native Hawaiian women have an even higher, and growing, rate or incarceration.

Incarceration of parents profoundly affects families, and children whose parents are incarcerated are six times more

likely to end up in prison themselves. So this is a really important issue.

Public education, housing, and economic opportunity. Education advocates argue that quality education is a civil right. And the history of our civil rights movement was grounded in the struggle for school desegregation and co-educational opportunity. Success in employment and economic opportunity are directly tied to education.

If we hope to do a better job on civil rights and equal opportunity, we need to do better on education. As a divide between rich and poor grows, exacerbated by the high cost of housing, poor people are being pushed to the margins. And schools need resources and support. They're our first line in a broader struggle for equal opportunity.

And my conclusion sort of I wanted to try to tie this together. Our civil rights laws were enacted to remedy historical discrimination and exclusion. Discrimination and exclusion from slavery to Jim Crow, from treatment of women as chattel to denying the vote to women, from alien land laws and exclusion to the English-only movement.

With the evolution of civil rights law enforcement some view civil rights as neutral policy. But civil rights laws and policy cannot be viewed in a vacuum but have to be seen in an historical context. Our civil rights laws were born out of struggle for justice and they were meant to right wrongs.

They have a remedial purpose.

Another larger trend that affects our struggle to improve in the area of civil rights is the growing economic divide and relationship between race and class as it affects equal opportunity. The growing chasm between rich and poor and the relationship between race and class forces us to re-examine, reframe the struggle for civil rights and equal opportunity as economic stratification resegregates our society and denies people equal opportunity.

Finally, I think there is really grave concern over what happens to our civil rights in times of crisis. In these times of crisis our faith in and commitment to civil rights is sorely tested. Too often we fail to live up to the ideals. that we hold dearest.

One need only look at our recent history for examples: the incarceration of Japanese-Americans based on false military necessity justification during World War II; the red-baiting of McCarthyism justified by Cold War fears; and attacks on civil rights and COINTELPRO domestic spying abuses during the Vietnam War.

Once again, today we live in a time when dissent is all too often characterized as unpatriotic, and we are asked to sacrifice that which we hold dearest because we are in crisis.

The challenges we face are many, but change comes only through struggle and hard work. And thank you for your hard

work and commitment, and I commend you to your work.

MR. FORMAN: Thank you very much for covering so much ground in such a short time. I'd like to give SAC members a chance to ask Mr. Hoshijo any questions, if there are any.

I'll start with Uncle Charley again just in case.

MR. MAXWELL: Bill, that was very informative. Thank you.

MR. HOSHIJO: Thank you, Uncle Charley.

MR. FORMAN: I'd like to ask. You talked a little bit about our state's proud history and how we have kind of in a sense led the way. I'm wondering if you had any observations about the history of Hawai'i and what kinds of lessons we can serve as a laboratory of democracy for the rest of the United States.

MR. HOSHIJO: Yeah. I think looking at the progress that we have made here, and there are a couple of things that we have to offer. One is there's a real spirit of inclusiveness that I think comes from, really from Hawaiians.

Just as an historical example when, under the Hawaiian kingdom the immigrants from Asia could become citizens of the Hawaiian kingdom. But at the time and up to World War II they could not become citizens of the United States. There are actually a lot of examples of things like that.

I believe that under the Hawaiian kingdom women could vote. And it was not very a long time after that in the U.S.

that women got the vote.

So there is that -- or there's something very basic in terms of the values that we have and what we have to offer.

The other thing is I think in terms of being a laboratory that in some ways with the demographic changes across the rest of the country that we are what people fear. The way that we deal with issues of diversity can be instructive for, well, issues of diversity and justice can be instructive for the rest of the country and some instances beyond I think.

So if we do the right thing and build on a foundation I think first with ensuring justice for Hawaiians then we can build a just society and be an example for others.

MS. KENNEDY: Since you're speaking about general things and also as executive director of the Hawai'i Civil Rights

Commission which I serve on, if you had a wish list of just one or two things that would help the Civil Rights Commission being more effective in solving the problems, are there a couple of things that you would like to put on record?

MR. HOSHIJO: Thank you, Faye. In Hawai'i our basic statutory protections are very strong. So in terms of enforcement of civil rights, anti-discrimination laws, we have, again, very strong protection, strong remedies, stronger laws than federal laws than most other states.

We have been facing a number of procedural challenges

which I think have been affecting our ability to do our jobs.

And this is consistent with what other enforcement agencies have faced nationwide. In terms of -- so those are some of the challenges that we face.

In terms of anything that you wish for that would help to advance civil rights of the Commission I think a higher level of consciousness, which is really what your work is all about, about civil rights and the importance of maintaining, being vigilant about guaranteeing citizens, residents, all persons their civil rights. That's really an important thing.

Because civil rights protections are not just about enforcement. By the time we get to the back end we are dealing with complaints, we are pretty far down the road. I think the more we can have people in our community make the commitment to civil rights and diversity that would be good.

MS. KENNEDY: More staff and more money I would assume.

You didn't mention that. (Laughter)

MR. HOSHIJO: Thank you, Faye. Actually there is also an appropriation bill, and maybe appropriation budget for increased staff and three additional positions which is actually the first increase in the number of permanent positions since the Commission was established. So it's about time.

MS. KENNEDY: So we could testify for that bill? Is it still crossed over?

MR. HOSHIJO: It was actually in the budget as a cross-over from the House to the Senate. It's with the Ways and Means Committee.

MR. FORMAN: Committee member Stender.

MR. STENDER: Bill, just off the top of your head, how many issues predominates your HCC office?

MR. HOSHIJO: Let's see. That's a good question. Our office accepts and investigates complaints of discrimination in four areas: Employment, housing and public accommodations as well as state and state-funded services.

Access to state and state-funded services, the only protection is for disability access.

Of the complaints that we receive, that are filed each year 90 percent of them are employment discrimination complaints. Of those the largest number between 20 to 25 percent generally are sex discrimination complaints. Of those the largest number of complaints are sexual harassment, pregnancy discrimination.

MR. FORMAN: Any other questions from the committee members? While they're thinking about that I'd like to follow up. You talked a little bit about the spirit of inclusiveness under the kingdom. Then I think what was left unsaid is that there's a transition from the years of the kingdom to a sense of separateness under the Territorial government of the United States followed by, I think most people just focus on the

democratic revolution that led to Hawai'i becoming a state.

Then attention essentially turned back to Native

Hawaiians -- after advances were made to address the

deficiencies affecting the Asian communities in Hawai'i, that

there was a recognition that there were serious issues of

Native Hawaiians that also had to be addressed.

I'm wondering if you're interested in tying that together a little further.

MR. HOSHIJO: Between the kingdom and the...

MR. FORMAN: Well, I was just thinking more about a lot of folks look to the advances that were made in Hawai'i at least for the Asian-American community and talking about how that progress is sometimes just focused on the fact that of the participation in the World War II that led to that involvement.

But then you have very prominent Asian-American politicians like Daniel Inouye wholeheartedly supporting the Native Hawaiian sovereignty. And that comes from a place that I think is beyond pure democratic. Really ties to the issues that you mentioned before about that inclusive spirit.

MR. HOSHIJO: I think one of the things if you look at the period after the Overthrow that for Asian workers in Hawai'i that it was a mixed bag. Because on the one hand the contract labor system was struck down because that's involuntary servitude.

On the other hand, you have this system composed off de

facto and du jour segregation which created a lot of the conditions that you're just referring to: Restricted covenants, segregated neighborhoods, all of those things that I think gave rise to some of the reforms and actually pretty much revolutionary changes that we have seen over the past 60 years.

25.

In terms of how that experience shapes our perspective on Hawaiian rights issues I think that really going through that experience for many people it really does inform their position or take on the Hawaiian issues that are now a controversy I guess.

Because from personal experience, from my own family history knowing about the discrimination against

Asian-Americans and going through the reparations movement, learning about the denial of rights that my own family and others went through, I think really raises a, really, the basis for my involvement in rights work.

And I think that for many people in a broader sense too that it's, that that experience is the basis for support for Hawaiians in their struggle for justice. Again, I think that there is a sense that we're all in this together and that we're really not going to be able to move forward and build a better society unless we address these justice uses.

MR. FORMAN: I think you were here for Attorney General Bennett's presentation. When you're talking about that

1 inc.
2 Akal
3 said
4 add:
5 Hawa

inclusiveness there are some folks that in response to the Akaka Bill have said you focus on this issue of race, have said, "Well, why not tie the definition of the folks who are addressed by the Akaka Bill to citizens of the kingdom of Hawai'i who might not necessarily have been Native Hawaiian?"

MR. HOSHIJO: My understanding of that issue and how I look at it is that it really has to do with a political issue that we are dealing with the rights of indigenous people to self-governance. I think that at some point it's up to Hawaiians. And we need to get to that point.

MR. FORMAN: Thank you. Faye.

MS. KENNEDY: I have a question from a member of our audience. I'm not quite sure if I understand but you probably would. You currently can't investigate or handle cases related to the *chilling* effect. Does that mean something to you? Are audience members allowed to talk?

MR. FORMAN: Yeah. Bill Woods.

MR. WOODS-BATEMAN: I'm Bill Woods-Bateman. The chilling effect, the feds do cover this under a number of EEO provisions where -- different from Hawai'i, is that in Hawai'i you must have a personal situation of being harmed by the potential discrimination like employment, housing, whatever. So you must have a claim based on your own harm or someone's harm.

Chilling effect is about they have policies. They have

formal statements. They have taken positions and said, "We won't do this." There are many institutions that have formal policies regarding codes of conduct either for religious or against sex, against sexual orientation, a number of other issues too. And they put this out. It's published in a lot of forms. And their local or national chapters or policy makers have said, "This is our official policy."

But because they sometimes hire through word of mouth and through friends and things like that there isn't a person who has made an application and been rejected and therefore cannot be a case.

So chilling effect is a process in which you can do it based on the claims that they wouldn't hire people or wouldn't do whatever on a discriminatory basis without actually having a person involved.

Is that a limitation? Is that something that would benefit Hawai'i civil rights?

MR. HOSHIJO: It's actually, the question you're asking basically goes to standing, the issue of standing to file a complaint and whether a person has actually suffered a harm.

And the short answer to your question is that there's not that big a difference between federal and state law in this area. Because in terms of suffering a harm or suffering from an adverse act, if a person is, let's say, I'll try to illustrate my answer by an example.

If a person goes in or pulls down an application form off the internet or goes and just gets an application, and there are unlawful inquiries in the application that are so demeaning or hurtful and unlawful that the person decides that they don't have a chance; they're not going to apply, they could still file a complaint even if they didn't actually file their application. In essence the harm that they suffered was that they were discouraged from applying for the job.

So what you're characterizing is the chilling effect -MR. WOODS-BATEMAN: Some places that they won't give you
an application to even go through that.

MR. HOSHIJO: Yeah. So it would really depend. Under our jurisdiction what we do is we make -- when someone comes to us to file a complaint we make a threshold jurisdiction. If everything that they allege is taken as true would it constitute a violation of law. That's basically our starting point.

MR. FORMAN: Thank you, Bill. Any other questions from the committee members? Thank you very much. We will hear now from Gary Smith, the executive director of the Hawai'i Disability Rights Center.

While he's getting situated, for the committee members,

Jill Nunokawa was scheduled to appear next but submitted

written testimony. With the commission's permission I'll

defer reading excerpts of her testimony to later in the

meeting. Okay? Thank you.

5

If you could identify yourself for the court reporter.

MR. SMITH: Good morning. My name is Gary Smith and I'm president of the Hawai'i Disability Rights Center. I want to thank you for the opportunity to provide our perspective on the status of civil rights for people with disabilities in the state of Hawai'i.

The March 13, 2006 issue of the Hawaii Business News recorded that the population of Hawai'i grew 1 percent from 2004 to 2005 reaching 1.27 million people. It's generally estimated that 15 to 20 percent of the population or in Hawai'i about 190,000 people to 254,000 people have a disability. That's a lot of people.

HDRC is Hawaii's designated protection in advocacy system for these people with disabilities. P&A was first authorized in the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act of 1975.

Subsequently, Congress has expanded the authority of the P&A system under six additional federal laws, so that today the nationwide P&A system has the authority to advocate for and represent people with disabilities and classes of people with disabilities on a broad range of individual and systemic civil rights issues.

I would like to call your attention to just four critical areas in which people with disabilities routinely

experience discrimination or denials of equal protection.

Those four areas are: employment, housing, services, and education.

First of all: Employment. On Monday of this week,
March 20th, the Garden Island Newspaper from Kauai had an
article on employment in Hawai'i. It said this in part. "The
state's unemployment is so low that there are more jobs than
there are workers to fill them. At 2.4 percent Hawai'i's
unemployment rate is the lowest in the country, according to
the most recent figures. The national average rose to
4.8 percent in February. Workers are in such high demand that
businesses are offering better salaries, more benefits and
extra overtime pay."

Then the newspaper went on to get a quote from a state official and it is: "There's so much demand for workers that even ex-cons, people with disabilities, high school dropouts and older residents have a good chance of finding jobs,' said Tom Smyth, senior adviser for the state Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism."

Mr. Smyth's unfortunate remark reflects the bias that people with disabilities face when they go job hunting. Far too many Americans with disabilities are underemployed or unemployed and have no hope of changing that critical circumstance of their lives.

The 2000 census reports that 56.6 percent of

working-age Americans with disabilities are employed compared to 77.2 percent of non-disabled Americans. Many sources report even lower employment rates for people with disabilities.

It has been postulated that the Americans with Disabilities Act, or the ADA, actually resulted in a drop in employment with people with disabilities during the 1990s.

Because the ADA only provides sanctions for employment discrimination it has become too risky for employers to take a chance on people with disabilities.

Instead, the prudent course of action is to screen out people with disabilities during the application process and give the job to someone more qualified, a decision that is virtually impossible to disprove.

Recently, there's been a flurry of federal activity aimed at reducing the unemployment rate of people with disabilities. In 1999 Congress passed the Ticket to Work and Work Incentives Improvement Act. To date, 33,162 tickets have been issued to people with disabilities in Hawai'i, but only 33 of them, that's 1/10th of 1 percent, have been assigned to an employment network to enable that person to prepare to return to work.

Authorized in the Ticket to Work Act is another program called Benefits Planning Assistance and Outreach or BPAO that has been so ineffective that the Social Security

Administration is rolling out a major overhaul reinventing it as the Work Incentives Planning and Assistance program beginning in fiscal year '07.

I recently attended a conference in Washington, DC where a federal official said -- and this was not from the Social Security Administration, she said, "We know that the Ticket does not work. Does anybody want to disagree with me on that?" And no one did.

So some of the issues that need to be addressed concerning the employment of people with disabilities: New programming needs to somehow focus on employer incentives to hire people with disabilities and not just sanctions for not hiring people with disabilities.

New programming needs to focus on job design and employer development and not just on vocational rehabilitation for the person with the disability who's most likely to never get a job anyway.

As far as the Ticket to Work is concerned Hawai'i needs to adopt Medicaid Buy-In if it is to have any chance of success here.

And, finally, in Hawai'i, state and county governments, large employers, the visitor industry need to step up to the plate and hire more people with disabilities.

Moving on to housing. The real estate market is booming in Hawai'i. And while that's a very good thing for

many people it has been devastating for people with disabilities. It is simply a fact that if you're living on SSI, SSDI, a minimum wage job or part-time work, as so many people with disabilities do, it's very unlikely that you will be able to find a place to rent that you can afford.

For people unable to afford the rents in the private housing markets, public housing projects and programs have traditionally kept them from becoming homeless.

Unfortunately, there are numerous serious problems with public housing projects and programs in Hawai'i.

First of all, the designations of housing: Elderly housing, disability housing, so forth. For many years now federal housing policy has pitted senior citizens against people with disabilities for public housing. And people with disabilities have been the clear losers. Even the small percentage of housing that should be allocated to people with disabilities, based on federal regulation, is not always available to them.

For example, federal regulations require that 5 percent of public housing units be wheelchair accessible and 2 percent of public housing units should be accessible to people with visual and hearing impairments.

After nearly three months of inquiry the Housing and Community Development Corporation of Hawai'i, HCDCH, has not yet been able to tell us if the state of Hawai'i is in

compliance with that requirement. They've also not been able to tell us how many accessible units are occupied by people without disabilities while people with disabilities remain on the waiting list.

Lack of maintenance. Legislative testimony has indicated that that are currently some 825 federal and state public housing units, that's 13 percent of the entire inventory, vacant and uninhabitable due to deferred maintenance.

Section 8 vouchers. There was a time when Section 8 vouchers were the housing lifeline of people with disabilities who by definition are usually poor. Now, however, the wait list for the Section 8 voucher housing program has been closed.

For those individuals fortunate enough to actually have a voucher it may be impossible to find a landlord that will accept the voucher because the HUD established fair market rent is too low.

Given Hawai'i's rental market an increase in the fair market rent is critically important to the success of the Section 8 voucher program.

New construction money. Hawai'i has never gotten Hope Six funding which is the only new federal money available for construction of public housing.

And community development block grants, which could be

6

4

8

9

12

.11

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

another major source of funding for housing in Hawai'i, is seldom used for that purpose. And what can we do to increase the use of CDBG funds for public housing?

Disability services. Just a couple critical issues related to services. Following employment and housing disability services are the third major concern of people with disabilities.

The deinstitutionalization movement before or without developing an infrastructure for community residential care has been difficult for people with disabilities. But particularly so for people with mental illness. Many have become homeless and live on our streets without adequate health care or services. Intervention has come from our police departments and corrections system.

Because of this, not just in Hawai'i but across the nation, jails have effectively become America's new mental institutions. They house a larger volume of mentally ill people than all other programs combined. Some 283,800 inmates or 16 percent of the inmate population are identified as having a mental illness.

The rate of disability appears to be even higher for juvenile detainees. A study funded by the Hawaii State Office of Youth Services on the mental health of adolescents and youth at the Hawaii Youth Correctional Facility indicated that of the 260 case records reviewed for a one year period, June

1999 to July 2000, 215 of the adolescents, or 80 percent of them had at least one psychiatric diagnosis.

In recent months Hawai'i's Department of Health, the Adult Mental Health Division, has made tremendous strides in the development of community-based care for people with mental illness. And the National Association for Mental Illness recently reported that Hawai'i's system has moved from 50th to 14th in the nation. While there's still a great deal of work to be done, we do want to acknowledge and commend the Division for their efforts that they've made.

Over the years the ACLU and the Department of Justice have maintained surveillance of the state's provision of mental health services to prisoners within the adult corrections system, and more recently to juvenile detainees at the Hawai'i Youth Correctional facility. We also want to acknowledge them and thank them for this work on behalf of people with disabilities.

One issue that's, one other -- well, two other issues that are of interest to us related to services for people with disability: Fitness to proceed evaluations.

About two years ago we studied a random sample of 67 pretrial detainees who were the subject of court-ordered forensic examinations in 2001 and 2002. And found that the mental examination process averaged 84 days from the date of issuance of the court's order for the examination to the

judicial ruling on the fitness to proceed.

During the forensic evaluation process persons suspected of mental illness may remain in prison for weeks or months without appropriate mental health treatment. In 31.4 percent of the cases reviewed the initial period of evaluation was extended by the court for additional periods of 30 to 180 days. So it's not uncommon for pretrial detainees who have been detained for misdemeanors who undergo one-panel forensic examination to actually be incarcerated longer than the possible length of incarceration for conviction of the crime for which they were charged.

We believe that the state statute should be amended to provide timelines for completion of these evaluations. For example, Vermont law provides for an examination not more than 30 days from the date of the court order with the one possible 15-day extension.

South Caroline law requires the examination within 15 days after court order. If it's being done in a facility they may request an additional 15 days. And the examiner is allowed five days to prepare the report.

Then on another front, people with disabilities both physical and intellectual, are asserting themselves to move out of institutions or to avoid institutional placement altogether.

You may have heard the term "Olmstead". Olmstead was a

case which was brought on behalf of two Georgia women with mental illness that was appealed to the Supreme Court, and is the landmark decision of the Supreme Court in the world of disability is Olmstead.

It has become the rallying cry across the nation for people with disabilities who want to live in the community and gain control of their own lives.

The basic principles of Olmstead: Unnecessary institutionalization of persons with disabilities who are qualified to participate in an existing state community based program constitutes a form of discrimination by reason of disability, which is prohibited by the ADA.

At the federal government's behest most states including Hawai'i, have written and adopted an Olmstead Implementation Plan. Unfortunately, Hawai'i's efforts to develop community residential care alternatives, the cornerstone of Olmstead, has been fully inadequate. And the state still expends about three times more money to support people in nursing homes than it expends to support in the community.

Education. Finally, I would like to bring to your attention the right of children with disabilities are entitled to a "free and appropriate public education" or FAPE, which is also referred to as SPED, or special education, as authorized in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, IDEA.

Virtually everyone in Hawai'i is familiar with "Felix", the class action suit that was brought on behalf of children with mental illness or also referred to in the case of children "serious emotional disturbances", who were entitled to "special education and related mental health services."

After years of federal court supervision control was finally returned to the Department of Education last year.

Unfortunately, many of the problems which resulted in the filing of Felix persist.

Within the past two weeks the Special Education

Advisory Council released its report which attempts to analyze all due process decisions for the school year 2004 to 2005 and identified a fairly long list of problems:

Difficulty reporting and accounting for cases.

Failure to provide information on federal appeals to the advisory council.

Lack of good faith by DOE.

Unnecessary hearings for cases which should have been settled.

Late identification of students with special needs.

Refusal of services not in the best interest of students.

Only 4 percent of hearings were held within 45 days as required by law.

DOE under-reported the cost of due process petitions to

the Board of Education.

There are approximately 12 attorneys in private practice in the state who devote their entire practice or a significant portion of their practice to IDEA cases.

Our agency, the Hawai'i Disability Rights Center, during the fiscal year ending September 30th, 2005, provided representation on 531 IDEA cases or nearly 25 percent of our individual case work.

We do have a high rate of success in resolving cases through negotiation as our federal mandate requires of us.

However, 16 cases or just about 10 percent of our cases required filing of an administrative hearing. And one of those cases required filing of a complaint in family court.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to talk to you about these major concerns of people with disabilities.

MR. FORMAN: Thank you very much. That was some very disturbing information that needs to be addressed. And I also appreciate acknowledgement of some signs of encouragement as well as specific signs for improvement. Any questions from the committee members?

MR. MAXWELL: Yeah, I have one question for Mr. Smith.

Charles Maxwell on Maui. Mr. Smith, have you in the past filed any complaint with the U.S. Civil Rights Commission pertaining to these violations that occurred?

MR. SMITH: Primarily in the case of complaints of

employment discrimination which we received because we, in 1 order for people to sue they need to get a Right to Sue letter 2 either from the Civil Rights Commission or from the EEOC. 3 So whenever those issues we always send to the Civil 4 Rights Commissioner first. 5 MR. MAXWELL: And have you had a response? 6 7 MR. SMITH: We always have a response. MR. MAXWELL: From our office in LA? 8 MR. FORMAN: Yeah, I think Uncle Charley is asking about 9 the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, not necessarily the 10 Hawai'i Commission on Civil Rights. 11 MR. SMITH: Oh, I'm sorry, yes. No, we don't -- no. 12 MR. MAXWELL: Because I think this is not only unique in 13 I think it covers the rest of the 49 states. But, Hawai'i. 14 yeah, maybe you should have some national recognition on these 15 violations. Maybe it would help you. 16 MR. SMITH: I'm sure you're absolutely right. 17 This is not a problem unique to Hawai'i. It's nationwide. 18 19 MR. MAXWELL: Right. Nalani Fujimori. 20 MR. FORMAN: 21 MS. FUJIMORI: I'm curious about, you talked a little 22 bit about the Section 8 vouchers and the public housing issue. Is there a separate list that you know that's 23 maintained for those with disabilities in terms of access to 24

those units? I know they're asking the question right now of

25

HCDCH but I'm curious about that.

MR. SMITH: Apparently there is not. There probably should be, yes. So since they have had our request for a month, I think they're frantically putting together a list.

MR. FORMAN: You had mentioned one of the things, and maybe this is related to the question that Charley Maxwell asked, I'd never heard that Hawai'i had never received any Hope Six funds. Has any justification been issued for that? Might this be something that we could ask the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights to look into?

MR. SMITH: I'd be grateful if you would. It's fairly new information to me. We've been doing some, focusing some new additional attention on housing issues recently. And that was one of the pieces of the information that we discovered. But, yes, we'd be grateful for any assistance getting more money to Hawai'i.

MR. FORMAN: Any other kinds of things that perhaps inquiry by either this committee or the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights that might help advance the interests of the disabled community in Hawai'i?

MR. SMITH: Well...

MR. FORMAN: And the record is going to stay open for 30 days. If you can give it some thought and get back to us we'd appreciate it.

MR. SMITH: Actually the one issue that I would really

6 7 8

10

9

11 12

13 14

15

17

16

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

like to see addressed at the national level is the battle that's been created between senior citizens and people with disabilities for public housing.

I'd like to see a way for that to be resolved on a national level and for people with disabilities to receive an equitable share of public housing. The reality is those of us who are growing older, being a senior citizen is nearly always accompanied by a disability. So it's a division that doesn't need to exist.

MR. FORMAN: Oswald Stender.

MR. STENDER: In the HCDCH, part of their charge is to build housing. Do they have in their scheme of things an allotment of housing for the disabled? I've never heard of it.

MR. SMITH: That's one of the pieces of information that we have asked them for.

MR. STENDER: You would think, they seem to be providing housing for the needy but I've never heard of a disabled project by HCDCH.

MR. SMITH: It is my understanding that they should maintain a list of housing set-asides for people with disabilities. But I think they don't have that list as of right now.

That's certainly something that our MR. FORMAN: committee can ask them for as well.

> MR. MAXWELL: Is that a federal law requirement that

this list is maintained?

MR. SMITH: Well, it's a federal regulation that 5
percent of public housing must be wheel chair accessible and
2 percent needs to be accessible for people with hearing and
vision impairments. So I would think you would have to have a
list to verify that.

MR. FORMAN: Faye Kennedy.

MS. KENNEDY: Yes. I was glad you mentioned that there's some kind of a competition with senior citizens.

Because early on you mentioned -- it wasn't something you're saying, you were quoting that ex-cons got some privileges ahead. That seems to be a battle set up between quote "ex-cons." And I assume that you realize that ex-cons are people who are going to be spoken about later on by Kat Brady.

MR. SMITH: Yes.

MS. KENNEDY: And I think that is the type of things that sets up competition and is unfortunate. So I'm sure your clients share that view that the ex-cons were getting certain benefits ahead of people who are disabled. Because all of the ex-cons I think deserve that too.

MR. SMITH: Yes. I just, I quoted that because I think the Kauai newspaper had not been out more than an hour before I started receiving emails about it. So, yes. But that's not at all to say that people released from prison should not have employment and all of the ability to create a new life.

MR. FORMAN: Thank you very much for your time. We're going to take a short break so the court reporter to reenergize and the rest of us.

(Recess was held.)

MR. FORMAN: We will reconvene. If you happened to have any written testimony, please provide it to our court reporter. Otherwise we'll go on. She's got skills. She can take care of it. (Laughter)

If you would state your full name and spell it for the record, please.

MS. ROSE: Good morning, everybody. My name is Jennifer Rose and I'm with the Domestic Violence Clearinghouse and Legal Hotline.

I've given the reporter notice that I talk very fast so
I made sure I had no caffeine this morning. (Laughter) Just
decaffeinated tea. I also submitted written testimony. I've
also warned her that I skip around a lot and sometimes make
things up. But I promise it will be the truth. (Laughter)

Again, I work at Domestic Violence Clearinghouse. And I'm an attorney as well. I've been at that agency for nine years so I submit this testimony on behalf of the clearinghouse but also I'm a member of the Interagency Council which is a coalition of immigrants' rights advocates on Oahu. And I believe that I speak on their behalf as well.

I am not an expert on language access, which is going

to be the focus of my testimony. So if there are any really hard questions I'll just defer to Bill. (Addressing Mr. Hoshijo) (Laughter) I will be buying him lunch and I've asked time to stay for the duration of my testimony.

I'm talking from the perspective of a service provider, someone who has worked with immigrants and limited English proficient individuals for many years.

I speak as an attorney who has represented immigrants in family law cases, survivors of domestic violence. And I also draw my experience from my community work. I was formerly the legal services director of the Domestic Violence Clearinghouse for a number of years. And recently started different department in the agency focused solely on improving access to services for underserved populations, particularly immigrants.

And we're doing this not just through our agency but also providing technical assistance to other agencies locally, nationally, and in some cases internationally to build capacity to increase access of services on domestic violence issues.

I also provide technical assistance to the Office of
Violence Against Women which is housed in the Department of
Justice. And I'm working currently with the United States
Territories, particularly with Guam, CMI and American Samoa to
help them build capacity to do more grass roots work in the

area of domestic violence and sexual assault.

4.

·23

I also run what I believe to be one of the only programs in the country that focuses on culturally based intervention practices particularly for Filipino survivors of domestic violence. I don't think there is any other such program in the country that provides that kind of bilingual and bicultural advocacy for domestic violence intervention.

So now that I've qualified myself I will begin.

Immigration continues to change the face of Hawai'i.

According to the 2000 Census:

Hawaii ranked 5th in the nation, approximately 27 percent for persons over the age of five speaking a language other than English at home. This is over 8 percent higher than the national average.

Hawai'i also ranks 4th in the nation, 13 percent, for persons over the age of five speaking English less than "very well."

Hawai'i ranks 4th in the nation in terms of the percentage of foreign-born residents, which I think is really amazing that we're actually tied with New Jersey, having that large a percentage under Florida, California and New York.

In the last several years Filipinos continue to represent the largest immigrant population, representing over half of all annual incoming immigrants in Hawai'i.

The numbers of individuals migrating to Hawai'i from the Federated States of Micronesia also continue to increase, although I do not have any statistics for you at this time.

Bill referenced in his testimony under Title VI, the denial of access to services based on languages prohibited national origin discrimination.

As many of you are aware in 2000 former President
Clinton issued Executive Order 13166 affirming that Title VI
requires federally funded programs to provide language
accessible services. Underscoring the importance of language
access for limited English proficient individuals, President
Clinton further directed all federal departments to develop
and implement plans that would provide meaningful access for
all LEP persons. So anybody who is receiving federal funding,
non-profits including myself are held to this Executive Order.

Despite Hawai'i's demographics and a very clear federal mandate, most state entities are in woeful non-compliance.

LEP persons continue to experience national origin

discrimination on the basis of language.

Over the years that I've worked with the Domestic
Violence Clearinghouse, and I've been working with the
community alliance, I've heard many, many horror stories from
my own clients and other staff members' clients as well as
from community members.

Many basic civil rights violations such as being denied

public benefits due solely to language. DHS workers on a weekly basis have told our clients things such as, "Oh, no, I think your English is good enough. You can get by. You don't need an interpreter." Or, "I heard that they learn English in the Philippines so I don't think an interpreter will be necessary."

State workers have also told our clients that they should know to bring their own interpreters. In one case one worker said, "Well, the Chinese know to bring their own interpreter. You should have brought your own interpreter."

While some clients have been outright denied state benefits to which they are entitled, others have experienced great delays in accessing these benefits.

One of the horror stories that we experienced at our agency was a woman on Moloka'i who was a victim of domestic violence, also an LEP person. She finally decided to get protection after being abused for years by her husband and nephew.

Neighbors had encouraged her to go and get that TRO which she finally did. At her protection order hearing two weeks later there was no Ilocano interpreter provided. She had to come back for a continuance. She came back for the continuance and there was no Ilocano interpreter. She came back again for another hearing and there was no Ilocano interpreter so she had to have had her sister interpret for

her.

A week later she did get her protection order but she committed suicide. And I'm not suggesting that it's because she didn't have the court interpreter. But we can only imagine the public shame that there is in obtaining protection orders. Many of the family members were very afraid of the batterer as is true in most cases. It is completely inappropriate for any family member to be interpreting in a domestic violence case, particularly children.

The truth is it happens all the time. The truth is that children are interpreting not just in LEP cases but in situations where medical services arrive and there's no interpreter there. So children are trying to explain what is. a condition or symptoms of their parent or sibling.

They're trying to explain how their mother got choked or strangled or raped. And children are missing school in Hawai'i because they're interpreting for their families.

They're playing the role of the state.

The sad truth is that we are going to pay a huge price for that. There is a long-term cost to that, the trauma that these children are experiencing.

In another situation an LEP woman was not provided an interpreter when the police were called to a domestic situation. The police spoke to the English-speaking male who was present at the scene of the crime. The woman, of course,

could not speak English well at all and she did not speak with the police. He told the police that she was suicidal.

Without ever obtaining an interpreter the police then called CPS since there was a child present on the scene. The child was not the biological child of the man that was present on the scene. So CPS was called. And she was asked to voluntarily give up her children to CPS in an English-only form that was never translated, nor was there any oral interpretation of what that form was.

She, of course, signed the form and she was taken to a medical, a psychiatric facility where she spent a number of days before anybody ever knew what was going on.

Finally, one of the psychiatric staff workers figured. out she was a victim of domestic violence and not at all suicidal and had no mental illness, and she was taken to a shelter where an interpreter was finally provided. Yet it still took weeks for her to get her children back from CPS. This is just an egregious situation. It happened very recently.

Through the testimony of individuals who are part of the community of Kokua Kalihi Valley Comprehensive Family Services, patients have reported being violated by paramedics who touched the patient all over the body without first communicating their intent.

Hospital staff have asked patients in the waiting room

to interpret for other patients.

Children are often asked to interpret for parents and relatives in emergency rooms.

Whether it's a health care situation or a domestic violence situation or sexual assault incident, there is serious harm that is being inflicted when there are language barriers such as these. Again, we pay a price.

The community has felt outrage for some time. And you should know that language advocates have been working in this area for almost 30 years. At a recent conference that we had hosted on "Domestic Violence within the Filipino Community," in fact first ever I believe, has been focused solely on domestic violence among Filipinos, some 100 community members in attendance prioritized language access as a barrier for Filipino domestic violence survivors.

The National Federation of Filipino American

Association is the leading voice advocating for Filipino

Americans on public policy issues.

Pacific Region IX of NaFFAA, recently passed a resolution to address language accessibility for Hawai'i's LEP population. Similarly, the Oahu Filipino Coalition for Solidarity, a political action group that addresses issues affecting the Filipino community in Hawai'i, also passed a resolution at their annual meeting in August 2005 addressing the disparities that persist for the Filipino community with

respect to language access.

. 2

I also speak from the perspective of an immigrant and from the perspective of a Filipino that's lived in this community.

The Department of the Attorney General recently

published the Hawai'i Strategic Plan for Victim Services, a

statewide report that recognized that LEP persons are a highly

vulnerable population of crime victims. The AG's office

brought a hundred stakeholders together to design the elements

of a strategic plan and made recommendations to increase

accessibility of services for all LEP crime victims.

One stated goal for the strategic plan was to enhance the civil and legal rights of immigrant and LEP crime victims. The report made recommendations such as having specific training on immigrant legal rights and having the population learn more about Title VI.

Language access advocates, again, have worked tirelessly on this issue. In part due to the community outcry and mobilization advocates and members of the Interagency Council decided to try once again this legislative session.

Currently a legislative measure authored by the House is still alive in the Senate as we speak.

The measure proposes an affirmative approach to addressing language access on a statewide level. The bill would require the state and all federally funded entities to

meet the minimum requirements of Title VI of Executive Order 13166 and to develop language access plans.

The bill creates a position of a language access director to be housed with the Department of Labor. The language access director would be responsible for reviewing and monitoring each state department's language access plan, they would provide technical assistance and oversight and endeavor to eliminate barriers using informal methods such as mediation and conciliation.

The bill also creates a language access advisory council composed of representatives from the community, non-profits and the state.

There was an enforcement measure that was before both the House and the Senate that would create a private right of action similar to disability rights that would be housed in the Hawai'i Civil Rights Commission, but that bill died.

Amazing, the House bill has passed out of subject matter committee within the Senate was due largely to the fact that the state departments headed by the Department of Labor, the Attorney General's office, the Hawai'i Civil Rights Commission, and us language advocates who were able to agree on the affirmative model to the specific language in that model.

However, the role of the community can't be underscored as a driving force behind this process. It has been a

collaborative grass roots community effort.

The benefits to limited English proficient individuals if this bill is made law, can be significant. Improved access to a variety of services as well entitled benefits not only ensures safety and well-being but also allows LEP persons to get the support they need to become economically viable in the community.

It is our hope that this measure is made law. We have tremendous community support for its passage. But whether or not it does become the law of the land the Interagency Council and agencies such as mine continue to work on community-based efforts to increase accessibility of services for LEP persons.

We're aware that there are both quality and quantity issues that impact accessibility of interpreters. We are working towards community-based language banks, the development of language advocates and training for existing interpreters.

But the state must meet its legal obligation under Title VI and Executive Order 13166. The measure before the Hawai'i State Senate will help the state to show good faith compliance under federal inquiry.

However, in order to truly provide meaningful access, the state should recognize that effective development of a free and democratic society depends on the right and ability of its citizens and its residents to communicate with their

government. Given Hawai'i's demographics, the state should work towards employing a sufficient number of bilingual staff in public contact positions.

Even if this measure does pass, the state must also provide leadership in ensuring that state agencies and other covered entities comply with the Act. I also believe that if passed, the policy goal of making state entities more accessible also requires the state to proactively work to eliminate barriers that prevent LEP persons from utilizing their services.

Other suggestions for constructive change, regardless of whether or not this bill passes -- suggestions that I make are not just coming from me but suggestions that people have made over the years:

1) Create economies of scale. Significant economies of scale can be achieved by consolidating and coordinating language access resources. In addition, some state agencies currently have protocols for determining an LEP person's primary language. Some of the effective policies in place can be utilized statewide, regardless of the type of service.

And on that note another idea is to identify successful models and best practices that state agencies or non-profits are already utilizing.

A third we need to identify sources of funding to implement state legislation to improve language access. The

state should research and identify all federal sources of funding that could be used to help with translation and interpretation services.

And, finally, provide resources for LEP persons to learn English. Very simple. The state has both a legal and ethical responsibility to ensure basic civil rights for residents of Hawai'i. We must not ignore Hawai'i's demographics or the public outcry of the community and language access advocates over the years.

Vulnerable populations such as LEP victims of crime, those living in poverty and the elderly will continue to be both traumatized in their denial of civil and human rights and be treated in inhumane ways. And there's a long-term cost to that.

We as a community will continue to pay the price of inaction. So I urge you to consider some of these recommendations. And I thank you for the opportunity to testify.

If there are any questions Bill will answer them. (Laughter)

MR. FORMAN: Thank you very much. Are there any questions from the committee members? Os Stender.

MR. STENDER: Actually, are you familiar with Pacific Gateway?

MS. ROSE: Yes.

MR. STENDER: Because I used to serve on that board. The whole idea, one of the activities was to have a pool of interpreters of different languages that would be provided if called upon. And I guess that's really where the problem is getting the agencies to call upon where the service is available.

.23

MS. ROSE: Right. I think you're absolutely right. One area for non-profits is that we are very ill equipped and often not trained on how to access interpreters and what are the best practices in using them.

On Oahu we're a lot more lucky than the woman on Moloka'i. Because through a VOCA grant from the prosecutor's office and with agencies such as Helping Hands and Gateway we have bilingual access lines.

So, for example, on our hotline I can access pretty much any of the main languages spoken in Hawai'i. At that time the hotline call is being taken we can determine the victim's language, their first language. So I can have that person on the call at the same time. I can also have bilingual access for intake and walk through the whole legal process.

That's not true for the neighbor islands.

MR. FORMAN: Faye Kennedy.

MS. KENNEDY: I was wondering what type of arguments are used by people who oppose this bill?

MS. ROSE: That's a great question. They say that it's an undue burden. Of course you folks all know that it was required by law already. Whether this measure -- people are in non-compliance of the federal law. So it needs to happen whether or not this measure or any other measure passes this year.

As far as the affirmative model the cost is not very great as far as putting the staff into the Department of Labor. They realized that there are lots of cost to maintain which is why I suggested looking at economies of scale.

The arguments we make in return are some of the things that I've said today which is you're going to pay now or you're going to pay later. And you're going to pay a lot ... later. And I think that -- and I mean, Bill, you can nod your head or shake your head -- I think that most of the legislators get that. There has been very little disagreement in opposition.

MS. KENNEDY: So there's a good chance it will pass.

MS. ROSE: Yes. Some version.

MR. FORMAN: Any other questions? I could just reinforce the things that Jennifer said. Thirty years for sure. My family lived on Moloka'i 30 years ago. And my parents were -- my mother's an immigrant. My father also speaks the language. But just the simple matter of these old Filipino laborers trying to get their driver's license when

they wouldn't administer the test.

My parents had also testified before the Legislature about they did a little test. They called. My father would be on one line and my mother on the other line. My mother would speak Filipino and then see how the state agencies reacted.

My father would call back, say exactly the same things in English and there were completely different responses to the two people. On several occasions the state agencies who were obligated to provide these services would refer my mother to herself. So there are serious problems here that have been ongoing for a quite a long time.

What are the barriers here? Is it unwillingness of the state to comply with its mandate? Is it really the funding?

Are there other things that are going that are going on?

MS. ROSE: I think that there is a sense of overwhelm.

It is difficult to try -- it's not hard to come up with a plan.

Here's our plan for oral interpretation. And when they walk in the door we'll have like the ten most common spoken languages.

And they'll check off which language they speak.

I mean there are obviously a lot -- each state agency would have to make their plan work and their policies work for the specific kind of services they provide. We would look at a number of different factors.

As far as the written interpretation we're asking for

Tales in

the vital documents to be translated, things like denial of benefits or, you know, notice of a hearing. Those are the kinds of things.

I think, David, that there is that sense of overwhelming, how to get started. I think that people think they don't want to put the money into it. But what feels like what's behind that is a lack of prioritizing immigrants' rights and a sense I believe -- this is my own personal opinion, not the opinion of the Domestic Violence Clearinghouse -- that there is a false consciousness in Hawai'i because we're all brown that somehow we can all figure it out.

Whereas language is such a huge barrier and language and culture the way that you look at the world. In a perfect world there would be bilingual, bicultural advocates, interpreters everywhere.

Of course, there is the issue of quality among interpreters. The Judiciary is looking of having court interpreters being certified.

But as Mr. Stender pointed out there are resources that are already available. The state could be looking at what non-profits are doing because we have been successful at pooling our resources.

MS. KENNEDY: Also most immigrants don't vote. That's the other half.

MS: ROSE: Well, I didn't want to say it but, yes. But thank you for saying that. It is an issue. It seems like there's a lot of political power. This is a huge issue in the Filipino community as they're celebrating our centennial this year.

And Faye's absolutely right. A lot of the testimony that was presented at the first hearing were from Sakadas and Manongs who still, it's not that people don't want to learn English. People say, "Well, why can't they just learn English?" A lot of the Manongs will tell you, "I know English very well. But when it comes to a document about fiduciary duty...." when it comes to a document, legal document, those kinds of things some things don't translate very well from ... your primary language. So there's still a challenge.

A lot of the testimony came from our elderly community that pay taxes in this state for many, many years for these exact same programs and benefits to which they're entitled to and yet can't access.

MR. FORMAN: Nalani, did you want...

MS. FUJIMORI: Do you have a sense of, I think I understand that you need what's called a level 5 translator for legal services. Do you have a sense of how many translators we do have in the state that are certified at that level?

MS. ROSE: I think the Judiciary would know. I was just speaking with one of their staff the other day at a hearing. I

don't think it's very many. That's why they're slowly, they've got a lot of funding to slowly move toward this certification plan. Again that would be for the court.

.18

. 23

A lot of the horror stories we hear and other state departments I personally believe that in some ways the Judiciary has the hardest in trying to meet LEP needs and comply with Title VI.

MS. FUJIMORI: To follow up with that. How much training do you need in order to get that level 5 certification?

MS. ROSE: I have no idea. I know in the court certification process it's many hours. They actually told me that but I couldn't remember. Sorry. I can find out if I have 30 days. (Laughter)

MR. FORMAN: Sure. Absolutely. We appreciate that.

Since Bill Hoshijo's name was invoked in your presentation I'll give him an opportunity to say a few words.

MR. HOSHIJO: In terms of the barriers that we faced over the years towards, in the way of addressing this issue, I think one is we really need a commitment on a statewide systemic basis.

Because, you know, one of the things that came up during the hearings on this bill is that there's, in individual instances people are trying. So there's a lot of kind of goodwill and good faith effort to try to help but not

a real high level of awareness of what the requirements are.

And as an administrator of a small state agency I know that if you leave it to each individual program, division or even department it's not going to happen. Because without that commitment of resources it's an impossible task.

The other thing is that I don't know that we're that much better off than we were 20 years ago. Part of the reason for that is when the state was going through its worse fiscal crisis and the downturn in the economy, one of the first things that was cut were the programs that were added in the late '70s and early '80s which included a lot of these bilingual access type programs.

At one time through Pacific Gateway which was then

Kalihi-Palama Immigrant Service Center and Catholic

Immigration Center there were more resources available than
there are today. The focus was on bilingual case management
which even goes beyond interpretation. Those programs were
really cut to the bone or eliminated during the budget cuts.

So, again, in terms of priority it was, I think, seen as sort of a luxury and those programs were actually cut. We have less now than we had. Thanks.

MR. FORMAN: Thank you very much Jennifer and Bill. We can now turn to Mr. Alphonso Braggs. If you could approach the microphone. If you happen to have any copies of written testimony the court reporter would appreciate it. Yes, Uncle

Charley?

MR. MAXWELL: I've been hearing the conversation of the testimony intermittently. So I don't know if I'm -- I don't know what's happening. But I wanted to ask Ms. Rose if in the past she has filed anything with the U.S. Civil Rights Commission.

MS. ROSE: No, I have not. I know that NALOYO has been work on filing a complaint with Legion Nine for those DHS violations. But I have never filed anything.

MR. MAXWELL: Uh-huh. Maybe you should. I mean at least have some record. You said some federal laws, if I'm not mistaken, were violated.

MS. ROSE: Actually what you just mentioned is what our interagency council has been talking about, particularly if our bill doesn't pass. Then we're going to look at more towards the enforcement approach versus the care and nurturing model that we're still trying to hold onto. Thank you.

MR. FORMAN: Thank you. Uncle Charley, I'm sorry about the poor connections.

MR. MAXWELL: Yeah. If everybody can just talk up, okay. It sounds good now.

MR. FORMAN: Okay. Thank you. If you could identify, state your name and spell it for the record.

MR. BRAGGS: Good morning. My name is Alphonso Braggs,
A-l-p-h-o-n-s-o B-r-a-g-g-s, President for the Honolulu Hawai'i

branch of the NAACP. Thank you for this opportunity to testify today.

The Honolulu, Hawai'i branch of the National
Association for the Advancement of Colored People is grateful
that we have an opportunity to share with you our perspective
of civil rights in Hawai'i from an African-American
perspective.

We are concerned about the number of alleged violations of federal, state, and local civil rights law. And based on the volume and nature of these complaints we are compelled to conclude that, yes, racism and discrimination is still prevalent in Hawai'i. The following highlights some of the cases that we have received.

Racism and discrimination in education. We've had a number of meetings with the Department of Education and the Board of Education since September of '04. We've also met with representatives from private schools and charter schools. Although we've seen over this time some changes at administrative levels all the way down and in the classroom, we still receive a significant number of complaints.

We only need to look at the national reports that grade us on how we are doing in comparison to other states. We can only conclude that we are not achieving at the rate that we need to be achieving.

Unfortunately, this means that African-American

students and other marginalized students are being further disenfranchised. The bottom line is that children are being left behind.

Some of the complaints have to specifically do with African-American teachers and parents alleging discrimination by teachers, staff and administrators. Concerns that are raised that the system is not sensitive to the need for a multicultured staff.

Allegations that staff, teachers and students are not being provided adequate sensitivity and/or bullying training. Let me say that this doesn't mean that there isn't a degree of these taking place. The determination is that it is not having the desired effect. That's the real message that we're trying to convey today.

We have an allegation of teachers who feel that their rights with respect to the unions and as teachers are being denied based on their race by administrations.

Several parents allege students reporting to schools during the midterm have not received the required sensitivity or diversity training or bullying training. Consequently, this leads to incidents or an increased rate of incidents within our school systems. And this matter needs to be addressed.

It is the parents' contention that had these kids had this training subsequent or throughout the year, that this

rate of incidents would be much lower.

We also noticed that military parents and students also feel that they are somewhat received in a less than equal way as their counterparts who are permanent residents or live permanently here in Hawai'i. We see this at all levels in recent cases ongoing. We haven't seen a decline in that to be quite frank with you.

We also need to indicate that we not only receive those types of complaints pertaining to the military from minorities but we also receive those from Caucasians as well.

Recommendations with respect to education. We think that an independent type of investigation should be conducted to help determine what are the root causes for these complaints. I know that a lot of these are regarded or set aside as just mere perceptions.

However, I think in all fairness to parents and to teachers and to students these alleged perceptions, if that's what they want to call them, really do warrant review or consideration and not just simply be dismissed or given the bureaucratic response. That's the feeling of a lot of the students, a lot of the teachers, a lot of the parents who register complaints with us.

We feel that there needs to be an aggressive effort on the part of the Department of Education to hire and retain more African-American teachers, staff, security and administrators.

.23

It is our contention that students who see more diversity will feel more confident about being a part of the process. This gives them that reassurance and also it helps foster a philosophy where they see equality being practiced and consequently we're setting a template that will work in our communities as we desired.

After the discussions and meetings with several parents and administrators and teachers, we find that if there had been more clear communication on the part of the teachers, on the part of administrations when certain messages or actions are taken -- say there is a disruption in the class. If there had been some clear communication initially between the official reporting to the parents or the means where that message got conveyed to the parents or someone else, a lot of the problems that followed could have been alleviated.

So again it's really key that we articulate what happened and what we think may have happened versus automatically a presumption that this is it. Not all cases and complaints have a racial basis. But if they're not properly dealt with they're allowed to foster this concept of racism because we already have two ethnic groups dealing with the conflict.

Students are also asking to take a greater role in being responsible for their own demise. In other words, we

are receiving feedback that if they were given more of an opportunity to be part of a resolution and more of a study or a feedback, then they feel that some of these conflicts could be resolved.

And that gives them ownership of their school. It instills pride. Again it fosters a philosophy that "I can be a part of a society even at this age where I can make things better for my community." And this carries over into the workplace and on. So I think we really need to look at this.

Campus security personnel. We need to take a look at whether or not those individuals are being properly trained with respect to diverse cultures, the sensitivities that need to be exercised.

An example would be if we have an African-American student that's first year here, and we have a local security guard where there may not be an understanding of what one's body language or deportment of words may mean and intent.

So because of that misunderstanding, because of that lack of sensitivity and training and preparedness, we have a conflict ensue because we did not properly prepare both the student and the individual in position of authority.

Basically it means that it's the entire community working with the schools, working with the teachers. And also we noticed that parents have a greater role to play in this.

And I think our best case we saw, we recently had a

meeting with some parents and school officials. And at that meeting it was discovered that while the parents actually have enrolled their kids in private tutoring and also into some learning centers to reinforce what is supposed to be taking place in the classroom. And it was only at that meeting that the administration finally decided: Wow. You know, if we communicated with this established learning center, you know, if the teachers would give some feedback or some correspondence, we could probably achieve higher rates of successes with these students.

The other thing that came out of that was that parents simply want to be heard. I mean when you say that, you know, "This kid is failing," they want real responses. They don't want the bureaucratic response. I think that a lot of the emotion that clouds our ability to bring progress is because we tend to have little canned responses or answers. Not all situations fit every situation.

So I think that identifying a student as an individual and honoring that and empowering that student as an individual as well as respecting what are the concerns of the parents. It does mean that we have to go back aways to what is the fundamental principles about teaching and how it is that we -- that's the foundation.

And I want to emphasize that because it leads to other problems that we're having within our communities. I'll talk

about that in a quick moment here and I'll be through.

Also we've received a significant number of complaints about racism and discrimination within the business community and hotels and tourist industry. To be quite frank with you we're quite shocked and just appalled at allegations against the hotel tourist industry primarily in the Waikiki area.

One case here we have an individual who was denied the opportunity to use a credit card at a hotel. This individual, you know, stated, "I probably looked like, I probably represented myself as the typical rapper style young man."

However, that should not be a determinant fact as to whether or not you receive the standard of service that is supposed to set your establishment apart from and also what it is that we want to be reflective of the message for individuals arriving to Hawai'i as guests.

The other irony here is that most people who come to Hawai'i think that this is the last place on Earth that you would experience racism and discrimination. So there's this double effect when it happens. And I mean particularly here in Waikiki where we have a lot of tourists they're just not anticipating.

For many of them their concept of racism is a white/black issue. So when they get here and they have, "they" being black, and it comes from a brown it's like an overwhelming experience.

So, you know, we continue to get several complaints a months on those. And some of our recommendations on that is that we need to respect all cultures, not just marginalized based on one culture's economic ability and resource in Waikiki. That's the perception.

If I may quote one, "Our dollar is the same dollar as other individuals. However, we may not make as many dollars as they do."

But I think if we are to succeed in the business world we have got to make sure that everybody's dollar is given equal value and the worth of their spending power is fully recognized. And that requires intervention at the government level and by other civil rights minded individuals.

We are also concerned with the number of complaints that we get, again, from military personnel, who in this particular community there are many of the younger ones who feel that there is a perception of transitness. Consequently that because they aren't anchoring down here they're not being given full credit for their ability to make a worthwhile contribution other than the use for those in favor of their national defense ability, it's almost like they have no purpose and they're unwelcome. Yet still we'll take that dollar when we want it.

But they complained that they are not being equally serviced in establishments throughout town. Also they receive

a different degree of service at establishments. And in particularly for a lot of them I think their biggest complaints arise around clubs and others where it's known it's easy to identify a military person so they receive a lesser service.

Of course we have the ongoing issues of the eating establishment of the wait longer, disquality service.

The basic recommendation on that is that, again, culture awareness, businesses really need to make sure that they don't lose out across the board on the success of their businesses because they fail to recognize diversity and they fail to adequately train their staffs.

This is staff including management. We had one complaint of allegations of discrimination from management on down. So if management is practicing this then we can clearly understand while staff, and most of whom are already facing culture challenges and language barrier challenges, automatically feel that if the boss is doing it it's okay.

So this is the same type of ignorance that has been fought for many years in the South. You know, we managed to make some headway. So the sense of complacency that we have here in Hawai'i has got to be dealt with so that we all come to the table and say how can we irradicate this. We need to stay vigilant about that.

The bottom line is that a bad image ultimately leads to

a bad economy. And that's not what we need.

24-

While we haven't received as many complaints we still continue to get allegations of sexual harassment, racism and discrimination in the workplace.

And many feel that while they were equally as qualified as other applicants, that they were overlooked for promotions and hirings based solely on their race.

And others' complaints include a minority and a non-minority or an African-American and another minority being in an equal incident and security choosing to single out with the presumption of guilt towards the African-American and the local individual being treated in a different way.

So again it's happening at all levels across the board.

It just needs to be addressed. I think that standards and enforcement of standards and training can help and go a long way in improving that.

We're also, and this is to wrap this up here, we're also concerned about the proposed legislation for three strikes bill. We would be remiss in our responsibility if we did not advise this body that we're adamantly opposed to any type of a three strikes legislation.

As it is African-Americans across the nation, while they don't rank in the top here in Hawai'i, but, however, the same statistics that affect African-Americans -- right now African-American women are the fastest growing prison

population.

We have more African-American men in the prison system than we have enrolled in institutions of higher learning. The fallout from that should be quite obvious to all of us. And really should awaken our moral consciousness to say this isn't a criminal justice concern. This is really a social concern.

We again need to get to those systemic issues that allow that end result. When that individual is standing before the judge for sentencing now it's too late. We've got to look at the issues that I addressed early on. What is it that we're allowing to take place within our community?

What is it that we're failing to ensure is being met within our school system?

How is it that we're failing to really build our community to eradicate some of these enablers that end up with that individual standing before the judge?

So, consequently, we urge you to not only consider this a criminal justice matter but the social. And also we need to take a strong look at the economic impact for Hawai'i in particular here. This particular piece of legislation would be a major, major, major tax burden on already overtaxed citizens.

There are some reports that put estimates at, if this goes through, that each individual prisoner would be costing us somewhere in the vicinity of \$1.2 million for the 30 years.

Obviously if it goes -- that doesn't include health concerns for this individual getting older. This doesn't include building one prison or any additional security guards. This is the basic cost for that one guy just to have him behind those bars.

We really need to figure out are we exercising our best practices to make our neighborhoods a safe place. And all of this ties into the issues that we raised. How can we make our community safe so that our children will grow up in a safe environment where they will be productive members of society? And that our elders as the baby boom grows, more and more people are coming to Hawai'i.

The other issue has to do with homeless. We are finding more and more homeless people are coming to Hawai'i. Why? Because they can survive here outside in the winter. And in the mainland they cannot. So there are a lot of social and economic implications involved in this that I urge you all to please consider.

With respect to the three strikes it's important not to think that it doesn't matter here because our concerns for Hawaiians, for Filipinos, for other minority groups, you know, they are equally affected.

In other words, it's about economics. If you can afford a good system and a good defense then you probably will not fall prey to a poor system, to the fallout as we have a

lot of in the mainland where we have a poor public defenders system. Consequently that contribute to the high volume of individuals in our penal system.

Finally, let me say thanks to, I think it's important for you to know that a measure of our success as an organization has been the partnership that we've managed to succeed at with the Hawai'i Civil Rights Commission, with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and the Japanese-American Citizens League.

Our collaborative efforts have helped us to move forward an agenda where we really can say that we're trying to achieve. We have not yet achieved. But we are remaining vigilant in our struggle for justice and equality for all.

And I thank you for this opportunity today. I will be happy to take any questions.

MR. FORMAN: Thank you very much, Alphonso. Committee members, any questions?

MR. MAXWELL: Yes. Charley Maxwell on Maui. I truly agree with Mr. Braggs, your interpretation of what's happening.

But I'd like to speak from the perspective as a Native

Hawaiian.

When Captain Cook came here and the missionaries who came later, you know, there was racism and prejudice from then on. And it continues up until the present time. For Native Hawaiians we make up all the social ills of Hawai'i in prison,

in welfare and suicide.

So I can sympathize with what you're saying. But for Hawaiians they're trying to find their identity in their own land here in Hawai'i. But there is so much barriers that is economical and educational and everything else that is set up.

Look at the economy, for instance. Here on Maui a common house, a house, a median priced house is 700,000. Rental is up to \$2,100. So the poor, the poor, like you said, the poor people, they're the ones living down the beach. They're the ones that's economically deprived in the education system, in everything.

And I can see where military would be prejudiced against. But not only blacks but also military, the haole, the white people that comes in the military. They would be prejudiced against by the local people because they have, Hawaiians are going through, like I said, this battle amongst themselves of us stop being a military footprint in Hawai'i.

Already we probably are the first, second or the third target for any nuclear attack here on Maui with the space station up in Haleakala and with Pearl Harbor.

So these are all the kind of things that we also have to combat as Native Hawaiian people. And I sympathize with you and I agree there's a lot of work across the board with all ethnic groups. Like I said Hawaiians, we're still in that social ill. We still make up all the social ills of Hawai'i.

Yet this is our own land. This is where we came from, where we originated.

MR. FORMAN: Thank you, Uncle Charley. I want to pick up on what Uncle Charley's been asking. Are there specific areas of inquiry that you think that our committee can undertake that might address some of the issues that you raised today?

MR. BRAGGS: I think that we may want to start if there is an opportunity to work within the educational system. And I don't mean just the Department of Education, but I think the private and charter schools as well.

That's because it gives us a greater opportunity to work at the foundation, at the lowest common denominator.

And I think it's worthwhile for this group, if you haven't already, several years ago, a few years ago there was a study done by the U.S. Civil Rights Commission which talked about the social ills and the effect that it was having on various ethnic populations.

And African-Americans and in specific here the Pacific Islanders were at the low end of that. In other words, they were the ones most affected. And the number one ill that it had as the greatest effect in happened to have been the criminal justice system. So I agree. I wholeheartedly concur with...

MR. FORMAN: Mr. Maxwell.

MR. BRAGGS: Mr. Maxwell from Maui.

MR. FORMAN: Faye Kennedy.

. 20

MS. KENNEDY: As a committee member I don't want to be in the position of trying to testify because I'm also the vice president of the NAACP. I want to really commend you, first of all, for the things you covered and the way you covered them.

I'm really very proud of you, Alphonso. You did a good job.

As far as your question that you just asked about what could be done. When I got involved with the NAACP I didn't realize there was such a lack of African-Americans in schools. And I think If nothing else comes from this hearing, if we could do something about that.

When I was on the Civil Rights Commission we had a committee that was looking into the lack of employment of minorities in schools. It's just ongoing.

Right now I serve on the State Schools Advisory

Committee. The problem is that there's so much defensiveness and circling of the wagons. And I think anything that this body can do to make them confront the problems -- they're not just against the African-American students. They're against the gay students. They're against the students who are poor.

That one against the African-Americans, as an African-Amercian that's the one that I think I want to address because that is something that we met with the students in public schools. We now have a safe school advisory committee

Nothing changes.

And my feeling is that not only does it not change but the people who are like the whistle blowers they get treated worse and worse.

The first case that we had started in September '04 that got us really involved in the schools. This teacher, he's just about ready to take some kind of a breakdown, have a nervous breakdown. I just think that what they do they're so afraid that they're going to be criticized, the more you talk about the problems really the worse they get.

Even the Civil Rights Compliance Office, they, if you talk about problems, their very defensive. So that's the main thing.

One other thing I wanted say in response to Uncle
Charley. You'd be surprised how many complaints we get from
Hawaiians and part Hawaiians. I myself when I get the
complaints on our hotline I take them very seriously because
it gives me chills and thrills of happiness when Hawaiians and
part Hawaiians call to complain.

I've been involved in a case where there's a coach in the school. He said his daughter is Hawaiian. She has one of the best records in soccer of the school. The PAC 5 head does not help him. He doesn't know who to turn to. He calls me. We talked hours trying to think how to resolve it.

We had another case of a part Hawaiian man, part

Hawaiian, park black, he went out to one of the resorts. They turned him away said that he shouldn't be there. They didn't like his car. They accused him of stealing. They called the police.

1:1

And he said they kept calling him a, "black buddy."

And he said he's Hawaiian and he is part black. But he said

it's a denial of access to some of these resorts. So it's not

only in Waikiki do they have these problems, but they also

have them in some of the more expensive resorts out on the

north shore area.

So I just want to say that what the NAACP does is concern themselves with all different problems. Sometimes we have the haole children who call us. I just think you'd be quite amazed at how multi-cultured the NAACP is and the depth of our concerns not just for African-Americans.

MR. FORMAN: Thank you, Faye. Unless there are any more questions the record is going to be left open for 30 more days. So we appreciate it if you have anything additional to add.

We're going to divert a little bit from the schedule.

Kat Brady has graciously allowed Lois Perrin to speak ahead of
her. So we ask you to approach the microphone.

MS. PERRIN: Good morning. My name is Lois Perrin. I'm the legal director for the American Civil Liberties Union of Hawai'i.

I have been in Hawai'i for the last two years. And :

think that most of you know that the mission of the ACLU is to protect and defend civil liberties and civil rights which are found in the federal, and state constitutions as well as the federal and state laws.

What's resonated with me over the past two years in my position is really the shear breadth of issues that our organization deals with on an annual basis. It really runs the gamut from everything from the First Amendment to people talking about Jesus Christ in city hall to the rights of kids who are in secured confinement to the rights of the homeless. And it really is every issue in between.

We get approximately 2,000 requests each year that we respond to. Most of this is done very informally. We try refer when we can. Litigation, of course, is always the last resort.

In order to put into context some of the national issues we're working on, I did want to touch briefly upon some of the local issues we are working on.

Specifically the Hawai'i constitution is really a beautiful document in a number of ways. It creates a lot of protections that are greater than what is afforded by the federal constitution. Most notably in this regard is the right to privacy. We have a specific right to privacy which the framers determined was appropriate to give to the citizens of this state, to give us power against our government.

What's been really disheartening is that in the last five years there has been a trend to erode this additional protection and other protections. This has been directly the result of a campaign from the law enforcement coalition to federalize the Hawai'i constitution.

What's really disappointing about this also is that Hawai'i does not have an attorneys fees statute. Most states have a specific statute that allows for the recovery of attorneys fees for civil rights action. Hawai'i does not have that statute.

So it makes it very unlikely that individuals are going to challenge the sort of Hawai'i-specific issues because there's no chance to get compensated at the end of the case.

We challenge them anyway because that is our mandate. Although realistically it does become a budget decision as to whether we can afford to keep taking cases for which we cannot be compensated at the end. So that's just a little bit of context.

Of course the recommendation on that is for them to pass an attorneys fee statute. And every year I ask and every year the Legislature says no. So we can continue to try but I don't think it's going to happen any time soon.

I want to talk about two cases that we worked on that really raise issues of national implication. The first is I have spent probably 50 to 60 percent of my time in the last

two years working on issues from the Hawai'i Youth

Correctional Facility. The Hawai'i Youth Correctional

Facility is the only secured juvenile custodial facility in the state.

It was originally designed as a very small facility. This was done intentionally. It only has 40 beds. It was supposed to be for 30 boys and for 10 girls. And the point of this facility was to ensure that we had enough alternative placement programs in the community to divert our kids away from secured custody.

Unfortunately, over the last 15 to 20 years the original model has completely broken down. Two and a half years ago the former legal director did a scathing report on the conditions at HYCF. And found, for example, at the time there were almost 90 kids that are living at HYCF. They were being triple bunked in cells, cells that were designed for one person.

So what was happening is in an 8 x 10 cell there was one bed affixed to the wall and two beds that were literally on the floor with the kids sleeping head to toe, head to toe with one child's nose being inches only from the toilet.

They were so short staffed that the kids would be locked down for days on end. When I say locked down it's not as if they're in their module and they're free to walk around.

They were locked down in their cells, taking every meal in

their cells with absolutely nothing to do but to stare at the walls.

What ended up happening is there was a lot of violence when the kids came out of their cells, mostly because they were stir-crazy because they weren't allowed to have a single personal affects in their cell.

In addition the staff at HYCF had not been trained at all with respect to anything since 1987. The majority of the people who are at HYCF have a background in adult corrections which is fundamentally different than juvenile corrections.

The primary goal of juvenile corrections really should be rehabilitation. But, unfortunately, the lack of services, the lack of training, the lack of other things, these kids were being treated as if they were adults as if they were in a very, very restricted adult facility.

We're recently in the middle of a case right now which is about the mistreatment of lesbian/gay/bisexual and transgender wards at HYCF. So on top of the fact that none of the individuals have ever had training generally, there has never been any training with respect to sensitivity issues in the care and treatment of LGBT kids.

It's an interesting case for a number of reasons. One is that it's really the first case of its kind in the United States. There are problems like this all across the United States. And very recently and actually about to be published,

we now have Best Practices for the care of LGBT youth in out-of-home custody. That refers not to just secured facilities but also to foster homes and alternative placement programs.

We had a terrific result. We had a preliminary injunction from Judge Seabright. And the facility is being ordered to develop and implement policies, procedures and practices to ensure the safety and well-being of LGBT kids.

Judge Seabright has also ordered the state retain specific consultant for this purpose recognizing that the defendants when left to their own devices simply do not have the expertise in how to handle this particular vulnerable population.

The one thing that's been really shocking to me in working with HYCF, though, is the lack of alternative placement programs and the fact that the majority of kids that are at HYCF should not be there.

For example, one of my clients was placed at HYCF, she's a transgender girl, and she was placed at HYCF for solicitation. This is not a violent crime. This is, frankly, a victimless crime to anybody but the person who is soliciting.

Because there was no placements for her, there was nowhere for her to go, she went to HYCF for almost 18 months.

I have another kid who was there, a gay girl, who also

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PACIFIC REPORTING SERVICES UNLIMITED

The second case that I wanted to talk about is a case

because there were no alternative placements for her she's there for truancy.

Now, originally what happens with these kids, there's an initial event of some sort that subjects them to family court jurisdiction. Thereafter a status offence which could be running away from home, not holding down your job, quitting school, being truant, allows the family court to revoke your probation and sentence you to HYCF.

Now, there are some kids at HYCF that do deserve to be there. And I'm not saying that there aren't. There was one kid who held up an AV break and that was not good. But the majority of the kids don't truthfully, they don't come from really stable families. They're from marginalized populations. There's a disproportionately number of Native Hawaiians and other minorities. Very few white kids out at And they come from a place where they have not been given the support that they need in the community.

So going back to what Mr. Braggs just stated, it really is to get into the schools, start teaching cultural sensitivity, being able to offer services and programs so that the children have a network outside of their families of people that they can rely upon and identify with, we might do a very good job of diverting them from HYCF in the first instance.

that we brought last year which is, it was to strike a law called Act 50. Act 50 was brought, enacted by the Legislature in 2004. It was originally conceived by Senate President Bobby Bunda to combat the problem of homelessness out at Mokuleia on the north shore.

Unfortunately for the Legislature they simply took the words public property and threw it into an existing statute dealing with criminal trespass for private property. And in doing so they didn't recognize the constitutional implications.

What ended up happening was a law that was incredibly sweeping in scope. And it allowed any public officer or his or her agent to ban any individual from any public property. for up to one year. And he didn't need to tell the person why. All you needed to do was give them a piece of paper that said, "Your presence is no longer desired on the property."

Once you were banned from the property for a one year period you had no right to appeal. The person really had no recourse whatsoever.

The statute was used in a wide variety of circumstances. It was used with my client to expel him, ban him for a year from the Hawai'i State Public Library on King Street because he accessed gayhawaii.com which is a gay website that talks about restaurants and movies and that sort of thing because the security guard found it to be

distasteful.

-16

Whether or not he finds it to be distasteful it is absolutely constitutionally protected. The individual was banned for a year and had not recourse until he came to us.

There other thing is that it was being used not just in Mokuleia but to literally sweep the homeless all throughout Hawai'i. But what was interesting about it, though, was they didn't use the law to sweep Waianae. They used the law to sweep Waikiki.

So what was coming out of this was so long as you moved the homeless to a place where the tourists won't see them or the wealthier people won't see them, if they're out of sight they're out of mind.

What was interesting about Act 50 was that ultimately we got it repealed. It was an interesting coalition of people that came together at the Legislature to do this. We had homeless advocates, we had church groups, the Interfaith Hawai'i, the gay community, civil rights groups, everybody coming together to talk about this.

But instead, one of the things that I left with was the lack of services for the homeless population. We only have a single shelter on Oahu which is simply not equipped to house the thousands of people that are homeless. The majority of people who are homeless are suffering from mental illness. They also are suffering from, they're basically just

completely disenfranchised both from society generally and from their families.

So if there are services that are available to the homeless they don't know how to get those services.

Unfortunately IHS the shelter is not equipped to be able to put the people in need with the people who have services to provide.

In this regard to the extent that a study has been done with respect to service providers that already exist and putting them in contact with those who need it the most we could do a lot and we could get the homeless the help they need.

That's all I have, and I'll take questions.

MR. FORMAN: Thank you very much, Lois. And questions from members of the committee for Lois Perrin?

Lois, is it possible to provide the committee with a copy of Judge Seabright's order?

MS. PERRIN: Oh, it's so well written. I sure will. (Laughter)

MR. FORMAN: Okay. We'd appreciate that. When you were talking about the lack of attorneys fees statute for civil rights, I guess this is focused on issues that are outside the jurisdiction of the Hawai'i Civil Rights Commission?

MS. PERRIN: The only attorneys -- right, that's true.

It's outside of the Hawai'i Civil Rights Commission. There is

1983 of course which allows for the recovery of attorneys fees for any right that is secured by the federal constitution or federal laws.

But to the extent they're something outside the jurisdiction of the HCRC, something that's specifically outside of the Hawai'i constitution, we challenge it and we did challenge a case last year and we overturned a constitutional amendment that would give attorneys fees pending on a very clever argument, if I do say so myself. (Laughter) However, it's by no means guaranteed that that won't happen.

In talking with people in advance trying to get people to help with these kinds of cases, one of the things that would come up is, "Can we be compensated at the end of the day?" When the answer is, "No," people aren't as willing to give the pro bono work, to dedicate their time if there really is no chance to even recover the cost of bringing the lawsuit.

MR. FORMAN: Did I understand you correctly to say there has been no training?

- MS. PERRIN: "No," none.
- MR. FORMAN: Since 1987.
 - MS. PERRIN: Since 1987.
 - MR. FORMAN: Was that reflected by Judge Seabright?
- MS. PERRIN: I'm not sure if that particular case but it
- is actually in the transcript from the proceeding. I'd be

happy to provide the commission with it. 1 MR. FORMAN: The Best Practices also? 2 MS. PERRIN: Best Practices were attached to Exhibit L 3 to my declaration in support of the preliminary injunction ٠4 motion. I'm happy to provide that as well. 5 MR. FORMAN: Thank you. Anything that you think might 6 be helpful to the committee as it looks at these issues would 7 8 be appreciated. MS. PERRIN: Okay. So I have 30 days. 9 MR. FORMAN: Thirty days. 10 MS. PERRIN: To where should I deliver it? 11 12 MR. FORMAN: To Mr. Pilla of the Western Regional Office. He can provide you with -- the letter that he sent has 13 14 the address there. MS. PERRIN: Oh, I have it, yeah. 15 16 MR. FORMAN: Any other questions from the committee 17 members? Thank you very much. Any other questions from committee members? Thank you very much. Next Kat Brady from 18 19 Community Alliance on Prisons. MS. BRADY: Aloha, Commissioners. Mahalo for this 20 21 opportunity to share some information on Hawai'i's correctional 22 crisis. Let me introduce myself. My name is Kat Brady. I'm a community justice activist. I'm also the coordinator of . 23 24 Community Alliance on Prisons which is a community initiative

working on issues of criminal justice and prison reform.

25

came to this work because I'm also the Assistant Executive
Director of Life of the Land, a 36-year old environmental and
community action group.

And in the mid-'90s I was wondering where's all the money going. As environmental programs and social service programs were being slashed I was trying to figure out where is Hawai'i spending its money?

I really believe that the state budget is a moral document. The state can say many things but the budget shows what they actually do. So I consider it a moral document.

I was actually shocked when I read the state budget because while everything else was tanking, you know, higher education, social programs, everything else was being slashed, the one budget in this state that has constantly risen is Department of Public Safety, the department that's responsible for prisons and jails all across the state.

Then I got really curious. And I wondered, well, who's in prison and how come? That was a harder question. But I actually dug and dug and dug and found out that it's basically people who are somehow involved in drugs.

So it's people who possess drugs and people who commit crimes that are drug related. You know, steal to get money to buy drugs.

I've been working on these issues about a decade. And

I'm the only, I'm considered the only prisoner advocate in the

state. And I sit on the UH Institutional Review Board that reviews social science research to make sure it's ethical and not coercive.

ı

I'm also on the Legislative Task Force, from last year's session there was a resolution passed, looking at issues of children of incarcerated parents. Because children whose parents are in prison are six times more likely to end up in prison than other children.

So that really resonated with me because I just think that we're locking people up willy-nilly, spending lots of money and not really getting any return on that.

I also authored the report of the Task Force of the Children of Incarcerated Parents that was distributed to the Legislature this year. We have a bill in that will extend the work of the Task Force for another year.

We only have two meetings but it's really important because Hawai'i has such a huge number of people who are incarcerated on the U.S. continent. And how do we keep those families together.

So I tried to break my testimony into different sections so that you sort of get the whole picture. My first section is: The Crisis of Leadership. The Department of Public Safety is imploding. We are currently looking for our sixth director since 2003. That's sixth. The first person withdrew his name, nominated by the governor, withdrew his

name when some issues arose that he didn't really want to go public on. His name was Stephen Watarai, a retired police officer.

The second person, John Peyton, who was a former U.S.

Attorney, took the job and was at the job for 18 months. Then
he left. And people aren't really sure if he left of his own
will or he was asked to leave.

The third person then was Jim Propotnick who is the deputy director for law enforcement at the Department of Public Safety, former U.S. Marshal. He was in the position for a few months as the Acting Director.

The fourth person appointed as an Acting Director was Richard Bissen who then got appointed to the bench on Maui. And he left after, oh, about six to nine months.

The fifth director who's currently there as an interim director, and his name is Frank Lopez, and he's been in the Department for about 34 years at the intake service center.

So the Department's in total disarray. There's a lack of leadership, no consistency and staff with years of institutional knowledge are just bailing out and retiring. So we have a lack of consistency, a vacuum of leadership and varying commitments to rehabilitation which has really left the system in crisis.

Then we also have a staffing crisis. This is about all of Hawai'i's prisons. There's a shortage of Adult

Correctional Officers, ACOs, and social workers. This is important because without a security staff there are basically no programs and no visitation.

.18

So when facilities are short staffed it impacts not only the management of the facility because inmates are basically spending the day on their bunks with nothing to do, so tension rises and fights happen, and also many inmates are actually mandated to complete programs in order to be eligible for parole.

So people are spending more time in prison because they haven't done the programs through no fault of their own. They just -- at the women's prison about two years ago there were only programs two days a week. Three days it was all dead.

The women were serving dead time. It was because of a shortage of security.

We currently have a legislator who is from Maui who is a former ACO. So it's kind of nice to have somebody in there who can say in the caucus the things I'm saying in the public domain. He has said a security shortage is dangerous for the inmates and dangerous for management. It doesn't serve anybody.

The next crisis we have is the banishment crisis.

Hawai'i leads the nation in exporting prisoners. Currently 47

percent of our inmates are shipped to four private prisons on the U.S. continent.

All these prisons are operated by Corrections

Corporation of America which has a very checkered history.

Lots of inmate deaths, lots of abuse, many riots in their prisons.

They basically hire guards at minimum wage, no training. And they just don't know how to deal in a situation that can be very tense at times.

So the fallout from the banishment crisis, that crisis is definitely economic costs. Currently we're spending \$33,179,292.95 to send 1,858 people to prisons on the U.S. Continent.

The Department has just asked for an increase to send another 701 inmates to those four prisons on the continent which are in Arizona, Oklahoma, Mississippi and Kentucky at a tab of \$12,133,586. So we'll have almost \$45 million a year being bled from Hawai'i's economy and basically buying jobs somewhere else. This is only the economic cost.

The social cost of shipping our inmates abroad is enormous. Phone calls:. The cost of phone calls from these prisons to Hawai'i is really burdening the families that can least afford. Phone calls cost anywhere, some of the prisons you can only call, the inmate can only call collect. Each phone call costs between \$15 and \$20. I know this because I take several a week.

My work is unpaid for Community Alliance on Prisons so

this is my donation. But I feel like the inmates need someone who's neutral that they can talk to. I log all the complaints. Then I read the contracts with the prison. And I verify that, you know, it is a contractual violation. Then I can sometimes talk to the Department about it.

Other times I wish there was a pro bono attorney that wanted to take these cases. But it's very onerous to sue the Department of Public Safety.

So we're working on the Task Force for Incarcerated Children. That task force, some of the subcommittees have come up with some really creative ideas on how to deal with keeping families connected. It doesn't have to be by the phone. You know the Internet now, they have free phone programs on the Internet. Almost every school has Internet access. So we think that there's ways that we can actually keep families connected and at a cost that's affordable to them.

The next issue is family visits. When people are on the continent there are very few family visits, almost none.

Actually in ten years I've only heard of two families that have actually been able to afford to visit their loved ones in prisons on the U.S. Continent.

One family actually moved to Oklahoma to be near their loved ones so that their kids could actually know their incarcerated parent. So the very fabric of Hawaii's families

is being torn asunder. When our people are so far from home the likelihood of visits is just not there.

10.

All the research on family visitation is -- I've never researched an issue that had all the research on one side -- and it basically says visitation reduces recidivism; that keeping families connected is vital.

And I cite there are several studies, empirical study done in 1972 by Holt and Miller. They found that prisoners with no visitors were six times more likely to re-enter prison during the first year of parole than those who had no visitors. So it's out there and it's very real.

There is actually a bill going through the Legislature this year and it's still alive on family visits despite the fact that the Department of Public Safety has testified against it. That bill basically says pre-approved family visits, they need to happen.

Because what happens is we have one woman's prison in Hawai'i. There are women from all the islands in that prison. Many of our neighbor people are in Halawa. So families save the money. They fly over with their kids. They get to the gate, they find out, oh, lock-down. No can. So they spent all that money and they can't get to see their kids.

So we have worked out on arrangement that I think

Public Safety is going to sign off on with the Senate

Judiciary Committee that those visits -- currently you don't

have -- the visits are, there's no glass. You don't have to speak on a phone. You're basically across the table from your loved one.

We said: Well, what if we could construct those; get Hawai'i Correctional Industries to construct those little booths with phones. And then families would not have to be turned away. We could somehow work out something because it would be less monitoring when people don't have physical contact.

So the Department has agreed to that. They're researching how much that will cost. I can't see it costing a lot. But we'll see what they come up with. And I'm hoping that that bill passes because that's really important, especially for children to know their parents.

Gangs. Well, in the last decade since we've been sending more people far away gang activity has really increased. What I think the genesis of that is we send our people to prisons in, you know, small towns and far away places that have no idea who Hawaiians are.

Many Hawaiian inmates have cultural tattoos. They're immediately marked as gang members. Even if they're not gang members they're just practicing their culture, that's a problem.

So what happened was people started banding together.

The Hawaiian inmates were starting to band together to protect

themselves from all -- the prisons on the continent are full of gangs, many gangs. So to protect themselves they sort of banded together.

Then, the gangs grew really big. In Arizona we had a huge problem because there was a gang called the United Samoan Organization. And they basically ended up running the prison. They were bigger, badder than the guys who were in existing gangs there.

Then they started making this prison alcohol called swipe made out of all sort of icky kind of things and also were dealing drugs in the prison.

So a lot of our inmates were removed actually from
Arizona and sent to other places. But when those inmates
started coming back, the members of USO, United Samoan
Organization, the inmates in Hawai'i then formed gangs to
protect themselves from their own inmates who had formed a
gang and had really been hardened by the U.S. prison
experience.

So then there was another gang, La Familia, The Family. Then the guards were nervous in Halawa and they formed a gang. So I think there's gangs all over the place now and it's all home grown. I mean we created this problem by sending people far away with absolutely no training of the prison workers in the prisons we're sending them to about who Hawaiians are, what Hawaiian culture is, what are some very important

practices that Native Hawaiians practice in prison and why it's important to keep those practices going. So we really grew this problem and now we're dealing with the problem that's huge.

So in Florence Correctional, this is as of November 15th, 2005 in Florence, Arizona, that prison we had 59 men.

In Oklahoma a facility called Diamondback, we had 822 men.

We just moved a bunch of men to Tallahatchie

Correctional Facility in Tutwiler, Mississippi. And I can

guarantee you they know nothing of Hawaiians in Mississippi.

857 men are there.

And we just moved the women from Brush, Colorado. We had 64 women in Brush, Colorado. And two of our women were allegedly sexually assaulted. There is a lawsuit going on right now about that.

So after a big huhu they moved the women to another Corrections Corporation of America prison called Otter Creek in a tiny, tiny little former mining town in Wheelwright, Kentucky. So it's in the southeastern part of Kentucky. I tried to go there. You cannot—you have to make many connections. I think they have to fly to Louisville, take a small plane to Virginia, then take, then drive across the state. It's really in the middle of nowhere.

We had 120 women there, the 64 from Brush; but we also

shipped women from W because W's capacity, W, the women's prison, has a capacity of 265 inmates. And we had at one time well over 300, like 320 inmates there. So really unsafe conditions.

So they shipped the women to Otter Creek to my dissatisfaction because it was so far away when there was actually a prison to Texas that would have been, at least been a little bit closer. But they shipped them there.

I was also concerned because all four of our contract prisons are run by one company. So that puts Hawai'i at great jeopardy because they could basically say, "Okay, we're upping the prices." What are we going to do, you know?

people and where are we going to place them? So I think

Corrections Corporation of America was very smart to make the

Otter Creek prison a little bit lower than the other

Corrections Corporation of America prisons that our inmates

are in to make it very attractive for Hawai'i. But I still

contend that the social costs are just so enormous that we

continue to pay and pay and pay.

On December 31st, 2005 one of our women in Otter Creek died, Sarah Ah Mau, 43 years old, under very suspicious circumstances.

I've been battling with the Department who promised me a report on the team that went out there after. I tried to

get on that team but I'm not very welcome there.

But I think it's really important that an independent voice go, and especially a woman. The women know me. That I could go and let them know that the people at home have not forgotten about them.

The health care complaints that I've received from the contract prisons, the bulk of them are from the women. Many of the women are on various medications for diabetes, heart conditions, high blood pressure especially.

And when they were shipped from Brush, Colorado to
Otter Creek they denied them their medication even though it
was doctor-approved medication and it was Department-approved
medication. They just cut off their medication.

So when the arrived at Otter Creek at 2:00 in the morning one of the women passed out. And her blood pressure was like 190. It was just sky rocketing. So they immediately took her to the hospital. Bad press. Not good for them.

So they gave her a few days' medication and then she didn't have it after that. And, you know medications you have to really keep that level of medication up in many cases and that has not been happening. I posit that's why we have so many problems there.

In the month of December we had a woman that had, was rushed to emergency room: Pneumonia. She went to surgery.

She then called me a new days later after she arrived back at

the prison and said, "I'm really worried because I'm supposed to have a follow-up appointment with the doctor and they're telling me that the prison nurse will take care of it."

.4

And she went up to the medical unit. She was called to the medical unit at, like, 3:00 in the morning. And she went up to the medical unit and the nurse was treating another inmate who had an open wound. And she turned right to her with her gloves and said, "Okay, now I'll work on you."

She said, "No. I just got of the hospital. I don't want to this to happen." So she got written up for refusing.

I called the doctor. And she called me and said, "I'm really concerned. They're not going to let me have a doctor's appointment."

Of course I couldn't get the name of the doctor or the medical facility that she went to. But I am good at digging.

And I found out where she went. And I called the doctor's office and asked, "Does this person have an appointment?" And the nurse said, "Of course because that's protocol. After surgery there's always a follow up appointment."

I said, "Well, the prison is telling her that there's no notation in her file and that the prison doctor or the prison nurses were actually going to give her her chest x-ray and bloodwork. And she's very scared because she's not sure that they're actually following best practices at the medical unit in the prison."

She said, "No, there is an appointment." So then I called the prison. And to my surprise the assistant warden didn't even know the name of the doctor at the prison, said he would look into it.

I called him back a couple of hours later. He said,
"No, there's no notation here. It just doesn't say anything.
So I called the Hawai'i medical unit that's responsible for
all our inmates at the Department of Public Safety. They
said, "Oh, no. No, the prison is going to take care of it."

I said, "No. After surgery isn't it protocol that a doctor, the doctor that did the surgery for nothing else but malpractice reasons they want to do a follow up?"

"Oh, no, no. That's not the way it is."

Well, she then sent me the letter she got from the doctor saying, "You missed your appointment."

So there's just something really screwy going on and it's very concerning to me. So that was one person who was rushed to the hospital with pneumonia.

Another one of our inmates was rushed to the hospital after multiple complaints with the medical unit and needed a triple bypass. They told her, "Oh, you have leg problems." She started with a pain in her leg and it went all the way up her left side. And oh, no, they were giving here Ben-gay or something like that. I mean ridiculous.

The third person was Sarah Ah Mau. And I talked with

many people in the system, people who work in the system, people who run programs and other inmates and they all said she was a model inmate, very quiet woman, 43 years old.

She started complaining of, she had, her stomach was distended. And she couldn't figure out what was going on.

She was having trouble eating. She was having trouble sleeping. She asked for medical care numerous times, was denied.

One night she went up to one of the inmates who is kind of outspoken and said, "You need to help me. Something is very wrong. And I don't know what it is. I'm requesting to see an outside doctor and they're not letting me."

And this woman took a look at her. She was completely swollen. She said you wouldn't even recognize her feet, they were just so hugely swollen. So she, the woman, the other inmate called the guard, who came in and was shocked at what she saw.

And Sarah was rushed immediately to the hospital and placed in ICU. She died the next day. And my phone started ringing at 6:30 New Year's Eve, 6:30 in the morning, families of other inmates who were really concerned not only that Sarah had died but their loved one is on medication, had been denied and they started worrying that their loved one was going to die.

So the healthcare at Otter Creek is absolutely abysmal.

Some of the nurses, I've hear, have quit because they were asked to do things outside of their scope of practice and they didn't want to lose their license.

So something is suspicious there. And whenever I talk to the Department of Public Safety they assure me that everything is fine. So there's something really wrong.

Environmental problems at that prison. All their water is surface water and it's a former mining town. Actually some families of Kentucky inmates saw my name in the paper and started calling me and saying, "You're right. That water is coming from an abandoned mine shaft." Because our women got there in October. And from October to early December I would say the majority of them have complained of diarrhea and vomiting.

Finally, one of the nurses told the women, "Don't drink the water here." Of course how can you avoid that? Ice, it's used for cooking, showering. I mean it's just really hard to avoid that. Plus buying the bottled water from the commissary which is generally open between 2:00 and 4:00 in the morning, which is strange to me, is prohibitive to say the least.

I mean these women can't even afford winter clothing that they were promised. That's another thing about the health care. When their medication was restored it was either changed or reduced with no doctor's input at all.

So the woman who had pneumonia, in order to get her

medication when she got out of the hospital she had to stand outside. It's in another building in the medical unit. It's dispersed from like a half-door thing in the building. So the women have to stand outside on a line to get their medication.

And it's been really cold there. They were promised warm clothing. But for the most part the women have gotten what they consider thin jackets. And standing on line has not been a very productive thing because most of the women ended up with the flu.

Hawai'i has monitors that are permanent at some of our prisons, contract prisons. In Arizona and Oklahoma I think there are contract monitors there that are hired by Hawai'i that are there to oversee the contract daily.

But in the other two prisons there are monitors -- we have a monitoring team that runs out of the Department of Public Safety that makes quarterly visits to the prisons.

And I've read their monitors' reports. I log in all the complaints and all the things I get from the people who are in prison. Then I look at the contract to make sure they really are contract violations. Then I check the monitors' reports. They never, ever look the same.

The monitors' reports are completely white washed. It seems like everything's fine. It's all good. It has nothing to do with what I'm hearing from the inmates or the families are hearing from the inmates.

We also have several people who are not in those four private prisons but are in prisons under an Interstate Compact that Hawai'i has. We have one inmate in Colorado who is a gang defector. He was member of USO. He wanted out. And he's basically being punished. He's had life threats, death threats on him. He's had a lot of trouble.

So he asked to be sent to another facility. So they sent him on this Interstate Compact to a prison in Colorado where he was in solitary confinement for 23 hours a day because he was trying to do the right thing. He's had no writeups, no nothing. It seems like he's being punished because he's trying to make his life better, trying to extract himself from the gang culture.

There are no monitors that go to those prisons that check to see if our people's civil rights or needs are being met at all. So they are really left to their own devices.

There are major inconsistencies. One of the problems with having our people in prisons far away is it sort of gives the private prison administration a chance to play with the rules. Sometimes they tell them, "Oh, you have to file that, a Hawai'i form for that."

Then they'll file a Hawai'i State grievance form. Then they'll be told, "Oh, no, you really have to file a grievance form for this prison." So they give these people the runaround. And they really have no recourse.

And when they complain to the monitors, the monitors say, "I'm not here to hear your complaints."

It's like, "Yes, you are. That's your job to make sure that the contract is complied with." These people make \$60-\$70,000 a year of publicly funded money. And they have absolutely no accountability.

I have to pay if I want the monitors' reports, pay a quarter a page to get them copied. So to me it's worth it because I really want to make the case. I'm trying to involve the Legislature telling them this is public money that's being used to incarcerate these people. We have contracts that are constantly being violated and our people are at risk.

Then we also have language access issues. We have an inmate who, her mom only speaks Portuguese. She is no longer allowed to speak to her mom on the phone because she's not allowed to speak in another language. Although, inmates of other ethnicities have been allowed to do this. So that's a problem. I've asked the ACLU to look into that.

But I told her, "You need to complete the grievance process." That's where I found out all the huhu about the grievance because Hawai'i has no grievance forms there.

So the women are smart and they've been taking
Kentucky forms and changing it to Hawai'i and making do.

In the women's prison here we had a deaf inmate. She had no -- was provided no interpreter. So some of the other

inmates who could sort of figure out what she was saying ended up being her interpreter.

She was provided no help so it was very hard for her to get into any kind of program because she couldn't hear what was going on and nobody really took the time to help her.

Then we have a huge cultural crisis. It's interesting to note that the Department says 85 percent of the people in prison need substance abuse treatment. When you look across the socio-economic spectrum drug abuse is pretty even among all ethnicities. But who's in prison? Native Hawaiians are in prison.

So between -- the 2004 and 2005 stats from the

Department of Public Safety revealed that 38 percent of

inmates incarcerated in Hawai'i are Native Hawaiian and

41 percent of inmates who are sent to the continent are Native

Hawaiian. This has a huge impact since ohana is so important

to us. It's really difficult to keep families connected.

Many of the inmates, I really see cultural programs as a rehabilitation strategy. Many of the men when they were in Minnesota at one time they started a group. And they really wanted to learn olelo Hawai'i, practice hula, practice chanting and celebrate, like, makahiki.

The Department was dead set against this. I saw men who were really hardened change when they realized who they were. Because they realized: I have a responsibility not

just to myself and my immediate family but to my ancestors, my genealogy.

That has been around an amazing thing. I've seen amazing transformations of men who were in for violent crimes who once they realized who they were, something came together in their heads and one of them is out now and he's doing really great.

And he's actually starting a group on the outside that's communicating with some of the guys on the inside.

They actually waged a lawsuit against the state of Hawai'i because the director of the Department at one point said that Hawaiian is not a religion.

He got a letter saying that, from the Hawai'i

Historical Society. We were like, "No, everything about

Hawaiian culture is spiritual." And other people are allowed

to practice their beliefs. Native Americans have sweat lodges

at the prisons on the continent. Yet our people were denied

their cultural rights.

So a lawsuit was waged, and then it was settled with the state of Hawai'i. So now the men in Diamondback, Oklahoma are allowed to celebrate makahiki. That's been a really wonderful thing because OHA has helped them, sent Native Hawaiian food up there so they have a pa'ina. And they chant from outside the gate. They do a whole protocol except the hihiwai. But they really, it's been a really transformative

thing for these inmates.

So it's very difficult for me to believe why the Department would want to stop something that's peaceful and so healing to people. It's a great rehabilitation strategy.

The next section is the recidivism crisis. Our recidivism numbers are between 51 and 80 percent. That should outrage everybody because the same people are basically going in and out. At one point the director of Public Safety said, "On any given day 50 percent of the people at intake services," which is the first stop on your way to prison, "are parole or probation violators." Most of them for dirty drug screens.

Yet they know that 85 percent of the people need treatment. Less than 15 percent of any of the inmates in Hawai'i get any substance abuse treatment at all. So we wonder why people are recidivating. We give them no chance to develop marketable job skills. We don't directly treat the reason we know they're in prison. Drugs are basically the underlying cause of most of the crime in Hawai'i. And yet we just don't meet those needs. And we wonder: Gee, what's happening? What's wrong with these people?

It's like if you don't get treatment when you have cancer you're either going to die or you might go into remission and relapse. And relapse is part of the substance abuse problem.

MR. FORMAN: Kat, can I ask you to bring it to a conclusion?

MS. BRADY: Yep, I'm on my last paragraph. Okay. So
The reason that the Hawai'i prison population is growing so
rapidly is because of the institution of mandatory minimums in
1996. In four years that law, mandatory minimums for crystal
meth has doubled the women's population and the men's
population.

Alphonso talked about the proposed three strikes laws. Since this administration has been in office they have every year proposed amazingly punitive laws that offer no rehabilitation.

And I guess one of the most egregious things was in the proposal for three strikes the original proposal actually wanted to include 21 class C felonies as a violent crime.

I couldn't figure out why would Hawai'i try to increase its felon class. Why would we want to do that? Because most of the contract prisons won't even take people classified as violent. So what are we going to do with them?

So what can we do? We can actually have a diverse array of community-based programs that directly affect the needs of people. There are many people sitting in prison who are community custody, could get out and should be in community programs where they could be better helped.

We can have more work furlough beds. The Department

testified that they need 2,725 work furlough beds. That has been a strategy that really prevents recidivism. Because when people have support when they get out of prison they're more likely to have a successful reentry.

Of course the third thing is enforcement. That's the thing that Hawai'i does the least well. We have many great laws and just don't enforcement them. We have contracts. We don't enforce the provisions. So there are many people who really want to lift themselves out of poverty. They want to help their families. They want to be back in the community. They need help. That's why I'm here.

MR. FORMAN: Thank you very much for that very comprehensive presentation. Are there questions from the committee members? We'll start with --

MR. MAXWELL: I'll make it real brief because I know we're running into --

MS. BRADY: Hi, Uncle Charley.

MR. MAXWELL: Hi, there. You know, I was involved in the Diamondback with Melody McKenzie --

MS. BRADY: Yes.

. 23

MR. MAXWELL: -- as one of the kupuna that speak about the makahiki. I was involved in the lawsuit. It was amazing that you said exactly what you said. And it substantiates what I said. The majority of the people in prisons and in all the social ills of Hawai'i is Native Hawaiians.

MS. BRADY: Yes.

MR. MAXWELL: What is so disturbing is that nobody seems to care, the governor, that all these rules are being broken as we speak, you know. That is a very frustrating part.

I'm speaking from a personal level because I have a former son-in-law in a California prison. He was just moved up there. And my granddaughter is 10 years old. But with her her father's been involved with drugs for like five, six, seven years since she was about four years old.

So what she's done was turn on to education and she makes honor roll every quarter.

MS. BRADY: Right on.

MR. MAXWELL: But her father calls her. And it's a sad part, makes her sad when she hears him because he hasn't changed. He's a three-time loser. But, I mean there's a lot of other stuff happening in the prison, like you said, that sometimes as the advisory committee to the U.S. Civil Rights Commission this is a perfect example of what we should be involved in from a state advisory.

But, you know, all we can do is try. We've tried with other Native Hawaiian things in the past and some success happened. But we still gotta keep trying. We gotta have the government, the governor's office and every federal agency and everybody involved to correct this problem. It's really bad.

MS. BRADY: Yes.

MR. FORMAN: Os Stender.

MR. STENDER: Yes. I guess with the recidivism issue, it's so pronounced I think because of the isolation the prisoners from family and friends so they don't build networking for the day they get out.

How serious is the current governor? There was an announcement in the paper not too long ago about building a prison, one or two I think. And how much of that will improve programs for building relationships with prisoners and families that really need this?

MR. BRAGGS: Yes. Sadly, this administration came into office saying that they were going handle the drug problem and the prison problem. The prisons are, they haven't done anything to help the prisoners. In fact on that three strikes law AG Bennett got up and said: These people are absolutely hopeless and we will just send them up there and forget about them.

Yet the Maui Best program that's modeled on DeLancey
Street? Their first grant was a federal government for
serious and violent offender reentry. So DeLancey Street and
Best take serious violent offenders who are actually
rebuilding their lives. So I don't give up on people. I'm
sad that the governor and this administration has given up on
people. But I will never give up on people.

So every time they talk about a prison I ask, "Okay.

Î *-

1	Let's take about visiting space, program space, what kinds of
2	programs, how you're going to do this." So I am quite vocal.
3	And they just can't get rid of me as much as they want to.
4	MR. FORMAN: Thank you. Any other questions? Kaulana
5	Park.
6	MR. PARK: Who is responsible for the sending of Hawai'i
7	prisoners to mainland prisons?
8	MS. BRADY: It started 10 years ago. It happened
9	because of the consent decree that Hawai'i prisons were under
10	for 15 years. At that point they started a commission, a
11	governor's commission called the Corrections Population
12	Management Commission. Their goal was actually to manage the
13	population. Unfortunately they haven't met for a year. It's
14	been kind of sporadic.
15	They realized in order to get out from under the
16	consent decree they were going to have to ship people out and
17	make the prisons less crowded.
18	MR. PARK: So it's kind of an, to some degree an
19	inherited problem?
20	MS. BRADY: Oh, yes. It's not just this governor, no.
21	But I'm sad that this governor has not anything about the
22	prisons. That's been something the Department has felt because
23	they haven't really gotten any direction.

MS. BRADY: It is. But it's not insurmountable.

MR. PARK: It's no question it's a huge issue.

24

25

MR. PARK: You're right. I think in the leadership you're correct. But it's not to say that it's not on the radar.

MS. BRADY: I hope so. Because we could have the model system. When you look at our jurisdictions --

MR. PARK: Sure, sure.

MS. BRADY: -- ours is very small.

MR. PARK: That's what we're looking at. But to get that person to commit to that it's a huge order.

MS. BRADY: Thank you.

MR. FORMAN: Thank you very much. I appreciate Jo-Ann Adams being so patient with us. We are running beyond time. I hope the community members are able to stay. We don't have very much business to take care of after Jo-Ann is finished with her presentation. And we're hoping that we don't get kicked out of the room. (Laughter)

MR. MAXWELL: Lock the doors. (Laughter)

MS. ADAMS: Thank you very much. My name is Jo-Ann
Adams and I will try to speak slowly since I don't have written
testimony. And I will speak my first name very slowly. J-o
hyphen capital A-n-n. Then if you get that part the Adams is
easy because it's standard A-d-a-m-s.

I've been asked by the chairman to give the status of the sexual orientation issues here in Hawai'i. And I kind of want to begin with saying I'm really pleased to be here.

Sometimes it's been frustrating to me. When you hear, "Lucky you live Hawai'i" and that there are no problems here.

I'm not saying that we need to spend all our time complaining about what's going on in Hawai'i but I was very please to hear people talking about that there are some really significant issues to be addressed here in Hawai'i.

And I also wanted to share anecdotally I came here in 1959 which was a wonderful thing to come when I was 10 years old and to see Hawai'i become a state.

And I remember at that time being surprised when I saw black and white couples walking down in Waikiki with no comment. That was shocking to me growing up in Southern California.

But at the same time I do think in a lot of ways

Hawai'i now lags other parts of the country in areas of

discrimination. So I'm thrilled that this commission will be

doing its part to try and help us catch up to resume our

leadership position.

So that's what I'm here to talk about is the status of civil rights in Hawai'i regarding sexual orientation. And I am active in the GLBT caucus, the Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgender caucus of the Democratic Party. And also the Gay Collaboration Group which gets together and talks primarily about legislation, trying to get legislation for the gay/lesbian community.

23

24

25

Bill Woods is also here. Just as the other speaker said if you have any questions ask Bill Hoshijo. I would say the same thing. If you have any questions ask Bill Woods. He's been the shaker and mover for years in the gay community and probably has more historical knowledge than any other person on this.

I do want to mention, as you can see our title has grown over the years. It started out as the Gay Rights Movement, then the Gay and Lesbian Rights Movement, then the Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual Movement, then the Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgender Movement. Sometimes people have collapsed the names and have gone down to things like the Rainbow Coalition, or Rainbow Committee.

We're ending up really picking up almost any sort of sexual minority. I think that's one reason that we receive the most disparate treatment of any group. By that I don't mean that we are the most discriminated against. saying that.

I think others have had more horrific experiences than we have in part because we can pass so easily. But in terms of what are your rights and protections as we move from one state to another, I think we receive the most disparate treatment of any minority group.

And why? I think it's in part because we as a society are completely obsessed with marital status. From the time

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 spouse is now dead. 13 14 your spouse is no longer around. 15 16 some sort of transition. 17 18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

when you're growing up as girls or boys and you kind of get to the age where I remember girls in 8th grade talking about what bridal gown they were going to wear, what church they were going to be married in. They had everything but the groom in place. You know, it's just an obsession with our culture.

So when I looked at the U.S. statistics in preparing this presentation I wasn't terribly surprised to find out that the U.S. Census Bureau in describing households, almost everything is in relationship to your marital status.

You're married and your spouse is present.

You're married and your spouse is absent.

You're widowed which means you're married but your

You're divorced which means you were married but now

Or you're separated which means you're married and in

And then there's is category of 'never married.'

And the part that I find that's interesting is we don't seem to care who really makes up the 'never married' category. What are their relationships among each other? I think that's partly why we suffer in the unique ways that we do.

You would think since we're in this small, also-ran category that that would mean that there are very few of us. And I think that would be the public perception is that there are really very few in the never....married.... category.

But in fact we make up 30 percent of the population of the

United States.

We make up more than the people who are separated, divorced and widowed combined. If you would put those categories in with 'never married' so that you would have 'never married, separated divorced and widowed, i.e. the 'unmarried' population, that's 47 percent of the population. Whereas the married population is 57 percent. So it's almost half.

These statistics we see are also true here in Hawai'i.

The 'never married' category makes up 30 percent of the

Hawai'i population. Again, far more than separated, divorced,

and widowed combined.

When you look at it in terms of comparing it with other racial groups at 30 percent, and I just focused on Hawai'i statistics bu5 it's also true in the U.S. that never married group then becomes a larger subgroup than any racial minority on the mainland.

Here in Hawai'i it is not the larger than any racial group because Asians make up 41.6 percent. However, if you look at the next chart where we break down Asian, which is what we tend to do here in Hawai'i. Because there are so many people of Asian background we don't think of Asians as 'Asians'. We break them down by their ethnic group. We think

of them as Chinese or Filipino or Japanese or Chinese-Hawaiian.

When you look at it from that perspective 30 percent, the never married group, is more than any other sub-racial or ethnic subgroup in Hawai'i. There are more never marrieds than whites. There are more never marrieds than Chinese, Filipinos, Japanese, each of those groups, not the total combined.

So here we have, really, a very large minority but really is not identified by the federal government, the state government or in fact even with each other. We don't as a group see ourselves as the 'never marrieds'. Because part of that doesn't really accurately describe our group.

Many of our group has been married. Some of our people are still married. Some of them are transgendered, so on. So when you look at the legal status in Hawai'i the terms that are used are sexual orientation. And that tends to cover gay, lesbian and bisexual, or gender identity and expression. And that tends to cover the transgender and trans-sexual community.

So how have we faired in terms of legislation with those two components? We started off in sexual orientation with employment being passed in 1981. So we have protection, again, legal protection as opposed to enforcement as other people have mentioned. But we have legal protection for

sexual orientation beginning in 1981.

We brought it up to add gender identity and expression here in 2005. That legislation was vetoed. If you looked at hate crimes -- I'm going to skip grants and subsidies because that's basically saying you're giving out money. It doesn't really protect people per se.

Hate crimes was a 20-year gap between the passing of employment legislation and the passing of hate crimes legislation here in Hawai'i. By that time gender identity and expression was included. A part of that was because the transgender community itself had evolved and identified itself in 1981.

In housing, which was just last year, we were able to get sexual identity and sexual orientation and gender identity and expression added into the housing bill. And that one was signed into law.

We are currently, we have public accommodations legislation. It has passed both the House judiciary committee and the Senate judiciary and Hawaiian affairs committee. So we may be able to add public accommodations to the list at the end of this year, assuming that it passes and assuming that the governor doesn't veto that.

As Bill Hoshijo mentioned, one of the main issues that put Hawai'i on the map in terms of sexual orientation was this was the first state that took a giant leap forward. This was

not the beginning of the same sex marriage movement. But it took a huge leap forward when three couples who were actually under the guidance of Bill Woods -- that's why he's so great for an historical perspective -- applied for marriage licenses and were denied.

· 4

They then retained counsel, who is now Judge Dan Foley, who crafted I think a brilliant legal argument that said that marriage licenses were not denied based on sexual orientation because they really didn't ask about sexual orientation.

They were denied based on gender. Therefore because they were denied based on gender they were covered by the Equal Rights Amendment and should not have their suits denied, their marriage licenses denied.

In 1993, much to everyone's surprise, the Hawai'i

Supreme Court agreed with that argument and remanded the case
saying the state must show a compelling state interest.

I mentioned parenthetically in 1994 and also because another group mentioned, Japanese-American Citizens League. The YACL was the first non-gay organization to sign on in support of the quest for same-sex marriage.

In 1996 the circuit court, because the case was remanded, reheard the case and ordered the state to permit same-sex marriage. And this, I think, begins what I see in my concern about the state of civil rights for people in Hawai'i based on sexual orientation is that there is beginning to be

an alignment of government forces to prevent those persons in the sexual minority categories from full exercise of their rights.

In 1997 the Hawai'i Legislature knew that they had to, in order to overcome the 1996 ruling, they had to amend the constitution.

So in 1997 they proposed a constitutional amendment to allow the Legislature to define marriage. And in 1997-'98 there was a huge campaign to support that amendment to allow the Legislature to define marriage. And \$800,000 was reported as coming from the Church of the Latter Day Saints to fund that, coming into Hawai'i to fund that campaign.

In 1998 the constitutional amendment passed by about 80 percent. And that really knocked the wind out of a lot of people who were civil rights activists here in Hawai'i.

I was on the mainland at the time, not that that's why it lost, but anyway, I was surprised to find out when I came back and talked to my friends later about it, these were straight friends that I worked with, apparently the message in this whole campaign got so distorted that they believed that we now had rights to same-sex marriage here in Hawai'i.

They completely did not realize that there was a constitutional amendment that was passed. That's how muddled the whole message got during that very bloody campaign.

We do have gay bashings. And I noticed there were two

that were reported in the paper in 2004 just one week apart.

One was on September 18th, 2004 a doctor from Missouri was

bashed near Hula's.

Then on September Pam Disel, who was from Oklahoma, was bashed on her way to Hula's.

The first fellow did not feel that it was a hate crime, although I find that astounding. And the second one did.

What I thought was interesting as I was pulling this together was these two were people from the mainland.

What happens to local gay bashings? My guess is they don't go reported. I think they're here but they just don't go reported. And the reason I think that is because I then went to the state schools website.

And they said they have lots of testimony about gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender youth being harassed in the schools and receiving little or no protection from school counselors and teachers.

We are becoming the one group that it is still politically correct to bash physically and verbally. They said that one girl said she went to her counsel and said, "I had been harassed. I had been called a butchy. "And the counselor said to her, "Well, look at you."

Now, can you imagine if anyone else was hurled a racial epithet, went to the counselor and said, "I was called" whatever the racial epithet was, and the counselor said,

"Well, look at you." This is the type of harassment that we need to correct.

And as Alphonso said it needs to be started in the schools. If there's one thing that someone needs to do, and I'm hoping it's this commission, someone needs to look very seriously at the Department of Education.

And I say that, and I'm going to digress from my notes for a minute. Because when I working for a law firm downtown we were taking random calls -- we were a prepaid legal thing so we were taking calls of a random nature, anything from, "I didn't get the services I ordered," to, "I'm having problems getting my insurance to pay for my medical."

The one that I received the most complaints on were people who were teachers in the DOE who felt that they were either fired or not retained for other reasons or that there was hiring discrimination in the Department of Education.

That was the most common theme. As someone mentioned earlier, those who are whistle blowers -- I received a call from a whistle blower who felt that she was being discriminated against because she was doing whistle blowing on the Department of Education.

I won't belabor the Hawai'i Youth Correctional Facility because I think that the other speaker from the ACLU did a brilliant job in outlining the abuse there.

I think it's absolutely important that we look at the

DOE -- I'll talk about that later.

Another huge issue for us is faith-based social services. This strikes terror in our hearts, as those in the sexual minority community, because the faith-based initiatives are the vehicle by which members of our society are being allowed to continue to discriminate against people.

They are particularly, those of you who have been privileged to see the website in Kansas, there's a God Hates Fags website by Reverend Phelps out of Kansas. They are particularly targeting people who are members of the sexual minorities. But it doesn't stop there. They also go after racial minorities as well.

We have to realize if you look at it for an historical perspective that's when it made sense to me. We have the civil rights movement coming up out of the South. What happens out of that you had a lot of the evangelical churches forming to counteract the civil rights movement.

They have then used the religious protections to be -- and asked for lots of religious exemptions. You'll see that even in our Hawai'i statutes exempting religious institutions from civil rights laws.

Then they used these religious exemptions to perpetrate further discrimination. So now we have presidential executive order providing funding to faith-based organizations to provide social services.

Now, it's not just a matter of "We're going to deliver a religious message." It's a matter of "We're now delivering social services." These social services are now being tied to religious messages or services are being denied based on a person's beliefs, a person's desire to have, perhaps, an abortion, a person's racial background, a person's sexual orientation and so on.

The governor, I believe it was last fall, provided a seminar for the faith-based, for those who wanted to take advantage of federal funding for faith-based community services. One of the workshops in that government-sponsored seminar was how you can legally circumvent discrimination rules using faith-based initiatives.

So who's responsible for enforcing the civil rights here? Obviously the Hawai'i Civil Rights Commission if in fact it falls within their legislative mandate. One of the things that they have done which is, I think, very insightful and brilliant is they realized that gender identity and expression, discrimination based on gender identity and expression really is fundamentally based in sex discrimination.

We discriminate against people we perceive who are acting other in their gender identity because of the discrimination that we feel about persons based on their gender not just their gender identity. And I would frankly

say the same thing about sexual orientation.

.18

22.

The men who decide that they are gay and act as if they are women by being drag queens or whatever, receive far greater discrimination and brutality than women who decide who decide that they want to act more like men and maybe go into the unions or the trades or dress more like men.

So there is an underlying sex discrimination when you're looking at discrimination based on sexual orientation, gender identity or expression.

I remember giving a talk years ago, gosh, it must have been in the '70s, given to gay men about why should gay men be interested in women's rights. And I said basically it's like this. There's a binary theory of sexism where men are ones and women are zeros. Our society has been based on that there can only be one union: A one and a zero.

And if you allow ones and ones or zeros and zeros it's going to wreak havoc through the whole community. That's basically what we've been seeing played out over the last 30 years.

Those who want to push for any relationship other than ones and zeros were going to have problems. And we see this played out in Texas. Texas, the transgender community says you're going to learn a lot from us if you can come in with us. Here's what they did in Texas. They went in and they had a gay or lesbian couple go in and apply for a marriage

license. It goes up through their courts. The court says, nope, you've got to have an XX chromosome and an XY chromosome or you can't have marriage.

So what did the transgenders do? They found themselves an XX male who is now female -- excuse me. An XX female who is a female and an XY male who is now transgendered into being female. And they trotted that lesbian couple in there. And they said, "You have to give us a marriage license because the Supreme Court has said sex is based on chromosomes and chromosomes we pass."

And I think that's what we really have to look at is what is the deal about marriage and where would we really be?

Look in our hearts. Where would we really be with ethnic and racial discrimination if we have laws here that prohibited people from different ethnic groups or racial to marry? Where would we be?

We have to look at that seriously. It really is a matter of to know us is to love us. As we get to know people that aren't quite like us we get the joy of finding out who they are. But as long as we can keep them separate from us we will never get to know who they really are.

So hate crimes -- I want to talk about that too -- hate crimes is applicable only at sentencing so therefore you can't charge someone with a hate crime. It comes on at sentencing.

The other thing that we have going on right now which

could potentially be a very serious problem is the Hawai'i National Guard. When a person joins the Hawai'i National Guard they are guaranteed under *our* constitution that they will not be discriminated against based on sexual orientation.

25.

If they are called up and sent to Iraq or Afghanistan or anywhere by the federal government, those protections are stripped from them. They are at risk that they will be discharged from their service at a less than honorable discharge.

And that's not just the disgrace of having left the service. That affects your ability to get student loans, your ability to get housing, your ability to get employment. It can follow you and haunt you for the rest of your life unless you go through extraordinary efforts to get your discharge status upgraded.

So just to run through some examples. There are two subgroups that really get fairly even treatment from one jurisdiction to the other. That is two persons, one male and one female who are legally married and both are U.S. citizens. Or one person who is celibate and perceived to be celibate and living alone.

If you're in any other groups your legal rights will vary. If you are two persons; one male, one female married in Massachusetts but living in Hawai'i, your marriage will be recognized.

If you're two persons of the same gender who are legally married in Massachusetts, the only state that allows legal marriage right now for same sex couples, your marriage will be recognized in Massachusetts but it will not be acknowledged or recognized in Hawai'i.

. 18

If you're two persons, one male and one female married in Canada and you are now living in Hawai'i, your marriage will be recognized.

But if you're two persons of the same gender -- Bill Woods-Bateman cannot have his marriage recognized here in the state of Hawai'i.

If you are two persons, one male, one female legally married in the United States, you have all sorts of rights. But if you're two persons under a common law marriage, that common law marriage is only acknowledged in six states.

If you are two persons, one male, one female who are legally married you have a full panoply of rights. But if you're two persons, one male, one female who are not legally married, I don't care how long you've lived together, you will have very few rights.

Since I practice law in the area of estate planning that's where I've seen horror stories of people who have lived together for 20 years, one male, one female. And when one of the persons died that person has nothing.

If that person dies without any estate planning they

have not only lost their lover but they lose their home. They will lose all possessions unless they have them in their own name or unless they took the steps to own them jointly.

If they own them separately they have no access to that person's property. They can't even visit each other in a hospital. That whole horror came up for us in the AIDS crisis. If you are not legally married, you're not even allowed in the hospital room. We had all sorts of stories of people dying. They finally contacted their parents because they were dying. And the family comes in, boots everybody else out and says, "We'll take it from here."

And the whole support group for the person with AIDS is stripped from them in their last moments.

Two persons who are reciprocal beneficiaries here in Hawai'i versus two persons, one male and one female, cannot apply for reciprocal beneficiary status here in Hawai'i, they will have very different rights under Hawai'i law.

Two persons, one male and one female, both married but one of them is a U.S. citizen versus one is not a U.S. citizen. If you're both U.S. citizens and you're legally married and you're of opposite genders you can have an unlimited marital deduction for estate tax purposes.

But if one of them is not a citizen you can't. You're limited to the current exclusion amount.

Now, you can put that, you have the option if you're

legally married of putting in a QDOT and therefore preserving the estate. But, of course, if you can't legally marry and that's not recognized by the United States, which applies to this whole 'never married' group, you can't transfer wealth in an unlimited deduction.

So the whole passage of wealth is a special right that's been granted to married couples that was not granted to any other group.

So what can this commission do? Certainly, and I emphasize again, one of the most important things that needs to be done is to look at the Department of Education. As Alphonso indicated in his remarks, education is our one common experience. It is the first experience that kids have.

If they go into a school and they don't see faces like theirs why should they even bother continuing to school, particularly at the higher end?

How can they feel that there is a just society if they don't see faces like there's looking back at them?

How can they feel that they'll have a right to succeed if they don't see faces like theirs coming back at them?

What happens when they begin to realize that all the adults that they know or so many of the disproportionate faces like theirs have been shipped off, as Kat indicated to someplace on the mainland to a prison?

There are kids in minority groups in the mainland that

have said, "Why should I even bother going to school? Why don't I go ahead and sign up at the local prison because that's where I'm going to spend my life anyway."

What kind of message is that sending to a whole generation of kids? We've got to address early that our schools must look, must reflect the population at large.

Ice is also, I didn't put that in my notes, but Ice is also a huge epidemic in our gay male population. And with that often comes AIDS which is often disproportionally historically affected our population.

Right now the federal funding for housing for AIDS patients is in jeopardy. We also need to deal with the ice problem.

I've mentioned tax-exempt status because when we had the constitutional amendment and we ended up with \$800,000 coming in strictly from one church to make sure that our rights were circumscribed, no one seems to raise a red flag about churches and non-profit organizations acting in political ways which should strip them of their tax exempt status.

We have heard that there are churches that tell you which candidates to vote for and how to vote on issues. And we need people to follow up on those, and to strip them of their tax-exempt status accordingly.

Faith-based initiative. We need to have quidelines for

the state. We need to monitor the awarding of grants to make sure the grants aren't being awarded to institutions that discriminate on the basis of sexual orientation or any other non-merit category.

22.

Same with the provision of social services. They've already had problems where the provision of social services was tied to the proselytizing of religion. And we have to make sure that services are provided in a manner that did not discriminate based on sexual orientation or any other non-merit related criteria.

The other thing where we could use support is in the passage of the Military Readiness Enhancement Act. Under Bill Clinton he by executive order did the Don't Ask/Don't Tell policy. We need to change that and acknowledge that gays and lesbians, bisexuals and transgenders have and are serving in the military and have done so with distinction.

Our major allies including the United Kingdom,

Australia and Israel allow gays and lesbians to serve openly
in their services.

Our defense-related civil agencies such as the

Department of Homeland Security, the Central Intelligence

Agency, the National Security Administration, so on allow gays

and lesbians to serve openly.

The policy is not working. What is happening is hundreds and thousands of people are being ostracized from the

.

1.3

2,3

military services, many of them in critical positions such as translators.

We also need to have help at the federal level to recognize marriages for those who have been married in other countries as is currently acknowledged for opposite couples.

We need help so that when marriage is a state's rights issues and states acknowledge and provide same-sex marriage for their citizens that those are given full faith and credit.

We need to work for the repeal of the Defense of
Marriage Act. And we need to work against the attempts to ban
for the U.S. Constitution to ban same-sexed marriage.

As I mentioned briefly I think we have to really look at -- Hawai'i is in a unique position to do this. We have more interracial marriage and more integrated neighborhoods than any state in the union.

And I think we have to acknowledge in our heart of hearts that a lot of that was because there was not ever legislation that forbade people from other different ethnic groups or different races from marrying.

Having access to marriage is absolutely crucial to achieving parody. And with all the attempts to disallow same sex people what is happening is the message is being laid down in law that people who fall in the 'never married' category or any other category where they are not married and sexually living -- where they are not married, they are being legally

now placed in a second class status box and will continue to be so.

Now, I shouldn't say 'continue' forever. Because, frankly, the message of hope that I always have is frankly those persons who are under the age of roughly 35 to 40 have a huge difference in the way they perceive sexual orientation than those who are older, people my age, I'm 56, or older.

I have borne the shame of being called, you know, the lesbo or whatever. I've spent most of my life hiding my orientation. I spent most of my time either not talking about it or passing because most people presume that I'm straight so I don't correct their impression.

Those people in the younger generation they don't understand what the big deal is. And they're kind of surprised: You don't have marriage? So eventually this will get corrected.

I would love it if it would be in my lifetime. But if not all of us old foggies will eventually die off and eventually we will have same sex marriage. Because the younger people as they grow up having more gay/straight alliances, having more friends, being more open, they're like: What's the big deal? People love each other. They care for each other. They form stable relationships, all the reasons why we want marriage in a society.

Or what's happening in the gay relationships. What

they found in Massachusetts and Canada -- and I'll use
Massachusetts because it is a state of the Union. They found
that in the one year from the time marriage was legalized to
just one year later, the huge, huge swing in popular opinion
on their support for gay marriage. It went from being not too
sure to tepid to being against it to hugely in favor 85, 95
percent in Massachusetts are not in favor of gay marriage.

And why? Because what happened in Massachusetts is what's going to happen everywhere. Once your relationships are sanctified, those people that you worked with that you never really kind of understood what was going on, there's just this sort of huge void of about how they wouldn't talk about what's going on in their homes.

All of a sudden it comes to light. These people, these people have been in long term relationships. They have been loved and supported for years by their own families of choice. And what was so frightening because we didn't know what was that huge black hole that wasn't being talked about comes to light.

The thing that it is is that they have been loved by someone that you said was unacceptable. And I certainly think that people here in Hawai'i can understand what it's like for someone to come in and say to you who you are and what you do is wrong. And you've got to change that or pretend to be something other than who you are.

We all have the right to fully participate, I believe, in the pursuit of happiness. I firmly believe that unless we continuously press for same-sexed relationships to be acknowledge as are opposite-sexed relationships we will never get there.

There will always be this fear that those that we don't know are the ones who will prey upon our children. I was pleased in the sense on one hand at the last hearing when that sexual predator was coming out that they finally moved off gays and lesbians and now they're going to try to hang that handle on the transgenders. I was pleased with that part. I was not pleased that it doesn't belong to the transgenders either.

You need to know who we are. You need to embrace who we are. When we do that we will all be able to move to a place where we can create families because we know that families stabilize communities. They provide loving homes to children. And loving homes for children means you won't end up in prison. Or if you do you'll have a family to return to.

Thank you very much for the time. (Applause)

MR. FORMAN: Thank you very much. That was very powerful and informative testimony. Are there any questions from the -- I realize that the hour is late but are there any questions from the committee members? Or as I did before when Bill Hoshijo was referenced in testimony I gave him a chance to

say a few words. I'll do the same for Bill Woods-Bateman.

MR. WOODS-BATEMAN: I think this, and I'm really surprised that more of the public is not present and witnessing this. And I don't know what mechanisms that we as a community or you as a body can do to promulgate the information that was shared here with the real world which has to deal with the life and the attitudes where fairness is not the objective.

I would say every single person here I'm glad that I've worked and known these people and have seen them helping to change the world. I'm tremendously impressed that my live has touched people who are making a big difference.

I have to obviously acknowledge Jo-Ann who I've only met in the last four or five years who has tremendously made a difference in people to understand the legal issues as well as the human issues which are really relevant to the issue of equal opportunity.

I just think this is a great process. I just don't how, and I would like to encourage new mechanisms like this group and the commission itself can promulgate the information that comes here and not just to the reports but to the public as a whole that that's an educational process that you know what people are saying about the reality of discrimination and the impact on our world is not better.

We waste money. We waste lives. And we waste creativity involving every person in the system that can

possibly make the contribution that will make all the differences for us all.

Every time we cut somebody out of the process, those ideas and solutions that they may have will never be heard. Thank you.

MR. FORMAN: Thank you very much. That was much appreciated. Rather than, I'm going to share later with you and I'll just go share with you rather briefly. Jill Nunokawa has submitted a very short testimony. I'll read some quick excerpts.

She talked about the application of Title IX within the state of Hawai'i's Department of Education secondary education's extracurricular athletic activities and the University of Hawai'i at Manoa's athletic department.

She made her comments in the context of 34 years after the passage of Title IX which has been renamed the Patsy T.

Mink Equal Opportunity in Education Act. And observing that there are some disturbing things that are happening in Hawai'i.

Ms. Nunokawa had started advocating in this issue about 13 years ago when she was in the Public Defender's office and now works as a civil rights counselor at the University of Hawai'i.

She did acknowledge that after much resistance and reluctance the Department of Education and University of

Hawai'i have engaged in efforts to improve the spirit and intent of Title IX within their respective areas noting that in 2000 Governor Cayetano signed the Gender Equity in Sports Law.

There was a three-year commission that was set forth that sunset that was not renewed. But now Ms. Nunokawa serves as the vice-chair of the Superintendent's Advisory Committee on Gender Equity in Sports although it just meets once a year to monitor and assess compliance and enforcement issues.

She also acknowledged that the DOE has made substantial improvements in the implementation of Title IX in athletics.

But she also provided some articles about some specific areas where DOE continues to ignore, neglect or deny obligations.

She noted specifically that we continue to be the *only* state in the nation --

MR. MAXWELL: David, could you talk louder?

MR. FORMAN: Okay. Can I have the microphone, please.

We are the only state in the nation that plays girls basketball from March to May. The articles, if you receive them later you can take a look at what that means in terms of opportunities for female athletes in Hawai'i. They don't have the opportunity to participate in the national tournaments because their season is held at a different time.

Whereas the boys have very prominent national tournaments that are held locally that have helped to elevate

the level of boys basketball in Hawai'i.

Also Ms. Nunokawa mentioned that in July 2002 the state Legislature appropriated \$10 million for gender equity capital improvements which was intended to build softball fields in order to meet Title IX requirements.

But to date few softball fields have been completed and of those completed or in construction there are errors at each field that should be fixed, but the DOE suggests it does not have monies to fix the problems or that the problems are not sufficient enough to warrant any subsequent efforts in correcting.

For example a DOE official misappropriated some of the funding to make necessary improvements to the boys baseball facility in order to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act. That ended up taking money away from money expressly appropriated to address Title IX concerns.

Also mentioned that the current status at the
University of Hawai'i at Manoa is also problematic. Although
the Chancellor of Manoa approved a second gender equity plan,
the Athletics Director refuses to implement this plan because
he did not approve it.

He agreed to develop his own plan with a deadline of
November 2005 but missed that deadline and all subsequent
deadlines that he requested. He has not submitted his own
gender equity plan and continues to ignore the requirements of

the previously approved gender equity plan at Manoa.

One of the specific areas, egregious areas of concern is the AD's lack of compliance with budget cutting. The plan is specific that during times of budgetary constraints, the AD shall not cut existing women's programs. However, the AD at UH-Manoa cut the women's funding across the board.

So she encourages the committee to seriously consider a further study on Title IX in athletics in Hawai'i. As mentioned again the fact that Title IX's new name is the Patsy T. Mink Equal Opportunity in Education ACt. Coming from the state whose congresswoman originated Title IX is somewhat embarrassing that these conditions are still in existence.

That brings to a close the testimony that we have been provided. There are a couple of housekeeping matters. I'd like to give the committee members who are present a brief opportunity to review the materials that Tom Pilla presented you with earlier.

There's a copy of the minutes from our teleconference meeting on February 23rd. I've gone over this and made some minor corrections that are reflected here in the revised minutes I believe.

MS. KENNEDY: As people review, I agree with what Bill suggested. I feel very strongly about the fact we need publicity. I'm surprised we had no public announcement. So that is past but if we could do something about getting the

word out.

MR. PILLA: I can address some of that. I did prepare a press advisory about this meeting. The new procedure is that in the past we would be able to release that ourselves at our regional office. We now have to submit that to the public affairs officer in headquarters, which I did do. Whether or not it was sent out from there I have no way of knowing. But we are precluded from doing that directly now by the new staff director.

MR. FORMAN: Perhaps reflective of that is the fact that the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights held a briefing on January 20, 2006 on the Native Hawaiian Reorganization Act. Despite the fact that our committee has issued reports in 1980, 1991 and 2001 on this issue we received no communication from the staff at headquarters about that briefing.

The western original office has kept us advised and we had conversations with Attorney General Bennett who tried to provide testimony to the commission. But apparently they were unable to resolve the conflicts.

The staff director is the one who chose the individuals who appear, the four individuals to appear before the commission without seeking any input from us, and apparently without reviewing our reports based on the observations from the majority of the commission members.

So committee members are aware of some of the

difficulties that I've had as a chairperson in dealing with the commission. And I hope that in future years that we will continue to try to hold the feet to the fire and have the commission respect the role that the advisory committees were intended to play when the legislation was initially enacted.

4.

MR. STENDER: Are we going to write them a letter, and I guess, complain about it? We do these things. We have not had a meeting in a long time. We have had telecon meetings. This is the one way to have a meeting. Yet we have kind of, it just impresses me we are just window dressing here. They don't allow us to do anything.

We haven't really done anything other than in the days of, in the '90s that we were really more involved in issues that affect Hawai'i that we have been able to get those reports, those hearings down, reports out.

So, it seems in the last five years we've not been allowed to do anything. And it's shameful.

MR. PILLA: It's been very frustrating from a staff point of view. I realize the frustration that state advisory committee members have. We're down to three people in the western regional office, me and two secretaries to handle nine states. But we have not had the budget in the last five years to do much other than teleconference meetings which we have attempted to do.

If you read the minutes of commission meetings it's a

wonder it's done at all at that level. Presently it seems like they are more obstructionist than interested in civil rights issues. The advisory committees have always played a strong role in --

MR. MAXWELL: Could you talk louder, please.

MR. PILLA: -- doing the work of the commission. Sorry, Charley.

MR. MAXWELL: I cannot hear.

MR. PILLA: Okay. So it's been the regional staff perspective that we try to give them as much support as possible. But in an agency that has limited budgetary resources that's been a very major problem. It's been very frustrating. I'm sure you'll all agree with that.

You oftentimes put in requests for meetings and they tell you no, you can't do it. You can't hold it. We don't have the money for it. But we actually set up meetings, and then have to tell the state advisory budget committees we aren't having that meeting because they won't let us have it.

But the new sort of guidelines they have put in place regarding how we do normal routine business how they spent a whole year, the commission, they put together a working group on state advisory committees. They spent the whole year deliberating.

They did not take any action on state advisory committee rechartering packages that were sitting back there

for that year. By the end of 2004 when the old commission left they had considered 13 rechartering packages.

So this past year 2005 those are the only committees that had charters. This was one of four in our region that we are able to get rechartered by that December 2004 date.

There are actually 13 advisory committees have been recharted. We have four of them. The only reason we were able to meet now is that the staff director realized that nobody had met other than teleconference. He said he wanted all 13 to meet in the month of March.

I had to point out to him that these committees hadn't met in over two and a half years. They're not just going to want to meet to meet. They want to meet with people and talk to them about issues and that was going to take some time.

I said in a good year if I met with four advisory committees in their briefing session that would be a great year for me. You want to do that all in March? I'll give it a try. Three of them met in March. The other one is meeting in May.

But it's a serious problem with the fact that they
don't understand the advisory committee structure. They want
to control the advisory committee structure. They have issued
new guidelines about selection procedures. They were
published and commented upon. And now you have a set of what
was finally released in the Federal Register as part of the

package for today's meetings.

It's always been an issue of control: But this commission has found a way to do it. They're planning to impose a 10-year tenure for advisory committee members.

They've not grandfathered anybody. So that means anybody who has been on the committee for 10 years well, goodbye regardless whether you're an active member, a committed member and somebody who knows their community. They have just picked a number out of the air and you're going to be asked to leave and not be renominated for reappointment.

That's extremely frustrating to me. We have about 125 members in our region, nine committees. 78 people are going through no fault of their own just because they have had 10 years on the committee. But we have always had natural attrition on these committees. People leave the state, people die, people get too busy in their in of businesses so that they need to leave. It's always been there's some natural attrition.

But there's a sense of consistency if there are four or five members who stay every two-year rechartering period.

That's not going to happen. It's unfortunate.

I've got into a number of battles with this new staff director about different issues because what's he going to do with me. I've got 35 plus years. And I told him that I was opposed to the 10-year term for the reasons I listed.

I also told him that, getting back to your concern about the Akaka Bill, the briefing they had, I first got there, he didn't phone me either, by the way. And we handle the state of Hawai'i.

So I found it in the minutes of the meeting the commission meeting. I called him the day I read it. I said, "You know, the Hawai'i advisory committee has done extensive work on Native Hawaiian issues. You need to know this. And these are the reports that they've released. And I will send you a memo of their cites. They're back there at the clearinghouse library. I think all commissioners should get a copies."

"Thank you very much" is all I heard from him.

Whether or not he did that I have no way of knowing. I said, "We also have members who can give you suggestions for people who should brief the commissioner on this issue."

"Thank you very much."

But he didn't contact any of you nor David. He didn't contact me to say, "Do you have the name of somebody?"

So they're doing their own thing. They've got an agenda.

MR. MAXWELL: Could I make a comment?

MR. FORMAN: Yes, go ahead, Charley.

MR. MAXWELL: I've been on this commission, I don't know why, but since 1974. And I want the records to show that Tom

has been the equator. He's done things that are so frustrating as a member of the advisory committee over the years because of the inadequacy of us having meetings, yet Tom Pilla has been the strong force in the western regional in trying to put things together even though it was totally impossible. We have gone, we have done that.

So to the testifiers, you know, Jo-Ann Adams and all the people that heart felt testimony they gave, you know, we've been in this for a long time but don't expect nothing to happen because of the budget constraints and the fact that we are away from Washington. We are very far away from Washington. They have even forget that we exist sometimes. But I'd like to take that moment to thank Tom for all your work you've done.

MR. PILLA: Thank you.

MR. FORMAN: Thank you, Tom. (Applause). Tom says that he thanks you and appreciates it, Uncle Charley. I'm going to consider Faye's motion for action. With there any amendments . to the minutes from our last meeting? Can I entertain a motion to approve the minutes?

MS. KENNEDY: I move to approve.

MR. HELELA: I second.

MR. FORMAN: Moved by Faye and seconded by David Helela.

24 All in favor.

11.

MEMBERS VOTING: Aye.

1	MR. FORMAN: Opposed? Any abstentions? None. Passes
2	unanimously. I believe, Faye, you were suggesting that we
3	MS. KENNEDY: Some kind of press release so people can
4	come out and testify. We've had testimony that everybody needs
5	to hear.
6	MR. FORMAN: So something along the lines of a report
7	along with a substantial kind of PR educational component to
8	it.
9	MS. KENNEDY: Anything you can get to say this happened,
10	who testified, some synopsis of what was said.
11	MR. PILLA: We're planning on doing that. There will be
12	a briefing memorandum that will be done by the advisory
13	committee that will go to the commission but then it's
14	available to be released publicly.
15	MR. FORMAN: Do I hear a second?
16	MR. MAXWELL: Yeah, I second.
17	MR. FORMAN: Second by Charley Maxwell. Any discussion?
. 18	All in favor?
19	MEMBERS VOTING: Aye.
20	MR. FORMAN: Any opposed? None. Any abstentions?
21	None. Motion passes. Any other business that the state
22	advisory committee members would like to address? I really
. 23	appreciate
24	MR. MAXWELL: Can I ask a question?
25	MR. FORMAN: Uncle Charley, go ahead.

MR. FORMAN: Uncle Charley, go ahead.

There's
this ju
that wh
report
away or
encompa
and dis
publici
ways of
Charley
extend
much lo
for us.
check,

MR. MAXWELL: You know, we had tremendous testimony.

There's so many things that is happening here in Hawai'i. Is this just going to be a report? I know I should have asked that when the motion was made. Is it just going to be in the report or subject that we discussed and it's going to be thrown away or filed? What's going to happen?

MR. FORMAN: I think the breadth of the motion would encompass something much broader. So we can meet to flesh out and discuss over email how that takes place, what kind of publicity we can generate, what kind of educational approach.

We can discuss that with Tom and think about creative ways of doing exactly what you're asking us. Thank you, Uncle Charley.

MR. MAXWELL: Yes.

MR. FORMAN: I'd also like to take this opportunity to extend our appreciation to Holly, our court reporter who stayed much longer than she was aked to and has done a tremendous job for us. So thank you very much, Holly.

MR. MAXWELL: There will be a little something in your check, Holly. (Laughter)

MR. FORMAN: Okay. If there's no further business...

MR. MAXWELL: Move for adjournment.

MR. STENDER: Second.

MR. FORMAN: It's been moved and seconded to adjourn.

All in favor?

23

24

25

1	MEMBERS VOTING: Aye.
2	MR. FORMAN: Any opposed? Okay, thank you very much.
3	The meeting is adjourned.
4	(The meeting was adjourned at 1:20 p.m.)
5	000000
6	
7	
8	·
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	-
16	•
17	
18	-
19	
20	•
21	·
22	
23	
24	
25	

CERTIFICATE

I, HOLLY HACKETT, R.P.R., C.S.R. in and for

the State of Hawai'i, do hereby certify;

That I was acting as shorthand reporter in the foregoing HSAC to the United States Commission on Civil Rights briefing on the 23rd day of March, 2006;

That the proceedings were taken down in computerized machine shorthand by me and were thereafter reduced to print by me;

That the foregoing represents, to the best of my ability, a correct transcript of the proceedings had in the foregoing matter.

I further certify that I am not counsel for any of the parties hereto.

DATED: This 9th-day of April 2006

Hairy Fr. Hackett

HOLLY M. HACKETT, R.P.R., C.S.R. #130 Certified Shorthand Reporter