: 1

HAWAII ADVISORY COMMITTEE

TO THE

U. S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

CONSULTATION ON NATIVE HAWAIIAN

HOME LANDS

Held in Room C-270, United States Courthouse, Honolulu,

Hawaii, commencing at 8:48 o'clock a.m. on Monday, August 27,

12 1979.

15 BEFORE: Roger K. Williams, Court Reporter

APPEARANCES:

Ms. Patricia K. Putman, Chairperson

Mrs. Thelma I. Akau Mr. Dennis Kauahi

Mrs. Rai Saint Chu Mr. Charles K. Maxwell, Sr.

Mrs. Alma Cooper Mrs. Florence Morinaga

Mr. Arthur A. Corrales Mr. Roy E. Crocker

MEMBERS OF THE STAFF:

Jeff Wallace Sally James

Phil Montez

CARNAZZO COURT-REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. SUITE 692 . ALEXANDER YOUNG BUILDING . HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813

SERVING HAWAII, THE PACIFIC BASIN AND THE FAR EAST (808) 538-7174

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

17

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

314

CCR 3 Meet.

INDEX

3	SPEAKER:	PAGE
4	RICHARD PAGLINAWAN	9
5	WINONA RUBIN	36
6	GEORGIANA PADEKEN	54
7	SUSUMO ONO	82
8	ADELAIDE DeSOTO	110
9	RONALD ALBU	152
10	DAWN WASSON	167
11	WAILANI BELL	171
12	MAUI LOA	174
13	KAMUELA PRICE	174
14	TOM MANAPUA	181
15	KAMUELA PRICE	185
16	MITSUO UYEHARA	188
17	MALAKA LEE	201
18		

CARNAZZO COURT—REPORTING COMPANY, LTD.

SUITE 692 • ALEXANDER YOUNG BUILDING • HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813

SERVING HAWAII, THE PACIFIC BASIN AND THE FAR EAST

(808) 538-7174

20.702

MS. PUTMAN: Good morning, everyone. The Hawaii
Advisory Committee public meeting on the administration of
native Hawaiian home lands will now come to order.

I am Patricia Putman, Chair of the Hawaii Advisory
Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights.

The State Advisory Committee advises and makes recommendations to the United States Commission on Civil Rights upon matters which the committee or any of its subcommittees study.

The other members of the advisory committee in attendance during the day for this meeting are: Thelma Akau, Rai Saint Chu -- Rai hasn't arrived yet -- Alma Cooper, Arthur Corrales, Dennis Kauahi, Charles Maxwell, Florence Morinaga, and Roy Crocker.

One of our members, Louise Manwell, is unable to be with us today because of a serious illness. A native Hawaiian and a dedicated citizen of our State, Louise is deeply committed to the project, and we will miss her presence today.

Also with us today from the Western Regional Office of the Commission on Civil Rights are the Regional Director, Philip Montez -- Philip is here in front (indicating) -- Jeffrey Wallace (indicating), Sally James (indicating), and Grace Diaz.

This consultation is being held pursuant to rules

CARNAZZO COURT - REPORTING COMPANY, LTD.

SUITE 692 • ALEXANDER YOUNG BUILDING • HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813

SERVING HAWAII, THE PACIFIC BASIN AND THE FAR EAST

(808) 538-7174

applicable to State Advisory Committees and other requirements promulgated by the United States Commission on Civil Rights.

The Commission on Civil Rights is an independent agency of the United States Government, established by Congress in 1957, and authorized by the Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1960, 1964, and 1973, to do the following things:

- Investigate complaints alleging that citizens are being deprived of the right to vote by reason of their race, color, religion, national origin or sex;
- 2. To study and collect information concerning legal developments which constitute a denial of equal protection of the laws under the Constitution;
- 3. To appraise federal laws and policies with respect to equal protection of the laws;
- 4. Serve as a national clearinghouse for Civil Rights information; and,
 - 5. Investigate allegations of voter fraud.

I would like to emphasize at this time that this is a consultation and not an adversary type of proceeding. Individuals have been invited to come and share with the committee information relating to the subject of today's inquiry. Each person who will participate has voluntarily agreed to meet with the committee.

Every effort has been made to invite persons who are

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD.

SUITE 692 • ALEXANDER YOUNG BUILDING • HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813

SERVING HAWAII, THE PACIFIC BASIN AND THE FAR EAST

(808) 538-7174

·

knowledgeable about the problems and progress in the areas to be dealt with here today.

In our attempts to get a well-balanced picture about the administration of Hawaiian Home Lands in Hawaii, we have invited individuals involved with home lands on a day to day basis, as well as those involved in legal research related to the administration and enforcement of the Hawaiian Home Lands Act of 1920 and Section 5F of the Hawaii Admissions Act of 1959.

In addition, we have allocated time this afternoon to hear from anyone who wishes to share information with the committee regarding the Hawaiian Home Lands. Each person or organization will have five minutes to speak to the committee and may submit additional information in writing for the record. Those wishing to participate in the open session, please contact commission staff during the day.

Since this is a consultation, the press, radio, television stations, as well as individuals, are welcome. Any
person discussing a matter with the committee, however, may
specifically request that they not be televised. In this
case, it will be necessary for me to comply with their
wishes.

We are very concerned that we get all of the information relating to the matter under study. We are, however, concerned that no individual be the victim of slander or

Electric State of Sta

libelous statements. In the unlikely event that such a situation should develop, it will be necessary for me to call this to the attention of the persons making the statement and request that they desist in their action.

If the testimony a person is offering, however, is of sufficient importance, it may be necessary for the committee to hear the information at a closed session. The person against whom the allegations are being made will have ample opportunity to make a statement in closed session before the committee if he or she so desires.

In any event, prior to the time that the committee submits its report to the commission, every effort will be extended to get a complete picture of the situation as it exists.

We are concerned that no individual be the victim of retaliation for any statements made at this consultation.

Witnesses are protected by the provisions of Chapter 18, United States Code, Section 1505, which provide:

"Whoever, by threats or force, or by any threatening letter of communication, endeavors to intimidate, influence, or impede any witness in any proceeding pending before any department or agency of the United States, or in connection with any inquiry or investigation being held by either House, or any committee of either House; or whoever injures any party or witness in his or her person or property on account

of his or her attending or having attended such proceeding, inquiry or investigation, or on account of his or her testifying or having testified to any matter pending therein, shall be fined not more thant \$5000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both."

In the event that any person testifying before this committee considers any adverse action taken against him or her to be the result of having testified, he or she should immediately contact the Western Regional Office of the United States Commission on Civil Rights.

With those formalities out of the way, I am now very pleased and honored to announce that Charles Maxwell, who is a member of our advisory committee, and Genoa Keawe will open this meeting with a traditional Hawaiian song, Kaulana Na Pua.

MR. MAXWELL: This song, Kaulana Na Pua, was written in 1918 by Ellen Wright Prendergast. The song was entered into several congressional testimonies as the feelings of the native Hawaiian people in 1893, when Hawaii was overthrown.

The song was a sacred song and could not be danced until recently, because it calls upon the four major kings of Hawaii. It calls on their help.

This song, Kaulana Na Pua, means: "Famous Are The Children of Hawaii."

And Aunty Genoa Keawe, appropriately, will be doing this song for us. Aunty Genoa is Hawaii's foremost

and those that are attending the consultation session this morning:

My name is Richard Paglinawan, and just to give you a little background, I have been with the Hawaiian Homes Commission as a deputy director for approximately six years, prior to going to the Department of Social Services and Housing as a deputy director there.

Originally, when I went to the Hawaiian Homes

Commission, Mr. A. Piianaia was the executive director at

that time; then after him, Mr. William Among was the director;

and then Mrs. Billie Beamer.

And at that time, I then moved over to the department.

So I have had approximately six years' experience with the

Hawaiian Homes Commission.

I would like to thank the committee for inviting me to present a historical perspective of the homesteading program, basically, up to 1921, when the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act came into being.

I will not touch on the recent Hawaiian Homestead legislation, because I understand the executive director, Georgiana Padeken, will be presenting that particular aspect of it.

I think in order to understand the Hawaiian Homes Land program, one must understand and go back into history. Let me take you back into history in terms of -- and start off

The districts or islands were subdivided into ahupua'as, and the ahupua'a is usually a land district that ran from the summit of the mountain all the way to the sea, and in some cases out to about one point five miles out into the sea, which included kouohiki fishing rights; and in some instances, out to an island that is out in the sea.

Let me give you an example. If you have ever been in the Kaneohe area, you will find that the ahupua'a of Kahalua extends all the way to the Island of Kapapa --

MS. PUTMAN: Excuse me. Would you see if that switch is on?

MR. PAGLINAWAN: Okay. Thank you.

The island extended all the way -- I mean, the ahupua'a extended all the way out to the Island of Kapapa, the small, flat island.

It is usually bounded by gullies or mountains that run parallel down to the sea. And so in this case, an ahupua'a is a subdivision of the moku.

Now, the ahupua'a is further subdivided into smaller.

land sections, which is called ili; and there are several

types of ili. An ili is usually a complete land section.

Oh, I might add that the ahupua'a is usually a land -- a section of land of the moku that is complete in its resources; okay?

All of the natives, chiefs and so forth, who reside

within the ahupua'a were limited within terms of resources to the ahupua'a.

As I mentioned already, it included not only the fishing rights, but also the plant and the material resources that the natives could obtain within the ahupua'a; so that you have the alii ai ahupua'a.

Now, you will find that we also use the term ohana.

Okay. When we talk about the social class system, the ohana is headed by what is known as the ahaku. Ohana in this case is the extended family system. The oha is the offshoot of the taro culture, and it is related to the many offshoots, which literally is what ohana means, and so its derivation is then going back to the taro culture, in which the taro was the staple crop of the native Hawaiians.

And, therefore, the ohana, the extent, the vigor of the ohana, the strength of the ohana laid in the land itself, because the oha or the offshoots were planted in the land itself; and whatever the nutrients of the land itself, the ohana derived from it.

And so therefore, the ahaku, the head, was next in authority after the alii ai ahupua'a.

Now, what we know as the hale or the individual families, these were headed by what is known as the po'o.

And these are what we would call today as the head of households.

Okay. Within the ahupua'a itself, the ohana, the ohana itself here -- and there are many ohanas that live within the ahupua'a -- okay? The ohana itself would have a section of land; and they in turn, each of the hale -- what we would call your nuclear families -- would have kuleana lands within; and they would be able to till these lands and fish and so forth.

I might add that the traditional ohana land system, if you might call it, included sections of land that were arable land; that could be cultivated, up in the uplands; usually taro lands.

And those lands that were makai, so that they could use for fishing. So this was, in essence, some of your particular land system that was operating at that time.

The islands were divided into many kingdoms or chiefdoms; and it wasn't until 1795 that Kamehameha I was successful in unifying the islands.

of course, at that time, he had unified only the islands of Hawaii, Maui, Oahu, Molokai, and Lanai. It was not until 1805 when Kaumualii from the Island of Kauai finally decided to cede the lands of Kauai over to Kamehameha I.

And of course, in 1819, Kamehameha I dies. His successors, I might add, due to the westernization of the Hawaiian Islands, was under great pressure by foreign

.1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The Great Mahele, of course, although the whole idea was that one-third of the land would go to the tenants, who -- or this case, the commoners -- the government survey information had indicated that after the Mahele occurred --

and if you need some statistics, it shows that the crown lands, those lands that were for the king, comprised approximately 984,000 acres; the land for the chiefs, or kouohiki, comprised of approximately one million -- one point six million acres; and the lands of the government comprised about one point four million acres; and the kuleana lands, which is for the makaainana, or the commoners, comprised of only 28,000 acres.

Now, one must also understand what at that time happened to the makaainana. And the reason for this discrepancy is that, first of all, when they were given the opportunity to acquire lands, they first must petition the government, and then have these lands surveyed. Many of them did not understand this concept. This concept was totally foreign to them.

This is not to say, though, that Hawaiians did not exercise this right. There were approximately 13,000 applications for Mahele lands, and of that 13,000, only 9000 was actually granted.

And many, thereafter, even after they got the land, lost it because they got in fee, and then sold it outright -- afterwards, again, because of the lack of understanding of the new system.

I might add that the whole psychology of the Hawaiian .

was that the land was always there; would always be there;

and therefore, they could return to it at any given time.

And that is one of the reasons why many of the Hawaiians were not able to -- again, as I've_stated, it's because of this lack of understanding of the new land system.

Secondly, they also had to pay for the surveying costs. And although at that time the surveying costs were very nominal -- two dollars up to approximately twenty dollars -- many of the Hawaiians did not have that money at that time.

A very sad case, I would like to point out, is that if you look at the Island of Niihau, Niihau was acquired by the Sinclair family during this -- after the Mahele.

Many of the natives that were living on the Island of Niihau had petitioned the monarchy at that time to get the lands surveyed.

However, when they were -- when they were approached as to payment for the survey, they were not able to do so.

And so many of them, therefore, were unable to acquire the lands that they had lived on for centuries.

And when the land was finally ceded to the monarchy, because of default -- because they weren't able to put up the necessary amounts -- the monarchy in turn turned around and sold it to the Sinclair family for approximately \$10,000.

Okay. And only history then points out as to what happened. Many Hawaiians then, who were natives, who

resided -- and I might add, there was a big population living on Niihau -- many, then, because of the inability to acquire land, finally decided that they were to leave, and many left for the islands of Kauai and the rest of the islands; and only a very few remained there.

And this is why you have a very small native population there. But this is a classic example of that, of all of the Mahele, the lands that were divided.

Now, we find that they -- the total amount of acres involved was approximately 4.1 million acres. Incidentally, I did mention lands of government. The king had a second mahele, and because he had second thoughts, he felt that if foreign influences would take over the Hawaiian Islands, that possibly he had to make it clear which was his own land, and which lands would be government land; and so therefore, he subdivided his lands into two parts, crown lands -- those that are reserved for him -- and lands of the government, from which revenues then could be derived, such as leasing and so forth, so that the government could make money, so that they could run the government.

One significant land act, which is of importance, is the -- after the monarchy, is the -- I'm sorry; not after the monarchy. But the Land Act of 1895, this was the first serious attempt at a comprehensive compilation and codification of land laws in Hawaii.

And at that time, the public lands were defined as all lands heretofore classed as government lands; all lands heretofore classed as crown lands; and all lands that may hereafter come into the control of the government, by purchase, exchange, escheat, or by the exercise of right of eminent domain, or otherwise except as below set forth.

Now, the first attempt at homesteading was in terms of this particular Act of 1895. Public lands available for homesteading were classified first as agricultural lands; and the agricultural lands were further broken down into first, second and third class.

The next category was pastoral lands, and those were broken down into first and second; and the third category was the pastoral-agricultural lands; fourth category, forest lands; and fifth category, wastelands.

Now, the Land Act of 1895 had established what is now known -- well, what was known at that time as a commission of public lands; and it was comprised of a board of three commissioners.

One was the Minister of the Interior; and two to be appointed by the president above the -- at that time, of the Republic of Hawaii, with his cabinet approval.

And I might add that the -- of the three commissioners, one member was chosen as the agent of public lands, and was the active business representative of the board.

Now, under the Land Act of 1895, the three types of homestead leases were created. The first was known as the homestead lease. The homestead lease was for a term of 999 years. There was no blood criteria.

It was issued only after compliance with terms and conditions of a Certificate of Occupation, which was a probationary right of occupation for the purposes of proving up on the homestead.

I might add that the issuance of both the Certificate of Occupation and the Homestead Lease was discontinued by an amendment of the Organic Act of 1951, and is known as Public Law 746.

Let me give you an example of this. If you are familiar with the islands, of these homestead leases developed throughout the territory, if you go to Keanae, many of the farmlands there are under this homestead lease, the 999 years.

If you go up to Palolo on the Island of Oahu, the Waiamao area, up in the right-hand side of the valley, as you go up, these are the 999-year leases.

And many Hawaiians, I might add, took advantage of this type of homesteading program.

I might add that on the homestead lease, on the term of 999 years, there was opportunity for successorship. And successorship is clearly defined, of course, by the law itself. And I will not go into this, because I think the

23

24

25

land department would be in a better position to make reference to this.

The second type of homestead program was the right-ofpurchase lease. It was a lease for 21 years, and one had a right to purchase at any time, after the third year; and the homesteaders were selected by either drawing or by lot. Okay

This was very clear, that in the right-to-purchase lease, when one got on it, he had the opportunity to purchase it in fee, outright, after he got it, after the third year.

And the third homestead category was the cash freehold agreement. And in essence, what it was, it was just an agreement of sale. The purchaser paid 25% of the purchase price as down payment; and over a three-year period, paid the remaining 75%. Okay. And then in the end, of course, would be able to acquire ownership of it.

MRS. AKAU: Excuse me. The second and third type, were there blood criteria?

MR. PAGLINAWAN: No.

MRS. AKAU: No?

MR. PAGLINAWAN: No. Okay.

The price for the fee was actually determined by bidding at that particular time, on this particular program, the cash freehold agreement. Okay.

Now, the Organic Act was amended in 1910. And the amendment at that time provided for homesteading of public

lands upon public demand.

Now, this was a very important factor which led to the Hawaiian Homestead Commission Act. What it provided for is that upon the receipt of a petition of 25 eligible citizens, the Land Commissioner was mandated to survey and open up agricultural lands.

And as a result of this, there were numerous requests from citizens to the government at that time to open up many of these particular lands.

And so many, many feared -- particularly the sugar interests -- feared that many of these lands that were now in cultivation would be petitioned, and would be taken over and used for -- for homesteading.

Again, you understand that this homesteading program is opened up to the general public. But again, only to citizens of Hawaii. Okay.

Now, after 1910, a substantial amount of acreages were again in sugar cultivation; and these were known as prime agricultural lands, flatlands, lands that have access to water and so forth.

In 1917, 1921, over 200,000 acres of government lands were due to expire under lease; and these were basically crown lands.

As a result of that, there was a movement in the community to secure many of these lands, to withdraw it; after

it is terminated, to open it for homesteading.

One must also understand that homesteading was not new only in Hawaii; but it was something that was also occurring elsewhere in the United States. The whole idea of the westward movement, settlement of new lands, was part of the American scene. And so Hawaii was no different.

So therefore, in 1917-1921, when over 200,000 acres were coming up for termination, there was great interest in securing these lands for homesteads.

So you have the homestead proponents, and then you have those that are the sugar interests, to keep it in sugar land. There are many converging factors or forces which then led to what we now know as the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, or the Rehabilitation Act.

At that particular time, if you look at the information I've given you on Table 1, if you look at the Hawaiian and part-Hawaiian population, 1778 to 1960 -- and this was taken from the Andrew Lind "Hawaii's People" -- you will find, in 1778, it was estimated approximately 300,000 Hawaiians; and these were pure Hawaiians. Okay.

And then you will find, 1848, after the Mahele, you find that there are 80,000, approximately 80,000 Hawaiians.

And down to 1920, when the Hawaiian Homes Commission

Act came into being, you will find the -- I'm sorry -- 80,000

total population, 1849; the number of Hawaiians was 78,000.

. ;

:

Okay. If you go to 1920, the total population in the territory at that time was 255,000, and you will find the native population was 23,000.

You will find there's a marked decrease in the native population from 300,000 in 1778 -- 1849, 78,000 -- and in 1920, dropped down to a low of 23,000.

And so therefore, there was a concern of the native Hawaiians. When we say "native Hawaiians," those that are pure. However, if you take a look on the part-Hawaiian population, although there was concern for the pure native Hawaiians, you'll find that the reverse is happening here.

You will find that the native Hawaiians were intermarrying outside of their ethnic group. And as a result of that, you will notice, as of 1849, when there was only approximately 78,000 native Hawaiians, you will find that there's 471 part-Hawaiians.

And then you will find by 1920, it has risen up to almost double that amount, 18,000. And as you go down to 1960, the proportion then increases.

You'll find, however, that the native Hawaiian has dropped to approximately 9,000 population currently. So you find that although the pure Hawaiians are decreasing, the part-Hawaiian population is increasing.

Okay. So the converging -- one of the converging forces at the time when the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act

was thought about, the concern for the native Hawaiians, and the need to take corrective action to stop further deterioration of their numbers, and as citizens of the territory at that time.

Another concern that was occurring at that time, as I have indicated, there were substantial amounts of acreages that was going to be opening up; and as a result of that, there was concern for the insistent demands to release more lands for homesteads by the proponents of the homesteading program.

And the third converging force was that there was urgent need, as was thought of at that time, both by the United States Congress and those in power here in the territory at that time, the urgent need to protect the sugar industry -- which, at that time, was the most profitable export industry -- and prevent the cultivated sugar lands from being withdrawn for homesteading purposes, those that were under lease.

Another concern at that time, which is not talked about much, but there were a lot of racial issues that occurred at that particular time. I have touched upon one of them, and that's the decline of the native population.

But one of the racial issues was also, at that time -- which indicates another facet in the changing Hawaiian population -- was the increasing prices of certain Hawaiian

CARNAZZO COURT—REPORTING COMPANY, LTD.
SUITE 692 • ALEXANDER YOUNG BUILDING • HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813
SERVING HAWAII, THE PACIFIC BASIN AND THE FAR EAST
(808) 538-7174

staples, like fish, poi, and so forth.

With the Hawaiians, under this system of ahupua'a and the ohana system, it was a self-contained system, a self-sufficient people. And although they were often referred to as subsistence farmers, they were able to maintain their home and to maintain their livelihood.

However, due to Western civilization, many of them flocked to urban centers, for job opportunities and so forth; and many left the land and were not cultivators of the lands.

And as a result of that, they were dependent upon -they became consumers; basically, became consumers, and were
then subject to those that provided these staples to them -like the cultivation of taro and so forth.

And as a result of that, the increase in prices of certain Hawaiian staples created a lot of problems to the native Hawaiians at that time, and they got very upset about it.

And again, many of these prices were controlled by, then, a lot of the Orientals that were leaving many of the plantation systems and were setting up businesses and so forth.

Another factor, a racial issue, which came into being was that the job competition between Hawaiians and non-Hawaiians, prior to the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, there was a sort of understanding in the community that many of

your -- let's take, for example, the stevedores -- was solely for Hawaiians at that time. But you find that a lot of the Orientals were forming into huis, and were breaking into this system. And as a result, many of the native Hawaiians were feeling threatened by this. And incidentally, I might add that it was particularly the Japanese that were very strong in this area. Another racial concern that was developing at that time, what is oftentimes referred to as the anti-tenement campaign of the Honolulu Ad Exchange. 11 The anti-tenement ad campaign was a very interesting 12 one, because it was again argued, because of the movement of 13 the native Hawaiians to urban centers, that they have been 14 living in socially deteriorating conditions, such as tenement 15 housing, especially here in Honolulu. 16 I might add, though, even after the Great Fire, the 17 Chinatown Fire in Honolulu, there were still many tenement 18 houses that were in disrepair and so forth. 19 And it was argued at that time that many Hawaiians 20 were living under substandard conditions in living in 21 Honolulu. 22 Many oldtimers -- that I'm sure that are here -- will 23

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

24

25

also recall what is now known as the kakaako. These were a

lot of the shantytowns that were established during that time

because many Hawaiians were living under substandard conditions, in hopes of uplifting their lifestyles by coming to urban centers, securing jobs and so forth.

And many, of course, were confronted by disillusionment.

Another factor that was occurring at that time was that the Hawaiian leaders were encouraging a racial consciousness among Hawaiians: that they were just as good as any citizen of the United States; and that they -- if they put their minds to it, they would be able to deal with many of these issues, both economically and politically.

The good Prince Jonah Kalanianaole Kuhio was instrumental in establishing the Hawaiian Civic Club, what most people identified as a social club. This was not so. The original intent of the Hawaiian Civic Club was to form a Hawaiian political movement.

And as a matter of fact, when he first started it, he chastised many of the Hawaiians who participated, who did not really recall the purpose of the particular movement.

And so the Hawaiian Civic Club movement came into being.

Now, if you put all of these factors together, the need then for the 200,000 acres, more or less, that were coming up, something had to happen.

There was another force that was operating, if you recall. It was during the time of World War I, and

afterwards. They were concerned at that time that many of those who had petitioned the government to release lands for homesteading were Orientals -- basically, Japanese -- and in the United States proper itself, they were concerned about the -- what they oftentimes referred to as the Yellow Peril -- those that are older than me would recall -- and as I might add, that mentality existed all the way up to World War II, and even afterwards.

But again, the Yellow Peril was so evident. And so therefore, the United States Congress itself was concerned as to what will happen to the islands if the homesteading program that existed at that time would continue; that many of these lands would then fall into the hands of non-Hawaiians.

Another concern, too, was that the homesteading programs that was successful in withdrawing these lands, and put into homesteading use, that many of them were dismal failures.

Let me give you an example. In Waiakea, substantial acres were withdrawn from the Waiakea Sugar Company, and these were considered at that time prime agricultural lands. They were withdrawn for homesteading purposes.

However, as a result of that those that petitioned and those that got the lands were not suited for homesteading purposes. And as a result of that, the agriculture adventurers became a dismal failure. And again, the sugar interests

CARNAZZO COURT—REPORTING COMPANY, LTD.

SUITE 692 • ALEXANDER YOUNG BUILDING • HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813

SERVING HAWAII, THE PACIFIC BASIN AND THE FAR EAST

(808) 538-7174

And as a result of that, of course, there were really concerns of not opening more lands.

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

÷18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Taking all of these converging forces together, what do you have? At that time, job-wise, the advent proponents of the Rehabilitation Act was able to locally develop what is known as the legislation, which was the forerunner for the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act.

I might add that when they first introduced the homesteading bill, there was no reference to Hawaiians. But as these converging forces came into being, the legislation that they introduced finally took a new twist, and it then brought into focus the plight of the native Hawaiians.

And as these converging forces started interacting to each other, one way out of it, to stop the homesteading -the need for opening up more homesteading lands by nonHawaiians -- would be to limit it to Hawaiians.

And just to show you the difference, if you take the homesteading under the existing at that time program, and the HHC -- okay? -- under the first, it's 999-year lease; the Hawaiian Homes Commission, 99 years.

I oftentimes wonder how in the hell, from 999 years, they somehow, the other day, developed the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 99 years. But anyway, that's the way it

ended up. Okay? 1 Options to purchase. No option. 2 Lease. Okay? No blood criteria. 50% Hawaiian, under 3 the Hawaiian Homes Commission. 4 And it's interesting to note that the Hawaiian Homes 5 Commission Act defined a native Hawaiian as those races in-6 habiting the Hawaiian Islands previous to 1978. Okay? 7 It's clear. It says: "Those races which had been in 8 the Hawaiian Islands prior to 1978." Okay? 9 Successorship? Likewise, successorship. However, 10 this limited to still 50%. 11 In other words, that if a successor is less than 50%, 12 he's unable to acquire the lease under the Hawaiian Homes 13 Commission. 14 But under the homesteading program, that person is - 15 able to do so. 16 And so, with a stroke of the pen, the Hawaiian Homes 17 Commission Act came into being. It staved off some of these 18 concerns. 19 First of all, the Hawaiian Homes Commission lands, 20 only those lands that were available. In other words, what 21 lands were available? The agricultural lands and sugar were 22 protected. They were under lease. Okay. 23 So these lands could not be withdrawn and used for 24

homesteading purposes. Okay?

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

23

24

25

For those that are proponents, to open up more lands to non-Hawaiians, by putting the homesteading program and limiting it to 50% Hawaiians, which would partically satisfy that need for homesteading. And so therefore, 50% Hawaiians.

The other concern is that of the native Hawaiians, this rehabilitation program, which would supposedly address that issue as to the native Hawaiians. And what they had in mind, the whole idea, was to get the Hawaiians back to the lands.

And supposedly, by the sweat of their brow, they would be rehabilitating themselves. Again, the whole concept was a foreign concept. Okay.

And again, the successorship, as was indicated there.

If you look on the Table 2, you will find that under the resolutions of 12683 and 13500, these two resolutions that went to Congress had identified the various lands throughout the islands.

And you find that the act itself, which is the far right-hand corner, in some cases differs with the proposed lands that were identified. Okay.

Prior to the enactment of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, you will find that under HR 12863, there was a total of approximately 191,000; under HR 13500, approximately 194,000; and the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 200,000 acres, approximately. Okay.

If you will take, then -- if you will look at the Table 3, when the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act came into being in 1972, a study was done; and as a result of the study there were -- the Hawaiian Homes Commission was interested to find out really how many acres they had that was under their jurisdiction.

And as a result of that, Akinaka was charged to do
the study; and as a result of that, you will find that the
total amount of acreages identified in 1972, that belonged to
the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, was approximately 189,000.

Now, again, there are discrepancies between these figures. And even the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act referred to 200,000 acres, more or less.

The problem in that is that, again, as I have mentioned previously, with the native Hawaiians, or even with the community at large at that time, the land was always there. And so there was no need to survey these lands, first of all.

And even if they did, they did not have their resources.

The survey department was unable to survey many of these
lands.

As a result of that, many of these lands were not surveyed, so they really did not know the total amount of acreage. So when they identified the location of these grants, they didn't really know the total amount of acreages.

It was a guesstimate at that time.

In some cases where the lands were surveyed, then,
there has not been a problem. Let me give you an example.

If you look down on the Island of Molokai, on Table 2, you
will find Kalaupapa.

Although in the two resolutions, there was no reference to Kalaupapa, you will find in the act that Kalaupapa included 5,000 acres.

Now, going back to the Hawaiian land system, the ahupua'a, Kalaupapa, if you fly along the north shore of Molokai and you look down, you see that peninsula, and it actually comprises three ahupua'as, not one -- although it is referred to as Kalaupapa.

So many people think that the whole of that peninsula belongs to the Hawaiian Homes Commission. This is not so. They own approximately 2,000 acres of that, because it involves three ahupua'a, and that's the total acreages that they have on Kalaupapa, is 5,000, which would be for the total three.

So that then brings up some of these kinds of discrepancies. I might add that the other discrepancies occur in that a provision in the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act make it possible for the Hawaiian Homes Commission to exchange lands with the land commissioner, of equal value.

In other words, whatever the appraised value is, they

.**24**

can exchange lands for that purpose, to promote the homesteading program under the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act.

Now, that means, then, that a prime land for residential purposes, a Hawaiian homestead -- well, let me take it the other way.

The public lands at that time, prime residential land, the value thereof, could be much higher than lands that were in agriculture. The acreages would not be the same -- okay?

-- because of the appraised value.

So when the exchange occurs, therefore, you will have a diminishing effect in terms of the Hawaiian Homes Lands, the exchange thereof. And for this, the Commission has been criticised.

But again, you have to understand the context in which it is done, because the Hawaiian Homes Commission law does make provision for it.

And of course, if you look at the Table 4, you will find that this gives you a current total of the lands that were identified in 1972 as 189,000; and the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act. So you will notice that as you go down, item for item, you will notice that there are some discrepancies in the figures.

And again, going back to the understanding that at the time of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, they really did not have a clear understanding as to the total amount of

acreages involved.

Madam Chairman, I'm open to questions.

MS. PUTMAN: I think you have done a marvelous job, Richard, in covering some very intricate issues over a long period of time.

Does anyone on the committee want to ask any specific questions?

MRS. COOPER: I would like to ask Richard a question.

MS. PUTMAN: Yes.

MRS. COOPER: Richard, in one of your last sentences, you mentioned that there's a provision for the equivalent exchange of lands between Hawaiian Homes, the land inventory, and the State.

Are you, in your statement, saying that there has been some equivalent exchange of lands, and that there is a record that shows that this exists?

MR. PAGLINAWAN: Yes. The Hawaiian Homes Commission should have information as to these exchange of lands. As a matter of fact, it must be spelled out by a Commission resolution.

And again, the lands must be appraised, both sides, the public lands and the Hawaiian Homes Commission lands, and the exchange thereof.

So there is documentation of that.

MS. PUTMAN: Any further questions?

CARNAZZO COURT—REPORTING COMPANY, LTD.

SUITE 692 • ALEXANDER YOUNG BUILDING • HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813

SERVING HAWAII, THE PACIFIC BASIN AND THE FAR EAST

(808) 538-7174

1	MS. JAMES: Madam Chairman, I just have one.		
2	On these 999-year leases, approximately what percent		
3	of the I assume there are quite a few of those still out?		
4	MR. PAGLINAWAN: Yes. I think okay. Continue.		
5	MS. JAMES: Approximately what percent of those, if		
6	any, do Hawaiians have, as opposed to, say, the plantations?		
7	Do you know?		
8	MR. PAGLINAWAN: No, I don't know. I think that's a		
9	question, as I have indicated previously,		
10	MS. JAMES: For the		
11	MR. PAGLINAWAN: for the Land Board. Perhaps you		
12	might want to address that question to them.		
13	I might add that many Hawaiians today that refer to		
14	kuleana lands, those are really lands that were originally		
15	on the original homesteading act, but not the Hawaiian Homes		
16	Act. But the original homesteading. This is a second chance		
17	to get lands for themselves, when perhaps they were not able		
18	to exercise the option under the Great Mahele.		
19	MS. PUTMAN: Thank you very much, Richard. We really		
20	appreciate your cooperation and marvelous performance.		
21	MR. PAGLINAWAN: Thank you.		
22	A SPECTATOR: Madam Chairman, can I say that if any-		
23	One in the front there does speak, can they speak into the		
24	mikes, please?		

MS. PUTMAN:

Oh, fine. Will you remember that, please,

to use the mike? 1 2 MS. JAMES: And I think you have to put it a little bit closer. 3 MS. PUTMAN: Our next witness is Winona Rubin, who is 4 5 speaking in behalf of her position as director of Alu Like, Incorporated. 6 7 Thank you, Winona. MS. RUBIN: Madam Chairman, members of the panel, 8 9 aloha kakou. 10 I am Winona Kealamapuana Ellis Rubin, Executive Director of Alu Like, a private nonprofit organization whose 11 major focus is that of assisting in the development of 12 13 economic and social self-sufficiency for native Hawaiians, consistent with the Native American Program Acts, Title VIII 14 of Public Law 93-644 and Public Law 95-568. 15 I might add, at this particular time, that we receive 16 17 federal funding from two major sources, one from the Division of Indian-Native American Programs, Department of Labor, 18 under Public Law 94-444, recently revised into Public Law 19 20 99-524; and the Administration for Native Americans, under 21 the office of the Human Development Services, Department of Health, Education & Welfare, under the earlier-cited public 22 23 laws. We do receive some State grants, as well as private 24

foundation monies in our organization.

3

5

8

10 11

9

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

As requested, my presentation will provide some data on native Hawaiians -- those of full and part-Hawaiian ancestry.

In cooperation with other public and private agencies in the State, Alu Like has put some information regarding Hawaiians together for people to utilize.

Copies of one of those summaries, He Hawaii Makou, have been provided for your general information. Other more detailed information is available, but rather than duplicate volumes of material, you may wish to be more specific as to the needs you have following all of the presentations today, since I believe many people will be providing you with a lot of information.

There are over 150,000 native Hawaiians in this State, according to the latest figures from DPED. This is nearly 18% of the total State population. Of the 150,000, approximately one-half are 18 years of age and younger. The median age for native Hawaiians is 18.7 years. Of the native Hawaiian population, almost 70% live on Oahu; 16% on Hawaii, 10% on Maui County, and about 4% on Kauai.

For the native Hawaiian population, 62.6% have no income. And that includes children as well. Of the persons receiving income, nearly one-third -- 31.2% -- get less than \$4,000 per year. The median annual personal income for native Hawaiians was about \$6,900 in 1975, and it is still

colleges is approximately 10%.

Of the native Hawaiian youngsters who come to the attention of the Family Court, the recurring characteristic is the youngster is in trouble in the educational system.

The absence rate of native Hawaiian youngsters in this State who are enrolled at public schools with 40% or more Hawaiian youngsters is an average of 43 days -- almost a full quarter of the year.

Native Hawaiian youngsters tested in the public elementary schools score on an average at least two stanines below the average for the State in reading and mathematics.

And that's Stanine 1 and Stanine 2, for those of you who are aware of the nine-stanine scale, which means that it's between 11% and 20%.

The Grade 10 failure is still one or two stanines below the State average.

Earlier reports of test scores and absence problems

made by Queen Liliuokalani Children's Center in the 1960s

and early 1970s indicate that the same symptoms of alienation

and lack of success existed even at that time.

One-third of the Alu Like Needs Survey respondents are not satisfied with the public schools. The percentage is higher in some rural areas. One of the major complaints is that the public schools are not sensitive to the needs of the child with a culturally Hawaiian lifestyle.

In the area of employment, the unemployment level for native Hawaiians is approximately double that of the level for the State.

The percentage of non-Hawaiians in professional and management occupations is nearly twice that of the Hawaiians, but the percent not in the labor force is only slightly higher for Hawaiians, 38% to 36%.

Significant blocks to success in employment experiences -- and from our viewpoint, as an employment and training prime sponsor for the State -- appear to be: (1) lack of basic education; (2) stereotyping, low self-image; (3) lack of skill training and job readiness orientation.

Although Hawaiians constitute 2% more of the total working force in Hawaii, they occupy only 8% of the professional and managerial positions.

Some efforts are being made by the private sector to employ Hawaiians at other than entry levels, but too few Hawaiians have the necessary training to take advantage of the opportunities.

Increasing efforts are currently being made toward entrepreneurship among Hawaiians, particularly in areas consistent with the lifestyle -- aquaculture, agriculture, crafts, oli, mele, and instructions. And initial capital and technical skills in marketing projections are blocks.

(808) 538-7174

In the area of Social Services, of the approximately

19,000 Department of Social Services and Housing clients receiving AFDC assistance, 4,700, or 25%, are adult native Hawaiians.

Of the over 39,000 DSSH clients receiving ADC assistance, 12,000, or 31%, are Hawaiian children.

Therefore, approximately 30% of the welfare recipients in the State are of Hawaiian ancestry.

Of the 551 DSSH social workers and administrators in the State, 45, or only 8%, are Hawaiian or part-Hawaiian.

Of those people in poverty circumstances, 4% are native Hawaiians.

Health? Native Hawaiians do not fare as well by many indicators of health when compared to the average for all other ethnic groups in the State.

Native Hawaiians have higher than normal physical health problems for specific chronic conditions such as cancer, diabetes and gout, coronary heart disease, and for dental health and child and family nutrition.

While self-reports of health conditions, such as days in bed, hospital visits and time lost from work, are comparable to all other groups, native Hawaiians have death rates at all ages higher than the other groups. The life expectancy at birth is shorter by six to seven years for native Hawaiians, as compared with all other ethnic groups.

Approximately 25% of elderly native Hawaiians, age 65

and over, have either not registered for Medicare or not enrolled in other health care programs.

The poorer-than-average health and lower-than-average income of elderly Hawaiians leave them especially vulnerable to high health care costs.

Most elderly native Hawaiians make use of traditional means of coping with illness, both spiritual and folk remedies. Professional help would be sought by them only after traditional remedies are exhausted, and only if the health care provider-patient relationship is a personal one.

Because Hawaiian Homes Lands is presenting information,

I very briefly indicated just a few points.

Approximately 3,000 lessees occupy over 25,000 acres of Hawaiian Homes Lands; and the breakout is: 87% residential leases; 11% farm, or farm-residence combinations; and 2% pastoral.

There are 5,300 active applicants seeking Hawaiian Homes Lands, and 90% for residential purposes, 6% farm, and 4% pastoral.

Approximately one-third, or about 55,000 native Hawaiians, are of one-half to full-Hawaiian ancentry. And if we allow for a family comprised of five to six persons, that would mean approximately 9,000 potential applicant families for Hawaiian Homes Lands.

In the area of Native rights, legal assistance is a

T-4

major problem. It's needed for those Hawaiians who may not be eligible for poverty programs since they share an interest in land, but cannot afford to safeguard their interest without selling the land or giving it up because legal services for court action cannot be afforded.

And I have indicated that the problems there, in the legal area, are: adverse possession; kuleana land rights, land registration, title search, land access, water rights, preservation of sites of historic and religous significance and importance.

In 1977, arrest rates for persons of Hawaiian ancestry were lower or equal to the State's rates. However, the offender population rate (persons in correctional facilities) is twice as high for Hawaiians and part-Hawaiians.

Since the types of crimes causing arrests were not appreciably different, an explanation appears to be that those arrested who have Hawaiian ancestry may not be receiving the same legal assistance, sentencing practices and parole procedures, as are other ethnic groups.

Disproportionate percents of the juvenile offenders come from homes receiving welfare and are living in public housing; disproportionate percents of the adult male offenders over 30 years of age have physical handicaps, mental problems, and alcohol addiction.

Determination still has to be made by the State

regarding the percent of Section 5F public trust land revenues to be used for addressing the needs of native Hawaiians and the means for addressing the needs.

The Hawaiians are a heterogeneous population; that is, the population as a whole is not a "depressed" one, but segments of it are. However, some problems are found in all Hawaiian groups.

While one-fourth of the population could be considered successful in terms of income, one-fifth have incomes below the poverty line, and one-third of the women interviewed receive two or more types of public or private assistance.

While one-half of the population report owning their own homes, many of these are quite modest, and many are on subsidized land, since fee simple ownership is the exception in Hawaii, and land costs are the highest in the nation.

Hawaiians are a working population with 80% of the adult men and over half of the women employed or looking for work. They are overwhelmingly family-centered. Only a fifth of the men and an eighth of the women (nearly all of them young) have never been married, while about a third have had six or more children.

Since the median income ranges from eleven to thirteen thousand for men and women interviewed, respectively, there is not much to spare. (These figures must be reduced by about 20%, for comparison with the United States Mainland

figures.) Larger families report incomes that are inadequate.

Different categories of the population have different problems. The urban, higher income group, both men and women, lack adequate educational preparation for the better jobs that they want. The lower income urban group suffers from joblessness, an insufficient supply of low-cost housing in the urban areas, and consequently doubling-up of families.

The rural group suffers from lack of job opportunities, a limited range of job choices, and, particularly on Oahu, a steady loss of access to natural resources. From 30 to 90% of those interviewed (differing by island) reported obtaining at least some food by gardening, hunting, fishing, gathering, and sharing -- even on Oahu -- but this is becoming increasingly difficult as land is turned to urban uses, and people are either evicted, or access to land for these purposes is denied.

Hawaiians in all groups frequently report loss of pride and bitterness resulting from the historic loss of their family lands and their homeland. Some three-quarters desire to return to the self-sufficiency that they associate with living off the land and sea.

Hawaiians in all groups are also frequently frustrated and angry about a system of public education that they see as largely irrelevant to learning how to make a living, one which contradicts their most cherished values of group

1	cooperation and personal relationships, is insensitive to
2	their identity, traditions and history, and is generally un-
3	responsive to their individual efforts to effect changes
4	(this came from our survey of the community.)
5	The problems of the host population of this State
6	Hawaiians and part-Hawaiians, who are recognized by congres-
7	sional legislation as Native Americans are complex and
8	must be addressed on several fronts concurrently, and at
9	least initially with more resources and comprehensive plan-
10	ning than has been previously provided.
11	MS. PUTMAN: Thank you very much.
12	Are there any questions?
13	MRS. COOPER: I have a question.
14	MS. PUTMAN: Can you use the mike?
15	MRS. COOPER: Yes, I will.
16	Winona,
17	MS. RUBIN: Yes.
18	MRS. COOPER: since Alu Like has identified the
19	needs of the Hawaiians in education, and since you have this
20	very concise statement on the last page of your report
21	MS. PUTMAN: Is that mike on?
22	MRS. COOPER: Oh. I will start again, and I will
23	abbreviate it this time.
24	Since, on your last page, you very concisely identify
25	the feelings of the Hawaiians relative to their disenchantmer
,	

with the public education system, I wonder what Alu Like is doing to resolve this educational problem that we recognize as existing?

MS. RUBIN: There are a few things that we initiated,

I believe, that may have some effect. The initial needs

assessment in 1976 identified many of these areas. And so,

for 1977, we did ask of the congressional delegation to

initiate four items of legislation, really.

One, which dealt with the employment and training problem, which was second priority in the Hawaiian community;

And, two, which was first priority, and that was the education. And we asked for an introduction of legislation to address that area.

The Native Hawaiian Education Act is currently in Congress. It was passed by the Senate last year, and did not pass the House in the last of the congressional sessions.

It has been reintroduced in both houses this year, and is in the Select Committee on Union Affairs in the Senate, and in two House committees, one on the elementary and secondary education committee, and the higher education committee.

We are hopeful maybe that some of the resources produced from the Native Hawaiian Education Act will provide the resources that are sorely needed to make the major kind of change in direction for Hawaiians in the system, since

the Department of Education earlier had indicated that they did not have the funds to address the special needs of the native Hawaiian group here locally. And this would provide that means.

In the absence of such legislation, and the limitations of our funding -- since we have one program fund only, and that's the Employment and Training Program fund that we receive as a prime sponsor in the State -- we have had difficulty in doing too much more.

The other funding source that we have pays only for administration and operation costs.

We have, however, through placement of people in some employment and training positions, in certain projects, attempted to impact the system in a small way.

We have placed individuals at the Waianae High School, as para-counselor positions, two positions there, with a supervisor and a monitor of that arrangement, in collaboration with the Department of Education, and with other agencies of the community.

In the cooperative effort to address the attendance problem, which is a severe one, at Waianae High School, when the records were assessed to see how large a problem it was, the people of 20 days of absence or more, they stopped counting at 500.

And so these people then attempted to address this

Q

problem, and were fairly successful with a small pilot group that they attempted to address, with increase in attendance as well as success in school.

The spin-off arrangement, collaboration with this particular effort, the Hawaiians assistance program, was that of assisting parents with this problem to better know how to address the system, and to try to support the efforts of their youngsters in the school, as well as to provide more sensitivity to the educational system for their concerns.

And so a parent group was initiated there, with the assistance of a number of agencies, including the Queen Liliuokalani Children's Center. And in turn, that parent group, after learning how to, and developing some of the skills there, having on their own to address the Board of Education, to impact on the school processes, successfully initiated efforts to have a summer school, where the summer school was not previously planned for.

And has in turn, I believe, been the impetus behind some of the efforts by the Waianae High School administration to meet with many community groups and parent groups to revise some of the things that may be happening at the school.

And we believe that, with better access to the many other resources in the community, in collaboration with the school, that that can help to meet the needs of those youngsters.

1 MS. PUTMAN: Winona, --2 MS. RUBIN: Yes. MS. PUTMAN: -- the main direction of our concern or 3 4 consultation, and the recommendations that we will be making 5 MS. RUBIN: Yes. 6 MS. PUTNAM: -- both at the State and the Federal level, is, I think, Native Hawaiian Home Lands. 7 8 MS. RUBIN: Yes. 9 MS. PUTMAN: I'm wondering if the Native American 10 Program acts that you have cited, going back to 1974, do any 11 of them address these issues specifically? 12 MS. RUBIN: The Hawaiian homestead is addressed in the 13 Administration for Native Americans -- the Native American 14 Programs Act, rather. 15 MS. PUTMAN: Yes. I guess what I'm wondering is 16 whether Alu Like has any specific progress to report, or any 17 issues that they feel we should consider in our recommenda-18 tions to the Federal Government? 19 MS. RUBIN: In order to provide appropriate resources 20 for the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands, in addressing some 21 of the needs of the Hawaiian community, there has not been 22 sufficient resources from the Federal Government, beyond what 23 the Home Lands is currently operating on, which is State 24 monies. 25 MS. PUTMAN: Yeah.

1	MS. PUTMAN: Winona,
2	MS. RUBIN: Yes.
3	MS. PUTMAN: the main direction of our concern or
4	consultation, and the recommendations that we will be making
5	MS. RUBIN: Yes.
6	MS. PUTNAM: both at the State and the Federal
7	level, is, I think, Native Hawaiian Home Lands.
8	MS. RUBIN: Yes.
9	MS. PUTMAN: I'm wondering if the Native American
10	Program acts that you have cited, going back to 1974, do any
11	of them address these issues specifically?
12	MS. RUBIN: The Hawaiian homestead is addressed in the
13	Administration for Native Americans the Native American
14	Programs Act, rather.
15	MS. PUTMAN: Yes. I guess what I'm wondering is
16	whether Alu Like has any specific progress to report, or any
17	issues that they feel we should consider in our recommenda-
18	tions to the Federal Government?
19	MS. RUBIN: In order to provide appropriate resources
20	for the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands, in addressing some
21	of the needs of the Hawaiian community, there has not been
22	sufficient resources from the Federal Government, beyond what
23	the Home Lands is currently operating on, which is State
24	monies.
25	MS. PUTMAN: Yeah.

	ł
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	

25

MS. RUBIN: Legislation for the HUD still doesn't clearly provide for a Native American focus; and I think other federal housing support types of programs do not provide the resources that could be utilized by the Hawaiian Home Lands.

MS. PUTMAN: Have those proposals been formulated into specific recommendations in Alu Like?

MS. RUBIN: No, we haven't. We have made inquiry with our congressional offices regarding these, but no specific formulation has been made, yet.

MS. PUTMAN: Charles?

MR. MAXWELL: Winona, on Page 5, you mention the offender population rate in the correctional facilities. Has Alu Like established whether the offenders come from Hawaiian homes, property of -- you know, Hawaiian Homes Lands? And if so, you know, what has Alu Like done, if anything, to work with the people in the correctional centers?

MS. RUBIN: The first question, no, we have not identified out of the correctional inmates how many were from Hawaiian Homes Lands.

And I think that the extraction of that information would be difficult, because I don't think that the input from the forms they keep, the records that they keep, includes Hawaiian Homes Lands delineation.

Secondly, in working with the correctional system, all

agencies is to provide for the inmates therein assistance, 2 with programs that they have requested, where Hawaiian 3 culture or training types of programs have been necessary for them, so that they would be better prepared for leaving the 5 institution. 6 So this is the only ways that we have on each of the 7 islands been involved with this type of program for inmates, 8 inside the institution. 9 MR. MAXWELL: You say on all the islands; right? 10 MS. RUBIN: Yes, correct. On the Island of Hawaii, 11 particularly in collaboration with the Hilo Community College 12 13 There, they have provided us with a tremendous number of resources and resource people, as their kind contribution to 14 efforts directed toward providing more programs to the inmates 15 in their institution there on the island. 16 The same has been on each of the different islands. 17 MR. MAXWELL: Okay. Thank you. 18 MS. PUTMAN: Any other questions? 19 I would like to ask another MRS. COOPER: Yes. 20 21 question. Winona, do you find that the people on Hawaiian Homes 22 Lands have more problems with the education of their children . 23 in comparison to the Hawaiian who does not live on Hawaiian 24 Homes Lands? 25

that we have been able to do in collaboration with other

Do you have any kind of comparative studies between the non-Hawaiians -- that is, those who do not live on Hawaiian Homes Lands -- with those who do live on Hawaiian Homes Lands?

MS. RUBIN: We have not specifically identified them as Hawaiian Homes versus non-Hawaiian Homes from responses in our surveys, purposely, because our advisory council has always insisted that we not differentiate; that Hawaiians are Hawaiians wherever they may be.

But if you would look at the data from the schools, other institutions, that are able to identify people from Hawaiian Homes Lands areas, you will find that there are high populations of Hawaiians in the school systems; and in those particular segments of the educational system, they are not doing well in school.

There are many problems in absences; there are related kinds of spin-offs of problems, failure and success in education -- meaning high unemployment rates, all these kinds of things.

MRS. COOPER: Isn't it strange -- or don't you think it's rather strange that in the areas where the population is highly Hawaiian, and the school population is the same, that those are the exact schools that should be experiencing so many of the problems with education for their students?

MS. RUBIN: Um-hmm.

1	MRS. COOPER: That seems to me to be a very significant
2	fact.
3	MS. RUBIN: It is, yes. We haven't labeled them as:
4	result of Hawaiian Homes Lands being located in those areas.
5	But it is very significant, that's true.
6	MS. PUTMAN: Thank you very much, Winona.
7	MS. RUBIN: Thank you.
8	MS. PUTMAN: We are going to take a 10-minute break
9	now. If you haven't found your way around, there's a cor-
10	ridor on that side of the elevator that goes to the women's
11	room; and there's a corridor on the other side of the elevators
12	that goes to the men's room, for your convenience.
13	We will reconvene in ten minutes. Thanks again very
14	much, Winona.
15	MS. RUBIN: Thank you.
16	(Recess.)
17	MS. PUTMAN: Our next witness is Georgiana Padeken,
18	who is the executive head of Hawaiian Homes Commissiion.
19	She will make a presentation, and then we will proceed
20	
20	as before, and the committee will be able to ask questions.
21	as before, and the committee will be able to ask questions. Thank you very much, Georgiana, for joining us.
21	Thank you very much, Georgiana, for joining us.
21 22	Thank you very much, Georgiana, for joining us. MS. PADEKEN: What I would like to do is just read

..16

I have been requested to present to the Hawaii

Advisory Committee of the United States Commission on Civil

Rights information and materials on the role and function of
the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands in the administration,

management and enforcement of the Hawaiian Homes Commission

Act of 1920, as amended.

The Department of Hawaiian Home Lands is the State agency which administers the Hawaiian Homes program. It is one of several principal departments which currently make up the Objective Branch of the State of Hawaii, having come into being on May 11, 1960, under the provisions of the Hawaii State Reorganization Act of 1959.

In reality, the establishment of the Department of
Hawaiian Home Lands was a matter of evolution rather than of
creation, providing for the continuation of the Hawaiian
Homes program as Hawaii progressed in political status from
an incorporated territory of the United States to becoming
the Fiftieth State of the Union.

Originally created by Congress as the Hawaiian Homes
Commission in the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920, it
was incorporated into the Constitution of the State of
Hawaii in accordance with the requirements of the Admission
Act.

Although the purpose of the Hawaiian Homes Commission

Act was not specified in the Act itself, the general intent

of the Act's supporters was clearly stated at the 1920 congressional hearings on the proposed measure and reinforced by subsequent opinions of the Attorney General; namely, that the emphasis in the Act was to permit the Hawaiian, a victim of change, to return to the land.

Paternal assistance was provided by a commission created by congressional statute. The statute protected the Hawaiian against himself and at the same time attempted to promote his well-being.

Shortly after the admission of Hawaii as a state, the agency known as the Hawaiian Homes Commission was transferred into the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands. This department is vested with the responsibility of administering the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920, as amended. The name Hawaiian Homes Commission is still retained as the name of the executive board which heads the department.

Now, the role and function of the department in the administration of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended:

The Department of Hawaiian Home Lands is headed by an executive board who are nominated and appointed by the Governor, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for overlapping four-year terms.

The commission is composed of eight members: three from the City and County of Honolulu; one from the County of

Hawaii; two from the County of Maui, one of whom shall be a resident of Molokai; one from the County of Kauai; and the eighth member shall be the chairman of the Hawaiian Homes Commission.

The commission is specifically (1) authorized to formulate and adopt rules, regulations and policies;

- (2) required to pay all expenses upon the presentation of itemized vouchers approved by the chairman of the commission; and
- Legislature upon the first day of each regular session and such special reports as are requested.

The Commission may delegate to the chairman such duties, powers and authority as may be lawful or proper for the performance of the functions vested in the Commission.

The chairman: however, shall report to the Commission for ratification of any action taken within the scope of delegated duties.

The Department is also responsible for the control of "available lands" which are to be used and disposed of in accordance with the provisions of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act.

Hawaiian upon the land in order to ensure his rehabilitation;

(2) ensure that alienation of such land be made

CARNAZZO COURT—REPORTING COMPANY, LTD.

SET 12: ALEXANDER YOUNG BUILDING • HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813

ERVINE PAVAIL THE PACIFIC BASIN AND THE FAR EAST

(808) 538-7174

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

impossible;

(3) provide water in adequate amounts for all tracts of land; and

(4) financially aid farming operations until such operations are well under way.

The Role and Function of the Department in the Management of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as Amended.

The management's role of the Department is to promote, protect, and insure that the resources set aside by the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act are maximized to the highest possible level in the interest of native Hawaiians. Management functions of the Department over resources established by the Act are comprised of two categories:

- (1) those resources which are used by the general public for revenue-generating purposes, such revenues to be used by the Department; and
- (2) those resources for native Hawaiians to be used for residential, farming or pastoral purposes.

As of July 31, 1979, a total of 2997 leases have been awarded to native Hawaiians for purposes of the Act. This represents approximately 25,000 acres distributed to native Hawaiians of "available lands" for purposes of the Act. ever, the waiting list totals 6310 applicants. 90% are applicants for residence lots, 6% for agriculture, and 4%

T-5 24

for pastoral lots.

The department, whose only independent source of revenues has been through the general leasing of its lands, will require continued funding from the State Legislature and hopefully from Federal and private sources.

This is just a brief overview of what our role and function is, as the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands.

MS. PUTMAN: Thank you very much. We will have some questions for you.

Any of you have a question? Charles?

MR. MAXWELL: Yes.

Georgiana, how much land is leased -- you said 25% here. How much land is --

MS. PADEKEN: What I indicated is that 25,000 acres of the original grant -- which was 200,000, more or less -- 25,000 of this number have been awarded to native Hawaiians through a homestead lease.

MR. MAXWELL: Okay. Then how many acres have been leased to non-Hawaiians?

MS. PADEKEN: Okay. Remember, when -- as I indicated, there are two resources that are comprised in two different categories; and conceivably, a Hawaiian can general lease a Hawaiian Home Land. So I think maybe the question is: How many acres of land have been general leased to the public?

At this point in time, the total number of acreage for

-- at this day and age, when it's hard for us to get our native foods, it is very important that if we can't lease the lands, at least we can use the land for access to the ocean and for some of what the land provides as resources.

I think this is a very important question, that if it has to be done legislatively, in a legislature, you know, let's do it. But I think it's a recommendation that we have to follow.

MS. PADEKEN: Yeah, it's a good recommendation. I'm not clear as to the legal implications at this point.

I guess one immediate concern -- you know, I would imagine a general lessee would have -- is, "Well, who will be liable, you know, if someone gets hurt? You know, in the process of crossing over this particular property?" et cetera. I don't know about these areas.

MS. PUTMAN: I think we have some general legislation for recreational purposes that might perhaps be re-examined, to see if it could be expanded for other aspects.

And as far as preserving endangered species, there is now some federal legislation that perhaps we could examine to see if -- I know that flora and fauna here do need protection; several varieties are very rare.

MR. MAXWELL: But my specific thinking is that when native Hawaiians go to the ocean, it's not for recreation.

It's for something other than recreation.

CARNAZZO COURT—REPORTING COMPANY, LTD.

SUITE 692 • ALEXANDER YOUNG BUILDING • HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813

SERVING HAWAII, THE PACIFIC BASIN AND THE FAR EAST

(808) 538-7174

the olapa trees; you have the kauili trees. 1 And this area is overrun with cattle. I saw evidence, 2 myself, of the forest in that area dying. 3 And a lot of people feel that this is an important 4 part of the culture and should be protected; and if it's on 5 Hawaiian Home Lands, that it will be protected. 6 I mean, you know, something should be done for that 7 8 to be protected. Now, my last question -- if I may, and then I'll yield -9 10 to you, Dennis -- my last question: How can a Hawaiian -- or, a group of native Hawaiians form a corporation? You touched 11 on that just a bit in your presentation. 12 How can they form a corporation? Say I'm interested 13 in a -- a whole group of us are interested in some land which 14 is being presently leased to a non-Hawaiian corporation? And 15 say we form a corporation? 16 Who do we -- we file our papers in incorporation, and 17 then what? We present it to the Hawaiian Homes Commission? 18 19 And in five years, if it's -- can you explain that process, please? 20 MS. PADEKEN: Just let me ask: You want to use the 21 land on the basis of a general lease, or a homesteading 22 lease? 23

MS. PADEKEN: Yeah. At this point in time, we are not

MR. MAXWELL: A homesteading lease.

24

MS. PADEKEN: Okay. The withdrawal provision relates to lands that were -- or are managed by the Department of Land and Natural Resources.

Now, we still have a few more lands managed by the Department of Land. I don't know if --

MS. PUTNAM: Mr. Ono is going to come next, so he can probably tell us that.

MS. PADEKEN: Okay.

See, with the exception of lands that were needed for homesteading purposes, lands that were actually awarded, all other lands under control of the Hawaiian Home Lands were actually managed by the Department of Land and Natural Resources.

Prior to statehood, it was under the Commission of Public Lands, and that particular commission later became the Department of Land and Natural Resources.

As a matter of fact, the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands has only established a land division in 1975. And at that point in time, it was set up to recall their lands.

Now, with respect to your question about the withdrawal clause, yes, we still have that ability to -- that
authorization to do that, for lands that are under the control of the Department of Land and Natural Resources.

It's a one to five year clause in the Act, a minimum of one year notice, and maximum of five years.

CARNAZZO COURT—REPORTING COMPANY, LTD.

SUITE 692 • ALEXANDER YOUNG BUILDING • HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813

SERVING HAWAII, THE PACIFIC BASIN AND THE FAR EAST

(808) 538-7174

1	MR. MAXWELL: So even though their lease has not
2	expired, say, for the next 10, 20 years, that can be applied;
3	right?
4	MS. PADEKEN: Yes. But see, here's where the catch
5	comes in again. If we are going to re-dispose of that land,
6	you know, it's going to be disposed of by a general lease.
7	Say, for instance, if you were the applicant, you
8	know, then we would be having to comply with the provision
9	of ConCon.
10	MR. MAXWELL: Yeah. Right.
11	MS. PADEKEN: But the withdrawal still exists, no
12	doubt, for those lands that
13	MR. MAXWELL: You know, I'm still a little confused,
14	and just excuse me; okay? So I can understand it?
15	I go home and I form this Hawaiian corporation, right,
16	with 10, 15 other Hawaiians.
17	We make a provision we make a request to the
18	Hawaiian Homes Commission for land that X Corporation has
19	here. And then we are going to do farming, ranching. Okay?
20	Now, then, you look at the merits of this corporation,
21	whether we are a viable corporation, whether we have sub-
22	sidies to subsidize, blah, blah, blah; okay?
23	Then, you then what will happen after that with
24	this land that I want?
25	MS. PADEKEN: Okay. If the land is presently

management at the present. 3 St. St. St. St. St. MR. MAXWELL: Right. 4 5 --6--Land and Natural Resources. to have these lands recalled. 10 « П ³ a Catch 22 situation. 19 20 2.1 to the Department. 22

encumbered under a general lease to someone else, we would and these are not lands under Hawaiian Homes

MS. PADEKEN: These are lands under the Department of

We would have to request and give notice to the Department of Land and Natural Resources that we would like

But there are other aspects to that problem. Okay? .These lands are general leased by the Department of Land and Natural Resources. The revenues derived from the general leasing of those lands are actually referred back to the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands for its purposes.

We are not mandated, under the provisions of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, to make these lands -- to have these lands recalled.

In a sense, you know, it's -- we are -- it's sort of

Because the lands are presently general leased for nonhomesteading purposes, there are revenues being generated

Now, if we are to take these lands out of general leases, then somehow, we have to find a way to compensate for the loss of those revenues.

MRS. COOPER: Will you tell us what some of the leases are, for general public lease, as issued by the Department of Land and Natural Resources, that may be regarded as leases including large parcels of Hawaiian Homes Lands?

MS. PADEKEN: One large parcel on the Island of Kauai, the Kekala Sugar Ranch, for cultivation of sugar cane. That is about 10,000 acres.

With respect to the smaller parcels, I would have to check.

MS. PUTMAN: Is that in your annual report, Georgiana?

MS. PADEKEN: Yes. We are going to get that.

MRS. COOPER: Then my next question is: As the director of Hawaiian Homes, what impact has the awarding of Hawaiian Homes Lands that are set aside for the rehabilitation of Hawaiian people had on the purposes and intent of the Act? In other words, has it been in the best interests of the Hawaiian people to have the general public leases of lands, to non-Hawaiians?

MS. PADEKEN: Well, my personal opinion is that I -- let me just talk to you personally at this point.

The intent of the proponents of the Hawaiian Homes

Commission Act was that the rehabilitation of the native

Hawaiian would come about through -- through a land base.

And I suppose, if we follow that particular position, you

know, to its fullest, then, you know, I would have to agree

that all of these lands should eventually be in the hands of native Hawaiians.

I think that the fact that the department has had to general lease its lands out to the public has created a lot of animosity, especially since there are native Hawaiians who are still waiting to secure, you know, a piece of land for themselves.

And you know, I would have to say that the general leasing, you know, of these lands to the public has really not served the best interests of the -- at least, the spirit of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act.

But there are limitations also, and I can appreciate why the commission has had to go this route. When the Act was passed, the only revenues that came to the department were the revenues that were 30% of the revenues from the cultivation of sugar cane lands, and the water licenses. And these were revenues derived from State lands.

Okay. This was the only source of revenue that the Federal Government set aside, and it's -- this is rather ironic, because these were actually State lands that were eventually conveyed back -- actually, these were Federal lands conveyed back to the State of Hawaii.

And the Federal Government has not funded the program in any other way, except to say the revenues derived from these lands would go back to fund out -- to go towards the --

well, a portion, anyway, to the support of the Hawaiian Homes program.

All other proportions that the Department of Hawaiian

Home Lands have received have come through the State, through

legislative proportion.

We are required to provide the access, roads, utilities, to the properties. I think in time, the specifications of the native Hawaiian community has changed. It is no longer 1920.

Ironically, the original purpose of the Act was for agriculture and pastoral purposes. But it was discovered, as early as 1928, that native Hawaiians did not want to live in the rural areas; that they wanted to continue to remain in residential lots in urban areas, if possible, but still residential lots, as opposed to farming or cattle ranching.

And so consequently, today, 90% of our waiting list are individuals, native Hawaiians, who are wanting a piece of property to build a home, rather than wanting land to farm or to ranch.

MRS. COOPER: Would you say that the funds received from the leases on these properties, under the general public use, has been fair and equitable?

MS. PADEKEN: Well, if I had to assess it today, I would have to say: No. The really profitable general leases are few and far between.

these lands under the guise of an executive order. It is the subject of litigation at this point in time.

- MRS. COOPER: What would be the intention of the Hawaiian Homes Commission, relative to a possible land that was, by executive order, taken out of the Hawaiian Homes inventory, and is presently a large income-producing source for the State of Hawaii? Is there a recourse at this point?

MRS. COOPER: Well, let's suppose that there's a parcel of land located somewhere on one of these islands, and from which its present use is bringing into the State a very large sum of income.

MS. PADEKEN: Can you repeat your question again?

Now, what would be the recourse of the Hawaiian Homes Commission, relative to this particular land that was taken out of its inventory without compensation or --

MS. PADEKEN: What you are saying is that -- whether the commission would be open to considering exchange of lands presently under executive order, to State lands?

MRS. COOPER: Well, would the commission be open to that? Or would the commission be looking at the source of income from this particular land and maybe looking now to see, "What does this mean in terms of what we have not gotten previous to this? And what we ought to be getting now?

Because this is still our land."

MS. PADEKEN: Well, so that there would be some

present testimony on the role and function of my office in the administration, management and enforcement of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920, as amended.

The Board of Land and Natural Resources is an executive board, whose members are appointed by the Governor and whose nominations are subject to confirmation by the State Senate. The Chairman is a full-time employee of the State and heads the Department of Land and Natural Resources, which is charged with the management, administration and control of the public lands, water resources and minerals of the State.

The department also manages and administers the conveyances, State parks, historical sites, forest and fish and game programs of the State.

I might add that the Board of Land and Natural
Resources' functions and responsibilities are similar to
those of the Hawaiian Homes Commission in its relationship to
the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands.

When the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act was passed by Congress in 1920, certain territorial public lands were designated as "available lands" and assumed the status of Hawaiian Home Lands. These lands then came under the jurisdiction of the Hawaiian Homes Commission.

The Act specified, however, that those Hawaiian Home Lands not used directly in the Hawaiian Homes program could be leased out to the general public until such time as they

were required for Hawaiian Homes' own program.

Under the terms of the Act this leasing to the general public could not be handled by Hawaiian Homes itself, but was to be handled by the Commissioner of Public Lands, the predecessor of the Department of Lands and Natural Resources, in the same manner as were the Territory's public lands.

Approximately 70,500 acres of Hawaiian Home Lands were involved. All proceeds from the leasing of Hawaiian Homes Land were to be turned over to the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands as were 30% of all revenues from Territorial public lands in sugar cultivation and from water licenses (up to a maximum of five million dollars). About \$250,000 a year was turned over under this arrangement.

With the advent of Statehood in 1959, the Hawaiian

Homes Commission Act became a part of the State Constitution

and the responsibilities of the Commissioner of Public Lands

in respect to Hawaiian Homes Lands were assumed by the Board

of Land and Natural Resources.

All revenues received from the leasing out of Hawaiian Homes Lands by the Department of Land and Natural Resources were and are being turned over to the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands.

In addition, 30% of the revenues from State-owned sugar lands and water licenses were turned over to Hawaiian Homes until the five million dollar maximum was reached (for

the second time as authorized by legislative action for a total of ten million dollars) some years ago.

Since Statehood, the Legislature has authorized the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands to handle its own leasing to the general public of lands not immediately required for the Hawaiian Homes program.

Accordingly, as leases covering Hawaiian Homes Lands which have been issued by this department expire, we have been returning the lands involved to the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands.

We can anticipate that within the next few years the
Department of Hawaiian Home Lands will be handling practically
all the leasing (and collection) of their own lands.

The 1978 Hawaii State Constitutional Convention amended Article XI, Section 1 (now Article XII) of the State Constitution by providing that 30% of the receipts derived from the leasing of State-owned cultivated sugar lands and from water licenses shall be transferred to the Native Hawaiian Rehabilitation Fund, Section 213 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, for the purposes enumerated in that section.

It also provided that 30% of the State receipts derived from the lands cultivated as sugar cane lands on the effective date of the section shall continue to be so transferred to the Native Hawaiian Rehabilitation Fund whenever

one. And it reached a peak in '74-'75, with \$326,000 being turned over.

And from '74-'75, the amounts gradually became smaller \$206,000 in '75-'76. And in '77-'78, it reached about \$152,000.

One of the reasons the reduction is taking place is because more and more of the lands are being turned over to the control, the direct control, of the Hawaiian Homes Commission. That's for the available lands.

There's another source, what we would call Act 4, the Additional Receipts Fund. One interesting -- two interesting aspects here. When the ceiling was reached, the five million dollar ceiling that was in existence was reached in '72-'73, that year, \$116,000 was turned over.

The succeeding year, because the ceiling was reached, nothing came from this source; but the following year, '74-'75, the ceiling was lifted. And at that time, also, the price of sugar was way up. So because there's a percent on the gross of sugar receipts, about 1.9 million dollars from this source was turned over to the Hawaiian Homes Commission.

So in total, for the ten years that we went back to look at these two sources, approximately 5.9 million dollars was transferred to the Hawaiian Homes Commission.

Chairman Putnam, that concludes my testimony.

MS. PUTNAM: Thank you very much.

MR. MAXWELL: Okay. Then you are the right person to ask this question.

I was interested in -- well, this particular lease, I know a large acreage on Maui that have native fauna and flora, and it should be protected.

I asked Georgiana, and she was supposed to be checking, if she can get this information probably from you.

But how can this be protected? Some of the native fauna and flora that's on Hawaiian Homes land, which you have jurisdiction over?

MR. ONO: Mr. Maxwell, there is a current lease that's in effect, when you're talking about this particular parcel?

MR. MAXWELL: Right.

MR. ONO: Yeah. Okay. One of the things that we would look for right now, on the current conditions, is to see what the land is zoned for. Okay. If it's agriculture or urban or --

MR. MAXWELL: Pastoral lands.

MR. ONO: Uh-huh. And if the lease is to expire, let's say, within the next year or so --

MR. MAXWELL: Excuse me. 1989.

MR. ONO: 1989? Then if -- if you have a current lease in effect, and you want to change the conditions of the lease, that's going to become a legal problem.

MR. DETOR: I have got --

CARNAZZO COURT—REPORTING COMPANY, LTD.
SUITE 692 • ALEXANDER YOUNG BUILDING • HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813
SERVING HAWAII, THE PACIFIC BASIN AND THE FAR EAST
(808) 538-7174

MR. ONO: Jimmy, have you got any ---

	1	MR. MAXWELL: No, no. I'm talking about lease lands,
	2	that are already being leased. Like I said, if it's being
••	3	leased for \$50,000, does it go to the general fund of the
	4	State, or does it go directly to the Hawaiian Homes?
	5	MR. TAKIKAYA: Directly to Hawaiian Homes.
•	6	MR. MAXWELL: Directly to Hawaiian Homes. Thank you.
	7	That's all the questions I have for now.
	8	MS. PUTMAN: Excuse me. Would you wait for just a
	9	moment? We have a little change of parties. We have one
•	10	committee member leaving and another arriving.
- T-7	11	MR. MAXWELL: Madam Chairman, if I might just address
T	12	this? If the audience has a question, if they could write
-	13	it on a note and bring it up to us, we will ask the questions.
	14	MS. PUTMAN: Thank you.
	15	Did you have any more questions, Charles?
ŗ	16	MR. MAXWELL: No. Thank you, Mr. Ono.
	17	MR. KAUAHI: I have a question. This is in regards
	18	to the withdrawal clause. I just wanted to know specifically,
•	19	you know, what are some of the specifics of the clause? Does
:	20	it give the lessee a period of time? Or so many days, or
	21	what?
	22	MR. DETOR: Well, the leases have a provision in them
<u> </u>	23	that says that within one to five years notice this is
	24	generally what are in them Hawaiian Home Lands can be
	25	withdrawn and returned to the jurisdiction of the Hawaiian
. 🕶		

CARNAZZO COURT—REPORTING COMPANY, LTD.

SUITE 692 • ALEXANDER YOUNG BUILDING • HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813
SERVING HAWAII, THE PACIFIC BASIN AND THE FAR EAST

(808) 538-7174

lands.

1,77

Rather than hold up the leasing process, by agreement with Hawaiian Homes, we have sold the lease, but have reserved the right, together with Hawaiian Homes, to make the partition later on. And this will be done.

The monies will then be -- you know, if the accounts do not balance out properly, pursuant to whatever division is made at the time, it can be straightened out at that time.

MRS. COOPER: But why couldn't Hawaiian Homes Commission itself lease these lands out?

MR. DETOR: They didn't have -- they weren't legally able to do so until -- I forget what year. But it's been about -- oh, maybe eight, nine years ago, that the Legislature passed the bill which gave Hawaiian Homes the authority to lease out their own lands to the general public.

Up to that time, they didn't have the legal ability to do so.

MRS. COOPER: I see. And so, Mr. Ono, you say that in a few years, it's most likely that all of the land will be returned to Hawaiian Homes, and under its jurisdiction?

MR. ONO: That's right.

MRS. COOPER: What will necessarily have to happen before this result?

MR. ONO: Usually it's at the end of the lease that's in existence. You know, instead of changing the management, so to speak, of that particular lease, we let the current

1	lease run out; and then turn it over to Hawaiian Homes for
2	issuance or for whatever disposition that the commission
3	decides to make.
4	MRS. COOPER: And so in terms of the leases you now
5	have, and the termination of those lease periods, when do you
6	see the end of the perhaps the most of your leases?
7	MR. DETUR: Oh, it's just a few years. I don't think
8	there are any in existence, with the exception of the Kekala
9	one.
10	MRS. COOPER: Does this also mean that you will not
11	be negotiating for new leases
12	MR. ONO: Well, again
13	MRS. COOPER: on any properties of Hawaiian Homes?
14	MR. ONO: Only if we are requested to do so, to assist
15	the Hawaiian Homes Commission.
16	Otherwise, we would not get involved.
17	MR. DETOR: I can give you a classic example, I think.
18	Humuula,on Hawaii,Hawaiian Home Lands which were under leases
19	to Richard Smart. And that lease ran out several years ago.
20	You're talking about some 30,000 acres.
21	When that lease ran out, it was turned back to
22	Hawaiian Homes. They have since leased it out, directly.
23	But we have nothing to do with it.
24	MRS. COOPER: I see.
25	MR. DETUR: So right there, you see how your acreage

those leases were 999-year leases, which were awarded by the

MR. DETOR: Right, so-called homesteading. It --

24

Land Commissioner. They did not cover Hawaiian Home Lands, just State lands -- or Territorial lands at the time. 2 MS. PUTMAN: Right. 3 MR. DETOR: And they're no longer given out. MS. PUTMAN: Right. Do you know approximately how 5 much acreage, total acreage, those leases now encompass? 6 MR. DETOR: The ones still in existence? 7 MS. PUTMAN: Yes. 8 MR. DETOR: No, I don't. But I can get it for you. 9 10 We had a report prepared. 11 It's not extensive. You're talking about, really, mostly about one-acre, two-acre parcels, like that. There 12 are no big acreages, under the 999-year leases. 13 MS. PUTMAN: Yes. 14 MR. DETOR: And the reason for that is that Congress 15 passed an act some years ago which provided that people hold-16 ing those leases could purchase the fee, and gradually they 17 have been doing this over the years. 18 19 Now, I don't think that you have any homestead lease of that kind that covered a -- you know, a great amount of 20 21 acreage. Most of it, you're talking about, as I say, one, 22 two acres -- some even less. I do recall some on Hawaii of 25 acres, but I don't 23 recall any great big acreages given out in that manner. 24 25 And they're gradually being phased out, so that today

So in that sense --

MR. DETOR: There's an escalator clause. And the classic example, again, is when the sugar was so high. Gee, it was amazing, the difference in income between that year and the next.

MS. PUTMAN: So there is an escalator built in?

MS. PUTMAN: All right. The next question:

In the event the Legislature does not provide funding for administrative expenses -- that's for the Hawaiian Homes Commission, I assume -- will the present level of general leasing have to be maintained, at 122,000 acres? Have any initiatives been made to decrease the number of acres in general leases?

MR. DETOR: It's a hard -- I don't know what the question -- you know. I'm not familiar with the 122,000-acre limit.

A SPECTATOR: That question was actually directed to Georgiana.

MS. PUTMAN: That really should go more to her. All right.

A SPECTATOR: And the next one, too.

MS. PUTMAN: Yes. All right.

MRS. COOPER: Just one more question. Of the 17,000 acres you now have, are there parcels in those acres -- or acreages -- that are appropriate for homesteading for farm

and said, "You ought to exchange them with Hawaiian Homes, because most of the people who are occupying these lands, by permit from the State, basically, are Hawaiians."

But then, when we started looking at it, you know, if we were to exchange, these people aren't even on the list with Hawaiian Homes. So if we were to make an exchange, the chances are, they would be out, the people who are occupying them now.

This is one of the problems.

MRS. COOPER: All right.

MS. PUTMAN: Charles?

MR. MAXWELL: Well, Mr. Ono, could you explain -- you know, you are aware of the intent of the Hawaiian Homes Act, the regulations as to acquiring land or exchanging of land.

Could you explain to me the acquisition of an executive order type of thing, that was placed on land which is owned by the Hawaiian Homes?

MR. ONO: Yes. A number of years in the past, whenever -- I'm using State agencies as an example, just as an
example -- whenever State agencies, like the Department of
Education, or the Health Department, required additional
land, and the desired parcel was under the jurisdiction of
the Hawaiian Homes Commission, the practice was to seek an
executive order from the Governor, to have that particular
parcel transferred -- and I'm talking abou the day-to-day

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. DETOR: I don't think -- that's something that's in the courts right now, so -- you know. No answer to your question.

> Um-hmm. So we would have to wait for MR. MAXWELL:

CARNAZZO COURT-REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. SUITE 692 • ALEXANDER YOUNG BUILDING • HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813 SERVING HAWAII, THE PACIFIC BASIN AND THE FAR EAST (808) 538-7174

the courts, huh?

1	We haven't really brought that issue up before right
2	now.
3	-MR. MAXWELL: Uh-huh.
4	MS. PUTMAN: But I think that's the problem, to
5	decide whether it's something that has to be referred back
6	to Congress or not.
7	MR. MAXWELL: Yes. Because, you know well, what I
8	from what I gather, and the way many Hawaiians look at the
9	Act, is the 200,000 acres or so, as something that is given
10	to us by Congress.
11	Yet presently, we are not using it. So this is where
12	the animosity is.
13	So we are just trying to find the problem and where
14	it is, what can be corrected.
15	Thank you.
16	MS. PUTMAN: I have another question from the audience
17	When Hawaiian Home Lands is exchanged for other lands
18	and I gather there are evaluations made to see that there
19	some sort of equivalency how is that recorded?
20	Do you have any idea of how the evaluations are made,
21	to insure equity and equality? Do you have any ideas on
22	that?
23	MR. DETOR: By appraisal. This is something like
24	someone said, we have mutually agreed on an appraisor who,
25	you know, appraised all the lands.

1 And I think the Act says it has to be of equal value. 2 MS. PUTMAN: Is there some notation of that made in 3 the Bureau of Conveyances, for instance, on that land, so it .4 could be traced? Or --5 MR. DETOR: Well, there's no requirement that it --6 see, the Bureau of Conveyances, number one, is part of our 7 department. 8 MS. PUTMAN: Yeah, that's why I asked the question. 9 MR. DETOR: And secondly, the Division of Land 10 Management -- which is my function -- is also an office of 11 And all State government lands are in effect 12 recorded there. 13 MS. PUTMAN: I see. 14 MR. DETOR: So we don't -- unless we are specifically 15 asked to, we don't record with the Bureau. 16 Now, maybe some of these -- I don't know offhand if 17 any of these exchanges have been recorded with the Bureau; 18 but they certainly are on record in our department, as well 19 as in Hawaiian Homes' department. 20 MS. PUTMAN: So through your department, the original 21 Hawaiian Home Lands could be traced back, historically? 22 MR. DETOR: Yes, um-hmm. 23 MS. JAMES: Mr. Maxwell mentioned a point, in clari-24 fication between the Federal Government's responsibility and 25 the State government's.

MR. ONO: Not that specific.

23

24

25

MS. JAMES: This is from the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act itself. You don't --

1	MR. ONO: Although we do have offices here, Department
2	of Interior offices, like Fish & Wildlife.
3	MS. JAMES: Right.
4	MR. ONO: Those representatives are here.
5	MS. JAMES: But no one specifically on the Hawaiian
6	Homes staff?
7	MR. ONO: Not that I'm aware of.
8	MR. DETOR: I have never heard of any.
9	MR. ONO: There was another change that took place
10	very recently, under Secretary Andrus. He has designated
11	his personal as his personal representative to work out
12	of the West Coast I guess either Sacramento or San
13	Francisco; I don't know if
14	MS. JAMES: Yes, Sacramento, right.
15	MR. ONO: But again, specifically on
16	MS. JAMES: But not on specific
17	MR. ONO: Hawaiian Homes, to act as a sort of
18	liaison with the State of Hawaii and the Secretary's office.
19	MS. JAMES: All right. Thank you.
20	MS. PUTMAN: Are there any other questions by the
21	members?
22	Mr. Ono, and staff, thank you very much.
23	Okay. We will now take a break. It has been a long
- 24	and stimulating morning, and we will reconvene at 1:15. And
25	I hope all of you will be able to join us again.
	(The luncheon recess was taken at 11:45 a.m.) CARNAZZO COURT-REPORTING COMPANY, LTD.

(The luncheon recess was taken at 11:45 a.m.)

CARNAZZO COURT—REPORTING COMPANY, LTD.

SUITE 692 • ALEXANDER YOUNG BUILDING • HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813

SERVING HAWAII, THE PACIFIC BASIN AND THE FAR EAST

(808) 538-7174

Let me remind you that if there is anyone here who wants to make a statement to this committee, it will be limited to five minutes at the end of our scheduled speakers. We will be very happy to hear from you.

And in the meantime, if you can let Jeff know, so that we have an accurate list of anyone who wants to speak to us?

If you have information that you think would take longer than five minutes to present, if you submit it in writing, we will consider it, and it will be added to the official record of this consultation. Okay?

We are now very pleased to hear from Adelaide DeSoto. whom most of us refer to as "Frenchy." And Adelaide is going to be speaking to us as the Community Services Director of the Waianae community satellite.

I think you all know that she was a ConCon delegate and chaired the Committee on Hawaiian Affairs at our last

24

13

14

15

16

17

18

. 19

20

21

22

23

State Constitutional Convention.

So, Frenchy, the way we are proceeding is that each of the scheduled witnesses makes a presentation of about a half an hour, and then the committee members can ask questions after that. So you are scheduled for 45 minutes. Thank you.

MS. DeSOTO: Mahalo kakou.

Pat and members of the State Advisory Committee on Civil
Rights.

I am quite honored and fortunate, I feel, this afternoon, to come before you to show mana'o, in response to the letter I received from you.

And as I understand that letter, it was to share what transpired during the 1978 State Constitutional Convention, as that relates to native Hawaiians in Hawaii.

thing prepared, which is typical of me, I think -- but I would like to first start out by explaining to you the purview of the committee at the 1978 Constitutional Convention and the scope of the Hawaiian Affairs Committee.

That scope and perview was to provide constitutional

bases for the Native Hawaiian Affairs, which includes but is

not limited to the protection and perpetuation of ancient

Hawaiian rites, traditions, heritage and archeological sites;

Two, the implementation of native Hawaiian culture

CARNAZZO COURT—REPORTING COMPANY, LTD.

UITE 532 • ALEXANDER YOUNG BUILDING • HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813

SERVING HAWAII, THE PACIFIC BASIN AND THE FAR EAST

(808) 538-7174

. 7

2

3

.4

5

6

. .

10

11

13

14

15

jo.

18%

19 20

نابد خسور

22 (**)

and language -- meaningful implementation, and not just lip service --

Three, the preservation of native Hawaiian vegetation and crops;

Four, the recognition of problem areas common to native Hawaiians, and the constitutional provisions which seek to address such areas as education, social adaptation, economic opportunity and general improvements needed to provide for the betterment of native Hawaiian conditions;

And, of course, the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920, as amended.

The Committee on Hawaiian Affairs was a representation of a broad section of our social and economic strata in Hawaii. Not only did Hawaiians serve on that committee, but the committee members were made up of every group or ethnic representation in the State of Hawaii

As we know, the old Constitution, under Article XI, addressed itself simply to the Hawaiian Homes Act. The committee felt that after entertaining the acceptance of proposals to implement on the Act, to impact on the Act, that after a lot of deliberations, we came out with amendments that were passed by the committee as a whole.

Amendments that would, as an example, change one word, such as "may." "The Legislature may fund" to "The Legislature shall fund."

The rationale back of this one word change was that this was the only state department in Hawaii that was forced to lease out their lands to generate revenue to pay for their administrative costs.

We felt that this was very inequitable; we felt it was -- the committee felt that it was surely perhaps something that was overlooked, we hoped.

But nevertheless, our principal article is now called Article XII, in that we did include another article in the Hawaiian Homes Act. We found that although 200,000 acres — in our research and input by staff and different members of our broad community — 200,000 acres were set aside for the use of native Hawaiians as defined by the Act, those that had the blood quantum, that fit into the blood quantum requirement of being no less than half — of having no less than half of blood of races inhabiting the Hawaiian Islands prior to 1778 — that although 200,000 acres were set aside, we find that in 1978, only 28,000, approximately 28,000 acres were being utilized by native Hawaiians;

That twenty some odd thousand acres were lost. And when I say "lost," I mean that it's our opinion at the ConCon, the Committee of Hawaiian Affairs, that it is unaccounted for; and twenty-four to twenty-six thousand acres have been executive-ordered out of that land bank for highways, for beach parks, for a multitude of things; some of

 them were being leased by the Federal Government at 21 to 24 cents an acre.

And these are the kinds of revenues that the Department was expected to exist on. We felt that that was just atrocious.

- E

We also found that 113,000 acres, approximately -because, you see, prior to today, we didn't have any idea of
exactly how much land and where it was, prior to the convention -- that 113,000 acres was being leased out to nonnatives
under general leases, for industrial, economic development
and things of that nature; farming, large ranches.

I think the maximum amount of money that was being utilized -- or realized -- was approximately three point some odd dollars per acre. So, obstensibly, then, the committee felt that the Hawaiian Homes Act had built-in failures.

With that in mind, we tried to look at it, look at the Act, and look at how it could better serve the native Hawaiian, without jeopardizing their existing status.

It's well known among us Hawaiians that we are very, very nervous when someone wants to look at Hawaiian Home

Lands, which somebody wants to look at some of the few crumbs that we as native Hawaiians have in Hawaii.

Sometimes those kinds of fears cause us to act in several ways. One of the ways was for me to decide, at the very last minute, that perhaps I might not attend this

hearing, this consultation.

Those fears were allayed because I trust Pat Putman.

And I didn't know who the other members were, or certainly I would have contacted them to express the fears that have been going through the Hawaiian community, is that at that point in time, because of the Indian backlash in Washington, we did not want Congress to look at the Hawaiian Homes Act.

We may be more stable in the future, for them to look at it and perhaps to decide that it's a State responsibility. But as of 1978, we did not want to jeopardize the people who live on Hawaiian Home Lands.

The things that we found out about that department were just atrocious. I'm sure that most of us who have been -- you see, for me, it was a revelation, because I had never been into the department itself, and I hadn't been into the Act itself. I had just been an applicant for 33 years.

I had no idea. So what I found out, personally, was shocking: that although people have petitioned for the use of land, it went to someone else, a non-Hawaiian.

We tried to correct those things. We did not want to tie ourselves or tie the Department down, so we didn't mess with rules and regs.

In the beginning, we started to fool around with that; we wanted to set down some rules and regs, but we need some flexibility.

17 🕏

, 23 , 23 We felt, towards the end, the committee did, that to lock in the department to rules and regs in our Constitution would be in effect a crippling effect.

We recognized that the intent and purpose of our committee proposal was to provide the means to locate more Hawaiians on the lands specified for them through the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920, as amended.

And the committee learned that the Department of
Hawaiian Home Lands must finance its own program through the
general leasing of its lands, and that it is the only one
that has to do this, so the -- that is, of the seventeen
State departments, the only one which must fund itself.

Therefore, the land of any value, through the years, has been general leased for revenue purposes which are used by the department for its operating budget.

The committee argued that, in its eagerness for state-hood, the Territory made promises regarding Hawaiians and the Act that it would soon forget. Members concluded that consequently it had taken all too long to even arrive at Committee Proposal No. 11, which at the Constitutional Convention dealt with the Hawaiian Homes Act.

There were no nays heard to this committee -- no nay votes heard to this committee proposal. And the committee as a whole recommended adoption unanimously, almost, and passed it on the second reading.

22 .

24 🖟

We amended Section 1 of Article XI, in that we said that -- we tried to define -- you see, it was the feeling of the Hawaiian community, as we went statewide, that much of the things that -- let me back up a little bit.

Many of the things that were worked on at the Constitutional Convention did not occur at that point; they had occurred several months and years before, where people had met at an aha kaukana'wai to discuss, from all of the moku ai'nas -- that's all of the islands -- they had come together in a legislative body, to try to identify the needs of the Hawaiian community.

so many of that -- many of those proposals and recommendations for solutions -- problem-solving or solutions -- were initiated before. We just took them mana'o.

We said that in that Article XII, that the Legislature

-- we changed that section that says, "may from time to time

make additional -- and we said, "shall make sufficient sums

available for the purposes of -- "

We now tried to identify one systematic rehabilitation thing, where it was left up to whim. Whenever a director is put in there, the director determines what is rehabilitation.

It was never documented.

So consequently, the beneficiaries always suffer. One term, somebody will say, "Well, the way to rehabilitate a Hawaiian is to build 50,000 Hicks homes and throw them in

CARNAZZO COURT—REPORTING COMPANY, LTD.

SUITE 692 • ALEXANDER YOUNG BUILDING • HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813

SERVING HAWAII, THE PACIFIC BASIN AND THE FAR EAST

(808) 538-7174

So we attempted to outline some policies for the department. We said that, "Funds shall be made available for the purposes of the development of home, agriculture, farm and ranch lots; home, agriculture, aquaculture, farm and ranch loans; rehabilitation projects to include, but not limited to, educational, economic, political, social and cultural processes by which the general welfare and conditions of native Hawaiians are thereby improved; the administration and operating budget of the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands; in furtherance of (1), (2), (3) and (4) herein," and so on and so on.

So we say to the Legislature: "You have a fiduciary responsibility to that department, because of the Admissions Act, because of your trust agreement."

Because the committee thoroughly believed -- at least, up until the time that we adjourned -- that the State -- no, that the Hawaiian Homes Act, and provision for it, to have constitutional basis was an important factor in order to generate -- or achieve statehood. That was a condition of statehood.

We added a Section (B): "30% of the State's receipts derived from the leasing of cultivated sugar cane lands under any provision of law or from water licenses shall be transferred to the Native Hawaiian Rehabilitation Fund, Section

213 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, for the purposes enumerated in said section.

"30% of the State receipts derived from the leasing of lands cultivated as sugar cane lands on the effective date of the section herein shall continue to be so transferred to the Native Hawaiian Rehabilitation Fund whenever said lands are sold, developed, leased, utilized, transferred, set aside, or otherwise disposed of for purposes other than the cultivation of sugar cane. There shall be no ceiling established for the aggregate amounts transferred into the Native Hawaiian Rehabilitation Fund."

Now, I'm sure that the learned committee members are well aware of Sections 5b and 5f of the Admissions Act, that caused the money to be set aside for the use of Hawaiian Home Lands.

We also established eight special funds, and those special funds are called the Native Hawaiian Rehabilitation Fund, with those monies derived from the sugar cane lands. Even if they wiped out sugar cane and built houses, they have to give us that money.

We amended Section 204 of the Act, "(Controlled by

Department of 'available lands', return to Board of Land

and Natural Resources, when.) Upon the passage of this Act-"

We also amended Section 204, saying: "Any available land, including lands selected by the department out of a

larger area, as provided by this Act not leased as authorized by the provisions of Section 207 of this Act, may be returned to the Board of Land and Natural Resources (and may be leased as provided --)" No; we struck "(and may be leased by it as provided in Chapter 171, Hawaii Revised Statutes)," and said: "as provided under Section 212 of this Act."

What we tried to do was say: Before you lease the land out to nonbeneficiaries, make sure that you have satisfied the needs that -- you know, make sure that the beneficiaries get the opportunity to lease land.

Who says that a Hawaiian, a native Hawaiian, cannot -as an example -- go into economic development? Who says
that Hawaiians cannot form a hui as long as they are beneficiaries, petitioning for the use of that land, for welding
shops, for whatever it is? That's economic self-sufficiency.

And it is not historically and continuously for the rest of our lives being employed by other people. The lands are set aside for our use.

It was the committee's opinion that, with our agricultural lands, that diversified and cooperative types of agriculture businesses be allowed for the Hawaiians.

And to that end, that native Hawaiian, the beneficiaries of the native Hawaiians Homestead Act, is contributing to the breadbasket of this State.

4 5

6

8

7

10

11

12. 13

19

20

and what cannot be grown there, on a rotating basis. can envision a pie that is cut up in five sections, perhaps, with one refrigeration unit in the middle and one tractor.

So that we implement the ohana concept, reinforce that concept, and still contribute to the broader base of this state community.

Many of the land -- of the provisions that we have in here are said to have been self-serving. And since I have been accused of that all the time, I might as well get it I don't feel very regretful about any of this.

Perhaps history will prove me wrong, but we felt strongly that the department be expressly authorized to negotiate, prior to negotiations with the general public, the disposition of a lease; that the department make available to the native Hawaiians -- or organizations or associations owned or controlled by native Hawaiians -- for commercial, industrial, or other business purposes, in accordance with the procedures set forth herein."

And we also deleted one very important part: department shall not lease, use, nor dispose of more than 20,000 acres of the area of Hawaiian Home Lands, for settlement by native Hawaiians, in any calendar five-year period."

me said: "The department may, with the approval of the Governor -- " and we took that approval process out; we deleted the approval of the Governor, retained the approval

.

of the Secretary of the Interior.

The committee's original feeling was to delete that process also. It was when the committee was petitioned by Hawaiian homesteaders to leave that in as a check and balance that the committee decided to retain that.

"The department may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, in order to consolidate its holdings or to better effectuate the purposes of this Act, exchange the title to available lands for land, privately or publicly owned, of an equal value."

That is to say that if the department wanted to build a homestead program on Lanai, they may exchange private land area, so that the Hawaiians who live on Lanai may have an opportunity -- or Hawaiians who are beneficiaries -- to get homesteads.

We said that: "No such exchange of land publicly owned by the State shall be made without the approval of two-thirds of the members of the Board of Land and Natural Resources. For the purposes of this subparagraph, lands 'publicly owned' means land owned by a county or the State or the United States."

We said that -- what we did was amend another section.

We said that Hawaii Revised Statutes -- we said, "except --"

we deleted that, and we said: "provided that such lands may

not be sold, leased, set aside, used, transferred, or

T-9

otherwise disposed of except under a general lease only. Any lease by the Board of Hawaiian Home Lands hereafter entered into shall contain a withdrawal clause, and the lands so leased shall be withdrawn by the Board, for the purpose of this Act, upon the department giving at its option, not less than one nor more than five years' notice of such withdrawal; provided, that the minimum withdrawal-notice period shall be specifically stated in such lease."

Now, the thing that we -- that the committee talked about was to cause the leases to be retracted immediately. The committee also realized the economic impact, and we probably would be in court for the next two hundred years; but with the existing -- the leases that existed prior to our convention had withdrawal clauses, but they varied; and we don't want to cause an economic impact, a lessening of anybody's money from any race.

All we are saying is that: As your leases come up for renewal, the department, you negotiate with the beneficiaries first, so that everybody in Hawaii who is using -- especially the town of Hilo, a classic example, those businesses there.

Now, we need to talk about fair value, fair market value; yeah? And we need to look at all those things.

"Notwithstanding the provisions of Hawaii Revised Statutes Section 171-95, in the leasing of Hawaiian Home

Lands by the Board to a public utility or other governmental agency, where such use directly benefits the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands or the homestead lessees, the rental may be nominal."

That is because when we develop homesites, and the light company comes in and puts in the utilities and things like that, they service the Hawaiian community, the beneficiaries, so we say, "Yes, you can do that; you can allow the electric company, the water company, nominal rates. In all other instances, however, the lease rental shall be no less than the value determined in accordance with Hawaii Revised Statute Section 171."

And you attorneys know more about that than I do.
But what it does is, it says, "You get fair market value;
yeah?

"Any general lease of Hawaiian Home Lands, hereafter entered into by the Board, shall be null and void unless prior to the disposition of said lease by public auction, direct negotiation or otherwise, approval shall be obtained from the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands."

We amended Section -- or, we added a new section in the Constitution, but amended the Act, Section 221, by saying:

"Water systems in the exclusive control of the department shall remain under its exclusive control; if any

provision or the application of such provision is inconsistent with the provision contained herein, this section shall control.

"Water systems includes all real and personal property together with all improvements to the same, acquired or constructed by the department for the distribution and control of such water for domestic or agricultural use."

I would like to just briefly give you an example of the thinking of the committee at that point.

We had found out in our research, as an example, that the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands had constructed a water reservoir over on the Big Island.

Immediately upon completion of that reservoir and water systems, it was given over to the County of Hilo.

Below this water system existed old agricultural lots, 40-acre plots.

If you can envision a mountain (indicating) that has a reservoir? Okay. A well was dug, and the water was tapped, and the whole system was built.

Below here (indicating) on the flats were agricultural lands, ten 40-acre lots. When this water system was completed, it was given over to the County of Hilo.

The County of Hilo immediately diverted the water away from the Hawaiians down here (indicating), and then the director at that time went back to these homesteaders and

3

5

6 7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

said, "You are not developing your land to its maximum capability. So consequently, you'll have to surrender the land."

So we said, "Where there's water -- " and I think we have only two existing systems in the whole department, and one is on Molokai, and that's so that Maui County doesn't get tourist happy over in Molokai -- we said that the department keeps that water forever.

Well, of course, that is contingent upon whether or not the courts find out that the water system belongs to individuals; and in that case, Hawaiian homesteads will be all right, or if it belongs under the jurisdiction of the State, it will still be all right.

So many of the proposals that came out of the committee dealt not only with Hawaiian Home Lands, it dealt with education.

In going statewide, the heavy, heavy appeal to the committee was for changes in -- for the Hawaiians. As an example, it was to our dismay, the committee's dismay, to find out that the Hawaiian language was in the foreign language department of the University of Hawaii. like throwing salt in an already-gaping wound; insult to If anything, English is the foreign language.

So then, we did something symbolic. We pushed to have the Hawaiian language recognized as one of the two

languages of Hawaii. We also said that the Department of Education -- which historically has not addressed the needs of the native Hawaiian community, until this date; although there are attempts, however, in all honesty, to address our unique problems of education -- but the hit-and-miss attitude of the Department of Education with respect to education is grotesque.

And for many of the committee members -- and I know I risk sounding like I'm a radical -- but the feeling was that it is done because if you take away our language, you take away our souls. Our eyes have no sight. The kaunoa is lost forever; and we will float, like dead sponges, upon the sea.

So we felt that we needed to incorporate in our educational system the mana'o of the kupuna.

And I have to say, in front of my brothers and sisters, that this amendment was compromised. I compromised, in that the union had propagandized the other members; and I was afraid that we would lose the entire amendment.

So what the amendment does say now is that, "The

Department of Education shall provide for teaching, the

learning of the Hawaiian language and history in the schools."

And that instead of saying the kupunas, we tried to give -- you know, the unions are hung up on the accreditation; we have always got to play the palapala game.

It's like my trying to tell a Filipino chef how to

cook dinuguong.

But there was a lot of -- a lot of resistance to giving the kupuna any kind of stature. And so the compromise came, and we said that the use of community expertise shall be encouraged in a suitable and essential manner, in furtherance of Hawaiian language, culture, and history.

We also talked about traditional and customary rights.

This was another compromise. We talked about the right of

native Hawaiians, access to the mountains and to the ocean.

We talked about the kuleana lands; we talked about a lot of things.

But one thing was glaringly clear to the committee: that constitutional basis needs to be given to traditional and customary rights.

And we said, "The State reaffirms and shall protect all rights possessed by tenants of an ahupua'a, who are decendents of native Hawaiians, who inhabited the Hawaiian Islands prior to 1778 -- "you see, even us were caught up in that garbage -- "that are customarily and traditionally exercised for the subsistence, cultural and religous purposes, subject to the right of the State to regulate the same.

"Subject to the right of the State to regulate the same" is the compromise. And if anybody is interested in asking me why, I think it's obvious; yeah?

- 24 - 25

That we do not have religious freedom in Hawaii as
Hawaiians, because our religion takes us to the aina. And
the United States of America continuously will not recognize
our rights of religous freedom.

We also talked about quieting title. In Hawaii we have a law that legally licenses thievery. It's called "adverse possession."

And it's been going on for generations.

In testimony, in Kona, we had one kupuna stand, and
I need to tell you that -- and I say this only for the purposes of the staff understanding, because most of the people
here know that this went on for too long -- we had a kupuna
stand before us. Now, our people do not -- or have not in
the past -- come out and publicly testified to whomever
about whatever; it is not very Hawaiian to air your grievances
in public, because it doesn't have that aka; it doesn't have
that essence of love and respect in many instances -- not to
reflect negatively on today's proceedings.

But that's the truth. Because you are required to present 25 copies of testimony, five sets of fingerprints, whatever the critique is. It discouraged our people from participating in the past.

You see, we are lucky now. We are getting our act together.

So that this kupuna said, in front of the committee,

"Somebody please help me. My father and my father's father lived on this kuleana land. Now, the hotel come and put this big fence. I say, 'Oh, somebody make mistake,' because that's how I go to the ocean every day, to momoe, na upena, to lay my net.

"But now I look, da big fence. So I climb over the fence, and I throw my net over. I climb over the fence. I say, 'Maybe I see the boss, I go tell him make mistake, how I get to water now?'"

And when he got over there and was on his way to the beach, he was arrested for trespassing. He went to court. He was fined \$50 for trespassing and received 30 days in jail.

He's a kupuna, almost 80 years old. And I don't have to say that the entire committee just bust out crying, to realize that these things still occur in Hawaii today.

He said, "I don't beg, but now I cannot go catch fish.

I'm forced to go to the market. I'm on retirement. I

receive \$204 a month. I cannot pay the price for fish today."

That type of testimony was heard statewide. State-wide.

With respect to the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands, one kupuna on Molokai, at Hoolehua, we had the hearing, and she said to us -- and it was not only the Hawaiian Affairs

Committee; it was a lot of other committees -- she said,

(808) 538-7174

of this, and if you brought them in one by one and questioned them, they'll tell you the same thing, for the people in Hawaii - 1978, I'm talking about.

For the native Hawaiian to come and beg for help -my God, we are in big trouble. No wonder we've got so many
problems in Hawaii now.

We talked about rights; we talked about many things. We gave constitutional bases for a lot of things.

Many things, quite frankly, I thought that the general public was not ready for. But most of the things are documented: the things which impact on Hawaiians; the things that will impact on, say, Waianae -- such as education. If the Department of Education does -- I wish you folks could come to Waianae, as an example, where 51% of the population is Hawaiian.

"We always kicked out from Honolulu --" myself included -- "because we couldn't continue to pay the rates in Honolulu."

And many people who live on other areas on Oahu look at Waianae as a Hawaiian community; right?

So now, we hear talk in the State about housing developments for us poor Hawaiians.

What we also did -- I'm carried away now, E kala mai -- I'm sorry, Pat; not very professional.

We also established, at the Constitutional Convention,

4 5

6 7

8

10

12

11

£ 400

19

20

21

22 23

we gave basis to OHA. Now, the concept of OHA is very controversial. There are members in the Hawaiian community who disagree with the Office of Hawaiian Affairs.

The committee thought very strongly that we could not -- there were recommendations made from the Hawaiian community, for us to -- for the committee to give constitutional basis to establish perhaps another entity, a private entity, manned by Hawaiians out of the community, for the receipt of the trust corpus, which is 5f.

We set that corpus forth, and we say: "Our prorata share, if we identify the five purposes as public, schools, education, parks, home development -- and one of those five purposes under the Act was for the betterment of the conditions of native Hawaiians, native Hawaiians as identified by the Hawaiian Homes Act, which means that these Hawaiians would have to be 50% Hawaiian or more." Okay?

So we are saying if there's five purposes -- indeed, there are only two: the general public, and native Hawaiian.

This past Legislature gave substance to the idea of the Office of Hawaiian Affairs. And I would like to share with you my mana'o about what happened at the Constitutional Convention committee -- okay? -- so that you can get an idea from the very -- from the aka about why.

The committee members realized that in many instances, nd with all good intents and purposes, there are a lot of

Γ

people who are not native Hawaiian, who have been making our decisions and have been making policy for us.

The Hawaiian Homestead is a good example of that.

Congress gave birth to that, in conspiracy with Kuhio and the sugar interests; but they didn't give one dollar. They gave birth to that illegitimate child in the Western concept, you see, because in the Hawaiian concept, there is no illegitimacy; that all children -- one of the things that we need to address among ourselves is the realization that every child is a valuable child in Hawaii, whether they were born under the sanction of a church or not. They're still very valuable.

So the Office of Hawaiian Affairs was conceived at the 1978 Constitutional Convention. If you look at all the resources that the State develops, that the Federal Government develops under Native Americans -- right? -- all of a sudden, we have now become a Native American. The Hawaiian community has become Native Americans.

So because there's a lot of existing legislation that impacts on American Indians, they have linked us together with that.

So now, the Indians and the Hawaiians are native

Americans. Everybody else -- you guys -- are not natives.

(Laughter.)

So there's a lot of money that's being generated up

in Congress for us. We were saying that we need to have a vehicle that would identify existing resources for us, co-ordinate those resources, with no overlapping; spend wisely the dollar thirty-eight; take care of it.

And who else should be better qualified to take care of their own business but the native Hawaiian?

Out came this dream, that is now a reality. We are saying now that the -- you know, it's no sense to argue the concept of OHA now, whether it's good or bad. Because it is a fact. The last Legislature implemented the election process.

The election process deals with native Hawaiians electing native Hawaiians to form a board, who then would in turn hire an executive director to run the Office of Hawaiian Affairs.

Okay. They will be elected -- one must be elected from each island, and then -- I forget right now -- either four or five shall be elected at large.

You see, we are not -- we address this thing not looking at whether we are -- we, as Hawaiians, are an ethnic group.

No, we address this, in looking at prevention treatment that has been extended the native American Indians.

Congress has set precedent, as an aboriginal class of people.

And we are not looking at native Hawaiians with this respect:

that we are doing this for a particular ethnic group. We are doing it for a class of people.

The Office of Hawaiian Affairs is indeed -- was indeed created to become a public trust.

And again, history will show whether or not it's going to be effective for us.

We said that, in order to register to vote, you must be of Hawaiian ancestry. It doesn't matter what quantum. You must be a resident of the State of Hawaii, and you must, of course, be a citizen of the United States, 18 years of age by November 5th of 1980.

Nine members to be elected statewide; four State residents at large, one from Hawaii, one from Maui, one from Molokai, one from Kauai, one from Oahu.

And I really am sorry at this point that we did not include Niihau. And I don't remember, really, how that came about. I feel very sad about that.

And the four board members receiving the highest number of votes in the 1980 election will serve the four years; the remaining five members will serve for two years.

And the Committee on Hawaiian Affairs looked at the Office of Hawaiian Affairs as the nucleus, the malulani, because Congress has historically divided the Hawaiian people, because of blood quantum requirements. We look for the Office of Hawaiian Affairs to become a malulani, for that

CARNAZZO COURT—REPORTING COMPANY, LTD.
SUITE 692 • ALEXANDER YOUNG BUILDING • HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813
SERVING HAWAII, THE PACIFIC BASIN AND THE FAR EAST
(808) 538-7174

lokahi.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

We also see the Office of Hawaiian Affairs -- and this has not been written anywhere here, nor will you ever find it written, except today -- that the Office of Hawaiian Affairs will develop, hopefully, some political leaders.

Now, that makes a lot of people frightened; that frightens a lot of people.

Historically, we find that the native Hawaiian has not participated in the voting process, because of many reasons. And all of them, I'm sure this committee has heard before.

But for the information of the staff, some of the feelings, strong feelings that prevailed, even in some of our large Hawaiian communities, is that: "What the heck? don't participate or vote, for they going to do what the hell they like anyway."

Okay. So they're disenfranchised from the existing political system. So we need to cultivate that. We need not that disenfranchisement, but we need to cultivate the Hawaiian community, so that they can get ma'a; they can go out and participate and don't be frightened.

You see, because all of the other programs are Band-I'm talking about from the na'au, that unless'you can impact on any political level, you are going to always be subjected to somebody else's whim and interpretation.

> CARNAZZO COURT-REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. SUITE 692 . ALEXANDER YOUNG BUILDING . HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813 SERVING HAWAII, THE PACIFIC BASIN AND THE FAR EAST (808) 538-7174

÷.

I'm not saying: Take over the system. Because there are many, many native Hawaiians, and many nonnative Hawaiians, who are more Hawaiian than some of us with the blood; they have the Hawaiian essence, and they love us, and we love them. We love all people, you see.

But until we begin to develop some political clout, we are not going to impact at all; and that we will continually have to demonstrate on the runways of our airports, on the different mokuainas: Makua Valley and Kahoolawe and in other areas.

So that the Office of Hawaiian Affairs, hopefully, will not be seen as the only solution, but certainly a major cog in the wheel that will turn for the betterment of our people.

So that they do have the choice. They can't continually, for the next two hundred years, say, "The politicians did it all."

They didn't screw us. You have now the opportunity before the native Hawaiian to participate.

Because you can't take away the system. You can improve; you can impact; you can undermine. But you can't abolish the system.

But you do have a choice. So that when someone goes
-- you know, the Legislature is a unique body of people, in
that they are capable of doing this to Hawaiians -- because

T-10

I know firsthand. You go there with a proposal to implement at the Legislature, and they tell you, "Do all you Hawaiians agree on this?"

You know, that's kind of an unfair question; right? Well, we agree, insofar as the rest of you people agree on the issue of abortion.

Yeah, we are always asked to get our act together. We must come in, you know, with one voice. And that's ridiculous.

But I do need to inform this committee that the Office of Hawaiian Affairs is not received with open arms by the entire Hawaiian community. And that's because I have not had the money to be on each island, after the ConCon, to be able to answer any kind of question with respect to it.

We need to look at some of these symbolic things that were done at the Constitutional Convention. Another one was the adoption of a resolution calling for the return of Kahoolawe. We were given notice that we had overstepped our bounds. (Laughing.)

But the committee as a whole did pass the resolution, calling for the return of Kahoolawe to the State of Hawaii, for a cultural island, to be retained for cultural purposes.

I know I ramble, Pat.

MS. PUTMAN: Oh, no. We have gone a little bit over, but it's not by any means that I'm sorry about it.

1	I just wanted to ask one question.
2	Is Ronald Albu here?
3	MR. ALBU: (Indicating.)
4	MS. PUTMAN: Do you mind waiting a little bit?
5	MR. ALBU: No, that's fine.
6	MS. PUTMAN: Thank you very much.
7	MS. DeSOTO: Thank you, Ron.
8	MS. PUTMAN: Frenchy, you have told us so many things
9	I know there will be a few questions, but I wanted to say
10	just one thing:
11	In general, this committee from this State is an
12	advisory committee to the United States Commission on Civil
13	Rights, which is advisory to the President of the United
14	States and to the United States Congress.
15	We can make recommendations, both as they affect
16	State laws and State policies and administration, as well as
17	federal.
18	Now, at one point you expressed your apprehension
19	about calling too much attention to, for instance, Hawaiian
20	Homes Commission on the part of the Federal Government.
21	One of the previous witnesses did make some recommend-
22	ations that would affect the Federal Government. So I
23	thought maybe I should clarify this.
24	It was Winona who was saying perhaps we might want to
25	look and see what kind of assistance could be obtained under

the native American genus with respect to HUD, in housing and assisting in maintenance as implementation of the residential homesteads and such.

What I guess I'm asking you is: Would you object to that kind of a recommendation coming from this committee, if we were to decide that?

MS. DeSOTO: Pat, I think that I'm not really to say yea or nay, because I don't know the substance of that recommendation.

MS. PUTMAN: Yeah.

MS. DeSOTO: However, I would like just to give a little bit more mana'o, in that I hope that this committee, whatever issues derive out of what has been gleaned from this consultation, that because it impacts on Hawaiians, that it be taken to the Hawaiian communities, where the people would have an opportunity, so that you are not hearing only Winona and Frenchy and my other sister, Georgiana.

MS. PUTMAN: And Charles.

MS. DeSOTO: Yeah, whatever. That it be taken --

MS. PUTMAN: And then this is --

MS. DeSOTO: -- out to the communities, so that before, you know, you make your final recommendation, that you would have had as much input as possible.

There are a lot of people who would like to come today, but were not invited.

1	MS. PUTMAN: Could you explain that a little more?
2	MS. DeSOTO: Okay.
3	MS. PUTMAN: For instance, I can see taking it to
4	Oahu, but when you say to take it to the entire Hawaiian
5	community, that looks to me like a
6	MS. DeSOTO: Unwiėldy?
7	MS. PUTMAN: Well, I'm not quite sure what the
8	dimensions are.
9	MS. DeSOTO: Okay. I'm assuming that this committee
10	will develop a single issue or, glean everything, and
11	then identify a particular problem; hmmm?
12	MS. PUTMAN: Uh-hmm.
13	MS. DeSOTO: So that you will identify the problem,
14	and then perhaps come up with some recommendations; is that
15	correct
16	MS. PUTMAN: Yes.
17	MS. DeSOTO: as an assumption?
18	Okay. Now, that problem and those recommendations
19	for correcting the problem, could we not take it to once
20	in Maui? Twice on the Big Island, Kona and Hilo, because of
21	the geographic size of that island? Once on Molokai?
22	MS. PUTMAN: Waianae? Waimanalo?
23	MS. DeSOTO: Yeah, that's what I am saying. So that
24	we could say here: We have identified this as the problem,
25	and these are the recommendations for the solution.

MS. PUTMAN: I would point out that the composition of this committee does include people from -- certainly from Maui, from Hilo and from Kauai; but not from every island.

Well, we have your recommendation on that. I can't say that, necessarily, we will be able to, because we don't necessarily have that kind of funding and resource facility.

But we will think about it.

I just wanted to get your general feeling about this relationship to the Federal Government.

I have some more questions, but I am going to defer to the other members of the committee first.

Charles?

MR. MAXWELL: Yes. I think -- which I am in favor of her recommendation -- what actually she means is: The recommendations we as a body make, before those recommendations are acted upon, that we go to basically the Hawaiian community to get their feelings, if they are in agreement with the recommendations.

Now, maybe some of the staff members can clarify that, because my concern was going to be her concern that she voiced earlier, is also my concern, about this process that we have.

MS. PUTMAN: No, I think our recommendations will be based on the background work that we have done in reading, and from what we hear here; and it's not only Winona. We

have had a number of very knowledgeable people who have been and will continue to testify today.

But I think we -- maybe you can help me, Phil, but -- MR. MONTEZ: No.

MS. PUTMAN: -- but our recommendations are made on the basis of this consultation, with an indication of where more work needs to be done.

MR. MONTEZ: I don't think you have to put yourself in a box of having to make any recommendations, if it isn't necessary. If there's such diversification among the community, maybe it is better for the committee not to make any recommendations, and just go on the record to assist the community in doing what they have to do with the record.

So it's not necessary to make recommendations.

MS. DeSOTO: The only thing that I tried to express is that, too often, federal bodies sit and make all kinds of recommendations, with no input --

MR. MAXWELL: No maka ai nana.

MS. DeSOTO: Yeah. So consequently, we are always going to have the problem, you know. So I -- I don't know where the direction is for you folks right now. But I just wanted to show you mana'o, Pat, and the committee, so that I you -- you know, if you are going to take it over somewhere, let the people have a whack at it.

MS. PUTMAN: Well, I think one thing that could be

very specific, in staying away from the Federal Government for this purpose, is the result of your committee's work at ConCon, and the amendments to our State Constitution.

This last session of our State Legislature, the implementing legislation was begun. It is not completed yet.

MS. DeSOTO: Yeah.

MS. PUTMAN: We would like to know: What are your recommendations, as chairperson of that ConCon committee, of what further implementing legislation we need in the State, to carry out the direction that came from the ConCon proposals?

MS. DeSOTO: Okay. The committee was not -- is not thoroughly satisfied with the legislation that was enacted and is being implemented. The voting -- or the process for registration and voting -- is okay. But we felt -- some of us in the Hawaiian community felt -- that it may be premature to start taking an uku comb and looking at the words, and start messing with the words; that it is there; OHA is there.

We need to now focus on developing the political clout that may change the words later down. That is, to register the Hawaiians for voting for OHA.

Incidentally, for your information purposes, Peola Sylva is in the back to register people from Oahu County, Honolulu County.

And we need to look at the next step, which is setting

forth, identifying that percent of the trust corpus that 1 would be used by OHA for native Hawaiians, as defined by 2 the Act. So this is where we should be focusing, I think. 3 Now, the community has not been able to secure any 4 funds -- like yourself -- to do this statewide; to go out 5 and ask people, "What do you think about that?" or, "What 6 7 would you like to see happen? How much -- what do you think is a fair share of those monies?" and things like that. 8 9 But it's just that I -- you know, Pat, I have seen so many government agencies and representatives of them come in 10 and -- what it ends up is that they interpret what we need. 11 They tell us what's the best thing for us. 12 And then, twenty years later on, we're still screwed. 13 So that's all I'm saying. You know. 14 MS. PUTMAN: Frenchy, not by me. 15 (Laughter.) 16 17 Frenchy, you were talking about emphasis on your religous rights and your educational --18 19 MS. DeSOTO: Right. 20 MS. PUTMAN: -- rights. 21 MS. DeSOTO: Right. I think that has to be explored. 22 And I think some of your committee members will agree with me that -- you know, Pat, as a girl growing up, I went to 23 what was commonly called, in those days, an English-standard 24 school. Would you believe? 25

Do you remember that, Mrs. Morinaga?

MRS. MORINAGA: I do.

MS. DeSOTO: And where the English language was stressed. And I was forbidden to speak the Hawaiian language.

And for those who did, the stigma of being indolent, stupid, and nonconforming, et cetera, et cetera -- all of those negative labels were placed on our people.

And what you see today is probably with our opio pio, some of the byproducts of that kind of attitude.

So if we are looking towards the broader community in Hawaii, I think that I don't need to tell you about -- sometimes the feelings are quite emotional, about the things that have happened to us as native Hawaiians, throughout history -- and that still occur in Hawaii today.

Give us a chance to learn our language and our school systems. Make those systems workable for us.

In Waianae the kids are being graduated out of high school with a piece of paper saying that they graduated; and you know, they can't even fill out a job application.

We're talking about not quantity of education; we're talking about quality. We're talking about the rights of one -- anyone, any human being in the face of the world -- that wants to go to Halemaumau and practice a religous form of worship; that they should be allowed that.

I think our Constitution grants us religous freedom, and the Hawaiian people have -- who practice their ancient religions, insofar as they're able to determine what those religions are today, because there's indeed some confusion -- but that they be allowed access to the aina.

Now, a lot of people read kauona into that.

I'm saying: "Let them go, if they want to, to Kahoolawe, if that's where they want to." But Kahoolawe is not the only place.

In our National Park systems, we are not allowed to go in and take some of the material there for our medicinal purposes that is being practiced today. That's a federal offense.

So, some of the recommendations perhaps that come out of this committee is, you know, that somebody better start looking, looking at us, and recognize some of our needs.

MS. PUTMAN: Charles, you have a question?

MR. MAXWELL: Yeah. I might be out of order, but all I want to -- I want to say is that I want to praise Frenchy for taking the bull by the horns, even though she said she compromised. But in compromising, I think we got to the root of the problem, and some of the problems will be solved.

So don't feel that you have compromised. And I commend you.

MS. DeSOTO: Thank you.

CARNAZZO COURT—REPORTING COMPANY, LTD.

SUITE 692 • ALEXANDER YOUNG BUILDING • HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813

SERVING HAWAII, THE PACIFIC BASIN AND THE FAR EAST

(808) 538-7174

MS. PUTMAN: Okay, Frency. I have two rather specific questions.

One, you mentioned that in the recommendations on changes to the Hawaiian Homes Act, that you first thought about it, and then changed your mind, and did want to maintain a relationship with the Secretary of the Interior.

I would like you to amplify on that a little bit.

And the other one is: Will there be a regular working relationship between the Office of Hawaiian Affairs and the Hawaiian Homes Commission?

MS. DeSOTO: Okay. I'll answer your last question first, in that that's relatively easy to answer.

Yes, indeed. That was our intent. If you read the legislation, you'll find that we have made provisions to encompass or take over lands.

Now, the committee felt that, pretty soon, in Hawaii, there's going to be a large hue and cry about so-called tax monies being used for a specific ethnic group; okay?

I think that's clear. So the committee -- remember, we are not made up of all Hawaiians; I think there were three or four of us there; the rest were of every racial extraction -- felt that we better start developing a vehicle to retain those lands for the use of Hawaiians, to -- also, to become a receptacle in the event that the pie-in-the-sky lands, which is reparations -- okay? -- and because we spoke

to congressional members, and they said that one of the problems is that there's no vehicle in this State to do that.

So, the Office of Hawaiian Affairs certainly -- which, incidentally, I don't think I need to tell you, the entire congressional committee agreed with the concept of OHA, of the Office of Hawaiian Affairs.

And they encouraged us to pursue it. And we saw, as a committee, the necessity to work very closely with Hawaiian Homes, because of the trust corpus within the 5f Section, that identifies the native Hawaiian by blood quantum.

So there has to be that relationship.

Now, with the first question, what was the first question?

MS. PUTMAN: It related to the relationship with the Secretary of the Interior.

MS. DeSOTO: Okay. Originally, we thought — the committee thought, on representation by the staff, that we ought to take away all those — all those things, because it has been cumbersome in the past, where lands have been exchanged for fire departments, health — comprehensive health clinics, et cetera, and the consummation of that swap of lands has not occurred.

Oh, some land has been "exchanged," some 25 years a But in reality, it was never consummated. The department gave out the lands, but never received the swap.

So, because it's stuck up there at this time, the department is saying that it's stuck up there at the federal level.

So the committee says, "Well, why do we need to continue that process? And why do we need the approval of the Governor?" and all this and that.

So we said, in proposed amendment, that we would eliminate those two processes. And the homesteaders themselves pointed out to us that, "We need a check and balance through the Secretary of the Interior," even though that process was slow, so that an unscrupulous commission may not readily start swapping out lands, and never getting any return, and that kind of thing.

So the committee agreed with the position of the -- I think it was the Papakolea homesteaders -- that that process was needed.

MS. PUTMAN: All right. Do you have any questions, staff?

Again, thanks very much.

MS. DeSOTO: I want to thank each and every one of you, especially Jeff. And I haven't met the young lady yet --

MS. PUTMAN: Sally.

MS. DeSOTO: Yeah. But I want to thank you very much for the opportunity to share with you -- I certainly think this is what I have been doing, is sharing with you. Some

of it was nana'o'io, and some of it palapala. But I'm grateful for this opportunity, Pat, and to your committee members.

Mahalo. And if I have offended anyone, please forgive me, because that was not my intent. Mahalo.

MS. PUTMAN: Our next speaker will be Ronald Albu, staff attorney for the Legal Aid Society of Hawaii.

Ronnie, I think you've been sitting here for some time but I'll go through our proceedings again with you.

The general policy has been for each scheduled witness to speak for approximately a half an hour -- or, as long as they wished -- and then the committee members to ask questions.

MR. ALBU: Okay. Fine. I'm sorry I couldn't be here this morning, but I have been in court, so -- I'm also going to be speaking somewhat extemporaneously. I didn't prepare any specific notes, because I didn't know what you would have heard already.

But let me tell you something of my involvement with the Hawaiian Homes Commission program, which I understood to be the primary inquiry here.

I and some other attorneys that I work with represent the Keokelopana or community association over on the Big
Island. And we got involved when the homesteaders over there discovered that 25 acres of their prime farm land was going to be dug up and covered with concrete for a flood control

under the provisions of the Act.

2 3

1

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Upon investigation into the transfer of land, we found out a number of things: Number one, back in 1962, the County of Hawaii had gone to the commission and asked them if they could have 12 acres of Hawaiian Home Lands, for which an equivalent amount of land in value would be made available to the commission from State lands -- not Hawaiian Home Lands.

The homesteaders were understandably upset, because

they had been trying for years to get that land surveyed out

and parceled out to them, so they could go ahead and farm it

But that land in exchange had never been obtained. There wasn't even any paper work that had been started on an exchange, and no land had been identified.

Well, the Hawaiian Home Lands are held in trust by the State of Hawaii. One of the conditions of statehood imposed by the United States was that the State accept the program and administer it as a trust for the people of native Hawaiian ancestry.

Now, a legal trust is a very severe legal standard. A trustee has to take care of property as strictly as he Would care for his own. He can't give it away; he has to maximize the benefits of that property for the beneficiaries. And he can't let anybody else use it.

If anybody else does use it, it has to be legal, and

1 they have to get income for that use. 2 What we had here, however, was the land was given to the County; no land was even in the foreseeable future to 3 come back in exchange. And County had already started rip-4 5 ping it up. They had asked for 12 acres, and we found out by the 6 time they were through, they would take 25 acres. 7 So, the Chairman of the commission was asked to do 8 something about it, and her response was, "We have more 9 10 important things to do. We have some houses with mildew on them that need repainting," and so on. 11 So, we brought suit in the United States District 12 13 Court. The judge was Judge Dick Yin Wong, who passed away about a year ago. The suit was brought in 1975, and Judge 14 15 Wong found that the Hawaiian Homes Commission and the State had breeched their trust obligations to native Hawaiians in 16 17 four different ways: They had failed to hold the trust property for the 18 benefit of the native Hawaiians; 19 They had failed to obtain any income from it; 20 They had failed to obtain the approval of the Governor 21 22 and the Secretary of the Interior; and They had failed to hold that property for the 23 beneficiaries. 24 Okay. Well and good. The Hawaiian Homes Commission 25

took an appeal to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeal, and the Ninth Circuit held that Judge Wong did not have the power to hear that case, because, it said, native Hawaiians do not have the right to bring suit to protect the Hawaiian Home Lands; that only the United States of America can bring that suit.

So now, the beneficiaries' hands are tied behind their backs.

We learned some other interesting things in that lawsuit. Number one, not only was the 25 acres involved here
not following the land exchange process, but since 1962, more
than 1700 acres of Hawaiian Home Lands were being used by
State and County agencies, for which no land exchange had
ever been consummated.

Since Judge Wong issued his decree in 1976, as far as I know, no lands have yet been exchanged in return for the lands being used.

I brought with me an annual report from the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands for 1976-77, because it's somewhat complete, in terms of accounting for the lands.

And the figures there I find a little bit disturbing. We find that, first of all, the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act says there are 203,000 acres; only about 190,000 are accounted for.

One example, Waimanalo, there's supposed to be 4,000

acres of Hawaiian Home Lands, but the State only shows on its books 2,000, about half of what's supposed to be there.

Where did the other half go? Okay.

Of that approximately, let's say, 200,000 acres of Hawaiian Home Lands, native Hawaiians are presently occupying as homesteaders 25,000 acres, about an eighth of the total lands.

About 125,000 acres of those lands are being used by non-Hawaiians: Federal, State, County government, private individuals under leases, licenses, and permits, under public utilities, under right-of-way easements.

Let's look at the income. The Federal Government pays an average rental per acre in '76-'77 of 45 cents; the State pays 12 cents; and the Counties pay \$3.10.

Now, I think that the current land prices in Hawaii will bear our that this is ridiculous. This is supposed to be a trust created by the Congress, administered by the State; and the trustees are ripping it off.

The native Hawaiians are not getting fair market value for these lands that their trustees are supposed to be holding for their benefit.

And the native Hawaiians cannot even bring suit to protect their own trust lands.

What can this commission do? It can recommend that the United States bring that suit.

It might be able to do one other thing, although timing is short. We have asked the United States Supreme Court to review the decision of the Ninth Circuit, saying that native Hawaiians cannot bring suit.

MS. PUTMAN: Do you have the citation for that decision?

MR. ALBU: I have given copies to your staff. It's all available. That petition for certiorari, it's called, will be ruled on by the U. S. Supreme Court, we believe, around October 1st.

The United States Attorney's Office took a position, in the Ninth Circuit, that native Hawaiians should be allowed to bring suit in their own behalf, simply because there are just too many cases for the United States to bring all of them.

Okay. Now, having given you some of the gory details, let's back up a little bit and look at what this Hawaiian Homes program is and what its historical basis is.

Sometimes people talk about Hawaiians getting a free handout. And Frenchy was concerned about the concerns of taxpayers, that their money is being used for a special group

Well, it just so happens that whenever, in the history of our country, we have taken away the land of a native people, we have tried -- and I say "tried" -- to be fair about it.

When Indian lands were taken, they were often taken by treaties. When the land was negotiated for, certain lands were retained; others were given up.

In other cases where there were no treaties, there was an act of Congress creating the Indian Claims Commission, where the groups of native Americans could go before the commission and prove their damages, and be paid for what was taken from them.

In the case of native Hawaiians, about two-thirds of these islands were taken at the time of the overthrow, and they were given by the revolutionary government to the United States for free. Native Hawaiians received nothing.

Out of the lands that were received by the United

States, which were about two and a half million acres, the

Hawaiian Home Lands were carved out, about 200,000 acres.

And so that's the beginning of repayment of the obligation

of the United States to the native Hawaiian people.

And you asked the question a little bit earlier:
Shouldn't the Secretary of the Interior be involved here?
What's his role?

Well, we find the United States, even though this program has gone to the State for administration, has retained several powers to insure that the Hawaiian Homes Commission

Act is faithfully carried out.

By the way, that's another condition of statehood.

Our State Constitution is required, in Article XI, to state that the Hawaiian Homes Commission accept this program as a trust; and that the people of the State promise to faithfully carry it out.

To insure that, the United States did four things.

Number one, they said that in turning this program over, you have to accept the trust;

And number two, you can't change any of the substantive provisions of this Act without the approval of Congress;

Number three, Congress itself reserves the right to alter or amend that Act;

Number four, the -- well, it slips my mind right now.

Well, the fourth one is that the United States reserves the right to bring suits to enforce the trust.

So with -- I think it's a mistaken assumption that some people have, that this is only a State obligation. It is a federal obligation which the State has agreed to help carry out, merely because of the distances involved and the ease of local administration.

But what we have is a State government that really is using many of these lands for its own benefit. And if we look at the lands involved, the federal government uses 14,000 acres; the State government uses 29,000 acres, more than native Hawaiians themselves use.

And the Counties use 259 acres.

We have talked about their using the lands, but we haven't talked about its legality. We haven't -- we have a device called the Governor's executive order.

Now, with the normal State lands, rather than Hawaiian Home Lands -- unencumbered lands, they're called -- the Governor has the right, with the stroke of a pen, to take some State lands and give it to a government agency for a public use.

The Hawaiian Homes Commission Act specifically states the Governor does not have that power over the Hawaiian Home .

Lands.

Nevertheless, the State of Hawaii has, by Governor's executive order, transferred Hawaiian Home Lands for use for airports, schools, parks, forest reserves, game reserves, public services, and rights-of-way totaling about 16,862 acres.

Now, about three years ago, the Attorney General for the State of Hawaii wrote an opinion that said: "This practice is illegal."

We filed another action on the Island of Kauai, over the Anahola Beach Park there. That park was given to the County of Kauai to use as a public park. Again, not a nickel was paid to the Hawaiian Homes Commission.

And then, it was supposed to expand that park by giving another 12 acres of prime beachfront lands to the

CARNAZZO COURT—REPORTING COMPANY, LTD.

SUITE 692 • ALEXANDER YOUNG BUILDING • HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813

SERVING HAWAII, THE PACIFIC BASIN AND THE FAR EAST

(808) 538-7174

County of Kauai to expand this park, so they could use some federal revenue-sharing money to develop it.

There was no proposal to pay the Hawaiian Homes

Commission, or to give them any land in exchange for that.

We were told, "Well, the Hawaiians use that park, too, so why should they complain?"

I guess the answer is: "If you owned beachfront property in the Kahala area, and the County wants it for a park, they condemn it and pay for it, and you still get to use it.

Why should Hawaiians be treated any differently?"

If it's a public park, then let the public pay for it.

If it's not a public park, then reserve it for the native

Hawaiians, because they've got little enough.

Well, we brought that suit in Federal Court, and that again come in front of Judge Wong, and he again ruled in our favor.

And now, that case is subject for dismissal; because again, the Ninth Circuit has said: "Native Hawaiians don't have the right to bring a lawsuit to protect their own land."

So if you want to know what you can do to help, the answer is: You can recommend to the Congress either that they recognize our right to bring suit, even on behalf of native Hawaiians; or, two, you can ask the Supreme Court to hear an appeal; or, three, you can ask the United States Attorney to bring that suit to clean this mess up.

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

This practice has been going on for years. though the illegality has been admitted by everyone concerned, it still hasn't been cleaned up. And the very land exchanges that Judge Wong ordered in the Keaukaha-Panaewa case, today the Department of Lands and Natural Resources still hasn't identified land suitable for an exchange.

And they say these things all have to be surveyed; they have to be appraised; these things take years. while we wait, native Hawaiians are deprived of the use of their lands; and they're deprived of the fair rental value.

In the case of the Hilo Airport, we are talking about an appraisal of over half a million dollars a year -- which brings us to another problem, and that is: At least, up to now, the Hawaiian Homes Department has been forced to finance itself by leasing out the Hawaiian Home Lands to non-Hawaiians.

Now, that wouldn't be so objectionable, except the leases -- and they do a lot better than with government use -- the leases for 122,000 acres generated \$994,000 of revenue, a little over \$8 per acre per year.

That money is not enough to run the administration of the department alone, let alone the costs of developing the Home Lands for use by homesteaders.

Now, the ConCon helped with that a little bit, because it passed an amendment -- or, it proposed an amendment which the voters ratified, which required the State to fund the

department's administrative costs, as well as the programs to develop the Home Lands for native Hawaiian use.

Unfortunately, I haven't seen the implementation out of the Legislature yet, and I'm concerned that it will be interpreted in a way that we are really not going to see much of an increase.

But I think this commission could at least maybe put a little heat on the government to carry out its responsibility, not only in that.

MS. PUTMAN: Georgiana testified that they were preparing legislation in the form of a supplemental appropriation for next year, but --

MR. ALBU: Okay. Well, I would hope that the State

Legislature will honor that and will come up with a lot more

support than we have seen in the past.

And that's even aside from all the claims native

Hawaiians have against the State for trespass -- really, all

this constant illegal use, practically from the beginning of

this program. There's just been a tremendous amount of

abuses. And they're ones that I think people now, with good

faith, admit them.

But they have gone on for so long, they don't know what to do about it. And I think they got a little bit of a push.

Thank you. I would be happy to answer any questions.

MS. PUTMAN: Are there any questions? Charles?
MR. MAXWELL: Yes, I have one, Ron.

Ron, there are some fears that if this committee pursues the whole idea of looking into the Hawaiian Homes

Act, that -- and it gets to the Supreme Court, that that would in effect put the whole program up for toss. In other words, the constitutionality of the Act itself.

What is your remarks on that?

MR. ALBU: Well, I think that has been a very effective tool to keep Hawaiians from raising any questions. Every time the Hawaiians say, "We are not getting what we are entitled to," they are told, "Well, you better not raise any questions, because you might not get anything."

And I think it's a shibai.

The Constitution of the United States empowers Congress
to legislate on behalf of native Americans -- they're called
Indians, but the courts have said that means aboriginal
people, the people who were there first.

And we have a very fundamental concept. It's called the Fifth Amendment due process clause. When the government takes your land, it pays for it.

It still hasn't paid for the land it took from native
Hawaiians. The Hawaiian Homes Lands are the only thing
they've got. They fit that qualification of native Americans
in every way.

They're -- in my mind, there's just no question whatsoever about the legality. As a matter of fact, I believe it is illegal to not include native Hawaiians in the programs that Congress has adopted for all other native Americans.

A while ago, we had a committee of Congress come through here looking at whether or not native Hawaiians should be included in the Indian education programs, and that was chaired by Senator Inouye. And we submitted an opinion at that time, and the time before when they came through, showing the legality of it.

People raise claims, for instance, that the aboriginies in Alaska -- meaning Eskimos -- aren't Indians. And the Court held that they were native Americans, and that Congress has full power to legislate for them.

And if anything, it's overdue and unconstitutional to exclude them. It is not a racial distinction. It is a distinction based on history.

It is a distinction that says: When the United States and their people take something from someone, and they benefit from it, they have -- they have taken upon themselves the obligation to make it right.

And to exclude Hawaiians because they're not racially Indians is unconstitutional, and not the other way around.

MR. MAXWELL: So you think this committee could help a whole lot by forcing the United States Interior Department

to file suit; right? MR. ALBU: Yes, I do. 2 MR. MAXWELL: Okay. Thank you. 3 MS. PUTMAN: Thank you very much, Ron. 4 We are going to have a short break, and when we re-5 convene, we will move to the open agenda. 6 As I announced at the beginning of our consultation, 7 anyone, or anyone who has any information, will be given a 8 chance to speak to the committee. Each will be given five 9 minutes. 10 If your position takbs longer than five minutes, you 11 can submit anything else in writing. That will be taken into 12 consideration and become a part of the official record. 13 Now, so far, I have only two organizations and their 14 spokespersons listed: Ho'ola Kanawai, with Mits Uyehara, 15 and the Ohana, by Peggy Ross. 16 Is there anyone else who wanted to address us? If so, 17 at the break, let Jeff (indicating) know. 18 So we will take a break for ten minutes right now. 19 (Mid-afternoon recess.) 20 21 MS. PUTMAN: The State Advisory Committee to the 22 United States Commission on Civil Rights is reconvened. We are now in open session again, and there are a few 23 people who have some messages for us. You recall, this is 24 to be limited to a five-minute presentation. So if you can 25

try and observe that, you will be a part of the official 1 2 record. Dawn Wasson. 3 Incidentally, if you are speaking on behalf of an 4 organization, will you identify it? If you are speaking just 5 for yourself, that's fine, too. 6 Okay, Dawn. 7 MS. WASSON: Well, my name is Dawn Wasson. 8 resident of Nanakuli, a new resident. I have there about 9 three months. 10 11 I'm speaking today not because I volunteered. 12 pressured by Mr. Maxwell. 13 (Laughter.) But I speak this afternoon very proudly, because I'm 14 a Hawaiian. And I do have strong feelings about rights of 15 Hawaiians, and rights that I have personally experienced that 16 have been violated. 17 Number one, I would like to clarify that. 18 lessee under the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands. 19 been on the waiting list for nine years. 20 I lived in a community of substandard houses for a 21 22 number of years; and when I was given the opportunity to get a new home, we were very happy about it. 23 I'm quite sure all of you know that whenever you have 24

a new home, you don't realize what it can do to a family, and

especially to kids who are trying to struggle through the educational system of the State of Hawaii, and Hawaiians that are trying to uplift themselves.

We were what you call makokiauakau. I would like to call myself a very common person, but people don't consider me common, because they say I have a White Man's brain and a Polynesian body.

I don't know what that means, because they said I don't think like a Hawaiian. I don't know what a Hawaiian is supposed to think like.

All I know is that I'm fighting for something I believe
I'm entitled to: respect; a good education; and a good job.

But I live on Hawaiian Home Lands. I live in the community of Nanakuli; and in the short space of time that I've lived there, I really love that place. And I love the place because of the people.

No matter what I've heard or you may have heard about Nanakuli, or whatever the area is, it's part and -- that it has a high crime rate, whatever it is, as long as I have been there, I have never experienced any kind of adverse action taken against me or my children -- except it's been just the opposite.

I don't think it's just because I'm Hawaiian, but it's because people are people in that area, that if you do good to them, they will do good to you.

And as long as I live in that community, or wherever I go, I can always say and I would always say that it is the most beautiful place and the closest thing to heaven.

Another thing, too, I would like to speak about is being a Hawaiian and living in a community like Laie, where 6,000 acres of land was bought by the Mormon Church in 1865 for \$14,000.

There were a group of Hawaiian people who owned small parcels that totaled up to 300 acres. A lot of these lands were being adverse possessed by the Mormon Church against Hawaiians who were also members of the church.

A lot of times, when Hawaiians tried to go and see the manager or anyone in charge, to see if they could get their land back, or to see if they could get access to their land, they were told that that land was no longer theirs; or that if they'd -- would take the church to court, it would make them look really bad.

So what the Hawaiian people did was just let it go.

And quite a few of our people have lost their land that way.

So what we did was, we formed a group, called Kuleana Landowners, or the hui o malama Laie.

And what we did was, we went and got some legal advice-- namely, Ron Albu -- some legal aid, to let people have
some knowledge of their rights, and to take cases to court;
to help them preserve this land.

And some of the things that happened was that -- again the people would not take the case to court, because they didn't want the church to look bad, or they were afraid their memberships would be in jeopardy.

And another thing that we had was some courageous people that did take the chance, and didn't even have to go as far as to court. They were just given rights to the land.

But the problems as -- that Hawaiians have, especially kuleana landowners, is that they have to survey the land.

And again, we were right back to the same problem.

"You show us where your land is, and you survey it, and we will let you get to your land."

But what they have done is, when the land was given to them, all the metes and bounds was destroyed, so the Hawaiians would have to go and survey from the main highway, and bring it all the way in, and then find their property, where they think it might be.

And that would cost them money. And so they couldn't afford it, and they lost it that way.

But we still -- again, we would have the problem, if someone doesn't come and help us protect our rights.

And if there's any way your committee can sort of express that the problems are here, to help other people regarding lands.

And like you said, and a lot of people said, that --

- ||

decided to go back and get my fifth-year education.

At that time, it was very difficult to get a teaching job here in Hawaii and all over the United States; I'm sure all of you are aware of this. And there were many times I thought, "Well, maybe I should just look into another area." Most of the professional fields right now are very saturated. And I thought of -- you know, going into law. And I thought about going into other areas.

But I have a -- my child was two years old at the time, and it was very difficult to pursue these other areas.

So I continued to go on for my fifth year. At that time, also, a few of the professors was sincerely encouraging me to stay on, because of the problems that we are having within our Hawaiian community. They felt that we needed more part-Hawaiian teachers, so the children within the community could identify with us.

And being kanaka makua at heart and faith, I got this fifth year.

I was over 4,000 in the waiting list. Recently, I just got a letter -- and this is about six years ago -- that there are just no jobs available, and they sent me back my transcripts, saying that I'll probably need it to look for another job.

What I guess I'm trying to say is that if there is a need for part-Hawaiian teachers in the community, and we

struggle to work for the certificate, isn't there some avenue 1 that can be touched upon to -- to get over this hump? 2 Even when principals wants to hire part-Hawaiian 3 teachers, they are still stuck, because of the unions. I 4 don't know what can be done about it. I'm just sharing my 5 mana'o and letting you know that this is a definite concern 6 on my part, and I'm sure on the part of a lot of other part-7 Hawaiians, too, that are going through the college of 8 9 education. Thank you. 10 Thank you. Are there any other questions? 11 MS. PUTMAN: Thank you very much, Wailani. 12 We are now going to hear from Ohana. Is Peggy Ross 13 here? Or someone on behalf of Ohana? 14 Does anyone know about Ohana? 15 16 A SPECTATOR: No, Ohana is not here. MS. PUTMAN: How about Ho'ola Kanawai? Is Mits 17 Uyehara here? 18 A SPECTATOR: Is it 3:30? He said he would be here 19 at 3:30. 20 21 MS. PUTMAN: 3:30? Okay. 22 Was there someone else who wanted to speak? This is Maui Loa, a chief of the Whole-Hawaiians. 23 Did you want to --24 25 MR. LOA: -- yes.

MS. PUTMAN: -- speak to us? 1 MR. LOA: Hello, ladies and gentlemen, people from 2 homestead, people from the Civil Rights, Mr. Maxwell, and 3 my fellow Hawaiians: 4 I'm chief of the Whole-Hawaiians. This is my father, 5 Kamuela Price, who is our talking chief. And I mainly came 6 down today, because this is regarding an issue that the Whole-7 Hawaiians have been involved with for many years, and that's 8 the native Hawaiians that are defined under the Hawaiian 9 Homestead Act of 1920, which are those that are 50% Hawaiian 10 blood, to pure. 11 12 My father ran for the Senate, to express the grievances of these people who have waited so patiently for their prom-13 ised homestead land. And to this day, they haven't received 14 this land. 15 And I'm mainly down here to express my mana'o as an 16 indigenous Hawaiian, who is underneath this Act, the 17 Homestead Act. 18 19 And my father, he could better put it in words, I This is Kamuela Price, for the Whole-Hawaiians. 20 quess. MR. PRICE: Mr. Chairman -- Madam Chairman, ladies 21 22 and gentlemen: My name is Kamuela Price. I'm the advisor to the Whole-Hawaiians. 23 I did bring down some stuff that's been sort of on 24 the shelf for a while, so you could see what the attitude of

 the Whole-Hawaiians has been towards the failure of the State and the Federal Government to carry out the promises of the Homestead Act, for whatever reasons.

And our concern is that the -- and I think Senator

Inouye expressed it one time in a letter to me very clearly,
that those of less than 50% Hawaiian naturally would like to
be entitled to the same benefits as those of us with more
than 50%.

But I think we have to realize that any legislation that deals with native Hawaiians is really being done in the name of the indigenous people. I don't think there's a native Hawaiian in the world who wouldn't want to see his people of less blood benefit.

I have grandchildren, many of them of less blood.

But I think I believe that legislation, that things that deal with native Hawaiians, that it always must be made clear to everybody that the native Hawaiians as defined in the Homestead Act has priority, because you will see there's a new office, the Office of Hawaiian Affairs, that's coming into existence; there's a Native Hawaiian Educational Act -- this is Public Law 9644.

All of these acts have diluted the blood of native
Hawaiians, for I read: Anybody with any amount of Hawaiian
blood is entitled to benefit under these acts.

Now, speaking for the Wholes, we are not against

these people receiving benefits under these acts. But we don't want these benefits to be at the expense of indigenous people who are over 50%. They will soon be dying out; they will be gone.

And when we talk-about the lands which -- the trust lands which were given to the native Hawaiians, we must first be certain that all of these people -- because it's been made a treaty, and we believe that as far as the Wholes are concerned, we teach our people who are all indigenous people to be loyal citizens of the United States.

When we think of sovereignty, we think of our own people being able to speak for themselves, within the framework of the laws of our country, because we look to the United States to protect our rights; we look to the Federal Government, naturally. The State government can't do this.

It would be like going to the State of Arizona and asking them to protect the American Indians. How could they do that, when the private interests in the State of Arizona are the ones that want the lands of the Indians?

It takes the Federal Government to come in and say, "We have made a deal."

And as part of the Admissions Act, Hawaii is a State, based on the promise -- this is why Hawaii is a State, because it's based on the promise that the native Hawaiians, as defined in that act, will be rehabilitated and placed

T-12

back on the land.

Now, the failure of the State to do that, and the failure of the Federal Government to come in behind that and make sure that it is done, is a blot upon the heart of our country.

We don't feel that it's done purposely in any way. We recognize the difficulties in the United States being way over there, and we're way over here, and there's so many interests here, for one reason or another, that they would like to have the lands and the rights of the native Hawaiians, it's a difficult thing.

But now that you're down here from the Federal

Government to look into this, I believe that the simplicity

of the matter is that your position should be, "That we are

going to carry out the Homestead Act as it is written; we

are not going to make any changes in it, whether they be for

the better or for the worse."

Because the law -- the Act is already perfect. It says that the State of Hawaii can make any changes in the Act that it wants to, as long as it doesn't dilute the right of those people who have already been covered by the Act.

So any changes that the Federal Government would make would be for the worse. You can't do anything more for us than that. Don't dilute our rights.

Don't put things in there that will confuse the issue

Because if the thing goes back to the Federal Government, for them to make some additions, why, we could find the whole Homestead Act just done away with.

You can't control what the Congress of the United States might do with that Act. We don't want any changes made in that treaty.

And this is the position of the Wholes: You have made a treaty with us. Until you have lived up to that treaty, and given our people the lands that they're entitled to, and been rehabilitated on that land, we feel that you haven't carried out that treaty.

And to do anything less than that would just jeopardize the entire reputation of our country, insofar as when it made its word with its own people. And I don't think the United States Government wants to do that.

I would be willing -- and I would hope that this group would keep in touch with us; we will leave you some letters for you with our addresses.

We have native Hawaiian people who will go back to the Congress and explain our position. That's what has made it so difficult in the past. We have never been able to go there, so that the Congress really doesn't know how the native Hawaiian feels about it.

But now, we have a whole group of people that are 50% Hawaiian or more, who are ready to go at their own expense,

if necessary, at any time this issue comes up before Congress and make it clear to Congress what the attitude is of many of the people who are 50% Hawaiian or more.

And since the treaty was made with these people, as long as there's even one of them who wants the United States Government to live up to the treaty, I don't think there's any moral way that it can be abrogated, because that was a promise, and you can't change a promise later on down the line.

Until the promise is carried out, there are no changes that should be made in it. And anyway, that's what the position of the Whole-Hawaiians are. And we are really honored that you allow us to come in here and speak to you today.

And I hope that you will take back the message that there is a group of indigenous Hawaiian people down here who want to stand pat on the Homestead Act; and that they do not object to other legislation that deals with helping Hawaiian people.

One thing that we do object to -- and I think you should carry this message back -- I do not believe that the Hawaiians should be referred to as native Hawaiians, in other legislation, unless it's the same as the Homestead definition.

It's all right to deal with them as part-Hawaiian, or people of Hawaiian ancestry; but when you use the word

"native Hawaiian," it is reflective upon the integrity of the United States Government, to use it differently in two acts.

And we are asking that -- we are for a lawsuit now; we are trying to -- we have people in Washington, and we are going to ask for a lawsuit to clarify this definition, so that it is very clear to the Congress and the people of the United States that when we use the term "native Hawaiian," you're talking about 50% Hawaiian blood or more.

And when you talk about people with Hawaiian ancestry, you're talking about people with any amount of Hawaiian blood. And we are not asking you -- or suggesting to you, once more, that all of these people are not entitled to certain benefits. But not the Homestead benefits. They are set aside for our people.

But I want to thank you again on behalf of the Whole group for allowing us to make this presentation.

MS. PUTMAN: Thank you. Are there any questions?

MS. JAMES: I just want to get the brochure.

MS. PUTMAN: Oh, yes. We would appreciate having your material, and it will become a part of the record.

Is there anyone else who wants to make a presentation?

A SPECTATOR: When the people of the audience make a presentation, do we have to --

MS. PUTMAN: Well, just so we have a correct record.

illustrating that Hawaiians fill our jails.

Well, what these people do not make an accurate study, what they have not told you, is that when the U. S. came in, they not only stole our land, they destroyed our pride in ourselves.

They took our soul. And they planted -- and gave us their values, their history, their culture.

If we are in disarray today, it comes from this background. And it's not only the physical loss, the material loss, it's a spiritual and the self, the soul.

We Hawaiians today, many people -- what you don't know -- that most of the Hawaiians have taken very little from our past. If one knows his past -- and I don't know it thoroughly -- but I know the Hawaiians had a lot of love and respect for each other. They respected their land. They had their own gods.

But what makes me mad today, we see that the religions in Hawaii tolerate every kind of religion, yet when our -- they only tell us what is bad about the Hawaiian and his religion; and everything that was Hawaiian was negative.

I feel personally that if we Hawaiians are to go anywhere, we have to look into ourselves and listen to our own voice. Let's find our answers.

Too long, we have listened to everybody else coming here, bringing their values to make judgment on us. At

1--

least, I think so.

Many Hawaiian parents tell their kids, "Get educated.

Join them." They end up, they've lost their souls; they have achieved, but they've lost their soul.

I think that's very important. I try not to -- we Hawaiians have to realize, too, that if we are to keep things in perspective, Hawaiians are by nature gentle people. Our kupunas weren't violent people.

The violence that you see today among the youth, this is not Hawaiian. Pakalolo and drugs and rape, that's -- and underworld is not Hawaiian.

This is the influence from the United States upon us, and the outside influence upon our shores. To me, I think for me, speaking for myself, trying to look into myself, into my Hawaiianness, look into my rich past, and maybe there's some negative areas; but look into them and retain and perpetuate the beauty of my culture. It's about time we Hawaiians got a sense of pride.

I think personally our parents failed us by telling us to assimilate in the process. And we lost ourselves, I think.

So one more important thing I have to say. How many statements, in which everybody commenced to tell us how badly we are doing in schools. One of the -- what a lot of you, you folks don't know, that we Hawaiians -- well,

Frenchy, in that community center, that relationship, we are 1 humanistically oriented. We love others. We love -- if we 2 are bitter today, it is because we love the world, but we 3 found out that they are not like us; they only came to take. Study our history. Everybody came in to take. We 5 are the only ones who are giving out. 6 And as the statements show you, even the churches are involved in that. They come in, and they downgrade us, 8 everything Hawaiian; they downgrade our religion. 9 Today, they go and tell the big wide world, "Give us 10 moral support." 11 Well, we are the ones who are the strongest backers 12 in the churches in Hawaii today, and we are -- I don't think 13 they should be telling us to give them any more support. 14 More important than that -- and I'm closing now -- I 15 say this to our poor people: Be proud of what you are. And 16 search, because there's much riches that we as Hawaiians 17 knew of. 18 Even a feeling of love and aloha, I like to keep. 19 mean, I'm not -- I say this sincerely, not out of a hate to 20 21 anybody. If we are going to go any place, we have to find out 22 who we are. Talk to your brothers. Function thoroughly as 23 24 Hawaiians. If you don't, that's not Hawaiian. Maybe sometimes 25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A SPECTATOR: He told me. I called him up. He must have left, because I just called his office and he is not

MS. PUTMAN: Well, I saw him earlier in the hallway.

A SPECTATOR: He went to court this morning.

MS. PUTMAN: I see. Yes.

I would like to make a simple statement MR. PRICE: And this is on a question that we hear all of the here.

time, and it's been raised here today, trying to raise the 1 question about the word "rehabilitate" and the meaning of it 2 in the Homestead Act. 3 In the Homestead Act, "rehabilitate" was meant to 4 mean "reinstate on the land." It wasn't meant to cast any 5 aspersion on the Hawaiian. 6 And I think that when the Hawaiian people object, that 7 they don't want to hear the word "rehabilitate," it's in the 8 sense that they're decent people; they don't need rehabili-9 10 tating. 11 But I think the Homestead Act used that word in the 12 sense that they need to be reinstated on the land, in that 13 sense. MS. PUTMAN: Yes. I think the legislative history of 14 15 the law indicates that. Whoever knows Mits, since there's no one -- no one 16 17 else, and I don't see why everyone should wait, tell him, if 18 he would submit a written statement to the commission, or if he wants to do it through me or any member of the committee, 19 that it will be made a part of the record. 20 21 A SPECTATOR: Okay. 22 MS. PUTMAN: And other than that, I don't think we 23 have anyone else who is scheduled to appear here. 24 The obvious focus of today's proceedings has been 25 primarily, but not exclusively, on the administration and

So, whatever it is, if you'll just -- these statements 1 are supposedly limited to five minutes, but the entire 2 written --3 MR. UYEHARA: Oh, I think I can do it. 4 MS. PUTMAN: -- the entire written statement will 5 become a part of the record. Following your presentation, 6 we will adjourn. Okay. 7 MR. UYEHARA: Thank you. 8 MS. PUTMAN: Will you give the reporter your name and 9 organization? 10 MR. UYEHARA: Mitsuo Uyehara; U-y-e-h-a-r-a. 11 Madam Chairman and members of the Hawaii Advisory 12 Committee to the U. S. Civil Rights Commission. 13 A SPECTATOR: Mits, will you talk into the mike, 14 please? Mahalo. 15 MR. UYEHARA: My name is Mitsuo Uyehara. I am the 16 attorney for Ho'ola Kanawai, Inc. (awakening the law). 17 Ho'ola Kanawai, Inc., is a native Hawaiian organization 18 created and existing for the specific purpose to insure that 19 native Hawaiians, as defined in the Hawaiian Homes Commission 20 Act, 1920, shall secure their vested rights under Section 5f 21 of the Admission Act. 22 Under the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, a 23 native Hawaiian is defined to be "any descendent of not less 24 than one-half part of the blood of the races inhabiting the 25

Hawaiian Islands prior to 1778."

This specific definition is quite important and shall be noted in the remarks following.

The interest native Hawaiians have in the Hawaiian

Homes Commission Act, 1920, and the Section 5f trust, are

based upon their traditional vested interests in the communal

lands of the Hawaiian people.

All lands in Hawaii were held as communal lands until the Great Mahele of 1848, when these lands were partitioned amongst the classes of people with interests therein: the king, the chiefs, and the common people.

These interests as specified were set forth in the
Bill of Rights of 1839, which bill of rights were incorporated
almost intact in the first Constitution of the State of
Hawaii -- the Territory of Hawaii, in 1848.

The king and the chiefs obtained their respective onethird interests under the partition. The commoners were literally kept from obtaining their interests. The interests of the commoners became the government lands of the kingdon.

After the overthrow of the monarchy in 1893, the government lands and the crown lands (that which the king obtained in the Mahele), were merged to become the public lands of the Republic of Hawaii, the Territory of Hawaii, and the present State of Hawaii.

The public land is the corpus from which the Hawaiian

22

23

24

25

Home Lands was carved out of in 1950, 1951. Prince Kuhio set forth the above history in the congressional record for 1920, which exhibit is attached as Exhibit A. The Section 5f land trust is composed of the remainder of the public lands.

The fundamental perspective which emerges from this analysis of the history of the two land trusts in Hawaii for native Hawaiians is that their interest is based upon vested rights, otherwise known as aboriginal rights, recognized by all modern nations as a fundamental aspect of international law.

This aspect of international law was first set forth by a professor of archeology at the University of Salamanca in Spain; and about four years thereafter, this enunciation by this professor at Salamanca, at the university, was set forth as papal bull. So that there is a fundamental aspect of that, and whatever has transpired since then, any claims made under that aspect of international law are based on that writing set forth by Professor Vittorio.

And this is what I am indicating, insofar as history of rights happen to be.

The rights of native Hawaiians is not based upon a compassionate interest to rehabilitate native Hawaiians by the United States or the State of Hawaii. The history of the ruling classes in Hawaii throughout the history concerning the lands in question has been the lack of compassion to

rehabilitate the native Hawaiians. Only suppression has continued to today.

The two land trusts are today in the process of being further partitioned so that the native Hawaiians of today, who were essentially the commoners of 1848, may not even have the undistributed remainder of the lands held in common up to 1848.

The classes of people who obtained their respective one-third share, and their present heirs, assigns and representatives, now seek to add onto what they obtained in 1848, that part which is in the two trusts.

The process of encroachment has occurred in three stages: First, in the creation and administration of the Hawaiian Home Lands program, native Hawaiians were given the lands the government, sugar and pineapple plantations, and ranches did not want. Native Hawaiians were given the use of the unwanted remainder.

The Hawaiian Home Lands program was not designed to rehabilitate native Hawaiians, but designed to provide lands which would have gone to so rehabilitate native Hawaiians to the sugar plantations, after the leases made during the period Kalakaua was on the thrown to finance the construction of Iolani Palace expired.

The second stage occurred after the creation of the Section 5f land trust, which provided the possibility to

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

rehabilitate the great number of native Hawaiians in need of such assistance from resources which belongs to them, under the doctrine of aboriginal rights.

The Governor of the State, in his first report to the Legislature, acknowledged the trust; then buried it to today. This process was executed by taking all money in the public land trust fund and allocating it to the Department of Education in the General Budget for the State of Hawaii, then taking an identical sum out of the Department of Education budget in the General Budget, so that the Department of Education ended with the same amount allocated in the General Budget.

Today, on the date of this consultation, the public land trust fund is totally committed to the Department of Education, as set forth above, as it has been for the past 20 years in the State Biennium budget for the period 1979 to 1981, as provided in the said budget set forth and attached hereto as Exhibit B.

The stage is the present. This stage began as a matter of public record in the halls of Congress in 1974. Then, Congresswoman Patsy Mink from Hawaii introduced an amendment to the Native American Programs Act of 1974, HR 14449, Title VIII, to include native Hawaiians as defined in the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920; that is, those with 50% or more blood.

T-13

In the Senate, Senator Fong from Hawaii amended the amended HR 14449 definition of native Hawaiians to mean "any individual any of whose ancestors were natives of the area which consists of the Hawaiian Islands prior to 1978."

What Senator Fong did was to say that a person who has one full-blood Hawaiian ancestor -- and 16,384, who is not assuming a 16-year generation cycle; or 8,192, assuming an 18-year generation cycle; or 4,096, assuming a 20-year generation cycle -- has an interest in the trust lands, just as a full-blood Hawaiian does.

Senator Fong's position was that Hawaiians should be treated the same as the Indians. The monumental treatise by Felix S. Cohen entitled, "Handbook of Federal Indian Law," which is attached hereto relating to definition of "Indian" as Exhibit C shows that such was not the case among the Indians. Senator Fong's position was erroneous.

The position expressed by Congresswoman Mink and supported by Matsunaga was closer to reality, as may be seen in Exhibit D, which documented their respective remarks in the congressional record for May 29th, 1974; and of Senator Fong, which is attached hereto as Exhibit D.

Senator Fong touched upon an issue of extreme sensitivity. He states that there should be no difference in blood quantum when dealing with Hawaiian ancestry. I agree, for social, geneological and many other reasons. But we are

here dealing with property rights based upon ethnic heritage, and the effect of such heritage upon the lives of such people.

In Hawaii, blood quantum has a great bearing upon the evolution of interests in the two land trust being considered here. The consideration of blood quantum has always been of importance in the Kingdom of Hawaii. Throughout its history, persons of less than full blood were identified as "half-caste" or "half native." Such treatment is universal among aboriginal people, tribal people, even today.

Only after the overthrow of the monarchy and the commencement of full-scale Americanization of Hawaii were the terms "half-caste" or "half native" abandoned and replaced by the term "part-Hawaiian."

The reason given was as follows: "It --" meaning half-caste -- "does not cover all admixture of blood, and it is a term which is regarded as an aspersion by many. The term 'part-Hawaiian' has no such objection from the sentimental or practical side." Report of the General Superintendent of the Census, 1896, at Page 33.

The change commenced by Senator Fong has been carried forward in the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973, the Constitutional Convention in Hawaii in 1978, and in the past legislative session in 1979.

Step by step, the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, definition is being enclosed. The intent to change the

Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, definition to the native American definition is more than just an imagined possibility.

Such intent is expressed in the Committee Report No.

59, at Page 8, accompanying the Office of Hawaiian Affairs

Constitutional Convention proposal which is attached here as

Exhibit E.

We have here in process a wholesale abandonment of native Hawaiians who are more than one-half or more, who historically and in terms of needs for assistance have never been assisted.

Many supporters of the lowering of the blood quantum are of the belief that by so doing the general welfare of the Hawaiian community will be so uplifted. Such fact is to the contrary.

There is today on the waiting list for a Hawaiian

Home Lands lease more than double actually on the Home Land.

What the expanded number of eligible would do would merely increase the number on the waiting list.

More important, however, is the fact that control and benefits would not go to people who act and think Hawaiian in the traditional sense, but to people whose ancestry is Hawaiian to a minute degree, but whose thinking and acting are non-Hawaiian, in the sense of the common people.

As an example, Ho'ola Kanawai has been engaged in a

Ĭ

concerted effort to preclude the State of Hawaii from giving to Campbell Estate 32.5 million dollars worth of coral which as present belongs to the Section 5f trust in the Barbers Point Deep-Draft Harbor Project.

Should the definition of native Hawaiian be changed to the definition as set forth in the Native American Act of 1974, the Campbell beneficiaries would become native Hawaiians; and as such, they would be beneficiaries to the coral — which they're really not entitled to.

Such examples can be set forth almost endlessly, relating to other aspects, private property interests.

Going back to 1848, the Great Mahele, what was in effect then, what the Mahele was was a partition of the surface of the land, two-dimensional. Within every deed made pursuant to the Mahele, there is a reservation of the minerals, which means that is a third dimension, and retained to the government. This aspect is part of the land trust.

By creating the Office of Hawaiian Affairs, it is assumed that native Hawaiians would be in control of their destiny. The example relating to coral clearly indicates who shall control the Hawaiian community.

Thus, the directors of the Office of Hawaiian Affairs is structured so that representatives of the large estates, large corporations, and labor unions shall control it. Thus the filing fee is \$250 for an unlimited campaign spending.

į- ,

If a person seeks to abide by the limit, it is \$25. The limit is \$600 if the Alu Like election is any measure of participation -- therefore setting the limits as to campaign spendings, which I think is \$600, as I indicated a second ago.

The Office of Hawaiian Affairs Act also provides a means to shortchange native Hawaiians in two ways. First, trust funds specifically limited to those over 50% shall be used for all persons with Hawaiian ancestry. Such numbers exceed those of 50% by about two times.

Secondly, whereas Section 5f under the Admission Act includes all lands which were administered by the Territory of Hawaii under Section 5a, and in addition those retained by the Federal Government under Sections 5c and 5d, and then granted to the State under Section 5e, the Office of Hawaiian Affairs limits the trust funds to only trust funds ceded to the United States in 1898, or lands in exchange for such ceded lands, but excluding the Hawaiian Home Lands and Section 5e lands.

These limitations, expressly set forth, as noted above, would exclude some of the most valuable parcels of land in Hawaii, such as a large portion of the Honolulu International Airport and the harbor in Honolulu, right. beside this building.

These citations of wilful failure and deliberate

 effort to sidestep the legally entrusted responsibility to carry out the land trusts has been remarkable in the effort to sidestep this wrongdoing.

During the past Legislature a House Resolution No. 740 was introduced to request the Federal Government to investigate the alleged wrongdoing. This resolution which is attached hereto as Exhibit F was sidetracked.

So was a bill to provide funding for a native Hawaiian conference, so that the Hawaiian community could determine what its interests should be in the future -- such as the Office of Hawaiian Affairs, as a structure. This was never done.

And even as to the Hawaiian Affairs Committee went statewide. Its position was merely, for the record, an indication that it went around statewide, as part of the books show, funded pursuant to the Hawaiian community.

The delegate from Maui was quite emphatic, to indicate that he did not know and was misinformed as to what the interests of the Hawaiian community happened to be.

This political bill was HB 2631-78, which is attached as Exhibit G.

The State of Hawaii has thus failed to conform to its responsibility toward native Hawaiians and is involved in a course to insure that its effort is successful by creating agencies it can control directly and indirectly. The Federal

Die I

-

1	attached.
2	MS. PUTMAN: It is attached.
3	A SPECTATOR: Mits, going over word for word in the
4	Admission Act, only an admission can be changed; right?
5	Nothing else in the Admission Act can be changed?
6	MR. UYEHARA: Correct, just admission of
7	A SPECTATOR: Word for word? For sure.
8	MS. PUTMAN: Wait a minute. I think this is getting
9	a little bit out of hand. I think we can all
10	A VOICE: No, no. I'm in doubt right now.
11	MS. PUTMAN: I think it is absolutely clear that
12	nothing in the Act can be changed that will dilute the bene-
13	fits to the beneficiaries; but it is not crystal clear
14	whether certain kinds of actions will in fact dilute those
15	benefits. And this has been a matter from time to time of
16	several Attorney Generals' opinions, and other decisions.
17	MR. UYEHARA: Right. What she said is correct.
18	A SPECTATOR: Okay.
19	MR. UYEHARA: Administrative changes could in fact
20	impinge upon the substantive rights. It could be.
21	A SPECTATOR: Okay. I was just wondering.
22	MR. UYEHARA: It could very well. Like I indicated
23	in the testimony, the process of administration is going to
24	sidestep it is going toward dilution of rights.
25	MS. PUTMAN: Thank you very much, Mits. We are glad

that you could join us. 1 And thank you very much for waiting. 2 And as announced previously, this consultation is 3 adjourned. 4 And again, I thank you all very much. 5 MRS. LEE: May I say a word, a few words about this 6 7 "rehabilitation"? 8 MS. PUTMAN: Oh, certainly. Certainly. 9 MRS. LEE: Like this gentleman said, he's tired of hearing about rehabilitation. I'm one of those that asked 10 11 for Kapakoli Homestead, 1933, and we had Princess Kanakoa 12 was one of the commissioners, and we didn't understand -well, then, we were just talking about trying to get this 13 homestead in the program, in that area, Palakulea. 14 So because we didn't understand what is rehabilitation, 15 so she being Hawaiian, she stood up, and she said, "I'm 16 going to give you some -- " well, she used the word "lessons," 17 because the Hawaiians of those days didn't understand. 18 19 So she said, "Rehabilitation is this way. Now, if I lived on a land, and I married a haole, my children are 20 21 half-Hawaiian; right? 22 She lives on the land; she marries a Japanese. Her children are half Japanese. So, when my half 23 married into her half, that's rehabilitation." 24 25 (Laughter.)

1

4 5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

Then you go -- and, you know, I have contested all of the directors, except Georgiana -- oh, she's not here. I have contested all the directors in that Hawaiian Home Lands. And this is what's told to us in 1933, by Princess Kanakoa.

MS. PUTMAN: That's the best story I've heard today.

MRS. LEE: And you know, I don't like to hear the people say, "I don't like the word 'rehabilitation,'" because they defined the language, that word, in a different sense. But Princess Kanakoa at that time, because we were just starting to have this Homestead of Palakulea there, and that's the way she told us. That's Princess Kanakoa. you.

> Could you identify yourself? MS. JAMES:

MRS. LEE: Oh, my name is Malaka Lee, from Palakulea.

So don't feel that "rehabilitation" is -- they don't like that. It is a fine word. But you must understand what it means.

> MS. PUTMAN: Okay. Thank you very much again.

And you will be hearing from us later.

(At 3:55 o'clock p.m., the hearing was concluded.)

--000--

STATE OF HAWAII)
) ss.
CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU)

I, ROGER K. WILLIAMS, a Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of Hawaii, certify:

That I was present on Monday, August 27, 1979, at the hearing held in the above-entitled matter and that I correctly took down in machine shorthand all of the testimony given and proceedings had in said matter;

That I thereafter caused my said shorthand notes to be reduced to typewriting, and that the foregoing transcript, consisting of Pages 1 to 202, inclusive, is a full, true, and correct record of such proceedings.

Certified to on this 4th day of September 1979.

ROGER K. WILLIAMS