

TESTIMONY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL KA 'OIHANA O KA LOIO KUHINA THIRTY-SECOND LEGISLATURE, 2024

ON THE FOLLOWING MEASURE:

S.B. NO. 2687, S.D. 1, RELATING TO ELECTIONS.

BEFORE THE:

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY AND HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS

DATE: Friday, March 15, 2024 **TIME:** 2:00 p.m.

LOCATION: State Capitol, Room 325 and Videoconference

TESTIFIER(S): Anne E. Lopez, Attorney General, or

Tricia M. Nakamatsu, Deputy Attorney General

Chair Tarnas and Members of the Committee:

The Department of the Attorney General (Department) provides the following comments.

The purpose of this bill is to prohibit anyone from distributing digitally created information, including audio, image, or video, that falsely depicts someone engaging in speech or conduct that the individual did not engage in, knowing that it will harm the reputation or electoral prospects of a candidate in an election, or change the voting behavior of electors. It establishes remedies for injured parties and criminal penalties for distributing materially deceptive media.

The Department has several suggestions to increase the effectiveness of the bill.

CRIMINAL OFFENSE (section 11- (a))

While we appreciate the prior Committee's work to clarify the applicable state of mind for this proposed offense, we believe it would be difficult, from an enforcement standpoint, to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that someone **knows** their actions "will harm the reputation or electoral prospects of a candidate in an election or [] change the voting behavior of electors in an election[.]" Page 2, lines 19-21, emphasis added. Rather than requiring that a person knows or reasonably knows that their actions will have such effect, the Department suggests applying a reckless state of mind, insomuch as someone would be acting in "reckless disregard of the risk" of having such effect.

Testimony of the Department of the Attorney General Thirty-Second Legislature, 2024 Page 2 of 5

We also suggest deleting subsection (a)(1) on page 2, lines 16-17. By definition, "materially deceptive media" always "[f]alsely depicts an individual's appearance or voice," and "[f]alsely depicts an individual engaging in speech or conduct in which the depicted individual did not in fact engage" Page 7, line 20, to page 8, line 5.

We also suggest deleting wording at the end of subsection (a)(2) on page 2, line 21, through page 3, line 3: "by deceiving the electors into incorrectly believing that the depicted individual in fact engaged in the speech or conduct depicted". By definition, materially deceptive media "[w]ould cause a reasonable viewer or listener to believe [incorrectly] that the depicted individual engaged in the speech or conduct depicted[.]" Page 8, lines 6-8.

If the above suggested changes are adopted, subsection (a) of the proposed offense, beginning at page 2, line 9, of the bill, would read as follows (shown in Ramseyer in comparison with the bill wording):

- (a) Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), no person shall distribute, or enter into an agreement with another person to distribute, materially deceptive media, if the distribution occurs between the first working day of February in every even numbered year through the next general election [and the person knows or reasonably knows that:
 - (1) The media falsely represents a depicted individual; and
 - (2) The distribution of the materially deceptive media will harm], in reckless disregard of the risk of harming the reputation or electoral prospects of a candidate in an election or [to change] changing the voting behavior of electors in an election [by deceiving the electors into incorrectly believing that the depicted individual in fact engaged in the speech or conduct depicted].

For ease of envisioning the final, here is the above wording, set forth as it would appear in the bill:

(a) Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), no person shall distribute, or enter into an agreement with another person to distribute, materially deceptive media, if the distribution occurs between the first working day of February in every even numbered year through the next general election in reckless disregard of the risk of harming the reputation or electoral prospects of a candidate in an election or changing the voting behavior of electors in an election.

Testimony of the Department of the Attorney General Thirty-Second Legislature, 2024 Page 3 of 5

DISCLAIMERS (section 11- (c))

In proposed section 11-___(c)(1)(C) (page 3, lines-16-18), we suggest deleting the phrase: ", or if there is no other text communication, in a size that is easily readable by an observer." This is already covered by section 11-___(c)(1)(B) (page 3, lines 13-14), which requires that all disclaimers are "clearly visible to and readable by an observer."

CIVIL OR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF (section 11- (d) and (e))

To ensure clarity between the civil and criminal portions of this bill, the Department recommends that subsections (d) and (e) (page 5, line 1, to page 6, line 15) be placed in a new and different section, separate from the proposed criminal offense, to address all civil and injunctive remedies.

PENALTIES (section 11- (f))

Although the Department takes no position on the severity of the penalties contemplated for this proposed offense, we note that page 6, line 20, through page 7, line 2, presents a heightened penalty, a class C felony, if the offense is committed with "intent to cause violence or bodily harm." This appears to be incompatible with the nature of the offense, which is distributing false depictions of someone's speech or conduct.

In addition, placing multiple levels of a criminal penalty in the same subsection of the HRS, as is proposed in subsection (f) on page 6, line 16, through page 7, line 2, is unnecessarily confusing and should be avoided when possible. For purposes of clarity in charging and record keeping, the Department recommends separating different levels of penalty into separate subsections, as follows (if the class C felony offense remains):

- (f) Unless otherwise specified in this section, a person who violates subsection (a) shall be guilty of a petty misdemeanor;
- (g) A person who violates subsection (a) within five years of a previous conviction for a violation of this section shall be guilty of a misdemeanor;
- (h) A person who violates subsection (a) with the intent to cause violence or bodily harm shall be guilty of a class C felony;

The remaining subsections in the bill should be redesignated accordingly.

Testimony of the Department of the Attorney General Thirty-Second Legislature, 2024 Page 4 of 5

DEFINITIONS (section 11- (g))

In proposed section 11-___(g), the term, "depicted individual" (page 7, lines 17-18) should be deleted entirely, as this definition is not helpful and is potentially confusing. Specifically, the word "falsely" is ambiguous, and use of the term "materially deceptive media" here would result in circular meanings (with the definition of "materially deceptive media"). Given the wording of section 11-___(a), the term "depicted individual" does not appear to be ambiguous, and we believe that no further definition is needed.

With regard to the definition for "materially deceptive media" (page 7, line 20, to page 8, line 16), the Department has three suggestions:

- 1. Paragraph (2) of this definition, on page 8, line 2, should be deleted, as that is already covered by paragraph (3), on page 8, lines 3-5. Information that depicts an individual engaging in speech or conduct would necessarily depict an individual's appearance or voice.
- 2. The wording of paragraph (3) (page 8, lines 3-5) should also be amended to delete the word "falsely," as that term is both ambiguous and unnecessary. Other wording in that paragraph already specifies the individual "did not in fact engage" in the depicted speech or conduct.
- 3. Paragraph (5), on page 8, line 9, contains its own state of mind, which is confusing and unnecessary. We suggest deleting the word "intentionally."

If all of these suggestions are adopted, the definition of "materially deceptive media" beginning at page 7, line 20, of the bill, would read as follows (shown in Ramseyer in comparison with the bill wording):

"Materially deceptive media" means any information, including any audio, image, or video, that:

- (1) Is an advertisement:
- [(2) Falsely depicts an individual's appearance or voice;

¹ See the definition of "materially deceptive media," under section 11-___(g)(2): "Falsely depicts an individual's appearance or voice;" (page 8, line 2) and section 11-___(g)(3): "Falsely depicts an individual engaging in speech or conduct in which the depicted individual did not in fact engage;" (page 8, lines 3-4)

Testimony of the Department of the Attorney General Thirty-Second Legislature, 2024 Page 5 of 5

- (3) Falsely depicts [(2) Depicts an individual engaging in speech or conduct in which the depicted individual did not in fact engage;
- [(4)] (3) Would cause a reasonable viewer or listener to believe that the depicted individual engaged in the speech or conduct depicted; and
- [(5)] (4) Was [intentionally] created by:
 - (A) Generative adversarial network techniques or another technique that translates a source image into another image using machine learning, deep learning techniques, and convolutional neural networks;
 - (B) Artificial intelligence; or
 - (C) Digital technology.

For ease of envisioning the final, here is the above wording, set forth as it would appear in the bill:

"Materially deceptive media" means any information, including any audio, image, or video, that:

- (1) Is an advertisement:
- (2) <u>Depicts an individual engaging in speech or conduct in which</u> the depicted individual did not in fact engage;
- (3) Would cause a reasonable viewer or listener to believe that the depicted individual engaged in the speech or conduct depicted; and
- (4) Was created by:
 - (A) Generative adversarial network techniques or another technique that translates a source image into another image using machine learning, deep learning techniques, and convolutional neural networks;
 - (B) Artificial intelligence; or
 - (C) Digital technology.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this bill.

JON N. IKENAGA STATE PUBLIC DEFENDER

DEFENDER COUNCIL 1130 NORTH NIMITZ HIGHWAY SUITE A-254 HONOLULU, HAWAI'1 96817

HONOLULU OFFICE 1130 NORTH NIMITZ HIGHWAY SUITE A-254 HONOLULU, HAWAI'1 96817

APPELLATE DIVISION

DISTRICT COURT DIVISION TEL. No. (808) 586-2100

FAMILY COURT DIVISION TEL. No. (808) 586-2300

FELONY DIVISION TEL. No. (808) 586-2200

FACSIMILE (808) 586-2222 1959 1959

STATE OF HAWAI'I OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC DEFENDER

HAYLEY Y.C. CHENG ASSISTANT PUBLIC DEFENDER

HILO OFFICE

275 PONAHAWAI STREET SUITE 201 HILO, HAWAI'1 96720 TEL. NO. (808) 974-4571 FAX NO. (808) 974-4574

KONA OFFICE

75-1000 HENRY STREET SUITE #209 KAILUA-KONA HI 96740 TEL. NO. (808) 327-4650 FAX NO. (808) 327-4651

> KAUA'I OFFICE 3060 EIWA STREET SUITE 206 JHUE, HAWAI'I 9676

Lihue, Hawai'i 96766 Tel. No. (808) 241-7128 Fax No. (808) 274-3422

MAUI OFFICE

81 N. MARKET STREET WAILUKU, HAWAI'I 96793 TEL. NO. (808) 984-5018 FAX NO. (808) 984-5022

S.B. No. 2687, SD1: RELATING TO ELECTIONS

Chair David Tarnas
Vice Chair Gregg Takayama
Honorable Committee Members

The Office of the Public Defender **opposes** this bill.

While the conduct targeted by this bill—preventing the use of deceptive practices against a political candidate—is laudable, a rigorous prosecution or enforcement of the proposed law can run afoul with the First Amendment. People have a First Amendment right to criticize candidates running for office and make all kinds of political speech attacking candidates for office.

Making it a petty misdemeanor to distribute "materially deceptive media" that will hurt the "electoral prospects of a candidate . . . by deceiving the electors into incorrectly believing that the depicted individual" made a speech or engaged in conduct could violate the First Amendment. As the Supreme Court recently stated:

We have consistently rejected attempts to restrict campaign speech based on other legislative aims. . . . However well intentioned such proposals may be, the First Amendment . . . prohibits such attempts to tamper with the right of citizens to choose who shall govern them.

Federal Eelection Com'n v. Cruz, 596 U.S. 289, 305-06 (2022). Costly legal bills incurred by the state in defending the law can and should be avoided. The bill should be deferred.

SUBJECT:



STATE OF HAWAI'I CAMPAIGN SPENDING COMMISSION

235 SOUTH BERETANIA STREET, ROOM 300 HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813

March 13, 2024

TO: The Honorable David A. Tarnas, Chair

House Committee on Judiciary & Hawaiian Affairs

The Honorable Gregg Takayama, Vice Chair

House Committee on Judiciary & Hawaiian Affairs

Members of the House Committee on Judiciary & Hawaiian Affairs

ΚEJ

FROM: Kristin E. Izumi-Nitao, Executive Director

Campaign Spending Commission

Testimony on S.B. No. 2687, SD1, Relating to Elections.

Friday, March 15, 2024 2:00 p.m., Conference Room 325 & Videoconference

Thank you for the opportunity to testify on this bill. The Campaign Spending Commission ("Commission") supports this bill and offers the following comments.

This bill adds a new section to Chapter 11, Part XIII, Hawaii Revised Statutes ("HRS"), and prohibits a person from distributing, or entering an agreement to distribute, materially deceptive media, unless the media contains a disclaimer that the media has been manipulated by technical means and falsely depicts an individual. The bill also establishes civil remedies for persons injured by the distribution of materially deceptive media, as well as criminal penalties. SD1 makes clear that materially deceptive media are also advertisements as defined in HRS §11-302 and thus must provide the disclaimer required by HRS §11-391(a) identifying the person who paid for the media.

To make it clear that the Commission can also assess a fine for a violation of the new section or refer a violation for criminal prosecution, the Commission recommends a new subsection (g) on page 7 as follows:

"(g) The Commission may assess a fine for a violation of this section or refer a violation of this section for criminal prosecutions under subpart I."

The existing subsection (g) would then become subsection (h).

Testimony of the Campaign Spending Commission S.B. No. 2687, SD1, Relating to Elections March 13, 2024
Page 2

The Commission strongly supports transparency in campaign spending and requests that this Committee pass this bill with amendments.



HAWAII STATE AFL-CIO

888 Mililani Street, Suite 501 • Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Telephone: (808) 597-1441 Fax: (808) 593-2149

The Thirty-Second Legislature
House of Representatives
Committee on Judiciary & Hawaiian Affairs

Testimony by Hawaii State AFL-CIO

March 15, 2024

TESTIMONY ON SB2687 SD1 - RELATING TO ELECTIONS

Chair Tarnas, Vice Chair Takayama, and members of the committee:

The Hawaii State AFL-CIO is a federation of 74 affiliate labor organizations who represent over 68,000 union members within the State of Hawaii. The Hawaii State AFL-CIO serves its affiliates by advocating for workers and their families before the state legislature and other branches of state and county government.

The Hawaii State AFL-CIO is in <u>support</u> of SB2687 SD1, which prohibits a person from distributing, or entering into an agreement with another person to distribute, materially deceptive media unless the media contains a disclaimer. This bill also establishes remedies for parties injured by the distribution of materially deceptive media. Further, this bill establishes criminal penalties for distributing materially deceptive media and defines "materially deceptive media".

The potential for deceptive media to manipulate public opinion, spread misinformation, and undermine the very foundation of our democracy is a cause for grave concern. We firmly believe that preserving the authenticity of political discourse is essential to a fair and informed electorate. This bill takes a vital step towards ensuring that our elections remain free from the harmful influence of deceptive media.

The Hawaii State AFL-CIO commends the committee for addressing this issue and urges its members to support this bill to take a proactive stance in protecting the democratic values and principles that our great state holds dear.

Respectfully submitted,

Rándy Perrelra

President



Charter Communications Testimony of Rebecca Lieberman, Director of Government Affairs

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY & HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS

Hawaii State Capitol Friday, March 15, 2024

COMMENTS ON S.B. 2687, S.D. 1 – RELATING TO ELECTIONS

Chair Tarnas, Vice Chair Takayama, and Members of the Committee.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide **comments and proposed amendments on S.B. 2687, S.D. 1**, a bill that would prohibit a person from distributing, or entering into an agreement with another person to distribute, materially deceptive media and establishes remedies for parties injured by the distribution of materially deceptive media.

As the largest cable television provider in the state, Charter understands the importance of transparency and accountability in media distribution and is committed to upholding the highest standards of integrity in our operations. However, we urge the committee to consider certain amendments to S.B. 2687, H.D. 1 to ensure that the burden of compliance does not disproportionately fall on distribution platforms like ours. While we support the intent of the bill, we believe that the current language may inadvertently impose unreasonable obligations on distributors without providing clear guidance or feasible solutions.

The bill already recognizes that broadcasters should not be held liable for distributing certain advertisements. Cable operators and streaming services are subject to the same concerns and federal laws as broadcasters with respect to the ads that the bill currently recognizes broadcasters should not be held liable for distributing. We respectfully request that the same consideration be applied to all similarly situated carriers of ads, including cable operators and streaming services.

But beyond that, across hundreds of channels and thousands of hours of ads being distributed over our systems, whether or not they are covered by the federal law that prohibits editing, Charter and other distributors should not be responsible for determining which of those contain AI-generated media. Liability should clearly rest with the entities that created the ads. Distributors like Charter do not have the capabilities to scrutinize every piece of content for potential deception, especially considering the rapid advancements in technology.

The technology currently available does not exist to allow us to determine if an ad contains a deepfake. The detection and identification of deepfakes require specialized tools and expertise that are not currently available. Therefore, holding distributors responsible for detecting deepfakes would be impractical and unrealistic.

This does not mean that Charter will air deepfaked ads without any ability to address concerns. With ads alleged to violate defamation or other laws, we will remove an ad if we receive a cease and desist letter. This system allows those with the best knowledge of, and interest in an ad to identify it as violating the law. Charter takes allegations of deceptive advertising seriously, and we are

committed to cooperating with law enforcement and regulatory agencies to address any concerns promptly.

Given these concerns, we respectfully we respectfully request that the committee consider amendments that clarify the responsibilities of distributors and ensure that compliance measures are reasonable and practical. Specifically, we suggest:

• Page 3, line 4, subsection (b) amended as follows:

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to a broadcaster, cable operator, or streaming service when it was not involved in the creation of the deceptive media. if federal law or rule requires the broadcaster to run the materially deceptive media without editing the media.

We are committed to working collaboratively with the legislature to achieve these goals and to uphold the integrity of media distribution in Hawaii. Mahalo for the opportunity to provide proposed amendments to S.B. 2687, S.D. 1.

<u>SB-2687-SD-1</u> Submitted on: 3/12/2024 3:43:05 PM Testimony for JHA on 3/15/2024 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Ralph Cushnie	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

<u>SB-2687-SD-1</u> Submitted on: 3/13/2024 7:15:06 AM

Testimony for JHA on 3/15/2024 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
April Handog	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

<u>SB-2687-SD-1</u> Submitted on: 3/13/2024 7:49:26 AM

Testimony for JHA on $3/15/2024\ 2:00:00\ PM$

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Andrew Crossland	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I **oppose** this Bill and I urge all committee members to **VOTE NO**.

Submitted on: 3/13/2024 8:01:52 AM

Testimony for JHA on 3/15/2024 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Stephanie Maldonado	Individual	Oppose	Remotely Via Zoom

Comments:

This is another attempt against free speech and the ability of people to discern and make their own decisions and conclusions about information received!

<u>SB-2687-SD-1</u> Submitted on: 3/13/2024 8:07:07 AM Testimony for JHA on 3/15/2024 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Brendan Ajolo	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

oppose bill

<u>SB-2687-SD-1</u> Submitted on: 3/13/2024 8:09:48 AM

Testimony for JHA on 3/15/2024 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Justin Kaawa	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

This is SUBJECTIVE and can be SELECTIVELY ENFORCED

<u>SB-2687-SD-1</u> Submitted on: 3/13/2024 8:10:10 AM

Testimony for JHA on 3/15/2024 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Shawnie Campbell	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Submitted on: 3/13/2024 8:18:40 AM

Testimony for JHA on 3/15/2024 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
David E Shormann	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Opposed, as "materially deceptive media" can be highly subjective. It's the Aloha State, campaigners should focus on aloha, honesty and integrity in their campaigns.

Submitted on: 3/13/2024 8:19:24 AM

Testimony for JHA on 3/15/2024 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Timothy Ashton	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I've seen this before...oh yes, Douglass Mackey. He was arrested and sentenced to 7 months for posting a meme. No thank you! I strongly oppose this tyrannical bill restricting freedom of speech!

Submitted on: 3/13/2024 8:38:20 AM

Testimony for JHA on 3/15/2024 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Mary Smart	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Do not pass this bill. It is susceptible to subjective interpretation of content and selective enforcement of the law. We are seeing too much subjective "lawfare" happening regarding previous elections. We are seeing a two-tiered justice system. This is a form of censorship against the 1st amendment. People are wise enough to do their own research and decide on whether content is true or not. We don't need "government" making those decisions for us. Based on someone's personal interpretation, all candidates could be threatened with criminal penalties and therefore this measure could be a deterent to to a citizen being willing to run for office.

<u>SB-2687-SD-1</u> Submitted on: 3/13/2024 9:04:46 AM

Testimony for JHA on 3/15/2024 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Kaiulani Bowers	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I oppose this Bill because it is subjective and may be selectively enforced

<u>SB-2687-SD-1</u> Submitted on: 3/13/2024 9:15:03 AM

Testimony for JHA on 3/15/2024 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
kamakani de dely	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

<u>SB-2687-SD-1</u> Submitted on: 3/13/2024 9:30:02 AM

Testimony for JHA on 3/15/2024 2:00:00 PM

Sı	ıbmitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Ma	llory De Dely	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

<u>SB-2687-SD-1</u> Submitted on: 3/13/2024 9:36:09 AM

Testimony for JHA on 3/15/2024 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Susan Dedely	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Submitted on: 3/13/2024 10:09:40 AM

Testimony for JHA on 3/15/2024 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Deven English	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I strongly oppose this bill, there is deception from the media, truth comes from those who do there own due diligence.

<u>SB-2687-SD-1</u> Submitted on: 3/13/2024 12:08:21 PM

Testimony for JHA on 3/15/2024 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
David Williams	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Too vague, strongly, oppose this bill.

Submitted on: 3/13/2024 12:13:32 PM

Testimony for JHA on 3/15/2024 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Joy Dillon	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Aloha, JHA Committee Members.

I strongly oppose this bill and urge you to vote NO on it.

SB2687 has the potential to take away our 1st Amendment right of free speech. We should not be allowing any persons or organizations to determine if our media materials or comments are deceptive. No one has that right. We each have the right to decide for ourselves.

Please do not pass this bill. It will have disasterous results that do not adhere to our Democratic Republic principles.

Thank you for your consideration.

Joy Dillon

Hilo Resident

<u>SB-2687-SD-1</u> Submitted on: 3/13/2024 12:28:00 PM

Testimony for JHA on 3/15/2024 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
David Ruiz	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

This bill would be subjective. This could be easily enforced for 1 favoring party.

Submitted on: 3/13/2024 1:17:34 PM

Testimony for JHA on 3/15/2024 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Luis Ma	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I am strongly opposed this bill, because it limits free speech and state government can selective reenforces this law.

Submitted on: 3/13/2024 2:28:31 PM

Testimony for JHA on 3/15/2024 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Lesha Mathes	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

This is way too subjective. Who is going to decide what's deceptive? No, we the people are capable of sorting through and finding the truth. We don't need more laws eroding our 1st amendment right to free speech. We don't need the government telling us what to believe. It is not the government's job to censor, period!

<u>SB-2687-SD-1</u> Submitted on: 3/13/2024 3:31:34 PM

Testimony for JHA on 3/15/2024 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Vivek Pathela	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

OPPOSE. THIS IS SUBJECTIVE. What and who decides materially deceptive media!

<u>SB-2687-SD-1</u> Submitted on: 3/13/2024 4:08:46 PM

Testimony for JHA on 3/15/2024 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
THOMAS KENT	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

This bill could be selectively enforced if passed.

Submitted on: 3/13/2024 4:32:42 PM

Testimony for JHA on 3/15/2024 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
CHESTER LUM	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Thank you for allowing me to submit testimony opposing this bill.

SB2687 should be tabled.

Once again, thank you for allowing me to submit testimony opposing this bill.

Chester Lum

<u>SB-2687-SD-1</u> Submitted on: 3/13/2024 8:02:08 PM

Testimony for JHA on 3/15/2024 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
James R Cabodol Jr	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

OPPOSE,OPPOSE,OPPOSE

<u>SB-2687-SD-1</u> Submitted on: 3/13/2024 8:29:19 PM

Testimony for JHA on 3/15/2024 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Sharron VanDeusen	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I OPPOSE SB2687.

<u>SB-2687-SD-1</u> Submitted on: 3/13/2024 11:33:10 PM

Testimony for JHA on 3/15/2024 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Jennifer Cabjuan	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Oppose this bill.

<u>SB-2687-SD-1</u> Submitted on: 3/14/2024 3:34:13 AM

Testimony for JHA on 3/15/2024 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Alice Abellanida	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I oppose this bill. It is subjective and open to interpretation. Vote no.

<u>SB-2687-SD-1</u> Submitted on: 3/14/2024 5:53:54 AM

Testimony for JHA on 3/15/2024 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
julie schaus	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I oppose sb2687 sd1

this bill would criminalize opposing media views.

Hawaii is already the most corrupt state

<u>SB-2687-SD-1</u> Submitted on: 3/14/2024 6:04:27 AM

Testimony for JHA on 3/15/2024 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Greg schaus	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I oppose Sb2687 sd1

this bill is communism.our right to free speech would be violated, Hawaii is already the most corrupt state.

Submitted on: 3/14/2024 6:23:34 AM

Testimony for JHA on 3/15/2024 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Sam schaus	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I oppose sb 2687 sd1

Hawaii is already the most corrupt state in the USA

this bill criminalizes opposing views. An infringement of our first amendment right to free speech

Submitted on: 3/14/2024 8:45:19 AM

Testimony for JHA on $3/15/2024\ 2:00:00\ PM$

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Corinne Solomon	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I oppose SB2687 SD1.

- 1) The enforcement of this bill, once it becomes law, can be used to selectively target political oppopnents.
- 2) AI is moving at a much greater speed than piecemeal legislation can keep up with.
- 3) Who will enforce this?

Submitted on: 3/14/2024 10:48:29 AM

Testimony for JHA on 3/15/2024 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Derek W	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Strongly oppose. Vague, ambiguous and can be selectively enforced, and will probably be challenged as unconstitutional, thus costing and wasting time and money of Hawaii taxpayers.

Sounds like a bill introduced in Animal Farm or 1984 by George Orwell, or in a banana Republic to establish a Ministry of Truth thought police for the purpose of political prosection of enemies.

There are already existing laws of libel, slander, fraud, etc. that adequately enforce any wrongdoing this bill is intended to address.

Submitted on: 3/14/2024 12:00:20 PM

Testimony for JHA on 3/15/2024 2:00:00 PM

Sı	ıbmitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Mich	ael EKM Olderr	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Election distrust is at an all-time high despite last year being the most secure election in our history. We have to do our part to put those unfounded fears to rest. We saw this on the continent with the AI voice clone of Joe Biden urging Democrats not to participate in the primaries. The political weaponizing of technology and media, especially with AI, is something we can not afford to overlook. Please support this bill; it's too important to ignore.

Submitted on: 3/14/2024 2:07:57 PM

Testimony for JHA on 3/15/2024 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Ryan Willis	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I OPPOSE SB2687 SD1

Submitted on: 3/14/2024 2:12:08 PM

Testimony for JHA on 3/15/2024 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Kanoe Willis	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I OPPOSE SB2687 SD1

Submitted on: 3/14/2024 4:11:28 PM

Testimony for JHA on 3/15/2024 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Mary Healy	Individual	Oppose	Remotely Via Zoom

Comments:

I oppose this bill and will give oral testimony