

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email [webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov](mailto:webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov)

John Mascaro, Ph.D.  
P.O. Box 3256  
Honolulu, HI 96801  
DrMascaro@outlook.com

Re: Testimony regarding SB1  
Equal rights

I am a psychotherapist licensed with the state of Hawaii as a marriage and family therapist who will soon become licensed as a psychologist. I work in private practice and with CAMHD in a contract called intensive in-home therapy, which works with children who are having the most trouble in the system. I work with the child along with the family to help them stabilize and work through their behavioral and emotional issues.

SB1 effects me personally. As a gay man, I do not have the ability in this state to marry so that I can have federal and state rights that are given to those who are able to legally marry. I work with many struggling families in this state and I can assure you that they are not one bit concerned about my ability to marry. The struggling families I work with have their own issues completely removed from my ability to marry the person I have been with for over 13 years.

SB1 is about equality for all. I am very concerned about the ohana in this state and I have spent the last 10 years as a therapist working to help build strong families. I want to stay and continue to help families in Hawaii but if Hawaii continues to not allow marriage for all people in Hawaii, I will need to move to a state that will allow marriage for all. Please open your hearts to those who are asking for justice and equality. Marriage is licensed by the state not the churches here in Hawaii. Let the Churches marry who they want but the ability to marry should be a right for all people of Hawaii.

Thank you.

John Mascaro, Ph.D.

My name is Mike Kai and I am born and raised on the Big Island of Hawaii and have lived the past 25 years on O'ahu. My wife and I are the parents of three daughters and have chosen to live and remain in a state where we believe appreciated our rights to raise our daughters as our personal values dictate.

My girls' range in ages from 8 to 26 and it is for this reason that I am submitting a written testimony.

SB-1, relating to equal rights, tells me that our Governor does not respect my right, nor my responsibility as a parent. Same Sex Marriage is NOT a civil right. Additionally, the rush to push this bill through and to initiate a special session displays that the will of the people will not be considered and that the future of our state lies in the hands of 52 elected officials, not the over one million people in this great state. Democracy is not honored, the people of the state are not taken into consideration and the process is circumvented.

Please vote NO to SB-1. Mahalo.

## TESTIMONY IN OPPOSITION TO SB 1 RELATING TO EQUALITY

Dear Honorable Chairs Rhoads and Luke and Members of the House Judiciary and Finance Committees:

I am Carm Celine Akim, a legal permanent resident in the State of Hawaii and I live in Makakilo. My future is in the hands of the voters and their chosen legislators. I may not have the right to vote but I have every rights and responsibilities of every American citizen. I sincerely trust the house representatives to do what is right for all.

I submit to you this testimony to present my strong opposition to SB 1 commonly known as "Same-Sex Marriage Bill." I believe that there is another way of giving the homosexual group the said FEDERAL benefits of heterosexual married couples without having to change the definition of marriage. There should not be a traditional versus non-traditional marriage. It has been established since the beginning of time and why should something sacred to people be altered and conformed in such fashion that only a very small percentage of Hawaii will benefit. I learned of the ramifications of bill when it turned into a law. Before rushing into conclusion on how "awesome" is it to provide this homosexual community that waited two decades to have equality, let us take the time to know what is waiting for Hawaii and its children a thousand more decades after today. We might not live to see all the effects of this bill but we are wise enough to see the mistakes of other states and countries that chose the said "equality." This equality as mentioned in the bill is not really equality. The proponents or authors of SB 1, for example Sen. Hee, will not claim that this bill is insufficient in providing religious protection to affected parties (violating the First Amendment of the US constitution) for it is a humiliation to who he is and his expertise in law. Amending the bill, or worse saying no to SB 1 would mean lack his ability. It is now passed to you representatives. You can decide because you did not call for a special session and you did not construct this bill but you have the ability to amend and better yet, dissolve it.



Common people like me who does not have any political background took precious time to research in this very important issue and as you saw from the last senate hiring, even us who just have that enough knowledge to fight for our rights manage to convey the incompleteness and irrelevance of this bill to those who wrote it. For example the DOMA is not entirely struck down as Attorney General David Louie claims, the Supreme Court only mentioned section 3, which allows same-sex couples that are married in other states that allow such union to enjoy the same federal benefits that a traditional married couple will have in that state they CHOOSE to live in. As for state benefits, we have Civil Union Law, which gives the same benefits that a married man and woman would have here in the state of Hawaii. If tax benefits are what they are after, then why civil unions in this state are very low. Why should we pass this bill if it is only a plane ticket away and when individuals go to honeymoons in places like Timbuktu and not worry about the amount of money they have to spend? All people have a choice and that is their right. Being married is a choice but none of these homosexuals will be accountable for our children's future. I am not willing to allow that just because "they want to get married here." There is no rush to pass this bill. If it is really a pressing issue why is then the other 34 states not rushing to pass this law. I am sure that there are homosexuals there that waited for more than two decades. How about the people of other islands? Are they not part of the State of Hawaii? Their voices are not heard in this special session. If SB 1 becomes a law, does it not affect the other islands too and not only Oahu?

I am more afraid of the ramifications that this bill would have to our keiki. This concerns Rep. Mark Nakashima and Rep. Takashi Ohno because they are the chairpersons of Education. For example is Canada and most recently Massachusetts where there is a massive change in their curriculums. If we say yes to same-sex marriage, we are saying yes to homosexuality everywhere. I have nothing against them but if they were going to impose and teach my little future children, nieces and nephews such things that go against our up bringing, I would not let that happen. I am not going to let my future children be raised by a stranger who does also does

not inform me of the said curriculum “because I don’t need to.” Click on this link for more information to see how Canada is doing after years of passing same-sex marriage: [www.peacehamilton.com](http://www.peacehamilton.com). This might be a faith-based website but you should look into it so you can protect us. Our public education is still a work in progress, adding this burden will not only make them the least smart children in the nation, they are also now the most confused.

I have a drastic decision that I had put aside in my mind. If this bill turns to a law and all that has happened in other places that approved this “equality” come to pass, I rather cut my tubes and not have children than have them and be exposed in this sickening society driven by a handful of people. I cannot leave Hawaii because of my love for the state and this is my husband’s place of birth. I am married to a native Hawaiian and whose rights are not heard and was trumped by gay rights.

Let me remind you that injustice causes people, whose kuleana is to perpetuate the righteousness of their land, to become aggressive in attaining that goal. Aloha is also respect. Our Aloha should not be equated to lenience to few people and our kindness be trampled. I am from a country where tyrannical rule does not continue to flourish because of its people. I am from a place where impeachment is not just a word but is a positive action. I am from a place where hearts burn for justice and love for all is shown by multiple people power revolution.

I can go on and on about this issue. Please look at the future of Hawaii. Today we leave our legacy to the keiki of the land.

Honorable Chair Rhoads □ Chair Luke and members of Committees on Judiciary □ Finance

My name is Shirley Y Kinoshita. I am a Kapolei registered voter and I strongly oppose S.B. No. 1 and wish to address comments in the report from the Standing Committee on Judiciary □ Labor to Senate President Donna Mercado Kim dated 10/29/2013 referencing SB 1.

Included in the report was the Record of Votes of the 5 □ Ayes □ and 2 □ Nays □ plus the committee's reasoning for its vote.

The committee writes: □ Since the Governor released draft measures on 8/22/2013 and 9/9/2013, your committee notes that there has been genuine confusion about the protections for clergy and religious organizations and their facilities. Your Committee is committed to ensuring religious liberty and freedom as protected under the federal and state constitutions and believes that religious protections can coexist with marriage equality. As such, the language under this measure amends the previously released draft measures by the Governor and lists the ways the 9/9/2013 draft of SB 1 were changed.

1. There is still confusion regarding church □ use of facilities □ and □ profit. □ And the subject of where religious organizations fall with respect to □ public accommodations law and parameters. □

For example: Do Preschools in religious organizations fall under the Public Accommodations Law because it provides a service to the general community and must make a profit to remain solvent?

The committee states in this report: □ However, your Committee recognizes that a bright line does not exist between a religious activity and commercial activity and such determinations should be made on a case-by-case basis that takes into account all of the facts involved. □

Does this mean: □ that a bright line does not exist between a religious activity and commercial activity □ □ that the committee is confused on such determinations and further that it now has to go to a third party so a case-by-case review can be made?

Page 10 of the Standing Committee Report states: □ Additionally a testifier was concerned that this measure would have an impact on the curriculum for the Department of Education schools. However, your Committee emphasized that this measure is not intended to change or add to the educational curriculum in public schools and does not impact the Department of Education's authority to maintain its curriculum. □

Ladies □Gentlemen: I ask that you do your homework□there is nothing new here. We've been looking at the impact of Same Sex Marriage for a long time□that□why we agreed with the Civil Liberties Union Bill to give the same rights and benefits.

look at the other 13 States and the District of Columbia and see the kind of educational material now taught in the public school systems of states who currently have same gender laws. You legislators are moving to change our thousands of years old society and attitudes here by passing this bill.

Undecided Legislators, Registered Voters and General Public: I ask that you DO NOT sit passively and believe this vague statement by the Senate□Standing Committee Report! The curriculum here will change as the Governor has already answered that question in the media by saying that the Department of Education will be expected to □follow the law.□

2. Therefore, the Department of Education would be required to follow the new law and have a curriculum that teaches all of the same gender lifestyles-- Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender? AND, also that they are to be taught as acceptable to our society, that they are normal and that they are natural?

I am not of the opinion that those lifestyles are ACCEPTABLE-- neither are they normal, nor are they natural.

In fact in 1998--269,617 voters including myself, overwhelmingly voted for the Constitutional Amendment to reserve marriage to opposite gender couples. Same gender marriages are not civil rights and should not be legislated. Individual voters need to cast their votes to make these irreversible changes in this state--just as we did in 1998.

Lastly, I want to leave you with the undeniable fact that in the United States the incidence of HIV infections which is the prelude to Aides continues to advance. Go to the Centers of Disease Control website and look at the latest tables for 2011.

3. Is it a coincidence that the Northeast Region of the U.S.□the states where Same Sex Marriages are most prevalent and the South have the highest rates of HIV Infections? This is another unknown and unspoken fact in these hearings to date. Don't the negatives impacts have to be aired in your reports?

The Senate Standing Committee closes its report to the Honorable Donna Mercado Kim, President of the Senate by saying: □The time has come to take this historic step□and voted 5 to 2 to pass the bill on its Second Reading.

4. I submit that there is still confusion with religious organizations, unknown impacts, and unreasonable time constraints placed on the registered voters that will long be remembered. There are problems with the federal law but few of the testimonies have said that the federal law should be clarified before we change our state law on Same Gender Marriage!

Voter confidence has been shaken in the legislative process of this Special Session in the actions of our legislative leadership including the governor, to usurp the true democratic process of the State of Hawaii residents ☐ voters.

5. IF NOTHING ELSE☐ I ASK THAT THOSE LEGISLATORS WHO ARE UNDECIDED OR THOSE WHO REALLY DIDN'T THINK ABOUT THE EFFECT THIS WOULD HAVE ON OUR CHILDREN IN OUR SCHOOL CURRICULUM, VOTE ☐NO☐SO THIS RUN-AWAY TRAIN CAN BE SLOWED DOWN AND THOSE WHO DON'T KNOW THE TRUE EFFECTS OF SAME GENDER MARRIAGE HAVE TIME TO FIND OUT.

Mahalo,

Shirley Y Kinoshita - Kapolei, HI 96707

Opposition

Submitted: 10/30/2013

## **Testimony Against SB 1**

Understanding the intent of SB1, to provide equal federal rights for same-sex couples, I strongly oppose SB1. The duty to provide federal rights to same-sex couples falls under the responsibilities of the federal government. The State of Hawaii has done its duty by providing equal state rights to same sex couples under civil unions. SB1 seeks to provide federal rights by redefining the institution of marriage. That is not the proper way to serve the people of Hawaii.

In 1997, the people of Hawaii voted to give the legislature the authority to maintain the definition of marriage as a union between 1 man and 1 woman. SB1 seeks to redefine marriage and allow same sex partners to enter into marriage. Marriage is a religious institution founded within the framework of the 3 major religions of the world; Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. The majority of the world believes in the practices of one of these religions and common to all of them is the institution of marriage being between a man and woman. The people of Hawaii believed that you, the legislators of our state would uphold our values and tradition of marriage by keeping its definition. Now, there are those of you who, under the guise of equal rights, seek to change this fundamental institution in order to please a small minority.

It is the duty of the elected representatives and Senators of this state to serve the people of Hawaii. With so many people in opposition to changing the values and beliefs of our society, how can you consciously support this bill? The fight for equal rights for same sex couples lies within the federal government. The federal government should recognize civil unions as equal to marriage under federal law. Changing the definition of marriage, an institution formed by God, is not the duty of this, or any other legislative body. Thank you for your service.

Respectfully,  
Jason Flowers

<b>Submitted By</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Testifier Position</b>	<b>Testifying in Person</b>
shane jackson	Individual	Oppose	Yes

Comments: The House Judiciary Committee The House Finance Committee Hearing  
Date/Time: Thursday, October 31, 2013, 10:00 a.m. Place: Capitol Auditorium Re:  
Strong Opposition to SB1 My name is Shane Jackson and I oppose SB 1. I love Hawaii.  
Its important to know that. I want to say, on important social issues like these, why not  
let the people decide? I believe the people should be able to decide on this issue. Put it  
to a vote to the people. What is the hurry in changing thousands of years of tradition?  
Let the people vote on it. Any person who votes for this bill, I will vote against next  
election. If I'm allowed to influence races out of my district (I will make sure its allowed  
before hand), I will actively try to get those who vote for out of office. Thank you for your  
time

Karl Rhoads, Chair  
House Judiciary Committee  
&  
Sylvia Luke, Chair  
House Finance Committee  
Senate Bill 1  
Thursday, October 31, 2013  
10:00 a.m.  
State Capitol, 415 South Beretania Street

My name is Michael Baysa and I live in the town of Laie, Hawaii. I am testifying on Senate Bill 1. In regards to this bill, I would like to testify in **OPPOSITION** to Senate Bill 1.

I am opposed to Senate Bill 1 (SB1) because of the inadequate protection provided to religious institutions, other religion-based organizations, and individuals and businesses seeking to follow their morale conscience.

After analyzing the bill in detail, I found that only two limited forms of religious protection were provided throughout the bill. According to Senate Bill 1 Page 2 Lines 11-22 and Page 5 Line 16 – Page 6 Line 18, the only religious protections provided are: (1) Only clergy and officers of religious organizations can refuse to solemnize any marriage without legal retribution and (2) Only religious organizations who do NOT earn profit by providing their grounds to the general public can refuse to make their grounds available for solemnization of any marriage celebration without legal retribution.

This bill constitutes inadequate religious freedom protection in most other scenarios outside of what is mentioned in the bill. Of the many conflicts suppressing free expression of religion which will arise, three of the most prominent that I would like to point out will be (1) religious organizations who open their facilities to the public while earning any amount of profit on their general public events being subject to legal penalties for refusing to provide their facilities to those who act contrary to the organization's morale standards, (2) religious organizations and charities, such as adoption agencies, who will be forced to acknowledge and provide services for activities which are contrary to their morale conscience, and (3) business leader's legal inability under the proposed law to follow their morale conscience and refuse to participate in events they believe should not be supported.

For the first conflict addressed, religious organizations who open their facilities to the public while earning any amount of profit on their general public events being subject to legal penalties for refusing to provide their facilities or materials to those who act contrary to the organization's morale standards, it is my firm belief that the protection of freedom of religion **must** protect every religious organization's rights to ensure that the facilities they own are used **only** in manners that are agreeable and acceptable to that religious organization, **whether or**



**not** the use of those facilities or materials results in the organization earning a profit. Each religious organization must be allowed the right to choose how their facilities and materials are used, and no other parties should have the right to force a religious organization to use their facilities in a manner contrary to their conscience under threat of legal penalty.

Under the second conflict addressed, religious organizations and charities (such as adoption agencies) who will be forced to acknowledge and provide services for activities which are contrary to their morale conscience, SB1 provides no protection whatsoever. Similar to the previous conflict mentioned, the protections from freedom of religion **must** be extended to the operations of **all** religious organizations. In the example of the adoption agency of a religious organization, that organization should not face any penalties stemming from the exercise of their religious beliefs in seeking to place a child into the best home that conforms with the organizations morale guidelines. All religious organizations of any kind are entitled to the exercise of their religious convictions as they seek to do that which they deem good for the betterment of society, and SB1 provides no protection to this entitlement.

Under the third conflict mentioned, business leader's legal inability under the proposed law to follow their morale conscience and refuse to participate in events they believe should not be supported, SB1 provides no protection for both the freedom of speech and the freedom of the exercise of religion for those seeking to follow their morale conscience in the work that they do. This has become an especially important matter as has been shown throughout the nation recently, with incidents such as legal actions as well as other forms of retaliation against those who refuse to do business with those who would act contrary to the morale convictions of the business owner. While I firmly believe that everyone must be respected for their varying opinions and beliefs, I believe that it is both **constitutionally and morally wrong** to penalize any individual or business that acts to follow their morale conscience.

The free exercise of religion was an important addition as the very first amendment to the constitution instituted by the founders of our country. According to this, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press." This amendment applies also to the state of Hawaii, and it is my firm belief that no law should be passed by the state which would restrict religious liberty in any way, shape, or form.

I would like to reiterate that I am **AGAINST** Senate Bill 1, and that I firmly oppose its passing into state legislature.

Mahalo,

Michael Baysa

Aloha. I am J. Michael Hughes Jr. I was born in Hawaii and I love Hawaii. I am proud and happy to be from Hawaii .

As a young voter of this generation I want to be able to raise a family and children in a morally right culture, where the school system and government don't force them to learn and know something they don't believe in like they do now in Massachusetts. The young voters of Hawaii believe in the culture of Hawaii, The Aloha spirit. We want freedom to live life in a place where the culture has good morals and good values. As the voice of the future we say that we want to live a free life, right morally and right under Jesus Christ. I and 70% of the voters are against same sex marriage and we all believe

"let the people decide". We will reflect this strong opinion in all the upcoming elections in Hawaii. We are the voters, the workers and the candidates for the future of Hawaii. People can be what they want to be. We have Aloha for everybody

but don't force their lifestyle and morals on our children and down the throats of our future. Keep country country, Keep Hawaii Hawaii, keep family family, and keep Hawaii sacred.

Mahalo and God bless you.

**From:** Jami Waite [<mailto:sunnywaite@gmail.com>]

**Sent:** Tuesday, October 29, 2013 10:09 PM

**To:** Judiciary Special Session; FINTestimony

**Subject:** Testimony in Opposition to SB1

To: The House Judiciary Committee

The House Finance Committee

Hearing Date/Time: Thursday, October 31, 2013, 10:00 a.m.

Place: Capitol Auditorium

Re: Strong Opposition to SB1

Dear Chairs Rhoads and Luke, and Members of both the House Committees on Judiciary and Finance:

I am writing to voice my strong opposition to Bill SB1. I am not a very politically active person. I'm a busy mother of 5. Yet I feel strongly enough about this bill that I hauled my 5 children to the capitol building for the rally for religious freedom on Monday evening. I am deeply concerned that this six day special session does not allow for amendments to the legislation that will serve to protect the religious freedoms guaranteed in our Constitution. It is the height of arrogance for a handful of politicians to go against the will of the people and pass a bill which will have lasting consequences and unforeseen effects on our children. A six day special session is not enough time to discuss the most controversial issue of our time. If this bill passes with the current weak religious exemptions, it will open the doors to religious persecution in the form of lawsuits against those churches who dare to hold with their (constitutional right) to disagree with the morality of same-sex marriage. Our building is used for Cub and Boy Scout meetings, girl's activity days, youth meetings, birthday parties, movie nights, women's meetings, and other functions besides Sunday worship. Ours is also a missionary church. We welcome visitors off the street and friends and neighbors. Anyone is welcome to attend our worship services and activities. Our church and its members, while accepting of those who are gay or lesbian, absolutely believes that marriage should only be between a man and a woman. The current exemption makes it so that unless our religion changes its moral code and allows gay marriage to take place in the building, our building and church will be liable to lawsuits with the "public usage" that takes place. This bill forces our church and many others around the state to either bend to the will of the state or to shut down all usage and activities for anything other than worship services. How is this religious freedom? How is this ok? Please defend our religious freedoms. Please vote no for this bill. Please stand up for me and for my children. Please take longer to debate and vet a bill so

that the granting of “equal rights” does not equate to taking away religious freedoms. You should allow the people to vote on something of this magnitude. That is the right thing to do. You betray democracy if you believe that you, as a representative of the people, somehow “know more or know better” than those who elected you.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Jami Waite

Mililani, Hawaii

To: The House Judiciary Committee  
The House Finance Committee  
Hearing Date/Time: Thursday, October 31, 2013, 10:00 a.m.  
Place: Capitol Auditorium  
Re: Strong Opposition to SB1

Dear Chairs Rhoads and Luke, and Members of both the House Committees on  
Judiciary and Finance:

I am writing to voice my opposition to Bill SB1.

I am asking you to allow the people to decide on the issue of marriage, as I believe the legislature is going against the will of the people. I support equality for all including the rights of conscience and religious freedom, which I ask you to respect as our elected leaders.

I am opposed to the most contentious social issue in our history being decided virtually in one week and ask that you please uphold the principles of democracy and the democratic process, which are being disregarded in this special session.

This bill should be given due process during the regular session where it can properly be vetted and examined as all other bills. The people who elected you to serve as their voices should have a say in public policy that will forever obliterate thousand of years of indigenous and non-native culture, customs and traditions. Your "yes" vote in special session is clearly a NO vote to democracy!

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Cara Ahn  
Mililani, HI

Danielle Surface  
1265 Ala Alii st.  
Honolulu, HI 96818

Re: TESTIMONY IN OPPOSITION TO SB 1 RELATING TO EQUALITY

Dear Honorable Chairs Rhoades and Luke and Members of the House Judiciary and Finance Committees:

As a citizen of this nation and a part of the 'ohana of Hawai'i's communities, I add my voice in strong opposition to this proposed bill.

I believe that this bill was written and rushed into session in a deceitful and underhanded manner. Please do not destroy the trust that the people of our state have placed in you. I am greatly disappointed in the Senate's refusal to honor the traditions and foundational practices of our government. If we are truly a democracy - a nation created by the people and for the people - than please prove that to be true.

Give this vote to the people. Legislature cannot redefine a word and a culture.

This issue is not a burden for any select group of people to bear. I hear murmurings from many groups of people - concerns and disillusioned voices. Please show our people your trust in **THEM**.

As an educator of our children and families and as a woman who desires to raise a family in Hawai'i, I am concerned about the vast and long-term ramifications if you pass this bill. The terminology leaves room for MY RIGHTS to be completely threatened. Are my rights important?

The premise has not been clearly established. Terms are used ambiguously and frivolously. If this - then what next? Bigamists and polygamists would also make the same claims as those in homosexual relationships. What makes them an exception? Where does it end?

The discussion must be held. You **MUST LISTEN TO THE PEOPLE**.  
Or this is not the nation it claims to be.

I thank you for your service, your graciousness, and your commitment to our people.

Mahalo.

Danielle Surface

<b>Submitted By</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Testifier Position</b>	<b>Testifying in Person</b>
Wesley Yamada	Individual	Oppose	Yes

Comments: I am opposed to this bill because it does not give equal protection to the religious freedom rights of Christian churches and business owners I am also upset that the Governor is taming this bill through in a special session When it can be better and more fairly handled in the regular session

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testifying in Person
Jose		Comments Only	Yes

Comments: To ask whether the government class should change the traditional meaning of the word marriage is to ask the wrong question. The correct question is "Does the government class has a legitimate right to change it?" I refer to the definition forged by all of humanity's true religions and great philosophies, from time immemorial, which is: A permanent bond between a man and a woman, A bond that creates a basic unit of society devoted to the conception of protection, and raising of society's future - it's children. A bond that is protected, and enforced by society as a whole. First, Americas Founders devoted 85% of the Deceleration of Independence to explaining the basis on which they claimed a right to scribble over beliefs held sacred by old Europe for centuries. Hawaii's governor and legislature have stated no basis on which they claim a right to scribble over the definition of a word that has been held sacred since time immemorial - other than "We do, because we can", which is to say that we spit on the face of what Americas Founders described as "a decent respect to the opinions of mankind".



Aloha Members of the State House Committees,

I understand that the Hawaii State Senate has approved SB1 and now it is your hands to pass it or kill it. I humbly remind you of the two previous times that it was put on a ballot and an overwhelming majority of Hawaii Residents voted against it! Now you are being lobbied to pass a law that will redefine marriage and I cannot and will not support such an effort. I have nothing personal against homosexuals. They are free to live that life style if they choose to but we should not be redefining an institution that has been set up since the creation of man.

This is not nor will it ever be a civil rights issue! Homosexuals have all the civil rights as everyone else. Marriage is a union between a man and a woman. Therefore, by definition, it is impossible for same-sex marriages to exist. I hope and pray that you will not collapse under pressure because truth will always be truth and I WILL STAND FOR THE TRUTH!

Hawaii State Motto:

Ua mau ke ea o ka aina i ka pono o Ke Akua  
(The Life of the Land is Perpetuated in the righteousness of Almighty God)

Mahalo,  
Aaron Cummings

**From:** Olaso Ohana [<mailto:olasos@hawaiiantel.net>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 29, 2013 10:31 PM  
**To:** Judiciary Special Session  
**Subject:** In Strong OPPOSITION to SB1, relating to "Equal Rights"

October 29, 2013

To: Karl Rhoads, Chair, House Judiciary Committee and Sylvia Luke, Chair, House Finance Committee

From: Tiffany Olaso

Re: In **Strong OPPOSITION to SB1**, relating to "Equal Rights"

Hearing Day & Date: Thursday, Oct. 31<sup>st</sup>

Dear Honorable Chairs Rhoads and Luke and Members of the House Judiciary and Finance Committees:

As a voting citizen of the United States of America and the State of Hawaii, I am in **STRONG OPPOSITION** to SB1, relating to Equal Rights.

I believe it is our right as voting citizens to allow this issue to be voted on **BY THE PEOPLE** and not in a special session that circumvents the Democratic process.

Please do our government and people justice and **LET THE PEOPLE DECIDE!**

Thank you,

Tiffany Olaso

**From: Sharon Martin [mailto:sharonmartin7@gmail.com]  
Sent: Tuesday, October 29, 2013 10:33 PM  
To: Judiciary Special Session  
Subject: RE: Opposition to SB 1**

**Re: TESTIMONY IN OPPOSITION TO SB 1 RELATING TO EQUALITY**

**Dear Honorable Chairs Rhoads and Luke and Members of the House Judiciary and Finance Committees:**

**I stand in opposition to SB 1. My voice as well as THOUSANDS of others opposed to this Bill needs to be heard. It is an outrage that the Senate voted so quickly while knowing they did not hear and take time to consider the voice of the people. This legislation should be put before the voters of this state to let US decide. The passage of this Bill will negatively impact the lives as well as the rights of the rest of us who believe and stand for traditional marriage.**

**Though it's language seems to make religious exemptions for our pastors, this doesn't exempt the rest of us so how can our pastors preach to us if the definition of marriage is fundamental in the Bible! This is infringing on our right to exercise freedom of religion.**

**In Massachusetts, the educational system was immediately affected by the passage of this legislation. Parents opposed to having their kindergarten and elementary children taught about same sex relationships were told by the federal courts that the schools had no obligation to notify or give parents the option to opt out because same sex was legalized and considered normal. This denial of my parental and religious rights will surely come to pass if this Bill is approved. Our country was founded on the Word of God by our founding fathers. God and His Word is not the problem.**

**This is just an example of the ramifications that will come about with the approval of such a Bill. This 5 day special session is NOT adequately addressing the consequences nor taking into consideration the voices of the majority of full time resident voters in this state ~ not special interest groups.**

**Please DO NOT pass this Bill! I urge you all to vote NO ~ the majority vote of the people.**

**Thank you for your time and consideration. I do appreciate all that you do for our state.**

**Mahalo,  
Mrs. Sharon Martin  
Pharmacist  
Castle Medical Center  
640 Ulukahiki Street  
Kailua, HI 96734  
808-263-5192**

**res: 45-621 Halelo Place Kaneohe 96744  
ph#391-8508**

To: The House Judiciary Committee  
The House Finance Committee  
Hearing Date□Time: Thursday, October 31, 2013, 10:00 a.m.  
Place: Capitol Auditorium  
Re: Strong Opposition to SB1

Dear Chairs Rhoads and Luke, and Members of both the House  
Committees on Judiciary and Finance:

I am writing to voice my opposition to Bill SB1.

I am asking you to allow the people to decide on the issue of marriage, as I believe the legislature is going against the will of the people. I support equality for all including the rights of conscience and religious freedom, which I ask you to respect as our elected leaders.

I am opposed to the most contentious social issue in our history being decided virtually in one week and ask that you please uphold the principles of democracy and the democratic process that are being disregarded in this special session.

This bill should be given due process during the regular session where it can properly be vetted and examined as all other bills. The people who elected you to serve as their voices should have a say in public policy that will forever obliterate thousand of years of indigenous and non-native culture, customs and traditions. Your "yes" vote in special session is clearly a NO vote to democracy!

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Amanda Wong  
Kapolei, Hawaii

**From:** Matthew S. LoPresti [[mailto:matt\\_lopresti@yahoo.com](mailto:matt_lopresti@yahoo.com)]

**Sent:** Tuesday, October 29, 2013 10:41 PM

**To:** Judiciary Special Session

**Subject:** Strong Support for SB1

To: House Committee Considering SB1

Hearing Date/Time: Thursday, October 31, 2013, 10:00 a.m.

Strong Support of SB1, Relating to Equal Rights

Dear Chair Hee and Members of the Committee on Judiciary and Labor:

I am writing in strong support of SB 1.

Marriage equality is a the single greatest civil rights issue of our day. The simple and straightforward arguments for marriage equality are of two kinds: (1) practical and (2) moral.

On the practical side, the State of Hawaii must act now to bring state law in line with SCOTUS's recent ruling requiring that same sex couples be allowed equal access to the same rights and privileges of other married couples and that this essentially means that marriage equality is the only constitutional way to ensure such equal treatment under the law.

The moral argument concerns respecting the liberties of our GLBT brothers and sisters and treating them as those of us who may be straight wish to be treated. This means that we cannot reasonably or ethically discriminate and create second-class status that condones one group of persons who wish to marry while limiting the rights of another group who wishes to also have their loving relationships recognized on an equal footing. This is basic.

Sadly, numerous poorly reasoned counter-arguments abound opposed to gay marriage alleging fallacious harms or insisting upon deliberately absurd slippery slopes that suggest if we allow gay marriage then we will soon face a need to condone a motley list of completely unrelated unions. As for the former, no alleged harms have ever upheld under even the least bit of scrutiny and faux scientific studies have been objectively discredited. And as for the later, the supposed slippery slopes that you will have heard, either do not actually apply to gay marriage, or merely apply to marriage between same sex couples as much as it applies equally to marriage between heterosexual couples.

As a straight married man in a mixed race marriage, I am very keen on ensuring that people have no illusions about these above sorts of counter-arguments as being almost identical to ignorant and hateful agendas of the past that were

directed against mixed race couples. Those arguments were invalid and unsound then against mixed race couples then and they are invalid and unsound against GLBT couples today.

As a democratic society we simply cannot allow the myopic religiously-based infatuation of an increasingly shrinking number of people dictate who does and does not qualify for equal treatment under the law. Reason, justice and a cosmopolitan morality must prevail.

Please pass this bill to allow for marriage equality for all of Hawaii's families. Any delay would be, in effect, a denial of justice for thousands of our citizens.

Thank you for this opportunity to testify.

Matthew S. LoPresti, Ph.D.  
91-1411 Keoneula Blvd., unit 2106  
Ewa Beach, HI 96706

-----Original Message-----

From: [ishikawas@wwdb.org](mailto:ishikawas@wwdb.org) [<mailto:ishikawas@wwdb.org>]

Sent: Tuesday, October 29, 2013 10:44 PM

Subject: Let the People Decide Testimony

Dear Honorable Chairs Rhoades and Luke,

I am writing to voice my opposition to Bill SB1. I am asking you to allow the people to decide on the issue of marriage as I believe the Legislature is going against the will of the people. I support equality for all including the rights of conscience and religious freedom which I ask you to respect as our elected leaders.

I am opposed to the most contentious social issue in our history being decided virtually in one week and ask that you please uphold the principles of democracy and the democratic process which are being disregarded in this special session.

This bill should be given due process during the regular session where it can properly be vetted and examined as all other bills. The people who elected you should have a say in public policy that will forever obliterate thousands of years of indigenous and non native culture, customs and tradition. Your "yes" in special session is clearly a NO vote to democracy.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Salvacion Ishikawa  
7510 kekaa St.  
Honolulu, Hi 96825

October 29, 2013

Mr. Karl Rhoads, Chair  
House Judiciary Committee

Ms. Sylvia Luke, Chair  
House Finance Committee

**Re: TESTIMONY IN OPPOSITION TO SB 1 RELATING TO EQUALITY**

Dear Honorable Chairs Rhoads and Luke and Members of the House Judiciary and Finance Committees:

I am a registered voter in the State of Hawaii. Thank you for the opportunity to testify in opposition to SB-1 at the upcoming Joint House Hearing scheduled for October 31, 2013. I oppose SB-1 for the following reasons:

1. The Same-sex marriage should not be addressed in a special session for the following reasons:
  - A five-day special session is not enough time to discuss the most controversial issues of our time, the amount of time to debate and discuss the issue is far too limited.
  - A yes vote during a special session will reflect the desires of the governor, legislators and special interest groups but not necessarily the desires of the people of the State of Hawaii.
  - In 1998 the people of Hawaii voted on this issue and a 70% majority specified that Marriage was defined as one man and one woman
2. Legislators are elected to respect the fundamental Democratic principles provided for in the State of Hawaii and the United States constitutions.
  - The governor and legislators are elected to represent the people and as a result should respect the process that allows their voices and opinion the greatest opportunity to be heard.

I believe that the current bill and the pursuit of its passing in a special session called by the Governor eludes my rights as a citizen, violates my right to religious freedom guaranteed by the first amendment of the US Constitution and jeopardizes social fabric of the State of Hawaii.

Sincerely,

Shari Ann Lau  
95-1151 Ko`olani Dr., #87  
Mililani, Hawaii 96789



I oppose Bill SB1.

I am a strong supporter of traditional marriage between one man and one woman. Anything else is contrary to God's law. I truly believe our forefathers who founded our country are turning in their graves because of what our society is facing today regarding the issue of same sex marriage which I feel we are being forced to accept. I do not harbor any ill feelings towards those individuals whose values are not in line with mine. But I do have a problem with being forced to accept someone else's values which I cannot support, this takes away my religious freedom.

I also oppose the most contentious social issue in our history being decided virtually in one week. What has taken place so far tells me our representatives, who were elected to be our voice, are not listening to the will of the people. I ask you, why the rush? Do you have a hidden agenda? Please allow the people to decide on the issue of marriage. I support equality for all including the rights of conscience and religious freedom, which I ask you to respect as our elected leaders.

Thank you for giving me this opportunity to testify.

From: gfri [mailto:rezumes@hotmail.com]  
Sent: Tuesday, October 29, 2013 11:23 PM  
To: Judiciary Special Session  
Cc: rezumes@hotmail.com  
Subject: Our Testimony in Support of SB! - The House Committees on Judiciary and Finance

I failed in my attempts to submit our testimony via online website on October 30, 2013 @ 1030pm hst; Therefore sending our testimony via email as directed on the website for the House Committee Hearing on:

Thursday, October 31, 2013 –10:30 a.m.

The House Committees on Judiciary and Finance  
State Capitol Auditorium  
415 South Beretania Street  
Honolulu, HI 96813

RE: STRONG SUPPORT for Senate Bill 1

Aloha Chair Rhoads, Chair Luke, and members of the House Committees on Judiciary and Finance:

Our family and friends strongly support marriage equality in Hawaii. We urge members of the Committee to stand with the people of Hawaii on the right side of history by supporting marriage equality.

Since 1993, my beloved life partner, Louise Esselstyn, and I have been in a loving and committed relationship. We are hardworking taxpayers who contribute to our community in many generous ways. We are true American patriots who uphold the values of truth, respectfulness, honesty and liberty and justice for all, without exception.

We fully support Marriage Equality and full Civil Rights in Hawaii and we support SB 1, For Marriage Equality. While we value our privacy, we would like to take this opportunity to share our personal story with you. We want you to truly understand how the proposed Marriage Equality Law will affect our lives in very important and positive ways.

We live on O'ahu in the State of Hawaii and have been in a loving, supportive, and committed relationship for 20 wonderful years. Our relationship began in 1993 when we met at the very first fund raiser for what was then known as the Same Sex Marriage Equality Project.

Louise and I grew up during the slowly evolving progression of Civil rights legislation throughout the United States. The Esselstyn family is from Pennsylvania and the Lovinger family is from Chicago. In 1963, Louise and her church youth group attended the March on Washington and witnessed Dr. King's memorable speech.

Separately and together, we have always STOOD UP for the Civil Rights of others. One thing we know for sure is that Civil rights should never be put to a popular vote.

In 1993 the Hawaii Supreme Court ruled that there was no compelling or legal reason for the State of Hawaii to deny marriage to same-sex couples.

Instead of taking the opportunity at hand in 1993-1998 and leading the way by championing Civil Rights for all of America and the world to follow, we felt that our Legislators chose to slam the Equality door in our faces. Their message was clear to each of us in the LGBT community: You are not deserving of equal rights in our backyard; you are not welcomed at our table!

When Hawaii Legislators did that in 1998, it subjected the people of Hawaii to an onslaught of distortions. And it painfully and unfairly subjected members of the LGBT community to unwarranted vilification. It traumatized many of our adult friends and family members and their children, who witnessed horrific attacks and ugly behaviors from people who supposedly were following the orders of their religious leadership. Where was the separation of church in state? Where is it today?

We have been patient and we have been disappointed repeatedly over the past 20 years of legislative foot-dragging. Hawaii has side-stepped our Civil Rights for the past 20 years and the LGBT community have suffered - emotionally and financially.

The current SB1 legislation addresses this inequality and we urge quick passage so that all those who seek Marriage Equality can have it now...without further delay.

We are Civil Rights workers. We know how discrimination and stereotyping deeply hurt people. Despite the Civil Rights legislation passed in 1967, there are many places on the Mainland right now where non-white Americans are not wanted and not safe to live. You can get a map of the hate groups by checking out the website for the Southern Poverty Law Center.

While working for FEMA doing disaster response and recovery deployments, I utilized this resource to ensure our diverse staff working in the impacted communities stayed safe and did not accidentally wander into those areas where the hate groups were located.

Every single legislator who is non-white and who is opposed to Equality for those in the LGBT community, should carefully check out this resource.

For as intolerant as some are of the LGBT community in Hawaii, I can absolutely assure you, there are hundreds of equally intolerant hate groups throughout the United States of America who would not welcome YOU to their communities, and who would happily return to the "good old days" which were actually not good for any one of color or any female of any race . But I digress.

In July 1997, we were excited when we heard the news about legal recognition in Hawaii for our then 4 year relationship, when the HI Legislators passed The Reciprocal Beneficiary Act...or the "RB" Act.

We were first in line on July 8, 1997 at the Department of Health where we eagerly anticipated the legal recognition of our relationship under HI State law; we unceremoniously received our single sheet of paper which recognized us as being RBs, a unique classification of 2nd class status, which is unique to Hawaii.

We entered into RBs because HI State Legislators falsely assured us that we would be afforded the same 1138+ legal benefits, rights, responsibilities, protections and privileges as those who have a "Traditional Marriage"; however, this did not occur in 1997, nor did it occur in 2012 when HI enacted The Civil Unions law.

Under the RB Act, we were promised equal medical insurance opportunities. However, I was denied medical insurance thru Louise's employer, Goodwill; they simply did not want to do it. Louise soon

changed jobs and we were able to get medical insurance thru her new employer, Hawaii Counseling and Education Center.

In 2005 when Louise's health worsened and just before her diagnosis of MS, I took a sabbatical from FEMA because Louise needed me to be home to care for her. I quickly got another full time job offer, this time with the State of Hawaii. Fortunately, we were able to sign Louise up for medical insurance after submitting many more forms than my married colleagues were required to do.

Additionally, there were tax consequences for this benefit if you were an RB. Unlike my married colleagues, I was unfairly taxed on the premiums paid toward Louise's medical insurance by my employer...in the amount of approximately \$21,000 over the past 5 years. Because we are not legally recognized by the IRS, I was unable to claim the other \$21,000 I paid for Louise's medical premiums.

Where is the fairness and equality in all of this? It's not in the RB Act nor is it in the Civil Unions Law in Hawaii.

Louise and I have been responsible tax paying citizens and worked hard our entire lives for a combined 95 years. However, without federal recognition of our 20 year relationship, we are "just friends" under the law. This is heart-breaking and very disrespectful.

Beyond the emotion, there is additional unequal adverse financial impact to this inequality. For example, if I die tomorrow, my beloved Louise would be denied my social security survivors benefits and my pension survivors benefits. We do not have children.

If I die tomorrow, without being married, Louise will be subjected to inheritance taxes on our jointly owned home. She is excluded from the spousal exemption afforded to our straight family.

As a Social Security pensioner, Louise would be unable to afford these taxes and would be forced to sell our beloved home. Where would she go? Who would take care of her? How would she receive the care she needs and how would her care be paid? Where would our beloved dogs, Pono Puggles and Koko Puffff live?

These are the thoughts that steal my peace-of-mind at night after a very long day of work and care giving.

Without a Federally sanctioned marriage, we are legally denied a more favorable tax status and we pay higher taxes than our married family and friends, despite our significant out-of-pocket medical expenses. I estimate this to be a loss of approximately \$100,000 in tax deductions and extra taxes paid, over the past 20 years we've been together.

Today, we are 60 and 69 years of age. We have persevered in our love and commitment despite serious health issues including spine surgery in 2000...neck surgery in 2005...brain shunt surgery in 2006...and the devastating diagnosis of Multiple Sclerosis in 2008 for Louise.

As anyone in a committed and loving relationship knows, when one of you has the diagnosis of a life altering disability, you both have the diagnosis. We continue to persevere with the love and support of each other and that of our families, friends, neighbors, and colleagues. And soon there will be Equality in Hawaii.

There are 1,138 federal benefits, including social security survivor benefits, filing joint federal returns, the ability to transfer an unlimited amount to a spouse on death without federal estate tax, sponsoring loved ones (and their families) for immigration.

In 2012, we opted out of exchanging our RB status to that of entering into a Civil Union, because the new HI Civil Unions law did not afford us the same 1138+ legal rights and responsibilities as marriage. Under the HI Civil Unions law, we would still be 2nd class citizens under State Law and Federal Law.

Today, in October 2013, our relationship is as loving and committed as any marriage among our large family. Yes, of course we want our state and the Federal Government to recognize our 20 year commitment as something to be honored and celebrated. Our families are very proud of us and we are strong and united in standing up for Civil Rights for all people, without exception.

In June 2013, the U.S. Supreme Court struck down Section 3 of the Defense of Marriage Act; those in same-sex marriages are now eligible for federal benefits. However Same-sex couples that are currently married, e.g., in Massachusetts or Canada, and living in Hawaii are recognized as civil unions and not marriage. Consequently, they cannot receive federal benefits w/o a change in the marriage laws.

Committed same-sex couples are able to claim the state's benefits and protections under Hawaii's civil unions law. But now the U.S. Supreme Court has ruled that all couples legally married in their states should be treated the same under federal law.

Today, it is not equitable that Hawaii should have a two-tiered system of legal recognition, with couples in marriages having access to federal benefits and those in civil unions denied those rights.

In closing, we want you to know that we both sincerely believe in Marriage Equality and Equal Rights.

We believe in the separation of church and state and implore you to step up to your constitutional duty as an elected official -- to uphold our Civil Rights without further compromise because of your personal religious beliefs. The time for Equality is now!.

Traditions can and do change, especially if the aim is to extend the rights and privileges of American life to more Americans. Faith still can be respected, as it is in the proposed legislation. Do not dilute our Public Accommodations laws; they work just fine.

But it's time to take down barriers precluding one class of people from claiming the "liberty and justice for all" that the nation's founding documents promise them.

We are getting older and "going toward the light". We cannot waste anymore time and we are unwilling to accept 2nd class recognition of our 20 year loving relationship.

We are counting on you to be mindful of your constitutional duty and uphold Equality and Equal Rights in Hawaii. And we urge you to pass SB 1 for Marriage Equality in HI in 2013.

Mahalo for this opportunity to share our story and testify!  
IMUA Hawaii!

Respectfully submitted by:  
Louise Esselstyn and Robie Lovinger

92-1085 Kakoo Place, Kapolei, HI 96707  
rezumes@hotmail.com  
808-722-0746

Dear Honorable Chairs Rhoads and Luke and Members of the House Judiciary and Finance Committees:

I am testifying in favor of traditional marriage in Hawaii.

Before I begin, let me say “thank you” for your service to our State. I recognize that being a legislator is challenging, especially when dealing with issues of this nature.

There are two key points I would like to make in my brief testimony.

The first point is regarding the issue of civil rights. The Hawaii homosexual community is not considered a lower class and denied basic human rights. They are free to participate fully in society. Thus, the issue of preserving traditional marriage is not about civil rights.

My second point has to do with the term “marriage equality”. This is a compelling moniker since equality is an important value of American society. However, a same sex marriage can never be equal to a traditional one. The “equality” argument falls short in a key aspect of natural law – same sex couples cannot procreate.

As a licensed engineer I am trained to work with principles of natural law - not against them – in order to avoid catastrophe. Being that the fabric of traditional marriage is the bedrock of our society, redefining marriage in a manner contrary to natural law will have dire consequences.

As to those consequences.... Including “same sex” in the definition of marriage will legitimize a lifestyle choice with the force of law in order to force those that do not agree with that choice to not only accept it, but to be prevented from expressing their dissent with it. Businesses, schools and families will all be hugely affected. Schools, public and private, will be forced to teach non-traditional lifestyles as normal, and parents who disagree will not be able to “opt out” of such teaching for their children. Above all, the label of “bigot” will be freely applied to anyone that disagrees with gay, lesbian or transgender lifestyle choices, even if they respect others that choose such. There are many, many more ramifications that will ensue and there is no way to legislate around these effects.

This is not far-fetched. This is reality. As engineers we pay attention to the mistakes of others who have violated natural laws and reaped the consequences. We would do well to learn from States such as Massachusetts who have redefined marriage and are seeing these very problems.

I am convinced that this direction is not good for Hawaii and plead with you to uphold the definition of marriage as being between one man and one woman. By doing so, you will retain the fabric of Hawaii society for our keiki.

Mahalo and Aloha,

Ayman El-Swaify  
Aiea, Hawaii





-----Original Message-----

From: Alvin Ty Law [<mailto:alvin@fatlawfarm.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, October 30, 2013 12:14 AM

To: Judiciary Special Session; FINTestimony

Subject: Testimony in support of Same-Sex Marriage

Dear Esteemed Representatives,

My name is Alvin Law and I am writing to you all today to express my support of the same-sex marriage legislation.

I am a gay. I wish to be treated equal to my straight siblings and cousins. I wish to be afforded the same opportunity to choose if and when to get married to my committed partner of 7 years. He and I moved to Hawaii to help run the family business, FAT Law's Farm. We employ around 50 employees on a full time basis out in Ewa Beach.

Now is the time to make this right.

Thank you,

Alvin Law

Aloha, my name is Eva Kuuipo Hubbard, from Nu'uau and Nanakuli, and I strongly oppose SB 1. The majority of Hawai'i residents have spoken testimony after testimony, after testimony against this bill and hear we are again earning a good days work! Thank you for this opportunity

People come from all over the world to see Hawai'i – they come from Asia, South America, Canada, Greenland, Norway, Europe, Africa, Asia, Australia, and from the almost 30,000 islands in Oceania, arriving through 15 ports and 23 airports throughout the islands. We have shared our Hawaiian culture and traditions, we have shared our Hawaiian values and ethics, we have shared our lives. We have shared our Aloha with the world who comes to experience Hawai'i and it cannot be duplicated anywhere else, people have tried. Last year alone Hawai'i had 74 million visitors to the islands. What will the statistics of visitors be once they find out that this billed has been passed? What will the world think of Hawai'i then? Who will want to come to Hawai'i then? You are changing our culture with the decisions you make. Our traditions and values continue to be watered down by these outside influences, what kind of culture will we have left to present to those 74 million visitors? This is not PONO. Of the only 10% of the Hawaiians living here, I do not want to be included on the map of the 14 states that approve this. Immoral practices of all kinds bring immoral judgments.

Maybe, the districts leaders in many of the other states have it right when they say they want to create their own states and become Separatists because they have had enough of the immoral decisions this government is making. Maybe sovereignty, which I have never thought about, is not such a bad idea for Hawai'i because it seems as justice for the Hawaii I knew, or my ancestors knew doesn't seem to be available. Given an avenue to go by, unification for the Hawaiian is not impossible. This certainly has had me prayerfully thinking about it. Please make this PONO to who we are as Hawai'i!

Mahalo ke Akua.

**SB1**

Submitted on: 10/30/2013

Testimony for on Oct 31, 2013 10:00AM in Conference Room Auditorium

<b>Submitted By</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Testifier Position</b>	<b>Testifying in Person</b>
ricardo coral	Individual	Support	Yes

Comments: I have been married to my same sex partner for 3 years, my husband is from Washington State and I am from Canada. When we knew Hawaii had civil unions and recognize same-sex partnerships we were thrilled. Only to find out that their definition of civil union, limited our rights as a married couple. It is frustrating not to be recognized as legally married, when both my country and his state of original residency recognize our union, even at federal level now with the repeal of DOMA provides us with federal rights for me to immigrate and file taxes. However at State level, we can not access to medical services as a married couple, according to Kaiser (who I called them) even when our marriage is legal, it is not recognize by the state definition , therefore we cannot access to spouse benefits as other heterosexual couples. In order to do these I need to register and change my status to be "civil unioned" to my partner who I am already married to. This makes absolutely no sense, and its not only an inconvenience and burden to us as citizens, but also its complicate acces to serveices that are granted to other couples , heterosexual couples that is. This is violation to our rights, and it should be considered unconstitutional under the law. Extending the the right to marry, and recognizing the legality of our marriage should be one of the most important acts of respect towards gay couples, The aloha state needs to spread Aloha to all as equal members of one Ohana.

-----Original Message-----

From: [michael@mterui.com](mailto:michael@mterui.com) [<mailto:michael@mterui.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, October 30, 2013 12:16 AM

To: Judiciary Special Session

Subject: gay marriage bill

Aloha,

My name is Michael Terui and I am against this bill. Please do not pass it on behalf of the people of Hawaii. Please hear our voices. Please represent us and not what you think we want. This bill will infringe on my beliefs and rights and if this passes I know a lot more will soon come after that will affect myself and the generations to come. I have seen what happened in Canada, California, and Colorado already when bills like this pass and soon the next generation will not be safe from morals that I do not want them to learn. Please to not give in to peer pressure, lobbyists and money and do the right thing and represent us. If anything take a vote again and you will see that the people of Hawaii are still against it. Do not do this so that our budget for next year will be higher because you think it will bring in more revenue. Please listen to us and stop the bill.

Much Mahalos,

Michael Terui

**From:** Cayce Rosario [<mailto:cayce808@aol.com>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 30, 2013 12:20 AM  
**To:** Judiciary Special Session  
**Subject:** Testimony for House session Thursday

Karl Rhoads  
Chair

Judiciary Committee

Subject: Testimony in Opposition to SB1 Relating to Equality

Dear Honorable Chairs Rhoads and Luke and members of the House Judiciary and Finance Committees;

As a concerned citizen of the state of Hawaii, I am submitting my testimony against SB1, which would legalize same sex marriage.

I oppose this bill for several reasons. On page 6 starting on line 4, the definitions of church exemptions are too poorly written to guarantee our first amendment rights to the free exercise of religion. There are too many exceptions which all of the churches I know of would fall under. Many churches serve the community by allowing the usage of facilities for support groups, classes and sports and fitness programs that are open to the public. The language in SB1 is not strong enough to protect the churches that offer these services for free or small fee to the public, many of whom don't attend church, from lawsuits or other challenges. We have not voted nor had town hall meetings to get adequate feedback from the community. The only type of meeting I heard of was in Keaau on the Big Island at a community center, but when we the public showed up our representative Richard Onishi who was scheduled to meet and answer questions, cancelled. Apart from this I was not aware of any opportunities for public meetings on the subject. In 1998, the people only voted to allow the 'legislature to have the power to reserve marriage to opposite sex couples' because we had no other choice. To not have accepted the poorly worded measure would have left the decision to our state judiciary, which had the Baehr v, Miike case pending. Voting to grant the power into the legislatures hands in 1998 was the lesser of two evils. A 'yes' vote in the special session is a 'no' vote to democracy because you are clearly not listening to the voices of the people of Hawaii, whom you have been elected to represent. I honestly believe the surface has not even been scratched in getting the people's input. I first became aware of this issue approximately 3 weeks ago and it has taken me much time and energy to study up and get answers about it. Most people I come in contact with and bridge the subject with have either just heard about

it or are very unaware of the ramifications of such a measure and they are all certainly surprised that this huge societal issue is being decided for them.

Being born and raised in Hawaii and now raising the next generation I also have great concerns about this bill's effect on education. I believe the civil union bill addresses the rights of homosexual couples and that that bill can be expanded to cover anything that is deemed missing. It is not necessary to try and change the framework of society to give this group of people their civil rights. Marriage is not a civil right. Marriage is a definition: The legal status, condition, or relationship that results from a contract by which one man and one woman, who have the capacity to enter into such an agreement, mutually promise to live together in the relationship of husband and wife in law for life, or until the legal termination of the relationship. Across geographical lines, throughout history, spanning religions, and scientifically marriage is between a man and a woman. And this is not to the exclusion of any other group living, being educated, working, voting and being in society. It just simply means a marriage is by definition between a man and a woman.

These are just a few of the concerns I have about you voting into law possibly the most controversial issue of our time. The short time allowed for the special session and the extra issues that the governor has added prevents you the representatives of this great state from justly and adequately addressing the concerns to the people of the state of Hawaii. I request that you vote no or table this issue and bring it to a vote of the people

Sincerely,  
Cayce Rosario

Dear Honorable Representatives Luke and Rhoades, Chairs of the House Finance and Judiciary Committees and Members of the Committees,

My name is Kay Hishinuma. I am a registered voter of Hawaii from Kaneohe who is in strong opposition to SB1. I have testified before the Senate Committee on Judiciary and Labor regarding this bill, and I write to you both to request the opportunity to testify and to state my opinions.

Same sex marriage is an issue with far reaching ramifications. On its face, it is simple. Grant people the right to marry regardless of gender. Socially and legally, it is far, far more. To legitimize this relationship will cause an avalanche of consequences that, it seems, our legislators are unwilling to weigh carefully lest it cause them to stand against something that a small, but vocal, minority demands as morally right.

It has been pointed out that a provision of the bill, as written, will adversely impact the state's judiciary. Couples from other places where gay marriage is not legitimized will be forced to return here if they decide to divorce. If children are involved, this further complicates what is often already a messy issue for the courts to clear up. Hawaii will bear the burden of the costs to provide judicial services. Hawaii's family courts are already inadequate to face the present needs. How, then, will they handle an increased need? These people would not be state residents who pay taxes to support our system; we who reside here will pay for their services.

The impact to our educational system is a grave one. I am told that this is pure conjecture – that parallels cannot be drawn from the examples of Canada and Massachusetts. However, one cannot avoid the fact that the LGBT community has been very clear that the trends going on these places are exactly their aim. In every state where homosexual marriage has been enacted or adjudicated, the legitimizing of this relationship has led to the same ramifications. Children are exposed to sensitive material at inappropriately early ages. Graphic depictions of homosexual acts are common. Parents are denied the right to know if and when sensitive material is being taught. Teachers are directly instructed not to give parents information or allow them to see what is being taught. Schools are required to have homosexual clubs, and faith based clubs are disallowed as conflicting with these gay clubs.

In Hawaii now, we have GSA clubs on campuses. Some students from one of these schools were recently asked how they felt about the GSA clubs on their campuses. Their replies? They were afraid to speak out against them, pressured to wear wristbands and other emblems of the LGBT communities, and bullied for not wanting to participate. One of the LGBT's big arguments is that this will quell the bullying. Representatives, as an educator of many years, I am here to say that the only thing that stops bullying is for all of us to teach our children to respect and love all people, regardless of their differences, and to teach our children to stand up to a bully by refusing to give them power over us to change the way we act. THAT is how we resolve bullying. All that legitimizing gay marriage does is give the bullied reason to become the bullies. It does not resolve the root cause of bullying, the failure to value *all* people.

The impact to the faith community has been dismissed, calling us bigots and intolerant. Please understand that Christians who follow the teachings of the Bible faithfully do not hate homosexuals. Read Romans 12. We are called to love no matter what, to seek to live at peace with those around us to



the very best of our abilities, to treat those who offend us with love and respect – regardless of the offense against us, and to do all as an act of service to the One who loves us just as unconditionally. Understand that loving someone does not mean that we must agree with them. We must still speak the truth – in love – even when that truth is not accepted by others. God uses strong language when He speaks of homosexuality. He tells us that its practice is against His laws – not because He seeks to limit our freedom to choose, but because homosexuality is dangerous to our well being. We do not presume to tell homosexuals that they must stop what they are doing. We simply ask that we not be forced to participate in what we believe is wrong. Teachers, business people, landlords, and many others are already under attack. This law will simply lend more legitimacy to the persecution of the church.

I have heard several legal authorities say that the protections afforded the faith community in this bill are woefully lacking. They are the weakest in the nation. If this bill is supposed to be for ALL of the people, why are the demands of a very small minority being placed over the welfare of the vast majority? Morality is not an arguable position. It is apparent that what is moral no longer has any anchor. Where there has, for centuries, been foundational truths regarding what is right and wrong, that seems no longer to be the case. Morality, then, seems to be at the behest of the majority. If this is the case, it is certainly not the LGBT's morality that should be a guiding force. I am not saying that the faith community should take precedence. I am arguing that we are equally to be protected and allowed to be who we are.

It would take too many pages to lay out every argument. I am sure others will raise the rest of them. There are many, and I am no lawyer. I am a teacher. I am a mother. I am a woman who loves the Lord and has raised my children to respect and love all people regardless of their circumstances, beliefs, race, or sexual orientation. If homosexuals want to marry, I would grieve the damage that I believe they are doing to themselves, but I would not love them less or stand in their way. You see, it is not that I wish to deny them the freedom to do as they please; it is that I and those who believe as I do need to be given equal protection to act upon my own convictions. God does not hold me accountable for the actions of others. He holds me accountable for my own actions and attitudes.

Please . . . please take a stand to allow *all* of us to live as we believe we must. Grant us the protections that we need, or allow us to decide on the ballot. You have been elected to represent us, not to make your own decisions regardless of what we think. I think the turnouts of the last few days have spoken clearly. The people of Hawaii do not want this. It is your job to do the will of the people. Please honor that oath that you took.

Sincerely,

Kay S. M. Hishinuma



**From:** Glenn Agunat [<mailto:gagunat@gmail.com>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 30, 2013 12:57 AM  
**To:** Judiciary Special Session  
**Subject:** Special Session on Same Sex Marriage

Karl Rhoads, Chair Sylvia Luke, Chair10/31/13  
House Judiciary Committee House Finance Committee

Re: TESTIMONY IN OPPOSITION TO SB 1 RELATING TO EQUALITY

Dear Honorable Chairs Rhoads and Luke and Members of the House Judiciary and Finance Committees

As a concerned citizen, I am submitting testimony against this special session and the bill that would legalize same sex marriage. I oppose the special session because it rushes the legislative process and does not give we, the people, sufficient input into the process.

I am particularly concerned that the religious exemption clauses are so sparse. Priest, pastors and churches are exempted under only very limited circumstances. There is no exemption for religious organizations, charities or fraternal societies, nor are there any exemptions for individuals. I am concerned that my First Amendment rights be protected in the process.

Finally, since we voted a constitutional amendment in 1998 giving the legislature the power to limit marriage between opposite sex couples, the only legitimate way to change this is to let we, the people, decide.

Please do not circumvent the democratic process!

Thank you for the opportunity to testify against this special session and against this bill.

Fern Agunat

91-1018 Kailike St  
Sea, Hawaii 96706  
808-214-0894  
[gagunat@gmail.com](mailto:gagunat@gmail.com)

## Submitted Testimony

Date: 29 October, 2013

To: House Committee on Judiciary and Committee on Finance

Measure: SB 1 – Relating to equal rights

Hearing: Thursday, October 31, 2013 at 10:00am

From: Mark Wolfersberger

---

I OPPOSE bill SB1 – Relating to Equal Rights for the following reasons:

First, gay marriage is a serious issue that has the potential to redefine the fabric of our society. Thus, it deserves serious thought and input from all areas of our society here in Hawaii. By calling a special session, the governor is attempting to bypass the serious debate that this issue deserves. Let's not legislate by edict from the governor. Rather, let's legislate from the will of the people.

Second, because of the gravity of this issue, it should be decided by the people. In 1998, the people of Hawaii demonstrated their desire to carefully consider this issue by passing Constitutional Amendment 2. This amendment paved the way for the issue of same-sex marriage to be debated and decided by the legislature, and by extension, the people of Hawaii rather than the courts of Hawaii (e.g. *Baehr v. Lewin*, 1993). The governor's hasty introduction of Bill SB1 – Relating to Equal Rights and the special session that he has called is an affront to Hawaii voters and the trust that the voters demonstrated in the Hawaii State Legislature by passing Constitutional Amendment 2. Again, let's not legislate by edict from the governor.

Third, as clearly stated in the bill's introduction, Bill SB1 was introduced as a bandwagon reaction to the recent U.S. Supreme Court decision that declared portions of the federal *Defense of Marriage Act* unconstitutional. This court decision has relevance in states that have already passed laws for gay marriage: it is not relevant in states that have not passed such laws. Until the legislature and people of Hawaii debate this issue and make a decision, the U.S. Supreme Court decision has no impact on Hawaii. Let's not allow distant federal courts to impact serious local decisions in our state. Again, let's allow the people of Hawaii to have a proper debate of the issues and make a determination.

Finally, I have heard a number of people referring to the gay marriage as a civil rights issue similar to slavery and women's suffrage. I hope none of our legislators believe in these misguided comparisons. During slavery, African-Americans were bought and sold as a man's property. This was an issue of human trafficking and is morally reprehensible. Gay marriage is not an issue of gays being bought and sold as another

man's property. Women's suffrage was an issue of fair representation in government. Gays have not been denied the right to vote. In stark contrast to slavery and women's suffrage, the issue of gay marriage is a question of redefining families, which are the most basic unit of our society. This potential redefinition could have a far-reaching impact that goes well beyond the federal financial benefits that the bill's introduction uses as a rationale.

In conclusion, this issue deserves serious consideration by the state legislature and people. Please vote "NO" and give our state the time that it needs on this issue.

Karl Rhoads, Chair  
House Judiciary Committee

Sylvia Luke, Chair  
House Finance Committee

**Re: TESTIMONY IN OPPOSITION TO SB 1 RELATING TO EQUALITY**

Dear Honorable Chair Rhoads and Luke and Members of the House Judiciary and Finance Committees:

I am writing to voice my opposition to Bill SB 1.

I am asking that you would let the people of Hawaii decide on this issue of marriage. I believe that this special session does not give the people of Hawaii the opportunity to let their voice be heard on this issue.

I am a 27-year-old man and am writing this because I am concerned about my future keiki and what they will be learning in their public school curriculum if this same sex marriage bill is passed. I am getting married in December and am looking forward to having children and raising them the way I believe is correct. However, if this bill is passed, the public school system will enforce curriculum that I do not agree with.

There are documented incidences where parents are harassed because they have a difficult time with the curriculum that their children are being subjected to. Hawaii's public school system will change, Governor Abercrombie has assured us of this.

My fiancé is a case manager and I am teacher in the public school system. We will not have the financial freedoms to pay for a private school education for our future children so that they can be exempt from the promotion of homosexual relationships. My wife will not have the ability to home school my children, as she will need to provide financially as well.

As you can see, this is an extremely important issue that will have dramatic effects. More time is needed for further discussion of this bill. The determination of this bill is being rushed into a one-week decision, while the institution of traditional marriage has been around for thousands of years. Please give us, the people of Hawaii, the chance and time to have a say in this bill.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Chad Reis  
(Honolulu, HI 96816)

**From:** Evelyn Takara [<mailto:etnow808@gmail.com>]

**Sent:** Wednesday, October 30, 2013 1:49 AM

**To:** Judiciary Special Session

**Subject:** TRADITIONAL MARRIAGE-YES!!

- I am for TRADITIONAL MARRIAGE
- I am furious that the legislature and Governor have brought this up again! the people have VOTED twice against the same sex issue, under the name of civil rights or civil union.
- our representatives are ignoring the voice of their constituents who put them in office and whom they represent.
- RECALL VOTE: i am hoping the people will demand a recall of all senators and representatives who vote yes on the anti-gay bill and remember these people WHEN they seek re-election...
  
- **THEY DO NOT REPRESENT THE PEOPLE OR EVEN CARE ABOUT THE PEOPLE THEY REPRESENT.**
- Equality has been mentioned; America: Land of the Free...have any of you considered where America will be in the years, decades to come should we promote same-sex marriage?
- The united States and the European Countries are currently below the number of children born every year that is necessary to sustain a race or population.
- the moslems are going into many countries, having many children...no guessing their stand on gay rights! they surely have the numbers to sustain their race and way of life.
- **Where will America be?**
- Where will the gays be? Not neighbors to the Moslems, I imagine
- **Senators and Representatives: Remember your oath to represent the people in your District**

- Serving as a Representative or Senator isn't about YOU or what you WANT or THINK, IT'S ABOUT THE PEOPLE YOU SERVE AND THEIR WISHES AND NEEDS
- REMEMBER...

Evelyn Takara

[etnow808@gmail.com](mailto:etnow808@gmail.com)

Ph: 808-389-3225

**From:** Francis Takara [<mailto:minoru808@yahoo.com>]

**Sent:** Wednesday, October 30, 2013 2:03 AM

**To:** Judiciary Special Session

**Subject:** I AM FOR TRADITIONAL MARRIAGE

i am for traditional marriage.

i am against the gay rights bill

if you can't vote "yes", you aren't following the will of your constituency...Shame on You  
to forget the little guys that supported and voted for you.

Francis Takara  
Kaneohe District

To whom it may concern,

I thank you for taking the time to hear my voice concerning "same sex marriage". As a concerned citizen I am opposed to this bill as it is written as it will take away my freedom of religion in addition to that of the church in order to give another group "rights" that trump mine. I am a disabled veteran who has served this country to guarantee that I will be free to worship God the way that He commands me to. I also served for those who do not believe in the God I believe in to be free to do so. I believe the same things that the Founding Fathers of this great country believed in including the same God whose Word permeates through the documents they created to guarantee the freedoms and rights we still enjoy here but will not if this bill and others like it are made into law as has happened elsewhere. It is my belief that no law can be crafted that would take away or erode any right that I am guaranteed under the Constitution. It is my position that you the representatives of the PEOPLE should LET THE PEOPLE DECIDE. This issue is way too important to try to rush through a special session. God loves everyone of you in this room as do I. Thank you and God bless you!

Don Wisniewski



**SB1**

Submitted on: 10/30/2013

Testimony for on Oct 31, 2013 10:00AM in Conference Room Auditorium

<b>Submitted By</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Testifier Position</b>	<b>Testifying in Person</b>
In Kwon Jun		Oppose	Yes

Comments: This special session does not accurately represent the voice of the people. This law is directly against the interest of the people and God and does nothing but empower only a small section/representation of the population to change moral laws that have existed and benefitted all mankind for generations to the farthest times of history. This law cannot pass. Moreover, this law will take away the rights of families and children to learn as their heritage and cultures and customs want to learn. Let the people decide.

**From:** mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov [mailto:mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 30, 2013 10:12 AM  
**To:** House Special Session  
**Cc:** pkkmail@yahoo.com  
**Subject:** Submitted testimony for SB1 on Oct 31, 2013 10:00AM (In Person)

**SB1**

Submitted on: 10/30/2013

Testimony for on Oct 31, 2013 10:00AM in Conference Room Auditorium

<b>Submitted By</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Testifier Position</b>	<b>Testifying in Person</b>
Paul Kanoho	Individual	Oppose	Yes

Comments: My main concern is the Bill's impact on religious liberty. --Paul Kanoho

Please note that testimony submitted less than 24 hours prior to the hearing, improperly identified, or directed to the incorrect office, may not be posted online or distributed to the committee prior to the convening of the public hearing.

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email [webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov](mailto:webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov)

From: Charlotte Hee [mailto:hokunme@hawaii.rr.com]  
Sent: Tuesday, October 29, 2013 8:23 PM  
To: Judiciary Special Session  
Subject: Testimony in OPPOSITION OF SB1 RELATING TO EQUALITY

TESTIMONY BEFORE THE  
HOUSE JUDICIARY AND FINANCE COMMITTEES  
IN OPPOSITION OF SB1 RELATING TO EQUALITY

DATE OF HEARING: THU., OCTOBER 31, 2013  
TIME: 10:00 A.M.  
PLACE: AUDITORIUM, STATE CAPITOL

Dear Honorable Chairs Rhoads and Luke and Members of the House Judiciary and Finance Committees:

I am strongly opposed to Senate Bill One. This legislation does not cover equality. The language appears to be vague and would harm religious organizations, small business owners, government employees, and judges whose religious beliefs are not that of the gay/lesbian community. This bill will force individuals to abide by something that they strongly are against or face persecution. Passage of this bill will affect the sanctity of marriage between one man and one woman.

I believe that SB1 does not represent the best interests of the majority of the people of Hawaii. Please do not allow this type of legislation to be passed. Please let the people vote!

Charlotte Y. Hee

TESTIMONY

Presented before the

House Committees on Judiciary and Finance

October 31, 2013, 10:00 AM, State Capitol Auditorium

by

Karen Ginoza, Past President of the Hawaii State Teachers Association

In strong support of SB 1 Relating to Equal Rights

This testimony is in strong support of SB 1 Relating to Equal Rights. Many opponents of SB 1 are making statements about education that are not true. People fear that the passage of Equal Rights will force changes in the curriculum and in schools. After a close reading of SB, 1 I find that it only refers to marriage, not education. It does not include any mandates for schools. The Board of Education is the agency that mandates changes in the curriculum and in education.

The most important thing we as teachers need to remember is that all people, including children, need to be treated with love and respect.

Thank you for this opportunity to testify.

October 30, 2013

Karl Rhoads, Chair  
House Judiciary Committee

Sylvia Luke, Chair  
House Finance Committee

Hearing: Thursday, October 31, 2013

Time: 10:00 a.m.

Place: Auditorium, State Capitol, 415 South Beretania Street

Re: TESTIMONY IN OPPOSITION TO S.B. 1, RELATING TO EQUAL RIGHTS

Dear Honorable Chairs Rhoads and Luke and Members of the House Judiciary and Finance Committees:

With utmost respect, I want to thank you Senators, for your service to the truly protect and uphold the rights of the people of Hawaii. You are true warriors, fighting for the people of Hawaii, and standing on the battle grounds of the very people you protect.

I am Faith Strecker, resident and voter in the Waipahu district of Oahu, and I am in **STRONG OPPOSITION** to SB1, Relating to Equal Rights.

Firstly, marriage is **NOT** a civil right, as you will hear many supporters of SB1 claim.

Also, the word "EQUALITY" has been used a lot by the supporters of this bill, and they claim this is their right. However, that disturbs me a lot, because the truth is sexual preference is a **CHOICE**. How can supporters of this bill say it is their right? It is an individual's choice of sexual preference; it is not based on how one feels, or what clothes is put on the person that day.

Equality in Race, Equality in Skin Color, Equality among Nationalities, should not be confused by with the equality supporters of this bill is pushing for. For example, I am born a Japanese-American, and I can not say I don't feel right, I feel Irish, and so I change and claim to be Irish.

The truth is I am born into my Family, and I am born into my Race, and I am born with a certain eye color, of which I have no choice to decide because I like everyone else am born into it. Nevertheless, regardless of my nationality, my race, my skin color, nor my eye color, I am considered equal with all other people, and am privileged to receive rights just as anyone else.

You will hear many supporters of this SB1 falsely claim that they are born into the Same-Sex lifestyle, and thus their civil union should be equal to and receive rights just

as other heterosexual marriages. This is false simply because supporters of this lifestyle made a personal CHOICE of their sexual preference. This "Choice" simply DOES NOT equate to "Equal Rights", plain and simple.

I urge you to not rush a decision, but to allow the People to decide in a regular legislative session, such as in January where there is more time and space to receive a true representation of the public input.

I know many, many people and families are in strong opposition of SB1, because while it seems to be validating a certain sexual preference and way of life for a very small minority group, truth be told it is inadvertently trampling on the rights of many others. Therefore, I also humbly ask you to oppose SB1.

My short journey on this earth has been a colorful one, and by the grace of God, I am still here on this earth. Through my own walk in life, I have had my share of being bullied, verbally abused, neglected and unprotected emotionally in every sense of the word. Through it all, I have found the true meaning of equality. That is to love each other for who they are. I have learned to appreciate people and love them all, with various and different walks of life, including backgrounds, religions and sexual preferences. This is what I believe makes Hawaii, the land of Aloha so unique and special to the world. I can even say that I love the same-sex lifestylers, gays, lesbians, bi-sexuals, transgenders and queer peoples, as I love myself. But, I can not allow any policy to come against what I truly stand for. Hawaii's State Motto is, Ua mau ke ea o ka aina, I ka pono, Iesu Kuristo; The life of the Land is perpetuated in Righteousness.

I commend all of you for standing firm on the absolute truth, not being shaken, and not being swayed by a lot of the emotional hype surrounding, nor half-truths generated by this bill. I trust that you hear the majority, the Kama'aina of Hawaii, saying to stand up for righteousness and please "Let the People Decide." Thank you.

I am grateful for all that you do, and thank you for the opportunity to share my testimony on this Equal Rights bill.

Respectfully submitted,

Faith Strecker

October 30, 2013

**Karl Rhoads, Chair**  
**House Judiciary Committee**

**Sylvia Luke, Chair**  
**House Finance Committee**

**Hearing: Thursday, October 31, 2013**  
**Time: 10:00 a.m.**  
**Place: Auditorium, State Capitol, 415 South Beretania Street**

Subject: Testimony in Opposition of SB1, Relating to Equal Rights

Dear Honorable Chairs Rhoads and Luke, and Members of the Committee:

I am John Strecker, I am 7 years old and I live in Waipahu.

I am not old enough to vote, but if I could, I would vote no to same-sex marriage.

Why would a woman and a woman, and a man and a man be together, when they can not even have children?

Why would a child want to be in a home with a man and man, and a woman and woman? That is not marriage.

Thank you for letting me share my testimony.

Thank you for everything that you do for us, the people of Hawaii.

Sincerely,  
John Strecker

**From:** Mel Yukumoto [<mailto:melyukumoto@hotmail.com>]

**Sent:** Tuesday, October 29, 2013 11:27 PM

**To:** Judiciary Special Session

**Subject:** Testimony Against SB1

Dear Representatives,

I urgently request that you NOT pass Bill #SB1 on same sex marriage. My testimony is not like others that you have already heard. It is from 20 years of research and development in helping over 4,000 people solve critical personal problems in Hawaii. Through many hours of intensive interviews about their personal and family history, I have discovered the real source of many of the destructive behavior issues that plague our city, state, and country. I have dealt with a wide variety of issues, and among the people met have been families that had homosexual members and some homosexuals themselves who were seeking freedom from their lifestyle. By discovering the root source of problems, I have been able to develop solutions that have brought excitingly joyful freedom to people. Today, I can confidently tell you how a person becomes homosexual and how that behavior can be reversed and even prevented from happening. If you understand this you will realize that same sex marriage will be destructive to you, the community, and even the homosexual people themselves. In fact I can prove to you that the reasons that cause a person to be a drug addict are the same reasons that cause a person to be homosexual. Both of them are seeking something, anything, to remove the emotional pain they carry and will become bitterly disappointed when the pain persists even after getting what they thought would bring them happiness.

My material cannot be explained in a short testimony, but I would be happy to answer any questions that you may have. My discoveries are unique, but are well tested, both here in Hawaii and in other states and countries. I am in the process of teaching my material to as many as possible in order to bring needed help to families and communities throughout the world. I think you would be really disappointed at yourselves if you learned about my material after passing such a bill. What I am conveying to you is that you do not have the proper information to pass that bill. You will hurt and destroy a lot of people and may even cause the loss of our Aloha Spirit in Hawaii.

My qualification for such a project is that I am an information technology consultant, trained by IBM Corporation, and know how to track and manage information in a complex environment.



I am also personally trained in a dynamic problem solving concept called, “Strategic Thinking,” by its founder, Albert Kawamoto, the top business consultant for IBM Corporation and well-known for bringing astonishing solutions to critical problems faced by the top executives of the largest corporations, universities, State governments, and Federal agencies in America, and internationally.

Aloha,

Mel Yukumoto  
98-072 Puaanuhe St.  
Aiea, HI 96701  
Home Phone: 488-8513  
Cell Phone: 754-8335

**This decision whether to pass SB1 in Hawaii basically comes down to 1 specific issue.**

**Look at the historical record.**

**Roe vs Wade decision**

**55 million and counting murdered babies - Children**

**The consequence millions of \$ to those in the abortion industry who experiment and sell the bodies of those babies. We are still murdering them.**

**On Monday you heard the arguments pro or con on SB1, some were for the concern for the most vulnerable of our society - children,**

**BUT their rights ARE NOT specifically addressed or protected under SB1 legislation.**

**In Canada - you have heard the testimony how same sex legislation and law has now allowed so many social evils and consequences aimed at the larger part of their society to suffer under wrong laws which the gay and lesbian agenda is aimed at ..primarily the children - the most innocent and the most vulnerable.**

**The supporters of SB1 bill already have civil unions, and domestic partnership legislation, which gives them the same rights as a traditional married couple, now they want our children thru Same Sex Marriage.**

**History tells us - anytime a specific group or individual is given power or special**

**rights over the majority of the population  
what follows is the "children will suffer,  
society suffers, death and destruction"**

**If they can control the kids they control  
the future and you and me**

**Our governor who is a strong supporter  
abortion rights and the patriot act wants  
SB1 out of committee and fast tracked for  
his signature - if this legislation passes  
w/o appropriate revisions to allow  
complete protection IAW the U.S.  
Constitution to all of the residents of this  
State of Hawaii. Mr. Governor your  
cullmination of public service will be the  
legacy of forcing SB1 upon and lived out  
on the carnage and tragedy of the lives of  
the most vulnerable "the children".**

**One of the primary jobs of govenment is  
protect the innocent/weak from the the**

**strong/rich/evil and powerful.**

**We are seeing a gradual grinding down of our public policy, removal of our civil rights and the progression of what the gay and lesbian, social agenda is seeking after - the children, dominance and control over the rest of us..**

**The gallup organization did a poll in 2013, surveying 200,000 folks in 6 months the poll determined that 3.5% of the U.S. population is gay/lesibian or homosexual.**

**What has happened to the equal rights and constitutional rights of 97% of the rest of us, including the children.**

**Abraham Lincoln - America will never be destroyed from the outside. If we falter and lose our freedoms, it will be because we destroyed ourselves.**

**God have mercy on all of us, please vote  
"NO"**

**SB1**

Submitted on: 10/30/2013

Testimony for on Oct 31, 2013 10:00AM in Conference Room Auditorium

<b>Submitted By</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Testifier Position</b>	<b>Testifying in Person</b>
Kela Miller	Individual	Oppose	Yes

Comments: I am writing to voice my opposition to Bill SB1. I am asking you to allow the people to decide on the issue of marriage as I believe the legislature is going against the will of the people. I support equality for all including the rights of conscience and religious freedom, which I ask you to respect as our elected leaders. I am opposed to the most contentious social issue in our history being decided virtually in one week and ask that you please uphold the principles of democracy and the democratic process which are being disregarded in this special session. This bill should be given due process during the regular session where it can properly be vetted and examined as all other bills. The people who elected you to serve as their voices should have a say in public policy that will forever obliterate thousand of years of indigenous and non-native culture, customs and traditions. Your "yes" vote in special session is clearly a No vote to democracy! Mahalo nui loa, Kekela Mokuiki Miller Laie Community Resident

Aloha Hawaii State Legislatures,

October 29, 2013

My name is Sammantha Villacres and I would like to submit a testimony concerning the Hawaii Marriage Equality Act of 2013. I am opposed to the bill, and I would like to ask that this bill be brought before the people to decide. While this bill is intended to right an injustice, it is in fact creating one. If equality was brought to marriage and same sex marriages become legal, would the religious freedoms of so many of your constituents be compromised? Would it later be found that the reading of our holy text (where it clearly states that same sex relationships are prohibited) be considered a hate crime? Would we be forced to deny our beliefs in order to accommodate one we oppose? I ask respectfully that this bill be presented to the people to decide. There are a great many who also oppose this bill.

Thank you for your time, service and patience.

God Bless You,

Sammantha Villacres



**From:** MMMMMM TTTTTT [<mailto:mtanonymoumt@gmail.com>]

**Sent:** Tuesday, October 29, 2013 11:29 PM

**To:** Judiciary Special Session

**Subject:** Strong opposition to SB 1; Vote "No" to the Marriage Equality Bill; put this issue on the ballot; let the people decide on marriage!

Committee: Committee on Judiciary and Finance

Measure Number: SB 1

Date and Time of Hearing: Thursday, October 31, 2013, 10:00 a.m.

Testifying in person and/or writing

Marie T. Rorie

[mtanonymoumt@gmail.com](mailto:mtanonymoumt@gmail.com)

**Subject:** Strong opposition to SB 1; Vote "No" to the Marriage Equality Bill; put this issue on the ballot; let the people decide on marriage!

Dear Honorable Chairs Rhoads and Luke and Members of the House Judiciary and Finance Committees:

As a concerned citizen of the State of Hawaii, I would like to take this opportunity to inform you that I am opposed to there being a Special Session on any Same Sex Marriage issue. As a voter in the State of Hawaii, I feel that it is important for you to know how I feel about this as part of your decision making process.

It is my opinion that the issue of Same Sex Marriage should be voted on by the public just as it was back in 1998 when the majority of citizens in the State of Hawaii voted to approve a constitutional amendment against same sex marriages. The use of a special session limits my opportunity to voice my opinion on this issue and may result in legislation that does not represent the will of the people you have been elected to represent.

I believe that if this issue is placed on a ballot, it would encourage those who have not yet registered to vote to be motivated to participate in this American privilege. Thus, the younger and older generations of Hawaii (and residents on the neighbor isles) will have a better representation of how we want the future to be.

My theory is that if we want Hawaii to remain sacred and separate from the rest, we should honor our State motto, (translated in English) "The life of our land is perpetuated in its righteousness." The Hawaiian Monarchy would not have existed if gay marriage was practiced.

As adults, we have individual choice on who/what to be... but to be exposed to this alternative lifestyle at a young age (which is occurring in elementary schools), it can contribute to greater problems in society and in the child's physical and emotional development. An increase in formula drinks for newborns may result in poorer immune systems. Those prone to "child-porn"/pedophile habits, will be exposed to more temptations when young children/babies are brought into the restrooms with their "mommies." You should ask yourself if you are comfortable with entering restrooms that have urinals, stalls, and tampon machines available, even if you thought you entered the "men's room." The same feeling applies to dressing rooms in retail stores. If children are encouraged to try a different identity from day to day, when they begin to complete forms for legal purposes, not only will it confuse themselves, but even the legal authorities and agencies. Why jeopardize our God-given keiki's identities and future health?

Whatever happened to SR 123, where a local task force was supposed to review the effects on social, economic, and the religious impacts in states where SSM is legal? I thought a report was supposed to be submitted no later than November 1, 2013? Not allowing time for careful analysis of the findings and manipulating the political procedure to favor a one-sided vote is very unjust and violates our democratic process.

In closing, I greatly appreciate your time and I am praying that God will continue to give you wisdom and discernment for all your decision making for Hawaii Nei.

Aloha Ke Akua,

*Marie T. Rorie*

Former Education Assistant, DOE

Current Health/Human Services Worker, Non-Profit

Hawaii Resident over 30 years

**SB1**

Submitted on: 10/30/2013

Testimony for on Oct 31, 2013 10:00AM in Conference Room Auditorium

<b>Submitted By</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Testifier Position</b>	<b>Testifying in Person</b>
Shelley Ige	Individual	Oppose	Yes

Comments: Aloha Honorable Chairs Rhoads, Luke and members of the House of Judiciary and Finance Committees: My name is Shelley Ige and I oppose SB 1. We do not need to rush into a decision at this point. No other state is doing that. This is such an important issue that needs to be discussed in a considered manner. Rushing into a hasty decision would be detrimental for hundreds of thousands of Hawaii residents. A "Yes" vote would be against democracy. The voice of the people would not be heard in this rushed time limit. Please postpone the bill to next year, which is only months away...not that long to wait. Respectfully, Shelley Ige 46-265 Nahewai St. Kaneohe, HI 96744

October 29, 2013

To: The House Judiciary Committee  
The House Finance Committee

Hearing Date: Thursday, October 31, 2013

Time: 10:00am

Place: Capitol Auditorium

Subject: Strong Opposition to SB1

Dear Chairs Rhoads and Luke, and Members of both the House Committees on Judiciary and Finance:

My name is Lily Hong and I am currently a junior in high school.

First and foremost thank you for your dedication to this beautiful state and to your country. I was at the capitol on Monday in hopes of securing a spot to testify for the Senate hearing. I am writing to voice my strong opposition against SB1. I am sure that many of you have heard how many people were shut out of the hearing and being able to testify because it was cut short. I was one of those people who arrived at the capitol after 1:30 pm and was not given the opportunity to testify. I am also a part of your next generation that cares deeply about this issue and will be a part of Hawaii's upcoming workforce. I know that this issue will deeply affect society as a whole. In a matter of two years I will be voting and will be remembering what the government and more importantly the representatives have been doing and what was decided upon this issue. This whole process of special session has made the people of Hawaii feel cheated and that their voice does not count. We are the ones that put you the representatives into office and we can always take you out the next term around. I implore you to deeply consider this issue and take into consideration that there is an enormous amount of people who are against the special session and SB1. Regardless if this bill was suggested by the governor, your obligation is to represent and speak for Hawaii and what the people want. Thank you for your time and consideration. Mahalo.

Sincerely,

Lily Hong  
Aiea, Hawaii

-----Original Message-----

From: michael ruff [<mailto:ruffmixmusic@me.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, October 29, 2013 8:24 PM

To: Judiciary Special Session

Subject: Strongly Opposed

Dear Representative,

I, and my family are strongly opposed to SB 1. I trust that You know in your heart of hearts that no government has the right to re- define marriage as anything but between a man and a woman.

We have to work extra hard to raise children these days in a moral home and with some family values in this lost and misguided world.

Shall we legalize murder?, adultery. ? just because there are people choosing to do it anyway?

Civil unions yes. re define marriage, NO, NO!

Thank you, Michael Ruff

**SB1**

Submitted on: 10/30/2013

Testimony for on Oct 31, 2013 10:00AM in Conference Room Auditorium

<b>Submitted By</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Testifier Position</b>	<b>Testifying in Person</b>
Eddie Chung	Individual	Oppose	Yes

Comments: I strongly oppose the bill SB1 and will let u know why when i testify.

This bill is a disaster at best, and the demise of a culture at its worst. This bill is a 'rage against society', attempting to silence any opposition. It removes Freedom of Religion and Speech. It wants all freedom FROM religion, and wants no condemnation or opposition in speech. It is a bill to satisfy a few at the cost of the majority. And it is being rushed, to be jammed through at all costs. This is WRONG, UNCONSTITUTIONAL, and UNDEMOCRATIC. This is Not OHANA, OR ALOHA.

It is a bill that is **EXTREMELY CONTENTIOUS**, and 5 days cannot address all the issues associated with this bill adequately in this short of time. Some of these issues are the lack of protection this bill covers regarding Freedom of Speech. It does not allow any opposition from anyone regarding this topic. It would allow the Civil Rights Commission to determine if someone, or some place of business, is not in compliance. The same goes for the Freedom of Religion, and once again, it will give the Civil Rights Commission the power to determine if someone, or some place of business, is or is not in compliance. This is a conflict of interest as they assisted in writing the bill. It also allows the possibility of a 'power grab', which could lead to a thug style of business. This is NOT our Ohana way.

Redefining marriage was given in 1998 to the legislation to define marriage. In that year, 76% of the voters clearly stated that marriage was to be defined between the opposite sex. It did NOT state that the legislative branch could alter the definition between same sexes. It is a bogus argument to try and justify the position that the legislative branch has the power to change the wording of the meaning of the bill that the masses understood to be of marriage between opposite sex couples. Trying to define marriage to include same sex is a deliberate deception.

Also, this bill of a 'no amendment' clause, states 'marriage for 15 years and older', allowing the legislation to **legalize statutory rape**, as defined in the Hawaii code of legal talk. A 15 year old in Hawaii is considered a minor. You are also circumventing the parent's responsibility for allowing the courts and NOT parents, to decide on such a set-up. This bill also does NOT protect religious institutions, facilities, and/or properties from frivolous lawsuits as we have seen on the mainland. The lack of clarity on this issue is a can of worms to say the least. Washington, Oregon, New Mexico, New Hampshire, and Hawaii are a few of the states that faced unnecessary lawsuits because someone's feelings were 'hurt'. Not one of those cases was refused any service or product where another place of business was offered as an alternative. No satisfaction to the 'offended' homosexual was acceptable except for the demise of the companies. This law will open up more such lawsuits, with the threat of putting businesses on edge, especially in such an unstable economy that we have now.

Looking at this bill and the rush to pass it shows the willful and deceitful intent of this bill. There was NO JUSTIFICATION for this special session that the taxpayers will have to pay. Sadly, it is the politicians who have to 'dog and pony' this show for the governor. And sadly, it is Hawaii's legislation that is being made pawns in a knee-jerk reaction of 'feelings' for those wanting this bill rushed to passage. It is also a projection of a false discrimination, of 'inequality' regarding marriage. Marriage is NOT a right.

Civil Unions was made into law to satisfy the desire for marriage in the homosexual community. There are presently two or more open bills to amend for any inadequacies that the current Civil Union laws

affect. This would AVOID the whole issue of radically redefining marriage as it is historically, traditionally, and culturally defined.

In Summary this special session should be stopped IMMEDIATELY. If not stopped, then voted NO due to:

- It is UNCONSTITUTIONAL
- It is UNDEMOCRATIC
- It is INTENTIONALLY DECEPTIVE AND MISLEADING
- It allows STATUTORY RAPE and CIRCUMVENTING Parental Rights
- It allows lawmakers to be used as PAWNS
- It denies FREEDOM OF SPEECH AND FREEDOM OF RELIGION

IT IS THE **MOST CONTENTIOUS** BILL THAT NEEDS MORE THAN 5 DAYS TO BE ADEQUATELY HEARD.

**IT NEEDS TO BE PUT TO THE VOTERS----P E R I O D .**



**From:** Eli (Rezne) Wong [<mailto:reznewong@gmail.com>]

**Sent:** Wednesday, October 30, 2013 12:01 AM

**To:** Judiciary Special Session

**Subject:** SB1 Testimony

Aloha,

I am Eli Wong, a 22-year old undergraduate student at the University of Hawaii Manoa.

As a citizen of this country, a future contributor to society, and as potentially future father or multiple children, I would like to voice my opinion and urge that SB1 not pass in the state of Hawaii.

Considering the potential circumstances that may happen to my personal religious freedom, my family's religious freedom, and my beloved church ohana that has been a light to the community here in Honolulu, I would like to request the SB1 bill to NOT be implemented. Lawsuits and institutional regulations that may be forced upon the mentioned parties will damage the "openness" of our ohana, suppress our beliefs and marginalize the help that we give the community.

I love these islands and am consider myself a steward of the aina in the field of science, and would like to do so in the form of government and religion.

Mahalo,

Eli Wong

Karl Rhoads, Chair  
House Judiciary Committee

Sylvia Luke, Chair  
House Finance Committee

Re: **TESTIMONY IN OPPOSITION TO SB 1 RELATING TO EQUALITY**

By: Carol K. Nakata      99-129 Uahi Street      Aiea, HI 96701

Dear Honorable Chairs Rhoads and Luke, and Members of the House Judiciary and Finance Committees:

Please allow me to share two stories that relate to same-sex marriage.

After 9 months of pregnancy, my young nephew and his wife were joyfully expecting to welcome their first child. Instead, his wife died during childbirth. The baby, though, survived. This left the husband and extended family with deep grief, and years of coping in hardship.

My cousin, after 8 months of pregnancy, was expecting to celebrate a new birth. Instead, the baby was delivered dead in a miscarriage.

I cite these stories of real grief & suffering to highlight the risks & sacrifices that heterosexual couples endure in the rendering of their uniquely natural contribution to society. Children. Homosexual marriages could never match in value the rigors and expenses borne in heterosexual marriages -- of natural childbearing with its attendant risks, of raising kids in homes balanced with the unique traits of male & female parents, and in the perpetuation of the human race.

As one who's single, I gladly support any special benefits and rights above my own that we as society grant to traditional couples. They deserve it. The value of their contributions to society are unique, and far exceed what other persons can offer, either singly or as couples.

Should the Legislature grant homosexual couples the status of marriage on par with heterosexual couples, a true inequality would result. It would mean the **granting of equal rights and benefits for unequal contributions to society.**

Respectfully,  
Carol K. Nakata

**From:** Leila Lee [<mailto:leilalee5@gmail.com>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 30, 2013 4:30 AM  
**To:** Judiciary Special Session  
**Subject:** SB1

To: The House Judiciary Committee  
The House Finance Committee  
Hearing Date/Time: Thursday, October 31, 2013, 10:00 a.m.  
Place: Capitol Auditorium  
Re: Opposition to SB1

Dear Chairs Rhoads and Luke, and Members of both the House Committees on Judiciary and Finance:

My name is Leila Lee and am here to show my opposition to Bill SB1. I am a small business owner who has resided in Aina Haina for the last 34 years. Prior to living in Honolulu, I lived in Halawa at the veteran's housing where the Aloha Stadium now stands and then on the slopes below Camp Smith.

My dear legislators, I am not someone of great importance, nor am I someone of wealth, nor someone with considerable knowledge. But this I do know: on an issue as emotionally charged as SB1, hearing without bias from the people--your constituents--is necessary for you to carry out your duty as public servants dedicated to be the voice of the members of your communities.

With that point made, I implore you to listen to the leaders of our religious community who are asking you not to pass SB1. These men and women of faith stand solely upon the Word of God--no higher authority exists for them. They cast all fear of man aside, not looking for personal gain, but holding fast to the precepts of the Holy Bible and dispersing its contents knowing that they will be held accountable to their loving but just God for their actions. They are exhorted to be lights in this world, lights that illuminate God's truth.

You know and have seen the good works their ministries have done; works that have benefitted tens of thousands in our state; works that have made Hawaii a better place to live. This week they stand before you to continue these good works. So, once again, I exhort you to heed their testimonies.

Thank you for allowing this mother and grandmother to humbly stand before you.

Sincerely,  
Leila Lee  
Honolulu, Hawaii

"Be very careful, then, how you live—not as unwise but as wise, making the most of every opportunity, because the days are evil. Therefore do not be foolish, but understand what the Lord's will is." Ephesians 5:15-17

**From:** Buffy Cushman-Patz [<mailto:buffycushman@gmail.com>]

**Sent:** Wednesday, October 30, 2013 12:05 AM

**To:** Judiciary Special Session; FINTestimony

**Subject:** Support for marriage equality: SB1

Committees on Judiciary & Finance

Hearing Date: Thursday, October 31, 2013

Hearing Time: 10am

Hearing Place: Capitol Auditorium

Thank you for addressing this important issue with this special session.

I am writing to express my complete support for marriage equality.

Civil Unions already grant same-sex couples all of the rights, benefits and responsibilities as defined by the State for marriage. Now that the Defense of Marriage Act has been struck down, it is time to allow same-sex couples to marry in Hawaii so that Federal rights, benefits and responsibilities will apply for them as well.

This is a basic civil rights issue.

Let's have our state stand on the right side of history.

Mahalo for your time and consideration.

Buffy Cushman-Patz,  
Honolulu

Dear Honorable Chair Rhodes and Members of the House Committee on Judiciary:

In 1998, we the people of Hawaii voted for what we understood would be defining marriage between one man and one woman. 70% of the people of our state voted for this definition of a marriage between one man and one woman. It is now 15 years later and this definition is still in question even as the people of our state have already voted to define marriage between one man and one woman.

If you want to redefine marriage, please let the people you represent decide by a constitutional amendment. One that means what it says, not a legal loophole.

"Should the State of Hawaii define marriage as solely between one man and one woman."

It seems that our elected officials are taking upon themselves to undo what the voters in Hawaii have already decided.

I ask that you take the issue back to the people of Hawaii and allow us to vote for a clearly worded constitutional amendment and to decide on the definition of marriage we choose for our state. Please do not take away our right to vote. Please do not decide for us.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Josephine Araki  
Registered Voter and Concerned Citizen  
Pearl City

**SB1**

Submitted on: 10/30/2013

Testimony for on Oct 31, 2013 10:00AM in Conference Room Auditorium

<b>Submitted By</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Testifier Position</b>	<b>Testifying in Person</b>
demand bell	Individual	Oppose	Yes

Comments: It is my strong belief that SB 1 is a bill that should not be passed. There are several reasons why I feel this way, but mainly for the same reasons that a majority of opposers have stated.

**From:** mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov [mailto:mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 30, 2013 1:23 PM  
**To:** House Special Session  
**Cc:** lyparkin@gmail.com  
**Subject:** Submitted testimony for SB1 on Oct 31, 2013 10:00AM (In Person)

**SB1**

Submitted on: 10/30/2013  
Testimony for on Oct 31, 2013 10:00AM in Conference Room Auditorium

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testifying in Person
Lucy Parkin	Individual	Oppose	Yes

Comments: I strongly oppose the SB1 bill due to many points that are not well thought of in consideration to the majority. Please do not pass this bill and let the people of Hawaii vote. This is not a matter to be decided upon in just 5 to 6 days. Mahalo, Lucy Parkin 808.357.3938 600 Queen Street #2107 Honolulu, HI 96813

Please note that testimony submitted less than 24 hours prior to the hearing, improperly identified, or directed to the incorrect office, may not be posted online or distributed to the committee prior to the convening of the public hearing.

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email [webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov](mailto:webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov)

Committees on Judiciary & Finance  
Hearing Date: Thursday, October 31, 2013  
Hearing Time: 10am Hearing Place: Capitol Auditorium

Aloha and thank you for attending this special session to address this important issue.

I am writing to express my full and unequivocal support for marriage equality in Hawaii. Civil Unions already grant same-sex couples all of the rights, benefits and responsibilities as defined by the State for marriage. Now that the Defense of Marriage Act has been struck down, the logical next step is to allow same-sex marriages so that Federal rights, benefits and responsibilities will apply in Hawaii as well.

This is a basic civil rights issue and will be considered self-evident in the not so distant future as it is now in the Netherlands, Belgium, Argentina, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, South Africa, Sweden, Uruguay, etc.

There is no reason other than intolerance to not move forward with this.

Mahalo for your time, please do the right thing.

Thomas Decloedt, Manoa

--

Thomas Decloedt, Ph.D.  
Department of Oceanography  
University of Hawaii  
Honolulu, HI, USA  
Website: <http://www2.hawaii.edu/~decloedt/>



**From:** [heybooboopeace@aol.com](mailto:heybooboopeace@aol.com) [mailto:heybooboopeace@aol.com]

**Sent:** Wednesday, October 30, 2013 12:05 AM

**To:** Judiciary Special Session

**Subject:** In person testimony

Karl Rhoads  
Chair

Judiciary Committee

Subject: In Person Testimony in Opposition to SB1 Relating to Equality

Dear Honorable Chairs Rhoads and Luke and members of the House Judiciary and Finance Committees;

As a concerned citizen of the state of Hawaii, I am submitting my testimony against SB1, which would legalize same sex marriage.

I oppose this bill for so many reasons. On page 6 starting on line 4, the definitions of church exemptions are too poorly written to guarantee our first amendment rights to the free exercise of religion. There are too many exceptions which all of the churches I know of would fall under. Many churches serve the community by allowing the usage of facilities for support groups, classes and sports and fitness programs that are open to the public. My kids take martial arts at one church and we pay a fee to the club/instructor. Is this "for profit"? I attend a parental support group at another church. Many who attend are not members of that church. My kids go to a boys and girls club at yet another church. By practice churches outreach and are open to the community. This should not mean they have to compromise their fundamental beliefs and religious writings, does it? The language in SB1 is not strong enough to protect the churches that offer these services for free or small fee to the public, many of whom don't attend church, from lawsuits or other challenges. Because they have Zumba classes they have to preform homosexual marriages or be liable to a lawsuit. Why not very strong and clear religious protection for these institutions?

We have not voted nor had town hall meetings to get adequate feedback from the community. The only type of meeting I heard of was in Keaau on the Big Island at a community center, but when my children and I showed up along with a full house of interested public our representative Richard Onishi who was scheduled to meet and answer questions, cancelled. Apart from this I was not aware of any opportunities for public meetings on the subject. In 1998, the people only voted to allow the 'legislature to have the power to reserve marriage to opposite sex couples' because we had no other choice. To not have accepted the poorly worded measure would have left the decision to our state judiciary, which had the Baehr

v, Miike case pending. Voting to grant the power into the legislatures hands in 1998 was the lesser of two evils. A 'yes' vote in the special session is a 'no' vote to democracy because you are clearly not listening to the voices of the people of Hawaii, whom you have been elected to represent. I honestly believe the surface has not even been scratched in getting the people's input. I first became aware of this issue approximately 3 weeks ago and it has taken me much time and energy to study up and get answers about it. Most people I come in contact with and bridge the subject with have either just heard about it or are very unaware of the ramifications of such a measure and they are all certainly surprised that this huge societal issue is being decided for them.

My great grandmother lived here, grandparents, parents and now my husband and I are raising the next generation here. What we have assumed for all generations is now up for debate. Being a parent, I also have great concerns about this bill's effect on education. I believe the civil union bill addresses the rights of homosexual couples. We have not even given it a chance for the ink to dry and that that bill could be expanded to cover anything that is deemed missing. What is the rush to jump into marriage? It is not necessary to try and change the framework of society to give this group of people there civil rights. Marriage is not a civil right. Marriage is a definition: The legal status, condition, or relationship that results from a contract by which one man and one woman, who have the capacity to enter into such an agreement, mutually promise to live together in the relationship of husband and wife in law for life, or until the legal termination of the relationship. Across geographical lines, throughout history, spanning religions, and scientifically (If entire population adopted a homosexual lifestyle that would be the last generation of human beings) marriage is between a man and a woman. And this is not to the exclusion of any other group living, being educated, working, voting and being in society. It just simply means a marriage is by definition between a man and a woman. If this bill happens, what will education look like? Will there be a re-educating of our children? Will that have to be intensive to combat years of religious influence, culture, history, experience? Is that a good thing? With all the things our children are facing out there is this where we want to spend our time and effort? Will that infringe on the religious freedom of the children? Their families? What about the teachers? Will they be forced to "teach" something that is directly contrary to their religious beliefs and convictions? Will curriculum be rewritten? Who will pay for all of this and at what expense, not just in dollars, but to the fabric of our society, to the loss of our right to our convictions and our religious freedoms. What about our right to raise our children according to our beliefs, values & traditions.

These are just a few of the concerns I have about you voting into law possibly the most controversial issue of our time. The short time allowed for the special session and the extra issues that the governor has added prevents you the representatives of this great state from justly and adequately addressing the concerns to the people of the state of Hawaii. I request that you vote no to this bill that has so many loose ends or table this issue and bring it to a vote of the people.

Sincerely,  
Heather Rosario

Monday, October 28, 2013

Mr. Karl Rhoads, Chair  
House Judiciary Committee

Ms. Sylvia Luke, Chair  
House Finance Committee

**Re: TESTIMONY IN OPPOSITION TO SB 1 RELATING TO EQUALITY**

Dear Honorable Chairs Rhoads and Luke and Members of the House Judiciary and Finance Committees:

As a registered voter in the State of Hawaii I would like to thank you for the opportunity to testify in opposition to SB-1 at the upcoming Joint House Hearing scheduled for October 31, 2013. The following is an outline of what I will be testifying to:

1. The Same-sex marriage should not be addressed in a special session for the following reasons:
  - A five-day special session is not enough time to discuss the most controversial issues of our time, the amount of time to debate and discuss the issue is far too limited.
  - No amendments to the bill are permitted which circumvents the democratic process.
  - A yes vote during a special session will reflect the will of the governor, the legislators and special interest groups but not necessarily the will of the people of the State of Hawaii.
  - The proposed religious exemption language is rendered invalid because of the public accommodations.
  - The proposed religious exemption does nothing to protect individual business owners, teachers or other citizens right to practice their religious freedom.
  - In 1998 the people of Hawaii voted on this issue and a 70% majority specified that Marriage was defined as
  
2. Legislators are elected to respect the fundamental Democratic principles provided for in the State of Hawaii and the United States constitutions.
  - The people of the State of Hawaii believe that they addressed the issue of same sex marriage in 1998, if there is concern that the will of the people has change in the past 15 years they should be given the opportunity to vote on the issue again.
  - Marriage is not a civil right and no court, including the Supreme Court, has ever said that it is.

- The governor and legislators are elected to represent the people and as a result should respect the process that allows their voices and opinion the greatest opportunity to be heard.

It is my belief that the current bill and the pursuit of it's passing in a special session called by the Governor circumvents my rights as a citizen, violates my right to religious freedom guaranteed by the first amendment of the US Constitution and jeopardizes social fabric of the State of Hawaii.

Sincerely,

Tera Caparida  
3009 Ala Makahala Place  
Apt 914  
Honolulu, HI 96818

-----Original Message-----

From: mary rosolowich [<mailto:marybearry@gmail.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, October 30, 2013 4:49 AM

To: Judiciary Special Session

Cc: [john@onelove.org](mailto:john@onelove.org)

Subject: Marriage Equality

Thank you for your service to the state and people, this can't be easy

> Regarding the same sex marriage bill, while I believe as I think most people do, in equal rights and protections under law, the proposed bill will abridge the freedom of religious practices for those who do not believe in solemnizing gay marriages or having their religious venue used as a setting for this type of union.

It seems like people are (someone is) trying to shove this bill down the throats of the electorate, Quickly - in this special session rather than the regular session just over two months from now. Misleadingly - characterized as equal rights when in fact it will strip whole groups of people of their rights, and effecting so much more than marriages, and - Wrapped in a cloak of political correctness, as the right thing to do for this minority group, especially children of same gender couples, when this bill will harm children and families the most. The ramifications of the passage of this bill are enormous and will be devastating to the people and to this state. The observable consequences of even less encompassing bills are evident in several states where same sex marriage laws have passed.

This bill is not right

> This bill as proposed does not respect people's freedom of religion and will not protect religious organizations from having to provide services or accommodations contrary to their religious beliefs.

>

> Most churches and religious organizations perform marriages for guests and not only for their members, this would open the organizations up to prosecution if they do not perform same sex marriages.

>

> In fact many religious organizations do not have "membership" at all, but are groups of people who share a common faith and meet together in buildings shared with other entities for other than religious purposes, i.e. schools, etc.

>

> For these reasons, as well as others, I believe that this issue should be brought up in a regular session of the legislature when all affected parties can have their voices heard and concerns addressed by our public representatives.

>

> Thank you for your consideration,

The life of the land is perpetuated in righteousness

Mary Rosolowich  
Honolulu



# HOKUALA MATTHEW KEKELA LWIN-MALUO

87-2049 Pakeke Street  
Waianae, Hawaii 96792  
808.983.9827

---

To: The House Judiciary Committee  
The House Finance Committee

From: Hokuala M.K. Lwin-Maluo  
87-2049 Pakeke Street  
Waianae, HI 96792  
(808) 983-9827

Subject: Testimony in Opposition to Special Session and SB 1

---

Aloha Chair Rhoads, Chair Luke and Members of Both the House Committees on Judiciary and Finance,

As a concerned citizen and registered voter, I am submitting this testimony to voice my strong opposition to Bill SB1 that would legalize same sex marriage in Hawaii.

In 1998, my parents voted for what they understood was defining marriage to be between one man and one woman. In fact, 70% of Hawaii's voters agreed with them. Now here we are, almost 15 years later, and this is still an issue. If you want to redefine marriage, please let the people you represent decide by a constitutional amendment. One that means what it says, not a legal loophole. It seems that our elected officials are taking it upon themselves to undo what the voters in Hawaii have already decided.

Additionally, I oppose this bill because the religious protection clauses are inadequate for people of faith to exercise their First Amendment right of speech and religion.

I ask you to please do one of two things:

- A. Leave the institution of marriage the way it has been for thousands of years. And the way we thought we defined it in 1998
- B. Take the issue back to the citizens of the State and allow us to vote for a clearly worded constitutional amendment

Thank you for the opportunity to testify against this special session and against this bill.

Mahalo!

Karl Rhoads, Chair  
House Judiciary Committee

Sylvia Luke, Chair  
House Finance Committee

Re: **TESTIMONY IN OPPOSITION TO SB 1 RELATING TO EQUALITY**

Dear Honorable Chairs Rhoads and Luke, and Members of the House Judiciary and Finance Committees:

This issue of same sex marriage is a recurrent one, which wastes taxpayer money by being debated repeatedly. Other important issues must also be addressed with our limited funds. Since marriage is an issue of great importance to Hawaii's people, WE should settle this issue once and for all with OUR votes, not yours. In fact, we already voted in 1998. The Legislators defy and disrespect us by trying to push this legislation through in a Special Session. Let US decide in true democratic fashion.

Also, I hope that legislators realize that by voting for this bill, they are automatically voting against traditional marriage, which most of us prefer and already voted for, and will again.

Thank you for allowing me to testify.  
Darrel M. Sakamoto

**From:** [adeal@hawaiiintel.net](mailto:adeal@hawaiiintel.net) [<mailto:adeal@hawaiiintel.net>]

**Sent:** Wednesday, October 30, 2013 8:18 AM

**To:** Judiciary Special Session

**Subject:** SAME SEX MARRIAGE

**Importance:** High

Aloha,

It is clear that the Governor and those whom are in lock-step with him care not for the beliefs and feelings of the majority of our people in the State of Hawaii, for with an estimated 2-8% identifying themselves as homosexual our elitists are willing to corrupt the definition of marriage for the vast majority - a long way from the initial challenge to simply being treated fairly!

Mahalo,

Andrew Deal



**From:** Willie/Lauri Santos [<mailto:santosfamily@hawaiiantel.net>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 30, 2013 2:51 AM  
**To:** Judiciary Special Session  
**Subject:** Testimony and Opposition to SB-1

Honorable Chairs Rhoads and  
Luke,  
Oct. 29, 2013

Ref: Testimony in opposition to SB-1

We would like to take this opportunity to inform you that we are opposed to there being a Special Session on any Same Sex Marriage issue. As active voters and whom you represent for our aina, we feel that it is important that you know that we (meaning the voters of Hawaii) should be actively involved in the decision process regarding this topic.

Same Sex Marriage should be voted on by the public just as it was back in 1998 when the majority of citizens in the state of Hawaii voted not to approve a constitutional amendment to include same sex marriages. The use of a special session limits our opportunity to voice our opinion on this issue and may result in legislation that does not represent the will of the people you have been elected to represent.

Both my wife and I have special interest in this issue as our only son is in a homosexual relationship. Although we are committed to a loving relationship with our son, our spiritual moral values do not include marriage between same sex couples. We are also greatly concerned that our keiki in Hawaii will then view homosexuality as being the norm (especially in public schools).

In closing, we greatly appreciate your representation of the voters of the state of Hawaii to say NO. We are praying that God will continue to lead you in all of your decision-making and that He will continue to encourage you in all that you do.

Mahalo !! Willie/Lauri Santos

To: The House Judiciary Committee  
The House Finance Committee  
Hearing Date/Time: Thursday, October 31, 2013, 10:00 a.m.  
Place: Capitol Auditorium  
Re: Strong Opposition to SB1

Dear Chairs Rhoads and Luke, and Members of both the House Committees on  
Judiciary and Finance:

I am writing to voice my opposition to Bill SB1.

I am asking you to allow the people to decide on the issue of marriage as I believe the legislature is going against the will of the people. I support equality for all including the rights of conscience and religious freedom, which I ask you to respect as our elected leaders.

I am opposed to the most contentious social issue in our history being decided virtually in one week and ask that you please uphold the principles of democracy and the democratic process which are being disregarded in this special session.

This bill should be given due process during the regular session where it can properly be vetted and examined as all other bills. The people who elected you to serve as their voices should have a say in public policy that will forever obliterate thousand of years of indigenous and non-native culture, customs and traditions. Your "yes" vote in special session is clearly a NO vote to democracy!

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Alex Panida  
Waipahu, HI

**From:** Lily Brunke [<mailto:lbrunke@gmail.com>]

**Sent:** Wednesday, October 30, 2013 8:29 AM

**To:** Judiciary Special Session

**Subject:** Same Sex Marriage Bill

Aloha,

Please consider this as my testimony **against** the Same Sex Marriage bill out of concern for our children and our culture & lifestyle. It will impact our way of life and such a big impact should be voted on by the **people**. The decision should be the made by the people of Hawaii not just a few legislators. The judiciary committee in the House has already been stacked in favor of the Same Sex Marriage bill. There are many more of us against the bill so where are our voices heard. Many of us were there on Monday and that should have made an impact on all of you. **LET THE PEOPLE DECIDE THIS ISSUE!!**

Make it a great day!

Lily K. Brunke

In God we trust! God bless America!

Susan Kunz, Citizen  
Testimony in opposition of SB1 Relating to Equal Rights  
Committee on Finance  
Representative Sylvia Luke, Chair  
Representative Scott Y Nishimoto, Vice Chair  
Representative Aaron Ling Johanson, Vice Chair  
October 31, 2013  
10:00 am Auditorium

Aloha Chair Luke, Vice Chair Nishimoto, Vice Chair Johanson and Members of the  
Committee,

Thank you for accepting my testimony. I do not support SB1. This bill takes away the religious rights of every citizen regardless of their stance on the marriage issue. There has been a lot said about the protection of clergy and religious organizations. Most of us are not clergy or religious organizations and we are not protected. Please vote no on SB1.

Mahalo,  
Susan Kunz

**SB1**

Submitted on: 10/30/2013

Testimony for on Oct 31, 2013 10:00AM in Conference Room Auditorium

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testifying in Person
Mark	Individual	Oppose	Yes

Comments: Thank you for listening! You have certainly received enough bible quotes showing why God opposes same sex marriage. And you may be thinking, I don't believe in God. Or, you may believe in god but not the God of the Bible. So why believe what the Bible says about marriage? 20 years ago I didn't believe either. But, at that time I had acquired everything I wanted from this life. You know, whatever your list includes, Finances-check, relationships-check, house with a view-check, car I dreamed of-check, significant other-check; I finally had all the things we desire. Yet there was still a big empty place in my heart. Despite acquiring all the riches and success of this life I was desperately empty. And now instead of checking another box of accomplishment I was considering checking out completely. In my desperation I cried out to God. And God answered. Just like He will answer you. At the time I didn't know God promises that, "if you seek Him with all your heart He will make Himself known to you." God did answer me, He has proved Himself to me for 20 years, over and over again. God has taken away the emptiness and blessed me with 20 years of meaning, purpose and fulfillment. If you want to know the God of the Bible. If you want Him to give your life the peace and joy of knowing and walking with Him. If you want the wisdom He promises to live life righteously then this is what He says: Romans 3:10-12, and 23 As the Scriptures say, "No one is righteous—not even one. No one is truly wise; no one is seeking God. All have turned away; all have become useless. No one does good, not a single one." ... For everyone has sinned; we all fall short of God's glorious standard. (NLT) Romans 6:23 For the wages of sin is death, but the free gift of God is eternal life through Christ Jesus our Lord. (NLT) Romans 5:8 But God showed his great love for us by sending Christ to die for us while we were still sinners. (NLT) Romans 10:9-10, and 13 If you confess with your mouth that Jesus is Lord and believe in your heart that God raised him from the dead, you will be saved. For it is by believing in your heart that you are made right with God, and it is by confessing with your mouth that you are saved ... For "Everyone who calls on the name of the Lord will be saved." (NLT) Romans 5:1 Therefore, since we have been made right in God's sight by faith, we have peace with God because of what Jesus Christ our Lord has done for us. (NLT) Romans 8:1 So now there is no condemnation for those who belong to Christ Jesus. (NLT) If you want to give your life to God then simply agree with Him that you have sinned, believe that He died and rose again to forgive all your sins, and ask Him to be your Lord and Savior. May God guide you in all your decisions. Mark Weber 808,321,9877

Please note that testimony submitted less than 24 hours prior to the hearing, improperly identified, or directed to the incorrect office, may not be posted online or distributed to the committee prior to the convening of the public hearing.

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email [webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov](mailto:webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov)

**SB1**

Submitted on: 10/30/2013

Testimony for on Oct 31, 2013 10:00AM in Conference Room Auditorium

<b>Submitted By</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Testifier Position</b>	<b>Testifying in Person</b>
Patricia Langi	Individual	Oppose	Yes

-----Original Message-----

From: David Shimabukuro [<mailto:surfer48@me.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, October 30, 2013 8:33 AM

To: Judiciary Special Session

Subject: same gender marriage

I have been trying to instill Godly principles to my children and now grandchildren ie don't: lie, steal etc. The passing of same sex marriage will take away my rights to teach my grandchildren that we were created man and women to procreate. With the passing of this bill I will be forced to abide, allow and worse accept the state teaching same gender sex to my grandchildren. You are opening up a pandora's box for after this is passed the 3some or more marriage will follow. Please leave marriage between a man and a woman it does not need to be redefined.

Thank you,

Joyce Shimabukuro

95-692 Makaunulau St.

Mililani