

TENTH DAY

Thursday, February 2, 2006

The Senate of the Twenty-Third Legislature of the State of Hawaii, Regular Session of 2006, convened at 11:35 o'clock a.m. with the President in the Chair.

The Divine Blessing was invoked by the Honorable Bob Hogue, Hawaii State Senate, after which the Roll was called showing all Senators present.

The President announced that he had read and approved the Journal of the Ninth Day.

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

Senator English, for the Committee on Energy, Environment, and International Affairs, presented a report (Stand. Com. Rep. No. 2002) recommending that S.B. No. 2134, as amended in S.D. 1, pass Second Reading and be referred to the Committee on Judiciary and Hawaiian Affairs.

On motion by Senator Hee, seconded by Senator Hogue and carried, the report of the Committee was adopted and S.B. No. 2134, S.D. 1, entitled: "A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO INTERNATIONAL MATCHMAKING," passed Second Reading and was referred to the Committee on Judiciary and Hawaiian Affairs.

ORDER OF THE DAY

THIRD READING

H.B. No. 1949, S.D. 1:

Senator Taniguchi moved that H.B. No. 1949, S.D. 1, having been read throughout, pass Third Reading, seconded by Senator Tsutsui.

Senator Hemmings rose to speak against the measure as follows:

"Mr. President, I rise to speak against this proposed appended operating budget for the State Legislature and its attached agencies.

"Mr. President, before I speak, I have to say that often in the past I have stood up and extolled the virtues of this Legislative Body and its attached agencies for its efficiencies – economies at scale, and spending the taxpayers' money efficiently. At that time, what I did not know was the way the money was being spent. And in a curious way, Mr. President, I still don't know exactly how the money is being spent, but I do want to thank the Senate Vice President for delivering to me some of the details of this proposed budget. I have to say we have not received nor secured any of the budget worksheets, only what appears to be expenditure figures from previous budgets. This whole process has, in my estimation, made a mockery of equal access for all.

"This proposed budget lacks transparency and, quite honestly, disfranchises many constituents, our constituents in the State of Hawaii. During the interim, for instance, the Majority Party Legislators have allowances for two fulltime permanent staff members, the Minority Party continues on with just one. This is a recent occurrence. You may rationalize that the Majority Party includes Committee Chairmen. Well, not all of them are Committee Chairmen, yet they still have two staff members. And I might remind everybody that Committees do

not meet in the interim so there is no justification for the added workload that an extra personnel would call for.

"In addition, there are few committee hearings at all during the interim, so there is just no justification for two staff members in the Majority Offices. But even more importantly, why was the Minority Party discriminated against?"

"Approximately \$350,000 is being cut from the proposed budget by the S.D. 1. This was done in the Ways and Means Committee. Was that money going to be used for better access for our constituents? We don't know the exact details because we don't know the details of where the money was going to be spent.

"I'm concerned that the Senate, by passing this amended budget, will be saying in effect that the constituents in Manoa or Kalihi are more important than my constituents in Waimanalo.

"This budget was revised in Ways and Means. This was after some of the details were publicly revealed by the Senate Vice President under Senate Rule 4. We believe that the taxpayers who pay for all this deserve to see the details and there should not be a cloak of secrecy on how this entire branch of government operates and who gets paid what, when, where, and why. We once again want to thank the Senate Vice President for her public inquires regarding this budget. Without them, we would have never been able to reveal the partisanship and prejudicial nature of this legislative budget.

"The Majority Party continues down the dangerous and, I might add, possibly unconstitutional practice of intentionally, systematically, disfranchising many citizens of this State. We're standing up and speaking for them.

"This operating budget, because it does not fund in equal and fair manner both parties makes a mockery out of the democratic process. For that reason, I'll be voting 'no' on this proposed budget. And since this budget poses so many problems, it may be worthy of asking the Governor for a veto so it can be sent back and remedies can be made to the secrecy and also the partisanship of this budget.

"Thank you, Mr. President."

Senator Hanabusa rose in support of the measure as follows:

"Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of this measure.

"Mr. President, first I'd like to thank yourself and the Senate Vice President for your hard work and for the sharing of the information that my colleague across the way, the Minority Leader, can now speak to, because in fact that was the intent and the creation of the transparency so that the criticisms can actually flow. And in fact, this is what facilitated or should have facilitated the discussions in Ways and Means as the matter moved forward.

"Mr. President, I take great issue with statements about the fact that this is an unconstitutional practice. I also have concerns about a call to the Governor to veto the legislative budget in this process as well because these are really uncalled for measures.

"As the Minority Leader pointed out, Mr. President, this Senate has poised to adopt a budget that is about 7 to 8 percent less than what the House is about to adopt. And it is because the Senate has decided, after looking at all of these figures, that

we can operate with that reduction and we do not want to take anymore money than is necessary.

“We’ve heard statements about the fact that the Senate has or the Majority members of the Senate has two positions while the Minority members do not. That is not correct, Mr. President, for the period of time that the Minority member has been taking about that. He should get his facts straight. And to say that we do not do anything in the interim, Mr. President, that is an absolute incorrect statement. Many of us work very hard in the interim, and depending on the Committee obligations as well as the community obligations, some work harder than others. What comes to mind, of course, is the good Senator from the Kalihi area and Nuuanu as well as our good Education Chair, Human Services Chair –they’ve worked very hard during the interim. Mr. President, Judiciary and Hawaiian Affairs had a statewide hearing, as did other members of this Body. We take very seriously the work that we do.

“Mr. President, this is a measure which has been debated among the members of this Body and it is a measure that requires and should be voted upon and I ask you and my colleagues to do so. We have more than justified the reasons why we were going to the increase, albeit about 8 percent less than the House, and we have shown the Majority members have carried the weight of Committee Chairmanships and Vice Chairmanships. Every member of the Majority Party has both of these responsibilities – one or the other. Some of us carry both Leadership positions as well as Chairmanships. As a matter of fact, I believe most members of the Majority Leadership here carry both burdens, or at least a Vice Chairmanship as well as the Leadership position.

“Mr. President, the staffing and everything is well justified and I believe that our colleagues from across the way should join us in approving this budget. Thank you, Mr. President.”

Senator Trimble rose in opposition to the measure and said:

“Mr. President, I rise in opposition to H.B. No. 1949.

“I would enjoy being able to confirm and discuss the facts. Unfortunately, they have not been presented to us. I rose on a point of privilege two days ago and I asked that the worksheets be presented to us. I asked that the State Senate in Ways and Means apply the same standard that they hold the administration to when they have a Ways and Means hearing as they do to their own budget. This I know is a fact. I do not know what numbers to which you refer. And it would be appropriate for the Governor to veto this measure because we are not applying the same standard and the same criteria when we look at administrative bills for money as we do for our own.

“And quite frankly, the public is beginning to question what is the price of friendship? What is the cost of loyalty? Wouldn’t it be easier to provide at the public hearings, so that there could be open and free discussion, somebody to testify and present the information on the part of the Majority Party on behalf of the Senate just like the Legislative Auditor was there to answer questions. But we don’t do this. And because we are treating appropriation measures differently, I think it is appropriate for all of us to vote ‘no’ against this measure.

“Thank you, Mr. President.”

Senator Chun Oakland rose to speak in support of the measure and said:

“Mr. President, I stand in support of this measure.

“I will not speak to the merits of the previous speaker – I think our process can certainly improve – but I wanted to speak to the merits of what is contained in the budget.

“My understanding is that most of the increase is in the area of personnel and that is to add positions to various offices. It is also to increase the per diem for, I believe, the neighbor islanders as well as to increase the Senate account that we have to be able to do a lot of our legislative functions from \$5,000 per year to \$7,500 a year.

“Just from my own experience as a Chair and I know Vice Chairs as well, we are responsible for responding and to work with the entire State of Hawaii. So, for example, for in the Committee on Human Services we continuously get inquiries from all over this State, not only in my particular district. 365 days are committed to this work, 16 to 20 hours. I don’t know if people really understand that.

“The interim work that we do is essential to making sure that, as we go into the next Session, the community is organized, that we have well thought out legislation that can make a difference in Hawaii. I think it’s long over due in terms of the per diem, and maybe our neighbor island colleagues can speak more to that in terms of what they’ve had to take out of their own pocket in order to do the business of Hawaii.

“Also, the Senate account, the \$5,000, doesn’t even cover one Senate mailing, and I think we have an obligation to communicate with our constituents about what has happened in the Legislature. Every year we walk the district in order to deliver the newsletter or to take surveys because we do not have that kind of resource, and I’m very thankful that we have a lot of volunteers to do that. The \$7,500 at least will cover one mailing. I think we should be communicating a lot more often with our constituents.

“So, thank you very much and I appreciate the opportunity.”

Senator Hemmings rose in rebuttal as follows:

“Mr. President, I rise in rebuttal.

“I want to greatly thank the Majority Party members that have stood up in a feeble attempt to defend this budget and give me further cause to rebut their logic and misrepresentations.

“Some have lauded that this budget is 7 to 8 percent less than the House budget. That’s because you cut wireless communication allocations out of the budget. The possibility of having this Legislature brought into the 21st Century when it comes to communication, this was so egregious that a couple of Majority Party members in Ways and Means when it was done stood up and said ‘I’m not voting against wireless communication,’ but yet that was the money that was allegedly being cut.

“Quite frankly, I’m insulted by the representation by the Majority Party that they are the only people who work in the interim and therefore deserve twice as many staff members. I will also remind everybody in this Body concerning Committee Chairmen that there are very few, if any, official Committee hearings during the interim, and if there are, that Minority Party members go to those too and have to do work.

“I also remind the good Senator from Waianae who brought this issue up, that there are only 13 Committee Chairmen as I think the number was last time I counted, yet every one of the Majority Party members or close to it have two staff members. The good Senator from Waianae implied that I don’t have my facts straight. Well I do, Senator, here they are. They were

given to me by the Senate Vice President sitting right next to her.

“These are the facts, and they do show the price salary ranges, not specifics, of what the Democrat Majority gets as opposed to the Republican Minority. But you want to talk about equal pay for equal work – something that seems to be politically correct oftentimes in this Chamber. I’d like to ask why Majority Party staff members make considerably more than our hardworking Minority staff members. Why is the Director of the Majority Research Office, according to this document, making \$70,000 a year and yet the Republican Research Office Director makes less than \$45,000. It makes a mockery out of equal pay for equal work, but more importantly it makes a mockery out of fairness, and I resent the implication that I don’t have my facts straight.

“I’m not a lawyer, but I’ve read the State Constitution. The Majority Party member across the way implied there is nothing constitutionally wrong with this budget. Well, it so happens that the Constitution has a segment in it called Rights of Citizens, Article I, Section 8 – ‘No citizen shall be disenfranchised or deprived of any of the rights or privileges secured to other citizens.’ My constituents are being deprived of fairness and rights on strictly partisan basis. You have disenfranchised them. You have taken away their ability to have me represent them with the full power and resources that you have generously allocated to yourselves. This is partisan.

“I did not ask the Governor, and I want to correct the misrepresentation, to veto this budget. I asked her to consider it.

“Regarding Legislative allotments and what is allowed in the office – maybe in order to be as transparent and detailed and accountable as the Majority Party often stands up and so self righteously demands from the executive branch of government, maybe we should demand that transparency for ourselves too.

“Let’s take a look at office allowances. We’re not objecting to allowances. We know that our salary does not include all of the protocol costs and other thing that are necessary – the leis and the other costs that we pay for in our offices – and there may be justification to have a 50 percent increase in that. We’re not objecting to that, at least I’m not. But maybe the public needs to know how that money is being spent.

“So there seems to be a lot of duplicity, a lot of doubletalk, but more importantly, a lot of petty partisanship.

“Mr. President and colleagues, in more enlightened jurisdictions there are better ways to do this. And that is simply to allot money based on the person’s office, not their political label. It seems to work pretty well on the City Council. It seems to work pretty well in the Congress of the United States.

“It’s about time we bring this Legislature into the 21st Century. This is not the old days when one party ran a political monopoly at the expense of fair play and honesty and openness.

“Thank you, Mr. President.”

Senator Slom rose in opposition to the measure and stated:

“Mr. President, I, too, rise in opposition to the bill, the budget.

“I don’t recall in the ten years that I’ve been here that I’ve ever voted against the Legislative budget, although I have raised concerns year after year. And this year in Ways and Means there were enough concerns raised and enough questions asked

and enough information not provided that I asked for the bill to be deferred the other day. And it was voted down handily – 11 to 3 I think was the vote – not even to defer, not even to wait until we got our facts, not even until legitimate questions were answered. And that disturbs me, Mr. President.

“What also disturbs me is every year the budget comes in and each section has a general fund appropriation, but nowhere in the budget itself is a total amount shown. Those of us that like to add up numbers and do so regularly, found, for example, that this budget now is over \$30 million in general fund and audit revolving fund expenditures – \$30 million to run a 60-day, part-time State Legislature. That’s a lot of money, and we’ve watched it over the years continue to increase. So we can talk about a percentage reduction here or we’ve cut out \$340,000 or \$355,000 there, but the fact of the matter is that 30 million bucks is real money. And increases in personnel foretells increased costs continuously year, after year, after year.

“And so I think it’s only right that we do in fact take our time and deliberately look at these expenditures. And I’m sure most of them can be justified, but I think as the good Senator from downtown Kakaako had suggested, this is the only financial document where we neither ask for nor have somebody sitting in the dock to answer questions, to make the presentation, to give the justification. And so, if we’re talking about fairness, I think that would only be fair that somebody could do that rather than making this partisan or making this contentious as it should not be.

“I, too, thank the good Vice President for getting this information, but it’s my recollection she’s been trying to get this information for more than a year now. Why should that be? And the statement by both the good Senator from downtown and also the Minority Leader about the scrutiny that we give to the Executive Branch and to departments, I absolutely support. If you’re going to talk about transparency, if your talk about programs, whether you’re talking about trips to China or anything else, there should be a justification and the public should know whether it’s public money or it is public agencies using private money. Those are legitimate issues and I think that they should be explored, asked, and answered. And I think we’ve tried to do that in every area except this legislative area.

“The other thing that amuses and frustrates a lot of people is the fact that today represents the 10th day of the 60-day Legislative Session – 1/6 of this Session is over. And after all the lofty speeches about homelessness and healthcare and identity theft and surplus and schools and rehabilitation, what is it that we always do first? We always take care of ourselves. We always pass first the legislative budget to take care of ourselves – to raise our allowances, to increase personnel, to increase salaries. I don’t want to get into the spitting match about who deserves more or why there is or isn’t equal pay. I’m looking at it from the taxpayer’s standpoint that this is a lot of money, particularly when people are struggling so – when we are creating homelessness, when we have the lowest unemployment rate in the nation and we cheer about that but businesses can’t find anybody to work for them, and if we find somebody, they can’t go to work because they don’t have a home or they don’t have a roof over their heads. These are the issues that we should have been grappling with from day one. We should have already passed two, three, five, a half dozen bills! But no, we sit here. This is the longest Session we’ve had since the beginning. We were getting used to those four and five minute Sessions. This is the longest Session and the only debate we’ve had, and what are we debating? To give us more money, to give us more options.

“I just think that we should be more careful and we should realize where this money is coming from. It is not government

money. It is not our money just to divide up. It is the taxpayers' money. It's all those people that we say we care about – the single mom and the elderly and the really young people trying to get a start. The things that we do, every penny that we spend in here is their money. It's not our money, and I think we give short shrift to that.

“So, Mr. President, reluctantly I'm going to vote against this to call attention to the fact that we've got to be more careful with the people's money and we've got to have our priorities set and our priorities should not always be us, us, us, us, us.

“And finally, Mr. Chair, my good colleague from the landfill area of golden Waianae, I don't dispute the work that's done during the interim sessions, but I do agree with the Minority Leader that Minority members of the Legislature are fully involved, whether there are informational briefings or hearings or anything else. But I detected in her voice a little bit of concern because the Majority seems to be overworked, or at least they think they are. So I will repeat my call and volunteer all five of your Minority here – all stalwart, young, hardworking, energetic people – to take some of this burden off your shoulders and give us Committee Chairmanships! We could take five out of the thirteen. We could really help you. You'd have more time to have your visions and your dreams. Give us the Chairmanships as was done on a bipartisan basis more than a decade ago when we had Mary George and Stan Koki operating Committees and operating them well. We will serve you well. We will serve the people well. So let us help you. We stand here . . . that's what we wait for day after day – for the phone to ring and say, 'hey, send in the first team.' (Laughter.)

“Thank you, Mr. President.”

Senator Chun Oakland rose and said:

“Mr. President, I wanted to ask a question of the previous speaker.”

The President posed the question and Senator Slom replied:

“Why I'd be honored.”

Senator Chun Oakland inquired:

“Could you explain to the public and to us how our staff would be paid if we do not pass the budget now?”

Senator Slom replied:

“The question is, how would the staff be paid if we don't pass the budget now? The staff will be paid and there's no reason that we could not pass this budget. What I said was, we pontificated here on opening day about how important these other issues are, so if we made them a priority we could have passed two, four, six, eight, ten bills immediately in the first couple of days. That's all I'm saying in terms of priority.

“No one is saying that staff should not be paid. No one is saying that anyone else is not entitled to the kinds of things they get. I'm just saying, what's the priority? Are we really first? Do we need to be first each time? That's my answer.”

Senator Chun Oakland further inquired:

“Mr. President, another question. So, your understanding is, if we do not pass this particular budget, our staff would not be paid, unlike the departments that do have a budget already to pay their staff. I just wanted you to inform correctly, the process here.”

Senator Slom replied:

“Well, I think we all understand the process, and again what I'm talking about is not mutually exclusive. There is noting that says that we cannot pass additional bills at the same time or in advance of the legislative budget. Nobody is trying to take away anything from our employees. I have employees too. I want them paid. I see new employees that come and they wait two months before their first pay and that has nothing to do with whether or not the budget was passed. That has to do with the way in which we pay our employees.”

Senator Chun Oakland then stated:

“Incorrect. Your point was that why do we pass the budget early on. My understanding with other bills, especially if they require money, we cannot pass those bills until the state budget is passed in the month of April.

“And with regards to a comment made by the previous Senator. I'm not too sure if he was referring to the workload. For myself I have invited every Legislator to participate in sharing the workload and unfortunately there has not been response.

“Thank you.”

Senator Slom responded:

“Excuse me, Mr. President, an answer to that again – maybe the good Senator from Nuuanu had a hard time hearing since she's seven feet away, but what I'd said was Committee Chairmanships, Committee Chairmanships. Since the issue was paying Committee Chairmen, Chairwomen, Chairs more money and having them do more responsibility, what I said was 'share the Chairmanships,' we'd be very happy to do that.”

President Bunda stated:

“Senator Chun Oakland, one more question if you have one.”

Senator Chun Oakland then said:

“A comment, Mr. President. Not with regards to these chairmanships, the workload issue is what I believe he was talking about as well. And we always encourage all members of this Body to actively be involved not only during the Session but during the interim, and unfortunately some members have not participated.”

Senator Slom then rose and said:

“Mr. President, a final point about that.

“I'd be very happy if the good Senator would supply us a list of those people that she feels are not pulling their weight, not doing their things. And I would also want to know if the good Senator is talking about just her Committee alone and her areas of interest or if we're talking about the broad span of issues that we are called upon to discuss and be involved in on a daily basis.”

“Thank you, Mr. President.”

Senator Kim rose in support of the measure as follows:

“Mr. President, I rise in support of this budget.

“Mr. President, first let me just say that all of the material, all of the information that I have requested have been given to

everybody. There is nothing that I have not shared. So there are no worksheets. There is nothing that we are withholding.

“There has been more transparency in this budget or in the information than there has ever been in the past. And if you talk about duplicity, then it interests me why my good colleagues across the way or the Minority Leader hasn’t stood up and asked for this information. I believe he voted in favor of an increase in budget last year, not asking any questions. Interesting enough, certainly there were some monies put in for the Minority as well. That’s probably why they supported the budget at that time.

“So, if you talk about duplicity, the bottom line is we’re cutting the budget. We’re trying to be responsible in making sure that the budget is lean enough, and yet they’re standing up and saying, why are we cutting it? Maybe we should continue and ask for all of the money that was included without really knowing what is being spent. So, I have to question the nature of which this conversation or this debate on this Floor is going regarding the budget. I believe that the Minority, our good Minority Leader, has been given all the information that we’ve received. Yes, we have not reached the level that I’m happy with as far as full transparency, but we have gotten more transparency than we’ve ever had in the past, and I think it’s a step in the right direction and we’ll certainly be working towards that, Mr. President.

“Thank you.”

Senator Hooser also rose in support of the measure and said:

“Mr. President, I rise in support of this measure.

“Mr. President and colleagues, I’d like to urge you all to vote ‘yes’ on this. I think this is a good budget. I want to complement the Senate Vice President and the Ways and Means Chair and the staff of the members of the Ways and Means Committee.

“I find it kind of ironic that this is the most transparent that we’ve been, I think, in my experience working with this budget. We’ve actually taken the budget and looked at it closely and cut a significant portion from it to be as economical and as efficient as we can, and yet as a result there seems to be more antagonism and more outrage and ‘no’ votes from the members of the Minority when in fact I think we’ve been more transparent than we’ve ever been. Certainly we can always make greater steps in that direction.

“I’d like to take issue with a couple of the comments made by earlier speakers, specifically the implication that our staffs that we have, our hardworking people in our offices, are not working and not doing the work of the people and the work of the Senate. I feel that my people in my office are insulted.”

Senator Whalen interjected:

“Point of order, Mr. President. There was nothing even close to that. The speaker obviously misunderstood something and I don’t want to sit through a fifteen minute explanation about how their staff works just as hard as ours because there was no comment ever implied that any of the Majority staff members did not do their work and work hard.”

President Bunda then said:

“Senator Hooser, please keep your comments germane.”

Senator Hooser continued:

“Mr. President, I think the comments made were that we’re part-time Legislators and we have two fulltime staff members year around and yet apparently there’s not work to do. To me that equates to the same as an insult both to myself, Majority members who do work hard, and to my staff.

“As I look around the room at the room of Majority members, very few take this job as a part-time position. During the interim, I know myself and many of you served on not just the Ways and Means meetings and site visits, there was the affordable housing taskforce, there was the sustainability taskforce, there was Judiciary work, plus there’s the work of dealing with our constituents on a regular basis. This is not a 60-day job. Many of us, and I’m not going to speak for the Minority Party, many of us take this job seriously and we work at it very hard and on a fulltime basis.

“Some of the other comments made earlier were about the wireless system. Quite honestly, that’s a ludicrous, straw-man type of saying. This is not about a wireless system, Mr. President. This is about passing a good budget. We all want to improve our technology and we’re all committed to doing that.

“This is a good budget and I must point out in support of an earlier comment from my colleague, that we have to pass this bill to pay our staff. It’s a good bill. It’s more transparent than it’s ever been and we’ve worked hard to make it as efficient and as economical as possible.

“I urge my colleagues to vote in support. Thank you, Mr. President.”

The motion was put by the Chair and carried, H.B. No. 1949, S.D. 1, entitled: “A BILL FOR AN ACT MAKING APPROPRIATIONS TO PROVIDE FOR THE EXPENSES OF THE LEGISLATURE, THE AUDITOR, THE LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE BUREAU, AND THE OMBUDSMAN,” having been read throughout, passed Third Reading on the following showing of Ayes and Noes:

Ayes, 20. Noes, 4 (Hemmings, Hogue, Slom, Trimble). Excused, 1 (Inouye).

At 12:23 o’clock p.m., the Senate stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate reconvened at 12:23 o’clock p.m.

HOUSE COMMUNICATION

MATTER DEFERRED FROM WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 2006

H.B. No. 1861 (Hse. Com. No. 4):

By unanimous consent, action on H.B. No. 1861, entitled: “A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO EDUCATION,” was deferred until Friday, February 3, 2006.

RE-REFERRAL OF SENATE BILLS

The Chair re-referred the following Senate bills that were introduced:

Senate Bill Referred to:

No. 2036 Jointly to the Committee on Media, Arts, Science and Technology and the Committee on Business and Economic Development, then to the Committee on Ways and Means

No. 2077 Jointly to the Committee on Commerce, Consumer Protection and Housing and the Committee on Intergovernmental Affairs, then to the Committee on Ways and Means

No. 2144 Jointly to the Committee on Judiciary and Hawaiian Affairs and the Committee on Intergovernmental Affairs, then to the Committee on Ways and Means

No. 2157 Jointly to the Committee on Commerce, Consumer Protection and Housing and the Committee on Media, Arts, Science and Technology, then jointly to the Committee on Judiciary and Hawaiian Affairs and the Committee on Ways and Means

No. 2160 Jointly to the Committee on Media, Arts, Science and Technology and the Committee on Commerce, Consumer Protection and Housing, then jointly to the Committee on Judiciary and Hawaiian Affairs and the Committee on Ways and Means

No. 2163 Jointly to the Committee on Human Services and the Committee on Commerce, Consumer Protection and Housing, then to the Committee on Ways and Means

No. 2233 Committee on Intergovernmental Affairs, then to the Committee on Ways and Means

No. 2291 Jointly to the Committee on Commerce, Consumer Protection and Housing and the Committee on Energy, Environment, and International Affairs, then to the Committee on Judiciary and Hawaiian Affairs

No. 2307 Jointly to the Committee on Transportation and Government Operations and the Committee on Judiciary and Hawaiian Affairs, then to the Committee on Ways and Means

No. 2319 Jointly to the Committee on Commerce, Consumer Protection and Housing and the Committee on Water, Land, and Agriculture, then to the Committee on Ways and Means

No. 2329 Jointly to the Committee on Health and the Committee on Human Services, then to the Committee on Ways and Means

No. 2350 Committee on Intergovernmental Affairs, then to the Committee on Ways and Means

No. 2461 Jointly to the Committee on Human Services and the Committee on Commerce, Consumer Protection and Housing, then to the Committee on Ways and Means

No. 2550 Jointly to the Committee on Water, Land, and Agriculture and the Committee on Intergovernmental Affairs, then to the Committee on Ways and Means

No. 2639 Jointly to the Committee on Health and the Committee on Judiciary and Hawaiian Affairs, then to the Committee on Ways and Means

No. 2753 Committee on Water, Land, and Agriculture, then to the Committee on Ways and Means

No. 2824 Committee on Water, Land, and Agriculture, then to the Committee on Ways and Means

No. 2858 Jointly to the Committee on Transportation and Government Operations and the Committee on Intergovernmental Affairs, then to the Committee on Education and Military Affairs

No. 2867 Jointly to the Committee on Commerce, Consumer Protection and Housing and the Committee on Business and Economic Development, then to the Committee on Ways and Means

No. 3004 Committee on Commerce, Consumer Protection and Housing, then to the Committee on Ways and Means

No. 3028 Jointly to the Committee on Human Services and the Committee on Commerce, Consumer Protection and Housing, then to the Committee on Ways and Means

ADJOURNMENT

At 12:24 o'clock p.m., on motion by Senator Hee, seconded by Senator Hogue and carried, the Senate adjourned until 11:30 o'clock a.m., Friday, February 3, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,

Clerk of the Senate

Approved:

President of the Senate