



**TESTIMONY OF THE STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL  
TWENTY-FIFTH LEGISLATURE, 2009**

---

**ON THE FOLLOWING MEASURE:**

S.B. NO. 1182, RELATING TO COMMUNITY SERVICES AND THE STATE HOMELESS PROGRAMS.

**BEFORE THE:**

SENATE COMMITTEES ON HUMAN SERVICES  
AND ON LABOR

LATE

**DATE:** Thursday, February 12, 2009 **TIME:** 1:30 PM

**LOCATION:** State Capitol, Room 016

**TESTIFIER(S):** Mark J. Bennett, Attorney General  
or Candace J. Park, Deputy Attorney General

---

Chairs Chun Oakland and Takamine and Members of the Committees:

The Attorney General has concerns regarding this bill as it appears to be in violation of article III, section 14, of the Hawaii Constitution, which provides that "[e]ach law shall embrace but one subject, which shall be expressed in its title."

The title of this bill refers to two separate subjects, "community services" and the "state homeless programs."

The bill proposes (1) to transfer the functions and duties of the Office of Community Services of the Department of Labor and Industrial Relations to the Department of Human Services, and (2) to transfer the homeless programs of the Hawaii Public Housing Authority to the Department of Human Services.

This same outcome is proposed in two separate bills, S.B. No. 905, Relating to the Office of Community Services, and S.B. No. 910, Relating to the Transfer of Homeless Programs Within the Department of Human Services.

S.B. No. 905, which has been referred to the Committee on Labor and the Committee on Human Services, proposes to transfer the Office of Community Services from the Department of Labor and Industrial

Relations to the Department of Human Services. This bill does not raise any state constitutional concerns.

S.B. No. 910, which has been referred to the Committee on Human Services, proposes to transfer the homeless programs of the Hawaii Public Housing Authority to the Department of Human Services. This bill also does not raise any state constitutional concerns.

The passage of S.B. No. 905 and S.B. No. 910 would serve the same purpose as S.B. No. 1182, but without raising a state constitutional concern that could invalidate S.B. No. 1182.