



The Judiciary, State of Hawai‘i

**Testimony to the Thirty-First Legislature,
Regular Session of 2022**

House Committee on Judiciary & Hawaiian Affairs
Representative Mark M. Nakashima, Chair
Representative Scot Z. Matayoshi, Vice Chair

Thursday, March 17, 2022, 2:00 PM
State Capitol, Conference Room 325
VIA VIDEO CONFERENCE

by
Shellie Park-Hoapili
Staff Attorney, Hawai‘i Supreme Court

Bill No. and Title: Senate Bill No. 2347, SD1, Relating to Constitutional Amendments.

Purpose: Requires the language and meaning of any proposed constitutional amendment and ratification question to be simple, concise, and direct to the extent practicable. Allows the presiding officers of the Legislature to request a written opinion of the Supreme Court regarding the legality of a proposed amendment to the Hawai‘i State Constitution and the corresponding constitutional ratification question. Requires the supreme court to provide a written opinion within one week of receipt of the request. Requires, for any written opinion by the supreme court that invalidates a constitutional ratification question, a detailed and specific explanation of the reasons for this opinion. Prohibits any appeal of a written opinion. Takes effect 7/30/2075.

Judiciary’s Position:

Due to the significant constitutional issues implicated by this bill, it is inappropriate for the Judiciary to take a position on this proposed legislation. The Judiciary, however, offers the following comments.

The Judiciary was unable to locate provisions in other states identical to that proposed in Senate Bill No. 2347, SD1, and only about ten states have provisions pertaining to advisory opinions requested by other branches of government. Concerns expressed about state provisions pertaining to advisory opinions include those arising from the separation of powers doctrine as well as the quality of opinions that must be rendered in short time frames.



Moreover, the opportunity to thoroughly consider an issue through zealous advocacy is absent in the proposal. Specifically, the proposal provides no opportunity for persons whose interests might be affected by the constitutional amendment or ratification question to be heard. In effect, the court would be reviewing the question without the benefit of any adversarial testing. Furthermore, the proposal provides that the court's written opinion "shall not be appealable," which suggests no further opportunity for judicial review even by those whose interests could be affected and who were not allowed to participate in the court's consideration of the important issue(s).

Additionally, the proposal does not indicate what factual record would be submitted to the court to assess the adequacy of the question. Nor does it provide the court with sufficient time (only 1 week) to review the potentially complex issues that are often posed by the constitutional amendment or ratification question, particularly when advocacy and adversarial testing, which are fundamental tenets of our jurisprudence, are absent from the court's review. Lastly, there are no limits on successive questions being submitted.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit testimony on this measure.



Committee on Judiciary & Hawaiian Affairs
Chair Nakashima, Vice Chair Matayoshi

March 17, 2022, 2:00 PM and Conference Room 325 and via Videoconference
SB 2347, SD1 – RELATING TO CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

TESTIMONY

Donna Oba, Legislative Committee, League of Women Voters of Hawaii

Chair Nakashima, Vice Chair Matayoshi, and Committee Members:

The League of Women Voters of Hawaii offers comments on SB 2347, SD1. Any change to our constitution should be carefully considered. The League is concerned that the proposed time frame in which the Hawaii Supreme Court must render an opinion is insufficient, nor does it allow interested parties sufficient time to provide supporting or opposing testimony to the Court.

We urge your Committee to amend the bill to provide more than a week for adequate participation by all relevant parties. The important interests of both the Legislature and any adversarial party must be protected in this measure.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit testimony.

SB-2347-SD-1

Submitted on: 3/15/2022 8:50:06 PM

Testimony for JHA on 3/17/2022 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Sherry Pollack	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

This measure is ill-advised. I echo the concerns as stated in the February 1 and February 18, 2022 testimony by Rodney A. Maile Administrative Director of the Courts and strongly oppose this bill. While we all would expect the wording of any proposed constitutional amendment and ratification question to be simple, concise, and direct, the requirements stipulated in this measure for the supreme court and subsequent prohibition of any appeal are completely unacceptable.

Please do not pass this measure.

Mahalo for the opportunity to testify.