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THE 1937 legislature of the Territory of Hawaii passed an act requiring revision of our city charter after careful study by a commission.

Legislators have explained that bills involving our city and county and the requests for appropriations from the legislature have become so numerous and confusing that it was found advisable to call for a governmental setup that would insure simplicity and unification.

A well-developed and unified biennial program for the City and County of Honolulu is said to be necessary before the legislature can consider the needs and program of the territory as a whole.

Public hearings recently held on the revision of the charter of the City and County of Honolulu have brought out several points of general agreement and several issues on which there are differences of opinion.

One disclosure is the general lack of knowledge on the part of people who are interested in good government, but who have never given governmental administration careful study.

This lack of knowledge was found in the most highly educated professional groups as well as among groups that have had far less educational opportunities.

However, some of those who addressed the charter revision commission had given considerable study to the subject, and the views expressed by them will doubtless be of value to the commission. The hearings have therefore proved to be of educative value for the public as well as for the members of the charter revision commission. So much information has been assembled and such a relatively small number of persons has attended many of the hearings that it is believed advisable to make a brief summary of the hearings and the points raised for the benefit of the citizens, all of whom are directly concerned.

The charter revision commission is required to prepare a revised charter for submission to the next legislature. The legislators should know how the public feels about all the changes that may be included in the revised charter. The public should consider these changes thoroughly and arrive at opinions based upon a careful, thoughtful study of all sides of the various issues.

Honolulu and Hawaii have historically kept well abreast of the times, socially, economically, and politically.

*This paper first appeared as a series of articles in The Honolulu Star-Bulletin.
The general feeling has been expressed that in our city-county government and administration we are comparatively well-off, but that we have an opportunity here in these islands in the middle of the Pacific to acquire nearly ideal conditions, compared with other places, if we all think and act cooperatively after careful analysis of our needs and possibilities.

We are now given the opportunity to secure the very best charter for our city and county that has so far been evolved anywhere. It becomes the duty of our leaders and of the public to determine the best type of government and administration and then enact laws providing such for our city and county.

The charter revision commission has now closed its preliminary public hearings. It is now reviewing the opinions expressed and studying the case from all practical and theoretical angles. The commission also expects individuals and groups of civic minded people to continue discussion and study. The commission is desirous of conferring with individuals and groups that are interested, feeling that such study and discussion will enable all to arrive at sound and constructive conclusions.

It is believed that as nearly as is humanly possible all should keep an open mind and an objective attitude during the study of charter revision matters. Whatever conclusions are reached should be based on sound theory and should be deemed practical in Honolulu's situation.

The great difficulty in improving a charter by revision lies in the lack of informed interest. This results in apathy and a feeling that it is too much work and too difficult to attempt to make any considerable change. The proper course would seem to indicate a decision as to what really is best, then conscientious and tireless efforts to enact indicated improvements.

**The Chief Issues**

There are several issues on which there is general agreement, although there may have been certain minor practical difficulties cited and a few people who have felt uncertain or doubtful about some of the issues. The chief issues raised to date are:

1. **Delimitation of powers**—

It is advocated that there should be clear delimitation of the powers of the legislative branch (the board of supervisors) and the administrative branch (the mayor and the department heads), and fixing of responsibility, together with granting of authority adequate to secure good administration. Without clear delimitation it is possible to have conditions such as cliques within the board or conflicts between board and mayor that would hamper and block necessary good administration.

Although all agree that duties should be clearly defined, the whole question of *separation* of legislative and administrative functions is
involved in this, and this raises many related questions as to how such separation should be accomplished.

For example, the type of government itself determines to some extent whether legislative and administrative functions are defined and separated. Also, the question of “checks and balances” versus “unification of powers, with authority commensurate with fixed responsibility” arises. These related issues require separate discussion.

2. Types of government—

In general there are three types of city administration: The mayor council plan, the commission plan, and the council manager plan.

The mayor council form has two types: (1) the type in which the mayor is held responsible for administration and has rather full appointive powers not requiring approval by the board, and rather full freedom to administer the government within the limits of the budget as determined at the beginning of the fiscal year by the supervisors or council; and (2) the type in which all appointments made by the mayor are subject to the council’s approval, and items of appropriation for current needs, month to month or project by project, or even portions of projects, are passed on by the council. Within these two general types the city charters are by no means uniform. They differ from city to city in details.

Honolulu’s Form of Government

Honolulu’s form of government illustrates the mayor council plan of the second type.

In general, all persons agree that we are fortunate in having one administration for our city and county, and not separate setups for each, as have many mainland cities.

Also, many mainland cities have separate city, county, or even township school administrations, whereas Hawaii benefits greatly by having all city and rural schools under one territorial administration—an executive commission known as the board of commissioners of public instruction. The same is true for tax assessment and collection, and for preventive measures in the field of public health.

Until about 1900 the mayor council plan was practically the only form of city administration existing among American cities. James Bryce, in his scholarly commentary on American government entitled "The American Commonwealth," found our American city government to be deplorable. This condition may have been due less to the form of government than to the lack of interest of good citizens, however, for it is generally conceded that no form of government is good unless it is administered by good men, with the backing of honest and capable citizens.

Mr. Bryce found in our cities generally the existence of political machines controlled by selfish and corrupt bosses who turned public funds to their own benefit. The citizens did not know conditions or
were not sufficiently interested to make the great effort necessary to change and improve conditions. Or, if an effort were once made and corrupt officials ousted, the system itself was not corrected and the evil conditions soon reasserted themselves as the temporary ardor of the reformers wore off.

The public hearings on the Honolulu city charter have brought out the fact that our people believe we have good government and administration in Honolulu, although (1) there are many proposals for improvement; (2) it is clear that we do not have the machinery to study in detail what we are getting for our tax dollar as compared with what other well-governed cities are getting; and (3) it seems that our present type of election campaign, complicated political ramifications, etc., discourage many able men from seeking city elective offices.

**Executive Commissions**

The accompanying chart of our city-county government (see chart of Type I—Mayor Council) reveals that we have evolved from practical experience a unit known as the *executive commission*. This is illustrated by the parks board, the police commission, the board of water supply, and the recreation commission. This executive commission unit involves an issue of charter revision which will be discussed later.

The appointive department heads, such as the band, health, city attorney, public prosecutor, public works, building and fire departments are typical in the mayor-council plan.

It will be noticed that there are two advisory boards: Traffic safety and city planning. These advise concerning formation of ordinances, the advice being furnished the mayor and board both directly and also through the bureau of plans.

The executive commissions were created by territorial legislative acts, and usually the legislature mandates the minimum amount that the city and county government shall appropriate for use of these commissions and fixes the rates of pay for the personnel of the commissions or departments.

**Flaws in Honolulu Organization**

Honolulu's organization chart reveals considerable overlapping of authority as well as certain lack of coordination.

The chart shows the mayor to be the chief executive officer, but there are dotted lines down from the box of supervisors, showing their partial control of administration through influencing appointments and making all money appropriations for each department as requested item by item and month to month, even after the budget has been initially approved and adopted.

The mayor has considerable independence, although he is required to administer ordinances made by the board.
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Being independently elected, the treasurer, auditor, clerk, and sheriff have less responsibility to the board of supervisors than some people think desirable.

The Commission Form

A second form of city government came into existence about 1900 in Galveston, Tex., following the terribly destructive Galveston flood.

The then mayor-council administration proved so ineffectual in recovering the city from the flood damages that the governor of the state abolished the mayor and council offices and appointed a commission of five well-qualified men to run the city. The results in this case were excellent. The accompanying chart shows the organization of a typical commission plan. (See chart of Type II.)

**TYPE II**

**COMMISSION PLAN (TYPICAL)**

Here there are five elected commissioners, usually the one with the highest number of votes becoming mayor or the commissioners themselves electing one of their members as mayor. Each commissioner runs a department of city government and the entire commission makes ordinances and decides upon a budget, also making all appropriations.

Shortly after the Galveston inauguration, several cities adopted the commission plan, which as a rule worked well and enlisted the services of good men. Except in the initial Galveston case, the commissioners were elected by the people, not appointed by the governor. However, it was soon discovered that this plan was no cure-all and that two ancient defects might still survive:

1. The political machine might elect and control the commission; and 2. the commissioners might be partisan minded and split on party lines, thus enabling three members to hamper the minority two and cripple the work of the minority commissioners' departments.
The commission plan is still in operation in about 500 cities, but there have been very few adoptions of this form of government for many years since 1917, and the Honolulu charter revision commission does not seem inclined to recommend this form for our needs.

_Trend Toward Council-Manager Plan_

A modern trend in city government is toward the third form—the council-manager plan. Originating in 1908 in the small city of Staunton, Va., the adoption of the council-manager plan has spread steadily, averaging about 20 adoptions a year, until there are now more than 450 council-manager governments. Only 21 cases are known where the council-manager plan has been abandoned when once adopted, and there have been only six abandonments since 1931. Reasons for abandonments are shown to be poorly drawn, indefinite charters with lack of definition of the functions of the council and the manager. There seems to be no exception to the rule that the council-manager plan increases efficiency.

In general, the council-manager plan and the "strong mayor"-council plan are similar, the chief differences being that the mayor is elected for a definite term whereas the city manager is appointed by the council (supervisors) for an indefinite term, depending upon his record.

_The Manager Plan_

The accompanying chart of organization shows that in the council-manager plan the voters elect the policy-forming officials—the council (supervisors)—just as the shareholders elect their directors in a modern business corporation.

Then the council seeks and appoints a well-qualified city manager, just as the directors in a firm appoint a manager.

The city manager is then held responsible for administering the ordinances of the city and carrying out the policies of the council, just as the manager of a firm carries out the policies of the board of directors.

The city manager is authorized to select heads of departments, and usually a civil service system selects under employes; the city manager is given authority, and he must accept the responsibility for successful administration and get satisfactory results or the council will dismiss him.

There are 67 cities of 100,000 population and over that are permitted by their state laws to adopt such charter as they may choose. It is a difficult accomplishment requiring much time to move the people to change the form of government.

Usually this is not done except when a great physical catastrophe, such as a flood, reveals the old governmental form to be inadequate, or when graft and corruption become so oppressive that people finally
TYPE II COUNCIL - MANAGER (or "CITY MANAGER TYPE")
POSSIBLE GENERAL ORGANIZATION PLAN FOR COUNCIL - MANAGER TYPE OF GOVERNMENT FOR CITY & COUNTY OF HONOLULU
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However, 25 per cent of these 67 cities now have council-manager governments and the number is growing annually.

The essence of the council-manager plan is the vesting of complete administrative functions in the city manager, who is held to full responsibility for the successful administration of the city's business.

If this plan should be adopted for Honolulu it would seem to necessitate the abolition of the executive commissions above mentioned, since the city manager would be given complete authority over the police, water supply, parks, and public recreation, as well as all other executive bureaus. Such commissions would become advisory in nature, if continued.

A change to the city manager form while retaining the executive commissions in effect as at present would simply mean that we should have an appointed manager instead of an elected mayor.

Although many people favor the rule, "When you wish representation, elect; when you wish administration, appoint," it is generally felt that if Honolulu wishes to continue its executive commissions, there is no adequate point in switching the type of government from mayor-council to manager-council.

Of course, the council-manager plan may wane in popularity in the future and it may not be the best form for Honolulu. This is an issue for consideration at present.

Some people believe that even though this plan is more efficient, it is less democratic.

The democratic ideal is that of the old New England town meeting, where all citizens met, discussed policies and details, and a majority vote ruled in administration. Manifestly this is impracticable in a large governmental unit such as ours (Honolulu city and county population 1937 more than 218,000).

Nor is it believed wise to elect all governmental officials. The question arises, "Where shall we draw the line in elections?"

It is generally maintained that it is not the type of government but the type of men in government that determines the quality of ordinances and administration. If this is true, the question may be whether our present form is such as to induce the best and most capable men in Honolulu to run for elective offices. They now seem willing to serve on non-political boards and commissions, even without pay.

The list of elective officials in some cities requires a ballot the size of a sheet of newspaper, with long lists of offices and candidates in small print.

Honolulu has a short ballot as compared with such, yet our ballot is not strictly a "short ballot," for the idea of the short ballot is to elect only the policy-forming officials. The only policy-forming officials in our city-county are the supervisors; all others are administrative officials.
Should we elect only the supervisors and auditor, as the shareholders of a corporation elect only their directors, who in turn elect from their number a chairman?

Or should we also elect a mayor, differing from the practice of business firms, whose shareholders do not elect the firm’s manager, this official being appointed by the directors?

Should we go further and elect department heads, thus varying further from business practices?

At present we elect not only the supervisors, but also the mayor, the auditor, the treasurer, the clerk and the sheriff.

Would good government be better served if we elected all department heads, all foremen, all employees?

Does the fact that a person is elected guarantee that all the people of the democracy have expressed their will concerning the matter?

How many of the city-county officials and employees do you or does the average citizen know well enough to enable him to vote intelligently concerning each one? How many candidates for city employment or office can the average citizen be expected to know well enough to determine which is best qualified for the specific duties of the office in question? How many average citizens know the exact duties of each job in the city-county?

Should we, in the name of an earlier, naive conception of “democracy,” entrust selection of administrative officials to the general public, who do not understand the jobs and who know few of the candidates, or should we elect to the council (supervisors) persons who are qualified and who make it their business to see that the best qualified men are selected for administrative positions? Or, again, should we elect the board and the chief administrative official—the mayor—and delegate appointive powers as at present?

Some have stated that a more nearly correct plan would be to have the treasurer and clerk appointed, as are other heads of departments, by the mayor with the approval of the board. It also has been recommended that the sheriff be appointed by the public prosecutor, since his duties fall in the legal field.

Should the Auditor Be Elected?

Many people think that the auditor should not be elected. What is desired in this office is trained ability in accountancy rather than in vote getting; hence, it is claimed, the auditor should be appointed by the mayor with the approval of the board, and the charter should specify that the auditor be a qualified and experienced municipal public accountant.

In this connection it was advanced that some of the duties now performed by the city-county auditor properly should be handled by a comptroller, who would see to it that all expenditures are as set up in the budget and provided for by law or ordinances. There is the pos-
sibility that if the comptroller duties were divided from the auditing, these former might be handled by one in charge of the proposed efficiency and budget bureau.

The practical issue is how far is it advisable for us to go in our elections? Practically, how many officials can the people elect intelligently and wisely? To what extent shall we follow the rule previously quoted: "When you want representation, elect; when you want administration, appoint"?

And this brings us back to the first mentioned issue: the delimitation of powers. In any form of government it seems necessary to fix by charter just what shall be the duties of the legislative or policy-forming officials (the supervisors) and what shall be the duties of the administrative officials (mayor and a few department heads such as the treasurer, auditor, clerk, etc.). Usually the duties of officials and employees below department heads are fixed by a classification system in the nature of civil service.

"Checks and Balances" Versus "Unification of Powers"

City administration in England is supposed to be very good.

It is said that the practice is to elect a very few councilmen, who then select well-qualified administrators and see that they do a good job of administering the business of city government.

This policy enables men to prepare themselves well for city service and to make a career in this field. Quite adequate trust is reposed in the city administrators and corresponding authority and responsibility granted them. Continental Europe also follows this plan as a rule.

In America we have thought it necessary to set up one branch of government to check and balance another, and one group of officials to check another group.

We seem to act upon the principle that it is safe to grant only a limited amount of authority to any one and that grant must be checked and balanced at all times.

Even in our business firms the manager is not left to operate solely on his own. Most important matters are considered by the board of directors or by committees of the board.

The directors carefully consider the annual expense budget, the creation of new positions, the success of departments, plans for new buildings or projects, plans for operation, and even the type of man to be a department head or to be singled out for advancement.

The issue is, to what extent should our new charter provide checks and balances as between the board of supervisors and the mayor (or manager) and to what extent shall authority be vested in the administrative officials without constant detailed check of the policy-forming branch—the board?
Some have advocated that the rural districts should have two supervisors on the board—one from windward and one from leeward Oahu. Some have said that provision should be made in the charter to guarantee two rural resident supervisors. Others think that, whereas it is desirable that there be two supervisors who reside in the rural areas and have the rural viewpoint, the system of election should not be changed but rather the rural people should put up good candidates and see that they are elected the same as city resident supervisors are elected. The latter groups of people fear that no entering wedge should be allowed that will lead to many districts wanting their own man and hence set up the outmoded "ward system."

For various reasons Honolulu has acquired executive commissions that function between the department officials and the mayor and supervisors (board of water supply, park board, police commission, and recreation commission). The work of these commissions, on the whole, is said to be highly efficient. The commissions are supposed to be non-political and they secure the service and time of many well-qualified men and women who serve without cost to the city and with wise efficiency based on broad experience. There seems to be nothing more important than having capable, well-qualified citizens interested and active in public problems. One of the devices that Honolulu has evolved to provide such active interest and contribution is the executive commission. Those serving on these commissions actually know how the city-county is being governed, take a deep interest in government, and aid greatly in government. It is an aid to the official employees to have able citizens conscious of the duties required and cooperating in getting work done. It seems to be a move in the direction of effective democracy, with citizens cooperating in government under a plan or organization. Possibly the chief problem in having many executive commissions is that of fairly coordinating the work of the several departments. With a good chief administrator this difficulty may not be too great.

The issue is whether to continue the present commissions or not, also whether or not it would be better to extend the commissions by placing the public works department under an executive commission, thereby providing a group of well-qualified engineers, business men, etc., for directing a long-term program of public works. Some people believe that if the public works department is placed on a civil service basis, thereby removing possibilities of patronage evils, it will be unnecessary to place public works under a commission. Also, many believe that problems of work relief should not be confused with the city public works department. They believe this department should be charged only with legitimate public improvements, and that work relief should be handled entirely separately, so that cost accounts will not be confused nor the element of patronage introduced into public service.
Non-Partisan Elections

Various people have suggested that non-partisan elections should be held.

It is stated that, with civil service in effect, there would be very little need for party organization, since parties are supposed to represent policies and the parties below the territorial government, at least, hardly represent specific policies but are party machines to dominate the elections. Some people feel that without the party system each candidate for the policy-forming offices would stand on his own feet and record and that if elections were freed of "politics" Hawaii probably would have the highest possible type of citizens willing to serve.

On the other hand, it is pointed out that it is very difficult to get elected without the support of parties, and that many people would be unable to arrange for public hearings at which they might appear throughout the city and county without the cooperation of party financing. Also, it is pointed out that if one did not have a party to back him he would at once look around for some sort of organization of friends or blocs, and in this way occasion might arise for the undesirable formation of voting blocs along racial, religious, social, or district lines.

Proportional Representation

The idea of election by proportional representation has been growing of recent years, the most outstanding example being the election in the city of New York. Since it is well-known that large cities have the greatest difficulty in making any changes in governmental procedures, the fact that the great city of New York changed to proportional representation attracts a great deal of attention and indicates that the matter must have advantages. Proportional representation is said to guarantee that the vote of each citizen counts toward some man he wishes to elect and therefore is not wasted.

Briefly, in this form of balloting, if seven supervisors are to be elected and there are, say, 20 or 30 persons running for the offices, each voter would express his preference for seven of the candidates in first, second, and third choice order. In counting the votes, if it is found that, say, two candidates are very popular and have accrued more than a fixed quota of first choices, these two, of course, will be elected. Then, the additional first choice votes will not be needed by these two highest men and these extra votes will be credited to the person named on each of the extra ballots as second choice. If this gives any other candidate more than enough to elect him, these remaining extra votes will be passed on to the person named on each other extra ballot as third choice, and so on. At the same time the bottom candidate has received first choice votes and, because the candidate is hopelessly out of the race, his votes would be transferred to the candidate marked on each as sec-
ond choice. These second choices from the bottom would be passed up to higher candidates and would help elect them. And so the transfer of second or even third or fourth choice ballots would go on from the bottom up, until the seven supervisors have been elected by receiving the fixed quota of votes required for election.

It is admitted that this system of voting takes a longer time to count, but it does away with primary elections and is said to be a fairer form of election, insuring offices for minority groups and proportional representation of all groups.

Proportional representation should have thorough discussion and debate before the public so that it is well understood prior to the next session of the legislature. It may be that very material benefits lie in its consideration.

Extension of Term for Elected Officials

The year term for elective officials is too short, believing that the first months are needed for acquainting the officials with their jobs and a large part of the second year is spent building political fences preparatory to the ensuing election. Some people have advocated the four-year term for elective officials and still others have thought that a six-year term, with a provision that there be no succeeding one’s self in office, would be best. The four-year term is in vogue in most American cities; nearly all recent charter revisions have established the four-year term.

It is felt that if the voters realize that their officials will be in office for four years they will be more careful in their selections.

On the other hand, it is pointed out that to have incompetent officials in office for four years might prove embarrassing, and if there are functions in the board needing legislation they may be held up for too long a period.

In some places the recall system is provided for officials who have a four-year term or longer, but without exception those who have spoken before the charter revision commission have explained that recall has not worked where it has been tried and that it would not be beneficial for Honolulu.

Legislative Mandates

The territorial legislature fixes the amount that the city and county government may raise by real and personal property taxes at $3,500,000 per year. Expenditures above this sum are raised from sources such as fuel and auto taxes, etc.

All taxes are collected by the territorial tax collector and made available for the counties. The legislature further mandates that each county shall expend certain sums for the support of governmental units as deemed wise by the legislature. For example, the legislature mandates
that the board of supervisors of Honolulu shall allocate not less than $500,000 for the support of the police department and such part of $250,000 as may be required by Leahi home. The city and county officials do not seem to object to these mandates, although they feel that in some respects they violate the principle of "home rule." The city and county officials maintain that since the people are demanding increased governmental services and the legislature mandates such extensive appropriations, it should permit an increase in the general fund amount of the city and county. That is, it should raise the $3,500,000 limit.

Others who have appeared before the commission feel that a thorough study should be made of all expenditures selected before this limit is raised.

Practically no one has advocated the popular vote mandate known as the "initiative."

**Civil Service Advocated**

Almost without exception, those appearing have advocated civil service in its most modern aspects for the city and county government.

It is advocated that not only tenure of office should be provided to prevent the throwing out of employees because of a change in administration just when they become efficient in their work, but more particularly a merit system, with provision that employees be rated and retained in office and promoted according to their efficiency, is recommended.

Also, it is felt that with some such modern personnel administration, many people would prepare themselves adequately for government service and look to this field as a life career, and that thus a greatly improved type of public employees would result and efficiency would increase.

It should be borne in mind that the adoption of a civil service does not require the dismissal of present employees, nor even require their examination for continuance in office. Persons in office at the time of adoption of civil service would continue in office as long as they work satisfactorily and receive a suitable rating within the department.

It is felt that there should be a civil service commission appointed, probably by the mayor with the approval of the board of supervisors. This commission should consist of outstanding, well-qualified men and should have an executive secretary well trained in the field of modern personnel administration. This is practiced by most business firms, and many cities and states are adopting this system.

Honolulu now has a form of civil service in the fire and police departments. Many of the territorial employees are under civil service, particularly employees of the board of health, and this type of personnel administration seems to be working out very satisfactorily in-
sofar as it has been tried. The charter revision commission is working with the governor's personnel commission on this subject.

City Planning Commission

The city planning commission has urged that legislation—not a city ordinance—be enacted giving this commission authority to draw up a complete map of the city showing the best locations for public buildings, highways, and other facilities. They desire that no highway or public or private structures be opened or erected except in accordance with this master map, which would include properly defined building zones. It is maintained that at the present time a subdivision may be opened and improvements made in areas of the city not in conformity with the interests of the city's future growth.

School Architect and Special School Fund

Members of the parent-teachers association have advocated that the department of public instruction have charge of the architecture of new school buildings and control the special school fund used for school buildings. At the present time the plans for school buildings are drawn by the city building department and the county supervisors control the special school fund. It is felt that such school buildings require studies that ordinary architects are incapable of making, since the school program and services are not fully understood by architects without special school building experience.

Efficiency Bureau Recommended

Several people have advocated the creation of an efficiency bureau, the function of which would be the continuous study of expenditures to see that value is being received in all departments of government. This would include such things as a careful study of the work performed by personnel, the best plans for treatment or use of garbage, the preparation or check of specifications for various projects, and an appraisal of the waste or efficiency in accomplishing each project, etc.

It is argued that we do not know just how our costs compare with those of well managed cities elsewhere. It is also claimed that with our several executive commissions, the city executives, and the people are not in a position to forestall mistakes and prevent unnecessary expenditures before the damage is done. Also, it is felt that constant studies should be made of the ordinances in the city code to revise and modernize them so as to insure greatest economies and greater general efficiencies in all departments. This requires expert study and research as well as experience.

On the other hand, it is argued by some that an efficiency bureau would simply create more positions and increase expense, with little likelihood of the studies ever accomplishing any change in established
practices, since critical studies of the work of officials and departments might lead to the shelving of a conscientious analyst. It may be noted here that the present mayor has advocated the wisdom of having such research personnel to keep a constant check on operations and to furnish advice concerning possible improvements and economies.

Main Points Studied

The foregoing 14 issues constitute the main points that have been evolved by the public hearings and by study of our city and county charter to date. All these issues will require careful discussion by the charter revision commission and all citizens should acquaint themselves with the various sides of each issue.

Insofar as possible all persons interested in good government should be ready to support the charter revision commission, assuming that it recommends to the legislature the form of government that is best suited to the needs of the city and county of Honolulu. Where opinions differ from those of the commission, full steps should be taken to insure public consideration of all sides of each issue.

For full discussion of city government see: "American City Government and Administration," by MacDonald, 1936; "Municipal Administration," by Munro, 1934, and other references in public library.
Herewith is a ballot that may be used by any citizen to express his opinion on the several issues. Such votes will be of interest and value to the charter revision commission. If you prefer not to vote on all issues or questions, your opinion on any one or more will be appreciated. Send the ballot, filled out, to Honolulu Charter Revision Commission, Room 400, Inter-Island Building, Honolulu.

INFORMAL VOTE

1. Type of municipal government desired:
   .........Mayor-council .........commission .........manager-council.
   .........Prefer not to vote until better informed.
   Remarks:

2. Delimitation of powers:
   Mayor's (or manager's) appointments should require board's approval.

   .........Yes .........No

3. Executive commissions should be continued. (Note: In city manager plan such commissions would probably become advisory.)

   .........Yes .........No

   Public works department should have an executive commission.
   .........Yes .........No

   Remarks:

4. City Planning commission should have authority (with suitable appeal to the courts) to fix legal requirements:
   (a) For location and nature of improvements.

   .........Yes .........No

   (b) For zoning.

   .........Yes .........No

5. Efficiency bureau and comptroller are desired.

   .........Yes .........No

   Remarks:

6. Short ballot:
   (a) For policy-forming officials only.

   .........Yes .........No

   (b) For policy-forming officials and mayor only.

   .........Yes .........No

   Remarks:
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Proportional representation desired.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remarks:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. All supervisors should be elected at large.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remarks:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Term of elected officials should be four years.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remarks:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Non-partisan elections are desired.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remarks:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Modern civil service with &quot;merit system&quot; is desired.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remarks:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Present legislative mandates should be continued.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remarks:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Board of public instruction should control special school fund and have a school architect.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remarks:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signature: ..........................................................  
Ballot may be submitted unsigned if preferred.