

MAUI COUNTY CHARTER COMMISSION

Wailuku, Maui, Hawaii

PUBLIC HEARING

DATE: July 11, 1966

PLACE: Makawao School, Makawao, Maui

CALL TO ORDER: 7:45 P.M.

PRESIDING: Douglas Sodetani, Chairman

MEMBERS PRESENT: Douglas Sodetani, Chairman
Emil Balthazar
William F. Crockett, Vice-Chairman
Shiro Hokama
Nadao Honda
Harry Kobayashi
George Kondo
James Ushijima
Charles C. Young, Research Assistant

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Paul Pladera
Keith Tester

OTHERS PRESENT: Philip G. Bruchal, Jr.
Y. B. Chur
J. Walter Cameron
Rachel M. Jio
K. C. Leebrick
Eric Lindberg
Mr. and Mrs. Raymond P. Freitas
Mr. and Mrs. Francis E. Pomroy
Mrs. Mary R. Freitas
Mrs. Gussie M. Smith
Mr. Antone S. Bras
Joseph L. Vierra, Sr.
J. V. Marciel, Jr.
Alfred O. Souza
Lawrence Diego
Frank Maldonado
Kaoru Moto
Joseph Cooper
Julio R. Franco
Earl Tanaka, Maui News Editor

---0---

The Chair opened the hearing by introducing the commissioners of the Maui County Charter Commission to the audience. The Chair then called upon Emil Balthazar to give a brief background of what the Charter Commission has been doing up to now. The floor was then opened for discussion.

Mr. Bruchal: What's wrong with this form of County government we have now? Why should we change from this form of government now to a charter government? What's good about this charter government?

Mr. Balthazar: Actually to use the term "charter form of government" would be misleading. We could very well use the same functions we have now in the County of Maui and still write a charter spelling out those functions in one document.

Mr. Bruchal: Under the County government, would the Charter Commission put the Water Board, in other words, now, the Water Board is separate--the Chairman appoints its head and the Board of Supervisors have no say. We elect the Board of Supervisors. Under the Charter Commission, does the council have something to say about the appointments of the Chairman or the Mayor in the Charter Commission to the Water Board? Does it run separate like how it's run now?

Mr. Sodemani: Mr. Bruchal, insofar as the Charter Commission is at the present time, I don't think any of the members here is definitely set whether we should have a separate Water Board, which is a semi-autonomous body. There has been some indications from the individuals believing that the Water Board should be part of the County of Maui. Others felt that they should be a separate autonomous body because it was something like a public utility. So in that, they would like to keep it away from politics as much as possible so that they can run a smooth operation. Now, this is something we want you people to tell us.

Mr. Bruchal: Well, I feel that the Water Board should be under the Council because we elect the councilmen. We should have a say. The councilmen should have a say with the Water Board. They can fight our problems. Now if we have a mayor--he puts Joe Blow here and Joe Blow there, our councilmen cannot do nothing. They cannot even confirm the appointments of the mayor to the Water Board. I feel it's unfair. I feel our councilmen should have the right to confirm all appointments by the mayor or any commission. I want the Water Board together. All confirmation of the appointments to the Water Board.

Mr. Sodemani: Presently, the Board of Supervisors have confirmation powers. Your problem is this--you would like to see all boards and commissions be confirmed by the councilmen?

Mr. Bruchal: That's right.

Mr. Sodemani: In other words, appointed by the mayor or executive or administrative body and confirmed by the legislative body?

Mr. Bruchal: Yes. I feel the mayor has the right to appoint anybody, but I feel that the councilmen has the say if five of the councilmen feel that Joe Blow is not fit for the job. They should have something to say. Not like when the Board of Supervisors--they raise their own pay sometimes back. We voiced our opinion--they went ahead and raised their own pay anyway. Any man, any citizen would like to have a raise, a decent raise, but don't take advantage of the taxpayer. I am very concerned about taxes. I worked hard, and I feel I paid a lot of unfair taxes to the State of Hawaii.

Mr. Sodemani: Well, these are some of the problems we face as far as the Charter Commission

is concerned. However, this is something again away from the charter itself, because this is a legislative body, and they represent the people. So, this is where you and I come in electing the people whom we think should be the legislative body.

Mr. Bruchal: I'm talking about pay. Councilmen have no right to raise their own pay. They can raise the pay for the next group. I feel that's fair, but not for their ownselves. I feel the councilmen have the right if they want to give the mayor another \$1,000 if they see fit, but that particular four year term or two year term they're going to sit, they have no right to get their raise. These new members who we elect have the right to get that raise.

Mr. Pomroy: I'd like to make a suggestion that through the news media different types of charter that would be available should be put before the public so they could see and compare the values of the different charters. There are four different types. The weak mayor, the mayor council and the strong mayor, and, of course, the commission type. I believe the one the people would be most in favor, I'm almost certain they would see the advantage of the council manager type of charter. There are approximately 2,000 cities throughout the United States that adopted that type of charter since 1908 when it was first originated. It has proven very satisfactorily. I think a good deal of thought should be given to the council manager type of charter government.

Mr. Sodemani: You can be sure the commissioners at the present time will make a careful study of the various forms of government. However, I'd like to inform you, Mr. Pomroy, that the County of Maui does not necessarily have to have any of these four basically speaking type of charter, so to speak. We can have a combination of all four of them, and we can still have a charter. It can be part city manager type, part weak mayor type, part strong mayor and part commission form. We can have all of this or combination of two, or combination of three, or whatever it is. What we'll come up with, I really don't know, but we're going to make every attempt to see that the charter will be acceptable and yet without losing the aspect of a government that will be responsible to the people, a government that will be efficient. These two that we are working at. Insofar as to what form of government it will be, it will be impossible to predict at the present time, but certainly, we are really going to work at. As far as your idea about this through news media, I believe that the former charter commission had made some serious study on this and tried to publicize it. You can see the previous charter was the shortest of the three neighbor islands. To bring everything together in a news media, I think it's impossible, and I doubt it if everyone will take the trouble of trying to read and study it. Later on they'll say they didn't read the charter. Your idea is good, but whether the people will take time out to read it, I don't know.

Mr. Pomroy: I was speaking of the basic design of all the different types. We know that the council manager type, the council is elected by the people and is directly responsible to the people. They in turn hire the city manager and that city manager takes over and he can be anybody. He does not have to be a resident of the County at

the time that he is hired, but he will make his residency here during his term of office or during his term of employment. Now, he is directly responsible to the council. The council hires him and the council can fire him, but he, with his business experience, is not an amateur. He'll know how to manage the various branches of the government and the water department that Mr. Bruchal speaks of would come under his jurisdiction, too, under his general management. These policies set up by the council would have to be administered by the manager and, of course, he sets up the budget. He is not going to overload any one department with a high budget just to take advantage of it. He is going to keep that budget down as low as he can, which is to benefit the taxpayer. He is going to manage that just as efficiently as is possible because he wants to stay on his job. If he goes in this favor with the council, naturally, he loses his job. So, he is going to do the right thing all the way through. He is going to be a manager and watch the taxpayer's dollars. That would be part of his job. I believe in the long run, it's going to save the county plenty of money to have that type of administration.

Mr. Cameron: I wonder if you would share with us, you say you're not ready yet, but in your general overall thinking of a mayor with a great deal of authority and Board of Supervisors, which is a great deal less because of that, have you been thinking in terms of adjustment of the expenses of those operations? I mean if you're going into a fairly strong mayor set up, then the salaries of the Board will be a little bit out of line. On the other hand, if you go on somewhat as we are, possibly, they're still on the high side, but possibly we can afford it. It seems to me that you got to look at the total, then the dollars you are going to spend, who's going to get it, and if you do put in a strong executive that you talk about, he should get a very good salary if he is the manager taking that job, but you couldn't have a high priced mayor and a high priced board with very little to do. It seems to me that our Board should take a real look at the fact that if they move into that area, that they should voluntarily expect that the set up that you would bring in would be voted on, would call for reduction or a change in their compensation. I don't think some of them thought about it very much. I think it's only fair for them to realize that if that's where you're going, they should know about it now.

Mr. Sodemani: I agree with you on that and this is some of the things that some of us have been thinking about, but in the previous charter, insofar as dollars incorporated in the charter, the State is completely away from the set down, because of the dynamic nature of government and our own economic mind that today may be adequate or too much or too little, but tomorrow or the next two years might be entirely different. I'd like to agree with that sort of type that the charter should be at least worth the trouble so that the ordinary people in the public can understand what he is trying to say in it because of so many legal words. This is something that the legislative and the administration has to look into very carefully once the charter is adopted, so that they will be answerable to the voters.

Mr. Crockett: Mr. Chairman, I don't quite agree with what you said. First of all, in answer to what

Mr. Bruchal said. The last charter specifically provided what you were suggesting, that is, the charter provided that the people in office should not increase their own salary, that any increase in salary had to be postponed until the next election so the new people could take office. That was what we provided and if the charter had been passed in 1964, the last hassle that you talked about would not have occurred, but for the Supervisors overriding the charter, we'd just forget about it. Secondly, we did provide in Article VII, Section 7-3, that the salary of the mayor shall be \$15,500 per annum, and it was also a provision for the salary for the people in the council, but I will agree with you that we did provide that the councilmen would have the power to change the salary by ordinance, but with a provision that Mr. Bruchal suggested that they had to postpone any increase in salary during the next term. The salary in Section 3.5 was \$4,800 per annum. The chairman of the council was to receive an additional \$600 per annum. That's because of the additional prestige, additional work, etc.

Mr. Bruchal: Now Honolulu is a big city. Our mayor in Honolulu gets \$33,000 a year. Our Councilmen gets \$10,000 a year. Our council chairman gets \$12,000 a year. Maui is a small place. You Charter Commissioners should watch out that the people we might elect don't get the idea that they are going to get the same pay as Honolulu or the big island or some place else. You should try to fix some kind of law in the charter that they cannot come up like Honolulu. Some of the Board of Supervisors don't work for the \$7,200 they have and get \$10,000 or \$12,000 as chairman of the council. We should watch out for those kind of things, too.

Mr. Kobayashi: In answer to Mr. Cameron, we have here a book called the "Model County Charter" put out by the National Municipal League. In this, it says: "In general, salaries of county council members should be nominal. It is doubtful that substantial salaries will attract better members. On the contrary, experience suggests that a generous salary is apt to attract candidates who are interested more in the income than in county affairs and the opportunity for public service. As the charter relieves the members of purely administrative functions, it should substantially reduce the demands upon their time. Too large a salary would encourage council members to think of their positions as full time jobs with administrative as well as policy-making duties." I think that is what we are trying to pinpoint.

Mr. Crockett: I personally would like to say that I sympathize with your point of view very strongly, and I think you're quite right. Not only do we have this point if we're going to concentrate the authority in the executive as a mayor or city manager, he then will have more authority than the councilmen, but we've got a practical problem. If we limit the salaries that should be obtained by anybody on the council, this will effect first of all the people who are present members of the Board of Supervisors because, presumably, these are the people who will run for the city council, and if they think eventually, and I imagine they will, then they will then mobilize all their political powers to defeat the charter and this then, I think, becomes a very practical question as to whether we can afford to throw the charter down the drain because of that one idea. Of course, I think it's a good idea, but I would like to limit it so that we could have a nominal salary, but what reaction is this going to have among the politicians?

Mr. Cameron: I think your point is well taken. I wasn't trying to say where we should stop. I was saying to adopt this as a basic policy and work it closely as you can to accomplish that without losing the whole picture because I'm sure a lot of them on the Board for practical reason or another, the position would still be valuable to them at a more realistic price for the work they were doing and then you got something to build on for the future. If you can establish it as a principle--to work for it not because of the pay--if you think it's good for two years--if it's any good as a charter, it will be in for quite a while.

Mr. Crockett: Well, I agree with you. What actually happens in situations Mr. Bruchal was talking about, the responsibilities of the Board of Supervisors were severely curtailed because they lost their authority over the school construction. They also lost their basic authority in hospitals under Act 97, so called, and yet at the same time having lost this authority, they increase their salaries.

Mr. Lindberg: First of all, I'd like to call attention to the press criticizing that there weren't people coming out to the Charter meetings. I want to say in defense of us, we did go out. As you remember, some of the old-timers, I was out there every opportunity I could. I think the Charter Commission should review the old testimony of those who are not coming out.

We got to be realistic. We know darn well we're not going to get the city manager form of government. The other thing is I'm for a strong mayor form of government. You're going to have a charter passed by the Board and you're going to have a charter passed by the people. I'm in favor of a four year term staggered. I'm not for the council spending money every two years. I think what's considered now, I believe the parties are getting more and more expensive. And, of course, I'm for recall.

I'm a construction man and for 50 years I was around engineers. I have a high respect for good engineers. Good engineers doesn't necessarily make a good administration. An administrator does not have to be an engineer.

Now talking about the police--we have the situation right here on Maui. We're basing the salaries of the police, especially the chief and assistant chief, on the larger cities. They don't have the responsibility. As Mr. Cameron brought up, they don't have the responsibility here as they do in the larger cities or even in Honolulu or Hilo or Kauai, and I don't think the salary should be the same. The same thing with the Board of Supervisors. I'm for the raise, but I can't say I'll adopt the raise until the next election.

Mr. Bruchal: Did you talk about merging the Fire Chief and the Assistant Fire Chief? I think it's waste of money to have a fire chief and an assistant fire chief. We should give that duty to the Police Chief and Assistant Police Chief. We save that much money.

Mr. Balthazar: You're talking about combining the fire department and police department?

Mr. Bruchal: I'm talking about the chiefs--the Chief of Police and Assistant Chief of Police will run the Fire Department throughout the County of Maui. I think you should think about that--merging of the fire chief with the police chief.

Mr. Balthazar: I was just going to comment that the Kauai Charter Commission did come up with establishing a Public Safety Department and putting the administration of both the Fire Department and the Police Department under one commission.

Mr. Young: In the proposed Charter of the County of Kauai, they have a Department of Public Safety. (Mr. Young read the section on Public Safety from the proposed Charter of Kauai).

Mr. Young: Could I explain one other thing to get it straight. Yesterday in Hana, somebody asked a question as to whether there had been any amendments made to the Honolulu Charter since it has been in effect in 1959. I believe Bill said there was none. The Star Bulletin Library gave me the correct authority, and I think it's the correct answer. The Honolulu Charter has been amended only once since it's adoption in 1959. This was in November, 1962. Honolulu voted 100,000 to 19,000 in the make up of the Planning Commission. It took away the voting powers from two ex officio members of the commission and added two new members appointed by the mayor.

Mr. Chur: I want to comment on Mr. Balthazar's statement "public hearings are waste of time" first. Do you blame the public for making statements "public hearings are waste of time?"

Mr. Balthazar: No. I was not criticizing the public, but I was saying that that was the general feeling and I hope that it's not the feeling transferred to the Charter Commission.

Mr. Chur: I want to express my opinion as a voter. The public hearings on Maui, I would say the majority of all public hearings, voters have expressed opposition and everyone of them went into effect inspite of all the voters' opposition.

Mr. Crockett: You opposed the charter and it did not go into effect in 1964.

Mr. Chur: There were many times when people were against lot of things and the administration saw fit to put it into effect. Same thing goes to the prison site we talked about. Public has opposed it, but the Governor thinks it's going to be in Pauwela.

Mr. Balthazar: Would you agree that this public hearing is different from any other, because you have the final say on the ballot?

Mr. Chur: Right. It's up to the people to come in to express what they want in the charter, and if they don't come and you don't put out a charter that they want, it's not your fault. It's their fault. Therefore, I'm here tonight to give you my point of view what should be in the charter.

I want to go the other extreme from what the people expressed their opinions tonight. Since the State government is taking away lot of functions of the County, and I presume if the administration stays as it is in the next Legislature, they will take some more, and the County people will have nothing to do, therefore, my suggestion for this charter to go ahead to have a city manager run the county with an advisory board instead of councilmen, without pay, because the functions that the County is doing now, it is almost on the same basis. You have police commission, you have liquor commission, you have water board commission, you have hospital management commission. What else you have? You have street light commission--everything is under commission, so, therefore, why have councilmen that we pay \$7,200 a year. Get businessmen who qualify being on the advisory board without any pay to advise your city manager and have the city manager run the county as efficiently and effectively as the taxpayer wants it to be run. It will save us a lot of money in running for election every two years. It will have an effective businessmen as a corps of our business to run our council. The amount of appropriation the County uses for running a county, a good business manager can handle that with a good advisory board.

We should go the other extreme and try and be most economical in every way that the tax is jumping. In the last three or four years, I think our taxes more than tripple four times what it originally was. Why is it that? We're not getting any more roads, we're not getting any more schools, we're not getting any more service. People that work in the County have salary increments right along. They are the "game" and we taxpayers are the losers. Therefore, I think my suggestion is to go the other extreme. Do away with politics. Run the city under business management, and I think we will have a good government. And if we're going into the other way, like this gentleman says he believe in the four year term, I don't know if four year term will benefit us because if the Congress of the United States have two year term for the Representatives and six years for the Senators, we're going to change ours little--councilmen for four years, I don't care. So I think I spoke my mind, and I hope you will give consideration to that portion of my idea in your Charter Commission.

Mrs. Jio: My suggestions are: Term of Office. Perhaps I am not in common with the group of people here, but I do not feel that council should have four year terms. They should have two year term because that way they will be closer to the people. This is my sentiment in 1964 and this is still my sentiment in 1966. However, if you feel very repulsive for a two year term, I have an alternate suggestion that you make it into a staggered term. That way might help. But if the candidate feels it is very expensive, they should stay home. Don't let the taxpayers pay for their expenses. There are many others who would run at their own expense.

Term of Office for Chairman. This, too, I am not in conformity with the group. I feel the Chairman should have four two consecutive terms and finish because when an individual stays in office year after year, he feels as though he owns the County. He does anything he wants.

Appointments of department heads should not be confirmed by the councilmen because I feel as Chairman of the Council, he must work with his department heads, and he must have people who are sincerely interested and who is loyal to him.

Qualification of department heads. One individual said it should not be spelled out, and I feel it should be spelled out. Why can't we have a sincere man who is really interested in the welfare of the people by whom he is elected. I feel it can be done. It should be spelled out so that we would not have to have an administrative head who is not qualified so he hires somebody to assist him that's paying too much money. So I feel qualifications should be spelled out.

Police Department. Why should we change it when it's running so nicely now. If it's not running smoothly, then perhaps we should change it. So is the manager with the hospital--it is running smoothly.

District Representation. To me a person who represents the district would know the problems of the district in which he lives. But I do not say that that individual will not think of the County as a whole. I feel in the primary why can't they run on the district basis and in the general run on the council as a whole. I think that would work out very much. If a candidate is intelligent enough, vocal enough and interested in the welfare of the County, I do not feel he would work for the district that he has been elected alone. Perhaps he would have a lot of pressure, but if he was honest and sincere, I don't think pressure would work too hard.

Mr. Crockett: That idea that you just expressed intrigues me because somebody mentioned the same thing over in Hana yesterday. This is the second time we're hearing it. I haven't thought about it before. How would you have it operated? Have you thought about the mechanics about it in detail?

Mrs. Jio: You could have, let's say, the outside district--Hana, Makawao, Kula, Pukalani, and have somebody represent this district in the primary.

Mr. Crockett: Of course, the primary election is a party election, basically. How would you work in people who didn't want to run on the party ticket?

Mrs. Jio: Well, I would work very hard for somebody to represent us as a candidate, and I'm sure that could be done.

Mr. Crockett: I'm saying supposing a person didn't want to run on the party ticket. How would he fit in?

Mrs. Jio: Well, I haven't thought about it that far.

Mr. Crockett: Well, would you think about it some more and sort of write it up and give it to us?

Mrs. Jio: Now, Code of Ethics. You have the code of ethics in the 1964 Charter, and I feel it should be placed in this charter, too, but I don't know how you would work it so that the elected officials and department heads would follow it. So, code of ethics should have a board to see that the code of ethics are followed by the elected officials.

Mr. Crockett: In the last code of ethics, we did provide for a board.

Mr. Chur: You had it in the charter, but that had no "teeth" in it, so it wasn't very effective.

Mr. Crockett: We did have a board which you could report the violations of the code of ethics.

Mr. Chur: But the board itself had no "teeth", so it wasn't too effective, but it was better than nothing.

Mr. Crockett: Mrs. Jio, of course, you are aware that we are confronted with the problem of reapportionment at the county level. About how large do you think we should have our council?

Mrs. Jio: I want you to work it out.

Mr. Bruchal: Just for the records, I am in favor of a two year mayor and two year council--not four year terms. I feel four year term is too long to get them out. Two year terms for both and watch their salaries.

Mr. Crockett: I'd like to ask Mrs. Jio and the other people in the audience whether the people in Makawao would be willing to go along with the type of arrangement that we have worked up for Lanai and Molokai. People generally call that district representation, but actually it isn't because the so-called representatives from Lanai and Molokai are elected by everybody in the County. The only requirement is that they be residents of Lanai and Molokai, respectively. I wonder if the people here would be willing to go along with that type of arrangement.

Mr. Chur: I don't like the set up they have right now because if and when they have two good candidates, they have a possibility of having two councilmen from whichever island they're representing, but it doesn't say it must have one, but the other can be at large or he can be elected by the at large votes, but they are guaranteed one whether he has the minimum votes regardless of the people they have. Isn't that right?

Mr. Crockett: You don't like it for them and I take it you wouldn't like it for yourself?

Mr. Chur: Right. If they're going to run, they're going to run like primary if a district has to have a candidate in the party and in the general everybody vote, and I think it's ideal of having district representation in the

primary and general. The way the Lanai and Molokai set up is they can have only 300 votes and they would still have one member on the Board. They can have 50 votes and still have one supervisor.

Mr. Crockett: There's one question that started out regarding salaries. There's certain problems that a lot of people think of salaries of the commissioners, as Mr. Chur rightly pointed out. A lot of work in the county is actually performed by the commissioners. Now, should they be paid?

Mr. Chur: No. I don't think any board or commission should be paid. I know the Police Commission and Liquor Commission is being paid. Right?

Mr. Crockett: Liquor Commission and Civil Service.

Mr. Chur: Why is that the two commissions get paid and all the others have to work without any pay. If they're going to be appointed, I think they should go on record without pay. Same thing as I proposed to the advisory board to the city manager. If this thing goes through, these boards should work giving their time to the county and advise the city manager to run the government the way they see fit. I think in that way the fellow who gives his time would say I gave my time to the County worth my time giving instead of trying to get something from the County. For a good government, I think the services is well paid in reward.

Mr. Crockett: There was some suggestion that the Water Board be brought back to the council or Board of Supervisors. Is there anybody else who share that opinion?

Mr. Freitas: I worked for the Board of Supervisors for the last 20 years. I started in the Water Board under the Board of Supervisors. We became Water Board in the few years after that. Then the Legislature returned us back to the Supervisors, then now back to the Water Board. Looking at the two departments, like two departments right now, when was it moving and when was it not moving? I think if we go back to the Supervisors and the Chairman or that strong councilmen, I think it's going to be a flop again. I think the way the Water Board is run of 20 years experience, it's moving slow. It's hard to move something, a business, that don't have money. When you have money, you can do anything.

Mr. Kondo: Mrs. Jio, I think that was an excellent suggestion regarding the term of mayor. Two terms, four years and that's all. If it's good for the President of the United States, I think it's good for the mayor of Maui. Now as far as paying the commissioners are concerned, don't you think the policy making commissioners are getting paid and advisory committee are not getting paid? Do you think we can find qualified men to serve on any commission, for instance, the Liquor Commission. I was a member of the Liquor Commission.

Mr. Chur: I think you can find qualified men who will sacrifice their time to serve the

County. They are the type of people we want in government to see that that particular department run on an honest basis. If I'm a volunteer board member, I would give my time to see that that department is run the right way, but if I'm paid for it, I'm only going for the pay. I think you can get any number of people who would volunteer for any board or commission, provided you give the board the authority to do the things that they see fit and you would accept their advice, but if you're going to put them in the board and tell them you got to do this and you got to do that, then don't expect anybody to volunteer for the board. It's just like you are running for cancer drive. You don't go in the cancer drive for any glory. You are giving your time because it is a worthwhile cause regardless of what people say. You give your time, you give your effort and you give everything to make the drive a success.

Mr. Balthazar: Does anybody here besides Mr. Lindberg favor a four year term? (There was no response from the audience)

Mr. Ushijima: On boards and commissions of the County of Maui, or any government, or any level of government, do you think limiting the term of commissioners is feasible or not?

Mr. Chur: I think as far as the commission goes, none of the boards have any set time except during the incoming administration. The highest will be four years.

Mr. Sodemani: Civil Service has five year term and you cannot be reappointed.

Mr. Chur: Isn't that long enough to get proof whether he is a good man or not. If he's not a good man, the administration is not going to appoint that guy.

Mr. Leebrick: On this particular point, I served on many commissions. Any number of commissions whether it's boy scouts, whether it's churches, whether it's cancer, I think there ought to be a turnover and let other people come on to it. My answer to your question is yes, I favor a turnover.

Mr. Ushijima: Let me clarify this. When I said limiting the term, he may serve that term, but he can be reappointed to another commission, like civil service, but I don't mean he continually serve on one commission.

Mr. Leebrick: Well, I wouldn't want to go into that. If I may, I'd like to answer that just one question of serving on a commission. It's from there on on whether there ought to be a turnover, that I'd like to answer your question.

Mr. Chur: Maybe on the same question on boards and commissions--the present set up that they have, there are quite a few commissions they have divided--church men, one businessman, one laborer. I don't know what other ones they have, but they always have divisions. I think rather than have that set up, the administration

should pick the best man that they can find for a particular commission, rather than one from this and one from that.

Mr. Kondo: How can we determine who is the best?

Mr. Chur: Judgment of the administration.

Mr. Pomroy: I believe the commission should be appointed definitely on non-partisan line. The policy of bringing politics into the appointments of commissions is bad, but all this points out the need for that council manager type of government. Everything I have heard so far tonight, I can see the manager type would settle the problems. The problems may be that of a professional man who knows how to solve those problems--one who is trained for it. He is not an amateur. He is not a politician. He is only responsible to the council who appointed him.

Mr. Balthazar: I cannot see anybody working for government who could not become involved in politics. It's impossible.

Mr. Crockett: I have another idea I have been think about, and this may be a bad time to propose it--bring it to life. I think we've got a real problem in this country on campaign expenses. I think we've ought to realize that when people stand for office, they're actually performing public service. I go along with the idea, and I don't think we should organize our government so that this person who gets elected gets this big fat salary at the end of the road, but I do think if we should have these people elected, I disagree with Mr. Chur in saying that we should forget about elections entirely. I do believe we've got a problem in regards to the expenses. For one, I would like to propose as a mile starter, that everybody who is running for election, but those people who are selected by the party would then receive a certain amount of money from the county government itself for their campaign expenses in the general election.

Mr. Freitas: Any man who can't pay his campaign expenses, get him out of the race. He's no good for the supervisors or representatives for the people.

Mrs. Jio: I can't see your suggestion. We pay taxes after taxes, now, why should we pay for a politician if he can't campaign. He can stay out because there are many who wants to run.

Mr. Crockett: Now can I explain something. You know what's happening in Honolulu. I suppose it hasn't really happened here on Maui yet because we are relatively small, but we are growing, and this is one of the problems we have in the charter. I think anybody who thinks of Maui today as being the Maui 10 or 15 years from now is not thinking properly. We're going to get like Honolulu. Now the politicians in Honolulu--they're not paying for their campaign expenses out of their own pockets. They are paying for their campaign expenses from contributions they receive. When a man receives contribution, he has an obligation to the person who is making these contributions. Now this campaign expenses in Honolulu even for the Board is getting very very high. Now they're talking about \$100,000 or more than that for a man

to run for the State wide office. Now when people are put to these expenses, obviously, there are very few people in this community who can pay that amount of money out of their own pockets. Even Mr. Johnson or Mr. Kennedy that you talk about, they couldn't pay for that. They get contributions. When a man is contributing \$100,000, or \$100, or \$50 to the candidate, he expects something in return, and you folks are talking about ethics. I agree with you. I want high standards of ethics in government, but how are you going to get ethics? How can you expect a politician who has received money from other people not to compromise himself. It's all right to talk about ethics. We are all in favor of it. So, we've got to realize that somehow we're going to have to work this system of democracy out to meet the changing times, because you got TV now, you got radio, you got newspaper, and all this costs money. Eventually, we are going to reach a point where the person who is going to get elected is the person who has the most money, and I think this is wrong and somehow we are going to meet this problem.

Mr. Chur: One way is to limit your expenses to a certain level. Nobody should spend any more than that. That way, it would be easier for a candidate to run because all the candidates will spend only so much money, rather than say unlimited amount underneath the table.

Mr. Leebrick: To sort of make it a text for that thing--it doesn't make a very great deal of difference what you men do. We have a peculiar situation here in the State of Hawaii and that is, we have a centralized government. You make a charter we hope it's approved by the people. The Legislature wants to change it, they change it by legislative act. They do not come back and suggest to the men, to the people of Maui and have them change the charter. The Legislature is the boss, the dominant factor, whether you make a charter, or whether you don't make a charter, and they can interpret it and they can change it by legislative act. That's the situation. That's the fact of life. I think you ought to think of that. Personally, I remember when the county manager or city manager time came, I still believed that, but on Maui at the present time if you or anyone of you asked me what to do, I would say codify the present situation on Maui and put that into the legislative act. Call it a charter or whatever you want and not try to put in some new scheme and this scheme and this other scheme. Then I think you will get it through. At the end you would just about be where you would be no matter what you write in the charter because if you get it approved, it has to be approved first by our own Governor and approved by the Legislature and even after they approve, they can change because the authority rests in the central government.

Now, one other thing. They are already changing the whole situation in the County. One of our great problems is that Maui County, our District Superintendent, our people here has nothing to do with the building operations of schools. That is all in Honolulu and that is quite a number of things. So the authority and responsibility for our council or supervisors or whatever you call them, has been lessened, and the tendency is to lessen it even more. My own recommendation would be to codify and bring together the situation as is now and proceed upon that basis. Perhaps you could add some staggered election.

There being no further questions or suggestions from the audience, the Chair thanked everyone for their presence.

The hearing ended at 9:50 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Ayako Ishikawa
Ayako Ishikawa, Secretary