

Am. Feb. 3/15,

## WOULD ABOLISH BOARD COUNSELS

BAR ASSOCIATION UNANIMOUS IN OPINION.

### WORK OF ATTORNEY GENERAL

Speakers at Meeting Agree That Functions Could Be Performed With Aid of One or More Assistants—Conceded That Opinions of the Official Should Be Available in Published Form—Differences as to Details.

It was practically the unanimous opinion of the speakers before the Bar Association of Baltimore, at its meeting last night in the Superior Courtroom, that the counselships for the various state boards should be abolished and their work put in the hands of the Attorney General. This reform can be put into effect by the legislature, the constitutional amendment making it possible, having been carried at the polls.

Many prominent members of the bar were in attendance at the meeting and the set program was made up of six speakers, Attorney General Edgar Allan Poe, Former Attorney General Isaac Lobe Straus, former Judge Alfred S. Niles, Secretary of State Robert P. Graham, Senator William M. Maloy and Mr. Albert C. Ritchie. The Secretary of State was the single voice in opposition to the reform. The question was referred to the committee on amendment of laws.

It was conceded that at the present time the lack of accessible records of the opinions of former attorney generals has hampered the service to some extent. Judge Oscar Leser, who spoke in the general discussion which followed the set program, pointed out from the statistics which he gathered on the subject that in 40 states these opinions of the attorney general are published in accessible form, which make them equal to the legal profession as quasi-judicial opinions and in the absence of an opinion by the court on certain points of great value.

Attorney General Poe pointed out the importance of a systematized collection of records. He discussed details as to probable salaries and possible exceptions of boards, which from the nature of their work should probably be excepted and allowed to retain their individual counsel. Among these he mentioned the Public Service Commission and the Election Supervisors of various counties. He was of the opinion that the expense under the new system would be slightly in excess of the present system.

Former Attorney General Straus believed that the work could be done with one assistant to the Attorney General and certainly with two, with a possible additional assistant during the session of legislature.

Former Judge Niles was in favor of placing all boards without exception in the hands of the Attorney General, so far as legal business was concerned, if the change was to be made at all.

The Secretary of State expressed the opinion that the amendment was passed at a time when it was suggested that the appointees would not meet with approval. This was shown to have been unfounded, he argued, and this is why nothing is done by the last legislature. The work of the counsel of many boards is such as to take up so much of his time that concentration into the hands of the Attorney General would be difficult, he said.

Senator Maloy said that there was little fear of politics and that the introduction of young lawyers into the assistant attorneyships of the state would qualify and educate them for the higher positions of government.

Mr. Ritchie agreed that it would be advisable to concentrate and among his possible exceptions were the Board of Health, where special knowledge of chemistry was required of the counsel and the Public Service Commission and possibly accident insurance.

The Committee on Amendment to the Law desires to hear opinions on the subject.

3500.4

See Apr. 28/4.

### TOWERS IS REAPPOINTED

Governor Names Him Full Term  
On Service Commission.

### EX-BULL MOOSE IS RECOGNIZED

Carrington Gets Place, But Bonaparte Is Dropped—J. F. Curley Keeps Game Wardenship.

Annapolis, Md., April 27. — Governor Goldsborough announced tonight a large number of appointments, most of which were to various State boards or the boards of State institutions and which, in the main, were devoid of particular political significance.

The most important position filled was that of Public Service Commissioner, and he reappointed Albert G. Towers, as was a foregone conclusion. Commissioner Towers is now serving out the unexpired term of the late Dr. Joshua W. Hering. He will begin now a full term of six years. Another sought after position filled was that of State Game Warden, and here, too, the Governor reappointed the incumbent, James P. Curley, of Laurel.

There may or may not be some political significance in the fact that the new appointments include Edward C. Carrington, Jr., who is named as a member of the Board of Examiners of Public Accountants, and does not include Charles J. Bonaparte, who is dropped as a member of the Board of State Aid and Charities, to which he was appointed two years ago by Governor Goldsborough, and of which he has been president.

Mr. Carrington and Mr. Bonaparte were foremost Bull Moosers in the Presidential campaign of 1912, but last year they parted company, Mr. Carrington returning to the Republican fold and Mr. Bonaparte staying out with many vehement expressions of dislike for his old party.

#### Lankford Likely To Go.

Next in interest are the three appointments to the Board of Managers of the House of Correction. The Governor names J. Kemp Bartlett and Henry B. Wilcox, of Baltimore, and Howard Adams, of Jessups, in place of George E. Nicholson, Thomas M. Purnell and Harvey H. Mackey. The new appointments give the Republicans control of the board and are taken generally to presage the displacement of Superintendent William F. Lankford. The latter has been under the Governor's displeasure almost from the beginning of the present State administration.

In detail, the appointments are as follows:

State Board of Barber Examiners—A. C. Hoffman and C. Henry Bischoff, both of Baltimore, who are reappointed, and Max Kunnert, also of Baltimore, who succeeds John E. De Mott.

State Board of Dental Examiners—Dr. T. L. McCarriar, of Baltimore, who succeeds Dr. T. B. Moore, of Rising Sun, and Dr. Harry Wilson, who is reappointed.

Board of Electrical Examiners and Supervisors—Joseph B. Dreleeb, Arthur B. James, Joseph M. Zamolski, William J. Gray and Stanley B. Prather, all of Baltimore and all of whom are reappointed.

Examiners of Public Accountants—Clifton Brown, Edward C. Carrington, Jr., and Edward Fuller, all of Baltimore.

State Game Warden—James P. Curley, of Laurel, reappointed.

Directors of Home and Infirmary of Western Maryland—Thomas Footer, John Keating, W. W. Hanley, H. A. Bachman, W. W. Brown, Hope Carleton and John W. Young, all of Cumberland, all reappointed.

Examiners of Horseboers—Luther Smith, Dennis A. Hogan and Edward Fohler, all of Baltimore.

#### To Direct House Of Correction.

Board of Managers of the House of Correction—J. Kemp Bartlett and Henry B. Wilcox, of Baltimore, and Howard Adams, of Jessups, who succeed George E. Nicholson, Thomas M. Purnell and Harvey H. Mackey.

Board of Managers of the Industrial Home for Colored Girls—Senator John P. T. Mathias, of Frederick, and Clifton E. Krebs, of Baltimore.

Lunacy Commission—Dr. Hugh H. Young, of Baltimore.

Board of Examiners of Moving-Picture Machine Operators—Marion S. Pearce and Clinton S. Whittier, of Baltimore, who are reappointed; and Nelson D. Baldwin, of Baltimore, who succeeds J. Howard Bennett.

Board of Examiners of Nurses—Helen C. Bartlett, of Baltimore, who is reappointed.

Public Service Commissioner—Albert G. Towers, of Denton.

#### Here Is Board Of Plumbing.

Board of Commissioners of Practical Plumbing—Allen W. Beam, Joseph C. Mitchell, Samuel E. Houck, Dr. Nathan R. Gorter and John E. Greiner, all of Baltimore.

State Board of Pharmacy—Ephraim Bacon, of Baltimore, who is reappointed.

St. Mary's Industrial School for Boys—Joseph J. Janney, Charles R. Wilcox, John R. King and the Rev. Dr. Arthur Chilton Powell, of Baltimore, and Robert B. Dixon, of Easton.

Public Library Commission—Mrs. Charlotte Newell, of Port Deposit; Mrs. Ethelene D. Oats, of Princess Anne; Joseph H. Apple, of Frederick, and Ogle Marbury, of Laurel, all of whom are reappointed.

#### Bonaparte Left Out.

Board of State Aid and Charities—Dr. J. H. Mason Knox, Robert Biggs and Dr. Hiram Woods, all of Baltimore, who succeed Charles J. Bonaparte, Thomas V. Richards and H. Wirt Steele, and Dr. Philip Briscoe, of Calvert county; Thos. M. Bartlett, of Easton; Emory L. Coblenz, of Frederick, and William Levy, of Baltimore, all of whom are reappointed.

State Veterinary Medical Board—R. V. Smith, of Frederick; C. Willard Ringsdorf, of Baltimore; Glenn W. Horner, of Westminster; G. H. Grapp, of Port Deposit, and A. K. Hagerty, of Baltimore, all of whom are reappointed.

State Weather Service—Dr. William Bullock Clark and Dr. Oliver L. Fassig, both of Baltimore, and Dr. W. T. L. Tallafarro, of College Park, all of whom are reappointed.

Inspectors of Steam Boilers—William A. Bryan and John E. Biddinger, both of Baltimore, who are reappointed.

Examiners of Stationary Engineers—Charles E. McCleary and James Gardner, both of Baltimore.

Amer. Jan. 27/4.  
1915  
Clifton S. Brown  
Chairman  
Ernest E. Wooden  
Lee & Sears.  
Howard P. Page  
Edward Fuller

Roads Commission

See Dec. 7/14.

## OFFICES ARE SCATTERED

Official State Boards Strewn Over City As If By Winds.

## NO SIGNS OF IMPROVEMENT

Conditions Have Been Growing Steadily Worse With Each Successive Legislative Term.

When the Legislature was in session last winter, Dr. George Wells and others made strenuous efforts to have a bill passed to appropriate \$300,000 for a State office building at Annapolis. The measure also provided that the offices of all the State officials and commissions and boards should be located in Annapolis, the State capital.

One of the arguments used in favor of the bill was that the offices of those who attended to the State's business were not only at various places in the State, most of them in Baltimore, but that in the city these offices were scattered about in so many places that they were hard to find. The statement was not without truth.

Dr. Wells made a good fight for his bill, but it was finally killed. The Legislature would not consent, of course, to make Annapolis the headquarters of the Public Service Commission, for example, much the greater part of whose business is with concerns in Baltimore or whose central offices are here:

### Many Boards And Commissions.

Much of the business of the State is done by a seemingly endless number of boards and commissions, from the Board of Public Works and the Roads Commission to the Board of Examiners for Horseshoers and the Commission on Practical Plumbing. Many of these have been patched on to the State government haphazard by Legislatures at various times, frequently for the purpose of creating new jobs to be filled, until the State government somewhat resembles a Joseph's coat.

Probably not one citizen in 50 has even heard of half of these boards and officials and still fewer have any idea where half of them are located. If they were all brought together in one building it would require a considerable skyscraper to provide office accommodations for them, and the rent bill, which the State has to pay, is a large one, not to mention salaries and other expenses.

The largest number of State offices and some of the most important are in the Garrett Building, German and South streets. There are the offices of the Governor, the Comptroller, the Treasurer and the Board of Public Works, the State Auditor, the Bank Commissioner, the Fire Marshal, the Commissioner of Motor Vehicles, the Game Warden, the Roads Commission and its various officials, the Board of State Aids and Charities, the Live Stock Sanitary Board, the Mental Hygiene Committee and the Boiler Inspectors. The Attorney-General has his private office in the United States Fidelity and Guaranty Building.

### Service Board Lives High.

The Public Service Commission is up among the clouds in the Munsey Building. The State Industrial Accident Commission and the Bureau of Labor Statistics are in the Equitable Building. Over in the Courthouse are the Police Commissioners, the Board of Election Supervisors and the Liquor License Board, all of them State boards.

In the Union Trust Building are the Tax Commission, the Insurance Commissioner and the board for examining moving-picture operators.

In the Brown Arcade Building, on Saratoga street, are the State Board of Health and the Advisory Board of Parole. The State bacteriologist is at 311 Courtland street and the Bureau of Immigration at 11 West Lexington street. The Board of Undertakers has its office in the Calvert Building.

At Johns Hopkins University are located the State Geologist, the State Weather Bureau and the State Forester and Board of Forestry. The State Lunacy Commission has its office at 330 North Charles street. The Public Library Commission has its headquarters at the Enoch Pratt Library. The Shellfish Commission is located in the Marine Bank Building.

### Others Have No Regular Offices.

There are any number of other boards and commissions which meet at various places without maintaining regular offices. The board of regents of the Maryland State University usually meets in the Governor's office in the Garrett Building. There are boards of medical examiners, including one for homeopaths, one for osteopaths, one for dentists and so on. There are boards of examiners for barbers, horseshoers, plumbers, electrical workers, public accountants, veterinarians, optometrists, stationary engineers and pharmacists. Every hospital, asylum, State school, college, reformatory, sanatorium and penal institution in the State has its own board of directors. There are armory commissions and boards galore for every sort of thing. There is a tomato weigher for Centre Market, a State vaccine agent, inspectors of hay, a measurer of wood carts, a State wharfinger and other officials. The State Board of Education and other boards meet in Annapolis and the directors of the various educational and other institutions usually meet at the institutions of which they have charge.

A GOOD BASIS FOR A GENERAL  
CATECHISM.

THE SUN'S special articles on the waste of the State's money under the present loose and costly system have pleased everybody except the beneficiaries and the practical politicians, and protests from those whose toes are in the way of the march of reform are naturally to be expected.

The abuses pointed out in yesterday's article on the needless employment of lawyers by various commissions and departments illustrate more strikingly than almost any others heretofore referred to the mediæval and inexcusable character of our business management of state affairs. And this is true because the State and the people have gone on record as formally condemning this abuse by the adoption of a constitutional amendment providing for its eradication.

In the face of what amounted to a popular command for the creation of a state legal department under the Attorney-General, in which all the legal affairs of the State should be concentrated, the last Legislature neglected to take the requisite action, possibly on the theory that a sufficient concession to political virtue had been made by the adoption of the amendment, and with the feeling, perhaps, that a little thing like the Constitution should not be permitted to interfere between friends.

The result is that where the State carcasses are, there the legal eagles are still gathered together; and there they will continue to remain, until the people insist that the Legislature shall carry out their orders.

We have heard a great many questions asked of Gubernatorial candidates in the pending primary campaign, a very few of which have been answered and most of which have been ignored. But it might be well for the voters in the legislative districts of the city and counties to carry this general political catechism to candidates for the House and Senate and insist on definite answers with regard to the reforms suggested by these special articles in THE SUN. Quite a number of heart-searching questions could be formulated from these expositions of our system of mismanagement, and the replies to them might throw a very desirable light upon the sincerity and political affiliations of legislative aspirants.

Like the Gubernatorial candidates, they are all doubtless inspired by the purest public spirit and the most altruistic desire to serve the people. The latter know how deeply all these gentlemen love them and how anxious they are to serve them, but the voters ought to be curious as to details and as to the definite program by which public servants propose to demonstrate their affection. They should require a bill of particulars from all aspirants and put them on record as to their intentions. The "glittering generality" is a gay deceiver, and the more glittering it is, the less likely it is to promise substantial results.

*Ans. Aug. 12/15,*

*Saw July 26/15.*

#### STATE AID AND CHARITIES.

IN THE SUN's articles discussing useless offices in the State of Maryland the Board of State Aid and Charities is justly classified in that list. The sum of \$5,100 was appropriated for its salaries, office rent and expenses this year. Many of the useless offices in this State were created for a special purpose—that is, to give some statesman a job. But this board was not created for that purpose. The purpose was a good one but it might have been seen from the beginning that it would fail, and for an obvious reason.

At the session of the General Assembly in 1900 the late Gen. Ferdinand C. Latrobe was chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Delegates. He was a methodical man and was annoyed and scandalized by the waste of the committee's time in hearing appeals of delegations for appropriations. It occurred to him that time could be saved and a better conclusion reached by having the hearings during recess before a competent board which could make some inquiry into the merits of the application and report to the Legislature. He thought, good easy man, full surely the Legislature would listen to this report and heed it. The Legislature did neither. Delegations continued to go before the Ways and Means and the Finance Committees as oforetime and made their appeals just as if no Board of State Aid and Charities was in existence, and the Legislature made appropriations regardless of its recommendations.

In the estimation of his constituents, the usefulness of a member of Congress is measured by the amount of money he can get out of the Federal Treasury for expenditure in his district. And so the member of the Legislature will suffer in popularity if he fails to get appropriations out of the State Treasury for the hospitals and private schools of his county. The general appropriation bills are usually formulated at a meeting of the Treasury officials, the chairmen of the Finance and Ways and Means Committees and sometimes the Governor. They are brought into the two houses and each member scans them eagerly to see whether his home hospitals and schools are in it for the full amount. Many of them are not included and then the work of amendment begins. Each member votes for the gratuity of each of the other members because he wishes the other members to vote for his, and so the total grows enormously without any regard to the ability of the Treasury to pay the money appropriated.

This same difficulty, it may be remarked in passing, would make the so-called "budget system" impracticable without a constitutional provision. It is true that the Legislature might enact it into law, but would be most unlikely to do so, and if it did the repeal would probably take place at the next session. When the "budget" is brought in the Legislature would want to put in amendments, and no law enacted by the Legislature can restrain them.

The best present protection to the Treasury and safeguard against ill-advised appropriations is the pruning knife of the Executive. In his message to the Legislature in 1882 Governor Hamilton strongly recommended the enlargement of the veto power by constitutional amendment, so that items of an appropriation bill might be disapproved without invalidating the entire bill. In 1890 the General Assembly submitted to the people an enabling act, drafted by the late John P. Poe, carrying out this recommendation. It was ratified in 1891, but nearly twenty years elapsed before any Governor exercised to any marked degree the power so conferred. The late Governor Crothers began the use of it and cut several hundred thousand dollars out of the general bills. Governor Goldsborough has continued the practice and it is to be hoped that succeeding Governors will also prune liberally. It takes moral and political courage to do so, for the pressure that is brought to bear in favor of each appropriation is hard to withstand.

It will be seen from what has been said that the Board of State Aid and Charities may as well be abolished. When it has made any impression upon the committees it has been by the personal influence of the secretary and not from his official position.

## USELESS OFFICES AND WORKLESS JOBS

Some Concrete Facts About  
Economy And Efficiency."

### HOW THE WASTE HAS MOUNTED

An Investigation Designed To Call  
Public Attention To Some Glar-  
ing Absurdities In Maryland  
Government—Methods That May  
Be Remedied.

#### PUBLIC WASTE IN MARYLAND

There has been in this cam-  
paign—and in others—much talk  
by Gubernatorial candidates and  
their friends about placing the  
State Government on a "business  
basis," eliminating waste and ex-  
travagance, and of the economical  
administration of the State's af-  
fairs, etc. No one, however, in this  
advocacy, has gotten beyond the  
broadest and vaguest generalities.  
No one has come forward with a  
single concrete, specific, practical  
proposition, although such are  
many and obvious.

It is the purpose of THE SUN  
in a series of articles, to bring to  
the attention of both Democratic  
and Republican candidates, and to  
the people of Maryland, a number  
of the more glaring instances of  
costly waste and absurd extrava-  
gance, and to point out the oppor-  
tunity to do something real for  
the State which lies to the hand of  
the candidate or party with the  
courage to act instead of dodge.

#### ARTICLE I.

At the outset it should be stated that  
the object of this investigation of the  
State's business affairs is not to muck-  
rake the individuals now holding office,  
whether they be Democrats or Republi-  
cans. In the main, they are decent fel-  
lows and not responsible for the slowly  
gathered conditions which have resulted  
in such waste that the demand for  
"economy and efficiency" is on the lips  
of every citizen.

The object of the investigation is to  
ascertain the facts which have caused  
the waste; or, at least, those facts that  
are especially significant or prominent;  
and having ascertained them, to present  
them to the candidates for public office  
and to the public in general, so that  
there may be a basis for intelligent dis-  
cussion of the means by which "econ-  
omy and efficiency" may be instituted.

The citizen may grasp conditions  
more easily if he will picture a pyramid.  
The base of the pyramid is the waste re-  
sulting from overlapping and duplica-  
tion of expenditures in the various State  
departments. This waste is less obvious  
and less striking than that resulting  
from other causes, but it is unquestion-

ably the greatest, the most serious and  
the most difficult to remedy. The apex  
of the pyramid is useless offices. Be-  
tween the base and the apex is found  
the waste resulting from loose meth-  
ods, etc.

#### State Wharfinger Does Nothing.

To begin at the apex and work down  
to the base, here is one State office that  
has no duties whatsoever. The salary,  
a very small one, is absolute velvet.  
That office is the State Wharfinger. The  
incumbent is John R. Bailey, of Balti-  
more, and his salary is \$250 a year.

The important thing about this in-  
stance is not so much the actual waste  
(\$1,000 for the four-year term), for the  
absurdity of the Governor appointing  
and the State paying a man who has  
not even the semblance of a duty is al-  
most funny enough to be worth \$1,000  
every four years to the people, assuming  
they knew what was happening, and so  
had an opportunity to laugh.

The vital thing is that it symbolizes  
the conditions confronting the citizens  
of the State. Years ago the State  
Wharfinger was an office of some im-  
portance. Supervision of State wharves  
in Baltimore rested with it and the  
collection of charges. Steadily its re-  
sponsibilities and duties declined until  
the present status was reached—that  
status, according to the State Comptrol-  
ler's office, being that there are no State  
wharves in Baltimore except those  
leased by the Pennsylvania Railroad  
Company, for which payment is made  
directly to the Comptroller. Plainly  
there is no excuse in the world for the  
State Wharfinger.

It would seem that when the office be-  
came, in fact, extinct, the Governor of  
the State, who appoints, would have de-  
clined to fill it. That would have been  
the rational thing—the thing that cer-  
tainly would have been done in any pri-  
vate business concern. But no! The  
office was an office and it could be used  
to reward some one, and it was no busi-  
ness of the Governor, as political morals  
have obtained in this State, drastically  
to abolish an office which had no work.

#### Vaccine Agent Useless.

The next office of the sort—very close  
to the apex—is the State Vaccine Agent.  
He is paid a salary of \$600 a year and  
his duties are to purchase and distribute  
each year \$2,000 worth of vaccine, for  
the use of the health authorities. Dr.  
W. F. Zinn holds the position.

Now it happens that the State of  
Maryland is singularly fortunate in hav-  
ing a State Health Department which  
is under the direction of such men as  
Dr. William H. Welch and Dr. John S.  
Fulton, the latter being the secretary  
and executive. Rapidly, in recent years,  
the department has been brought to  
high and higher standards.

It would be possible for the depart-  
ment to purchase and distribute the  
vaccine supplies in a much more busi-  
ness-like and thorough manner than a  
single physician may do, giving, as he  
does, but a stint of his time to the work.  
And the department would not need  
even an extra clerk to handle the work.  
That means, in brief, that if the office  
of the State Vaccine Agent were abol-  
ished and the duties given to the depart-  
ment the State would save the salary  
of \$600 a year and would have the work  
done in a more efficient manner.

The State Board of Health has fa-  
vored transferring this work to it and  
is perfectly willing to take charge of  
the purchase and distribution of the  
vaccine, without receiving the salary  
now paid the agent. Therefore, no  
reason can be given for continuing this  
totally useless office. It is plain waste.

#### Here's Where \$10,000 Goes.

There is the Land Commissioner—an  
office utterly unnecessary. Many years  
ago it was important, being a court of  
record and having authority for the de-  
termination of disputes as to titles, etc.  
It is now almost entirely an office of  
custody, having charge of old land rec-  
ords, the maps and records of the Shell-  
fish Commission etc. The other duties  
of the office are to make copies of pa-  
tents and plats.

This office costs the State approxi-  
mately \$10,000 a year in salaries. The  
Land Commissioner, John J. Hanson, of  
Baltimore, is paid a salary of \$1,500 as  
Commissioner and a salary of \$600 as  
custodian of the maps, etc., of the Shell-  
fish Commission. In addition to this  
\$2,100 thus obtained the Commissioner  
receives one-quarter of the fees charged  
for making copies of patents and plats,  
although, of course, the actual work is  
done by clerks, who are paid directly by  
the State, as will be stated. In the  
fiscal year ending September 30, 1914,  
Land Commissioner Hanson received  
\$508.29 as his one-quarter of these fees.

The regular force of clerks and their  
salaries are as follows:  
Chief clerk, James W. Hanson, a  
brother of the Land Commissioner,  
\$2,000.

Assistant clerks, Arthur Trader, of  
Annapolis, and William G. Dawson, of  
Cambridge, \$1,300 each.

Index clerks, Dr. Martin W. Golds-  
borough, of Princess Anne, a brother of  
the Governor, and Charles N. Hanby  
and William H. Leonard, both of Cam-  
bridge, \$1,000 each.

In addition to the regular force of  
clerks the last Legislature authorized  
the employment during the present year  
of two special index clerks, one at  
\$1,200 and one at \$1,000.

It will be seen that, including the fees  
paid in the last fiscal year to the Land  
Commissioner, that officer and his reg-  
ular clerks received \$10,208.29. Against  
that the State received from the Land  
Commissioner in that year \$1,850.76,  
being the fees of the office after deduct-  
ing the Commissioner's one-quarter.  
These figures, of course, do not indicate  
the cost of the office for the present  
fiscal year, because they do not include  
the \$2,200 for the two special index  
clerks.

There is no reason why there should  
be a Land Commissioner or why there  
should be so many clerks to perform the  
work of the office. It is entirely feasi-  
ble to give the custody of the records  
and the performance of the other duties  
of the office into the hands of some  
other official of the State, such as the  
Secretary of State. That would elimi-  
nate the Land Commissioner's salary.  
And if, while the change were being  
made, the force of clerks were so reduced  
as to be proportionate to the amount of  
work actually necessary, there would be  
a further and considerable saving.

In order to abolish the office of Land  
Commissioner and place the custody of  
the records, etc., in the hands of some  
other official, an amendment must be  
made to the State Constitution. The  
office is created in the Constitution.  
Such an amendment could be submitted  
by the coming Legislature and voted on  
in 1918.

Seen July 14/15. (1)

**Fire Marshal Not Needed.**

The last example of wastefulness to be given in this article is the office of State Fire Marshal. Possibly that office was of some account when created; today it is worth nothing to the people of the State. And it cost in the last fiscal year \$8,982.98. The State appropriates \$10,000 annually.

The law provides that there shall be a fire marshal at a salary of \$2,500 a year and a deputy at a salary of \$1,500. Until the present administration there was no one else employed in the office. Now there is a clerk, also. G. Ed. Myers, of Frederick county, is the Marshal; John W. Famous, of Harford county, the deputy, and "Bennie" Applestein, of Baltimore city, the clerk. The salaries of the first two have been stated; Applestein's salary is not known. The \$8,982.98 spent in the last fiscal year represents salaries, office rent, traveling expenses, etc.

In saying that the office is worth nothing to the people of the State there is no purpose to reflect upon Marshal Myers. The office is worth nothing because, in the nature of things, it has outlived its day, if it ever had one. Briefly, its duties are to investigate suspicious fires and to proceed against offenders. The facts are: First, that the fire insurance companies are keenly alert to all suspicious fires and their trained representatives are quick—far quicker than an inexperienced marshal, appointed for political reasons—in getting at the truth when there has been incendiarism; and, second, that when there is reason to believe a fire was caused by incendiarism the local prosecuting officer and Sheriff are ready and paid to investigate. In other words, the fire insurance companies, who are most interested in punishing incendiarism, are on the ground to run down suspicious cases and the local officers are there to lend aid.

It may be said that some incendiary cases are too difficult for the fire insurance representatives and the local authorities. That would be true. But the insurance representatives and the local officers could do what the State Fire Marshal now does when he has such a case on his hands—they could call for one of the city detectives. Very few, if any, important investigations are made by the Fire Marshal without the aid of a city detective.

**Hard To Find Work.**

Concluding as to the Fire Marshal, it may be stated that every one in touch with the office knows that the men employed in it have little or nothing to do. The work which they do could be left undone without loss to anyone, and when they have worked as hard at it as they know how they are not kept half-busy. Again, it should be stated that there is no purpose to reflect upon Marshal Myers. It is not his fault that he has an obsolete job.

The instances of waste which have been given are not of great importance in themselves. The total is only a few thousand dollars. But they typify in very plain fashion the much greater and less apparent waste which permeates the entire State governmental system. Another article will be given tomorrow in which other rat-holes for the State's money will be pointed out. J. W. O.

*Since July 14*

336.181

m3

2-

Sun - July 15 - 1916

## FURTHER EXAMPLES OF USELESS OFFICES

### The Boiler Inspectors Spend Some Very Pleasant Mornings.

### MR. ROE JUST SITS AND CHATS

Money Spent By State Board Of Aid And Charities Is A Futile Expenditure—State Auditing System Extravagant And Ineffective.

#### A LOOK AT FOUR DEPARTMENTS.

*This second article upon "economy and efficiency" will deal with four departments of the State government which, as now constituted and organized, cost the State far more than is necessary, and, considered collectively, give poorer service than could be had at less cost if a reasonable degree of intelligence obtained in the management of State affairs.*

*These departments are: State Boiler Inspection, State Automobile Commissioner, State Board of Aid and Charities and State Auditor. There is no purpose in this investigation to nuckrake individuals; it simply is an effort to bring before the candidates for public office and the public in general definite information about a condition that all say is wrong, but which has been discussed heretofore only in the most general manner.*

#### ARTICLE II.

There are two State Boiler Inspectors—William A. Bryan, who is very well known in Republican politics, and John E. Biddinger. Both live in Baltimore. They are paid \$1,500 each. They collect fees for their inspections, which are credited on their salary accounts. Should these fees not be sufficient to meet the salaries, the State pays the difference. In the fiscal year ended September 30, 1914, the State paid \$1,537.12 to make up the deficit in the salaries of the two men.

In other words, the State paid a little more than the salary of one of the inspectors. Some of the amount paid by the State may have gone for office rent, postage, etc., but not a great deal.

Inasmuch as the fees collected by the inspectors are ample compensation for the service of inspection, it is plain that the insufficiency of the fees to meet the salaries fixed is due to the insufficiency of work. As a matter of fact every one in touch with State business knows that these two places have been virtual sinecures for years. The inspectors habitually spend the mornings at their office in pleasant conversation with each other and with friends.

#### One Seems Sufficient.

At least one of the inspectors should be discontinued. On the salary showing given above—the State having contributed, as stated, more than the salary of one inspector in the fiscal year 1914—there is no room for debate about the elimination of one.

Probably both should go. The regulations of the insurance companies have been so advanced in late years that a greater degree of safety is had from the companies than is likely to be had from the State inspectors, especially as the latter are required to examine each boiler but once a year.

#### Auto Commissioner Should Go.

The Automobile Commissioner should be abolished, not because there is no work done in his office, but because it is silly to have that work constitute a separate department of the State with all the consequent overhead expenses.

The work of the Automobile Commissioner could be handled easily and more cheaply as a division of the State Roads Commission. And that is where the work logically belongs, for the functions of the Automobile Commissioner as to speed regulations frequently interweave with those of the State Roads Commission and the net receipts of the Commissioner's office go to the Roads Commission as a part of the maintenance fund.

Harry A. Roe, of Caroline county, is the Automobile Commissioner. The State pays him \$3,000. He is an earnest, conscientious man and endeavors to perform his duties faithfully and well. But his duties are meagre. He sits in his office while his clerks take in the money for automobile licenses. Then, still sitting in his office, he directs the money to be placed in certain banks. That is about all. Occasionally, after advising with counsel paid by the State, he hands down a ruling about speed. Occasionally he conducts a trial to determine whether an allegedly reckless chauffeur shall have his license revoked.

#### Could Save \$3,000 Clear.

All the executive duties performed by Mr. Roe could be handled by a man like Roads Chairman Weller in about a quarter of an hour a day, as an average. Bearing in mind the natural relationship of the Automobile Commissioner's work to that of the State Roads Commission, it is hardly necessary to argue that the State should save the \$3,000 which it pays the Automobile Commissioner annually.

A considerable saving probably could be made in clerk hire, too, by making the consolidation. The Automobile Commissioner has certain rush periods—the times when many motorists are getting licenses, especially at the beginning of the year and on the arrival of good weather in the spring. Sufficient clerks must be had for those times; almost inevitably the number of clerks then needed are kept on during the entire year.

If the office were a part of the State Roads Commission, only such clerks would be needed as could care for the average business. Additional clerical help could be given from other divisions of the Roads Commission when the rush periods were on. In a word, the usual elasticity of the large and well-organized department would meet the unusual strain. The savings, thereby, would be large.



2 - Cont.

Sun - July 15 - 1916

#### As To State Aid Board.

Before discussing the futile cost of the State Board of Aid and Charities, justice demands that an especial word be said in appreciation of some of the men who have been members of this board. Charles J. Bonaparte, Emory L. Coblenz, of Frederick county; Dr. Phillip Briscoe, of Calvert county; William Levy, of Baltimore; Dr. Hiram Woods, of Baltimore, and other men of that stamp are now or have been members and they have given their services freely in honest effort. But it has amounted to little, for the simple reason that the board has little or no real power.

It was created largely through the efforts of the late Mayor Ferdinand C. Latrobe. He was a member of the House of Delegates in the session of 1900 and was one of the Committee on Ways and Means before which the various institutions came with their pleas for State aid. General Latrobe thought the consideration given these pleas by the committee and the relative committee of the State Senate (the Appropriations Committee) was hasty and inadequate. Therefore, he urged the creation of a board to conduct hearings on appeals for aid and gather information about the institutions appealing and to report its findings to the succeeding Legislature.

The board was organized and duly performed its task—and duly was forgotten. When the time came to make appropriations the institutions promptly went to the committees which actually had power in the matter of appropriations and the committees promptly gave ear. Neither side bothered about the State Board of Aid and Charities and its recommendations.

#### Trivial in Practical Effect.

From session to session the board has asked the Legislature for greater power, and, in a minor degree, has been granted some. In the last four years it has been especially active in seeking to keep guard over institutions receiving aid from the State and in gathering data upon the varied social problems. But when all it has done along these lines is recognized and appreciated it is seen to be trivial in practical effect.

In a subsequent article the handling of State and State-aided institutions will be discussed at some length and suggestions will be offered. It will suffice now to say that the State Board of Aid and Charities is practically valueless, that it is extremely doubtful whether it could be developed to a point of real service and that it should be abolished and the money spent by it saved.

William H. Davenport is the secretary of the board. He received his position after a competitive examination. His salary is \$1,800. There are two stenographers, one at \$900 and one at \$600. The board spent \$3,500 in the

last fiscal year; it has \$5,100 for the current year.

#### Prize "Joke" Of System.

The State Auditor used to be the prize "joke" of the whole system. It is a little better now, but it costs more than formerly, and it is to be doubted whether the increase in cost is offset by the improvement.

The duties of the State Auditor are broad: he is to examine almost every public office which has financial connection with the State government. In the old days hardly anything was examined, and those few that were thus honored were merely scratched about the surface. In the last two years or so the work has been done with somewhat more vigor.

However, as the office is now organized and conducted there is, as there always has been, a good deal of politics in it—which, of course, militates against efficiency. Moreover, money is spent for overhead charges—such as rent, traveling expenses, etc.—that could be saved.

The State Auditorship should be abolished and its work placed in the hands of the Bank Commissioner. In an article to be printed in a few days, which will consider the Bank Commissioner and the State Insurance Commissioner, an effort will be made to show that if the Bank Commissioner had charge of the State auditing the overhead costs of the present system could be saved and probably the salaries of all the present auditing force except one man.

#### Means \$13,500 Expense.

The State Auditor is J. Enos Ray, a lawyer of Prince George's county. His salary is \$2,500. His first deputy is William A. Gillespie, Jr., of Baltimore, a certified public accountant, and his second deputy is Thomas J. Murray, a storekeeper in Elkton. Each is paid \$2,000. There are two assistants—William B. Weed, Jr., of Govans, and George H. Dawson, Jr., of Cambridge. There also is a stenographer, whose name is not known. The salaries of the assistants and the supervisors cannot be stated.

Mr. Ray is given \$7,000 to pay these assistants and the stenographer and to pay office rent, traveling expenses, etc. His total allowance, therefore, is \$6,500 for himself and deputies and \$7,000 for other expenses, or \$13,500 in all. Probably \$11,500 of that could be saved and the work done more thoroughly if the Bank Commissioner had charge.

J. W. O.

336.181  
m3

III

July 16-15

### WHAT STATE GETS FOR THIS \$125,000

Amount Spent In "Conserving And Developing" Food Resources Is Considered.

#### STOREKEEPER AT HATCHERY

The Lawyer-Editor-Bank President State Game Warden And His Pamphlet — "Tom" Howard's \$76,000 Oyster Navy, Some Of Its Accomplishments And Expenses.

#### NATURAL RESOURCES OF THE STATE.

This article upon "economy and efficiency" in the State government has to do with the departments that supervise or guard the State's natural resources. The expenditures for these offices present about the best example in the whole State machinery of spending without knowing how you spend or what you get for it.

There is no purpose in this investigation to muckrake individuals; it simply is an effort to bring before the candidates for public office and the public in general definite information about a condition that all say is wrong, but which has been discussed heretofore only in the most general manner.

#### ARTICLE III.

In the fiscal year ending September 30, 1914, the State of Maryland spent approximately \$125,000 for the conservation and development of its natural resources in seafoods and game. There has been much discussion in the State in recent years of the question of conservation and development. Is there a citizen who can recall having heard anyone express the belief that Maryland is handling the question with any degree of efficiency?

The two Fish Commissioners—one for the Eastern Shore and one for the Western Shore—show an expenditure for the last fiscal year of \$10,865; the State Game Warden, \$3,291; the measurers and inspectors of oysters, \$12,791; the Shell Fish Commission, \$20,800, and the Oyster Navy, \$76,000. And yet the cry comes constantly from informed men that the State is in danger of serious depletion of its natural food resources.

#### Few Know Of Results.

Of course, one of the great needs of the State is a comprehensive study of the whole question of conserving and developing these resources; determination upon a broad policy; and rigid, thorough administration of that policy. In the meantime, it would be proper to ask in what measure the existing instrumentalities are serving the best interests of the State. If such a question were asked, there is no man in the State who could give concrete information, so far as the knowledge of the writer goes. He has been unable to find anyone who could answer or to find anyone who knows one who might be able to answer.

If one inquires about the Fish Commissioners, he is told there are two—Edward S. Phillips, of Cambridge, for the Eastern Shore; William A. Smith, of Hoyes, Garrett county, for the Western Shore. Mr. Phillips is an active business man in Cambridge; Mr. Smith keeps the village store at Hoyes. Both are active in Republican politics. Each receives \$1,500 a year.

People interested in public affairs know, in a general way, that there is a hatchery somewhere on the lower Eastern Shore, which Mr. Phillips looks after; and another one somewhere in Western Maryland, which Mr. Smith looks after. That is about all—except that a year or so ago there was some question about one of Mr. Phillips' expenses accounts. It was alleged that he had gone from his home in Cambridge to the hatchery and had charged an extravagant sum for the use of his automobile, in which he made the trip. It was stated by officials of the Comptroller's office that, upon examination, the account was found to be reasonable and was passed.

#### Then There's A Game Warden.

If one inquires about the State Game Warden, he learns that the incumbent of that office is James P. Curley, of Laurel and Baltimore, a lawyer, an editor, a bank president and a reasonably and properly active Republican leader in Prince George's county. Mr. Curley's salary is \$1,200 a year and he has an expense allowance of \$2,600, plus certain fines administered to offenders in Carroll and Frederick counties.

Mr. Curley was appointed to office by Governor Goldsborough after the Governor's first appointee had been compelled to resign following charges. The office had been only a name and a salary and an expense account prior to Mr. Curley's advent. When he took charge he was given a room in the Garrett Building for an office. Then he purchased a nice oak desk, a typewriter desk, some chairs and a rug. The State Game Warden became visible to the naked eye.

#### Gives Some Time To Office.

Mr. Curley is a man of character, and so he undoubtedly has given to his office all the time and attention that a lawyer and an editor and a bank president can give to a \$1,200 political job. He has given more time than most men would have done under the circumstances.

But he has not set the world on fire. He has co-operated with those actively interested in the preservation of game and fish. They can be counted on one's fingers, probably. He has named deputy game wardens, when possible, and has made, or caused to be made, some arrests for violations. He has had the game laws printed and put out in a very neat pamphlet. Whether all of that is worth half of his salary, not to mention his expenses, is very much to be doubted; whether it amounts to a tithe of what could be done with the money under a

proper system is very much more to be doubted.

If one inquires about the measurers and inspectors of oysters, he is told that there are five of them in Baltimore during the season and one each at Oxford, Annapolis, Cambridge, Nanticoke and Crisfield. Those in Baltimore receive \$100 a month; those in the other places \$50 a month. Additional ones are named by the Oyster Navy as may be needed.

#### Acts Like A Boomerang.

Their duty is to enforce the cull law for oysters. If one has spent time at Annapolis while oyster legislation was under consideration he will remember that man after man from the tidewater counties insisted day after day that if the Cull law were enforced there would be no oyster problem in the State.

If one inquires about the Shell Fish Commission he will be told that this board was created to survey the oyster grounds, mark the barren bottoms and the natural rock and rent to planters the barren. It will be recalled that after the commission had been in existence a number of years and practically had completed its survey, the last Legislature passed the Shepherd bill, providing for a resurvey because of alleged gross errors which had resulted in putting much natural rock in the barren area.

#### Those On Commission.

The president of the Shell Fish Commission is Benjamin K. Green, of Somerset county, who is active in Democratic politics there; the treasurer is Frank S. Revell, of Anne Arundel county, who is extremely active in Democratic politics, and the secretary is William H. Maltbie, the Baltimore lawyer, who has an occasional and rather reformatory hand in Republican politics. They three constitute the commission. The president receives \$2,000 a year and the other two members \$1,800 each.

None of them is frequently at the commission's office. Go there on a day when the board is scheduled to meet and possibly all will be on hand; go there almost any other day and probably none will be on hand. In justice to Mr. Maltbie, it should be said that he has been a very patient student of the oyster question and, in the judgment of those most interested, has contributed to whatever steps may have been made in solving it.

There is a chief clerk of the commission, Samuel A. Harper, of Talbot county; an engineer, Swepson Earle, of Centreville; two assistant clerks, M. H. Gill, of Elkridge, and Harry C. Linstid, of Armiger, and a stenographer.

#### He's The Oyster Navy.

If one inquires about the Oyster Navy he is told: "Oh, 'Tom' Howard is commander of the Oyster Navy, has been for years and probably will be for years. He knows all about it." Commander Howard is the Oyster Navy. He and his deputy commanders are appointed by the Board of Public Works. When those formalities have been performed, the rest is left to Commander Howard.

There are those who say that many years in the position of commander have made "Tom" Howard rather an absolute monarch; that he comes when he pleases and goes when he pleases on the steamer Governor McLane, and that no one but him knows anything about it.

Dyer

About all the average man knows about the Oyster Navy and its worth to the State is indicated by the common assertion by tidewater men that when the natural-rock oystermen make up their minds to poach on planting ground or to destroy planting, they will do so! And it has been observed that when trouble breaks out among the oystermen the patrol-boats are sent to the scene.

**Study This Statement.**

The Legislature of 1912 found it necessary to supplement the regular revenues of the Oyster Navy with an appropriation of \$15,000. A statement of the receipts and disbursements of the navy for the fiscal year ended September 30, 1914, as shown in the Comptroller's report, is as follows:

SOURCES.	Amts. Aggreg's.
Balance to credit of oyster fund October 1, 1913.....	\$5,739.51
Appropriation by Chapter 637 of 1912.....	15,000.00
<b>RECEIPTS.</b>	
From clerk of Circuit Court for Talbot County.....	\$1,255.00
From clerk of Circuit Court for Kent County.....	317.50
From clerk of Circuit Court for Queen Anne's County.....	317.50
From repayment for one barrel of oil returned.....	16.45
From dredging licenses.....	16,769.00
From oyster measurers' licenses....	109.25
From oyster fines.....	794.25
From oyster canners and packers' licenses.....	4,365.75
From tong and scrape licenses.....	9,232.63
From Chesapeake Bay fishery li- censes.....	1,390.29
From purse net licenses.....	375.00
From excess of general measurers and inspectors of oysters.....	29,441.54
	64,384.19
<b>Total receipts.....</b>	<b>\$85,123.70</b>
<b>DISBURSEMENTS.</b>	
For salaries.....	\$46,830.63
For supplies.....	1,899.99
For repairs.....	19,142.09
For fuel.....	4,378.06
For incidentals.....	2,515.33
For headquarters.....	1,154.89
	75,920.99
<b>Balance to the credit of the oyster fund September 30, 1914.....</b>	<b>\$9,202.71</b>

J. W. O.

336181  
m3

IV

SUN

JULY 17-15

## SALARIES GET THIS DEPARTMENT'S MONEY

State Bureau Of Immigration Is Blessed With Officers.

### BOARD MEETINGS VERY COSTLY

The State Live Stock Sanitary Board, Whose Members Are Sometimes There And Sometimes Not There, And The \$1,000 Expert.

#### THE AGRICULTURAL INTERESTS.

*This article upon "economy and efficiency" will deal with some of the State's expenditures which have to do with the agricultural interests. Relatively, the farmers of the State are one of the most heavily taxed classes, but there is no other powerful class of citizens whose interests have been treated with such persistent asininity by the State government.*

*The State Immigration Bureau, the State Live Stock Sanitary Board and the State Veterinarian will be discussed here. It happens that nearly all the men now connected with these offices are well-meaning, so there is no criticism to be made of them personally. The criticism is of the waste which results from the lack of proper organization.*

#### ARTICLE IV.

The State of Maryland spends a great deal of money upon the Agricultural College, upon the Experiment Station connected with the college, upon the experiment substation at Ridgely and in sundry appropriations for agricultural interests. No one has ever contended that these appropriations yielded even encouraging returns.

Until very recently no one seemed to care especially. The politicians proceeded upon the theory that the farmer would be entirely satisfied if his taxes were not raised. If they were lowered a cent or so in some year, so much the better. But the important thing was not to raise the tax rate. So long as that was avoided it was accepted that the farmer would not inquire too deeply into the expenditure of the proceeds of the tax rate and of the returns from indirect taxation. Things, as they were, affecting the farmer, drifted along in pretty much the same way year after year.

#### Duties Of Immigration Bureau.

The facts about the appropriations for agricultural education will be given in a separate story. At this point attention will be directed to some other appropriations in which the farmer is interested and which should be considered before the educational appropriations. There is the State Bureau of Immigration. It has been receiving an annual appropriation of \$10,000; it has \$15,000 for the current fiscal year. The business of the bureau is to advertise the agricultural resources of the State so that more farmers and more labor may be attracted and the farming community thereby upbuilt.

In what measure has the bureau succeeded? Possibly an analysis of its financial statement for the year ending April 30, 1914, will indicate something. In that year the bureau spent \$10,349.97, of which \$5,844—more than 50 per cent.—went for salaries. That would indicate that a good deal of the bureau's advertising was done by word of mouth—which is a primitive method, to say the least.

#### Even Costs Board To Meet.

The analysis also shows that in that year the bureau spent \$701.20 for printing, \$932.74 for "advertising" and \$694 for postage, etc., a total of \$2,327.94. If one assumes that all the printing and all the "advertising" and all the postage, etc., were spent in persuading outsiders to come to us he finds that the total thus spent amounts to less than 25 per cent. of the total expenditures.

Some of the other expenditures of the bureau are worth giving. The rent cost \$660, office expenses \$600, an official trip of the secretary to Canada \$300, the board meeting expenses of the commissioners \$260 (they are paid salaries, too), discounts \$66.17 and telephone \$216.86.

#### Results Of Canadian Trip.

In 1913 John A. Tschantre, the secretary of the bureau, made a trip to Canada, the cost of which has been stated. Upon his return Mr. Tschantre wrote Governor Goldsborough a letter, in which he said, in part:

"As far as Maryland is concerned, I am decidedly of the opinion that two courses are open: First, that the State may continue her efforts, through her Immigration Bureau, along the same policy as heretofore pursued; that is, that the bureau act mainly as an advertising agency or clearing house between the prospective seller and the prospective buyer, merely listing the lands for sale, printing a general description of the advantages of the State, disseminating periodically the information. This is, of course, productive of some results, but it will never be productive of great results.

"If the State is actively to reach out for those who would settle and develop her agricultural lands, it must be done and be done only as a result of an active, energetic campaign, by which the claims and merits of Maryland agricultural areas shall be brought home forcibly to those who are prospective land seekers. This can be accomplished only by very marked increase in the appropriation made by the Legislature for this work."

#### Admits It Is Worthless.

It will be observed that Mr. Tschantre's letter virtually states that the bureau's work has not been worth while; he says that the method which had been pursued "will never be productive of great results." That really is a remarkable admission for an office-holder to make in writing. The explanation is that Mr. Tschantre is a genuine sort of man.

But note what he states to be the condition for an improvement in the bureau's work—an increased appropriation. 'Twas ever thus. No one concerned with State affairs seems ever to dream that reorganization and elimination of waste may bring improvement.

Neither Mr. Tschantre nor the Legislature of 1914, which gave the bureau a \$5,000 increase, seems to have given a thought to the obvious fact that a superintendent of the bureau at \$2,000 a year, two commissioners at \$500 a year each, a secretary at \$1,200 and two clerks are an absurdity in such a department. And yet neither Mr. Tschantre nor the members of the Legislature could think for a moment without realizing that all the bureau needs is one working executive and a clerk or two.

#### Lukewarm On Results.

Since the bureau has had its increased appropriation there have been signs of additional activity. Mr. Tschantre started a labor exchange, for example, which probably did some good, although his conversation while he was in the midst of it suggested that he was not the most pleased man in the world with the results.

But there are no signs today that the board is doing anything especially valuable for the State. There is no reason to expect it to. What may one reasonably expect of a small department that is all heads—a president of the board, a superintendent, a commissioner and a secretary?

The Immigration Bureau could be made useful if it were consolidated with some of the other agencies affecting the State's agricultural interests and its appropriation applied, not to salaries and rent and board-meeting expenses and office expenses, but to the business of intelligently placing the State's advantages before those interested.

The officers of the Immigration Bureau are: Superintendent, F. De Sales Mudd, Bryantown, Charles county, salary \$2,000; president, William H. Knowles, Sharptown, Wicomico county, salary \$500; commissioner, Jacob H. Waller, Cambridge, salary \$500, and secretary, John A. Tschantre, Baltimore, salary \$1,200. William M. Lyon, Charles county, is the clerk and there is a stenographer. The salaries of the clerk and stenographer are not known.

#### State Live Stock Board.

As to the State Live Stock Sanitary Board: The members of the board are Harry P. Skipper, of Queen Anne's county; Charles W. Melville, of Sykesville, and Hart B. Noll, of Ellicott City. They are paid a per diem of \$5 for actual service. Recently—due probably to the foot-and-mouth disease—there have been two members, at least, at the board's office on most days. That means that the salary cost of the board has been in the neighborhood of \$3,000 a year. It is not known whether or not the members of the board who have to spend the night in the city when they come to the office charge their expenses to the State.

OVER

This is an important board. Its duties are to protect the live stock of the State against disease and to inspect dairies, which means that it is charged with guarding a large element of wealth and the public health. The State gives the board a large appropriation. In the fiscal year ending September 30, 1914, the board spent \$18,519.01.

**Has \$27,000 To Spend.**

In the current fiscal year it has appropriations amounting to \$27,000. Of that, \$15,000 is for border patrol, \$2,000 for dairy inspection and \$10,000 for other work. To be entirely accurate, the \$15,000 appropriation runs from April 10 to the next April 10, instead of during the regular fiscal year, beginning October 1 and ending September 30.

The board makes a report and all that sort of thing, but no one really knows very much about it. There are two reasons, and they are obvious. In the first place, three heads in an executive office mean no head; in the second place, per diem employment usually means employment only when the per diem is more profitable than everything else, which, in turn, means that one never knows whether he will find at the office the member of the board who happens to have the information wanted.

**One Responsible Man.**

This office should form a part of some general department in charge of agricultural interests. To be efficient it should have at its head one man, who would devote his entire time to it and be responsible for it. That, if done, probably would lead to very material saving in the expenditures of the board. Approximately how much cannot be stated, for no one can make comparisons as against the present three-headed, sometimes-there and sometimes-not-there department.

The State Veterinarian is Lawrence Hickman. He is paid \$1,000, and most people think he has earned it in the last few months, while the foot-and-mouth disease was prevalent. The office should be abolished. In ordinary times a \$1,000 expert means either that the expert has little or no work to do or that he is not an expert.

The truth is that usually there is not a great deal for the State Veterinarian to do. If there were a department in charge of agricultural interests, the State Veterinarian's work probably could be absorbed with minor additional cost.

J. W. O.

## INEFFICIENCY BANE OF WORK AT M. A. C.

Institution Lacks Breadth And  
Practical Leadership In Task  
Of Aiding Farmers.

### POLITICS AT ROOT OF EVIL

Executive And Teaching Staff Held  
Blameless—Men On Board Not  
Interested In Agriculture—  
Claims To Adequate Support Sac-  
rificed.

#### THE MARYLAND AGRICUL- TURAL COLLEGE.

*This article upon "Economy and efficiency" will be the first of two dealing with the Maryland Agricultural College. The evil effect of politics in the management of the college's affairs will be discussed here and on Thursday there will be something about the finances.*

*There seems to be an idea in some quarters that the purpose of this discussion of public waste is to lay the foundation for a new constitution movement. That idea is erroneous. The purpose of the articles is to let the public have the facts about a bad condition that has been treated heretofore only in generalities. The Sun believes the condition may be rectified almost entirely by acts of the Legislature.*

#### ARTICLE V.

Ordinarily waste of the taxpayers' money is caused by multiplicity of offices and extravagance. There are instances, however, in which it is caused by sheer inefficiency. That is the trouble at the Maryland Agricultural College.

In speaking of inefficiency at the college the word is not used qualitatively. After all is said and done, the college does reasonably well in its present field. It is inefficient in that its work lacks breadth and comprehensiveness and practical leadership in the modern agricultural field.

The executive and teaching staff is not to blame for the inefficiency described. Speaking generally, they are good and earnest men. Dr. H. J. Patterson, late present of the college and now director of the experiment station, is a man of lofty character and purposes, and possesses a great deal of hard sense and trained ability. The same is true of Thomas H. Spence, vice-president, and others.

#### Blame Put On Trustees.

It is the board of trustees who must be blamed. In the main it is a political board and its predecessors have been political boards. Politics has entered into the management of the school and the injurious results have been felt in manifold ways—in the practical management; in the public's attitude; in the disposition of the Legislature.

The trustees of the college are Governor Goldsborough, Comptroller Harrington, State Treasurer Vandiver, Attorney-General Poe and Speaker Trippe, ex officio; Robert W. Wells, John Hubert, Henry Holtzapple, Harry P. Skipper, Robert Crain and Herbert B. Getty, appointed by the Governor; and F. Carroll Goldsborough, J. Harold Walsh, William Stanley, Charles F. Brooke and Albert W. Sisk, representing the stockholders of the old corporation. The President of the State Senate is a member ex officio, too. That place has been vacant since the election of Jesse D. Price to Congress. It will be noted that all of the ex officio members are strictly political. Those appointed by the Governor usually are members of the Governor's political faith.

Take, as an illustration of their practices, the recent action of the trustees in electing Robert W. Wells, of Prince George's county, as secretary and treasurer; or, at least, the board's action in trying to elect Mr. Wells, for Attorney-General Poe has ruled that there was no election, because the by-laws of the college were not complied with. Politics was behind that. No one familiar with this matter believed that, under the circumstances, the board would have elected Mr. Wells except for political reasons.

That is not said in derogation of Mr. Wells' ability or character. He is a man of position, of considerable attainments and of many attractive personal qualities. But he is a lawyer in active and successful practice in Washington.

#### Some Pertinent Questions Asked.

Does anyone believe it is better to have an active lawyer giving a half or a third of his time to a position such as secretary and treasurer than to have a trained accountant giving all of his time?

Yet, Mr. Wells was voted for by nearly all the Democratic members of the board of trustees. Comptroller Harrington who said a few days ago that the State had not paid enough attention to its agricultural interests, voted for him in the company of other Smith men and of Lee and Preston men. Mr. Harrington's name is not mentioned because he is worse than the other politicians; probably, Senator Lee would have voted for Mr. Wells if he had been a member of the board. Certainly his supporters on the board did so.

#### There Because Of Politics.

The truth of the matter is that the board has men on it who are there not because they are at all interested in agriculture, but because of the accidents of politics. There is Speaker James McC. Trippe. He is on the board because he is the Speaker of the House of Delegates. If Mr. Trippe's attitude toward the Agricultural College had anything to do with his selection for the speakership, either in 1912 or in 1914, it escaped the notice of every one. The same thing is true of Jesse D. Price, who was a member of the board, as President of the State Senate, until his election to Congress, and of State Treasurer Murray Vandiver and of Comptroller Harrington.

Instances of the inefficiency which results from the nature of the board could be given almost by scores. At the last session of the Legislature there was a strong movement to obtain a considerable appropriation for the extension of the college work. This was defeated very largely because the members of the board became embroiled in controversy.

The consequence of all this sort of thing is that the money now being appropriated for the college is not utilized to the fullest advantage, in the judgment of every man capable of judging who is known to the writer; and it is extremely difficult to get the average legislator or the average man concerned in public affairs to take a sincere interest in the college so that it may be given means to attain its full measure of usefulness.

#### Only One Remedy.

There is only one way to remedy the conditions which hamper the Maryland Agricultural College. That way is organized and positive action by the farmers and others interested. If they allow the Maryland Agricultural College to continue to be the victim of politics and personal prejudices, they can hope for no broadening of the work.

This article has departed from the preceding ones in substance. It has been deemed wise to call attention first to the root evil in the college's affairs. The next articles will give the facts as to the finances at the college. It then will be for the citizens to determine whether the great, if unseen, loss resulting from the college's limitations shall continue.

J. W. O.

See July 20/15.

## STATE WASTES \$21,000 IN COURT CLERKSHIPS

Seven City Clerks Are Employed  
Where One Would Be Sufficient.

QUESTION LONG DISCUSSED

But Political And Personal Influence Has Prevented Needed And Obvious Reform — Something About Sinecure County Clerkships.

### COURT CLERKS IN CITY.

From time to time attention is called to the waste resulting from having six court clerks and one Register of Wills in Baltimore when but one clerk is needed. It always has been difficult to make headway toward reforming this condition, owing, in a great measure, to the political influence of those holding the offices or aspiring to them. Another statement of this waste is given below; possibly the "economy and efficiency" attitude of the candidates and the public will make it worth while.

Some idea of the waste resulting from the clerk system in the counties is given too. This waste is due to the fact that many of the county court clerkships are the most obvious sinecures, the work being done by deputies, while the court clerk gives practically all of his time to his private affairs.

### ARTICLE VII.

There are six court clerks and one Register of Wills in Baltimore, as follows: Stephen C. Little, Clerk of the Superior Court; William M. Carson, Clerk of the Circuit Court; John Pleasants, Clerk of the Circuit Court No. 2; Samuel W. Pattison, Clerk of the Criminal Court; George Carey Lindsay, Clerk of the Baltimore City Court, and Adam Deupert, Clerk of the Court of Common Pleas, and Howard W. Jackson, Register of Wills. Each of them receives a salary of \$3,500 a year, making a total of \$24,500.

Of that \$24,500 there is wasted annually \$21,000, for no sound reason can be given why there should not be one clerk at the head of all the offices, which really are divisions of one office. If every one of the present clerks were to die tomorrow, neither the bar nor the public would be inconvenienced in the slightest degree, so far as the clerk's official duties are concerned. If no appointment was made to any of the clerkships for months, neither the bar nor the public would suffer. The deputies and the clerks would conduct the work.

### One Could Do It All.

Of course there should be some one at the head of the court clerks' offices, but there is not the slightest reason why there should not be one instead of seven. There would be just as much of a scramble for that one place at \$3,500 as there now is for the seven. The added work would not scare anyone—not even a little bit.

Two of these clerkships were expensive luxuries for the State, according to the Comptroller's report for the fiscal year ended September 30, 1914. They did not receive enough fees to pay expenses, including the clerk's salary of \$3,500. The two offices were Clerk of the Circuit Court No. 2, held by John Pleasants, and Clerk of the Baltimore City Court, held by George Carey Lindsay. The State paid the first office \$1,124.07 to make up its deficiency and the second \$4,255.50.

### Where The Money Went.

Mr. Pleasants' office took in \$11,935.33 from all sources, fees, etc. It paid out \$3,500 for Mr. Pleasants' salary; \$7,885 for salaries of deputies and messengers; \$780 for extra clerical help and \$894 for miscellaneous expenses, making a total of \$13,059.40. It seems a bit tough, does it not, that the State should have to meet a deficit of \$1,124.07 in the office's receipts, when Mr. Pleasants' \$3,500 need not have been spent?

Mr. Lindsay's office hits the State harder than did that of Mr. Pleasants. It did not take in much more than Mr. Lindsay's \$3,500. The total receipts of the office were \$5,942.21. The office spent \$10,197.71, of which \$3,500 went for Mr. Lindsay's salary; \$6,520 for the salaries of deputies, and \$177.71 for sundries. It seems a bit tough, does it not, that the State should have to meet a deficit of \$4,255.50 in the office's receipts, when Mr. Lindsay's \$3,500 need not have been spent?

There is nothing new about the suggestion that these clerks' offices be consolidated and put under the charge of one man. A decade or more ago the Baltimore City Bar Association recommended a very similar plan and had introduced in the Legislature a bill carrying out its recommendations. The measure passed the House, but was beaten on the third reading in the Senate.

The personnel of the bar association committee which recommended the reform should be given. The committee was composed of Edwin G. Baetjer, George R. Gaither, John Hinkley, H. M. Thompson and the late C. Baker Clotworthy. Certainly no group of Baltimore city lawyers could be more representative of the best thought of the bar.

It is proper to state here, and it is a pleasure to do so, that not one word is to be said in criticism of the men who hold the clerkships. The bar and the public which has to do with the offices are a practical unit in commendation of the six clerks and the Register of Wills as men and officials. That is especially true of Mr. Pleasants and Mr. Lindsay, whose offices have been mentioned in particular, and of Mr. Little and Mr. Deupert.

The criticism is of the system. It is wasteful and it should be reformed, and every well-informed man knows that a every well-informed man knows that the reason reform has been blocked is political and personal consideration.

### Amendment Is Needed.

As the court clerkships, including the Register of Wills, who is the clerk to the Orphans' Court, are offices provided in the State Constitution, an amendment would be necessary to bring about reform. Such an amendment could be submitted to the people by the next Legislature.

from July 26/15

Many of the county clerkships are sinecures. The clerks do little or no actual work. Just how this works out may be illustrated by considering five counties in which the total receipts of the clerks' offices are from \$10,000 to \$15,000 annually. The counties are: Allegany, receipts as given in the last report of the Comptroller, \$14,788.41; Anne Arundel county, \$10,361.21; Frederick county, \$11,978.94; Prince George's county, \$10,695.50, and Washington county, \$10,551.32. These counties paid to the State the following sums: Allegany, \$806.90; Anne Arundel, \$1,388.76; Frederick, \$1,048.14; Prince George's, \$536.79, and Washington, \$2,268.73.

### This Seems Strange Too.

It will be noted that Washington county, which is next lowest to Anne Arundel in receipts, paid considerably more to the State than any of the others. It paid nearly \$900 more than Anne Arundel and over \$1,700 more than Prince George's, with both of which it was practically even in receipts. It paid over \$1,200 more than Frederick, which had about \$1,400 more receipts, and \$1,400 more than Allegany, which had \$4,000 more receipts.

Probably the fact that Edward Oswald, clerk of the court for Washington county, has spent a good part of his life in the office and is a practical, working court clerk may account for the superior showing of his office.

### Expenses Vs. Receipts.

It is worth while to give the salary costs and the total receipts in some of the counties, so that an idea of the proportion of the former to the latter may be had. In Caroline county the clerk gets \$3,000 and the deputies \$2,000 out of \$5,927.65; in Cecil, the clerk \$3,000 and the deputies \$2,000 out of \$6,698.51; in Charles, the clerk \$3,000 and the deputies \$1,000 out of \$4,642.08; in Dorchester, the clerk \$3,000 and the deputies \$3,559 out of \$7,213.98; in Howard, the clerk \$3,000 and the deputies \$1,704.05 out of \$5,212.28; in Montgomery county, the clerk \$3,000 and the deputies \$4,401.70 out of \$8,974.89, and in Wicomico, the clerk \$3,000 and the deputies \$2,764 out of \$6,931.38. In addition to the clerks' and deputies' salaries sundry expenses are considerable in most instances.

There is not much doubt that if the county court clerkships were put on a business basis the total savings to the State would be very appreciable. These offices ordinarily are noticed by no one. Local people have no interest in them, because the net receipts do not go to the county government, but to the State, and the State officials are too far away to think much about costs.

Until the late Charles H. Stanley was made Comptroller it was no uncommon thing for the court clerks to be pretty far behind in making such payments as were due the State. Mr. Stanley stirred things up. As between being agreeable and doing his duty, even if disagreeable, he chose the latter.

### Nothing For State Here.

A word should be said about the county Registers of Wills. The practice of having deputies obtains in these offices too. Down in Calvert county, according to the Comptroller's report, the total receipts from January 1, 1913, to January 1, 1914, were \$335.92. Now Registers of Wills in the counties are entitled to salaries of \$3,000. Did the Calvert county official apply all his fees to the salary permitted him? No, indeed! He gave part of the \$335.92 to a deputy. The Register of Wills got \$200 and his deputy got \$135.92. Of course, this is merely causing; but it illustrates pretty well the average Register of Wills' passion for deputies.

See July 26/15

(2)

As things now stand, the Register of Wills, being entitled to \$3,000 salary and the receipts of the office usually being too low to pay him that, whether or not he has deputies, it does not make much difference financially to the State whether the receipts go all to the official, or part to him, and part to his deputies. There is nothing left over either way.

The idea that the Register of Wills' office should be combined with the clerk's is as sound as to the counties as it is to Baltimore city. If the combination were effected and the clerk's office put upon a business basis, it would be found that the cost of attending to the present Register of Wills' work would be small, and the State probably would get some of the receipts now going into salaries.

In this connection it may be stated that many lawyers think the Orphans' Court, for which the Register of Wills is clerk, should be abolished and the duties placed upon the circuit judges. That, if done, would simplify the consolidation of the clerk's and Register of Wills' offices.

J. W. O.



## D. J. LEWIS FOR REFORM

Maryland Congressman Promises To Help Improve State Government.

### COMMENDS THE SUN'S WORK

**Wants No "Glittering Generality" In Party Platform, But Definite Pledges To Be Carried Out.**

Congressman David J. Lewis, of Allegany county, who is supporting Emerson C. Harrington for the Gubernatorial nomination, was in the city yesterday and expressed himself strongly on the subject of the wanton waste and reckless extravagance in the State government as shown in the series of articles on this subject printed in THE SUN.

"Every man," said Mr. Lewis, "who has taken an active part in State politics or who has held public office in Maryland, has, of course, known that there has been waste and extravagance, inefficiency and unbusinesslike methods in the management of the State's affairs. I do not think, however, that any of us—even those who have had the closest opportunities for observation—have realized the almost criminal extent to which this waste and reckless expenditure of the public money has been allowed to go, until the presentation by THE SUN of the facts in such a way as to drive them home. I want to say that in making this investigation and presenting the result, THE SUN has performed a splendid service to the State of Maryland—a service that is in keeping with the high character and purposes of the paper.

#### **Says Facts Cannot Be Denied.**

"The facts as presented can neither be disputed nor denied. On the other hand, they cannot but be admitted even by the persons most closely affected. Now that the appalling inefficiency of the State government and the sinful waste of the people's money has been made so plain to the people of the State that no man in public life can afford to ignore the real situation, there remains but one thing to do and that is to remedy these conditions as speedily as possible.

"My belief is that the remedy must be provided by the Democratic party, as in this State, because of its peculiar make-up, the Republican party cannot be trusted to carry out a real and far-reaching system of reform. My hope—and I intend to do all in my power to bring it about—is that the Democratic State convention, which meets in Baltimore in September, will present to

the people of Maryland as an integral and vital part of the platform to be adopted at that time a plank pledging the Democratic Governor, the Comptroller, the Attorney-General and the Democratic Legislature to take up the question of placing the State's government upon a genuine business basis and settle it.

#### **Wants Positive Pledge.**

"I hope to see and will work to see that this plank is not a glittering generality, but a specific, definite, concrete proposition, in which the party will be pledged to abolish the useless offices in the State; to wipe out the unnecessary State boards, the unnecessary attorneys to State officials; to provide a sane, businesslike method of making State appropriations, either through the budget system or some other; to wipe out duplication of work and expense by consolidation of State departments and offices where such consolidation is logical and proper, and to reorganize from top to bottom the State's government so that the shame of such waste, extravagance and inefficiency as now exist may no longer rest upon us.

#### **Up To The Next Legislature.**

"This will be a splendid task for the Democratic party and for the Democratic Governor. Much of it can be done at the next session of the Legislature by the simple expedient of passing through the House and the Senate the necessary bills. For such reforms as require amendments to the Constitution, more time, of course, will be required, but at least the coming session of the General Assembly can pass the constitutional amendments and these will be ratified by the people at the next election.

"The situation—now that the facts have been laid bare to the people, and the material given with which to work—presents a magnificent opportunity to the Democratic party to measure up as the party of the people, and I believe the Democratic convention next month will take full advantage of the opportunity."

Ann. Aug. 13/15.

336,181  
m 3

9

Sun July 30, 1915

## NOT SIX; BUT ONE FOR STATE ROADS WORK

Salaries Of Five Members Of The  
Existing Commission Could  
Be Saved.

### SECRETARYSHIP A SINECURE

Then There Is The State Bureau  
Of Statistics And Information,  
Which Is Seriously Handicapped  
By Political Appointments.

#### ONE MAN COULD MANAGE ROADS.

*This article upon "economy and efficiency" points out the savings that could be made by placing one man at the head of the State roads work instead of having a large commission.*

*It also calls attention to the effect of politics in the appointments in the State Bureau of Statistics and Information and gives some idea of the resultant inefficiency. The article suggests that this bureau and the Ten-Hour Law Bureau should be consolidated.*

#### ARTICLE IX.

There are six offices in the State Roads Commission that are useless under present conditions and the conditions that almost certainly will prevail in the future. Those offices are the five commissionerships, other than the chairman and the secretary. The Commissioners are paid \$2,000 each and the secretary \$1,800.

It has been clear for months, to most people well informed about the State roads work, that it should have a one-man head. That is the opinion of some of the present Commissioners. The work has passed, in the great measure, the experimental stage when policies were to be originated. There was some reason at that time in having a number of men in charge, for discussion, debate, the exchange of information and opinion was desirable. But now that the broad policies of the work have been settled, the functions of administration are chiefly executive, and for that but one man is needed.

#### Mr. Weller The Commission.

This is not merely a matter of theory. The opinion of some of the present Commissioners that there should be a one-man head, to which reference has just been made, shows that it also is judgment based upon practical experience. The truth is that for three years past the State roads work has had a one-man head, to all intents and purposes. Chairman O. E. Weller, of the commission, has been the commission. He conceived its innovations in construction and such changes as have been made in the policy of the preceding board; he formulated the existing organization of the force; he supervised the operations in every section of the State. He has been successful.

It is not meant to criticize the other Commissioners. They, at least, seldom have been hindrances to the work and some of them, notably Walter B. Miller, of Wicomico county, and Andrew Ramsey, of Allegany county, who entered the commission with Mr. Weller, have taken a constructive interest in the whole enterprise. Mr. Miller, too, has been valuable in adjusting local problems on the Eastern Shore.

But the sum total of all the work the other Commissioners have done is not sufficient to warrant the continuance of the offices. Such work as they have done in adjusting local controversies would be done by public-spirited citizens without cost; in fact, often has been done. A man like Mr. Miller would do that work just as thoroughly and just as enthusiastically without pay.

#### Advisory Board Would Do.

It has been suggested that if there were one man at the head of the State roads work—a highway commissioner—it might be wise to have a small, unpaid advisory board, with men like Mr. Miller and Joseph D. Baker, of Frederick county, on it. If there were a board of that character all the benefits now received from the paid Commissioners would be had.

The secretary of the commission is unnecessary. The office is one of the sort for which work must be found. Such secretarial duties as are connected with the work could be done easily by a stenographer or clerk in a part of his time.

The State Roads Commission is composed of Chairman Weller and Commissioners Miller, Ramsey, J. Frank Smith, of St. Mary's; Thomas Parran, of Calvert, and John M. Perry, of Queen Anne's. Mr. Smith and Mr. Perry are Democrats; the others are Republicans. Chairman Weller receives \$2,500. The secretary of the commission is William L. Marcy, of Annapolis, who is active in Republican politics in Anne Arundel county.

#### Vital Bureau, This.

The State Bureau of Statistics and Information is one of those departments of the State government which should be of great value and which are retarded by political appointments. Its work requires training and sympathy and is peculiarly beyond the ken of the average political worker who is rewarded with a job.

The bureau is charged with the duty of factory inspection, with the enforcement of the Child Labor law and with the compilation of labor statistics. It has a total appropriation of \$27,000. Of this \$10,000, speaking generally, is for the principal overhead expenses and for factory inspection; the remainder is for the enforcement of the Child Labor law. These appropriations should not be reduced. Real economy must be had in this department by the institution of efficiency, so that the State will receive full return for the money expended.

The inefficiency and waste resulting from making political appointments in this department are shown best by a simple statement of present conditions. Under the Factory Inspection law provision is made for the appointment of two persons whose duties are to make inspections. These positions now are held by Benjamin M. Haughey and Charles A. Lutz, who receive \$1,000 a year each. Both men are exceedingly active in Republican politics, Haughey being the executive of the Fifteenth ward.

#### Inspectors Who Never Inspect.

They do not spend a moment of their time in factory inspection. For some reason they have been assigned to duties in a labor exchange—a sort of labor exchange!—which the bureau organized. It happens that one other State department, the Bureau of Immigration, has a labor exchange in the city, and there also is one conducted here by the Federal immigration office. Plainly, all three are not needed.

There are seven inspectors in the child labor work. Three of them are women and four are men. The women are Misses Marie L. Rose, Margaret Rosanowski and Mathilde L. Selig; the men are John A. Janetzke, Jr., of Baltimore; John E. Ermer, Jr., of Baltimore county; George Dean, of Dorchester county, and George Sharrer, of Carroll county. Each of them is paid \$1,000 a year.

#### Women Are Competent.

The women are competent. Miss Rose is stationed in Cumberland and has charge of Allegany, Washington,

Frederick, Carroll and Garrett counties. She is a trained worker. Miss Rosanuski has had exceptional training and speaks a number of languages—an accomplishment almost invaluable in her work. Miss Selig assists in the office and does child-labor inspection in the large department stores and in the Eastern Shore canneries.

None of the men has had training for his work. Some are earnest and willing, but lack the insight which is essential to handle properly the enforcement of child-labor laws. All of them are either political or personal appointments, caused by the ruling powers of the Republican party.

#### Five Of Nine Know Work.

Going back for a moment, it is seen that provision is made in the factory inspection and child labor appropriations for nine inspectors. There are nine persons drawing the salaries provided. Of the nine not more than five really meet the requirements, and of these the majority are women.

To illustrate the consequences: Miss Rosanuski, who is employed under the child labor act, does both factory and child labor inspection. Miss Rose, also employed under the child labor act, likewise does factory and child labor inspection in the Western Maryland counties. Although there are seven inspectors provided under the child labor act and two under the factory inspection act, the bureau is forced to employ a special worker to make the inspections among newsboys necessary under the child labor act.

Again, although the bureau has nine inspectors in all, it has been found impracticable to use any of those not actively engaged in inspections to aid in issuing permits to children during the rush periods. That is to say, not only are some of the inspectors not equipped for their appointed work, but they cannot be used to fill in. Consequently the officer in charge of this work is overburdened at times.

The bureau is compelled to go outside of its regular force to have its statistics compiled. Those of its inspectors and assistants whose capacities are such that they are not burdened with the usual duties have been found incapable properly to aid in the statistical work. When it is remembered that the bureau was inaugurated years ago to gather and compile statistics, this business of employing outsiders to do such work approaches the ludicrous.

#### Health Records Not Kept.

There is another serious weakness in the work of the bureau. The health records are not properly maintained. The law requires that children applying for permits to work be examined. If a child leaves employment because of occupational ills or because of excessive occupational demands, another examination should be made, so that the bad effects of the work upon the child, if any, may be ascertained. That is necessary to give the State data to guide in future legislation.

The failure to maintain the proper medical records may be shown by considering one of a dozen employments. In a given period, according to the records of the bureau, 851 boys and girls

left the manufacturing clothing trade and of that number 89 did so because of excessive occupational demands. The physicians' records at the bureau report upon only 17 of those 89 cases.

#### No Change In Law Needed.

No particular change in the law is required to place the bureau upon an efficient basis. What is needed is that the chief and the deputy chief of the department be free to select men and women because of their fitness, and not to have them named by the Governor of the State because of personal or political considerations. If the department heads were free to name their assistants, the responsibility would be fixed definitely.

The chief of the bureau is Frank A. White, of Talbot county, who is paid \$2,500 a year. The deputy chief is Miss Anna Herkner, of Baltimore, who is paid \$1,600. She has had many years' experience in her work. In addition to the inspectors under their charge, who have been named, Mr. White and Miss Herkner have, under the factory inspection appropriation, one stenographer, who is paid \$900, and another stenographer, under the child labor appropriation, who is paid \$720.

The Ten-Hour Law Bureau, which is charged with the enforcement of the Women's Ten-Hour law, is separate from the State Bureau of Statistics and Information. It should be a part of it, for the work is closely allied and, if combined upon a proper basis, could be done more cheaply.

This bureau has an appropriation of \$6,000 and is in the charge of Miss Sarah F. Martin, who is paid \$1,200 a year. She has two inspectors, who are paid \$900 each, and a stenographer, who is paid \$600. The bureau, of course, has charges for rent, printing, postage, etc.

#### Big Saving Could Be Made.

If it were combined properly with the main bureau the work of the inspectors of both bureaus could be co-ordinated, rent could be saved and some of the overhead charges. In suggesting the combination there is no intention to reflect upon the work of Miss Martin and her subordinates. The information at hand indicates that it is being done well. The point made is that the work could be co-ordinated with that of the Industrial Bureau and thereby handled as efficiently and more cheaply.

It will be remembered that there are two inspectors under the factory inspection appropriation, seven under the child labor appropriation and two under the ten-hour appropriation, or eleven in all. If the work of these inspectors were co-ordinated, it would be possible to make many of the inspections by the same inspector.

It often happens that an inspection of a given factory must be made for all three purposes. Assuming that all of the inspectors were trained for the work, one can appreciate the tremendous increase in the thoroughness and efficiency of the work that would be possible with the present number of inspectors if there were proper co-ordination.

J. W. O.

336.181

M3

10 -

Sun - Aug. 9 - 1916

## WASTING FUNDS IN STATE GOVERNMENT

Example Of "Economy" Given By The Payroll Of The Maryland Senate And House.

LAST SESSION COST \$206,958

Outcry Against Extravagance Generally Raised After Damage Has Been Done — Figures Presented Before For The Taxpayers To Think Over On Eve Of Campaign.

### HOW THE MONEY WENT.

Soon after the beginning of each session of the Legislature there is an outcry against the extravagance in legislative expenditures. A few months pass and the abuse is forgotten, not to be recalled until the next similar abuse is under way—until the hour has been stolen again.

THE SUN purposes to call the attention of the people of the State to this abuse now, while candidates for the Legislature are before the people. And by way of making plain just how and where the money goes, the persons to whom money was paid at the last session and the amounts they received are given in detail below. The total was \$206,958.34 for the three months' session in which there were 129 members.

### ARTICLE No. 10.

Of all the waste in the State government there is nothing quite so indefensible as that in the expenditures of the Legislature. Again and again, attention has been called to it; again and again, figures have been given to prove that Maryland's Legislative expenses far exceed those of most other states, including many that are much larger and much richer; and session after session the abuse arises and expands.

Nearly always there is a hue and cry—after the damage has been done. The net result of the hue and cry is usually some futile effort to keep the horde of employes apparently at work; as, for example, at one session when the Speaker of the House constituted himself a sort of overseer and made his rounds in the mornings, and at another session when one of the employes was designated the official timekeeper and was ordered to call the roll of his fellows each morning—which he did for a little while.

It is not worth while to attempt an analysis of the Legislature's expenditures; as a matter of fact, the expenditures defy analysis. The simplest and most graphic exposition of this universally recognized abuse may be had in a detailed statement of the last Legislature's salary costs. When one reads the long list of clerks and doorkeepers and cloakroom keepers and watchmen and cleaners and pages and "special orders"—beautifully broad term!—he knows the whole story.

The total salary, etc., expenses of the Senate were \$75,089.32; of the House, \$131,869.02, making a grand total of \$206,958.34.

### Statement Of Senate In Detail.

The statement of Senate expenses is as follows:

Frederick N. Zihlman, Senator, Allegany	\$555.00
Benjamin Watkins, Jr., Senator, Anne Arundel	769.50
Carville D. Benson, Senator, Baltimore	494.00
Alexander B. Duke, Senator, Calvert	525.00
Harvey L. Cooper, Senator, Caroline	549.00
Richard S. Snader, Senator, Carroll	505.00
Frank E. Williams, Senator, Cecil	511.00
John F. Mudd, Senator, Charles	523.00
James S. Shepherd, Senator, Dorchester	765.00
John P. T. Mathias, Senator, Frederick	508.00
Harvey J. Speicher, Senator, Garrett	785.00
James J. Archer, Senator, Harford	502.00
Edward M. Hammond, Senator, Howard	493.00
William W. Beck, Senator, Kent	539.00
Eugene J. Jones, Senator, Montgomery	501.00
William F. Holmead, Senator, Prince George's	700.00
J. Frank Harper, Senator, Queen Anne's	743.00
William F. Chesley, Senator, St. Mary's	546.00
Lewis M. Milbourne, Senator, Somerset	767.00
W. Oscar Collier, Senator, Talbot	561.00
Samuel Emmert, Senator, Washington	524.00
Jesse D. Price, Senator (president), Wicomico	1,131.00
Quince Ashburn, Senator (unseated), Worcester	299.00
Quince Ashburn, Senator, contested election expenses, Worcester	1,083.00
Orlando Harrison, Senator, Worcester	569.00
Orlando Harrison, Senator, contested election expenses, Worcester	1,104.41
William Curran, Senator, Baltimore city	790.00
Peter J. Campbell, Senator, Baltimore city	490.00
William M. Maloy, Senator, Baltimore city	490.00
William J. Ogden, Senator, Baltimore city	400.00
Postage stamps furnished senators and committees	803.50
John R. Sullivan, secretary of Senate, Anne Arundel	2,225.00
Charles C. Ford, assistant secretary of Senate, Washington	499.00
Joseph M. George, Journal clerk, Queen Anne's	1,443.00
I. Robert Fleetwood, assistant Journal clerk, Caroline	724.00
Andrew Shabb, reading clerk, Howard	1,243.00
Peyton B. Hodson, sergeant-at-arms, Dorchester	540.00

Peyton B. Hodson, expenses Harrison-Ashburn contest, Dorchester	4.00
Laonel Keyser, chief engrossing clerk, Kent	1,019.00
Nicholas S. Callahan, assistant chief engrossing clerk, Talbot	536.00
James Bradley, postmaster, Baltimore city	465.00
William W. Larmore, assistant postmaster, Wicomico	536.00
Jerome T. Hayman, secretary to president, Wicomico	736.00
Miss Helen E. Poist, stenographer to president, Baltimore city	545.00
Roy E. Smith, doorkeeper to president's room, Wicomico	636.00
Stanley Bedsworth, messenger to president, Wicomico	536.00
Franklin P. Waller, page, Wicomico	361.00
William J. Diggs, page, Anne Arundel	290.00
Hiram J. Soper, page, Howard	293.00
Miss Mary V. McCormick, stenographer to Finance Committee, Baltimore city	465.00
Rev. J. Earle Maloy, chaplain, 30 days, Cecil	186.00
Joseph C. Judge, clerk to Finance Committee, Baltimore city	465.00
Lawrence Keeley, doorkeeper to Finance Committee, Baltimore city	465.00
Miss Cassie Durgin, stenographer to Corporations Committee, Baltimore county	519.00
Russel Phillips, clerk to Judiciary Committee, Baltimore county	469.00
Miss Addie Deering, stenographer to Judiciary Committee, Baltimore county	469.00
Dall Worthington, messenger to Judiciary Committee, Baltimore county	469.00
William Armstrong, clerk to city Senators, Baltimore city	465.00
H. H. Hausman, stenographer to city Senators, Baltimore city	565.00
M. Nickel, messenger to city Senators, Baltimore city	465.00
Luther H. Nichols, clerk to Committee Chesapeake Bay and Tributaries, Anne Arundel	465.00
S. S. Stone, clerk to Elections Committee, Caroline	524.00
John A. Burroughs, folder, Montgomery	281.00

WASTING FUNDS IN STATE GOVERNMENT

(Continued from Page 1.)

Table listing various government employees, their positions, and the amount of money wasted. Columns include names, positions, and amounts. Total amount of expenditures is listed as \$1,811,869.92.

336181  
10 - Conf  
Sum  
August 9th - 1916

336181  
M3

H —

Sun. Aug. 11 - 1915

## "FAT" SALARIES PAID THE STATE LAWYERS

Counselships Long Recognized As  
Wasteful Abuse, But The Fa-  
vored Ones "Had Friends."

### LAST LEGISLATURE AT FAULT

Could Have Enacted Legislation To  
Create State Legal Department,  
But Failed, For Reasons Best  
Known To Its Leaders.

**ARTICLE NO. 11.**  
It is impossible to state exactly the amount of money spent annually by the State of Maryland in fixed counselships and in special fees to lawyers. The salaries paid counsel by the more important departments and offices may be ascertained easily, but there are various minor State offices, departments or institutions that pay counsel fees regularly or for special services, the details of which it is practically impossible to learn. The State has no system of uniform accounting by which all such payments would be shown in the same way in all reports; nor has it a central accounting agency for the analysis of the expenditures of the departments.

But although no one knows what the cost of the State's legal business is, everyone who has been in touch with State affairs knows that it has cost far too much. The waste has been appreciated and discussed for years. In 1912 the Legislature submitted to the people an amendment to the State Constitution giving authority for creation of a State legal department under charge of the Attorney-General, in which all the legal affairs of the State would be concentrated.

The amendment was adopted in the fall of 1913, but the Legislature of 1914, for reasons best known to its leaders, failed to enact legislation necessary to carry out the intent of the constitutional amendment. Another opportunity to bring about this reform will be offered next winter. The people should insist upon it.

#### These Are The Counselships.

- The list of counselships that are known is as follows:
- Automobile Commissioner—David M. Newbold, Jr., counsel, \$500.
- Bank Commissioner—Former State Senator Clarence W. Perkins, counsel, \$500.
- State Board of Health—William Pinkney Whyte, counsel, \$1,500, and former State Senator Henry M. McCullough, special counsel, \$1,200.
- State Roads Commission—Leon E. Greenbaum, counsel, \$2,000.
- Insurance Commissioner—Arthur D. Foster, counsel, \$1,000.
- State Tax Commission—State Senator Edward M. Hammond, counsel, \$2,000.

- State Industrial Accident Commission—J. Walter Lord, counsel, \$1,500.
- Public Service Commission—William Cabell Bruce, general counsel, \$4,800, and Osborne I. Yellott, people's counsel, \$3,000.
- Board of Police Commissioners—Robert F. Stanton, counsel, \$2,000.
- Board of Liquor License Commissioners—George W. Cameron, counsel, \$1,000.
- Board of Election Supervisors—Enos S. Stockbridge, counsel, \$1,200.
- Sheriff of Baltimore City—James B. Guyton, counsel, \$400.

#### Two Give Entire Time.

It should be stated here that the counsel to the Public Service Commission have been included in the list for the sake of the nearest possible completeness of record. It is very much to be doubted whether it would be wise to abolish the legal department of this commission, if a State legal department were instituted.

Mr. Bruce, the general counsel, gives his entire time to his duties and is almost constantly engaged in the preparation or trial of the very important cases in which the commission's decisions are tested; and Mr. Yellott, the people's counsel, is entirely engaged in the big investigations, such as those into the Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company and the United Railways and Electric Company.

It is difficult to see how money could be saved or efficiency promoted at this time by giving the legal work of the commission to a department under the Attorney-General; a few years from now, when the big investigational work of the commission is completed and the original legal questions as to its powers, jurisdiction, etc., have been settled by the courts, it may be feasible to abolish the commission's legal department.

#### Most Are Greatly Overpaid.

The work now done by the other counsel could be handled more cheaply and more efficiently by a State legal department. There is not a single one of the counsel, other than those to the Public Service Commission, who devotes his entire time to his duties, and most of them are rarely seen about the offices which employ them. Taken at large, they are the most overpaid set of lawyers in the State.

Consider the case of Mr. McCullough, the special counsel to the State Board of Health. There was no reason in the world why he should have been appointed—except the political reason. Mr. Whyte, the regular counsel to the board, has been employed for a number of years and has manifested a sincere interest in his work. He has been devoted to his duties—has been one of the counsel who worked—and is said to be the best informed lawyer in the city on sanitary law.

Mr. McCullough was appointed as "special counsel," but when the State Board of Health became involved in litigation recently, the "special counsel" did not assume the burden; Isaac Lobe Straus was called in and was paid a fee of \$500 or so for his work.

It is not meant to reflect in the slightest degree upon Mr. McCullough's legal ability; on the contrary, he is recognized as one of the ablest lawyers in the counties. And it is not meant to reflect upon him personally, for he is a man of very fine character. What is sought to be shown is the bad system—the badness of which is not lessened because good men occasionally have a hand in it.

#### As To State Counsel In City.

Consider the counsel to the three State boards in the city. They are paid a total of \$4,200—paid, by the way, by Baltimore city. It is a pretty safe bet that the three men who draw this money do little, if any, more work than Mr. Perkins, counsel to the Bank Commissioner, who gets \$500.

It is hardly worth while to continue specific cases. In nearly all there is some legal work; nearly all the State departments have need of a lawyer from time to time. But it is manifestly extravagant and foolish to have various departments paying lawyers fat salaries for occasional work, when a properly organized State legal department could handle it all at less cost and with greater efficiency. Imagine a great corporation permitting its departments each to employ a lawyer at whatever sum it thought fit!

J. W. O.

336, (8)

-13

SUN

August 25-16

M3

### RENT AND INSURANCE HEAVY TAX ON STATE

Departmental Office Space In Baltimore Costs Commonwealth About \$40,000 A Year.

### FIRE PROTECTION BILL HUGE

Suggested That Sum Paid For Office Rentals Would Go Far Toward Caring For All Charges On State Office Building And That State Should Arrange To Carry Its Insurance.

#### ARTICLE No. 13.

The State of Maryland annually spends large sums for rent of office space in Baltimore city and for insurance upon public buildings, and many of those who have thought about the expenditures are inclined to think there is a large waste. They believe that it would be far cheaper in the long run for the State to own its own office building in the city and to carry its own insurance.

The total cost of rents for office space in Baltimore city is approximately \$40,000 a year, the details being as follows:

State Tax Commission, floor in Union Trust Building.....	\$3,480
Compensation Board, part of floor in Equitable Building.....	4,250
Public Service Commission, floor in Munsey Building.....	5,000
Public Service Commission, special space in Munsey Building.....	425
Shellfish Commission, part of floor in Marine Bank Building.....	600
Insurance Commissioner, part of floor in Union Trust Building.....	2,250
Bureau of Immigration, part of floor in Hoffman Building.....	600
State Board of Health, part of rent of two floors in the Brown Arcade Building.....	2,500
Bureau of Statistics, part of floor in Equitable Building.....	1,600
Ten-Hour Law Inspection, part of floor in Equitable Building.....	400
Total.....	\$21,165

To this should be added \$16,011.68 which is paid directly from the State Comptroller's office for rents. This sum goes as follows: \$1,500 for part of the rent of the State Board of Health (the board itself pays \$2,500 of its rental of \$4,000); \$700 for rent for the Board of Pardon and Parole, whose offices also are located in the Brown Arcade Building, and \$13,811.68 for rent of three floors in the Garrett Building, where are located the State Roads Commission and the Governor's, Bank Commissioner's, Automobile Commissioner's, State Auditor's and other officials' offices.

There should be added, too, approximately \$2,000 to cover rents of various boards which examine applicants for licenses, such as engineers, moving-picture operators, etc.

To summarize:

Total cost of offices enumerated.....	\$21,165.00
Total rent cost paid from Comptroller's office.....	16,011.68
Approximate cost of sundry offices.....	2,000.00
Grand total.....	\$39,176.68

#### How Money Could Be Saved.

Now suppose the State borrowed \$500,000 to erect or purchase a building for State offices. Such a building might cost more or less, but take \$500,000 as a fair sum. How far would the present rentals of approximately \$40,000 a year go in taking care of the loan?

Half of the present rentals of \$40,000—that is, \$20,000—would pay the interest at 4 per cent., the rate which the State has been paying for money of late. Four per cent. on \$500,000 is \$20,000. That would leave the other \$20,000—one-half of the rentals of \$40,000—for the redemption of the amount the State would have to borrow. How far would that go, bearing in mind that the Constitution provides that State loans may not run longer than 15 years?

The sum of \$20,000 a year compounded annually at 3½ per cent. for 15 years will amount to \$399,420, or approximately \$400,000. The same sum compounded annually at 4 per cent. will amount to \$416,500. If the lower rate, 3½ per cent., be taken the State would be able to save enough from its rentals to pay off \$400,000 of its loan of \$500,000.

It thus will be seen that the \$40,000 a year now paid for rentals would pay the interest on a loan of \$500,000 for an office building and in 15 years would redeem four-fifths of the loan, the raising of the other one-fifth—\$100,000—in the 15-year period being trivial. Upon that basis it would not be long before the State would own, absolutely free of incumbrance, its own building and subsequently, of course, there would be a large saving.

#### Efficiency Would Be Increased.

The figures which have been given take no account of the upkeep, maintenance and other similar charges during the assumed 15-year period. Such charges would be considerable and, of course, would increase the burden upon the State during the assumed 15-year period in which interest and sinking-fund payments would be required.

But when it is remembered that during the assumed 15-year period the present rentals would care for interest and sinking-fund charges, it will be seen that the actual cost of the construction of the building would be the upkeep and maintenance during the period; and it then will be seen that at the end of the period the State would have its own building with no costs whatever except the relatively minor ones of upkeep etc. There would be no taxes, no interest, no sinking-fund to be cared for. The far greater part of the present rentals would be saved.

All of these figures are predicated upon a \$500,000 proposition. As stated before, an office building might cost more or less. A change up or down in the cost would not alter the reasoning; it might make the burden upon the State somewhat greater or less during the 15-year period, but it would not change the ultimate effect.

Getting away from figures, it may be said that the argument for a State office building is this: The State offices would fill a building of fair size; inasmuch as the State would not have to earn a revenue upon its investment nor pay taxes, the cost of a State office building would be less than the total annual rents paid to buildings which must pay taxes and earn revenue.

There is to be considered, too, the increased efficiency which would come from having all State departments under one roof. How long would the officials of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company tolerate a condition under which the heads of the different departments were scattered blocks from each other? In the last few years the State of Maryland has evolved a business organization of very large scope and volume; it is reasonably comparable to large corporations.

#### Insurance Figures Incomplete.

As to the insurance charges paid by the State, the exact figures cannot be given, because the State accounting system does not show the total. The costs of each institution would have to be examined in detail, and that has not been practicable.

However, the statement that the Comptroller paid \$11,466.60 in the fiscal year ended September 30, 1914, and the statement that various institutions separately paid large sums in addition, will give an idea of the total charges. Springfield, for example, has an annual premium of about \$1,800, which is reduced to \$1,200 by purchasing a three-year policy for a two-year premium. Springfield pays about \$1,800 a year.

Agents' commissions usually take from 25 per cent. to 40 per cent. of fire insurance premiums and the companies get administration costs and profits. Ordinarily, the agents' commissions are well earned; for the fire insurance agent usually is the attorney-in-fact and the guardian of his client. But big corporations are finding that they do not need to pay for such service; they are finding they can perform the services for themselves.

The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company carries its own insurance; the city of Philadelphia has carried its own insurance with success, so the writer is informed, for a number of years, and now has a splendid fund. Baltimore city, after finding that it had paid about \$100,000 for insurance in 10 years and had got back only \$10,000, determined to follow Philadelphia's example. It has set aside \$10,000 and plans to do so for a number of years. When the fund has accumulated and compounded sufficiently, it is planned to do away with insurance in the companies and save the \$10,000 a year now paid in premiums.

The State of Maryland could hardly afford to begin carrying its own insurance at once. The danger—rather slight, but a danger, nevertheless—of conflagration might bring down upon the State a serious burden, if there were no insurance. But it might well begin the accumulation of an insurance fund, so that in a few years a sufficiently large fund would be in hand to justify the discontinuation of the present very large outlay—of which, as stated, so large a percentage goes to agents. J. W. O.

336(8)  
M3

14

Sun - Aug. 27 - 1915

## BIG WASTE IN STATE'S AFFAIRS IS REVIEWED

Final Article Summarizes Useless Expenditures In Carrying On Public Business.

### WAY TO ECONOMY IS SHOWN

Abolition Of Sinecures, Centralization Of Power And Adoption Of Modern Business Methods Suggested As Only Means Of Saving Taxpayers' Money.

#### ARTICLE NO. 14.

It seems worth while to close the series of articles upon economy and efficiency in the State government with a summary of the points which have been made against the waste resulting from useless offices, duplication and loose or obsolete methods. The articles probably have not told the whole story. It is quite possible that there is some waste in the State Industrial Accident Commission, the Public Service Commission, the State Tax Commission and other departments which have not been touched, but as most of these departments are relatively new, it has been thought hardly fair to criticize them; they should have opportunity to find themselves, so to say. The purpose of these articles has been to develop for public discussion the definite waste of State funds.

In the first article, four offices were named which should be abolished. The State Wharfinger, John R. Bailey incumbent, receives \$250 a year and has no duties whatever. The State Vaccine Agent, Dr. W. F. Zinn incumbent, receives \$600 a year and has charge of the distribution of vaccine. The duties of this office could be performed more acceptably by the State Board of Health, without any appreciable additional expense.

The Land Commissioner, John J. Hanson incumbent, received \$2,100 salary and \$508.29 fees, a total of \$2,608.29, in the fiscal year ended September 30, 1914. The duties of this office could be taken over by the Secretary of State without additional compensation. It should be possible, too, to reorganize the clerical force in the office so that the expense on this account, which amounted to \$7,600 in the last fiscal year, would be reduced materially.

#### Fire Marshal's Office A Waste.

The State Fire Marshal's office cost \$8,982.98 in the last fiscal year. It is worthless, although the men in the office are of good character and perform their nominal duties faithfully. These officers are: G. Ed. Myers, marshal; John W. Famous, deputy, and "Bennie" Applestein, clerk.

In the second article attention was called to the two State boiler inspectors, the Automobile Commissioner and his office, the Board of State Aid and Charities and the State Auditor.

The boiler inspectors receive \$1,500 a year each. In the last fiscal year the fees, from which they are supposed to be paid, were not sufficient and the State Treasury had to pay them \$1,537.12—more than the salary of one of them. It was stated that at least one of the inspectorships should be abolished, and probably both, because the regulations of the insurance companies have advanced so in recent years that the State inspections are hardly necessary, especially as the State inspectors are required to examine each boiler only once a year. William A. Bryan and John E. Biddinger, both of Baltimore, hold these positions.

#### Should Wipe Out Roe's Office.

The Automobile Commissioner is Harry A. Roe, of Caroline county. His office should be abolished and the work put under the State Roads Commission. Thus his salary of \$3,000 a year could be saved. The executive of the Roads Commission could do all the executive work of the Automobile Commissioner in a tithe of his time. Probably if the Automobile Commissioner's office were placed under charge of the Roads Commission it would be possible to co-ordinate the clerical forces so that a considerable amount of the salaries paid by the Automobile Commissioner could be saved.

The Board of State Aid and Charities cost the State \$3,500 in the last fiscal year; it has \$5,100 for the current year and all of it is likely to be spent. This board was created about 15 years ago with the expectation that it would examine the petitions of institutions seeking State aid and make recommendations to the Legislature and thus relieve that body of the necessity of hearing the claims of representatives of the institutions. The board's membership has included some of the best and most faithful men in the State, and it has done all that was expected of it.

However, the Legislature has ignored its recommendations, so the money spent has been wasted, in the main. The board has collected data in the last few years that have value. This hardly warrants the expenditures made. As now constituted, the board should be abolished. This is said without derogation of the men now on the board or who have been; most of them have given liberally of their time in a thankless, neglected service.

The State Auditor is given \$13,500 a year. Until recently this office was a joke. Since J. Enos Ray has been the incumbent the work of the office has improved, but it is far from justifying the money spent. It was suggested that the work of this office be merged into a department which also would include the Bank and the Insurance Commissioners. The work of all is largely accounting.

#### \$125,000 For Conservation.

In the third article it was pointed out that the State spent approximately \$125,000 in the last fiscal year in conservation and development of its natural resources in seafoods and game; and the question was asked whether anyone could recall having heard that the State handled the business with any degree of efficiency.

This approximate \$125,000 was spent



as follows: Two Fish Commissioners—one for the Western Shore and one for the Eastern Shore—\$10,866; State Game Warden, \$3,291; measurers and inspectors of oysters, \$12,791; Shellfish Commission, \$20,800, and Oyster Navy, \$76,000.

In the fourth article the State Immigration Bureau, the State Sanitary Live Stock Board and the State Veterinarian were discussed. It was shown that the Immigration Bureau received \$10,000 in the last fiscal year and has \$15,000 for the current one. In the former period, \$5,844, more than 50 per cent., when for salaries. This office is burdened with salaried men, having a superintendent at \$2,000 a year; two commissioners at \$500 a year each; a secretary at \$1,200 a year and a clerk and stenographer. The balance of the appropriation went for rent, advertising, traveling, etc. The bureau accomplished practically nothing of importance.

The State Sanitary Live Stock Board is a haphazard affair in charge of important interests. In the current fiscal year it has appropriations totaling \$27,000, of which \$15,000 is for border patrol, \$2,000 for dairy inspection and \$10,000 for other work.

The members of the board in charge of this important department are Harry P. Skipper, Hart B. Noll and Charles W. Melville. They are paid a per diem of \$5, which is estimated as amounting to \$3,000 annually. Without meaning to reflect upon them, it is to be said that having a per diem board in charge of this work inevitably makes for inefficiency. The men do not get enough to warrant giving real attention to their duties. The \$3,000 a year salary cost, or part of it, should be paid one man and he should be required to give his entire time to his duties. It might be well if this work were included in a department having general charge of the State's agricultural interests.

The State Veterinarian is Dr. Lawrence Hickman, who is paid \$1,000 a year. During the foot-and-mouth epidemic Dr. Hickman earned his salary, but under ordinary conditions he is not overburdened. In the nature of things, a \$1,000 expert either is not an expert or has little work to do. If there were a properly organized department in charge of agricultural interests, the work done by Dr. Hickman probably could be handled at little cost.

#### As To Agricultural College.

The fifth and sixth articles dealt with the Maryland Agricultural College. In the former the charge was made that politics polluted the institution. In the latter it was charged that the school spent a great part of its money in teaching engineering and other subjects apart from agriculture, thus duplicating work properly done at other institutions; and, in consequence, neglecting its function of giving agricultural training.

The answer of the college authorities to this is that Federal funds given the college are dedicated, in part, to the teaching of engineering; to which it was replied that the college authorities had made no effort to alter the foolish application of the Federal appropriations. In brief, it was charged that the college failed to give in even reasonable measure the sort of instruction that helped the man in the field.

In the seventh article the waste resulting from having several court clerks in Baltimore city was pointed out. It was stated that there were six clerks and the Register of Wills, each of whom received \$3,500 a year, making a total of \$24,500; and that one clerk at \$3,500 could do all the work, thus saving \$21,000. It also was pointed out that two of the city clerks' offices failed to meet expenses in the last fiscal year and the State Treasury had to pay out for them the sum of approximately \$5,400.

Attention also was called in this article to the waste in the offices of the county clerks and registers of wills. These officials are allowed salaries of \$3,000 a year, if the receipts are sufficient, and most of the clerks get it, although many of them depend upon the deputies to do the work. The deputies, of course, are paid from the receipts of the offices. Most of the registers of wills use all their receipts for their own salaries and those of deputies. They have deputies, usually, when there is little or no work to do; as, for example, in Calvert county, where in the year from January 1, 1913, to January 1, 1914, the total receipts of \$335.92 were divided to give the register \$200 and the deputy \$135.92.

The eighth article was a rejoinder to Dr. H. J. Patterson's defense of the charges made against the Maryland Agricultural College. The substance of the charges, the defense and the rejoinder has been given.

#### Roads Board Too Expensive.

The ninth article had to do with the State Roads Commission, the State Bureau of Statistics and Information and the Ten Hour Law Bureau. It was stated, as to the Roads Commission, that five of the six commissionerships and the secretaryship should be abolished. The Commissioners receive \$2,000 each, and the secretary \$1,800. So far as the Commissioners are concerned, the time has passed when a board is needed; one official at the head of the roads work would meet present necessities. The secretaryship should be abolished because there are no secretarial duties of any consequence to be performed.

In the State Bureau of Statistics and Information, it was stated, there are nine inspectors appointed under the Factory Inspection and Child Labor laws, each of whom is paid \$1,000 a year. Most of those appointed were named for political reasons and not more than five really meet requirements. The consequence of naming persons for political reasons is that the few really competent inspectors are overworked and the laws are not enforced properly.

It also was stated that notwithstanding the number of persons regularly employed, the bureau was compelled to employ a special inspector for the enforcement of the Child Labor laws with respect to newsboys and to employ outside help in compiling its statistics. Again, although a considerable sum is spent for medical aid, the health records of the office are not in proper shape. The responsibility for the condition of these is disputed; but, so far as the writer knows, the fact that the records are not complete never has been questioned.

#### Where Effort Is Duplicated.

The Ten Hour Law Bureau was reported to be doing good work, but it was suggested that it might be combined with the Bureau of Statistics. The Ten Hour Bureau has two inspectors, each paid \$900. If this bureau were combined with the Bureau of Statistics and Information there would be 11 inspectors in all. If they were competent and their duties were co-ordinated there would be a tremendous increase in efficiency.

To illustrate, instead of having one inspector in the factory-inspection work, one on the child-labor work and a third on the 10-hour work, one could do all at the same time. Generally speaking, the same shop must be visited for all

336181

14 - Cont

Sun. Aug. 27, 1915

M 3

three purposes. This would enable the officials to thoroughly enforce the law, for there would be a sufficient inspection force. Having but one inspector for all three inspections would be a great convenience to the employer too. It would mean one visit instead of three.

The Bureau of Statistics and Information receives appropriations for factory inspection, child-labor enforcement and statistical work amounting to \$27,000; the Ten-Hour Law Bureau has an appropriation of \$6,000. Frank A. White is chief and Miss Anna Herkner is deputy chief of the former; Miss Sarah F. Martin is at the head of the latter.

The tenth article gave in detail the salary expenses of the last Legislature—probably the source of the most indefensible waste in the State Government. It is unnecessary to give these details again and space will not permit. About five columns in THE SUN, closely printed, were needed to give the list of "employees." The total cost for the Senate, in which there were 27 members, was \$75,089.32; of the House, in which there were 102 members, \$131,869.02, making a total of \$206,958.34.

The session in which this huge sum was spent lasted only 90 days. It should be understood clearly that the amounts given were only for the per diem and mileage of members for the salaries of "employees," of whom many were keepers of the cloakrooms, day keepers of the toilets, night keepers of the toilets, keepers of the retiring rooms, etc.

#### Big List Of Counsels.

The eleventh article gave the list of counsels to the several State boards, with their salaries, and pointed out the saving and increased efficiency which would be had by organizing a State law department under the charge of the Attorney-General. An amendment to the State Constitution giving authority for the creation of such a department was adopted in 1913, but the Legislature of 1914, for reasons best known to its leaders, failed to enact legislation carrying out the intent of the amendment.

The twelfth gave a statement of the astonishing waste in State printing. It showed that \$19,282.80 was spent in advertising certain public general laws following the last session of the Legislature. Of that \$600 was spent in each county of the State; in some of the counties one paper got the entire \$600, while in others it was divided, the different local papers getting from \$100 to \$400 each. In the city five newspapers—THE SUN, the American, the German Correspondent, the News and the Daily Record—got \$5,482.20. The city papers were required to furnish affidavits that they charged no more than their regular advertising rates. Every dollar of the entire \$19,282.80, whether spent in the counties or in the city, was wasted.

This article also showed that every time proposals to amend the State Constitution are submitted by the Legislature the advertisement of them costs approximately \$20,000. When the Legislature orders the proposals voted on in two groups—that is, one at the Congressional election following the Legislature and one at the general election in the next year—the cost is about \$20,000 in each year. It will cost about \$40,000 to advertise the proposals submitted by the last Legislature, \$20,000 for those voted on last fall and \$20,000 for those to be voted on this fall.

#### Plans For County Papers.

The county newspapers which printed proposals the last time usually received \$300 each. Political favoritism determined which papers should have the advertisements. In Harford county, one of the medium-sized counties, five papers received \$300 each and one received \$150. Allegany county, far larger than Harford, received but \$600, which went to two papers. The total cost of the advertisement in county papers was \$16,600. There were too many papers and each paper received too much money.

In the city the papers which advertised the proposals and the amounts which they received were as follows: THE SUN, \$828.75; the American, \$828.75; the News, \$655.20; the German Correspondent, \$655.20; the Sontag Post, \$655.20; the Colored Man, \$200, and the Maryland Voice, \$200. A total for the city of \$4,023.10.

It was suggested in the article that instead of advertising the entire proposals, which are lengthily worded in legal phraseology, the Attorney-General be required to prepare concise statements of the purport of proposals. These would take far less space and so would cost far less. Moreover, they would be read. No one except lawyers and newspaper men, and few of them, read the long advertisements now printed. It also was suggested that all newspapers, county and city, be required to give affidavits that they charged only their usual rates.

This article also dealt with the State printing contract. At present the printer bids on the job without knowing how big or how little the job will be. If he loses money he goes to the next Legislature and asks for reimbursement. That inevitably tends to abuse, for the printer who has no political pull cannot be sure of reimbursement of loss and so is likely to stay out of the competition, while the printer who has pull and who is sure that he can recover his losses may be extravagant and wasteful. The State printing contract should be reduced to units of work and printers should be required to bid so much per unit.

Again, this article dealt with the routine printing of the several State departments. It was stated that in many of the departments very loose methods were followed, and it was suggested that there should be some central control of this work, the total cost of which is believed to be extremely large.

#### High Cost Of State Rentals.

The thirteenth article gave the list of rentals paid by the State for departments located in the city. The amount was approximately \$40,000. It was shown that this sum would care for the interest and four-fifths of the sinking fund of a loan of \$500,000 to construct or purchase a State office building. The interest and sinking fund charges would last only 15 years, after which the sums applied to them would be saved. The only additional charges during the 15-year period would be for maintenance and upkeep; after the 15-year period maintenance and upkeep would be the only charges.

In this article it also was stated that the State pays a great sum each year for fire insurance. In the last fiscal year the Comptroller's office paid out for this purpose \$11,466.60, and in addition several State institutions paid their own insurance. Spring Grove Asylum pays annually about \$1,200; Springfield about \$1,800, for example.

It was pointed out that Philadelphia has carried its own insurance for years and has saved a great amount of money; that Baltimore city found recently that it had spent \$100,000 in 10 years for fire premiums and had received in that time only \$10,000, and consequently had set aside \$10,000 for a fire insurance fund, with the idea of adding a like amount each year until enough money was on hand to warrant it in discontinuing its fire policies and the cost of them, and that most great corporations carry their own fire risks.

It was suggested that it might be well for the State to begin a State fire insurance fund to the end that its present great payments for premiums might be discontinued in a few years. Of these payments, from 25 per cent. to 40 per cent. go to agents, in addition to the administration costs and the profits of the companies.

In closing these articles the writer desires to express his appreciation of the courtesy of Comptroller Harrington, his chief clerk, Harry J. Hopkins, and State Treasurer Vandiver and his clerks in putting at his disposal the records in their offices and in giving him such assistance in examining the records as was necessary.

J. W. O.

Ev. Sun Aug. 22/15.

5306.181

**WASTE OF THE STATE'S MONEY**

THE SUN this morning published the final article of the series dealing with the waste of money in the State government. The final article is a review and summary of the thirteen articles that preceded it. It is worthy the attention of the people and especially of the General Assembly at the coming session. It shows conditions which cry aloud for amendment and shows how the amendment can be made.

State taxation is higher now, it is believed, than ever before in this State. It is true that a large part of this taxation is imposed for the improvement of the roads and nearly all the remainder for the support of the public schools. Nevertheless, every dollar that can be saved from the revenues which come from indirect taxation and the tax on corporations would tend to decrease the tax rate. Useless offices consume a vast sum of money. The work of many of the commissions and departments with which the taxpayers of the State are burdened could be given to other departments and done at less cost and with greater efficiency.

The party which will control the Legislature at the session of 1916 will find it to its advantage to reform the flagrant abuses and give such relief to the taxpayers as may be possible. Above all else, the usual loot of the treasury and distribution of largess to "deserving Democrats," by placing them on the payrolls of the two houses, should be discontinued.

336.181

News May 7/15

### MAYOR PRESTON ON STATE GOVERNMENT

As Mayor of Baltimore, Mr. Preston occupies a place second only to that of Governor; in some respects his responsibilities and his influence are the greater. His statements concerning his own attitude toward politics is doubly gratifying because that attitude is most unusual for Maryland politicians. His statement as to what the State needs is doubly gratifying because the State does need much of what he says and he is in position at least to force attention to the shortcomings in its system of government.

The idea of a new Constitution for Maryland is by no means novel. Every student of government knows how complex and antiquated some of the passages in our organic law are and how much constructive legislation must be held in abeyance until the way for it has been paved by amendment of refractory clauses in the Constitution.

Much as a new Constitution is needed, we cannot agree wholly with Mayor Preston in his opinion that, for instance, the present one is responsible for the State Treasury's condition. A new Constitution could only compel men to do things which they ought to do of their own accord and which the present Constitution certainly gives them latitude to do.

It is not the Constitution which must answer for the fact that for year after year the Comptroller's report has been issued in a form which defies analysis, which fails utterly to disclose whether the State is running ahead or behind, whether taxes levied for specific purposes are or are not being used for current expenses. The Constitution does not forbid a budget; it does not forbid the Legislature adding up the total of its continuing appropriations before voting them. It does not order finance committees to work in the dark, or the Legislature to pass a thousand and one bills in distribution of the State's money when the whole thing could be done in one well-considered fiscal measure.

The Mayor would have a State Board of Estimates. We already have a Board of Public Works. There is nothing in the Constitution preventing a Board of Public Works, of which the Comptroller is fortunately a member, from making itself thoroughly conversant with the State's financial condition and needs or the Legislature from directing it to review them for its benefit. The prohibition unfortunately lies in the Board itself. There is nothing in the Constitution requiring it to devote its energies to playing politics. In fact, the Constitution predicates the exercise of its functions for the good of the State at large. This is all that any Constitution could do. The trouble is very far from lying wholly with the organic law. Most of it lies with a most unwholesome political conscience.

It would be service enough could the Mayor bring about a decenter conception of what officials owe the State than now obtains at Annapolis. There is no better use to which he could put the political prestige and influence he won last Tuesday than in work to accomplish that end. The News is very glad to see him turning so quickly to it. Certainly the public and political indorsement which efficiency has been given by this city must open Annapolis' eyes.

THE PRIMARIES SYSTEM  
AND STATE EXTRAVAGANCE

While everybody knows that the direct primary of today is not perfect in its operations; that "human nature in politics" has brought out defects in its application to our governmental system, and that it may be open to well-founded criticism in some minor matters, yet there is no denying that it has marked a long political step forward and upward in Maryland. The direct primary is an instrument capable of being made of the greatest good to the Commonwealth as the masses of the Maryland voters come to make proper use of it, and to cherish and advance its beneficent and far-reaching cardinal principle of placing the nomination of party candidates absolutely in their own hands.

That we have progressed far since the days when nominations for the highest offices in the State were made in back rooms at the dictation of one or two or three men, and when the people were not supposed to know or care a continental about party platforms or administrative principles or the personnel of the tickets given them to vote, is being made more and more evident in the present campaign. A striking illustration of the new order of things is seen in the illuminating statement of the facts of governmental extravagance in the articles now being printed by our morning contemporary. The central idea of these articles—that the taxpayers' money has been and is being wasted—is everywhere conceded. Thousands of Marylanders have long known just what has been going on at Annapolis, and The News has often pointed out what was to be expected in the matter of governmental inefficiency and extravagance from the ideals and methods of John Walter Smith and his lieutenants.

For one thing, the direct primary has brought them to a strict accountability before the people in this campaign, and it is interesting to see the alacrity with which they promise to do better if continued in power in the State. Mr. Harrington, to do him credit, did speak in his annual report and through The News some time ago of the certainty of a heavy deficit in the State Treasury because of the reckless appropriations of the last session, and he has been referring daily in this campaign to private and futile pleadings with the Legislature to halt its inroads on the public funds. Mr. Harrington then had the gubernatorial bee in his bonnet, and

he very naturally did not relish the idea of being made a scapegoat in September for the sins of the Smith organization. His friends and backers are just now plaintively confessing their past misdoings and earnestly promising better things in the future. Says the Salisbury Advertiser:

The thing for the Democrats to do is to acknowledge the sins of the past and promise that they won't be guilty again. Let the promise be concrete and definite, and let it be through the official body of the party, the Democratic convention. . . . This is the only way that the Democratic party could face the fall elections with confidence, for the pledge would no longer be the talk of one man, but the voice of the party. It should be no glittering generalities either, but written plainly and simply in language that anyone can understand and language that is not subject to several interpretations. Consolidate all the offices possible to consolidate; do away with all the salaried men the value of whose services are questionable; reduce the number of men on the various boards as low as the work and duties will allow; make no useless officeholders either in the Legislature or the State; take care that the patronage distributed is needed by the State.

For a plea of confession and avoidance the Advertiser, one of the ablest supporters of Harrington and in intimate touch with John Walter Smith, sets out:

The truth of the matter is all politicians, little and big, Democrats and Republicans, have not felt that it was unfair for the State of Maryland to pay hardworking party men for services rendered.

And this is the contribution of the Kent News:

The organization in Kent stands for reducing expenses of State Legislatures, of inaugurating better business methods for handling the State appropriations, and urge progressive business methods in all departments of the Government of the State.

Here is very frank confession that things are wrong. But it is curious to find the virtue of confession by those responsible for the past being used as the chief argument for their return to power. Why should those who have plunged the State into waste and careless government be the ones best fitted to rehabilitate it? If Maryland has at length succeeded in driving them to such confession in order to continue in power, why should the victory be lessened by giving them an election for the sole purpose of seeing whether they can reform?

News Aug 16/15

Handwritten scribbles and numbers, possibly "31" and "7".

336181

News Letter, 1/15.

## GET ROOT'S VIEWS

### Goodnow And Griswold See New York Senator.

### Commission's Head Tells Of The Work That It Is Doing For Reform At Annapolis.

In the course of an interview had with him today by a reporter for The News, Dr. Frank J. Goodnow, president of Johns Hopkins University and chairman of the Democratic Economy and Efficiency Commission, gave out the information that he had consulted Senator Ellhu Root, one of the greatest constitutional lawyers in the country, in the course of the Commission's work.

#### Talked At Length With Root.

Dr. Goodnow and E. Howell Griswold, Jr., another member of the Commission, talked at length with Senator Root in Washington on November 20. They explained to him, as far as they could, the situation in Maryland and what the Commission hopes to accomplish, and the New York statesman gave them the benefit of his advice, all of which will come out later when the Commission makes its report.

Senator Root was president of the recent New York Constitutional Convention and was interested in bringing about certain Legislative reforms in his own State. His ideas, however, while indorsed by many thoughtful citizens and a portion of the press, did not make the same impression upon some of the politicians, and he could not accomplish all of the reforms desired.

#### Why New Yorker Was Seen.

"Senator Root," said Dr. Goodnow, "is the only outside man of prominence that we have conferred with, and we sought him on account of his great ability and familiarity with the subject of Legislative reforms. We are, however, having the active cooperation of prominent men in Maryland, and I think, all things considered, we are getting along very well."

#### After Comptroller's Statement.

Mr. Harvey S. Chase of Boston, recognized as a financial expert, as is generally known, has been retained by the Commission, and has already begun his examination. He is now temporarily in Massachusetts on an important matter, but two of his men are at work here and at Annapolis.

Mr. Chase hopes to get from the Comptroller a statement in full of the financial condition of the State. Our idea, of course, is to discover just where we can find a saving to the taxpayers. Something may be done in this way by pruning down certain appropriations.

Mr. Ritchie, the Attorney General-elect, will report on a reorganization plan of the legal work of the State.

Dr. Flack, head of the Department of Legislative References at the City Hall, is helping us materially. He has supplied considerable information of the expenditures of the State Government as compared with the expenditures in other States.

#### Discussing Budget System.

"The Commission is discussing the best sort of budget to get up, and, therefore, we are going slow and securing information from such sources as we believe will be valuable. At this stage we could not indicate where the pruning knife can be used justly and to the greatest advantage and where the saving can be accomplished. These things are subjects for thought and consideration, and the result will be given in our recommendations to the Legislature."

The next meeting of the Commission will be held on Wednesday, December 8.

336.131

Star Dec. 4/151

## PLAN FOR BUDGET SYSTEM IN SHAPE

Goodnow Efficiency Commission Have Two More Details to Act Upon.

The final two important details connected with the proposed state budget system are to be settled next Wednesday afternoon by the Goodnow Efficiency Commission. These points are: First, who shall be delegated to prepare the budget for presentation to the Assembly, the Governor or the Board of Public Works; second, whether the legislature shall have power to increase the total amount of the budget as presented and to insert new items or whether the sole power of change shall be to cut down the totals and eliminate items.

Members of the commission said today that these two details would be disposed of at the meeting next week and that the commission would then take up the so-called useless state office, which will be recommended to the Assembly to be abolished.

The unfinished features of the budget system are the subjects of much discussion. The commission, through Harvey S. Chase, a national efficiency expert, has obtained copies of the budget systems of Ohio, Illinois, Massachusetts, New York and other states. While the principles of these systems are practically identical, they differ in many minor details. Some experts believe the authority to make up the budget should be vested in the chief executive, while others maintain that some board, such as the Board of Public Works of Maryland, should have the power.

The more important feature, however, is the question of what authority shall be vested in the legislature to make changes in the budget. There is a strong argument, officials say, for legislation which would place the Assembly in a position similar to the City Council of Baltimore in the consideration of the municipal budget. The Council has authority to eliminate items included in the budget by the Board of Estimates, but no power to increase the included amounts or to insert new items. There is some opposition to this plan for the Assembly, however, the argument being that the legislators should have equal authority with the Governor or the Board of Public Works to create items for the budget. This would make the latter hardly more than a preliminary report by the executive to the legislative department.

33 181

June July 28/15.

# PATTERSON REPLIES TO M. A. C. CRITICISMS

## Inserts Advertisement Defending Work And Methods Of College Park School.

### EVASION OF ISSUE, SAYS J. W. O.

Does Not Discuss Charges Made In  
Articles In The Sun That Politics  
And Poor Financial Management  
Are Apparent In Administration  
Of The Institution.

#### ARTICLE VIII.

Dr. Harry J. Patterson, of the Maryland Agricultural College, advertises in THE SUN today an answer to the criticisms of the college made in two of the articles in the "economy and efficiency" series.

After stating that it usually is difficult to measure the results of education in concrete terms Dr. Patterson says that fortunately for the agricultural college, it is able to cite certain specific evidences of the value of its work.

He then states that a Worcester county fruit grower neglected the advice of the college for two years and lost his crops, but in the third year accepted the college's advice and netted \$25,000 on his crop; that the next year a Harford county fruit grower followed the college's advice and did well, and a Carroll county dairyman increased his profits in one year \$300 by spending \$30 for testing his cows. Dr. Patterson says these are "typical examples of thousands of instances in which concrete, practical returns have been brought to the farmers of every county of this State, directly through the helpful teachings of the college."

#### Cites Corn Increases.

He follows with a statement that the average yield of corn per acre in Maryland in the last 13 years has exceeded the yield of the preceding 13 years by 7.35 bushels per acre. And, after stating the work of the college and experiment station, he implies that the college is largely responsible for this.

He then proceeds to discuss the work of the college proper. First, he refers to the Federal appropriations and quotes from letters written by the late Senator Justin S. Morrill to show that the appropriations in the bills bearing his name were intended to be used in part, at least, for engineering training. Dr. Patterson next discusses the lethargic attitude which prevailed for some years toward agricultural training, and says that it has only been through the "work of the colleges and experiment stations that the interest in and the possibilities of agriculture are beginning to be appreciated by the masses."

#### Would Abandon Department.

Dr. Patterson then states that the preparatory department of the school has been abandoned, but that a subcollegiate department is necessary, owing to the meagre acquirements of many high school students applying for admission. He states that it is hoped to abandon this subcollegiate department shortly because of the advancing standards of public education. He follows with this statement of the roster of the school: The student enrollment for the past year totals 659, classified as follows:

A—Collegiate students.....	225
B—Subcollegiate students.....	60
C—Unclassified students.....	15
D—Short course students.....	213
E—Summer school (1915).....	140
F—Postgraduate.....	6

Total ..... 659

This enrollment is analyzed by Dr. Patterson as follows: Class A, 73 per cent. are pursuing agricultural subject and 27 per cent. nonagricultural subjects; Class B, courses not selected; Class C, majority taking agriculture; Class D, all taking agriculture, and Class E, taking agriculture, pedagogy and domestic science.

Dr. Patterson then gives a statement of the receipts of the college, exclusive of about \$30,000 received from students, which, he says, is devoted to paying their living expenses, and makes a comparison of these receipts with those of agricultural colleges in other States.

Next comes a summary of the new activities of the college during the last two days, which are as follows: Adding of courses in agricultural education and engineering education for teachers, adding of courses in canning, bacteriology and rural engineering and a short court in road-making, introduction of summer school for rural school teachers, preparing of lessons in vocational education for use in public schools, correspondence courses in nature of "farm helps" for farmers, ministers' rural life and every-day life, systematic publicity, articles being regularly published in county newspapers, co-operating with banks and in sending out farm helps to depositors, cooperating with the Baltimore city government in giving systematic help to residents in protecting and improving lawns, trees, etc., inauguration of regular extension service in agriculture and home economics, consolidation and systematization of college and experiment station libraries, construction of new buildings and inauguration of farmers' day.

#### Defense "Wilderness Of Detail."

Dr. Patterson's defense of the Maryland Agricultural College consists in a wilderness of detail which might be valuable if it were as ingenious as it is ingenious. In order intelligently to consider it as an answer to the two articles which appeared in THE SUN last week, it is necessary to recall the substance of those articles.

The first article charged that the board of trustees of the college are almost constantly enmeshed in politics and that, in consequence, the college has been retarded seriously.

The second article charged that the college suffers (1) from a hodge-podge application of its finances, and (2) from inadequate funds. And it stated that the first was the greater evil because had the funds appropriated been used properly the results of the college's work probably would have been such that little difficulty would have been experienced in obtaining the additional money needed. As a glaring example of misapplication of the present funds, the article called attention to the fact that a considerable body of the students did not study agriculture at all.

It was stated that the college authorities claim that they must maintain the non agricultural departments because of provisions in the Federal acts of appropriations; but it also was stated that an able lawyer had questioned the soundness of the authorities' interpretation of the act. And it was further stated that despite the authorities' view as to the inelasticity of the Federal acts with reference to abolishing the engineering departments at the college, the acts had been found sufficiently elastic to permit the college to designate the Princess Anne department of Morgan College as its Eastern Branch and to pay over to it a part of its Federal appropriations. Morgan College, it should be understood, is a school for negroes.

#### First Article Recalled.

Now as to the first article, which charged that the trustees play politics and that the college has been injured thereby, Dr. Patterson says not one word about that in his defense. The reason is simple. Dr. Patterson knows that the work of the trustees has reeked with politics; he knows that there was a substantial political division in the board when he was elected president about two years ago, for example. And he knows, as well as any one in the world, that the recent fight over the election of a secretary and treasurer—the business man of the college—was a political fight of the baldest character.

As to the charge in the second article that the receipts of the college are applied in hodge-podge fashion and that this evil is the root evil of the college—Dr. Patterson does not discuss that, except in the briefest and vaguest way. Inasmuch as that is the question at issue, so far as the article in THE SUN is concerned, it will be considered again at this time. But for the sake of clarity

the points of special pleading made by Dr. Patterson will be disposed of first. They will be taken up seriatim.

Dr. Patterson says that after neglecting the advice of the college for two years a Worcester county fruit grower took the college's advice in the third year and netted \$25,000 on his crop; that the next year a Harford county fruit grower took the advice of the college and did proportionately well. And so on. Dr. Patterson says these are "typical examples."

#### As To Fruit Growers.

The Worcester county fruit grower is Senator Orlando Harrison, head of the large Harrison nurseries. He followed the advice of the college in 1913. The Harford county fruit grower is Gen. Murray Vandiver, Treasurer of the State, chairman of the Democratic State Central Committee and a member of the board of trustees of the college for years. It is entirely true that they benefited by taking the college's advice.

The question is whether the Harrison and Vandiver instances are "typical examples," as Dr. Patterson says. And the answer to the question is that they are not. Dr. Patterson is inaccurate. They are not "typical examples"; they are the most isolated examples imaginable. Right there is the milk in the coconut.



338/151

See July 28/15.

2

The Agricultural College has been in existence a half century or more; it has spent thousands and tens of thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars, but it had not enough of the confidence of the farmers of this State to persuade Senator Harrison to follow its advice until after his crop had failed twice; or to persuade General Vandiver—who has been one of its trustees for years—to follow its advice until the year following that in which Senator Harrison took a chance. And those years were but two and one ago, respectively.

"Typical examples," indeed! Does anyone suppose, if the college through its many years had won an authoritative position with the farmers and had done efficient work in many instances, that two such advanced farmers as Senator Harrison and General Vandiver would have endured crop failure after crop failure before taking its advice.

Of course, the college did good work in these two instances. Of course, the character of the work it did has been proved good, time and again in all parts of the country. The whole point is that the Agricultural College has not been enough of an agricultural college to win the confidence of the mass of the farmers of this State in such matters.

**More Light On Corn Crops.**

Dr. Patterson's implication that the college and experiment station are responsible for the increase in the production of corn is disingenuous. He knows very well that numerous agencies—public and private—have contributed to that advance in agriculture. His work probably helped, although his speech before the last Legislature suggests that he does not think his experiment station has done all that it might have in the way of increasing corn production. Dr. Patterson then said:

"By the expenditure of from \$5,000 to \$10,000 per year for five years for conducting demonstrations and investigations in corn growing the average yield could be increased to at least 40 bushels per acre. This small increase would give an annual return of over \$3,000,000 to the farmers of this State, or over \$60 per farm."

Consider now the question of the application of the college's finances, as stated by Dr. Patterson. The point made by everyone who looks into the affairs of the agricultural college is that it is wasteful and foolish to have engineering departments there when the State has given \$500,000 to Johns Hopkins University to establish a great school of technology, and that the money given to the Agricultural College should be used for agricultural training.

How does Dr. Patterson meet that? Simply by quoting letters written by poor, dear old Senator Morrill, whose life and work were in another generation. Senator Morrill, having indicated in general terms that the purpose of the acts bearing his name was to promote the mechanical arts as well as agricultural training, Dr. Patterson regards it as settled that the Maryland Agricultural College should continue its nonagricultural departments, regardless of the amount of money the State may be spending in other schools for such departments.

**Indicates Warped Reasoning.**

Nothing could indicate better the warped, self-centred reasoning which has dominated the affairs of the Maryland Agricultural College. Not a sign of an effort to co-ordinate its work with that of other State institutions. Not a sign of an effort to show the Federal authorities the recognized unwisdom of the present application of Federal money and to remedy that evil, as an able lawyer has suggested that it may be. "It can't be done!" Such is the attitude.

The underlying reason for this may be found in a paragraph in the next section of Dr. Patterson's defense. He says:

"The policy of the college is to offer instruction in the four-year courses of a grade consistent with the dignity of a State college."

There it is! "Dignity of a State college!" Not what does the State need; not how can we fit in with the State's other educational endeavors; not what will promote the broadest agricultural education among the men in the field; not any of that, but "dignity!"

Consider next the college's roster to determine how many of the students in the collegiate department are taking agriculture. Dr. Patterson, by piling in short-course students and summer-school students, arrives at the somewhat imposing total of 659.

But go into his figures a bit deeper and see what is to be seen. The regular students are as follows: 225 collegiate students, 60 subcollegiate students and 15 unclassified students, a total of 300. Of the group of 15, so Dr. Patterson says, "the majority" are taking agriculture. He does not say specifically how many. As the group is small, it may be disregarded. In the other two groups are a total of 285. How many are taking agriculture?

Of the 225 collegiate students 73 per cent., or 164, are taking agriculture; 27 per cent., or 61, are not. None of the 60 subcollegiate students is not taking agriculture. That means of the 285 students in question—practically the whole regular student body—164 are taking agriculture and 121 are not. An excellent showing for an agricultural college, is it not?

**Not On Basic Question.**

The next part of Dr. Patterson's defense deals with the activities started in the last two years. While the list rather reminds one of the list of ills curable by a popular patent medicine, there is no disposition upon the part of the writer to decry them. They are good. But they are the very minor phases of an agricultural college's work; they are the college's "scintillations" and have nothing to do with consideration of the basic question of whether the Maryland Agricultural College is serving efficiently the needs for thorough agricultural education, whether it is using the money given it strictly to that end. Of course, it has a Young Men's Christian Association and so on; what college has not?

The other matters discussed by Dr. Patterson, fertilizer tests, etc., really have nothing whatsoever to do with the question of the efficiency of the college and it would be futile to waste time and space in discussion of them.

Now to get back to the main proposition raised in THE SUN's articles. The assertion was made that the college is spending its money in a hodgepodge way; that is, it is spending a great deal upon departments that are cared for in other institutions and should be cared for there, while it is neglecting its primary work of agricultural education. Not one word has been said by Dr. Patterson in refutation of that. In fact, he admits it and enters a plea by way of confession and avoidance.

Dr. Patterson's defense is otherwise devoted to extolling the work of the college as it is today, and an attempt to convince the people that it is now an institution of genuine service. The writer will rest, as to this, by quoting from the speech made by Dr. Patterson when he appeared before the last Legislature in support of a measure to give the college a larger appropriation. Dr. Patterson said:

"This measure is intended to broaden the scope of the work of the Maryland Agricultural College in order to make it an institution of real service to the State. Its work should be made to reach and help the 50,000 farms in Maryland."

The italics are Dr. Patterson's.  
J. W. O.

336 181

## COMMISSION PLAN STIRS

Harrington's Suggestion For Democratic Convention Discussed.

### JOSEPH D. BAKER APPROVES IT

Mayor Preston Objects, Saying Pro-  
v-  
ince Is That Of Governor, Attor-  
ney-General And Comptroller.

The suggestion from Comptroller Emerson C. Harrington, candidate for the Democratic nomination for Governor, that the Democratic State Convention name a commission to study the problem of useless offices and waste in the State government—the commission to report to the next session of the Legislature in January—was discussed generally yesterday and was approved by most of those who considered it.

Few of those interested in the reform doubt the wisdom of having a commission to investigate conditions and to formulate a comprehensive plan of reorganization and reform. It seems to be believed by nearly all that the best and most lasting results can be reasonably assured only in that way. Otherwise, it is argued, there is serious danger of hodge-podge, catch-as-catch-can efforts at reform, even though those making them be entirely sincere.

#### Personnel Important Part.

And most of those in favor of a commission appeared to think that the Harrington plan was good in its general outline, especially in that it promised quick results. The big thing to be certain of in connection with the plan, it was pointed out, would be the personnel of the commission. If the men named by the State convention were of unimpeachable standing and recognized ability the people of the State would take the naming of them and their work at face value; if they were not such men—if they were men who had been very close to political management or very close to the conditions needing reform—naturally the very naming of them would be accepted as an evidence of insincerity.

Those in favor of the Harrington plan made the point that the Democratic State Convention would not dare name any other than the highest type of men. They reasoned that the character and ability of the men named would be taken as an index by the people of the real worth of promises of reform and that the Democratic leaders would realize it full well and would not take the slightest chance of disappointing the citizenry of the State.

Another point was made by the advocates of the Harrington plan, to assure honest treatment of the problem. It was that notwithstanding the naming of a commission, the candidates for Governor, in both the Democratic and Republican parties, be required by the voters to talk specifically about their plans for abolishing useless offices and eliminating waste. That, it was argued, would bring out the ideas which follow discussion and would force the candidates to take open and definite positions.

#### Baker Agrees With Comptroller.

Joseph D. Baker, who was the first man publicly to suggest a commission and whose suggestion was amended by Mr. Harrington, accepted the latter's idea. He said that plainly it would be far better to have the commission named in time to report to the next Legislature than to have it named by that Legislature to report, in the main, to the Legislature of 1918.

Mayor Preston took a stand during the day against a commission. He gave out a statement in which he made no reference to the Harrington plan, but discussed Mr. Baker's suggestion in some detail. The Mayor's idea is that the Governor, Attorney-General and State Comptroller, to be elected this fall, should be depended upon to whip the reforms into shape.

Senator Blair Lee, who is opposing Mr. Harrington for the nomination, was in Queen Anne's county yesterday with his running mates, State Senator William Milnes Maloy, for Attorney-General, and William B. Copper, for State Comptroller. It was impossible to obtain a statement from Senator Lee about the Harrington plan, because he was "on the jump" all day campaigning. He is expected to be in the city today and may have something to say.

Mr. Baker, in discussing the Harrington plan last night, said:

"I accept Mr. Harrington's amendment, and do it very gladly, for it would mean the saving of two years and all the waste and useless effort that would be expended in that time, and would, consequently, save that much of the taxpayers' money. I suggested the appointment of a commission to study the entire problem of doing away with useless offices and systematizing the State's expenditures, because I, as well as any thoughtful man, realizes that it would be practically impossible for the Legislature to do that work itself. It is work that will require time and study and absolutely disinterested effort and it is a task worth the best brains in the State.

#### Warns Against Partisanship.

"If the Democratic convention is composed of men broadminded enough to rise above partisanship and appoint a commission that will have no political tinge, and be composed of men in whom the entire State will have confidence to make plans for putting the State on a basis of economy and efficiency, then I think it would be an admirable thing for it to do. But if it should appoint a purely partisan commission, composed of officeholders, or prospective officeholders, it would immediately be discredited in the minds of the people, and it would fail of its purpose. No better plan to disgust the people could be devised than that, and no better plan could be adopted to jeopardize the success of the Democratic party in the coming elections, or to convict it of insincerity and bad faith. And when I say these things I am speaking as a Democrat interested in the success of my party. But I am a Democrat who believes that honesty, sincerity and absolute fair play is the best policy in politics as it is in business.

"If the convention should undertake to appoint a commission, that commission ought to be removed as far from politics as possible, it should be non-political, and there should be no geographical distinction drawn regarding its composition. The best and ablest men in the State should be chosen for the work, irrespective of their politics or their residence, and the work be put up to them as a patriotic duty, and I am enough of an optimist and have enough faith in human nature to believe

that if a party convention should be able to rise far enough above partisanship to appoint such a commission, the members of the commission would absolutely ignore possibilities of party advantage and work solely in the interests of the people of the entire Commonwealth.

#### "Best Work Party Could Do."

"As a matter of fact this would be the very best work the Democratic party could do, and the accomplishments of such a commission would mean more to the State than the work of the Governor or the Legislature. The best men in Maryland would be glad to serve on such a commission, for it would be an opportunity for them to do something unparalleled in the State's history. The convention would only have to name the men it wanted, and no man worthy the name of Marylander, no matter what his politics, would refuse to serve. And if such a commission should be appointed, it could do more to put Maryland to the front as a model State than all other agencies now existing in Maryland combined.

"If the State convention takes such action as Mr. Harrington recommends, it should pledge its nominee for Governor and the Democratic members of the Legislature to the ratification of the appointment of the commission at the very first meeting of the Legislature, and it should also pledge the members of the Legislature to make an immediate appropriation for the necessary expenditures of the commission, authorizing it to employ such expert help as it might need, requiring every State official to give it all the information in his possession, and throwing open every book and every office of the State Government to its examination.

"Mr. Harrington has evidently given much more thought to the matter than I have been able to do, and as I said before, I think his plan for the appointment of a commission by the State convention a splendid one. And it ought to be adopted. If the Democratic convention does not adopt the idea, I believe the Republicans will do it. They are not likely to let slip such an opportunity.

#### Mayor Against Plan.

Mayor Preston, after paying a tribute to Mr. Baker, said that he could not agree with his suggestion of a commission for a number of reasons. He said that it would mean the loss of two years, that a delay of two years probably would result in half-way expedients, rather than thorough reforms, and that a commission such as Mr. Baker had in mind, including an expert accountant, would entail a large additional expense.

#### Continuing, he said:

"If we mean business about a systematic method of managing the State's finances, which will keep our appropriations within our receipts and save the taxpayers millions of dollars, we will adopt a real budget system by constitutional provision. We don't need any commission to tell us how to do this. We have this budget system in the Baltimore City Charter. We have had actual experience with it for 17 years. It has worked admirably. It has saved the taxpayers of Baltimore millions of dollars. It has enabled us to spend more than \$20,000,000 each year for four years in succession without increasing the city tax rate.

Sun Aug 17/15

W. B. L. LST

Sun Aug 19 / 15

(2)

"If the people of Maryland are in earnest about this matter; if they really want permanent reform and economy in the matter of making appropriations, the only thing necessary is to put into the State Constitution the same provisions for a budget system for the State that were put in the City Charter for the city by the Act of 1898, chapter 123. This could only be done by a constitutional amendment or a new constitution, abolishing useless offices, consolidation of boards and other similar economies can be done by the Legislature; but these things should be done by the Legislature of 1916.

**Looks To Legislature.**

"We will get better results from this coming Legislature than from the Legislature of 1918. Experience in all governmental reforms teaches that the best results are obtained when action is secured while the subject is fresh in the minds of the people. The rapid increase in the State tax rate; the present deficit of \$1,500,000, the exposures of waste and useless offices made by THE SUN and the promises of all the candidates have brought the subject prominently before the people. Everybody is demanding the cutting off of useless expense, the abolition of useless offices and a business administration. We will get results if we do it now.

"No better commission could be formed to study and work out a detailed plan to submit to the Legislature, than the Governor, Comptroller and Attorney-General, who will be elected in November. They will have studied the subject for at least six months during the primary and the general election campaigns; they will have two months more after the election before the Legislature meets; they will have an incentive to suggest the best plan possible in order to make a record for their administration; their recommendation would probably have more weight with the Legislature than that of any commission which might be appointed, and they would perform this service without expense to the taxpayers beyond their regular salaries.

"In this way we would get action promptly while the subject is fresh in the minds of the people, and while the State officers and the Legislature are fresh from the people, and their campaign promises are fresh in their minds and in the minds of the people. Thus we can best secure the needed reform in the matter of economy.

**Again Urges Convention.**

"In order to bring about any change which involves a reorganization of the financial structure of the State Government, the very best commission is a Constitutional Convention. This I advocated in an interview some time ago. We ought not to hesitate about calling a Constitutional Convention for fear of legislating somebody out of office. The public welfare should not be hindered by the personal interests of individuals. Moreover the Constitution may contain a provision that every judge or other officeholder then in office should continue in office until his term expired.

"Above all I think it most important that this matter of deficit and the adoption of financial plans should not be forgotten or delegated to a commission. These people in charge of the State's finances have been caught red-handed with the goods, and the people ought to attend to it at once. The commission idea means delay—a postponement until after election. The best commission in the world is the men who are going to be nominated and elected, and they will have plenty of time to consider it. One and a half million of dollars deficit means about 15 cents on the tax rate of every property owner in Maryland. Do not let us nominate men who have created this condition."

336.181

W. Rev Aug. 19/15

**WHO SHOULD NAME THE COMMISSION?**

If any comprehensive and adequate reorganization of State affairs in the interest of economy and efficiency is to be accomplished, a systematic plan must be formulated for submission to the Legislature by some competent man or body of men. This seems too obvious for discussion and is admitted by practically everybody.

The only question seems to be as to the best method of selecting the men or commission to do the work. THE SUN is not wedded to the proposal that the Democratic Convention name such a commission, if anybody can suggest some better plan. So far, however, it seems to us the most practical and expeditious method that has been spoken of, and the one most likely to get results.

Mayor Preston's idea that the matter be left to the three men elected, respectively, Governor, Attorney-General and Comptroller is, we think, not at all a good one. These candidates will be as busy as possible until after the election in November, then they will need a rest, then they will be preparing to assume office and will be busy with office-seekers, politicians and advance work. They will have no time to draft reform measures.

Besides this, the personal political interests and political obligations of the newly elected officials will be so entangled with the proposals to abolish offices and the like that it would be unfair to expect them to tackle the subject with the open mind and broad view of men who are in no way interested.

It is also suggested that the commission be named by civic and business organizations and others in co-operation. One of the objections to this is that the work of such a commission would lack that party authority which may be necessary to put the reform through the Legislature. There is certain to be strong if not public opposition. A determined effort will be made to emasculate any real reform plan by amendments or otherwise. It would be in danger of meeting the fate of the Mahool city charter in 1910.

Civic organizations might perhaps name an abler commission, but its work would not have the authority of the party behind it and would be much more apt to go on the rocks of political manipulation.

The same objection applies with even greater force to a bipartisan commission, which might be an ideal body, if it were practical—which it would not be.

336-281

## ASKS FAIR ASSESSMENT

Mayor Blames State's Financial Commission On Inequalities.

### WRITES TO GOODNOW BOARD

Extension Of Budget System To All Of Maryland Urged And Revision Of Constitution Indorsed.

Mayor Preston yesterday sent a strong letter to the Goodnow Economy and Efficiency Commission, in which he urged that the commission look into the "fundamental question of taxation and assessment for taxation," stating that "inequality in the assessment of property and the consequent injustice in the contributions levied for the support of the State government have been notorious for years." He cited recent testimony of County Commissioner George Yellott, of Baltimore county, in support of this statement.

The Mayor set forth that the State Tax Commission was created by the Legislature of 1914 "for the purpose of correcting these outrageous inequalities in assessment, but they have practically accomplished nothing toward that end so far."

#### Not Limited To Budget.

Mr. Preston began his letter by saying that when he appeared before the commission some time ago he gathered that there was an idea among some of the members that the commission was limited under the terms of the Democratic platform to consideration of the budget system. He quoted from the platform to show that the commission was authorized to propose such laws and such amendments to the Constitution "as may be necessary to prevent waste and duplication, and to promote the greatest possible economy and efficiency in the administration of the State's affairs."

He then stated that in his judgment a constitutional convention is needed to frame a new constitution which will meet the needs of this day, adding that while the present Constitution has been amended frequently, experience has shown that amendments are carelessly submitted by the Legislature and voted upon by only a minority of the people. In a constitutional convention, he continued, the whole question of the organic law of the State would be thrashed out thoroughly.

#### Urges Budget System.

Mr. Preston went on to urge the adoption of a budget system patterned after that which has been in use in Baltimore city during the last 17 years. He said half the population of the State has lived under the budget plan for years and is satisfied, and asked, Why put aside the experience of Baltimore and go elsewhere for a plan?

He then discussed the taxation question, as follows:

"In Baltimore city the Appeal Tax Court tries to live up to the requirement of the law that all property be assessed at its full value. In the counties they do not make any pretense of assessing the property for its full value."

"In a recent case tried in Baltimore county, George Yellott testified, under oath, that certain property was worth from \$200 to \$250 per acre, when it was assessed for \$50. He was a County Commissioner, and it was his duty to increase any assessment that was below full value, and, when he was asked why he did not increase that assessment, if he thought the property was worth over \$200 an acre, his brother, John I. Yellott, made the excuse that, if the County Commissioners assessed everybody's property at its full value, he would not be able to be re-elected."

#### Report Only Result.

"The State Tax Commission was appointed by the Act of 1914, Chapter 841, at very considerable expense, for the purpose of correcting these outrageous inequalities in assessment, but they have practically accomplished nothing toward that end so far. They have, however, gotten up a very valuable report which shows that the assessment of all kinds of property in Baltimore city amounts to \$733,915,133.06, while the total assessment in all the State outside is only \$540,909,678.19. Of course, the value of all the property within the 31 square miles comprising the present city limits is not half as much as the value of all the property in all of the counties in the State, including all of the other cities in the State outside of Baltimore. It is said that in some of the cities they have two assessments, one on which they levy taxes for the city, and a lower assessment on which they levy taxes for the State."

#### Cites Sections Of Report.

"In the report of the State Tax Commission of Maryland for 1912, on Page 14, it is said: 'Many cities and towns assess property for local municipal purposes at a valuation which is nearer the actual value than the same property is assessed for State and county purposes.'

On Page 15, it is stated, as two illustrations, that in Cumberland the assessment for city purposes is \$16,098,010, while the assessment for State purposes is only \$9,000,000, and that Crisfield is assessed for municipal purposes at \$1,616,462, while the entire election district, of which Crisfield is a small part, is assessed for State and county purposes at \$1,258,965. Numerous other instances of like contrast are set out in the discussion under the assessment methods of the counties. . . . The taxable basis of some counties represents 80 per cent. of the true value of property, while in other counties the taxable basis represents only 40 per cent. of the true value."

#### Asks For Equal Assessment.

"If the State Tax Commission would do its duty and make a new assessment of all the property of the State at its fair value, as the law requires, the problem of getting enough revenue to pay the State's expenses would be pretty well solved, and it seems to me that this is not only a question with which your commission should deal, and upon which it should make a report, but that it is the most important question within the scope of your commission's inquiry. If the Act of 1914, Chapter 841, does not give the State Tax Commission sufficient power to correct these inequalities then that act should be amended."

"It seems to me that your commission could discharge no more important duty to the public than to suggest such method of procedure, or such amendment of the law, or both, as will make the State Tax Commission accomplish the result of equalizing the assessment throughout the State, which was the chief purpose of its creation."

Sun Dec 8/15

BB 6/18/81

Ev sun Aug 20 1915

**MAYOR PRESTON AND MR. WELLER  
LESSON ON AN ECONOMY  
COMMISSION**

As Mayor Preston:

I wish to renew my objection to postponing the getting rid of the useless State offices and relegating it to a commission appointed by anybody. This only means postponing it until after the nomination and election.

I believe in doing it ourselves, and making the State ticket elected by the people responsible for it. I do not believe in sidestepping the issue. Let us go at it and abolish the unnecessary offices—install economy of government, adopt the budget system in the Legislature and provide in the Constitution for budget requirements. . . . No commission of experts is necessary. . . . It simply requires the exercise of reasonable common sense. Do not let us postpone it until after the election, but discuss it now. . . .

To nearly all of which we can say "Amen" most heartily. But, Mr. Mayor, the naming of a commission by the Democratic Convention to work out a comprehensive and sensible plan is not postponing the matter, but expediting it in the most common-sense way that we know of; it is not sidestepping the issue, but, to the exact contrary, is committing the party and the candidates in the strongest possible way to the issue of economy and efficiency.

Naming a commission would not lessen the obligations of the elected officials or of the Legislature. The work of the commission would be merely to furnish a systematic and intelligent program upon which the State officials and the Legislature could base their action. There would be nothing binding about it, except the binding obligation of the party to accept that program or something better.

Mr. Weller in his statement in THE SUN of this morning very naturally objects to having a commission appointed by the Democratic Convention draft the economy platform, on the ground that Maryland is not a one-party state.

Well, Mr. Weller, there is no possible objection that we can see why the Republican Convention should not appoint a similar commission, and then we might have a genuine rivalry as to which commission could work out the best economy and efficiency scheme. Such a rivalry would be admirably worth while—vastly more so than the clash of personal ambitions and the contests for partisan advantage.

Mr. Weller's plan of having the incoming Governor appoint a bipartisan commission for the work means merely to sidetrack the whole reform for two years at least, if not indefinitely. It is doubtful whether the Legislature of 1918 would pay any serious attention to the report of such a commission.

33 (18)  
M3

Sun  
Nov. 18-15.

## EXPERT TO PROBE WASTE

Economy Commission Engages Harvey S. Chase, Of Boston.

### TO EXAMINE STATE OFFICES

Reorganization Plan For Departments Expected To Be Reported Before The Legislature Convenes.

The Economy and Efficiency Commission, which met yesterday afternoon in the office of the chairman, Dr. Frank J. Goodnow, announced after the meeting that Harvey S. Chase, of Boston, had been engaged to make an examination of the State offices and departments with a view of reorganizing them along business lines. Mr. Chase is a noted accountant and engineer. It is expected that he will make at least a partial report before the Legislature meets.

The commission also discussed at length the budget system which is to be recommended to the next Legislature. It had been thought that the formal draft of the plan would be announced after the meeting, but the members decided to defer final action until the next meeting.

In announcing the appointment of Mr. Chase, the following statement was given out by Dr. Goodnow on behalf of the commission:

"Mr. Chase was a member of President Taft's commission on economy and efficiency at Washington in 1911 and 1912. Subsequently he was retained by the Secretary of the Treasury for reorganization work in the Treasury Department in 1913. At present he is engaged in auditing the accounts of the city of Baltimore and has recently assisted in the reorganization of the budget systems and the Comptroller's accounts of this city. He has also been engaged as an expert with regard to the finances of the State of Maryland.

"Mr. Chase has had large experience in the reorganization of state and city governments. His firm has been engaged in various capacities by the Governors of Massachusetts, New Hampshire and Kentucky, and other state officials of Ohio, Colorado, Maine, New York and Rhode Island. It also has acted for the city governments of Boston, Portland, Providence and cities in Ohio, as well as having been associated in the reorganization work in Chicago and Minneapolis.

"Mr. Chase was graduated at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1883. He was superintendent and manager of water works, gas works, electrical contracting concerns and ore mining plants for 10 years or more. He then became treasurer and auditor of other companies, and finally a professional public accountant, with headquarters at Boston and Washington. As certified public accountants, his firm has acted and is now acting for a considerable number of commercial enterprises, including the large public service companies of Boston. Their business includes the investigation of accounting and efficiency conditions of reorganization methods, as well as of auditing the transactions in full detail."

336 (8)

Sun Oct. 26/15.

## ECONOMY BOARD MEETS

**Dr. Goodnow Presides At Initial Session Of Democratic Commission.**

### ONLY TWO MEMBERS ABSENT

**Budget System Is Declared Fundamental To Reorganizing Finances. Seek Data Of New York.**

The first meeting of the Economy and Efficiency Commission named by the Democratic State Convention was held yesterday afternoon at the office in McCoy Hall of the chairman, Dr. Frank J. Goodnow, president of Johns Hopkins University. Those present, in addition to Dr. Goodnow, were former Judge James Alfred Pearce, Joseph D. Baker, State Senator William Milnes Maloy and Francis Neale Parke. The other two members of the commission—Phillip D. Laird and B. Howell Griswold, Jr.—were unable to attend. Mr. Laird is ill of pneumonia at his home in Rockville and Mr. Griswold is out of town with his wife, who is in bad health. Gen. Murray Vandiver, chairman of the Democratic State Central Committee, who called the meeting, was present a few moments.

The first action of the commission was to designate Mr. Parke to act as secretary, after which it began consideration of its work. As Dr. Goodnow indicated in his letter of acceptance, the principal duty of the commission at this time is the formulation of a budget system in time to have it in readiness when the Legislature convenes in January. A budget system is regarded as fundamental to all financial reform. It may be that such a system as Dr. Goodnow and his associates shall think adequate will necessitate an amendment to the State Constitution in order to be made permanently effectual, but it is accepted that public opinion will compel the use of the system pending action upon the Constitution.

#### Look To New York For Pointers.

The commission decided to communicate with the committee on the budget system of the New York Constitutional Convention and to obtain copies of the amendments to the New York Constitution which are designed to introduce the budget system into the State government there. These amendments are to be voted on at the coming election.

Dr. Goodnow's advice was followed almost minutely in framing the New York budget plan. Dr. Goodnow appeared before a committee, of which former Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson was chairman, and explained his views while the Constitutional Convention was in session. The New York plan provides that the Governor of the State shall prepare a budget, after having been furnished an estimate of receipts by the financial officers of the State and after having received a form of requisition from the several State departments and institutions and the private institutions seeking State aid.

The budget prepared by the Governor shall be submitted to the Legislature, which shall have power to reduce or eliminate any appropriation, but shall not have power to increase or insert any. This prohibition against increasing appropriations or inserting new ones prevents deficits in the State Treasury caused by appropriations in excess of revenues, such as happened at the last Legislature. It also prevents legislative log-rolling, for if no appropriation may be increased there will be nothing to trade on.

Whether the commission will follow the New York plan in complete detail is not known. The prohibition against insertion of appropriations or increases of appropriations by the Legislature is almost certain to be a part of the local plan. There is a feeling in some quarters, however, that it might be better in this State to have the budget prepared by a financial board, rather than by the Governor. Such a board, it has been suggested, might be composed of the Governor, the Comptroller and the Attorney-General. This matter, of course, will be determined by the commission after consideration of all the facts of the situation in this State.

#### To Ask Views Of Ex-Governors.

The commission decided to ask Governor Goldsborough and each of the living ex-Governors of the State—Edwin Warfield, John Walter Smith, Frank Brown and Henry Lloyd—to submit in writing any views they may have regarding the work of reorganizing the State's system. Expressions from any citizen of the State who has ideas upon the subject will be welcomed by the commission, too, if submitted in writing.

A letter was received from Albert C. Ritchie, the Democratic candidate for Attorney-General, in which he offered to send the commission a report upon the plan to reorganize the Attorney-General's office and create a State legal department, to have charge of all the State's legal business instead of it being in the hands of special counsel to the several departments. Mr. Ritchie's offer was accepted.

Dr. Goodnow stated after the meeting that it is hoped to procure the services of one or more accountants to make a detailed examination of the books of the State departments so that the commission may be in possession of exact and complete information about all the branches of the government.

The commission was in session from 4 o'clock until about 6. When adjournment was taken it was determined to meet again Thursday, November 11, at 4 o'clock in Dr. Goodnow's office. It is expected the copies of the New York budget amendments will have been received and studied by the members of the commission in the meantime.



336181  
M3

News

Feb. 21-16

### THE SITUATION AT ANNAPOLIS

The "useless-office" pledge in the Democratic platform, if it could really be lived up to, would mean a complete reorganization of the State's administrative system. The question is not one of whether a salary can be saved here or there; it is whether there shall be in State offices and State departments the kind of straightforward, practical attention to business that an ordinary business man would expect of his employees.

The News emphasized in these columns last Friday an item in Mr. Weller's report to the Goodnow Commission that illustrates this point. He figured that by consolidating the Road and Motor Vehicle Commissions a saving of \$9000 out of \$11,000 of salaries could be effected—simply because much of the Auto Commission work could be done by the clerks and stenographers of the Road Commission. There is nothing really surprising in this; for we know that State and private business offices do not follow the same rules of efficiency. The success Mr. Weller had in roadbuilding was due more than anything else to his introduction of the private office rules into his particular department. It was because of his record, and to offset it, that the Democrats took up the "useless office" cry. But the man in the street who has cut his wisdom teeth knows the difference. He knows that to revamp the State government in the way indicated would be a Herculean task; that no amount of legislation alone could effect it; that, though the machinery may be provided by the Legislature, the driving power must be "spirit," and that the Democratic State organization has not yet materially changed its ways.

But the Legislature will nevertheless have done a good deal if it provides even the machinery alone. It is not in the heads of departments that money can be saved. There may be some discouragement over the fact that the best that could be worked out by the consolidation of the Shellfish Commission and the two Fish Commissioners into a single conservation commission was an increase from \$8600 to \$9000 in salaries. But why should there be? There is \$9000 worth of work to be done. Given the right sort of personnel, the Conservation Board could put life into the State's business. We know perfectly well that the Oyster Navy is today as much an incumbrance to the State as a politician's asset. Its prescribed functions, if they were performed, would be worth while. And it would be worth a \$9000 board to get these functions performed properly and to get the other uses out of the Oyster Navy which a concentrated authority could put it to.

The News is not particularly concerned over the slowness with which the Legislative wheels are grinding. Nor does it expect the final product to be the millennium. The Legislature is playing, as it always plays. The chances are that, as usual, the chief part of the session will be its closing hours. There is no real evidence that it is going to backslide—or, at east, that it will backslide to anything like its usual extent. And, so far as we know, the administration is itself earnestly bent on getting every Democratic pledge whipped into a bill and presented.

When the Legislature really balks will be time for the public to grow really mad. Thus far it has been a pretty decent Legislature—if not wholly virtuous, at least reasonably careful, and also extraordinarily patient.

We are confident that before the session ends a great deal of good will come out of it; a great deal more good than might have been anticipated. The danger is not with the Legislature or with legislation. The Democratic organization knows very well, indeed, how to give the public a lot of statutory forms in redemption of its pledges. But there are signs here and there that the statutory forms will be about all the public is going to get for the present. Possibly the signs are wrong. But a great deal too much attention is being paid to objections that have to do with the machinery of the proposed reforms. It is important to remember that the big share of the "useless-offices" that might be abolished do not require legislation for their abolishment. The essential pledge of the Democratic party was for efficient administration. The Legislature can help toward fulfilling it by providing better administrative machinery; and by so doing it may perhaps be conceived to have done all that is necessary. This is sticking to the letter of the pledge. We are a good deal surer of it than we are of the spirit being observed—and this latter is what will count.

336.181

Sun  
Feb 7-16

## PREPARING BILLS TO FULFILL PLEDGES

**Attorney-General Ritchie At Work  
On Measures Aiming At  
Economy.**

## TO CONSOLIDATE OFFICES

**Various Fisheries And Labor Activi-  
ties To Be United—Governor Said  
To Favor Change.**

Attorney-General Albert C. Ritchie is completing the draft of the various bills designed to carry out the platform pledges of the Democratic party, as well as those to make effective the recommendations of the Goodnow Commission to put the State upon a more efficient and economical basis.

Most of these bills have been finished and are in the hands of either the Governor or the Economy and Efficiency Commission. The others will be finished in a few days. The introduction of the entire lot probably will be consummated in the near future.

Among the bills that have been drawn are two dealing with the situation resulting from the condemnation proceedings that were instituted as a result of the passage by the last Legislature of the Shepherd oyster law. Mr. Ritchie declined to make public the particulars concerning these bills, saying that he feels that any information in regard to them should come from Governor Harrington.

### Conservation Bill Drawn.

Mr. Ritchie also has assisted in the draft of a bill to create a Conservation Commission to take over the duties now being performed by the State Shellfish Commission, the Fish Commissioners of the Eastern and Western Shores, the State Game Warden and the State Oyster Navy. W. Thomas Kemp did the greater portion of the work on this measure, Mr. Ritchie assisting him in an advisory capacity.

On the subject of useless offices Mr. Ritchie, at the request of the Goodnow Commission, has drafted a bill to change the name of the State Industrial Accident Commission to the State Industrial Commission, leaving out the word "accident," and directing that the new body shall, in addition to the duties now being performed by the State Industrial Accident Commission, also take over the duties of the Bureau of Statistics and Information, which administers, in connection with its other work, the child labor law, the administration of the 10-hour law for women, the work of the steam boiler inspectors of Baltimore city, the mine inspectors of Allegany and Garrett counties and the Bureau of Immigration.

### Another Consolidation Planned.

It is reported that the Goodnow Commission will recommend that the office of State Motor Vehicle Commissioner be consolidated with the State Roads Commission. If this report proves to be correct Mr. Ritchie will prepare the consolidating measure. Just what the Goodnow Commission intends to do with reference to this office will be known in a few days.

The Attorney-General also has prepared a bill to reorganize the State Roads Commission, but it is not known on what basis. It is said that Governor Harrington favors a three-man commission with a paid chairman and two other commissioners who either receive no salaries at all or merely nominal salaries.

### Waiting On McMullen.

Mr. Ritchie is waiting to hear from Comptroller McMullen before drafting the bills for a uniform system of accounting. Mr. McMullen requested him to postpone the drafting of these bills until he had had an opportunity to study the fiscal affairs of the State and perhaps be in a position to make some recommendations.

The bill to abolish continuing appropriations likewise has been drafted. So has the bill to carry out the party's pledge to abolish the envelope system of primary voting in the counties, and also the bill providing for a general registration day prior to every primary.

A bill that occasioned Mr. Ritchie some difficulty, but which has been drafted, is designed to put into effect the home rule amendment approved by the voters last fall. The measure he has drawn will be, in effect, a charter for those counties which desire to adopt home rule. It provides specifically what local legislation may be passed by the counties themselves, or in other words, defines what shall and what shall not be legislated upon by the county authorities.

### Drafting The M. A. C. Bill.

Albert E. Donaldson is drafting the bill to reorganize the Maryland Agricultural College. The expectation is that it will be completed in a few days. Mr. Donaldson probably will draft other measures intended to foster the agricultural interests of the State.

The Democratic platform pledged the party to strengthen the State Board of Parole. Mr. Ritchie has drawn a bill to accomplish this purpose. Last fall the voters approved an amendment to the Constitution under which the Parole Board can be given absolute authority when it comes to granting paroles. Mr. Ritchie's bill does this.

Under the existing law, the pardoning power being vested in the Governor absolutely, all the Board of Parole can do is to recommend a parole for those prisoners it believes entitled to such consideration. The Governor then could grant a conditional pardon. If the Ritchie bill passed the board will grant paroles, though the Governor's pardoning power will not be disturbed.

### Prison Bill Presented Again.

When it came to drafting a measure to create a State Board of Prison Control, Mr. Ritchie says he was unable to improve upon the bill passed two years ago, either as it was originally introduced or as it was amended, and which was vetoed by Governor Goldsborough. Hence he has sent a copy of the original bill and also the amended bill to the Governor for introduction if the latter approves.

This bill creates one board to have supervision over all penal institutions. It was amended so as to take from the board supervision over county institutions.

### Questions Indeterminate Sentence.

Mr. Ritchie has some doubts about the wisdom of enacting legislation providing for the indeterminate sentence. He and several of the Judges of the Supreme Bench of this city seem to think that if the bill giving the Board of Parole authority to parole prisoners passes it will accomplish everything desired.

Indeterminate sentence legislation is based on the theory that a prisoner will be watched while he is in prison and that if he behaves himself he can be pardoned when his conduct seems to indicate that he has reformed and that it will be better for him to be freed.

Exactly the opposite is true under the parole system. In that case the prisoner is released under the supervision of parole officers who watch his conduct. If after being virtually free for a while he shows that he is entitled to a pardon, it can be granted. In one case the prisoner, after being released, is entirely free, in the other case he is watched to see whether or not his reform is genuine.

Mr. Ritchie has drafted a bill to provide for a bond issue to cover the State deficit and another authorizing the sale of the Northern Central annuity. The bonds to be issued will be of the serial annuity variety, a portion to be redeemable each year and no sinking fund being provided.

Another than Mr. Ritchie is drafting the bill to put into effect the Constitutional amendment adopted last fall to permit the classification of property for purposes of taxation.

Mr. Ritchie still has to draft the bill to abolish the fee system and also the measure to reduce campaign expenditures. Both of these measures were promised in the platform of the Democratic party, but the drafting of them presents many difficulties.

336,181

Ann. Oct. 4 - 1917

## GOVERNOR HITS BACK AT CRITICS

DENIES CHARGE THAT CHASE  
REPORT WAS SUPPRESSED.

WAS GIVEN FULL PUBLICITY

Mr. Harrington at the Same  
Time Defends His Administration  
Against Attacks—Submits State-  
ment Showing Saving in Legisla-  
tive Expenses—Declares He is Re-  
sponsible for His Official Acts—  
Police Justices in Politics.

Governor Harrington yesterday came back at Chairman Tait, of the Republican State Central Committee, and other critics of his administration. He issued a lengthy statement in which he reviewed his official acts. He dwelt especially upon the Chase report, which embodied the result of a thorough examination of the books of the state comptroller and which recommended certain changes designed to improve the methods of keeping accounts. The Governor's statement, in part, follows:

The statement made that any Chase report was expurgated or suppressed is absolutely false, and there is not a semblance of truth in it. The original of the Chase reports made by order of the comptroller, either for himself or for the Goodnow Commission, are and have been on file in the office of the comptroller and the governor, and have been open to inspection at any time. These reports are precisely as filed, and there is nothing in them whatsoever, or in any annotations concerning them, that anyone would desire to suppress, and practically nothing in them that was not publicly announced and proclaimed by me in my campaign for governor from one end of the state to the other.

At the time of the announcement of my candidacy for the nomination for governor I gave out a full statement of the condition of the state's treasury, showing that on account of the overappropriation by the legislature of 1914 of \$1,555,000 there would be a deficit in the state treasury of an equal amount, and declared myself in favor of the establishment of a budget system in Maryland.

### REPORT DISTRIBUTED.

Early in the spring of 1915 I employed Mr. Chase to examine the books of the comptroller's office and advise in regard to certain changes which we were contemplating in the comptroller's report and to make any suggestions he might think advisable along the line of a budget. This report was filed in my office on June 21, 1915. The Goodnow Commission not having any money available for their purposes, at my request Mr. Chase brought this report up to the end of our fiscal year, September 30, 1915. This report was published by Mr. Chase and a copy of it placed upon the desk of each senator and member of the House of Delegates of the legislature of 1916. During the session of the legislature the Goodnow Commission at various times sent me reports, and with these reports were inclosed some recommendations or reports which Mr. Chase had made for them.

According to Mr. Chase's plan all of these reports were given to the newspapers, and, furthermore, upon the request of the Senate all of the reports and recommendations of the Goodnow Commission, including all the Chase reports, were forwarded to the Senate and House of Delegates, and were afterwards returned by them to the governor's office for safe-keeping, the reports always being at the command of the legislature and open to public inspection.

The Board of Public Works has carefully examined every department under its control, and particularly has the comptroller, Mr. McMullen, closely scrutinized every voucher that has passed through his office, and every unwarranted charge has been corrected. The strictest economy consistent with efficiency is being practiced in all departments. Every office in Maryland in which the state is interested from a monetary standpoint has been carefully audited.

As to the budget, we were the first to advocate it, and we are more interested than some others are in its successful operation. It will not be necessary to have a law to compel a Democratic governor to have public hearings. I have had investigations going on all the year in reference to all appropriations. In this respect I have had the loyal support of the Board of State Aid and Charities, and with full knowledge of the departments, have prepared to devote at least two months to public hearings. The proper expert assistance has been arranged for.

### RESPONSIBLE FOR HIS ACTS.

As to the criticism that I appointed Democratic central committeemen as police justices, I will state that I appointed certain gentlemen as police justices and two of them have since been elected members of the Democratic Central Committee of Baltimore City. I am perfectly willing to be held responsible for the record which these gentlemen shall make in reference to their offices.

The charge that the Treasurer places his deposits in the different banks for political advantage or personal favoritism is pure buncombe.

336/81

## FOR ABOLITION OF USELESS OFFICE

Senator Blair Lee Takes a Decided  
Stand.

## FOR THE SAVING OF WASTE SOARING TAX RATE DEMANDS ECONOMY.

In Speech in Keating Hall Candidate for Democratic Nomination for Governor Declares He Will Devote His Best Energies to Reforms—The "Old System," He Says, Has Controlled Legislation in the Past—Appealing Direct to the People.

"I have been conducting this campaign for the Democratic nomination for the high office of governor, as I did four years ago, by appealing directly to the people," said Senator Blair Lee, candidate for Democratic nomination for governor, in a speech in Keating Hall last night. "I have stated my position frankly and openly on the various questions that have arisen during the campaign. It may be that I have lost some votes by doing so. Some persons think it is good politics to deal in generalities, and let everybody interpret them to mean what they want them to mean; but I am asking the votes of the people, and I do not want to get any votes by misrepresentation.

One of the issues which has been very prominent in this campaign is the matter of abolishing useless offices and stopping waste and applying business principles of economy and efficiency to the state government. I am in earnest about wanting to do this. In my speeches in Baltimore and elsewhere I have declared in favor of the consolidation of various state boards; of the substitution of unpaid members for all of the members of the State Roads Commission except the chairman, and of the abolition of special counsel to various boards and offices. The subject of waste and useless offices is acute in this campaign because of the financial condition of the state.

### EMPLOYMENT OF COUNSEL.

On March 5, 1912, the Senate unanimously adopted a resolution requesting the Comptroller of the Treasury "to furnish the Senate, by March 11, 1912, a statement showing the amount of the state's money used for the payment of counsel to the various state boards, whether directly or indirectly." The Comptroller replied on March 6, 1912, giving only four counsel, the general counsel to the Public Service Commission and his assistant, counsel to the Insurance Commission and counsel to the State Board of Health, with total salaries of \$8,500. The fact was that there were more than a score of such special counsel and the

total salaries amount to \$25,000 or \$30,000 per year. The list given by the Comptroller was very incomplete.

The same legislature by the act of 1912, chapter 663, provided for an amendment of the Constitution relating to the attorney general. This amendment was submitted to the voters and adopted on November 4, 1913. It provided that the attorney general should appoint such assistants as the General Assembly might by law prescribe, and thereafter all the legal business of the state and its various boards, departments and officers should be performed by the attorney general or his assistants. All that was necessary for the adoption of this amendment in order to abolish the counsel to the various state boards and departments and to carry out the will of the people as expressed in the Constitutional amendment and to save the taxpayers \$15,000 or \$20,000 a year was that the legislature should pass the necessary act providing for such assistant as might be necessary to the attorney general.

The legislature of 1914 ought to have done this. The reason why they did not do it was that by the passage of such an act all of these special counsel to the various boards and departments would be legislated out of office.

### THE REAL ISSUE.

Senator Lee also addressed meetings in the rooms of the Eighth Ward Democratic Association, in Frohsinn Hall, Frederick avenue and Payson street, in Otterbein Hall at Locust Point, and an open-air meeting at the corner of Aisquith and Lanvale streets. The other speakers of the evening included Mayor Preston, William B. Copper, William Milnes Maloy, Hon. J. Charles Linthicum, William L. Marbury, A. S. Goldsborough, and the legislative candidates in the several districts favorable to Mr. Lee's nomination for governor.

City Councillman John J. Reahl presided at the meeting in Frohsinn Hall. Besides Senator Blair Lee and Mayor Preston there were about eight other speakers. Mayor Preston reached the hall a little before 10 A. M., and said the late hour and intense heat would prevent him from making any lengthy remarks, but that he merely came to deliver a few valedictory remarks.

"It is entirely too late in the day to discuss the issues and vital principles of the campaign," said the Mayor, "but I do want to tell you people of the Twentieth ward what an excellent chance you have to take a part in the making of a larger and better Baltimore."

Amer. Sept. 9/15

"The real issue in this campaign is the good of Baltimore, and while I am its chief executive, I shall insist that she be granted her just deserts and her lawful rights. We demand the right of growth, the right of expansion and the right of annexation to make our city larger and more impressive, and better than all, to take her proper place among the leading municipalities in the country, and I venture the assertion that there is not a man in this house who will not back me up in the effort to obtain these rights. We have waited for 101 these many years for our rights and the time has arrived when we are going to get them from somebody. Blair Lee, the candidate whose interest this meeting is being held, together with his running mate, is the man who, if he gets the gubernatorial nomination, and, by the way, which means virtually his election as governor, has made a solemn promise to see to it that Baltimore does get her rights in all the matters referred to. When you all want your city to grow and to rank as high in the cities of the country as possible, will you not support such a man and see to it that he has a chance to make good his party pledges along this line?" [Cries of yes, yes!]

"I want to say right here that while I am in the City Hall Baltimore must grow, and it must be governed from Baltimore and not from Annapolis or Washington. (Loud applause.)

"For years we have been trying to have our party leaders fulfil party pledges with reference to this city and we have failed, and when brought face to face with their promises they have been accustomed to laughing at us and saying: 'Wait awhile.' Now the time has arrived when we have in Blair Lee a man who has by his past record shown that he is progressive and that he is deeply interested in Baltimore, and if placed in the executive mansion at Annapolis we will be able to depend upon him to further our city's interests by extending the city limits; not that we want anything from the counties; not that we expect any sacrifice at their hands, but that we simply want our just deserts and want it made possible for Baltimore to grow and be able to extend herself when the need comes and when it is best for her interests."

336,181

THE COMMISSION PLAN TO REDUCE STATE EXPENSES

The overshadowing issue in the primary campaign has been efficiency and economy. It will be the overshadowing issue in the general election campaign. And we have no doubt that, regardless of who is nominated for Governor and who elected, there will be vigorous efforts at retrenchment. Public sentiment, aroused by the financial condition of the State and crystallized by the special articles in THE SUN, will compel that, whether those given charge of the government be sincere or insincere. The large and important thing now is to make sure that the efforts at retrenchment are wise and well-directed.

If the work be undertaken in haphazard fashion; if there be lack of complete and accurate information; if there be failure to look far into the future; if poorly equipped or demagogic men dominate, then the State will suffer; and possibly may suffer far more than it does now from financial mismanagement. Efficiency does not mean merely change; economy does not mean halting the modern governmental activities recently inaugurated.

Efficiency and economy in government, at this time in this State, mean practical reorganization of the State's machinery to the end that there be co-ordination of the work of State officials so that each will have useful duties to perform and will have sufficient useful duties to engage the entire time for which he is paid; and efficiency and economy mean that the manifold business interests of the State be conducted according to approved business methods of this day, rather than the obsolete methods of a past generation.

To accomplish sound and lasting results from the present agitation, there must be careful study of the whole business of the State government and deliberate preparation of a new working system. In the nature of things, this is a work that must be done by a small group of the ablest and cleanest men. It is proper that the results of the labors of such a group be criticized and considered by those whom the people elect to office. But only by the work of such a group may we have a comprehensive scheme of things that will put before the people and their servants in simple form the weaknesses of the present system and the remedies.

Joseph D. Baker, of Frederick county, an exceptionally able business man and public spirited citizen, saw the need of such procedure and suggested a commission to be named by the next Legislature and to report to that of 1918. Mr. Harrington amended Mr. Baker's suggestion—very wisely, we think—by suggesting that the commission be named by the Democratic convention, to report to the next Legislature, thus saving two years' time. Mr. Weller, one of the Republican candidates, accepted the commission plan, but said that, if nominated, he personally would name one; and Mr. Warburton, the other Re-

See Sept 4/15

publican candidate, accepted the Harrington idea, except, of course, that he would have the Republican convention name the commission.

Only Senator Lee, of all the gubernatorial candidates, is opposed to the commission. Senator Lee says that if he and his associates are nominated and elected they will formulate plans for the reorganization of the State's administrative and business system. It may be accepted that Senator Lee is as sincere as the other candidates in desiring reform, but his plan is wrong.

It seems to us that it opens the door to all the dangers—the dangers of haphazard action, of incomplete and inaccurate information, of short-sighted policy, of treatment by poorly equipped or demagogic men. Senator Lee, Mr. Cepper and Mr. Maloy, if nominated and elected, will be very busy men from now until January and very busy men, indeed, thereafter. It is hard to see how they will find time necessary to handle this vital matter, and their failure to do so surely would invite trouble.

It is worth while to repeat a part of the statement made by Mr. Philip D. Laird, of Montgomery county, one of the candidates for the Democratic nominations for the House in that county. Mr. Laird in a statement in THE SUN said, in part:

A commission such as has been suggested would have ample time calmly and thoughtfully to consider the situation and formulate bills for submission to the Legislature. Possibly two commissions—one to deal with fiscal affairs, the other to investigate the public offices with reference to their working forces and the feasibility of reducing them and improving their efficiency—might be better than one; but that is a detail of the plan which can be determined when the convention meets. The personnel of the commission should, of course, be above reproach as to character and ability, in order to inspire the confidence of the people and avert the charge of political trickery that would otherwise be made. Judge Pearce and Mr. Joseph D. Baker are types of the membership needed, but it is doubtful if the former could serve at this time.

It is apparent, I think, that the work of the Legislature would be greatly facilitated if this suggestion were adopted. Without something of the kind, it is probable that a flood of crude, ill-considered bills will be introduced by men of limited experience and information, carried away by popular outcry against extravagance, and the result might be a patchwork compromise in the closing days of the session. That would not be satisfactory to anybody and would be discreditable to the party and the State.

On the other hand, knowledge that an able commission was at work upon the problem would tend to head off the seekers after notoriety, and the General Assembly would have a concrete and comprehensive plan, based upon facts, to begin with, instead of a confused mass of piecemeal legislation to end with.

No man in Maryland has a more intimate knowledge of conditions and methods in the Legislature or of State affairs generally than Mr. Laird. His opinion, founded on experience and ripe judgment, should have proper weight with the Democratic convention.

336181

Due July 18/15.

THE MARYLAND STATE GOVERNMENT.

The series of articles describing the operations of the various departments of the State government of Maryland now appearing in THE SUN from day to day is intended to bring the people of the State face to face with the facts they ought to know.

As long as the rate of State taxation on property was low and affairs of the State were decently administered, the people were content. If a useless office was created and continued, so long as it did not apparently increase the tax bill there was no unrest. This was an unhealthy state of affairs. Nothing should occur, no condition should exist, which makes the people indifferent to public affairs. As soon as the taxpayers become indifferent the opportunity of the taxeaters arises.

The government of Maryland has, on the whole, been satisfactory. There have been no wholesale peculations, such as have afflicted other States; the State institutions have generally been well conducted and some of them are regarded as models. The Legislature, it is true, has been extravagant in its expenditures and reckless in appropriating money.

At length the time has come when public interest in affairs is aroused, and the people are disposed to take account of what is going on, and THE SUN, in the articles now being published, is furnishing them with the necessary information.

When Washington died, in 1799, it was the disposition of Congress to have his body rest in the Capitol. It was purposed to build a crypt for the reception of the sarcophagus and a keeper was appointed at a salary of \$3,000 a year. Mrs. Washington objected and wished the remains of her husband to be interred at Mount Vernon, and it was done. Nevertheless, it is said that one of the general appropriation bills carried the salary of the keeper of the crypt, and this was continued for three-quarters of a century, although there was no crypt to keep.

This incident illustrates what has been done in Maryland, although nothing so flagrant has developed here. But many offices which were properly created have been continued long after the need of them has passed.

The State tax rate is now double what it was down to in 1910. The increase in the rate was made for a very proper purpose—namely, the construction of good roads. But if proper economy in other directions had been exercised, the increase would not have been as great. THE SUN's articles on the State government will indicate to the General Assembly at the next session the places where the pruning-knife of economy can be properly applied.

336181

See July 20/15.

**THE LAND OFFICE.**

In the opinion of the writer of THE SUN's special articles about the State offices, the Land Office could be abolished without detriment to the public service. That opinion is well supported by the facts.

It is true that the Legislature cannot abolish the office. That can be accomplished only by Constitutional amendment. The Governor cannot abolish the office by refusing to fill it, unless in case of the death or resignation of the incumbent or a vacancy for some other cause, because by special provision of the Constitution the Commissioner in office holds over until the appointment of his successor. Neither can the Legislature abolish the office by failure to make appropriation for the salary, for the appropriation is made in the Constitution.

Nevertheless, a way may be found. The Constitutional provision is as follows, in Article VII, Section 4:

There shall be a Commissioner of the Land Office, who shall be appointed by the Governor, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall hold his office during the term of the Governor by whom he shall have been appointed and until his successor shall be appointed and qualified. He shall perform such duties as are now required of the Commissioner of the Land Office, or such as may hereafter be prescribed by law, and shall also be keeper of the chancery records. He shall receive a salary of \$1,500 per annum, to be paid out of the Treasury, and shall charge such fees as are now or may hereafter be fixed by law. He shall make a semi-annual report of all the fees of his office, both as Commissioner of the Land Office and keeper of the chancery records, to the Comptroller of the Treasury and shall pay the same semi-annually into the Treasury.

The net charge of this office upon the State Treasury appears to be in excess of \$10,000 a year, and if this or any large part of it can be saved without detriment to the public service it should be done. Prior to 1864 the office was of importance, and instead of being a charge upon the Treasury it produced a considerable revenue. That is the reason that the two constitutions subsequent to that date retained it. Under the Constitution of 1776 there were two Registers of the Land Office, appointed by the Governor. The Constitution of 1851 abolished these and provided for the election of a Commissioner of the Land Office by the people, with a salary of \$200 and the fees of office. By the Constitution of 1864 the salary was increased to \$2,000 and the fees were paid into the Treasury. In 1867 the present Constitution was adopted, under which the Commissioner is appointed by the Governor and has a salary of \$1,500, accounting for the fees with the Treasury.

In 1874 the General Assembly, by Chapter 66 of the acts of that year, transferred the land record books and papers from the office of the Clerk of the Court of Appeals, where the fees of the office were the only compensation, to the Land Office, where they still remain.

The Legislature can repeal the Act of 1874 and return the land records to the office of the Clerk of the Court of Appeals, and all other records now in the Land Office might be placed in the same keeping. This might be accomplished without actual physical transfer, as all of them are in the Court of Appeals building. The clerkships in the Land Office could be abolished, and even if the Commissioner remains, with his \$1,500 salary, his services could still be utilized as having charge of the records, as an adjunct of the clerk's office. But the proper way would be to abolish the office by Constitutional amendment.

3361181

See Aug. 30/15

**USELESS STATE OFFICES.**

A number of offices from time to time have been created in this State in order to make a place for some deserving person and continued long after that deserving person had gone to his eternal reward. Other offices have been created for legitimate purposes and perpetuated when the usefulness or necessity thereof has long since passed. The Land Office is a case in point. The Board of State Aids and Charities is an illustration of a board which has failed to accomplish that for which it was created. In THE SUN of Friday morning last the fourteenth and final article of the series dealing with this subject was published. It summarizes the previous articles of the series and should be read carefully by all thoughtful citizens who want to know how their money goes. In the articles published, among the offices recommended for abolition are those of the State Wharfinger, who has a little salary and no duties; the State Vaccine Agent, which should go to the Board of Health; the Land Commissioner, whose duties could be performed by the Secretary of State and whose records should be restored to the Clerk of the Court of Appeals, from whom they were taken; the State Fire Marshal, who spends a lot of money without appropriate results; one of the Inspectors of Boilers and the Automobile Commissioner. The duties of this last-named official should go to the Road Commission and that commission reduced to a single commissioner. The offices of State Auditor, Bank and Insurance Commissioners could be merged in some of the other offices with good results and at a saving of cost. The expenditure of \$125,000 on fish, oyster and game conservation should be looked into and a large reduction made. Two Fish Commissioners are unnecessary, and the Shellfish Commission is so hampered by legal restrictions that it can accomplish but little. A careful perusal of the article in Friday's SUN will convince anyone that a great saving of the taxpayers' money can and should be made.