

## CHAPTER I

### DEFECTS IN OUR CONSTITUTIONS<sup>1</sup>

---

It should be with a feeling of greatest caution that we undertake to point out defects in constitutions—caution lest criticism be understood as an effort to detract from those great state documents which make up our fundamental law. Recognizing the moral value of good opinion, the same care should be taken in our approach not to be understood as assailing the wisdom and patriotism of those great men who assumed the risk of leadership in securing to America its liberties. Rather let it be understood that we accept the general view expressed by Professor Frederic Jessup Stimson of Harvard University, that as documents of liberty “our own constitution embodies and improves on the English constitution”; and that as charters of liberty “the English constitution registers the total—the aggregate—of those great principles which, in eight hundred forty years of struggle, the Saxon peoples have won back from Norman kings.”

#### *Well Adapted to Preserve and Protect the Liberties of the People*

In this one important respect, namely, as a charter of liberty, the constitution of England is the constitution of all English speaking people—they all contain practically the same principles for the protection of human rights. Our written constitutions have taken over the great principles that our English ancestors fought for. They each breathe the same spirit; they each express the same idealism of personal, political and civil freedom which have come down through many centuries of organized opposition and attempted subversion. All Englishmen and, as affairs have turned, all the world, have a common heritage in the Charter of Liberties which was issued by Henry I only thirty-four years after the Norman conquest—a concession to English customary laws; in the great Charter signed by King John; in the Petition of Rights laid before Charles I; in the Bill

<sup>1</sup>Part of a discussion of “Proposed Reforms in State Government,” before the Economic Club, Boston, November 29, 1915.

of Rights—the pledge of William III when he came to a throne from which two kings had been recently deposed for violating concepts of public right; in the many political and judicial acts and decisions before our War of Independence.

Our forefathers accepted all of these well known concepts of liberty; and they did more—they added to them the institutional means needed for their protection. This was America's contribution. Instead of being forced to resort to the recurrent internal strife to which England had been subject for nine centuries, instead of being compelled from time to time to do what the citizens of Boston did in 1689, and what the thirteen colonies were compelled to do in 1775, the makers of our constitution found the institutional means for protecting the liberties of the people without resort to revolution.

*Contributions of America to the Success of Democracy*

Among the institutional things in our constitution which have made it stand out as the greatest of all political documents are these:

- 1—The assertion and establishment, beyond question, of the doctrine of popular sovereignty
- 2—The institution of a government which could act only as a trustee with no power to do things except in the manner provided in written deeds of trust—making it *ultra vires* for any officer to exercise authority or use political power except as granted in written constitutions adopted by the people
- 3—The codification of the war-worn principles of personal political and civil liberty—setting up this code of principles in these charters of government as rights and powers specifically reserved to the people which no public officer could use or abuse
- 4—The adoption of the republican principle of election of an executive for a fixed term
- 5—Incorporation of the principle of separation of powers—special care being given to the independence of the courts
- 6—The protection of local institutions and ideas of justice—for this purpose carefully setting up the boundaries of federal authority

*Our Constitutions the World's Greatest Charters of Liberty*

As our American constitutions are the world's greatest charters of liberty, so the records of early conventions, the arguments of delegates, the essays of those public-spirited men who explained their meaning and urged their adoption are the world's greatest masterpieces of democratic thought. And for all time they will be held to be the most important chapters in the Bible of democracy.

*The Weakness of Our Political System*

But there is another side. As charters of institutions for the conduct of business—for doing the welfare work of the people—our constitutions have been failures. Let us make the distinction clear. Charters of liberty are protective—they operate as restraints on government. The reason for the Charter of Liberties issued by Henry I, for Magna Charta, for the Petition of Rights, for the Bill of Rights, was to prevent things being done which would interfere with personal, political and civil freedom. The reason for codifying all of the acts and decisions scattered through nine centuries of English history, and for setting them up in our written constitution, was to prevent things being done by the government which would impair our liberty. The reason for the establishment of the doctrine of popular sovereignty as the fundamental concept of our written constitutions, for incorporating the principle of separation of powers, for imposing limitations upon the federal government, for adopting the republican principle of election of the executive, was to prevent things being done in opposition to the will of the people. All of these constitutional provisions, to which so much thought was given, were preventive, restrictive, negative in their operation.

*Not Adapted to Rendering Public Service*

Charters of incorporation for doing business, if successful, must be positive in their operation—they must provide for doing the things that the people want done; and to this little thought was given. At the time our constitutions were adopted there was little the people wanted the government to do—except to look after our national defense; and this at the time depended largely on a temporarily organized citizen soldiery rather than on the high specialization in the production and use of great mechanical engines of war. Other needs of the people could be

attended to by the local community. Even the English people to this time had felt little need for developing a government for doing things. They had little experience in institution-building that had for its end the rendering of public service. In our country, not only was the need not felt, but the whole political philosophy of our people had been set against the idea of the government doing things. For the same reason that we adopted our constitutions, we had also adopted a philosophy of *laissez faire*. So that in developing our institutions under these broad charters of liberty adopted by the people for their protection, almost no thought was given to the subject of making the government efficient.

*Need for Adaptation of the Representative System to Executive Leadership*

But the demand on the government for service grew. The need for a government which could do things was first felt in the older political societies of Europe. There they not only first felt the necessity for service by the government, but they also felt their own economic limitations. Increased service meant increased cost of government; increased cost of government meant increased revenues; increased revenues meant increased burdens of taxation. These things compelled attention not only to the constructive and positive side of constitution making—to an organization and to methods designed for getting things done—but also, to the development of means of control for making the government responsive to public opinion, and responsible not alone for its infractions of liberty but also for the manner in which it used the trust estate. It was this concept of trusteeship, and the pressure of economic necessity, that brought home to officers strict accountability, and caused the people to demand efficiency and economy in the management of their affairs.

As rural democratic England had been the great school in which the principles of personal, political and civil liberty had been taught, so it was that in industrial democratic England the world got its first and most useful lessons in the adaptation of principles of democracy to a government of powers—a government which was capable of rendering any and every service desired by the people, and at the same time subject to such controls as would make the administration of the public trusteeship responsible and responsive to the will of its beneficiaries. In adjusting the representative system which had already been

established it was found that this very machinery of control was just as well suited to efficient management as it was to the protection of liberty. In fact, the representative system of control had already been worked out by the people as a matter of experience in the management of their corporate joint enterprises—those great democracies for carrying on private business through which England was made prosperous. In these was also a board or “representative body.” In these was also an electorate. These agencies of control over institutions for doing things—the “representative body” and an “electorate”—had been forced on the government by the people, originally, to prevent things from being done. It remained only for the government in response to popular demand to develop a procedure for the proper use of the “electorate” and of “representatives” to make the corporation in which all the people were shareholders both efficient and responsive to the wishes of that great commonwealth that constituted the democracy of England.

The evolution of what may be called the technique of responsible government in England began about the time of our Revolutionary War. Before that time the government was subject only to the brute threat of revolution. Prior to the Great Charter such control as was exercised over what was to be done and what funds were to be provided, was through popular assembly. Then the people came to rely on an “electorate” and on “representatives” who met from time to time to make these decisions. Before the beginning of the last century, this form of control had been largely negative in its operation. To make it positive and effective in an institution which was called on to do things provision must be made for strong *executive leadership*—but a *leadership*, however, that would make and execute plans subject to the wishes of the people. Not having an *elected executive*, this adjustment was found in a prime minister.

To make the prime minister effective as a leader, however, and at the same time responsive to the will of the people, it was found necessary to require that he regularly appear before the “representatives” of the people and give an account of what he had done, as well as submit his plans for doing things in the future; and in case his administration—his leadership—were not found to be satisfactory, provision must be made for his prompt retirement. To the end that the government might be efficient it also was necessary to utilize the industrial principle of executive specialization—to provide the prime minister with able assis-

tants—who would represent him as the directing heads of departments of work; but in order that the prime minister might have the means of protecting his responsibility, it was also found necessary to adopt the principle of joint instead of individual responsibility—"solidarity" of the cabinet,—so that the prime minister could be held to account, so that the cabinet would stand before the representatives of the people as a single man. The occasion most favorable for review of the acts of the prime minister and his cabinet was that occasion on which they came before representatives of the people with request for funds.

Both the principles of executive accountability and of executive responsibility for proposals made necessary the development of a budget procedure, by means of which the representatives of the people could find out what had been done and what was proposed before new supplies were voted. This was also essential to the enforcement of responsiveness of the whole government to the will of the people. In case the prime minister found that a majority of representatives of the people would not approve his acts and support his leadership, he was given the choice of amending his proposal to meet their views or of taking the issue directly to the people. Thus the adaptation was effected which made the people the governors of the government. The government was made the machinery of democracy for doing things. Thus, step by step, adaptations were made of an initial system of negative control established by the English people for the protection of their liberties, to make it effective for carrying on the growing business of the nation—for making the executive a real leader before the people and at the same time their most obedient servant—for enforcing accountability on individual officers and responsiveness to public opinion in the preparation, appraisal and execution of plans.

From the experience of England the democracy of Europe has learned much. France has made her own the adaptations of England's constitution for purposes of control over what the government is doing and what it proposes to do. And with these the French Republic has developed an efficiency in administration which has far surpassed that of England's government. Republican Switzerland has profited by this experience. The rising spirit of democracy in every European nation has reached out for and taken over the representative system with its adaptations for control over the executive, and with the means developed for holding the head of the government responsible for doing

things that the people want done. Japan has made it her own. Crowned heads have found that service to a great democracy is the only guarantee of title. Monarchies have given way, and representative governments have taken their places. The English method of enforcing responsibility and responsiveness of leadership through an annual review, both of what has been done and of what is proposed before supplies are granted, is used by all great representative governments other than our own, whether the executive holds office by hereditary succession, during good behavior, or by election with fixed tenure.

*American Institutions Inefficient*

American institutions have had quite a different history. While the evolution of a technique of responsible management has been going on abroad, we have drifted along and done practically nothing to reconcile our charters of liberty to make them effective as charters of powers. Our early political acts, as in Europe, were directed toward the negation of executive authority. Our first acts were to destroy the executive. Then the federal congress recommended the organization of state governments with executive branches, thinking that all civil administration could be thus conducted. For fourteen years we tried to run the federal government with no executive department, but without success. Then we adopted a system in which an executive was provided for, but left out of our written constitution all of the essentials of responsible and responsive leadership.

From the beginning our governments have been built on negative lines—they have lacked the machinery for getting things done in a manner to command the respect and the support of the people. Our constitution makers have thought little about the adjustments necessary to make our fundamental law a charter of powers. Much attention was given to the two great instruments of popular control over the executive—the “electorate” and “representative body”—because these were thought to be necessary for the protection of our liberty. But in our institutional plans we failed to provide an effective “prime mover,” and we have failed to recognize the uses of the “electorate” and the “representative” body as instruments of control over an institutional prime mover.

The motive force in government, as well as in all other institutions, must be an executive. No matter what instruments of control over this motive force are provided, these cannot be

effectively used unless they are applied to a "prime mover." The executive must not only have the power to get things done, but also must be required to exercise this power in the face of a possibility of prompt retirement in case his leadership is not supported. Neither a broad "electorate" nor a great "representative body" can act effectively or intelligently unless it has before it a definite well-considered plan or policy; and the one best qualified to prepare such a plan is the executive. But the executive should have no power to act until his plan is approved, and he must know that every proposal submitted is open to closest scrutiny. Otherwise the government cannot be made responsive to the will of the people as expressed through representatives in expressing approval or disapproval.

Instead of providing in our system for utilizing the "electorate" and the "representative body" as instruments of control (the only purpose to which they were adapted) and then developing an executive machinery subject to this control, which would be responsive to the will of the people, we began with an executive who had no power of leadership. And then, as demands for institutional service increased, we did violence to every principle of representative government—we sought to develop the "electorate" and the "representative body" as prime movers—and to utilize the "executive" primarily as an instrument of control. We have done this wittingly. We have done this because we distrusted the representative system—for fear the "electorate" and the "representative body" would fail to prove effective as instruments of control; and that the executive machine would run wild. We have done this in the thought that by making the executive a responsible leader we might possibly sacrifice those liberties for which our fathers fought—preferring to rely on written constitutional inhibitions rather than on the representative system for control over a government of powers. We have succeeded in one thing only—the one thing we started out to do—demonstrated to the world that under written constitutions a republic can be established in which the executive can do little harm. We have also demonstrated to our own satisfaction that under the system which we have developed the executive can do little good.

#### *Results of Lack of Responsible Leadership*

But there have been also other results. It has been found to be impossible to operate a great complex institution at all suc-



cessfully without some kind of leadership. Not having provided in our constitution for responsible leadership for common welfare purposes within the government, irresponsible leadership has been developed by organizations of men for selfish purposes on the outside. In place of a responsible leader who may be held to account and made responsive to the will of the people, we have the "boss." Instead of the "electorate" and the "representative body" having laid before them each year a well-prepared plan, a definite proposal, for which a responsible executive may be held to account, the people without knowledge of what is going on have seen hundreds of millions of dollars of public resources each year voted away by a system of "log rolling"—they have seen great national resources wasted that might have been effectively used for public service. Instead of having a budget submitted by an executive who can be made responsible to the people for every item of past expenditure and for every proposal for future expenditure, as well as for devising ways and means that are acceptable, we have developed a system of "pork barrel" finance; and in addition to being criminally wasteful, we have the most inefficient public institution that the world has ever known.

#### *Increasing Popular Discontent*

For a century there has been a growing feeling of discontent—discontent not at the impairment of our liberties, which would cause the people to rise in revolution, but at the waste of resources, at inability to enforce official responsibility, at the irresponsiveness of the government to the will of the people, at what we have come to call "invisible government," at the "dark chamber" performances of standing committees operated on by back door methods through a "lobby," at the ineffectiveness of "paroxysms of political reform"—overthrows of administrations at the end of fixed terms without the ability to settle issues or determine policies.

But instead of approaching the problem of organization for public service in the same spirit and with the same prospective that the founders of our government approached recurring infractions of principles of liberty, instead of looking to the experience of other nations when making changes in our constitutions, we have listened to appeals to prejudice—we have applauded the harangues of demagogues who, profiting by the very conditions

that have given rise to growing discontent, have cried down all references to the experiences of others as "un-American" and "undemocratic." We have shut our eyes to the everyday experience of business men in our own country, or when having this experience brought to our attention as being worthy of consideration as a possible method for increasing the efficiency of our public institutions, we have applauded those who have decried them as the devices of "the Plunderbund."

And in efforts of the people to overthrow the "boss," one change after another has been made in our constitutions, which has resulted in making the "boss" more and more a political necessity. Our remedy for irresponsible government has been more irresponsibility. Our cure for the abuse of power has been not to provide for responsible leadership and for effective means of control, but to make responsible leadership impossible—to take away power from those who must be looked to to do things. Constitutional amendments have multiplied, but those have been limitations of power rather than impositions of duty. To cure inefficiency in a single executive, we have multiplied the number of elective officers and made each one independent of the other; to cure inefficiency in independently elected officers, we have set up commissions which are responsible to no one; to cure "log rolling" we have taken away the powers of the legislature; to cure irresponsiveness of representatives of the people, we do away with the representative system and adopt "direct legislation." And so we have gone on from bad to worse until our public institutions have become the despair of the people.

### *Conclusion*

It is time that the American people began to approach the problem of organization for efficient public service with the same breadth of view that our forefathers approached the problem of protecting our personal, political and civil liberties. From the experience of one hundred and forty years, under the theory and practice of American constitutions, this conclusion may be drawn; that as charters for the protection of liberty against executive usurpation our constitutions have served a highly useful purpose; that as charters of incorporation of institutions for transacting the public business—for doing the work of a democracy—they are among the world's greatest failures. While for a time, with our marvelous resources, we may continue to do business as we

have done it in the past, it is to be hoped that our government will not be called on to measure its efficiency against that of another great power until we have so far readjusted our institutions that they may command the united support and confidence of the people and we may be prepared to defend these institutions against a less free but more efficient nation.

## CHAPTER II

### RESPONSIBLE LEADERSHIP—AN ESSENTIAL TO EFFICIENT DEMOCRACY<sup>1</sup>

---

Since the Great War began it has frequently been said that democracy is on trial. If those who made this observation had applied their philosophic reasoning earlier it might have been well, for democracy was on trial as much in 1912 or 1913 as it has been in 1914 or 1915.

What Germans call "Kultur" is a plan of living; a plan of working; a way of thinking. Largely it is the economy of a people who, through cooperation, have been able to do things effectively—the economy of a people who have not only organized to do things but who also assert themselves with all their power in support of a right to compete commercially with people who have proved themselves to be less efficient. "Kultur" stands not only for German individual and group efficiency but also for German opportunity. "Kultur" means more of collectivism and less of that form of individualism which other people call liberty—a form of collectivism, however, which makes for German accomplishment.

#### *Responsible versus Irresponsible Leadership*

All government is a form of collectivism. The underlying assumption of democratic government is that the community, acting collectively under the direction and control of governing agents, will be able to have things done through the government much more effectively than if left to individuals. But Anglo-Saxon collectivism has been worked out through a leadership that has been made subservient to the will of a majority while the German collectivism has been worked out under a leadership which has steadfastly refused to admit that it is responsible to the will of the people; a leadership which asserts for itself divine authority; a leadership, however, which has been so far mindful

---

<sup>1</sup>Address by Frederick A. Cleveland delivered at the Dedication of the Harris Building of Economics and Administration, Northwestern University December 2, 1915.

of the needs of the people that it has gained for itself their united support. While German leadership has been arbitrary and paternalistic, like the Japanese government also it has been far-seeing enough to do the things the people want done, and being so disposed, has been the more effective because it was not hampered by constitutional limitations. It has been able to keep a majority behind a great centralized military program, by convincing the German people that this is necessary to their common welfare. With all their arbitrary powers of leadership the Hohenzollerns have not used them for conspicuously selfish and non-social ends. And so it is that within two generations they have been able to develop in the German people both an individual and a group efficiency that surpasses that of any other people.

#### *Irresponsible Leadership May Be Efficient*

An irresponsible executive may be highly efficient, but being irresponsible he may also use his powers for selfish and non-social ends. One of the things that the Anglo-Saxon race has stood for is the principle that the executive should be both responsible and efficient; but, if one or the other of these ends must be sacrificed it is better in the long run to sacrifice efficiency than to sacrifice responsibility. The American people are just beginning to wake up to the idea that they have sacrificed both to a blind faith in the principle of frequent elections of officers for fixed terms, as a means of control.

It is to be assumed that with all their unrest the American people have not lost and will not lose their faith in democracy or in republican institutions. The institutional adaptations of the last one hundred thirty-five years, however, have been such as to cause them to question their own wisdom—to ask why it is that they have not succeeded in the management of their public affairs, while they have been so eminently successful in private undertakings.

The purpose of this essay is to point out what seems to be the fundamental weakness in American public administration—the lack of provision for responsible leadership—as well as the conclusion that such a leadership is essential to efficient democracy.

#### *Some Interesting Facts About Democracies*

It may seem pedantic to bring into this discussion a definition of democracy; yet there are so many notions about what a

democracy is that consideration of the subject suggested demands not only a definition but also a categorical statement of certain facts and conclusions about the mechanism of leadership and control. We begin therefore with these fundamental propositions:

That a democracy is a free sovereign people, organized for doing the things that are commonly needed or desired, and controlled by the ascertained wishes of a majority

That the instruments which have been found most effective for ascertaining the wishes of a majority are an "electorate" and a "representative body"

That, in existing democracies, there are two ways of organizing for doing the things which a majority want done, viz.: by the "election" of a *multiple executive*—a number of independent officers; and by the "election" of a single or *chief executive* with provision made for the selection of subordinates

That, in democracies, which have a multiple executive, there are two ways of electing them, namely, choice by the "electorate" and choice by the "*representative branch*" of the government

That, in democracies which have chief executives, there are four ways of "electing" them, namely: (1) the choice of a specified *individual* as chief executive by the "electorate"; (2) the choice of a specified *individual* as chief executive by an "*electoral college*"; (3) the choice of a specified *individual* as chief executive by the "*representative branch*" of the government; and (4) the choice of a *reigning family* by *representatives* of the people.

#### *Some Interesting Facts About Leadership*

This categorical array of democracies and of different forms of organization for getting things done has for its purpose drawing attention to the following significant facts, viz.:

That *executive leadership* has been found to be an *essential to efficient direction and control* in any and every government whatever may be its form

That no democracy which has organized for doing things under a *multiple executive* has ever been able to develop an effective or a responsible leadership within the government itself

That few democracies which have elected a *single or chief executive for fixed terms* have dared to give to these chief executives such powers as would enable them to become effective leaders

That those democracies which have *single or chief executives without fixed terms* have developed effective leadership, and furthermore have made them, or are in the process of making them responsive to the will of the people.

*The Reason Executive Leadership Is Essential to Effective Direction and Control*

Before attempting to draw any constructive conclusions, let us make a few more observations. First let us reflect for a moment on the reason that executive leadership is essential to the effective direction and control of any cooperative enterprise. Argument is unnecessary to convince persons familiar with business, public or private, that successful management requires leadership of some kind, somewhere. In a representative government there are only two alternatives to *executive leadership*: one within the governing organization; and one, without. The alternative to executive leadership within the governing organization is *leadership in the legislative branch*.

Experience has shown, however, that a numerous representative body cannot successfully direct the exacting details of administration without great waste and inefficiency. At best, this means administration of different parts of the enterprise under the control of committees, the membership of which cannot be made responsible for results. For fourteen years we tried this form of leadership in our federal government before 1789 and failed. The state of New York tried it for two years, and the preamble of the constitution of 1777 begins with an admission of failure. Other states tried it and failed. Not only is all experience against this form of organization for leadership in state and national government, but so is all reason. Another fact is to be noted, viz.: that where such a leadership has been tried for any considerable period of time, it has operated to subvert the institutional purposes of the legislative body itself. It has failed both as an executive expedient and has destroyed the independence of the representative body. Executive leadership is essential to effective direction and control, because it is the only way of gaining for the institution the benefits of high specialization and effective cooperation; because it is the only way of making the management either of direct democracy or of representative government effective in the achievement of the results desired by the people; because it is the only way of making the organization

for doing the things the people want done responsive to the wishes of a majority.

*The Reason Effective and Responsible Leadership Cannot Be Developed with a Number of Independent Elected Officers*

All history has written down the multiple-headed executive as a failure. Rome had its Triumvirate—its small executive commission. With what result, the world well knows. Our American Republic is now trying the experiment over again. Under our constitutions and charters there are *two kinds of multiple-executive* forms of organization: (1) those in which the assignments of duty to each of the several independent executive officers are designated by law; and (2) those in which the assignments of duties to each of the several officers are left to be arranged between them, by agreement or majority action. All of our state constitutions, and all of our old form city charters, provide for an executive organization of the first type. The state organizations with all their inefficiency, all their irresponsibility, are still among the living. Most of the municipal experiments of this type are now among the dead. They all tell the same story in language that the American people do not mistake. The demand for an effective government, and for one which is responsive to the will of the governed, has marked them all for the institutional graveyard.

But the first step away from these initial forms of multiple executives was in the direction of another of the same general type—the executive commission. In this one, a number of executives of equal rank and coordinate powers are independently elected to manage affairs—the difference being that they sit as a board. This is the result of a reaction against management by irresponsible legislative committees. Commission government is to us a relatively new political toy. When first it started under the impulse of the popular lash, it “ran like a top.” Then it began to wobble. Then the people began to lay their commission government aside and to look for something that would stand on a firm basis. They are now experimenting with the city manager.

It may be accepted as an established conclusion that a multiple executive with coordinate powers and independent personnel cannot develop effective leadership because there is no way of preventing divided responsibility; because there is no way of preventing divided leadership—(and both of these defects are institutionally fatal); because it leaves out of account the principle



of unity of policy and solidarity of action; because it attempts the impossible—responsible leadership and critical review of executive action in one body—it confuses executive with legislative functions. The multiple executive is foredoomed to be inefficient for the same reason that the Roman Triumvirate failed. It is not adapted to the representative system of popular control.

*The Reason that Democracies Have Not Dared to Give to Chief Executives, with Fixed Terms, Powers of Leadership*

This brings us to the single executive—the chief executive type of organization. And initially it brings us to the consideration of the principle of a “fixed term.” The principle of “fixed term” for the executive was not adopted with a view to making this branch of the government more efficient; it was adopted to insure the successful operation of the principle of popular “election”; it was directed against usurpation and the irresponsible use of power. The makers of our constitutions had before them at all times as the one great end to be achieved at any cost, the protection of the liberties of the people without resort to revolution. “Frequent elections of officers for fixed terms” has been one of the many constitutional provisions adopted to insure this result. Another means of insurance was to take away from the executive powers of leadership. But when (with increasing demands made on the government for service) it was found that great waste and inefficiency resulted from lack of responsible executive leadership, the people did not dare to restore to the executive sufficient power to make leadership effective. This was because their executives had fixed terms—because, within the period of their terms, there would be no way of getting rid of one who acted arbitrarily, and who overrode the will of a majority, as expressed through the chosen representatives of the people.

We have some conspicuous examples of constitutions which provide for a chief executive, elected for a fixed term, but which hedge him about in such manner that he cannot be effective as a leader except by indirect and invisible methods of control. One of these is our federal government. The background of the convention of 1787 had been nine centuries of executive usurpation—of infraction of principles of personal, political, and civil liberty that were inborn in the Anglo-Saxon people. As has been pointed out by Stimson, under Norman kings and their successors, every

case of usurpation had come from the executive—from executives who denied the principle of popular sovereignty or acknowledged it only when it was backed by a mailed fist.

The plan of federal organization proposed in the convention of 1787 by Edmund Randolph of Virginia, the one alleged to have been presented by Charles Pinckney of South Carolina, provided for responsible executive leadership. But fear of usurpation of executive power—fear lest popular control would prove inadequate to cope with executive leadership in a centralized government—was a moving force which led a majority of delegates to favor a different kind of executive—one without the powers essential to effective leadership. In discussing the proposed constitution, some of our greatest men foresaw the danger which one hundred and thirty-five years of actual operation of this constitution have shown us.

*Predictions which Have Come True*

Madison, in commenting on experience prior to the Constitutional convention said: "The founders of our republics . . . seem never to have recollected the danger from legislative usurpation, which, by assembling all power in the same hands, must lead to the same tyranny as is threatened by executive usurpation. . . . Its [i. e. the legislative department's] constitutional powers, being at once more extensive and less susceptible of precise limits, it can with greater certainty mask under complicated and indirect measures the encroachments which it makes on coordinate departments. . . . Nor is this all: As the legislative department alone has access to the pockets of the people, and has, in some constitutions, full discretion and, in all, a prevailing influence over the pecuniary rewards of those who fill other departments, a dependence is thus created in the latter, which gives still greater facilities for encroachment by the former."

The results of the lack of powers necessary to make our federal chief executive an effective responsible leader before the representatives of the people, and before the people themselves, are significant. Through the insidious use of its powers, the representative branch of the government has completely reversed the original plan of separation of powers as conceived by the fathers. Congress dominates the administration, and the president dominates legislation. What we now have is an irresponsible government by congressional committees with a chief executive using

his powers of veto to protect the people against legislative usurpation.

Other examples of the same kind are found in our states. New Jersey has essentially the federal plan, and its history under this form of constitution has been the same. The very lack of leadership in our political system, even where we have provided a nominal chief executive, together with the natural inability to develop effective leadership in a representative body, has led us to accept unofficial, irresponsible leadership of the political "boss." This has been found preferable to no leadership at all. The conclusion (that a chief executive, such as is provided for in our federal and state constitutions, cannot be an effective leader without resort to underhanded indirect methods) is supported by all experience.

*Reason for Defeat of New York's New Constitution*

Another conclusion is supported not only by recent experience in New York but by the whole constitutional history of English speaking people, viz: that so long as our chief executives are elected for fixed terms, without any means for prompt recall, fear of executive usurpation (the use of executive power in a manner to impair our personal, political, and civil liberties) will continue to make the people hesitate.

The new constitution as submitted to the electorate of New York provided for increasing the powers of the governor to such an extent that he could become an effective leader. It made him the chief executive; it gave to him much the same powers that the federal constitution gives to the president; besides, it put the initiative in his hands on financial legislation and gave to him the right to the floor to explain and defend his measures. It did not, however, provide for adequate control over the use of this power. It did not provide for an immediate reference of executive proposals directly to the people in case a majority of their representatives refused to support them; it did not give to the legislature a right to call a new election in case the governor used his veto power or his leadership in a manner conceived to be opposed to the general welfare. It neither gave to the legislators a tenure long enough for them to become efficient representatives of the people, nor did it provide for a *prompt and effective recall* in case the powers of the governor or of the legis-

lature were arbitrarily used. The only action consistent with a thousand years of Anglo-Saxon history was for the people to sacrifice leadership rather than popular control and this was the action of the electorate. The American people may be counted on to refuse to grant to governors powers adequate to make them effective executives so long as they have terms of office with no constitutional means provided for prompt recall.

*The Reason that Democracies with Provision for Prompt Recall,  
Have Developed Effective Executive Leadership*

May we digress a moment at this point to explain what is meant by "recall." The term is not restricted to the narrow sense in which it is used in this country. As it is used here, it means the ability to bring the tenure and authority of an executive to an end at any time that he does not command the support of a majority of the legislature; or to end the tenure and authority of the legislature when its action is not supported by a majority of the electorate. The most effective recall is one in which the representatives of the people are empowered to force an executive to retire or call a new election simply by a vote of lack of confidence; and in which the executive may force a new election by an order of dissolution. The "popular recall" by petition and election can do no harm and may do some good. It may be a desirable device, since it may operate as a safety valve in case the regular and usual controlling devices fail to work. "Popular recall" may be used as an extra safety device to prevent high pressure explosions in democratic institutions, but a recall which is best adapted to making the government at all times subservient to the wishes of a majority is one which will not require popular discontent and organized opposition to rise to a point of pressure to make it dangerous to the state before it operates.

With a controlling device which is adapted to keeping our institutions in constant adjustment it would not be necessary to use the "popular recall" except to prevent collusion between the executive and the legislature. But the principle which is pointed to is this: That a *fixed term* which does not provide for the immediate retirement of an executive when he no longer has the confidence of a majority is wholly incompatible with democracy—incompatible with the principles of popular government in any form. Given, however, a plan of organization in which the representative body, by a majority vote in opposition,

may force the executive to retire, or call a new election at which both the legislature and the executive must stand, executive leadership is the only thing that is consistent with this form of control. It is only when the executive is required to come before the legislature and give an account of his stewardship, and to submit to representatives his future plans for their approval, that a legislative recall can be made effective. Therefore, the representative himself demands that the executive take leadership and assume responsibility for results.

May we also digress to bring to mind the essential difference between a republic and a constitutional monarchy? The distinction relates only to the method of choosing the executive. A republic is a democratic form of government in which one or more *designated individuals* are elected as executives—with or without a fixed term. A constitutional monarchy is a democratic form of government in which a *family* is chosen, without term, and the individual who is to serve as executive is determined by operation of a rule of law. To either of these forms the principle of "recall" may apply—whether by adverse vote of representatives, or by petition and vote of an "electorate."

*Forms of Republican Organization which Provide for Prompt Recall*

There are two forms of republican organization which provide for the prompt recall of the executive when he fails to retain the support of a majority of the representative branch of the government: the one is illustrated in what we have come to call in our cities "the commission-manager plan"; the other is illustrated in the French adaptation of the English system. The commission-manager plan is a representative form of government with a small council or board of representatives chosen by the electorate at large for a fixed term, and with an executive elected without term, chosen by a majority of the council. Here the executive may be retired at any time. For this reason he is made responsible for executive leadership—in fact, that is why commissions employ city managers.

The French adaptation of the English political system is one in which a nominal chief executive is elected for a fixed term, and the real executive head—the responsible leader—is chosen without term by a majority of the representatives of the people. The French modification is in the adoption of a method of selecting the titular head of the government, which makes it a republic instead of a constitutional monarchy. In case the

French people at any time may want to change from a republic to a constitutional monarchy, all they will have to do is to change the method of choosing the titular head—the responsible leadership would remain the same.

The reason that those democracies, in which the principle of prompt retirement of the executive by a majority-opposition vote is followed, have developed executive leadership is this: There is no danger from executive usurpation. On the contrary, there is an advantage, both to the people and to their representatives, in requiring the one who is made responsible for doing things to prepare the plans for the development of the public service and to assume responsibility both for submitting financial proposals and for operating results.

*Forms of Control which Have Proved Effective*

There is everything to commend executive leadership and nothing to fear from it, provided it may at all times be made subject to the control of the will of a majority. If it cannot be so controlled, then executive leadership operates to defeat the ends and purposes of a democracy. The question as to whether a strong executive who is made responsible for leadership can be controlled with certainty, therefore, is of highest importance. On this point we can learn much from those democracies which have developed constitutional monarchies. The methods of control developed in them are instructive because they have proved to be effective even as against the arbitrary assumptions of the most powerful and best entrenched absolutisms the world has known. They have not only operated effectively, but through them absolutism itself has been gradually reduced to subservience and democratic, constitutional government has been set up in its stead.

Control in constitutional monarchies begins with the notion of a strong executive leadership. To cure the irresponsible use of executive power they did not destroy or weaken executive leadership, as we have done in this country; they provided the means of controlling it. They did this by controlling the purse. The way they controlled the purse was, first to establish the constitutional principle that the executive could neither raise money nor spend it until he had submitted to the representatives of the people a plan, explained its purpose, and got from them the approval of a majority. They did exactly what every business corporation does to control its strong executive—require

him to assume responsibility for leadership, but make it necessary that he get his plans approved before he has any authority to go ahead.

The second principle of control established in these constitutional monarchies is this: That before the executive could be heard on his plans for the future, he must explain to the representatives of the people what he has done with the funds already voted. This gave to the people the means of enforcing strict accountability.

The third and last step was to force him to surrender his leadership to someone who could be "elected" and who, therefore, could be retired at any time that he did not retain the confidence of a majority. And because of the fact that the principle of hereditary succession had been established for the titular head of the government, they gave this leadership to a prime minister who took his place at the head of the administration as the choice of a majority.

A further interesting adaptation was made in the interest of democracy. Having taken away from the titular head of the government all responsibility for leadership, he was then made the instrument through which the popular branch of the government might be sent back to the "electorate" to insure that it was representative—that it reflected public opinion on any plan or proposal that had been brought before it for adoption. The titular head was, therefore, given the power to accept the verdict of the "opposition," or to appeal to the "electorate."

*Methods by which Democracies, with Elected Chief Executives, May Develop Responsible Leadership*

Although nearly all of our political experience has been without executive leadership, we need no evidence other than this experience to convince the American people of its need. The American people are more dissatisfied with their government than are any other people who have adopted and maintained the representative system over a period of twenty or more years. The fundamental difference between our constitutions and those of other countries having representative systems is: lack of executive leadership here, and provision for responsible executive leadership there. It seems unnecessary to do more than state the conclusion—that responsible executive leadership is essential to efficient democracy.

The American people are now asking themselves this question:

How can executive leadership be made effective and responsible in a republic such as ours? One possible adaptation has already been mentioned—that of the French Republic. Attention has been called to the fact that the republican elective principle is applied there both to the titular head of the government (the president) and to the responsible leader (the prime minister). To the president is given a fixed term. The tenure of the prime minister is without fixed term and subject to recall by an adverse vote of the representative branch.

But the background of experience here is quite different from that of France, or that of any other European country. There the whole constitutional development was one which had for its purpose control over a hereditary, irresponsible monarch. With our Revolutionary War we threw off all conditions that made it necessary to build our political institutions around a nobility or a royal family. Even if there was then, there is not now, anything to make it necessary to have a titular head of the executive branch in this country simply to do "honors." What we need above all things is a real executive who is required to assume responsibilities for leadership, and the constitutional means for retiring him in case he uses his power in a manner contrary to the good opinion of a majority. Does it not seem possible that we might provide for ourselves a somewhat more simple organization for doing the work of the people than has been provided abroad and at the same time make the principle of popular control quite as effective? Why may we not pattern our institutions of public business more largely after those great institutions of private business with which our people are familiar—institutions in which the executive is given every facility and opportunity to make good as a manager, with the understanding that he may be retired at any time if he fails to commend himself and his management to the continuing support of a majority of his board.

If we were to provide for individual suffrage, instead of dollar suffrage, in our private corporations we would have a simple representative system that could be applied to public business. If, in addition to the real responsible executive, it seems necessary or even desirable to have someone in the government who may be called on to waste his time and energies in the advertisement of social functions, to attend weddings and afternoon teas, to eat from two to six dinners after sundown each day, and to discourse on the humanities and inhumanities of the time,



would it not be well to let the representative body which is not charged with any of the exacting duties of administration elect one of their number to wear the gold lace and silk stockings? This is what is now being attempted in some of our "commission-manager" cities where there is a mayor. This solution has much to commend it, in any event it leaves the responsible executive leader free to give his thought to prepare plans for public improvements.

## CHAPTER III

### VISIBLE GOVERNMENT VERSUS INVISIBLE GOVERNMENT<sup>1</sup>

---

It has been said that the War for American Independence was one of a long line of protests against irresponsible government. Free to determine what their form of government should be, our fathers set up a republic. This was done in the belief that frequent elections of officers for fixed terms would make our institutions responsive to the will of the people. To this end it was provided that "the United States shall guarantee to every state in the Union a republican form of government." Belief in the efficacy of the republican principle caused Washington to decline a third term as chief executive. Not only have the American people accepted the conclusion that a republic is well suited to the ends of a great democracy, but they have relied on this principle as a cure for all political ills.

#### *Failure of Our Methods of Popular Control*

For one hundred and twenty-six years we have labored with this principle of popular control to make it effective. We have broadened the electorate; we have shortened official terms; we have increased the number of officers to be periodically chosen by the people; we have prohibited re-election of executives after the end of a fixed term; we have protected the ballot from corrupt practices; we have worshipped the fetish of "frequent elections for fixed terms" in various forms, only to find that we still have irresponsible government—so insidious and abhorrent to democratic ideals that practices under our republican régime have fairly earned for themselves the opprobrious designation of "invisible government."

#### *Examples of the Successful Application of the Electoral Principle*

The fact that all our experiments with the electoral principle have been failures, however, should not discourage us. While

---

<sup>1</sup> Part of a discussion of the subject of Budget making and the increased cost of Government before the Economic Association, December 28, 1915.

we have clung to one idea with a blind faith that is quite un-American, others under more favorable circumstances have cast about and found methods for making this principle of control a marked success. Not one but many democracies have found the means for impressing the will of a majority on their political agents—for making their governments both responsive and responsible. The easiest way to get a knowledge of the practical workings of methods of control that have been found effective is to go where they are used—to study them where for a period of years they have been in successful operation. This place may be Berne, the capital of Switzerland; it may be London, Paris, Rome, Athens; it may be South Africa or Australasia. Or, wishing not to go so far afield, we may simply cross our northern boundary; here, at our very door, in the provinces, and at Ottawa in the dominion government of Canada, may be found in successful operation the things that we seek. Here we may find visible government—and, as a result, responsive and responsible government—working under social and economic conditions quite similar to our own.

#### *Canadian Experience*

Let us go to Toronto, the capital of the Province of Ontario. This province is the New York state of Canada. It is by far the most populous and wealthy of our northern neighbors. The country and the people are very like those on this side of the line in Ohio, Pennsylvania, New York or New England. Let us go to Ontario when the government is holding its annual meeting—when representatives come together to find out what those entrusted with carrying on the business of the people have been doing, and to pass on their plans for another year.

#### *The People in Session by Representatives*

What would be heard and seen at one of these annual meetings of the Ontario government may best be told by following through a typical session like that of 1914. The legislative assembly of Ontario, as it is called, met February 18th. After they had found out who were entitled to seats and the new members had been sworn in, the session was formally opened by a representative of the crown. This takes the place of the speech of the governor in our states. Then followed the organization of the committees and certain other formal things, so that it was not until the 26th that they were ready to take up the real business

for which they had come together. The minutes of this day's session contain the following entry:

"On motion by Mr. Lucas, seconded by Mr. Hearst,

RESOLVED: that the house to-morrow resolve itself into the committee of supply, and

RESOLVED: that the house to-morrow resolve itself into the committee of ways and means."

### *Visible Government*

This simple entry is full of meaning. It means that in Ontario, in each of the provinces of Canada, in the dominion government, in all other countries where similar methods are used, there is no such thing as "invisible government"; that their method of holding officers to account is to call them before the bar of the house at public session. The motion quoted is the notice given by the chief executive to the representatives of the people: (1) that he is ready to report to them on what has been done and what has been spent during the last year, together with his views on what work and expenditures should be undertaken for the next year, and (2) that he is ready to report to them how past expenditures have been financed and how it is proposed to finance the new appropriations asked for. This motion means that the resolutions, if passed, thereupon become the "order" of each following day; and that when the main business of the assembly comes up, it will come before the whole house sitting informally as a committee, so that every member may be privileged to ask all the questions of responsible officers of the government that he may care to. At each session when it comes to the "order of the day" the house may resolve itself into a committee of the whole if it cares to take up this business. When in informal session to consider expenditures it calls itself a "committee of supply"; when in session to consider revenues and borrowings it calls itself a "committee of ways and means." These are simply names given to indicate what subject is to be discussed at the meeting.

### *The Executive at the Bar of Public Opinion*

But the significant thing is that the chief executive, by making the motion, indicates that he is ready to report, and after this notice has been given, it is in order for the house to call officers to the bar in committee of the whole house as often as it may wish till the business is disposed of.

*Open-Handed Fair Dealing*

There is another practice not to be lost sight of. After the executive has signified that he is ready to report, opportunity is given at each session, before the "order of the day" is reached, for members to ask "questions" of heads of departments, to be "answered" on the floor; also in case an officer is not prepared to answer at once, opportunity is given to members to obtain "orders" that the officer shall make "returns" on a future day to the questions that are deferred. On the 27th, the day following the proposed resolutions, "questions and answers" and "motions to make returns" began.

The whole theory of parliamentary practice there is that every representative of the people must be given a chance to get all the information he desires. So that in case there is any reason for criticising the government, this may be done openly and publicly. But there is another principle of quite as great importance to the country, namely: that an officer shall not be attacked in the legislature without opportunity being given him to explain and defend his action. The criticism must be made when the officer criticised is present. Such a procedure is of advantage both to the people, for the information of the electorate, and to the officer; it brings to the surface all those undercurrents of gossip, those disturbing rumors which, without such procedure, may carry the best of administrations on the rocks. It does away with ill-defined, underhanded methods of attacking officers who, while devoting themselves to the public service, are being assailed by canny persons seeking public office. It means open-handed fair play for the servants of the people. It means open-handed fair dealing with the public, as well. It means that members of the legislature are to be called to account as well as executive officers. How this method works out appears later.

*The Budget and the Budget Speech*

On March 2nd, Mr. Lucas, the treasurer of the province, gave notice that the next day he would make his financial statement. This was done to give everyone a chance to be there. The method of getting the accounts and the estimates before the house was this: Just before the "order of the day" was reached on the 3rd, the report of the auditor—the "public accounts"—were submitted and referred to the standing committee on public

accounts. This placed in the hands of members of the assembly a printed detailed analysis of expenditures of the last year. Then the "order of the day" for the house to resolve itself into a committee of supply having been read, Mr. Lucas moved "that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and that the house resolve itself into a committee of supply"<sup>1</sup>. At the same time Mr. Lucas had placed on the desk of each member of the legislature a copy of his estimates. In support of his motion "that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair", the provincial treasurer made what in Ontario is popularly known as the "budget speech"<sup>2</sup>.

### *The Import of the Budget Speech*

The budget speech does two things: it explains and interprets what has been done and what is proposed; it is the opening gunfire of the party in power to locate the batteries of the opposition. As a matter of parliamentary practice, it is assumed that it is of great advantage in a democracy to have publicity given not only to what the government is doing, but also to locate any smouldering discontent that may manifest itself in a camp hostile to the government. So we find that the one who makes the budget speech steps out on a public platform before all the representatives of the people and the representatives of the press who are given a place in the assembly hall and while explaining what has been done and what is proposed, he throws down the gauntlet to all comers, and invites attack from any and every quarter. And, to make sure that he may draw the fire of any hidden "opposition", he begins by attacking those who have shown themselves to be hostile by taking seats on the opposite side at the meeting.

<sup>1</sup> Proceedings of the Assembly of the Province of Ontario, 1914, page 4.

<sup>2</sup> It is to be noted that in the Province of Ontario the budget is submitted with the estimates for appropriations, whereas in England the expenditure estimates are submitted at the beginning of the session (December or January) and it is not until April (after the expenditure estimates have been discussed for weeks in the committee of supply) that the "budget" is submitted and the budget speech delivered. The procedure of the house in both cases, however, is practically the same. In each case the expenditure estimates are thoroughly gone over and votes are taken, item by item, on them under the "order of the day" that the house resolve itself into a committee of supply. It is not till the government knows what expenditures are approved by a majority and what are disapproved that the plan of financing is brought in, and then this plan as the "budget" is taken up under the "order of the day" that the house resolved itself into a committee of ways and means.

*Methods Used to Develop the "Opposition" to the Administration as a Whole*

To make this quite clear let us follow the budget speech of Mr. Lucas.<sup>1</sup> After the few preliminary references, the treasurer introduces his subject by saying:

"Although the estimated revenue that I presented to the house last year was substantially less than the estimated expenditure, I made the prediction then that the actual receipts would prove better than the estimates that I was submitting. I said then you would find the estimate of revenue increased and the estimate of expenditure decreased. The house now with the schedule of Receipts and Expenditures and the Public Accounts giving all details before them, will be glad to observe that in neither direction have we been disappointed.

"The total ordinary receipts for the province for the year closed, as per the schedule in your hands and in the Public Accounts, are \$11,188,302.09, and the total ordinary expenditure \$10,868,026.28, leaving a net surplus of ordinary revenue over ordinary expenditure for the year of \$320,275.81, and a balance of \$2,406,006.20 in cash to our credit in the bank. (Applause.)

"I assume that honorable gentlemen opposite who, a year ago, with perfectly serious faces told us that for the year now closed the ordinary expenditure would exceed the ordinary revenue by two to three millions of dollars will be delighted with the actual result. (Laughter.) . . . During recent years there seems to have been necessity for frequent changes in the personnel of financial critics for honorable gentlemen opposite. (Laughter.) A new man is tried out each year. The honorable member from West Northumberland (Mr. S. Clarke) held the post one year only, but he found it was no joke to be financial critic, and besides it soon developed that he had a past political history that was not calculated to qualify him for the position or make him feel comfortable in it, and so he was withdrawn. My honorable friend from Middlesex (Mr. Elliott) was then tried out. He got away to a good start by prophesying that there would be a deficit of \$3,000,000. The actual result showed a small surplus. So bad a guess as that put him out of the running, and he was duly withdrawn. So they go down the line, and my honorable friend from North Bruce (Mr. C. M. Bowman), being the next in the row, is apparently to be tried out this year. But he also has a political history. . . .

<sup>1</sup>Financial statement of the Hon. I. B. Lucas, treasurer of the Province of Ontario, delivered on the third of March, 1914, in the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, in moving the house into a committee of supply (page 4).

"Time has shown that all the gloomy forebodings of these various critics were not warranted, and although my honorable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, had due notice that the financial statement would be made this afternoon, he is not in his place, either to criticise or hear such explanations as may seem necessary or desirable in order to make clear the financial operations of the province for the past year. I ask no better evidence that he knows the finances of this province are all right. The Public Accounts show every detail of every transaction. But, Mr. Speaker, I would like to have had my honorable friend here this afternoon to read to him and to my honorable friend from Middlesex, the critic of last year, the gloomy prophecies then made, the criticism then offered, and compare them with actual results as we now have them. I am sure they would both feel inclined to apologize to Ontario. The best excuse, I fancy the only excuse, my honorable friends opposite can give for these gloomy prophecies—it is the only one that could be offered—is that things are never nearly so bad as they seem—to an Opposition. (Laughter.)"

The very evident reason for these remarks was to arouse the opposition. This is the reason that lies back of nearly one-half of the comments made by the provincial treasurer on the schedules presented to the assembly. He shells the ranks of the opposition to locate their batteries; to get those who had taken sides against the government to fire off all the ammunition which accumulated since the last meeting of the assembly. To this end much was made of published statements and reported speeches of members of the opposition to their constituents. Special attention was given to those members who had an interest in newspapers which were hostile to the government. The main thread of the speech, however, was an explanation and interpretation of a carefully prepared summary of revenues and expenditures (actual and estimated) and of a balance sheet which was in the hands of members at the time the speech was made. And these in turn were supported in very great detail not only by the auditor's report, but also by the reports of various heads of departments who had been getting ready for the session for months before the assembly met.

#### *Testing the Leadership before Considering the Budget in Detail*

It is to be observed that the motion "that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair" was not put to a vote at once. Time was given the opposition to muster their forces—to develop their plan of



attack and by "question and answer" and "motion and order" to get from the government all the statements and admissions desired before the assault. Finally on the 10th, one week later, the leader of the opposition led the assault. It was moved and seconded by the opposition that all the words after "that" of the original motion, which had been made by the provincial treasurer on the 3rd, be stricken out and the following be substituted:

"This house disapproves and protests against (1) the presentation to the house by the Honorable, the Provincial Treasurer, of his financial statement, which does not fairly set forth the character of the financial transactions of the government; (2) the extravagant and wasteful expenditures of public money by the government. . . ."

To have carried this amendment would have meant that a majority of the representatives of the people had lost confidence in the personnel charged with the management of public affairs and that, therefore, they did not care to have them submit their plans for the next year; this would have meant also that executive officers would have been forced either to resign or to call a new election on the theory that members of the assembly did not represent public opinion.

After debate on this motion on the next day Mr. Hearst (for the government) moved that all the words of the proposed amendment be cut out and the following be substituted therefor: "This house congratulates the public and the province on the fact that under the administration of public affairs by the present government, no such system as the spoils system has any place." He then proceeds further in the proposed amendment to the amendment to announce the policy of the government with respect to civil service. This motion carried. Then the motion made by Mr. Lucas on the 3rd that the speaker do now leave the chair was put and carried.

#### *Hearings on the Estimates before the Whole House*

All this was to clear the decks for action—for the consideration of the details of the estimates which were now taken up in committee of the whole house. These were considered in detail, each section being marked off on the margin for a separate vote. The purpose of doing so is to enable the government to have them taken up and discussed in committee of the whole house in an orderly manner, and to develop any opposition there may

**RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT**

be to any item. For example, the first section marked off for separate vote is the details of estimates for the "Lieutenant-General's Office"; the second section is the details of estimates for the "Department of Prime Minister and President of the Council," etc., etc. The estimate which actually came before the committee of the whole house for the "Department of the Prime Minister, etc., was as follows:

**I. CIVIL GOVERNMENT**

NO. OF VOTE	NO. OF ITEM	SERVICE	SALARIES AND EXPENSES	
			12 MONTHS ENDING OCTOBER 31, 1915	12 MONTHS ENDING OCTOBER 31, 1916
2		DEPARTMENT OF THE PRIME MINISTER AND PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL		
	1	Deputy Minister and Prime Minister's Secy.	\$2,900.00	\$2,900.00
	2	Clerk		900.00
	3	Clerk	825.00	825.00
	4	Clerk	725.00	725.00
	5	Messenger for Executive Council and Caretaker	1,400.00	1,400.00
	6	Contingencies	3,000.00	3,000.00
	7	<i>Office of the Executive Council</i>		
	8	Clerk of Executive Council	Transferred from	2,900.00
	9	Assistant Clerk of Executive Council	Attorney-General's	1,600.00
	10	Chief Clerk	Department	900.00
11	Contingencies		300.00	
			\$3,850.00	\$15,650.00

*Developing the "Opposition" in Detail*

From this it will be seen that it is proposed to add one more clerk to the "secretary's office"; and to add by way of transfer four additional clerks to the office of "executive council." It is submitted in this form in order that the estimate may be placed before the house item by item; in order that the executive whose estimate is being discussed may be there in person to explain and answer all questions; in order that the government may have recorded an informal vote in committee of the whole house which will not only bring out the opposition but also bring out the case of the government and put each member on record. This is done with the press and with the public present. This is publicity. This is visible government. This is also respon-

sible government—for every member of the cabinet must come there prepared to defend each item in the estimates. No matter what differences of opinion may have developed in the cabinet during the course of preliminary discussion of estimates; no matter how much the initial estimates of a particular department or of a particular member of the cabinet may have been cut by the cabinet as a whole; no matter what differences of opinion may have developed, before the estimates were submitted, on matters of policy, after decision has been reached as to the form of estimates, each member of the government must accept this decision and come before the Assembly prepared to vote as one man. In case any member does not accept the principle of solidarity of executive responsibility, as expressed in the estimates, he must resign beforehand. The cabinet must be as a man in its leadership, and that man the prime minister,—through whom both accountability and responsibility are to be enforced.

*The Conclusion Reached*

Debates were continued under the “order of the day” in committee of supply until April 24th, when a resolution was passed in form as follows: “Resolved that a sum not exceeding \$..... be granted . . . . to defray the expenses of .....for the year ending .....” This ended the deliberations of the house in the committee of supply. Immediately following and under “order of the day” the house resolved itself into the committee of ways and means and passed this resolution: “Resolved, that there be granted out of the consolidated revenue fund of the province a sum not exceeding \$..... to meet the supply to that extent granted . . . . .”

*Passing the Act of Appropriation*

The speaker then resumed the chair and Mr. Ferguson reported that the committee had come to a resolution. The resolution was ordered received forthwith and, continuing, the record recites:

“The following bill was introduced and read for the first time (Bill No. 198) entitled:

An Act for Granting \* \* \* \* Certain Sums of Money to Defray the Expenses of Civil Government for the Year Ending 31 October, 1914 (deficiency) and for the Year Ending 31 October, 1915 (Regular Appropriation) and for other purposes therein Mentioned.

Ordered read a second time forthwith. Bill read a third time and passed."

*Comparison with Our Own Involved Practices*

This brief description will give an idea of the simplicity, the directness, the publicity with which the main business that came before the assembly of the Province of Ontario for the year 1914 was despatched. It is also generally descriptive of the procedure used at each session not only in the Province of Ontario, but also in every other province of Canada. It is generally descriptive of the simplicity of procedure used in handling the business of the dominion parliament at Ottawa. It is characteristic of the simplicity of procedure used in the British Parliament, the French Chamber of Deputies, and in every other country where visible, responsible and responsive government is in practical operation. Compare this procedure with the involved, the occult, the invisible methods that have been worked out in our federal government and at each of our state capitals. Compare the direct dealings of representatives with members of the administration under the one system and the underhanded, indirect log-rolling, pork barrel dealings of representatives with members of administration and with their associates under the other. Compare the results in effectiveness for enforcing accountability, for developing leadership on the one hand, with the lack of accountability and lack of leadership on the other. Can there be any doubt as to which method is preferable?

*The Utilization of the Press for Purposes of Publicity*

In the Province of Ontario no provision is made for having long-winded speeches printed and circulated by members among their constituents. Everything is as open and direct, as straightforward and businesslike as a meeting of a board of directors of an ordinary business corporation. What is said, is said to the point of the business in hand. There is not even a minute kept of the speeches. The record only shows the action taken or the result achieved. The theory of this practice is that if members are given leave to print or a record is kept of the speeches of those who are there to look after the interests of the commonwealth, this will put a premium on "oratory" as distinguished from "business"; that a large part of the time of the assembly will be wasted by "wind-jammers" who are trying to make a record to send back home instead of giving attention

to the affair in hand. Ample opportunity is given, however, for publicity, by having the business in hand publicly discussed with the representatives of the press in attendance.

*What Makes Front Page News*

A matter which is being discussed between members of a standing committee and behind closed doors, as is the practice in our legislatures, seldom has any news value; if any opportunity is given for public attendance the discussion is largely academic, and academic discussion is not front page news. In these committee discussions or inquiries, no one assumes responsibility for a definite proposal until the committee reports, and then it is the report of a bi-partisan, star chamber proceeding. The bill is presented, not as an administrative measure, but as the proposal of the standing committee. Usually, it is introduced as the measure of its chairman who has no responsibility for administrative results. His committee may be one of a large number of committees reporting bills for appropriations on different subjects. They are usually reported toward the last end of the session with a voluminous record of hearings that no one has time to read. A large part of what has happened in the committee room never gets into the record. Seldom has a member of the legislature opportunity even to read the bill. When it is presented it comes up as a part of a program of the party in power, is jammed through by gag-rule and becomes law before even the legislature itself knows what has happened. Then the country looks to the executive to protect it against legislation and acts of appropriation that are positively vicious.

*Contrast between the American and Foreign Press*

Not only does the procedure worked out in our federal and state governments suffer by comparison, but so also do our various news agencies. The events which make news are those which have human interest. There are two things that always make news: one is a fight; the other is a scandal. A dog fight on the street may make news if each dog has a responsible backer. The events of a cock-pit make news. Unimportant nobodies become news when they go into a public ring. The more important the parties contestant, the more important the news. When the head of a great government takes a position on a public platform before the chosen representatives of the people and issues a challenge to one and all to come and attack him, any

issue joined becomes news that may travel on the wires around the world and the next day be before every reader at his breakfast table—this is political news that cannot be kept out of the daily press.

Given a parliamentary procedure, such as has been described which is adapted to bring out everything that is scandalous and derogatory to persons of high positions and to make any accusation the subject of "trial by battle," we need not be at a loss to understand why it is that "visible" government develops a press which prints political news. Nor on reflection need we be at a loss to account for the fact that with "invisible" government America has developed great dailies which in their news columns tend largely to peddle irresponsible political gossip, which in some cases are used as the mediums of covert attack by political scandal-mongers and which too often become vicious influences, instead of important mediums through which public opinion may be kept informed about what has been done or what is proposed.

#### *Budget-Making and Increased Cost of Government*

Let us approach budget-making as a cure for "invisible" government from another angle—that of increasing cost. Increasing cost is the necessary accompaniment of our constantly increasing public service. Expenditures have increased in countries where budgets are used as well as in countries where budgets are not used; but a budget procedure means careful executive planning and independent legislative review and criticism. A budget means careful executive spending; it means strict accountability; it means publicity; it means administrative preparedness. The budget is a device for requiring the executive to assume responsibility for leadership. Lack of responsible leadership and lack of administrative planning mean waste of public resources.

#### *Continuity of Policy*

Provision for open-handed fair dealing and publicity with provision for the prompt retirement of officers who do not retain the support of a majority make for continuity of policy and stability of political purpose. Lack of open-handed fair dealing and lack of publicity, without provision for prompt retirement of officers who do not retain the confidence of the people and their

representatives, make for lack of continuity of policy and instability of political purpose.

By way of contrast, let us again return to the province of Ontario. Although provision is made for keeping the "opposition" constantly on the alert, and every opportunity is given for well-informed criticism, the fact that the administration is placed on trial at every meeting of the assembly and may be retired at a moment's notice by a vote of lack of confidence has not made either for lack of continuity or for instability. The present administration has been in office eleven years; the administration immediately preceding this one was retained in office more than thirty years.

#### *Lack of Confidence Here Goes to Our Institutions*

Compare this with what has happened in New York State, Pennsylvania, Ohio, in fact in all of the American cities or the national government. By reason of the lack of opportunity given for public opinion to assert itself, it has become the habit of mind at each election day to turn out the administration, simply as a means of registering a public protest against our system of invisible government; furthermore, not a year passes but that some action is taken in one state or another to limit the powers of the executive on the one hand or the powers of the legislature on the other. Our constitutions are largely made up of statements of what the government cannot do or undertake. Instead of being documents of power with provisions made for enforcing accountability and responsibility for its use, they are documents of limitations—of inhibition of power. They are built on lack of confidence on the part of the people in our whole political system.

#### *The Question of Waste of Public Resources*

While increase in public service carries with it increased expenditures, it is not necessary that the business shall be transacted in such a manner that public resources shall be wasted. Without responsible leadership, waste is inevitable. During the whole period of our national existence there has been waste and extravagance in the management of public affairs. From all the facts on hand, it is apparent that the percentage of waste today is not as high as it was fifty years ago, but it is very much larger in amount. Reference to Senator Aldrich's sensational declaration that if he could run the national government as a

private business he could save \$300,000,000 a year has become hackneyed. This is to be said, however, that those who made light of the observation have not attempted to do more than prove that it is excessive. All admit that the waste of national resources runs into many millions which otherwise might be used to promote the welfare of the people. All admit that these millions are worse than wasted because they are used to subvert and defeat the purposes of democracy.

#### *Waste in the Federal Government*

During the two years of the existence of President Taft's Economy Commission, a number of federal services were gone into. In the offices at Washington, where careful detailed studies were made, it was thought by members of the commission that the average waste was not far from 30 per cent. Only a small part of this, however, could be traced to what might be called "individual inefficiency." To stop this waste and make it available for increased public service would require a thorough overhauling which must begin with congress and go through the personnel of administration to methods and processes of business that have been handed down from time immemorial.

For example, the adjutant general's office of the war department was run at an annual salary cost of \$781,000. It was thought that by changing the methods in use the work might be done much more efficiently at an annual cost of \$480,000. The office force was found to be widely scattered, and the personnel of the different units of organization so located that their work could not be done to advantage. As an illustration of defective method, it was shown that the working subdivisions were so arranged that a constant interchange of communication between these subdivisions through the medium of an elaborate messenger service was necessary.

#### *The Results of Irresponsible Government*

Again as illustrating the laborious methods used, the course taken by the average piece of correspondence due to bad organization and obsolete methods necessitated 40 operations in the mail and record division, besides 39 operations in those divisions which have to take administrative action in the case, a total of 79 operations in connection with the handling of the average piece of incoming correspondence from the time it is received in the office until the reply is prepared. Substantially, all letters



received in the office were briefed on the back of the first fold and the purport of each written on index and record cards, on which work of briefing nearly 60 clerks were engaged all of the time. In respect to outgoing correspondence this card-recording was carried to a much greater extent. A verbatim card record was prepared of every communication, at an expense, of course, very much greater than that sustained in regard to incoming correspondence. Under this practice, practically all letters and indorsements were written twice; the first copy written on the record card, frequently by hand, constituting the record of outgoing correspondence, and the second the final draft of the letter in form for transmission to the addressee. These same handicaps to efficient and economical administration existed in each of the divisions and subdivisions, a consolidation of which would have greatly simplified the work.

As showing a wasteful use of valuable office space, it was found that seventy-six good office rooms in the state, war and navy buildings were used for the storing of old and infrequently used records, while the personnel engaged on current business had been forced to occupy quarters scattered in about six different buildings in different parts of the city.

#### *Disregard for the Personnel Who Do the Work*

One thing the public as well as the public-officer must learn, namely: that regard for the welfare of the employee is an essential not to be overlooked. The need for this and the results of disregard were evident on all sides. In many instances the working force was rendered inefficient by badly lighted, badly ventilated and insanitary quarters—one building being so unsafe as to be a constant menace to life, having been condemned both by the health and building authorities of the District of Columbia. The following description of one of the suites of rooms used is taken from the health inspector's report:

"This is used as a file room and eight men are employed in it. In the toilet room adjoining, five men are employed on printing presses. This room is provided with three windows and one door, but is very dark and contains the following fixtures: Three water-closets, automatically flushed; four washbowls with combined trap, and one slop sink. The floor around the closet bowl is covered with sheet iron, which at the time of inspection was in a foul condition. The entire floor is continuously lighted during working hours by artificial light."

Disregard for the health and working efficiency of employees under our system of irresponsible government is also shown by the results of analyses of seventeen samples of water collected

from "coolers" and waste cans sent to the bureau of chemistry. From their reports it was found that in eight of the seventeen tests *bacilli coli* were found—in other words, the germs that find their origin in the human intestinal tract—and that in some instances it was more safe to drink out of the waste cans than it was to take water from the coolers.

The waste and inefficiency discovered were seldom attributable to any particular person. They were the results of an inheritance of bad methods. An elaborate system of records and office practices had grown up under conditions of civil service that utterly broke down in time of war—in fact it could be operated only when the war department was on a peace footing. After the Spanish War it took three years to straighten out the red tape that had become entangled when the system was really put to a test.

#### *Waste Due to Log Rolling*

In the field, that is away from Washington, it was thought by the commission that the waste was still larger. There are few well-informed persons who will doubt that not less than 50 per cent of the hundreds of millions of dollars that have been appropriated for rivers and harbors has been wasted. Due to what are known as log rolling and pork barrel methods, the losses from bad location and lack of planning in naval expenditures and war expenditures have been large. Navy yards are located at points where large vessels cannot enter, army posts are scattered all over the country at points which make them of little use for purposes either of training or for carrying on the movements of the army.

#### *Political Influence under Conditions of Irresponsible Leadership*

In 1913 a detailed study was made of the expenditures at the Port of New York under Mr. John Purroy Mitchel as collector and the conclusion was reached there that the waste was 35 per cent. By some it was thought that this condition is peculiar to large spending units. A large number of small local governmental agencies, such as counties, townships, towns and cities have been studied by the Bureau of Municipal Research during the last ten years. In many of the smaller governmental units a still larger percentage of waste has been found than in the centers of large population. In a few instances the waste has amounted to nearly 100 per cent. That is, the public got prac-

tically nothing out of the contributions to support the government—almost the whole amount went into the pockets of favorites as patronage or was aimlessly frittered away.

For the first time we are beginning to find the limits of our economic resources. Until the present time our resources were so abundant that the rising cost of public enterprise, of unpardonable waste and extravagance, drew slight attention to the need for economy, or to the need for careful planning. When our limitations were felt, those who pointed to waste and urged economy were the first to receive attention. But as the business of government was studied by those interested in economy and the need for increasing expenditures in any event, even after economies were introduced, became apparent, then thought began to turn to management—to the need for planning, to providing a means for intelligent consideration of work to be done, of organization for doing work, of methods and results; to an essential defect in the old order of things—the lack of a definite program of work, the lack of a definite forecast both of estimated expenditures and of ways and means for raising funds to make ends meet.

#### *The Beginning of Consideration of Budget-Making*

This attitude of mind marked the beginning of an era of propaganda for a budget procedure in the United States. It began with the cities where the demand for economy was first felt; and it began with a scrutiny of estimates for expenditures. In fact, many cities now call their expenditure estimates and appropriations their budget. So in discussing expenditures of national and state governments both writers and officers use the term "budget" as designating a request or an authority to spend.

When the necessity for better management and the idea of planning public business began to take hold, with it came a demand for responsible leadership and for means of enforcing responsibility. Then for the first time we began to appreciate the significance of the procedure worked out in England and Continental Europe, which gave to representatives of the people the ability to hold executives to account by requiring them each year to submit a carefully prepared financial plan.

#### *Increasing Expenditures Make an Effective Budget Procedure a Political and an Economical Necessity*

The political necessity for the adoption of a budget procedure lies in the fact that it is the only effective means which has ever

been devised for enforcing accountability and responsibility on an executive who has sufficient power to make him a leader—to make him effective in the preparation and submission of plans proposed for adoption, and to enable him efficiently and economically to execute them after they have been approved and financed. The economic necessity for the adoption of a budget procedure lies in the fact that demands for service by the government are going to continue to increase and with this the necessity both for careful, intelligent planning by the management, and a strict censorship on the part of those who pay the bills.

And the public is beginning to take a new, a more intelligent view of who pays for extravagance and waste. Before we began to feel our economic limitations it was thought that the taxpayer was the one who suffered; we were deluded, ourselves, with the notion that this taxpayer was some foreigner who was glad to pay the cost of running our government. This view is rapidly disappearing, as we begin to look the facts in the face. Our indirect taxes no longer suffice; when we begin to look for increased revenues from direct taxation, we are constantly confronted with the possibility of killing the goose that lays the golden egg. There is nothing more firmly fixed in our political sense than the notion that industries are made or ruined by different rates of taxation levied on one or another in a competitive market. Depression in industry hits not alone the taxpayer, but the laborer, the consumer, the whole community.

From the old theory, therefore, that we need care little about the cost of government, we have come to measure results and to say that the government must be held to strict account for expenditures; that every dollar squandered or wasted means that some one who can least afford it is being deprived of a community service to which he is entitled; that it is the poor man who is robbed by the grafter and the official incompetent, and not the rich; that waste in government is a levy on the poor.

#### *Essentials of An Effective Budget System*

In considering the essentials of a budget system or method of finance, it is at all times to be remembered that this is something that has been devised and used as a means of effectively exercising popular as well as legislative control over the executive. Any method which does not reach the people, which does not provide for the effective exercise of popular control falls short of the purpose.

This leads to a statement of what are conceived to be the essentials of an effective budget system: briefly they are—

- 1—*An executive who is responsible to the people for leadership*—i.e., made responsive to the popular will by being required to make, submit, and explain to the representatives of the people a proposed program of public service and a proposed method of financing this program, but with no power to execute the plan until it is approved by a majority of these representatives and who is forced to accept their conclusions or go before the electorate.
- 2—*A body of representatives who are also responsible to the people* for their action in granting or refusing to grant executive requests,—i.e., for inquiring what has been done with funds already granted, for critically reviewing plans for service submitted as well as methods of financing, and for withholding their approval to an appropriation or revenue measure before them until it is amended and presented in such form as to gain the support of a majority, this responsibility to be enforced through decision of the electorate on issues arising between the executive and a majority.
- 3—*Fullest publicity given to official acts and proposals*—by the adoption of a procedure requiring that the executive shall meet with the representative body and there present and explain his accounts, his estimates, and his proposals early in the session and in committee of the whole house, so that every opportunity may be given for an intelligent opposition to develop; and for the further purpose of enabling the administration to publicly meet the opposition before any one is required to assume responsibility for final action.
- 4—*An effective recall*—provision whereby any important issue may be settled between the executive and a majority of the representatives of the people. But, in case this is not possible, to enable either the executive or the majority against him to have the issue referred directly to the people at an election so as to determine which of the partisans to the controversy will be retained in the public service—the essential purpose of such action being to make the government responsive to the will of a majority, and to put the administration into the hands of persons who are in sympathy with the policy adopted, and to enable those in office to keep and develop a majority back of this leadership.

*What Steps Are Necessary to the Adoption of an Effective Budget Procedure in this Country*

The question is asked: What steps are conceived to be necessary to the adoption of an effective budget procedure in our

federal and state governments? In theory, it may be conceived that all these steps may be taken without constitutional amendment; that is, the legislature might require the executive to take the initiative in the preparation and submission of estimates and financial proposals; the legislature might provide for their consideration in a committee of the whole house or joint committee of both houses where two houses exist; the legislature might withhold its consent to an appropriation or revenue measure till it is amended by the executive in a manner to gain the support of a majority; and the legislature might provide for reference to the people in case of a deadlock.

As a practical matter, however, it is doubtful if any of these things, except possibly the first, would be done.

If an executive might assume that he has a right to prepare and submit a budget, as did President Taft and as Governor Whitman appears to do now, the legislature, following its customary practice, would in all probability refer it to a standing committee where it would be lost sight of forever; or, if it appeared at all, it would come to light toward the end of a session so far disfigured by legislative patches and shears that it could not be recognized. In that event, every good that could come from a budget would be lost. The legislature might pass a law requiring the executive to prepare and submit a budget as in Ohio, in which event the measure would be relieved from initial hostility such as was expressed in section 6 of the federal sundry civil appropriation bill of August 24, 1912, aimed to prevent such an attempt on the part of the executive. But the result would be little better, for it would not mark out a new practice which would require the executive to take the part of a responsible leader, nor would it take the steps to prevent log-rolling among members, nor would it provide the means whereby the executive on his motion or the legislature by joint resolution, might refer an issue to the people.

Furthermore, to be effective, a measure for enforcing responsibility and making the government responsive must reach to the people and provide the means whereby the executive may know what the opposition is, measure it, assume responsibility for leadership so that he will stand or fall on the action taken, and with all this he must be able to get a question of policy before the electorate when a majority of the representative body is against him; correspondingly, the legislative body should have the same right of appeal to the electorate in case of what

it considers an arbitrary veto or other action which causes a majority to lose confidence in the executive. These working relations can be effectually established only by a constitutional amendment.

Given, however, a constitutional amendment requiring the executive to submit a budget, and the legislature to meet with the executive as a committee of the whole to receive and consider it; given also an equal right on the part of the executive and the legislature to call a new election at which any irreconcilable issue may be submitted, a majority vote of the electorate thereby deciding both who shall be the executive and who shall represent them in the legislature, all other things would be added as a matter of current working adjustment.

Such a constitutional amendment might be initiated by the legislative body. But in all probability this will not occur until a campaign of education has been carried on which will force it as an overwhelming demand of the people.

This thought may be left in closing—namely, that until some such provision for making the “electorate” and the “representative body” effective instruments of control over the executive, the people will not sanction an increase in executive power sufficient to make him a responsible leader. They would prefer to continue to suffer from the results of inefficiency, log-rolling, pork barrel and all, rather than tie themselves up for a fixed term to an executive who could not be called sharply to account. The recent experience in New York may be pointed to as confirming this view. And if this be thought to be a too recent or too narrow experience, it is confirmed by a thousand years of Anglo-Saxon experience.

## CHAPTER IV

### THE BUDGET IDEA IN THE UNITED STATES<sup>1</sup>

---

Difficulty in tracing the evolution of the "budget idea" in the United States lies not so much in the historical material to be mastered as in reaching a decision as to what "idea" is to be discussed.

#### *What is the "Budget Idea"?*

Most controversies grow out of the failure of parties contestant to make clear what they are talking about. Words in ordinary use make expression of thought difficult whenever exactness is required. It is for this reason that science has gone entirely outside the common language for its terms. The word "budget" is a term used in so many different ways that no one can write on any aspect of budgets or budget practice without risk of controversy about the facts until he has taken the trouble to tell what he conceives a budget to be. Writers, therefore, not infrequently begin with a definition. It is an interesting fact, however, that nearly all these definitions are so indefinite that the reader is still left in doubt.

#### *Definition of Budget as Herein Used*

In this essay the term "budget," is used to mean *a plan for financing an enterprise of government during a definite period, which is prepared and submitted by a responsible executive to a representative body (or other duly constituted agent) whose approval and authorization are necessary before the plan may be executed.*

In order that no room may be left for inference, each of these clauses may be enlarged on and the reason given for its use:

(1) The idea "budget" is classed as a "plan" instead of a "document" or a "statement" for the reason that it is in the nature of a definite proposal calling for approval or disapproval with such details and specifications attached as are thought to be useful to the approving body or agents in arriving at a decision.

---

<sup>1</sup> Reprinted from *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Philadelphia, November, 1915.



(2) It is differentiated from other plans by the phrase "for financing an enterprise or government during a definite period." This includes the first idea of Leroy-Beaulieu's definition. But if it stopped here it would be just as defective; anyone might make a plan for financing an enterprise or a government. For this reason it is further differentiated by the requirement that to be a budget it must be "prepared and submitted by a responsible executive."

(3) One other essential is added, *viz.*, that it must be submitted to "a representative body (or other duly constituted agent) whose approval and authorization are necessary before the plan may be executed." Each of these qualifying phrases is so full of meaning and each so necessary to a budget practice that it is deserving of further comment.

#### *The Budget as a Plan of Financing*

The one thing that has been conspicuously lacking in our governmental business, federal, state and municipal, has been the element of careful, understandable, responsible planning. The lack of careful, understandable, responsible planning has been an incident of "invisible" or "irresponsible" government. Each year in every jurisdiction we have had "estimates" both of revenues and expenditures. But "estimates" in themselves do not constitute a budget. They only serve the purpose of laying the foundation for work plans and financial plans.

These estimates must be of two kinds, *viz.*: (1) there must be estimates of needs, and (2) there must be estimates of the financial resources that may be availed of to meet needs. To be of value the estimates must be made by a great many persons. The estimate of needs must be made by persons who are familiar with the requirements of each kind of work to be done, or each service to be rendered—with the operating requirements, the maintenance requirements, the capital requirements. Then one or more persons must make up estimates of needs for certain things that are common to all services—those which are general, such as requirements for interest, sinking fund requirements, the requirements for payment of maturing obligations for which no sinking funds are provided, requirements for purchase of common lands and the conduct of common business transactions such as advertising, printing, etc. Then again, estimates of the financial resources which may be availed of to meet estimated financial needs, to be of the highest value, must be made

up by a number of other persons who are familiar with present financial conditions; they must also be able to forecast probable revenues derivable under existing law; they must have knowledge of the present and probable future condition of appropriations and funds, having in mind present and proposed financial policies, they must have the ability to forecast probable financial conditions of surplus and deficit at the beginning of the period to be financed and of probable surplus and deficit at the end.

*Plan Must Be Made by a Responsible Executive*

All these various estimates of expenditures, of revenues, and of financial condition must be brought together; they must be considered by someone who can think in terms of the institution as a whole; they must be brought to a conclusion; and conclusions must be stated as a definite proposal and a basis for action by some one person or agency that can be held to account. The only person who can be held to account is the one who is to execute the plan proposed. This executive therefore is the only one who can be made responsible for leadership.

The estimates and conclusions must be presented to the representatives of the people whose approval and action are required before spending officers are authorized to go ahead. They must be presented as a definite plan or prospectus which will show what is proposed to be undertaken. This plan must not only show what undertakings are proposed but what will be the probable cost on the one hand and how the cost is to be met. The financial plan must deal with great questions of public policy—must set forth how much is to be met by revenue, how much is to be met by borrowing, and how much, if any, is to be met from surplus. The plan must show what authorizations should be given to the executive to enable him to carry on the business efficiently and meet obligations as they mature. Not only is it necessary that the “estimates” be prepared by persons familiar with the facts, but it is quite as essential that the plan of work and of financing be proposed and submitted by the same person who is to be held accountable for directing the execution of the plan. This means the executive. To have a plan—in other words the “budget”—made by persons who have no responsibility for carrying on the business would be destructive of the very purpose of representative government.

The representative character of a government is to be found in its legislature and in its electorate. As has been pointed out,

the constitutional or institutional purpose of a budget is to make the executive responsible and responsive to the people through their representatives and through the electorate. No plan or proposal can serve this purpose which comes from individual representatives any more than it could if it came from individual electors. In the first place it is incompatible that the proposer should also be the disposer of public funds. In the second place the proposal should not reflect the interests of a single individual or a single district—but the interests of the whole community or of associated interests which are comprised in the state or nation.

The one who submits the financial proposal should be responsible to all—he should be accountable for the management of the affairs of the whole government. Since the several parts of the government are interdependent, no legislative committee can prepare a budget unless the business of the government is to be managed by this committee as in a commission government, or in New York City where the executive power is in its Board of Estimate and Apportionment. But they must act together. Responsibility should be attached to some one man, or some group of persons acting as one man, who can be continued or retired as one man. It was for this reason that Great Britain did not succeed in establishing a true budget system till after 1800 when the principal of solidarity of responsibility was forced on the cabinet. Even then the budget could not be made effective until a means was provided for enforcing this responsibility through a truly representative parliament—until the reform acts of 1832 which made parliament in effect the people in session. In discussing the evolution of the budget idea in the United States, therefore, what is meant is the development of the idea of “a plan for financing the government during a definite period, which is prepared and submitted by a responsible executive to a representative body whose approval and authorization are necessary before the proposed plan may be executed.”

#### *Budget Control by the Representative Body*

As it is the institutional and constitutional purpose of the budget to serve as a means both of exercising control over what the government shall do and how it shall be financed and also for making the executive responsible and responsive to the people through their chosen representatives and through the electorate, the budget cannot be more than a proposal or request. Actual authorization must come from the representative or

electorate body before a dollar can be raised or spent. Or if some latitude is given to the executive to spend without such action first obtained, the expenditures so made must come to representatives and the electorate for approval. A budget can have no force. A budget, as such, can convey no authority. It is only the "act" of appropriation, the revenue or the borrowing "measure" which gives authority to the executive. Therefore, the "act" and "enacted measure" must be clearly distinguished from the "plan" or "proposal" of the executive.

*How Legislative Control May be Made Effective*

If the executive is to be held responsible for results, the legislature must do *three things: viz.:* (1) It must provide a means of enabling representatives to find out whether the executive has acted within his past authorizations and conducted the business efficiently; (2) it must provide a means of enabling representatives to inquire into the requests for future grants; (3) since the purpose of a representative system is to make the government responsible and responsive to the people, it must provide a means of reaching the people, of letting the people know what has been done and what is proposed and of getting controversies between a majority of representatives and the executive before the electorate for final decision. With provision made for these three things the representative system is adapted to the ends and purposes of a democracy; without provision for these three things the representative system is not adapted to the ends and purposes of a democracy.

*How Legislative Inquiry May be Made Effective*

The collateral means which have been found effective for keeping the executive within authorizations are the creation of an agency for independent audit and report on all transactions, the establishment of an independent judiciary for the settlement of legal controversies, and the authority of the legislature to make independent inquiries. But these are collateral means. The method which has been found to be most effective for enabling representatives to inquire into requests for future grants, and obtain exact information about what has been done as well as what is proposed, is to require the executive to appear personally before the representatives of the people at the time he makes his request for funds to answer questions and details.

*How the Electorate May be Reached*

The method which has been found to be most effective for keeping the people in touch with public affairs and for having questions in issue settled by the electorate, is to make provision whereby each representative can openly question the executive and every item can be separately debated and voted on. And in case the executive is not supported to make further provision, the electorate may promptly retire either the executive or the opposing majority. What this means is, that a budget which is to serve its constitutional purpose must not only be an executive proposal submitted to a representative body, but it must be submitted under such rules of procedure that each representative may have a right personally and publicly to make inquiry of the executive concerning any matter or detail of the business in hand and also have the right openly and publicly to oppose any part of the plan which, in his opinion, is against the general welfare of the state. And the only procedure which has been found effective for doing this is to require that the estimates and the budget be considered and discussed in committee of the whole house with the executive present.

Furthermore, the financial plan which is to be considered as a budget must be laid before representatives of the people in such a way that it will at all times be the measure of the responsible executive, and when approved or disapproved, the action taken must stand as the decision of sovereign power—must be the will of the people to support this responsible head of the government. The budget must be considered as the most important measure of any government.

*Action on the Budget an Act of Popular Sovereignty*

The passing of a budget, as the term budget is used in this discussion, is an attribute of sovereignty. When, as in a democracy, sovereignty is in the people, the authority given to the executive by the "acts" passed in response to executive request must come directly or indirectly from the people; therefore, the procedure to be effective must make the people an integral part of the action. This is what is meant by Leon Say in the statement that "Every member of the society or nation exercises a share of the prerogative of the budget which corresponds to the share of the sovereignty which is vested in him." It is on this idea of a budget that the theory that the "act" of appropriation

and the revenue and borrowing "measures" are in the nature of contracts made between taxpayers on the one hand and the executive in power. But the "acts" or "measures" are quite a different thing from the plan or, as it is here called, the "budget" of the executive.<sup>1</sup>

The "budget idea" whose evolution in the United States is here traced bears little relation to the estimates presented by an irresponsible executive or to the devices by which financial legislation is passed in a scheme of invisible government, with no means provided for bringing executive and legislative action to the test of approval or disapproval by the electorate. Those methods, which do not make for responsible government, are not the subject of this essay. The view adopted is the only one that is compatible with the evolution of constitutional law where "control over the purse" has been effectively used to bring the institution and practices of a representative system into harmony with the ideals of democracy and popular sovereignty.

Taken as a whole it may be said that until within the last few years the "budget idea," as the term is here used, has had no evolution whatever in the United States. Our citizenship, our legislators, and our constitution makers have until recently been as innocent of such an idea as an unborn babe. True, President Wilson had written a masterly treatise calling attention to the *devolution* of our government—to the gross departure made from the ideals of the constitution as it was understood by the fathers—and in this pointed to the fact that the administration was gradually drifting over into the hands of some forty odd irresponsible congressional committees. True, President Lowell and other students of foreign government had also written volumes on the gradual development of the principle of executive responsibility under representative systems abroad, and pointed to the part that the "budget idea" had played in this development. But these writings were unnoticed, except in academic discussion. The "practical" man complacently turned a deaf ear, or,

<sup>1</sup> There are two special treatises on what the authors have chosen to call budgets in this country, *viz.*: Eugene E. Agger's *The Budget in the American Commonwealth*, 1907; and S. Gale Lowrie's *The Budget*, 1912. Both of these proceed from the notion that the documents which have been developed in American practice to carry out the various constitutional inhibitions and the devices used to control expenditures are budgets. While these works are highly meritorious exposés of American methods, the practices described are so far afield from what is here described as the "budget idea" that the contrast should be noted. And this distinction should be drawn if we are to consider the merits and demerits of these two widely differing practices.

if he did not refuse to listen, patronizingly put an end to all suggestions and arguments with the bold assertion that the idea was "undemocratic" and "un-American." When a single Congress authorized a billion dollars of expenditures and the party in power was attacked for extravagance, the answer was that "this is a billion-dollar country." But increases in expenditures went on until within a few years we had a "two billion-dollar Congress." It was the uncontrolled and uncontrollable increase in the cost of government that finally jostled the public into an attitude of hostility to a system which was so fondly called the "American system." This growing hostility to doing business in the dark, to "boss rule," to "invisible government," became the soil in which the "budget idea" finally took root and grew. Questions raised by Mr. Tawney, as chairman of the committee on appropriations, with respect to the system of raising and spending money were not new. It was only the circumstance of the "two-billion-dollar Congress" that caused the public to be disturbed. The bold assertion of Senator Aldrich that if he could run the federal government as he would a private business he could save \$300,000,000 a year did more to upset complacency and bring about a demand for change in the methods of doing business than all the treatises that had been written on defects in the organic law. But this dramatization of waste had a constructive value. It caused men to ask for a remedy. It caused people to read and reread what had been written by President Wilson in 1885; it caused editors and writers to consider the methods employed in other countries which had succeeded in making their governments responsible; it provided an occasion for editorial comment; it made an audience for Professor Ford's book,<sup>1</sup> which pointed to the fact that what had been so patronizingly characterized as un-American in methods of political control in England, continental Europe, Bermuda, Australia, and Japan were the methods used in the management of private business, and what had been so much lauded as the American system could be nothing else but wasteful and subversive of the very purposes of democracy.

*Efforts Made to Apply the Budget Idea in the Federal Government*

This brings us up to President Taft's administration. During President Roosevelt's two administrations, the ship of state had been rocked and tossed about by storms of abuse. In this both

<sup>1</sup> *The Cost of our National Government*, by Henry Jones Ford, 1910.

the President and Congress took an active part, but nothing towards constructive legislation was undertaken which had a distinct bearing on the methods of controlling the national finances. For a period of six months after March 4, 1909, these storms subsided only to break again with renewed force. But the storm center was not the cost of government; it was the tariff, "standpatism," "government for the privileged classes." From the viewpoint of those who were interested in the development of the "budget idea," this was unfortunate, for President Taft had seriously undertaken to use the great powers and the influence of his office to foster that idea.

### *The President's Inquiry into Methods of Doing Business*

President Taft's answer to the demand for economy was to ask Congress in December, 1909, for an appropriation of \$100,000 "to enable the President to inquire into the methods of transacting the public business . . . and to recommend to Congress such legislation as may be necessary to carry into effect changes found to be desirable that cannot be accomplished by executive action alone." As soon as this appropriation had been made available the President instructed his secretary, Mr. Charles D. Norton, to make plans for the organization of the work. A preliminary inquiry was begun on September 27, 1910. The first task of Secretary Norton was to organize within each department a committee which would cooperate with the White House staff in developing a definite plan of work. Speaking on the magnitude and difficulty of the task, the President in his first report to Congress said:

"I have been given this fund to enable me to take action and to make specific recommendations with respect to the details of transacting the business of an organization whose activities are almost as varied as those of the entire business world. The operations of the government affect the interest of every person living within the jurisdiction of the United States. Its organization embraces stations and centers of work located in every city and in many local subdivisions of the country. Its gross expenditures amount to nearly \$1,000,000,000 annually. Including the personnel of the military and naval establishments, more than 400,000 persons are required to do the work imposed by law upon the executive branch of the government.

"This vast organization has never been studied in detail as one piece of administrative mechanism. Never have the foundations been laid for a thorough consideration of the relations of all of its parts. No comprehensive effort has been made to list its multifarious activities or to group them in such a way as to present a clear picture of what the government is doing. Never has a complete description been given of the agencies through which these activities are performed. At no time has the attempt been made to study all of these activities and agencies with a view to the assignment of each activity to the agency best fitted



for its performance, to the avoidance of duplication of plant and work, to the integration of all administrative agencies of the government, so far as may be practicable, into a unified organization for the most effective and economical dispatch of public business."

*The Organization of the President's Commission on Economy and Efficiency*

One of the conclusions reached as a result of the preliminary inquiry is the following:<sup>1</sup> "A very conspicuous cause of inefficiency and waste is an inadequate provision of the methods of getting before Congress a definite budget, *i.e.*, a concrete and well-considered program or prospectus of work to be financed."

*The Need for a Budget one of the first Subjects of Inquiry*

When the Commission was organized sufficiently to permit of collective consideration of work to be done by it, a program of work was formulated which provided for five fairly distinct subjects to be handled, as follows: (1) The budget as an annual financial program; (2) The organization and activities of the government; (3) Problems of personnel; (4) Financial records and accounts; (5) Business practices and procedure.

In the preliminary inquiry one of the first steps taken had been to ask the several departmental committees coöperating with the President to reanalyze the estimates in such manner as to show the different kinds of things that were being purchased by the government and the amounts spent and estimated for each. As a result of this inquiry the President for the first time had brought before him a summary of such facts as the following: The amounts spent by each bureau, by each department, and the government as a whole analyzed to show what part was for such things as personal services; services other than personal; materials; supplies; equipment, etc. For the first time it became known that the government was spending nearly \$400,000,000 for salaries and wages (the digest of appropriations made it appear that only \$189,000,000 was for this purpose); that the government was spending \$12,500,000 for the transportation of persons; that it was spending \$78,000,000 for the transportation of things; that it was spending \$8,000,000 for subsistence of persons and, in addition, was spending \$18,500,000 for provisions, and \$5,500,000 for wearing apparel, etc.

<sup>1</sup> See report on the preliminary inquiry under authority of the civil act of June 25, 1910, prior to the organization of the President's Commission on Economy and Efficiency, covering the period September 27, 1910 to March 8, 1911—circular No. 29 of the commission.

Among the first things undertaken by the commission after its organization was to continue the analytical work with a view of preparing a report on the need for an annual budget. In July, 1911, forms were drafted. These were discussed with department heads, and on August 1 were submitted to the President for his approval. On August 7 the President sent these forms to the departments and requested that they reclassify the data which was being obtained for the purposes of official estimates then in preparation. The forms asked for information on three subjects: (1) Expenditures for fiscal year ending June 30, 1911; (2) Appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912; (3) Estimates for appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913. A different form was prepared for reporting on each of these subjects and a fourth form for a recapitulation. Each of these forms was so drawn as to provide for showing the amounts expended, appropriated or estimated: (1) By each organization unit; (2) For each class of work to be done; (3) By character of expenditure, such as current expenses, capital outlays, fixed charges, etc.; and, (4) By the amount which had been expended, appropriated or estimated under each act or class of acts of appropriation—whether by annual appropriation, permanent legislation, etc. The heads of departments were asked to have these returns in by November 1, but it was not until after the first of the next year that they were made available to the President. This was due to the fact that the forms required by Congress were along entirely different lines, and it was necessary for the heads of departments to have the official estimates in the hands of the treasury and before Congress on a prescribed date.

The report of the commission on "the Need for a National Budget" was sent by the President to Congress with his approval on June 27, 1912.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> This was printed as house document No. 854 of the 62d Congress, second session (568 pages). The members of the commission who participated in the preparation and signed the report, besides the chairman, were: Frank J. Goodnow, for twenty-six years professor of administrative law in Columbia University, now President of Johns Hopkins University; William F. Willoughby, for more than twenty years connected with the government service in various capacities, now constitutional advisor to the Chinese Republic; Walter W. Warwick, for many years connected with the comptroller's office and auditing service of the federal government, now the comptroller of the treasury; and Merritt O. Chance, for twenty-six years connected with various departments of the government, now postmaster at Washington. From June, 1911, to January, 1912, Mr. Harvey S. Chase was also a member of the commission, but due to illness he was not able to be in Washington during the time that the budget report was being prepared and therefore did not share in author-

*The President Urges Congress to Accept the "Budget Idea"*

In his letter of transmission President Taft pointed to the fact that the Executive is charged by the Constitution with the duty of publishing "a regular statement of receipts and expenditures" and "that he is also enjoined from time to time to give Congress information on the state of the union and to recommend for consideration such measures as may be deemed expedient." With these constitutional prescriptions President Taft held that the President had the power to prepare and submit to Congress each year "a definite, well-considered budget with a message calling attention to subjects of immediate importance." The President stated, however, in his message that he did not assume to exercise this power except in coöperation with Congress; and he urged the necessity of repealing certain laws which were in conflict with the proposed practice.

The purposes of sending the report to Congress as described by the President were:

"To suggest a method whereby the President, as the constitutional head of the administration, and Congress may consider and act on a definite business and financial program;

"To have the expenditures, appropriations and estimates so classified and summarized that their broad significance may be readily understood;

"To provide each member of Congress, as well as each citizen who is interested, with such data concerning each subject of interest as may be considered in relation to questions of public policy;

"To have these general summaries supported by such detailed information as is necessary to consider the economy and efficiency with which business has been transacted;

"In short, to suggest a plan whereby the President and Congress may coöperate the one in laying before Congress and the country a clearly expressed administrative program to be acted on—the other in laying before the President a definite enactment for his judgment."

This was the first time that any responsible officer of the national government had advocated the "budget idea." This report not only contained a descriptive and critical report on the past practices of the national government with constructive recommendations, but supported these recommendations with an appendix of forms and a digest of the practices of thirty-eight other countries, in most of which the "budget idea" had already been incorporated and made a part of the public law.

Immediately following the submission of this report to Congress (July 10), President Taft issued an order to the heads of departments to depute some officer with the duty to see that

ship or join in signing the report. The subsequent use which Mr. Chase has made of the report, however, indicates that he is in general accord with the recommendations of the commission.

estimates of summaries for the next fiscal year would be prepared in accordance with the recommendations contained in his message of June 27, and in a letter directed the secretary and treasurer

to print and send without delay to Congress the forms of estimates required by it; also to have sent to him (the President) the information asked for. . . . This will be made the subject of review and revision and a summary statement in the form of a budget with documents will be sent to Congress by a special message as the proposal of the administration.

#### *Report and Recommendations Pigeon-holed*

At the time that this order was issued, Congress had not yet passed all of the annual appropriation bills—some of the bills as passed having been vetoed by the President. When on August 24 the sundry civil bill became law it contained one clause modifying the form of the estimates to incorporate some of the suggestions of the commission, and another clause requiring the heads of departments to submit the estimates in the form and at the time required by law to be submitted and at no other time and in no other form. Following this, when it came to the attention of President Taft that heads of departments expressed some doubt as to what were their duties in the matter, on September 9 the President sent a letter to each member of the cabinet, in which each was instructed to follow the orders both of the President and of Congress. With both houses of the legislature organized against the executive and making demands on the departments for information, the retiring chief executive had difficulty in obtaining the information desired. About February 1, however, all the data had been brought together and, on February 26, President Taft submitted to Congress a budget with a message, which was referred to the committee on appropriations and ordered to be printed with accompanying papers.<sup>1</sup> And there it lay without consideration, action or report.

#### *Acceptance of "Idea" by the Public*

The budget proposals of President Taft, however, were not pigeon-holed by the public. They were taken up by the press throughout the country. Almost unanimously they had the support of public opinion. This opinion was further registered in a referendum which was taken on the subject by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. Furthermore, many leading

<sup>1</sup> *Senate Document 1113*, 62d Congress, 3d session.

men, and even some of the members of Congress who, at the time expressed themselves as being opposed to an executive budget, from time to time since then have come out strongly for the "budget idea." One of those who has been emphatic in his opinion, is Congressman John J. Fitzgerald, chairman of the appropriation committee, who at the time the budget was referred to his committee opposed the act as executive interference. But Mr. Fitzgerald, speaking before the committee on state finances at the constitutional convention at Albany, June 26, 1915, said:

"We ought to have some way in the system of our government to fix direct responsibility, and you cannot fix responsibility if the power is too greatly scattered. . . . I would put it with the Executive. I would make him responsible at the outset. . . . Some persons object that we should not deprive the representatives of the people of the right to loosen up the purse strings, but the universal condition of this country today is not that we must safeguard the rights of the people to get money for things. The whole curse of our condition is that everybody is doing his utmost to get it and succeeds; and the evil to be corrected is the evil of excessive expenditure. . . . Now if there were some way by which that could be stopped . . . it would do what is done in the governments where they had a responsible government with the budget system. If my constituents were keenly interested in some matter that required an expenditure of public money, I would be compelled to present the matter to the department that had charge of it. They would make their investigations. They would determine whether it was one of those things that should be included, and they would have to take responsibility for requesting it."

#### *Outlook for a Federal Budget*

With President Wilson's long standing advocacy of a budget system, with Secretary McAdoo's reported determination to work for the introduction of a budget procedure; with the chairman of the appropriation committee outspoken in his belief as quoted above, it is confidently expected that something may be done in the next Congress to adapt the laws of the federal government and the procedure of Congress to a practical relation whereby the country may have the benefit of executive leadership and the voting of money may rest on a plane of openhanded dealing.

#### *The Budget Idea in State Government*

The provisions in the state constitutions as they were originally drawn having to do with the relations of the executive to the legislative branch follow very closely those of the federal constitution. At present, however, they differ very materially, due to the fact that the federal constitution, with few exceptions, is as it was originally drawn while the state constitutions have

been frequently changed. With the federal government there has been a gradual departure in practice from the spirit and expression of the constitution as drawn. This was pointed out very clearly by President Wilson in his treatise on congressional government. In the state, the changed attitude of the people toward the government is found in the gradual decimation of executive power on the one hand and the increasing number of limitations placed on the legislature on the other.

### *Requirements of State Constitutions*

It is of interest to note the duties that are imposed by state constitutions on the governor having to do with matters of money raising and accountability for expenditure. In every state in the union some such provision as this is made: That the governor shall "from time to time" or "at every session" or "at every regular session" give the legislature information on the condition of the state and make recommendations. In four states—Colorado, Idaho, Illinois and Kansas—it is required that he shall "recommend measures." As a matter of practice, however, these requirements have been construed in the same manner as the similar provision in the federal constitution. The governor has not been assumed to have any standing whatever before the legislature until a bill is passed. He has not been assumed to have any right personally to introduce any bill or to appear for or explain or defend any measure openly. Nine of the constitutions<sup>1</sup> require that the governor shall present at the commencement of each regular session estimates of the amount of money to be raised by taxation for all purposes. These provisions, however, have not been so construed as to lay upon the governor the requirement of preparing and submitting a "budget," nor has any procedure been developed that is based on such an assumption. As a matter of fact, the constitutional provisions have been either perfunctorily complied with by subordinates or have been dead letters, as is pointed out in the report of the Committee on Efficiency and Economy of the state of Illinois.<sup>2</sup> Although the governor was specifically directed by the constitution to lay before the legislature the estimates of money required, the committee states that so far as they could ascertain no attention whatever had been paid to it. This,

<sup>1</sup> Ala. V, 123; Colo IV, 8; Ida. IVA; Ill. V, 77; Mo. V, 10; Mont. VII, 10; Nebr. V, 77; Tex. IV, 9; W. Va., VII, 6.

<sup>2</sup> See report of the Economy and Efficiency Committee of Illinois, p. 22.

however, has only to do with the amount of money required to be raised by taxation; it does not lay upon the governor the duty of submitting estimates of proposed expenditure.

In the constitution of Maryland it is made the duty of the comptroller to prepare and submit estimates of revenues and expenditures. Other constitutions require that one or more other state officers shall prepare such estimates. In states where no constitutional requirement has been laid on the governor, or state officers, statutes have been passed providing that certain officers individually or acting as a board *ex-officio* shall prepare and submit estimates.

### *Boards of Control*

The futility of efforts to establish a budget procedure without some means whereby the executive may be responsible for its proposal and in which the executive will be required to explain and defend the financial measure of the administration is shown by the experience in each of the forty-nine instances where it has been tried. In 1912 Wisconsin undertook to provide a means whereby a budget might be developed as a joint measure of the legislature and of the administration. It was in support of this idea that the report written by Dr. Lowrie was submitted through the State Board of Public Affairs. While this may be a desirable adaptation, as long as we are to assume that the governor is not to be a chief executive and that the government is to be divided up into various small jurisdictions over which there is no control other than that of the legislature, it is not a method which is consistent with the "budget idea."

New York undertook to interject into its budget procedure a means of central control by the same method.<sup>1</sup> The purpose of this board was to make a budget as the term was understood by the legislators. The board was made up of the governor, lieutenant governor, the president *pro tempore* of the senate, the chairman of the finance committee of the senate, the speaker of the assembly, the chairman of the ways and means committee of the assembly, the comptroller, the attorney general, the commissioner of efficiency and economy—four members *ex-officio* of the legislative branch and five members *ex-officio* of the executive and administrative branches. The first year that the estimates came before this board it was unable to come to any conclusion and made no report except such as was submitted through

---

<sup>1</sup> See laws 1913, ch. 281—An act to establish a state board of estimate.

two officers of the board upon each of whom was laid the responsibility independently for submitting estimates with reports thereon.<sup>1</sup>

The unsatisfactory operation of the laws governing the administration of various states, within the last few years, has been the subject of much popular unrest. In recognition of this dissatisfaction several states have appointed commissions or committees of inquiry for the purpose of ascertaining wherein the methods of conducting business may be changed with a view to increasing efficiency and economy. In 1912, Massachusetts and New Jersey each appointed such a commission. In 1913, New York, Pennsylvania, Minnesota, Iowa, Illinois and California appointed commissions or committees with instructions to report. Most of these commissions have pointed to the irresponsible character of our state governments; all of them have made recommendations.

Under the federal constitution the President is made responsible to the electorate for the executive departments. It was the opinion of President Taft, set forth in a special message to Congress, that the President had the power, under the federal constitution, to prepare and submit a budget, although, without constitutional change or legislation, his proposals might receive no consideration. In the states, however, the executive branch has been so far carved up into independent jurisdictions that the governor could not obtain the information or coöperation required to make an executive budget effective. The only remedy is constitutional revision, which looks toward executive reorganization as well as a definite prescription for a budget.

New York, through its constitutional convention—the one which has just adjourned—is the first state that has ever undertaken to frame the financial measures of its constitution around the “budget idea.” The extent to which the convention succeeded in injecting this idea into the constitution will appear from a reading of the draft which in November will be submitted to the electorate for their approval.

---

<sup>1</sup> The commissioner of efficiency and economy was required to make a careful study of each office, examine the accounts, prescribe the form of submitting departmental estimates and examine these statements, and make recommendations. The comptroller was also required by law to prepare and submit to the legislature estimates of revenues and expenditures. Both of these officers performed the duties required by law, but the “board of estimate” was unable to come to any conclusion. Both of these officers were also members of the board of estimate.



*Budget Ideas Applied to Municipalities*

The political consciousness of the duties of citizenship was first awakened in the government of our municipalities. There, attention was first given to matters of electoral reform and charter reorganization. Later, through the organization of independent civic agencies with staff equipment to inquire into matters of public business, attention became centered on methods and results. Among the first conditions which came to attention, after these agencies of citizenship began to direct their attention to details, was the fact that the accounts did not provide the information needed to show what the government was doing, how it was doing it, what results were being obtained and what was the cost of results—whether good, bad or indifferent. Furthermore, it was found that responsibility for these conditions could not be located. The whole administration had been carved up into little jurisdictions and the business put into pigeon-holes and pockets in each of which some officer or subordinate came to have what was regarded as a proprietary interest or right to control. As a means of breaking down these many petty jurisdictions and requiring information on standard lines to come to a central office where it could be summarized and coordinated, the cities were led to adopt the same general method that had been employed in the national government—namely, that of sub-dividing appropriation accounts to such an extent as to force administrative agencies to account in detail to the legislative committee charged with the consideration of the appropriation bill. This detailed subdivision of appropriation accounts has come to be called a “segregated budget”—an evident misnomer. What the cities did which developed a new appropriation procedure from the viewpoint of enforcing accounting requirements was to confuse the “act of appropriation” with a “budget.” Since these legislative committees had no means of limiting administrative action in any other way, they substituted a highly detailed appropriation for control by use of a “budget” under general law requiring detailed accounts to be prepared and submitted in support of the requests of a chief executive. This was only one more step in the direction of government by limitations instead of a step in the direction of responsible government with powers and a means of enforcing accountabilities.

But in another respect this experience has been misleading. The “budget idea” as it is here used assumes a responsible execu-

tive—in other words, such an idea cannot obtain in any jurisdiction, municipal, state or national unless there is some one who is responsible for executing the plans—for doing the things for which appropriations and revenue grants are requested. Where no such provision was made to definitize and locate responsibility and where no means was provided for enforcing efficiency and economy in administration what was called the “segregated budget” gained advocates through preventing officers from doing harm. The cities which have adopted this means have been able to exercise control but they have not been able to establish responsibility—in fact, the method is one which stands in the way of enforcing responsibility for that discretion in management which will make for efficiency.

Municipalities that have been attempting to make budgets have suffered as much from charter provisions, passed on the theory that the purpose of a charter was to keep officers from doing harm, as have the states in their constitutions. For example, the city of Philadelphia, which has done much toward working out the forms and procedures of budget control, has not been able to make this effective because, although it has a highly centralized executive organization, the mayor is not made the responsible leader before councils in securing measures for better administration—the comptroller is the only one who by charter is permitted to submit to the board of aldermen the estimates and no one is required to assume responsibility for a definite financial plan or proposal for the next fiscal period. The finance committee on councils stands in the same relation to the administration in this respect as does the committee on appropriations of the national government. It is not until the finance committee has completed its work that there is anything officially before councils for consideration.

The charter of the city of New York constitutes a board of eight members as the chief executive of the city, made up of the mayor, the president of the board of aldermen, the comptroller, and the five borough presidents. In this there is no provision for the principle of solidarity of responsibility. Although the constitution requires that this board prepare and submit each year to the board of aldermen a budget, it has never done so in the sense in which the term “budget” is here used. What it has done is to prepare and submit each year in November an appropriation bill which when enacted by the board of aldermen determines expenditures for another year. Following the budget

principle the board of aldermen is not permitted to make any change except to reduce and in this respect the charter has gone farther than in some other cities. It is some months later that the revenue proposals come before the city authorities. In any event the board of estimate and apportionment of the city of New York never has prepared and submitted to the board of aldermen a financial plan which will bring before the city a prospectus of what is proposed nor a statement of affairs which will enable citizens or the board of aldermen to know what is the financial condition at the time that a vote is asked for.

### *Conclusion* ¶

In conclusion it may be said that the "budget idea" is just beginning to take hold of the American mind; that for a period of one hundred and twenty-five years American political institutions have been drifting steadily away from conditions which made the successful operation of a budget principle possible—away from responsible government; that the condition which is making possible the introduction of this idea into our political system has been a reaction against the results of irresponsible government, the political boss, log-rolling methods, pork barrel legislation; that the "budget idea" has finally come to be thought of as a constitutional principle—one which has been used effectively for the purpose of developing representative government and keeping it in harmony with the highest ideals of democracy.

While this idea has but recently been made a part of American political thinking it is one that is becoming rapidly absorbed and made a part of our political philosophy. More than any other principle of control, it is commanding the confidence and respect of those persons in the nation whose influence is being felt in legislatures and constitutional conventions, and other assemblies charged with the responsibility of redrafting our public law.

CHAPTER V

MEMORIAL TO THE LEGISLATURE AND CORRE-  
SPONDENCE WITH THE GOVERNOR  
OF NEW YORK

---

The annual message of Governor Whitman, which went to the legislature on January 5th, was devoted to the subject of state expenditures. With this message the governor transmitted to the legislature a book of consolidated estimates, entitled "Tentative Budget Proposals," which took in all of the services of the state. This was in the form of an appropriation bill which is described in the governor's message as "a suggested form of appropriation bill, together with the estimates on which the same is based." The message of the governor, therefore, brought before the legislature on the first day of its session definite, concrete proposals which had had the careful consideration of the governor and of the committee appointed by him to review the estimates.

To the trustees of the Bureau it seemed desirable to raise the following questions: (1) whether the legislature should not amend the laws and change its rules in such manner as to give full publicity to the consideration and discussion of the governor's proposals; (2) whether the governor should not follow his expenditure "proposals" with a definite plan for financing state requirements after the proposals had been discussed in committee of the whole by the legislature.

The first suggestion was the subject of the memorial sent to the legislature by the Bureau on January 19th; the second was the subject of a letter sent to Governor Whitman on January 11th with a draft of the memorial enclosed to inform the governor what it was proposed to ask the legislature to do.

## STATEMENT TO THE PRESS

On the same day that the memorial of the Bureau was sent to the legislature asking that the Legislative and Executive laws of the State be so changed as to provide for the consideration of the governor's message in committee of the whole, the following statement was given to the press.

## STATEMENT BY THE BUREAU

"In public discussion two erroneous assumptions have been made regarding the present state of financial legislation in Albany. One is that the governor on January 5th submitted to the legislature a 'budget'; the other is that it is possible to have a budget openly reviewed and discussed in the legislature without a very radical change in procedure.

"The Bureau approves heartily the action of the governor and congratulates him on having taken a long step in the right direction when he assembled and critically reviewed the estimates of all the executive departments and sent to the legislature a consolidated estimate in the form of a single appropriation bill. This alone is an important proposal. It shows clearly the needs of the governor's own departments as expressed by him after carefully going into the requirements of each office before the legislature met. The governor calls this a 'tentative' budget proposal; but he is undoubtedly aware that without an accompanying revenue proposal, which he has not yet seen fit to make, it is not a real budget, in the customary sense of that term. It does not purport to do more than prepare and submit an appropriation bill with explanations of items. The citizens of the state are interested in how the money is to be raised quite as much as they are in how it is to be spent. Leadership is needed on both sides. This must be clearly understood in order that there may be no confusion in the mind either of the legislature or of the public as to what it is possible to accomplish by acceptance of the measure, and what further action is needed to give the state a budgetary method of finance.

"To assume that what the governor has done is a budget would end all discussion except as to its passage, and would still leave the state without a method of getting before the legislature each year a definite financial plan—one which would clearly set forth on the one side what are the state's financial needs, and on the other side, how funds are to be provided to meet them. It is impossible to consider the financial needs of the state unless the

one who prepares the expenditure plan also considers the ability of the state to raise money. The two things necessarily go together. If the governor or the legislature first undertakes to pass appropriation bills and then to consider the ways and means of raising money, the state will always have the same slipshod, hit-or-miss financial legislation that has obtained in the past.

"The appropriation bill submitted has another importance in that it is designed to take the place of the irresponsible estimates of departmental heads and other officers heretofore made in the form of requests to the chairmen of legislative committees.

"The present procedure is to have everything done by one or another of 22 standing committees of the senate and 32 standing committees of the assembly. These standing committees have become the legalized trading posts for legislation. On all finance measures two committees have been given a monopoly. Section 23 of the Legislative Law requires that 'all bills that involve any appropriations . . . when introduced in the senate shall be referred to the committee on finance, and when introduced in the assembly shall be referred to the committee on ways and means.'

"Under the present rules the governor's 'bill,' if it is considered at all—and unless public opinion asserts itself it probably will remain in the pigeon-holes of the finance committee of the senate and of the ways and means committee of the assembly to which it has already been consigned—will take the following course: It will be reviewed, discussed and practically disposed of behind the closed doors of a committee of the assembly, with no publicity given to criticism or requests for change; it will then be brought out and be put through the assembly, and with little or no debate will be sent to the senate; there it will go to another standing committee and be made the subject of further parley behind closed doors; then it will be reported out, and after further merely formal actions, including the amendments, will be passed and sent to the governor, who may use his veto power either to prevent harm by the legislature or to do harm by punishing some of his political enemies. The whole procedure is adapted to covert, secret dealings; it is not adapted to open-handed dealing and discussion in which public opinion shall be the real and final arbiter.

"The end sought by the proposed amendment to existing statutes and rules is to require that finance measures be brought into the open; that those who are responsible for administration be required to lay before the representatives of the people in committee of the whole a plan of financing for which they may be held to account; that each representative be given a chance pub-

licy to get all the information he may desire, under a procedure which will enable him openly to question each executive head about any proposal under discussion and to make the answer of this executive a part of the record; that, after obtaining a full statement of facts and conditions from a responsible officer, each member of the legislature be given an opportunity in committee of the whole house publicly to offer all the criticism he may desire. But this is not all. The proposal made would further require that each member when criticising a proposal or attacking an officer before the bar of the legislature shall face the officer criticised and that opportunity shall be given to reply—also that fellow members of the legislature, as well as the public, shall have the benefit of open discussion. These are the alternatives: (1) publicity, through requiring all finance measures first to be taken up in committee of the whole house with executive officers present and opportunity given for inquiry and discussion; or (2) a continuation of the present practice of referring every proposal to a standing committee where it may be considered behind closed doors and disposed of in secret by the well-known practice of 'log-rolling' with all of its wasteful results.

"In support of this memorial the Bureau urges that the present procedure has been proved by experience to be vicious and subversive in every state and nation where it has been tried. That, on the other hand, such a procedure as is proposed, where used, has given publicity to business under consideration; has developed leadership; and has made the administration both responsive and responsible to the people. These are results for which the Bureau asks the serious attention of public-spirited citizens and citizen-bodies, as well as of legislators at Albany to whom the governor's appropriation bill has been submitted."

MEMORIAL

TO THE ASSEMBLY AND SENATE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, SUBMITTED BY THE BUREAU OF MUNICIPAL RESEARCH, ASKING CONSIDERATION IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE OF THE APPROPRIATION BILL SUBMITTED BY THE GOVERNOR WITH HIS ANNUAL MESSAGE JANUARY 5, 1916.

As Governor Whitman has carefully reviewed the estimates for expenditures for 1917 and submitted to the legislature, on the first day of the session, a consolidated estimate and a definite request for appropriations in the form of a bill, with conditions attached, which he deems necessary to efficient administration—we respectfully present this memorial and ask that the “Executive Law” and the “Legislative Law” of the state and the rules of the respective houses be amended after the manner indicated in the “Draft of Proposed Amendment” attached. We also ask that the senate and assembly, without waiting for legislation on the subject, and in any event in order to avoid question as to the constitutionality of a legislative act on the subject (See Art. III, sec. 10), change their rules of procedure in such manner as will admit of consideration of all financial measures initially in each house in committee of the whole, with the governor or his representatives present to answer questions of members concerning past expenditures and to explain the needs of the public service for the appropriations requested.

*Purpose of Proposed Amendments*

The purpose of the proposed change in the Executive Law is to place responsibility on the governor for the preparation of an annual budget. The purpose of the amendment of the Legislative Law is to prescribe a procedure which will secure publicity in the consideration of these proposals and give opportunity for each member of the legislature to question the administration openly and publicly respecting moneys spent and the needs for amounts requested.

*Summary of Proposed Changes in Procedure*

In order that these purposes may be secured it is proposed that the statutes and the rules of the senate and assembly shall be changed so that:

- 1—All financial reports, estimates and appropriation bills shall be first considered and discussed by



each house of the legislature in committee of the whole instead of being referred to a standing committee.

- 2—No reference of finance bills shall be made to any standing committee until the committee of the whole house shall have reported thereon.
- 3—The governor personally or by his designated representatives shall be given the right to attend sessions of the committee of the whole to explain executive proposals.
- 4—No amendments increasing amounts of items over and above the amounts as submitted by the governor shall be in order in the deliberations of the committee of the whole, and any provisions for increases that may be proposed shall be submitted to the legislature as separate bills.

#### *Facts About Present Procedure*

In support of this memorial, attention is called to the following facts:

- 1—That the present procedure is not adapted to giving publicity either to what has been done with moneys appropriated, or what is the need for moneys requested.
- 2—That under the present procedure, the governor, a large majority of representatives, and the people, remain in ignorance of what action is to be reported and recommended by the standing committee on finance of the senate and the standing committee on ways and means of the assembly, until it is too late to have intelligent consideration given to the subject.
- 3—That under the present procedure, emergency messages have been resorted to frequently and as a result have destroyed what little opportunity there is for publicity under the regular rules.
- 4—That the present procedure fosters practices familiarly known as “log-rolling” and “pork barrel” legislation.

Attached is a list of 272 bills introduced by members in the senate and the assembly during the last session, which call for the expenditure of public moneys, (Exhibit “A”); also a list of 33 such measures which passed the senate and were sent to the assembly for concurrence, and of 72 such measures which passed the assembly and were sent to the senate for con-

currence. (Exhibit "B.") A brief history of 100 measures reported by the standing committee on ways and means of the assembly is also appended. (Exhibit "C.")\*

*Public Business Should Be Transacted Openly*

An opportunity should be given the executive to explain publicly and to defend the reports of past expenditures and the need for further appropriations

In a popular government it is quite as desirable to know what are the views of the opposition as it is to have the views of the majority.

As a matter of procedure, no opportunity is now given to the opposition to put the administration on record, and no opportunity is given the governor and heads of departments to propose openly and publicly any constructive measure except by message or report, which, if considered at all, is taken up in their absence. It is important that the administration be given a chance to answer criticisms made on the floor of either house. Under the present system, appropriation bills are necessarily prepared by members who, being chosen by and responsible to a local constituency, cannot frame bills comprehensively from the standpoint of the needs of the entire state.

While under the existing constitution the most natural and effective working relations cannot be established between the legislature and the executive, it is urged that some such legislation and change of rules as herein suggested will tend to fix responsibility for extravagance and waste and provide opportunity for full public discussion of every fiscal measure.

BUREAU OF MUNICIPAL RESEARCH

R. FULTON CUTTING, Chairman  
MARY W. HARRIMAN  
JOSEPH W. HARRIMAN  
GEORGE B. HOPKINS  
VICTOR MORAWETZ  
BRADLEY MARTIN  
E. R. A. SELIGMAN  
ALBERT SHAW  
FRANK TUCKER  
GEORGE W. WICKERSHAM

TRUSTEES

\*No more convincing evidence is needed of the extent to which "log-rolling" and local "patronage" are employed in obtaining financial legislation than is found in these lists of bills introduced and passed. The last session is not exceptional in this respect. These exhibits are so voluminous that they are omitted from this folder. They will be printed as a part of "Municipal Research No. 69" in the January number of the Bureau's regular publication.

LETTER TO THE GOVERNOR

The action taken by Governor Whitman in laying before the legislature carefully reviewed estimates and a proposed form of appropriation bill was regarded by the trustees of the Bureau as a long step in advance. This letter was written in part to commend the governor for the action which had been taken, and in part to raise with him the question as to whether he should not also submit his views on the methods of financing expenditures.

Due to the fact that the estimates had been laid before the legislature the first day of its session in the form of a draft of bill, question was also raised as to whether the governor should not serve notice that he would refuse to use his constitutional powers of emergency message.

January 11, 1916.

To His Excellency,  
The Governor of the State  
of New York.

Dear Sir:

We are glad to note that you have taken an advanced step in submitting a proposed appropriation bill to the legislature during the first week of its session. From that fact, from your annual message and from your public statements regarding the financial problems of the state, it is evident that you are sincerely interested in the development of a procedure which will make the executive responsible for preparing each year a well considered plan for financing the needs of the state and for ending, for all time, the present chaotic and invisible system of making appropriations.

Since no legal provision is made for a budget practice in this state, we are about to send to the legislature a memorial asking consideration of proposed amendments to the Executive Law and to the Legislative Law of the State—the one authorizing the executive to prepare and submit an annual budget, the other imposing on the legislature a procedure requiring that finance measures be taken up and discussed publicly in committee of the whole instead of being referred to standing committees of the senate and assembly, and secretly discussed, as is the present practice. The first draft of the proposed amendment you will find attached.

It is assumed that you agree with us on the following propositions:

- 1—That the measure which you submitted with your annual message on January 5, good as it is, is

not a "budget," in that it is not a plan of financing the state's needs; that it is an appropriation bill designed to take the place of the irresponsible estimates of department heads and other officers heretofore made in the form of requests to the chairmen of committees of the legislature.

- 2—That unless the present procedure is changed, this appropriation bill, if considered at all, will be considered, discussed and practically disposed of behind the closed doors of a standing committee of the assembly, with no publicity given to criticism or requests for change; it will then be brought out and go through the assembly, and with little or no debate will be sent to the other house, where again it will go to another standing committee and be made the subject of further parley behind closed doors; then it will be reported out and after further formalities and actions with amendments, it will be passed and sent to you.
- 3—That in so far as the executive has any part in the parleys and treaties which affect this measure, he will have still less opportunity given to him by law for doing so openly and publicly than has a member of the legislature.
- 4—That the use of the executive veto does not take the place of open and public legislative discussions and action; at best it does not give to the people the information necessary to a vote of confidence or lack of confidence at the next election.
- 5—That revenue and borrowing measures are not presented or taken up at the same time as appropriation measures, and thus far have not been in any manner connected or associated with the bill which has been prepared and submitted.

These fundamental facts being undisputed and indeed indisputable, we desire to urge upon you that you do not rest your activities for financial reform upon the proposed bill which was sent in with your annual address to the legislature, but that you follow this with a further step in which all citizens of the state are interested—namely—present in the near future to the legislature a plan or proposal for financing the state's activities for the next year. By submitting this at a date somewhat later than the time when the estimates and requests for appropriations are sent in, the governor will have the advantage of discussion of the appropriation bill before submitting a final draft or revenue and borrowing bills. He will be able, therefore, at this time to

present to the legislature a real "budget"—a financial plan or proposal for the ensuing year which will set forth in brief, contemplated expenditures, estimated revenues, contemplated borrowings, estimated surplus of revenues over expenses (or vice versa), estimated cash receipts over cash disbursements (or vice versa). In short, a definite plan of financing with a formal statement or address from the governor would place before the state in a businesslike, clear-cut fashion just what the situation is that must be faced; and give to the people as well as the legislature the benefit of an executive statement of financial condition as well as a constructive proposal for meeting financial needs.

May we urge that your careful attention be given to another question of present procedure in dealing with finance measures in the legislature. As has already been pointed out, there has been little opportunity given to the members of the legislature, other than those of the personnel of the two committees, to analyze or review the various departmental requests. Legislators and the public have been still further deprived of opportunity to learn of the import of proposed finance measures, through the use of the "emergency message" of the governor. This permits such bills to be passed without first having been printed and placed on the desks of all members for three legislative days prior to the time that final action is taken—frequently in typewritten form, with pasters and interlineations. It is a procedure that inherently is bad, rightfully the subject of severest criticism, and one which cannot be reconciled with any effective budget practice. It may fairly be assumed that if public announcement were made to the effect that an "emergency message" would not be forthcoming this year to facilitate star chamber consideration of finance bills, it would have a salutary effect upon the legislature in the stand which it might take in consideration of proposals looking toward a more effective budget practice.

We submit these suggestions to you in the thought that they are not only possible but eminently practical under the present constitution; and in the further thought that the public is so thoroughly disgusted with the "log-rolling" and "pork barrel" practices, and with those inscrutable methods called "invisible government" that you have an opportunity to stand before the state and the nation as both champion and leader of a cause in which the large majority of the electorate are ready to enlist.

It is our purpose to send the proposed amendment to the legislature with a memorial setting forth present practices, and urging upon the attention of both houses the need for changes in law of the character indicated. We also have in mind giving out both

the proposed amendment and the memorial to the press. In order that we may have from you the benefit of criticism and suggestion, I am asking Mr. Holton to present this to you personally.

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) F. A. CLEVELAND, *Director.*

ANSWER OF THE GOVERNOR

On the 21st day of January the Bureau received from the Governor the following letter:

STATE OF NEW YORK  
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER  
ALBANY

January 19, 1916.

Mr. Frederick A. Cleveland,  
Director, Bureau of Municipal Research,  
261 Broadway,  
New York City.

Dear Sir:

I am in receipt, under date of January 11, 1916, of a communication from you, together with a draft of a memorial to the Legislature and certain proposed amendments to the Executive and Legislative Laws, these documents being suggested as you say by the Message and the Tentative Budget Proposal, which I submitted to the Legislature at the opening of the present session.

Because you appear to have misunderstood, to some extent, the purpose which I have in mind in connection with this matter, I will discuss your communication in such detail as is necessary to indicate the points upon which that misunderstanding on your part exists. You state:

"We are glad to note that you have taken an advanced step in submitting a *proposed* appropriation bill to the Legislature during the first week of its session. From that fact, from your annual message and from your public statements regarding the financial problems of the state, it is evident that you are sincerely interested in the development of a procedure which will make the executive responsible for preparing each year a well considered plan for financing the needs of the state and for ending, for all time, the present chaotic and invisible system of making appropriations."

Your assumption that I am in favor of the preparation annually by the Executive of a *complete*<sup>1</sup> appropriation act; all of the items of which shall have the final approval of the Executive, and that this proposed appropriation act shall be submitted to the Legislature as an established executive procedure is incorrect.

I am in favor of the Executive going just as far in this matter as I have done in my Tentative Budget Proposal, now before the Legislature, namely, that the Governor submit to the Legislature at the opening of the session during his term, or, at the expiration of his term, prepare for submission to the following Legislature, a tentative appropriation budget for all the departments which are under Executive control, and in such document

---

<sup>1</sup> Attention is called to the fact that "complete" was not used.

to indicate as nearly as possible the judgment of the Executive as to what the expenditures for those departments should be for the next fiscal year, and together with these revised estimates present the estimates of other departments as submitted to the Comptroller subject only to revision as to classifications of expenditure. I have done this in the present instance under existing laws and I cannot conceive that succeeding Executives will require the restraint of a legislative act to prevent their return to the old procedure.

Because up to this time, there did not exist a proper model for a state appropriation bill, my duty in the present instance was two-fold: first—to present for consideration to the Legislature such a model as constitutional restrictions permitted; and second—also to express my views as to what I deemed to be reasonable allowances for the financial support of departments under Executive control or direction for the next fiscal year. For those departments over which I have no administrative jurisdiction (except in the Department of Education, where the Commissioner joined with me in expressing the needs of his Department for the ensuing year on a minimum basis, commensurate with departmental requirements), my Tentative Budget Proposal does not represent my views as to the amounts which properly should be appropriated. In this group are included appropriations for the Legislature; for the Courts, other than the Court of Claims, and for the departments administered by the other elective officers of the State.

My budget proposal goes as far as I deemed it advisable for the Executive to go and does not attempt to establish the principle that the Executive shall originate appropriations. The expression by the Executive of what he deems shall be the allowances for the departments controlled by him is in effect a consolidation and review of departmental estimates by the Executive before they are submitted to the Legislature for consideration, and in no wise changes the principles established either under the present constitution or under existing law.

I hold the same view with regard to the function of the Executive in relation to any proposed revenue legislation. It is the duty of the Executive, where he deems revenue legislation to be necessary, to indicate his views in that respect by an advisory message to the Legislature. That has been, and will, undoubtedly, continue to be the practice.

Your proposed amendments to the Executive and Legislative Laws of the State represent an attempt to establish by legislation as much as possible of that Executive budget plan which was a part of the recently defeated proposed constitution.



Whatever may be my theoretical views as to the State budget procedure, except in respect of the right of the Executive to reduce, as well as to veto, items, I am opposed to any extension of this procedure beyond the limitations established by the existing constitution, and it is obvious that the existing constitution contemplates that both appropriation and revenue measures shall originate in the Legislature, and not in the Executive branch of government.

My suggestion to the Legislature for amendment to the present constitution in granting to the Executive the right to reduce an item in an appropriation bill in addition to his present power to veto the item as a whole, does not disturb the balance which exists under the present constitution between the Executive and the Legislature, simply allowing the Executive a slightly wider latitude in the exercise of his constitutional right to check legislative action.

A large part of the confusion and lack of system in the administration of State finance and in the form which has been followed in appropriating moneys for the use of government and in providing revenues to meet these liabilities, has resulted, I believe, from a lack of intelligent study of the problems and not from any inherent desire of our legislative bodies to do things improperly or incorrectly. If the Legislature is started on the right course in respect to these matters, I feel satisfied that a continuance of the right practice may safely be left to them. At any rate, a departure from that right course on the part of the Legislature will promptly be checked by the Executive under the budget plan suggested in my Message, and the Governor still continues to be a check on the Legislature and not the usurper of legislative functions.

Taking up your communication further in detail, you have stated five propositions, which you introduce by the phrase: "It is assumed that you agree with us on the following propositions."

Your first proposition is:

"1—That the measure which you submitted with your annual message on January 5, good as it is, is not a 'budget,' in that it is not a plan of financing the State's needs; that it is an appropriation bill designed to take the place of the irresponsible estimates of department heads and other officers heretofore made in the form of requests to the chairmen of committees of the legislature."

My answer to your first proposition is that the Tentative Budget Proposal, which I submitted to the Legislature, together with my references to it in the Message which it accompanied,

clearly indicate its nature. The phrase at the head of this budget proposal reads as follows: "An act making appropriations for the support of government." It is obvious that with this heading it did not purport or intend to deal with the revenue side of State finance.

Your second proposition reads as follows:

"2—That unless the present procedure is changed, this appropriation bill, if considered at all, will be considered, discussed and practically disposed of behind the closed doors of a standing committee of the assembly, with no publicity given to criticism or requests for change; it will then be brought out and go through the assembly, and with little or no debate will be sent to the other house, where again it will go to another standing committee and be made the subject of further parley behind closed doors; then it will be reported out and after further formalities and actions with amendments, it will be passed and sent to you."

I do not know whether your assumption, as indicated in this proposition, is true or not. The action of the legislature, in connection therewith, will have to be the answer. All conferences or discussions in connection with State appropriations, under my direction, have been in public. This was true of the procedure in the Spring of 1915, when open public hearings were held in the Executive Chamber, on the items in the "Thirty Day Bills," transmitted to me by the Legislature, and also similar open public hearings were held in the Executive Chamber in arriving at the tentative amounts to be included in the present budget proposal for the departments over which I have control or jurisdiction. I firmly believe that no discussion of appropriation matters should be held in private sessions either by the Legislature or by the Executive. I have endeavored to emphasize my views on this point, not only in public statements, but in my public acts. If the Legislature follows my example or conforms to my wishes in this matter, there should be no private sessions of a Legislative committee, either for the consideration of an appropriation bill or for the consideration of any other public matter. No public business of any kind should be considered in private, except those matters pertaining to criminal prosecutions, or legal prosecutions or defense where the public interest would be obviously jeopardized by publicity. I see no objection to the suggestion by you or by any other citizen of a plan of publicity to the Legislature, either in connection with the consideration of appropriation bills or any other legislative activity.

Paragraph 3 reads as follows:

"3—That in so far as the Executive has any part in

the parleys and treaties which affect this measure, he will have still less opportunity given to him by law for doing so openly and publicly than has a member of the Legislature."

I believe that with the Executive power to reduce as well as to veto, the Executive will be in position adequately to safeguard the public interest in the matter of appropriation. Your proposition 4 reads as follows:

"4—That the use of the Executive veto does not take the place of open and public legislative discussions and action; at best it does not give to the people the information necessary to a vote of confidence or lack of confidence at the next election."

In this connection, I call your attention to the following paragraph in my Message:

"Because of this latter constitutional limitation (the right to veto without the right to reduce) the budget form of appropriation act which I now suggest depends for its success on the complete co-operation of the Legislature and the Executive during its preparation, so that those features which require segregation shall before final enactment be acceptable to both the Legislature and the Governor."

If the Legislature does not submit this appropriation bill to me until the time when it becomes a "Thirty Day Bill," and does not co-operate with me in fixing the items of the segregated schedules supporting the appropriations, and the bill, as submitted to me, is in such shape that I must either veto activities as a whole or accept allowances for expenditures which I deem unwise, the condition which your proposition suggests would confront me, but I feel sure that nothing of the sort will happen and that the co-operation which I seek will be accorded me by the Legislature. In that event, the appropriation bill as passed will be a bill which I can approve in all of its items, and in approving which, to use your phrase, "give to the people the information necessary to a vote of confidence or a lack of confidence at the next election."

Your fifth proposition is as follows:

"5—That revenue and borrowing measures are not presented or taken up at the same time as appropriation measures, and thus far have not been in any manner connected or associated with the bill which has been prepared and submitted."<sup>1</sup>

The State of New York is not a corporation organized for earning dividends and it cannot be viewed from that standpoint. I do not believe that the revenue side of the State's finance, as

---

<sup>1</sup>This refers to the lack of consideration of "ways and means" by those

a first proposition, should be taken up at the same time as the expenditure side, because the expenditures of the State should not be based upon the possible revenues which may be gouged out of the taxpayers, but upon the minimum allowance for the actual necessities of State activities. It is easy to conceive that if both of these propositions were considered one as part of the other, and the revenue side of the State's finances were prosperous that the expenditures would increase because of that fact and that appropriations for other than mandatory or strictly necessary purposes would be encouraged.

The practice of the State in the past, so far as I have been able to ascertain, has been to appropriate to the extreme limit of the complaisance of the Executive or up to the point of public protest and then devise some scheme for increasing the revenues of the State to meet that appropriation program. It is my judgment that not one dollar should be raised either in revenue or by direct taxation, which is not mandatorily required by State needs. It is further obvious that if the amount of these mandatory State needs is expressed in a figure beyond the prospective resources of the State within the period covered by those appropriations, then either the appropriation bill must be amended to reduce it to those anticipated revenues or that some steps must be taken for the increase of revenues, but I am very certain that the two ideas should be clearly dissociated in the minds of the Legislature and in the mind of the Executive, that our first duty is to reduce our appropriation bill to its minimum and not confuse this issue or interfere with its success by a consideration of what the revenues of the State will be as an act preliminary to determining the minimum of the State's expenses.

When the Legislature has decided the amount, which in its judgment is necessary to be appropriated for the needs of the State for the ensuing fiscal year, a discussion of the revenue side of the problem will be in order, to determine, as I have previously stated, either upon a further reduction of the appropriations, if the anticipated revenues are not adequate, or to increase those revenues, if the appropriation act is at the lowest possible minimum which can be reached.

Following your five propositions, two points are raised, concerning which I shall speak specifically.

You refer to the abuse in the past of the Emergency Message of the Executive, in connection with appropriation bills. I have already, in conference with the leaders of the Senate and Assembly, informed them that, in view of the fact that a tentative budget proposal, containing, as it does, an agreed appropriation pro-

gram for the departments under my jurisdiction, was placed on the desk of each member on the opening day of the session, I would insist that the appropriation act shall be finally passed without recourse to an Emergency Message.

With reference to your statement that there has been in the past little opportunity for members of the Legislature, other than those on the Finance Committee of either house, to analyze or review the various departmental requests, I would suggest that the fact that a carefully reviewed program of appropriations for the departments under my jurisdiction, together with the departmental requests of all other State departments, reclassified in proper budget form, was in the hands of each Legislator from the opening day of the session, each legislator has, therefore, the fullest opportunity to be informed and to keep himself informed of each step in the process of appropriations. Furthermore, by reason of the fact that the documents composing and supporting the tentative budget proposal were made legislative documents upon their receipt from my hands, any citizen of the State, desiring the same detailed information, may now obtain it by application to the document clerks of either house.

On the assumption that my tentative budget plan, as I have indicated it, is followed each year, full opportunity for public and legislative scrutiny of items of proposed expenditure will be given from the opening day of the legislative session until the appropriation act is finally passed. This fact together with the form of the tentative budget proposal, which shows in the most minute detail how the money of the State is to be used, would seem to do away completely with what is, as you say, "the present chaotic and invisible system of making appropriations."

In conclusion I would say that I feel that I have gone as far as I am required to do in my suggestions to the Legislature in what I have said in my Message. It is, of course, entirely within your rights or the rights of any group of citizens to enlarge or amplify upon that program, but I believe that any action of this sort should be taken up directly with the Legislature and not through the Executive, with the understanding also, in the case of your proposals, that I am not at this time prepared to support any plan which shall make the Executive other than what he has been in the past, namely, an advisor to the Legislature, when necessary, on all matters of legislation, and a check upon the Legislature when its acts do not conform to his judgment as to what is for the best interests of the State.

Very truly yours.

(Signed) CHARLES S. WHITMAN.

## REPLY TO THE GOVERNOR'S ANSWER

As the answer from the governor seemed to be based on a misunderstanding of certain points which had been raised and left others somewhat in doubt, the following reply was sent for the purpose of listing certain propositions and bringing them to the consideration of the governor a little more definitely.

BUREAU OF MUNICIPAL RESEARCH  
NEW YORK

January 25, 1916.

TO HIS EXCELLENCY,

THE GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK.

*Dear Sir:*

This is to thank you for your esteemed favor of the 19th in answer to mine of the 11th, and to bring before you certain questions raised concerning which we are not entirely clear.

We regret that you began your letter with an argument based on an assumption that you were urged to submit "a complete appropriation bill." Such an expression is not to be found either in our letter of the 11th or in our memorial. Possibly we erred in not using the exact language of your message in which you refer to the document sent to the legislature as "a suggested form of appropriation bill, together with the estimates on which the same is based."

May we also point out that there is no suggestion on our part to decrease the powers of the legislature, as the phrase "preparation annually by the executive of a complete appropriation act" used by you might imply.

What moved the trustees of the Bureau of Municipal Research to send to the legislature their memorial on the 19th was this: that on January 5th you had sent to the legislature with your annual message a carefully prepared document variously described as "Proposed form of budget" with "tentative appropriation figures," "tentative budget proposals," etc.; whereas under the present statutes and the legislative procedure of this state there is no legal provision for a budget practice—in fact, the present statutory law does not contemplate that there will be a budget practice. Experience shows that wherever executives merely submit consolidated estimates to a legislative body and secure no open legislative procedure thereon, their efforts to place public finances on a sound basis are without avail.

You may recall that President Taft made such an attempt during the last year of his administration; but his budget was consigned to the pigeon-holes of standing committees and never again saw the light of day. Executives of at least ten states have done substantially what you did in your annual message; but their proposals have been taken into the dark closets of one standing committee after another, only to come out mutilated beyond recog-

last session for local constituencies; in the 67 separate appropriation bills which passed the house and were sent to the senate for concurrence; in the 33 separate appropriation bills which passed the senate and were sent to the house for concurrence; in the legislative record of 100 bills separately considered in the two houses; in the 82 bills which came to you for signature, many of which were actually signed before the general appropriation bills had to be acted upon, and before any opportunity was given for public hearing. After calling attention to the results of the practice that has grown up under existing statutes and procedure—a practice of sending all financial matters to standing committees where they may be considered behind closed doors, with no opportunity given to members of the legislature for interrogating executive officers openly on the floor, and with no opportunity given to executive officers personally to present to the legislature, explain and defend their own proposals—we suggested to the legislature that the laws be changed in the following particulars:

- 1—To require that all estimates of expenditures be sent to the governor for his consideration and review before the beginning of the session.
- 2—To authorize the governor to prepare a consolidated estimate of expenditures and a definite plan or proposal for financing next year's needs—the estimates of expenditures to be submitted by him to the legislature separately at the beginning of the session.
- 3—To require each house to take up the governor's proposals and estimates in committee of the whole, with opportunity given to the governor and his representatives to be present.
- 4—To require each house to come to a vote, after discussion in committee of the whole, on the amount asked for each office and on the financial plan presented before submitting these requests and proposals to standing committees for drafting bills, etc.
- 5—To require that any local or other measure submitted by a member which provides for an increase in an item or for an additional item of appropriation be by separate bill.

From your letter I understand your position on each of these propositions to be this:

- 1—That the proposed change in law requiring all estimates to be submitted to the governor is superfluous, since he can now get them from the comptroller if he wishes.
- 2—That the proposed change of law authorizing the governor to review estimates and prepare and submit at the beginning of the session a consolidated estimate of expenditures and a plan of financing which represents his views, is also superfluous in so far as it

pertains to estimates of expenditures; and unwise so far as it pertains to revenues and borrowings.

- 3—That the proposed change of law requiring that the governor's proposal ("tentative" or otherwise) be taken up in committee of the whole house is none of the governor's affair; but that, so far as it would give opportunity for the governor to be present to explain and defend, this is an opportunity the governor does not want.
- 4—That the proposed change of law requiring each house to come to a vote in committee of the whole house on the amount asked for each office, and on the governor's plan of financing, before submission to standing committees, is a matter in which the governor is not interested.
- 5—That the proposed change of law requiring every measure submitted by a member, increasing items in the governor's proposal, should be handled by constitutional amendment and not by statute.

May I also undertake to state what we understand to be your further views on the subject of our memorial. As I get them from the letter before us, you hold:

- 1—That the governor has done all he may be expected to do, namely, to submit a "tentative" budget proposal for appropriations, and to submit in an advisory capacity only "a proper model for a state appropriation bill."
- 2—That you are opposed to going even this far on revenue and borrowing measures.
- 3—That you are not "prepared to support any plan which shall make the executive other than what he has been in the past, namely, an advisor to the legislature when necessary, on all matters of legislation, and a check upon the legislature when its acts do not conform to his judgment as to what are the best interests of the state."
- 4—That "any action of this sort [i. e., such as our proposal] should be taken up with the legislature and not through the executive."
- 5—That you would regard any initiative or leadership on the part of the executive, which would bring his proposal in a formal way before the house and give to the governor an opportunity personally or through representatives a chance to be heard on the floor in committee of the whole, an invasion of the sacred constitutional principle of separation of powers.
- 6—That while you agree that the procedure on money measures should be such as to locate responsibility and give fullest publicity, in your opinion the introduction of a "tentative" proposal for expenditures by the governor at the beginning of the session without opportunity for question by members or for open discussion on the



floor; and a constitutional amendment giving to the governor power to reduce items after they have been passed would secure all the publicity desired.

As said before, the only purpose which I have in listing these propositions is to get them before us in such form that they may be either assented to or dissented from—thereby making it easy to define and discuss differences, should such exist.

Commenting on our proposals you say:

“Your proposed amendments [our suggested draft] to the executive and legislative laws of the state represent an attempt to establish by legislation as much as possible of that executive budget plan which was a part of the recently defeated proposed constitution. \* \* \* Except in respect to the right of the executive to reduce, as well as to veto items, I am opposed to any extension of this procedure beyond the limitations established by the existing constitution.”

This raises in my mind the following broad questions:

- 1—Do you consider the proposed amendments to the existing statute law unconstitutional?
- 2—Can the executive be held responsible for results on any “tentative” or other proposal under a procedure which permits individual members to increase items without consulting the wishes of the executive or giving to him an opportunity to be heard before the measure is passed?
- 3—Is there any procedure which has been developed anywhere that is so well adapted to give publicity to financial proposals; to give opportunities to members on the floor to ask questions of officers who are charged with the direction and management of the state's business; to give executive officers an opportunity to submit, explain and defend plans which they have conceived to be for the best interests of the state; to give the people through the press a chance to know what has been going on and to have the benefit of discussion and criticism of plans, as is the committee-of-the-whole procedure essentially in the form suggested in the draft that accompanied our memorial?
- 4—Has not such a procedure as is suggested always resulted in increasing the power and control of the legislative body by cutting out the monopolies exercised by a few men on standing committees, and forcing executive officers to convince a majority of the representatives of the people that their proposals are sound and in the interest of the general welfare, before they are approved?
- 5—Has not the standing committee system in this country been the very thing that has subverted the principle of separation of powers—put matters of administra-

tion into the hands of irresponsible groups of legislators and made the irresponsibility, inefficiency, and wastefulness of our government a subject of constant reproach?

6—Can public hearings by the governor after bills have been passed take the place of hearings on a definite executive plan prepared, submitted and discussed on the floor before the bill is up for passage; can it take the place of leadership and open-handed dealing; is not the extension of the veto power simply one of the many forms of "invisible government"?

7—If the governor were given the right to reduce as well as to veto items in the appropriation bill would not the exercise of this unusual right, not granted specifically by the constitution of any other state, greatly increase the power of the governor in his relation to the legislature on financial matters with a corresponding decrease in the powers of the legislature to determine amounts of appropriations? Would the exercise of this right of veto and reduction over items of appropriations satisfy in any manner the requirements of Art. IV, sec. 4, of the constitution quoted above? Would not this operate in practice, to take away from the legislature their proper function and enable the governor to override the legislative will without opportunity given to members to be heard?

These questions occur to me because it seems that the issue presented in this discussion is one which goes to the very foundation of the republican form of government. The ends of democracy, if they are served, must be attained through some kind of leadership which may be held to strict account. Is not the true picture of a representative body one which conceives of it as a meeting of the people through representatives—as an agency which, in addition to its own initiative in matters of making laws, is expected to review, approve or disapprove the acts and proposals of officers who are chosen to carry on the business of the people; is it not a principle which has been tested out by experience and found to be effective, that a body of representatives coming from different parts of the state is the best agency that the people can employ to review, discuss and express opinion as to the desirability of executive proposals? Is not such a use necessary to expression of the will of the majority on all measures concerning which there is not an irreconcilable controversy between the executive and representatives of the people? Is not such a review and revision essential to the intelligent expression of opinion on the efficiency and fidelity of the executive, by a broad electorate?

Sincerely,

F. A. CLEVELAND, *Director.*

## RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT

---

### APPENDIX

---

DRAFT OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE LEGISLATIVE AND  
EXECUTIVE LAWS OF NEW YORK

EXHIBIT A—LIST OF BILLS INTRODUCED IN 1915 CALLING  
FOR EXPENDITURES

EXHIBIT B—BILLS CALLING FOR EXPENDITURES, PASSED  
BY ONE HOUSE AND SENT TO THE OTHER FOR CON-  
CURRENCE

EXHIBIT C—BRIEF OUTLINE HISTORY OF EACH BILL RE-  
PORTED

DRAFT OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT

AN ACT TO AMEND THE EXECUTIVE LAW IN RELATION TO THE DUTY OF THE GOVERNOR TO PRESENT ESTIMATES TO THE LEGISLATURE AND IN RELATION TO HIS POWER TO EXAMINE AND INVESTIGATE; AND TO AMEND THE LEGISLATIVE LAW IN RELATION TO THE SUBMISSION OF BILLS INVOLVING EXPENDITURES AND OF ESTIMATES FOR EXPENDITURES.

*The People of the State of New York represented in Senate and Assembly, do enact as follows:*

Section 1. Chapter twenty-three of the laws of nineteen hundred and nine, entitled "An act in relation to executive officers, constituting Chapter eighteen of the consolidated laws," is hereby amended by adding a new section to be section ten, to read as follows:

**Section 10. PREPARATION AND SUBMISSION OF AN ANNUAL BUDGET, AND EXAMINATIONS AND INSPECTIONS BY THE GOVERNOR.**

*The heads of all departments, offices, boards and commissions of the state, except the legislative and judicial branches thereof, shall file with the governor annually on or before the first day of November estimates of all expenditures in their judgment required for the conduct of their respective departments, offices, boards or commissions during the next ensuing fiscal year, as well as for the purpose of meeting any deficiencies in existing appropriations to meet expenses for the current year, and together with such statements or information as in their opinion may properly be considered in connection therewith or which may be requested by the governor. The governor is authorized to review the same and to submit to the legislature not later than the first day of the following February a consolidated estimate and a budget which will contain a financial plan for the next fiscal year supported by summary statements showing: (a) actual and estimated revenues and expenditures for a period beginning not less than two years prior to the period to be financed; (b) the present assets, liabilities, surplus and deficit, and the estimated financial condition of the state as of the beginning and the end of the period to be financed; (c) the present condition of funds and the estimated condition of appropriations and funds as of the beginning and end of the period to be financed; (d) such revenue bills as are deemed necessary to meet financial needs and ratably*

and equitably to distribute the charges; (e) such measures for borrowing as may be deemed expedient.

The consolidated estimate when submitted under the authority of this act shall set forth what amounts, and the supporting items thereof which, in his judgment, are needed: (1) to meet, by new appropriations, the requirements of each department, office, board and commission established by law for the next ensuing fiscal year; (2) to supplement, by new appropriation, the authorizations already made to each department, office, board and commission established by law for the current fiscal year; (3) to complete undertakings authorized during past fiscal years by the re-appropriation of unexpended balances of authorizations which had been encumbered by contracts before the fiscal term of the original appropriation expired; (4) to meet, by new appropriations, the requirements of any additional activities of the public service not heretofore authorized by law and which are recommended by the governor, and the governor in that part of such consolidated estimate which sets forth the needs of the existing establishment for the ensuing year shall show in comparison opposite each total and each supporting item the amount appropriated or authorized for the current fiscal year and the amounts expended for the last two completed fiscal years.

Section 2. Section twenty-three of Chapter thirty-seven of the laws of nineteen hundred and nine, entitled "An act in relation to legislation, constituting Chapter thirty-two of the consolidated laws," is hereby amended to read as follows:

**SECTION 23. APPROPRIATION BILLS, HOW REFERRED.**—All bills that involve any appropriation from the treasury of the state, or any of its funds or any of the funds under its management, and all estimates for expenditure submitted to the legislature by the governor, when introduced or submitted to the legislature [in the senate shall be referred to the committee on finance, and when introduced in the assembly shall be referred to the committee on ways and means] shall be referred to and considered in each house by the committee of the whole sitting as a committee of supply, and neither the senate nor the assembly shall proceed to the enactment of any measure or the consideration of any bill or estimate for raising or spending money, or refer the same to any standing committee until such measure, estimate or bill shall have been considered and reported on by such committee of the whole.

The governor shall have the right to appear before either house, either in person or by a designated representative, and be heard

respecting any such measure, estimate or bill under consideration in such house by the committee of the whole, and the heads of the respective executive departments, offices, boards and commissions of the state shall also have the right, and it shall be their duty when requested by either house of the legislature, to appear and be heard in respect thereto during the consideration thereof, and to answer inquiries relative thereto. All meetings of the committee of the whole shall be open to the public. When the senate or assembly shall first resolve itself into committee of the whole on supply it shall notify the governor and give him or his designated representatives an opportunity to submit his budget, financial statements, and proposals, to explain the revenues and expenditures of the past year and the estimates submitted by him for the ensuing fiscal year, and to answer questions concerning the same. The estimates for expenditure shall then be considered in detail in the order of presentation by the governor; and votes shall be taken separately, in committee of the whole house, on the amount requested for each department.

After the first meeting of either house in committee of the whole to consider any such measure, estimate or bill, the meeting of such committee shall be a standing order of the day of such house at least one day in every week during the remainder of the session, until the committee shall rise and report its recommendations to the house respecting every such measure, estimate or bill; and whenever such order of the day is read, the house shall resolve itself into committee of the whole for the consideration of such measure, estimate or bill, and the president or speaker shall leave the chair without putting any question. If the committee of the whole in the senate or assembly wishes to hold public hearings or secure detailed information independently of that supplied by the governor, it shall be in order any time after the governor has presented the estimates or his budget to refer the same in whole or part to the finance committee of the senate, or to the ways and means committee in the assembly, or to any other standing committee or special committee for that purpose, provided such committees shall act as sub-committees of the committee of the whole in such cases and make their full and final report to the committee of the whole at such time as may be designated and not less than fifteen legislative days before final action is had in committee of the whole on any such measure, estimate or bill; but such reference shall not take the place of consideration in committee of the whole nor be substituted for the procedure presented in paragraph two of this section.

Upon the consideration of any fiscal measure in committee of

*the whole in either house any items may be eliminated or reduced, but it shall not be in order to move to increase any item of proposed expenditure submitted by the governor, or to add any new item, but any proposed increase or new item may be made the subject of a separate appropriation bill.\**

---

\*The foregoing amendment to the Executive Law and the Legislative Law of the state, taken with what is known as the "Moreland Act," is thought to be sufficient to lay the foundation for an effective budget procedure. The "Moreland Act," now in force as Section 8 of the Executive Law, is as follows:

**Section 8. EXAMINATIONS AND INSPECTIONS BY THE GOVERNOR.**—The governor is authorized at any time, either in person or by one or more persons appointed by him for the purpose, to examine and investigate the management and affairs of any department, board, bureau or commission of the state. The governor and the persons so appointed by him are empowered to subpoena and enforce the attendance of witnesses, to administer oaths and examine witnesses under oath and to require the production of any books or papers deemed relevant or material. Whenever any person so appointed shall not be regularly in the service of the state, his compensation for such services shall be fixed by the governor, and said compensation and all necessary expenses of such examinations and investigations shall be paid by the treasurer out of any appropriations made for the purpose upon the order of the governor and the warrant of the comptroller.

EXHIBIT A

LIST OF BILLS INTRODUCED BY MEMBERS IN THE SENATE AND IN THE ASSEMBLY DURING THE 1915 SESSION WHICH CALL FOR THE EXPENDITURE OF PUBLIC MONEY

DATE	INT. NO.	NAME OF PROPOSER	LOCALITY OR DISTRICT FROM WHICH ELECTED	SUBJECT (SHORT TITLE)
Jan. 14	S. 16	Bennett	New York City	Interstate bridge commission, reappropriation
Jan. 14	S. 44	Slater	Port Chester	Normal school, Westchester, establishing school
Jan. 14	S. 61	Whitney	Mechanicville	Saratoga Springs Reservation
Jan. 14	S. 63	Christman	Herkimer	Normal school, Herkimer, establishing school near
Jan. 14	S. 65	Marshall	Franklin Co.	Normal school, Potsdam, reconstruct old portion
Jan. 14	S. 68	Marshall	Franklin Co.	Grade crossings, Ogdensburg, eliminate
Jan. 14	S. 67	Marshall	Franklin Co.	St. Lawrence State Hospital, land for
Jan. 14	S. 72	Jones	Chenango	Agricultural school, Morrisville, reappropriation
Jan. 14	S. 87	G. F. Thompson	Niagara Co.	Eighteen-mile Creek, improving each branch
Jan. 18	S. 102	Sage	Menands	Dry River, Watervliet, improving
Jan. 18	S. 103	Sage	Menands	Bridge, Mohawk River, Dunsbach Ferry
Jan. 18	S. 104	Sage	Menands	Mohawk River Dike, Cohoes, Green Is.
Jan. 18	S. 105	Whitney	Mechanicville	Saratoga battlefield, acquiring lands
Jan. 18	S. 106	Norton	Cobleskill	Agricultural school, Cobleskill
Jan. 19	S. 132	Slater	Port Chester	Grade crossings, removal, state's share
Jan. 19	S. 139	Sanders	Stafford	Agricultural school, Alfred University
Jan. 21	S. 173	G. L. Thompson	Suffolk Co.	State hospital employees, extra service
Jan. 21	S. 175	G. L. Thompson	Suffolk Co.	Normal school, establishing
Jan. 21	S. 177	G. L. Thompson	Suffolk Co.	Peconic River, widening and deepening
Jan. 21	S. 186	Norton	Schoharie Co.	Bridge, Mohawk River, Visscher's Ferry
Jan. 21	S. 190	Jones	Chenango Co.	Highway route, & a new Chenango County
Jan. 21	S. 193	Wicks	Oneida Co.	Black River Canal, Stanwix St., Rome
Jan. 21	S. 195	G. F. Thompson	Niagara Co.	Eighteen-mile Creek, Lockport
Jan. 25	S. 214	Walton	Kingston	Normal school, New Paltz, new buildings
Jan. 26	S. 258	Cromwell	Richmond Co.	Health officer, port of New York

RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT



Jan. 27	S.	279	Argetsinger	Rochester	Armory, Rochester
Jan. 28	S.	312	Slater	Port Chester	Armory, boathouse, Ossining
Feb. 1	S.	333	Christman	Herkimer	Bridges, Twitchell Creek, Stillwater, Herkimer County
Feb. 1	S.	336	Lawson	Kings Co.	Vivisection, investigation by commission
Feb. 1	S.	340	Gilchrist	Kings Co.	National Negro Exposition, exhibit
Feb. 2	S.	346	Walters	Syracuse	Washington, George, statue of, Capitol
Feb. 2	S.	348	Norton	Buffalo	Radium for malignant diseases, institute
Feb. 2	S.	355	Wicks	Oneida Co.	Bridge, Utica, First St., Erie Canal
Feb. 3	S.	363	Towner	Towners	Training school for girls, Hudson
Feb. 3	S.	364	Walters	Syracuse	Law reports, commission to investigate
Feb. 3	S.	367	Wilson	Hall	Barge canal, Lyons
Feb. 3	S.	372	Wilson	Hall	Agricultural experiment station, buildings
Feb. 3	S.	395	Sage	Menands	Workmen's Compensation Commission
Feb. 4	S.	406	Slater	Port Chester	Becker, Philip, reimbursing
Feb. 4	S.	415	Hewitt	Locke	Fillmore, Millard, monument, erecting
Feb. 4	S.	419	Sage	Menands	Normal school, teachers' salaries
Feb. 8	S.	423	Whitney	Mechanicville	Water supplies, investigating, health commissioner
Feb. 9	S.	472	G. L. Thompson	Suffolk Co.	Agricultural school, Long Island, buildings
Feb. 9	S.	473	G. L. Thompson	Suffolk Co.	Agricultural school, Long Island
Feb. 9	S.	474	G. L. Thompson	Suffolk Co.	Agricultural school, Long Island, unexpended balance
Feb. 9	S.	475	Heffernan	Kings Co.	O'Sullivan, Michael, claim
Feb. 10	S.	496	Norton	Schoharie Co.	Canals, towing facilities, completed portion
Feb. 10	S.	497	Norton	Schoharie Co.	Canal structures, repair, etc.
Feb. 10	S.	498	Stivers	Middletown	Knox's headquarters, acquiring
Feb. 10	S.	501	G. F. Thompson	Niagara Co.	Bergholtz, Cayuga Creeks, improving
Feb. 11	S.	518	Spring	Franklinville	Fish hatchery, Bemus Point, additional lands
Feb. 11	S.	519	G. L. Thompson	Suffolk Co.	Orient, Suffolk Co., sea wall
Feb. 11	S.	531	Newton	Livingston Co.	Soldiers' Home, barracks, reconstruction
Feb. 11	S.	532	Newton	Livingston Co.	Chemung River, obstructions
Feb. 11	S.	534	Norton	Buffalo	Insurance superintendent, erroneous fees, refund
Feb. 16	S.	588	Spring	Franklinville	Agriculture, forestry, experiments, lands
Feb. 17	S.	595	Hill	Lestershire	Binghamton, reimburse, Cummings Island, removal
Feb. 17	S.	604	Wilson	Hall	Potter swamp, channel through
Feb. 17	S.	608	Halliday	Ithaca	Chemung River banks, near White bridge
Feb. 17	S.	623	Stivers	Middletown	Armory, Newburgh, new
Feb. 18	S.	635	Hill	Lestershire	Agricultural school, Delhi, buildings, equipment

EXHIBIT A—Continued

DATE	INT. NO.	NAME OF PROPOSER	LOCALITY OR DISTRICT FROM WHICH ELECTED	SUBJECT (SHORT TITLE)
Feb. 18	S. 649	Halliday	Ithaca	Elmira dikes, Chemung River, repair
Feb. 18	S. 653	Newton	Livingston Co.	Canisteo River, dredging, etc.
Feb. 18	S. 656	Wicks	Oneida Co.	Herkimer Homestead, caretaker's house
Feb. 22	S. 665	Jones	Chenango Co.	Normal school, Oneonta, addition to building
Feb. 22	S. 667	Wicks	Oneida Co.	Herkimer, Nicholas, Memorial Road
Feb. 22	S. 690	Jones	Chenango Co.	Agricultural school, Morrisville, storage building
Feb. 22	S. 691	Jones	Chenango	Agricultural school, Morrisville, poultry building
Feb. 22	S. 692	Jones	Chenango	Agricultural school, Morrisville, laboratory
Feb. 22	S. 693	Jones	Chenango	Agricultural school, Morrisville, director's residence
Feb. 23	S. 728	G. F. Thompson	Niagara Co.	Bridge, 18-mile Creek, Lockport, concrete
Feb. 24	S. 750	Norton	Schoharie Co.	Bridge, Mohawk River, Schenectady,
Feb. 24	S. 759	Stivers	Middletown	Armory, Buffalo, stable, reappropriation
Feb. 25	S. 772	Towner	Towners	Girls' training school, Hudson, reappropriation
Feb. 25	S. 776	Halliday	Ithaca	Catherine Creek, cleaning out
Feb. 25	S. 777	G. F. Thompson	Niagara Co.	Lockport, Richmond Ave., improvement
Feb. 25	S. 779	Gilchrist	Kings Co.	National negro exposition, exhibit
Feb. 26	S. 791	Walker	New York City	Seamen's Friend Society, New York City
Mar. 1	S. 816	Norton	Buffalo	Conservation commission, boats, Niagara River
Mar. 2	S. 831	Norton	Buffalo	Normal school, Buffalo, improvements
Mar. 2	S. 834	Whitney	Mechanicville	Conklingville, storage dam, reservoir, etc.
Mar. 3	S. 887	Spring	Franklinville	Allegheny River, Olean Creek, improvements, Olean
Mar. 3	S. 903	Lockwood	Kings Co.	Normal school, Oswego, buildings, equipment, etc.
Mar. 4	S. 912	Newton	Livingston Co.	Bridge, Genesee River, Portage, Letchworth Park
Mar. 4	S. 920	Wood	Hoosick Falls	Bridge, Hudson River, Albany
Mar. 4	S. 923	G. F. Thompson	Niagara Co.	Medina, canals, abandoned, fill in
Mar. 4	S. 938	Spring	Franklinville	Normal school, Fredonia, additional land
Mar. 8	S. 959	Sage	Menands	Highways, maintenance, repair
Mar. 8	S. 960	Sage	Menands	Highways, repair, state's share

Mar. 8	S.	976	Whitney	Mechanicville	Great Meadow Prison, school building
Mar. 9	S.	987	Towner	Towners	Matteawan state hospital, stream from, improving, reappropriation
Mar. 10	S.	997	Christman	Herkimer	Bridge, Black River, Moose River, Lyons Falls
Mar. 10	S.	998	Christman	Herkimer	Bridge, Black River, Deer River Station, Lewis County
Mar. 10	S.	1020	Stivers	Middletown	Cypress Hills Cemetery, Brooklyn
Mar. 10	S.	1035	Norton	Schoharie Co.	Bridge, Mohawk River, Hoffmans-Pattersonville
Mar. 11	S.	1054	Sanders	Stafford	Oak Orchard Creek, Orleans Co., improvement
Mar. 11	S.	1056	Wilson	Hall	Canandaigua Lake, improving entrance to
Mar. 11	S.	1061	Horton	Buffalo	Buffalo, militia boathouse, reappropriation
Mar. 11	S.	1079	Halliday	Ithaca	Glen Mill Creek, Schuyler County, improve
Mar. 11	S.	1101	Spring	Franklinville	Chadakoin River, Jamestown, improving
Mar. 12	S.	1111	Norton	Schoharie Co.	Canals, pontoons, lighthouses, cranes, etc.
Mar. 12	S.	1124	Whitney	Mechanicville	Highway route 22, Lake Champlain, improving
Mar. 15	S.	1135	Halliday	Ithaca	Catherine Creek, relocate channel
Mar. 15	S.	1137	Sage	Menands	Canals, Erie, Oswego, Champlain, improvement
Mar. 16	S.	1156	Sage	Menands	Highways, county roads, maintaining
Mar. 17	S.	1179	Towner	Towners	Matteawan state hospital, stream
Mar. 17	S.	1200	Wagner	New York City	Constitutional convention commission
Mar. 18	S.	1206	Christman	Herkimer	Ilion, Steele street wall
Mar. 18	S.	1219	Stivers	Middletown	New York Volunteer Cavalry, 25th Regiment, monument
Mar. 18	S.	1226	Stivers	Middletown	Military, lands for, Westchester Co., etc.
Mar. 19	S.	1238	Slater	Port Chester	Grade crossings, removal, Bronxville
Mar. 19	S.	1242	Sage	Menands	Palisades Park, commissioners, reappropriation
Mar. 19	S.	1254	G. F. Thompson	Niagara Co.	Highway route 30, Niagara, Orleans Counties
Mar. 20	S.	1258	Jones	Chenango Co.	Canal wall, Oneida
Mar. 22	S.	1264	Wicks	Oneida Co.	Rome, retaining wall, Erie Canal
Mar. 22	S.	1265	Wicks	Oneida Co.	Canal bridge, Yorkville, changing plan
Mar. 24	S.	1299	Walters	Syracuse	Foot and mouth disease, destroying
Mar. 24	S.	1300	Bennett	New York City	Workmen's Compensation Law, working of, investigation
Mar. 24	S.	1310	Sage	Menands	Legislature, contingent expenses
Mar. 25	S.	1313	Boylan	New York City	Superintendent state printing
Mar. 25	S.	1326	Sage	Menands	Albany, power house, site
Mar. 26	S.	1347	Wicks	Oneida	Bridge, Whitesboro, Erie Canal
Mar. 26	S.	1350	G. F. Thompson	Niagara Co.	Bridge, 18-mile Creek, Lockport, Newfane
Mar. 29	S.	1359	Sage	Menands	Census, state, taxing, expense
Mar. 29	S.	1360	Wicks	Oneida Co.	Rome custodial asylum, water connection

EXHIBIT A—Continued

DATE	INT. NO.	NAME OF PROPOSER	LOCALITY OR DISTRICT FROM WHICH ELECTED	SUBJECT (SHORT TITLE)
Mar. 30	S. 1369	Brown	Watertown	Bridge, Oswego River, barge canal, Minetto
Mar. 31	S. 1388	Norton	Schoharie Co.	Real estate commission
Apr. 3	S. 1443	Sage	Menands	Standards, state bureau, establishing
Apr. 3	S. 1444	Sage	Menands	Constitutional convention, salaries, expenses
Apr. 5	S. 1448	Towner	Towners	Prison, new, Wingdale, site
Apr. 7	S. 1486	Cromwell	Richmond Co.	Conklin, J. E., estate of, tax refund
Apr. 8	S. 1493	Walters	Syracuse	Bridge, Fulton, barge canal
Apr. 8	S. 1495	Halliday	Ithaca	Custodial asylum, site, committee on
Apr. 9	S. 1518	Sage	Menands	Mohansic state hospital, construction, etc.
Apr. 9	S. 1519	Halliday	Ithaca	Newtown battlefield reservoir, additional land
Apr. 12	S. 1537	Marshall	Franklin Co.	Forest lands, commission to investigate
Apr. 12	S. 1540	Christman	Herkimer	Fulmer Creek, continue improvement, Herkimer County
Apr. 13	S. 1541	Sage	Menands	State department, etc., moving to new quarters
Apr. 13	S. 1542	Sage	Menands	Barge canal, debt, interest
Apr. 13	S. 1543	Sage	Menands	Saratoga Springs reservoir, debt, interest, etc.
Apr. 13	S. 1544	Sage	Menands	Saratoga Springs reservoir, debt, interest
Apr. 13	S. 1546	Sage	Menands	Highway debt, interest payment
Apr. 13	S. 1547	Sage	Menands	Canal debt sinking fund, transfers to
Apr. 13	S. 1548	Sage	Menands	Canal lands, etc., abandoned, sale, proceeds
Apr. 13	S. 1549	Sage	Menands	Highway improvement, debt, interest, etc.
Apr. 13	S. 1550	Sage	Menands	Highway improvement debt, interest
Apr. 13	S. 1551	Sage	Menands	Cayuga, Seneca canals, debt, interest
Apr. 13	S. 1552	Sage	Menands	Cayuga, Seneca canals, debt, interest
Apr. 13	S. 1553	Sage	Menands	Barge canals, terminals, debt, interest
Apr. 13	S. 1554	Sage	Menands	Barge canal, debt, interest
Apr. 13	S. 1555	Sage	Menands	Palisades Interstate Park, debt, interest

Apr. 13	S.	1556	Sage	Menands	Barge canals, terminals, debt, interest
Apr. 14	S.	1569	Simpson	New York City	Secretary of state, copy documents, affecting New York City
Apr. 14	S.	1571	Sage	Menands	Constitutional convention commission, survey of New York City
Apr. 19	S.	1622	Christman	Herkimer	Black River canal, Port Leyden, Lewis County
Apr. 19	S.	1625	Norton	Schoharie Co.	Bridge, Mohawk River, Schenectady, commission to investigate
Apr. 20	S.	1629	Bennett	New York	Commission to investigate civil administration
Apr. 20	S.	1632	G. F. Thompson	Niagara Co.	Senate chamber, electrical devices, etc.
Apr. 22	S.	1641	Walton	Kingston	Canals, Delaware and Hudson, survey, map
Jan. 13	A.	3	Everett	St. Lawrence	Normal school, Potsdam, reconstructing
Jan. 13	A.	29	Brereton	Warren	Warren County, reimbursing, highway construction
Jan. 13	A.	47	Seaker	St. Lawrence	Grade crossings, Ogdensburg, eliminate
Jan. 13	A.	48	Seaker	St. Lawrence	St. Lawrence state hospital, land for
Jan. 13	A.	57	Emden	Oneida	Bridge, Utica, First St., Erie Canal
Jan. 14	A.	65	Ellenbogen	New York	Interstate bridge commission
Jan. 14	A.	102	Stoddard	New York	Cypress Hills Cemetery, Brooklyn
Jan. 14	A.	110	Tallett	Madison	Agricultural school, Morrisville, reappropriation
Jan. 14	A.	111	Macdonald	Franklin	Highways, construction and improvement
Jan. 15	A.	115	Blakely	Westchester	Normal school, Westchester, establishing school
Jan. 15	A.	120	Seelye	Saratoga	Saratoga Springs reservation
Jan. 18	A.	131	Talmage	Suffolk	Peconic River, widening and deepening
Jan. 18	A.	133	Grant	Lewis	Bridge, Black River, Port Leyden, Lewis County
Jan. 18	A.	148	Baxter	Albany	Bridge, Mohawk River, Dunsbach Ferry
Jan. 18	A.	149	Baxter	Albany	Mohawk River dike, Cohoes, Green Island
Jan. 18	A.	150	Baxter	Albany	Dry river, Watervliet, improving
Jan. 18	A.	162	Sullivan	Chautauqua	Fish hatchery, Chautauqua County
Jan. 18	A.	169	Coffey	Westchester	Armory, Mt. Vernon
Jan. 18	A.	171	Macdonald	Franklin	Agriculture, temporary loan, pest prevention
Jan. 18	A.	172	Macdonald	Franklin	Forest fires, prevention, temporary loan
Jan. 19	A.	180	Ferry	Allegany	Agricultural school, Alfred University
Jan. 19	A.	190	Law	Westchester	Grade crossings, removal, state's share
Jan. 19	A.	193	Stoddard	New York	Military establishments, indebtedness
Jan. 19	A.	194	Stoddard	New York	Armories, alteration, repairs
Jan. 19	A.	195	Stoddard	New York	Military establishments, deficiency
Jan. 19	A.	196	Stoddard	New York	Military establishments, statutory allowances
Jan. 19	A.	198	Dox	Schoharie	Agricultural school, Cobleskill
Jan. 19	A.	200	Hopkins	Westchester	Normal school, Westchester, establishing school

EXHIBIT A—Continued

DATE	INT. NO.	NAME OF PROPOSER	LOCALITY OR DISTRICT FROM WHICH ELECTED	SUBJECT (SHORT TITLE)
Jan. 20	A. 231	Seelye	Saratoga	Bridge, Mohawk River, Visscher's Ferry
Jan. 20	A. 232	Seelye	Saratoga	Saratoga battlefield, acquiring lands
Jan. 20	A. 236	Cheney	Erie	Agriculture, forestry, experiments
Jan. 21	A. 266	Wilson	Wayne	Barge canal, Lyons
Jan. 21	A. 276	Fuller	Oneida	Black River canal, Stanwix St., Rome
Jan. 21	A. 279	Bourke	New York	Law reports, commission to investigate
Jan. 22	A. 286	Macdonald	Franklin	Normal school, teachers' salaries
Jan. 22	A. 289	W. A. Wells	Kings	Armory, 23rd regiment, Brooklyn
Jan. 25	A. 297	Walker	Chemung	Elmira dikes, Chemung River, repair
Jan. 25	A. 298	Walker	Chemung	Catherine Creek, cleaning out
Jan. 25	A. 304	Lefevre	Ulster	Normal school, New Paltz, new buildings
Jan. 25	A. 305	Murphy	Suffolk	State hospital employees, extra service
Jan. 25	A. 306	Murphy	Suffolk	Normal school, establishing
Jan. 25	A. 309	Thorn	Erie	Cornell, range of glass houses
Jan. 25	A. 322	Lord	Chenango	Highway route 8a, new Chenango Co.
Jan. 26	A. 340	Stephena	Richmond	Health officer, port of New York
Jan. 27	A. 354	Adler	Monroe	Armory, Rochester
Jan. 27	A. 365	McElligott	New York	State office building, New York City
Jan. 27	A. 369	Oldfield	Steuben	Normal school, Bath, Steuben County, establishment
Jan. 28	A. 392	Grant	Lewis	Bridges, Twitchell Creek, Stillwater, Herkimer County
Jan. 28	A. 399	Malone	Albany	Animals, equine, destroyed
Jan. 28	A. 421	Law	Westchester	Armory, boathouse, Ossining
Feb. 1	A. 459	Keeney	Erie	Radium for malignant diseases, institute
Feb. 2	A. 473	Flamman	Kings	Vivisection, commission to investigate
Feb. 3	A. 492	W. W. Chase	Columbia	Training school for girls, Hudson
Feb. 3	A. 497	Fuess	Oneida	Bridge, Wood Creek, Oneida County
Feb. 3	A. 523	Macdonald	Franklin	Workmen's compensation commission
Feb. 4	A. 524	Arnts	Onondaga	Washington, George, statue of, capitol

RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT

Feb. 4	A.	546	Wiltzie	Cortland	Animals, destroyed by agricultural commissioners
Feb. 5	A.	568	Parker	Niagara	Bergholts, Cayuga Creeks, improvement of
Feb. 5	A.	570	Quick	Broome	Binghamton, reimburse, Cummings Island, removal
Feb. 8	A.	577	Conkling	New York	Canal structures, repair, etc.
Feb. 8	A.	585	Conkling	New York	Canals, towing facilities, completed portion
Feb. 8	A.	593	Colbridge	Herkimer	Normal school, Herkimer, establishing school near
Feb. 9	A.	601	Stoddard	New York	Military, lands for, Westchester County, etc.
Feb. 9	A.	609	Macdonald	Franklin	Indian Reservation, highways and bridges
Feb. 9	A.	610	Macdonald	Franklin	Highway repairs, state's share
Feb. 10	A.	624	Montgomery	Orange	Knox's headquarters, acquiring
Feb. 10	A.	637	Murphy	Suffolk	Agricultural school, Long Island, unexpended balance
Feb. 10	A.	638	Murphy	Suffolk	Agricultural school, Long Island, buildings
Feb. 10	A.	639	Murphy	Suffolk	Agricultural school, Long Island
Feb. 10	A.	648	Oldfield	Steuben	Chemung River, obstructions
Feb. 10	A.	649	Oldfield	Steuben	Soldiers' Home, barracks, reconstruction
Feb. 10	A.	663	Seelye	Saratoga	Water supplies, investigating, health commissioner
Feb. 10	A.	664	Sullivan	Chautauqua	Normal school, Fredonia, additional land
Feb. 11	A.	684	Fuller	Oneida	Canal wall, Booneville
Feb. 11	A.	688	Landon	Dutchess	George Washington building, District of Columbia
Feb. 11	A.	693	Talmage	Suffolk Co.	Orient, Suffolk Co., sea wall
Feb. 11	A.	704	Cheney	Chautauqua	Fish hatchery, Bemus Point
Feb. 11	A.	715	Walker	Chemung	Chemung River banks, near White bridge
Feb. 15	A.	729	Macdonald	Franklin	State racing commission, expenses 1914
Feb. 15	A.	755	Whitman	Cayuga	Fillmore, Millard, monument, erecting
Feb. 16	A.	767	Dox	Schoharie	Old Stone Fort, Schoharie, repair, etc.
Feb. 17	A.	809	Montgomery	Orange	Armory, Newburgh, new
Feb. 17	A.	813	Sullivan	Chautauqua	Agriculture, forestry, experiments, lands
Feb. 17	A.	815	Gillett	Yates	Potter swamp, channel through
Feb. 17	A.	827	Grover	Erie	Insurance superintendent, erroneous fees, refund
Feb. 18	A.	854	Prangen	Steuben	Canisteo River, dredging, etc.
Feb. 18	A.	869	Wheeler	Ontario	Canandaigua Lake, improving entrance to
Feb. 18	A.	874	Macdonald	Franklin	Supply bill
Feb. 19	A.	876	Bloomfield	Otsego	Normal school, Oneonta, addition to building
Feb. 19	A.	887	Mackey	Delaware	Agricultural school, Delhi, buildings, equipment
Feb. 19	A.	898	Tallett	Madison	Agricultural school, Morrisville, laboratory
Feb. 19	A.	899	Tallett	Madison	Agricultural school, Morrisville, storage building

EXHIBIT A—Continued

DATE	INT. NO.	NAME OF PROPOSER	LOCALITY OR DISTRICT FROM WHICH ELECTED	SUBJECT (SHORT TITLE)
Feb. 19	A. 900	Tallett	Madison	Agricultural school, Morrisville, poultry building
Feb. 19	A. 901	Tallett	Madison	Agricultural school, Morrisville, director's residence
Feb. 22	A. 937	Ames	Cattaraugus	Armory, Olean, alterations
Feb. 22	A. 940	W. W. Chase	Columbia	Girls' training school, Hudson, reappropriation
Feb. 22	A. 942	Bewley	Niagara	Bridge, 18-mile creek, Lockport, concrete
Feb. 24	A. 980	McNab	Schenectady	Bridge, Mohawk River, Schenectady
Feb. 24	A. 997	Pratt	Washington	Game farm, Washington County
Feb. 25	A. 1030	Stoddard	New York	Armory, Buffalo, stable, reappropriation
Mar. 2	A. 1103	Bewley	Niagara	Lockport, Richmond Ave., improvement
Mar. 3	A. 1149	Ames	Cattaraugus	Alleghany River, Olean Creek, improvement, Olean
Mar. 3	A. 1158	Graves	Erie	Conservation commission, boats, Niagara River
Mar. 3	A. 1175	Machold	Jefferson	Normal school, Oswego, buildings, equipment, etc.
Mar. 4	A. 1191	Fuess	Oneida	Herkimer, Nichols, Memorial Road
Mar. 4	A. 1196	Keeney	Erie	Normal school, Buffalo, improving buildings
Mar. 4	A. 1209	Magee	Livingston	Bridge, Genesee River, Portage, Letchworth Park
Mar. 4	A. 1210	A. A. Comstock	Orleans	Medina, canals, abandoned, fill in
Mar. 5	A. 1244	Macdonald	Franklin	Highways, repair, state's share
Mar. 5	A. 1245	Macdonald	Franklin	Highways, maintenance, repair
Mar. 5	A. 1246	Macdonald	Franklin	Unexpended balances, reappropriating
Mar. 5	A. 1248	Howard	Schuyler	Catherine Creek, relocate channel
Mar. 8	A. 1255	Macdonald	Franklin	Unexpended balances, reappropriating
Mar. 8	A. 1256	Macdonald	Franklin	Unexpended balances, reappropriating
Mar. 8	A. 1257	Macdonald	Franklin	Canals, unexpended balances, reappropriating
Mar. 8	A. 1261	Allen	Dutchess	Matteawan state hospital, stream from, improving, reappropriation
Mar. 8	A. 1262	Pratt	Washington	Great Meadow prison, school building
Mar. 9	A. 1312	Grant	Lewis	Bridge, Black River, Deer River station, Lewis County
Mar. 9	A. 1313	Grant	Lewis	Bridge, Black River, Moose River, Lyons Falls
Mar. 10	A. 1339	Machold	Jefferson	Bridge, Oswego River, barge canal, Minetto

RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT



Mar. 10	A. 1348	Pratt	Washington	Highway route 22, Lake Champlain, improving
Mar. 10	A. 1366	L. H. Wells	Genesee	Oak Orchard Creek, Orleans Co., improvement
Mar. 10	A. 1372	McNab	Schenectady	Bridge, Mohawk River, Hoffmans-Pattersonville
Mar. 11	A. 1397	Keeney	Erie	Buffalo, militia, boathouse, reappropriation
Mar. 11	A. 1403	Howard	Schuyler	Glen Mill Creek, Schuyler County, improve
Mar. 11	A. 1407	Cheney	Chautauqua	Chadakoin River, Jamestown, improving
Mar. 12	A. 1417	Fuller	Oneida	Oneida Lake, protecting wall, Sylvan Beach
Mar. 12	A. 1418	Maier	Seneca	Canal bridge, Waterloo, lowering
Mar. 12	A. 1419	Maier	Seneca	Canal bridge, Seneca Falls
Mar. 15	A. 1447	Macdonald	Franklin	Canals, abandoned, removing bridges
Mar. 15	A. 1449	Conkling	New York	Canals, pontoons, lighthouses, cranes, etc.
Mar. 15	A. 1464	Macdonald	Franklin	Canals, Erie, Oswego, Champlain
Mar. 15	A. 1468	Macdonald	Franklin	Appropriation bill (annual)
Mar. 16	A. 1477	Allen	Dutchess	Matteawan state hospital, stream
Mar. 17	A. 1500	Macdonald	Franklin	Highways, county roads
Mar. 17	A. 1508	Macdonald	Franklin	Constitutional Convention Commission
Mar. 18	A. 1522	Tallett	Madison	Canal wall, Oneida
Mar. 18	A. 1529	Fish	Putnam	Prison, Sing Sing, removal
Mar. 19	A. 1545	Macdonald	Franklin	Palisades Park, commissioners, reappropriation
Mar. 22	A. 1554	Fuess	Oneida	Canal bridge, Yorkville, changing plan
Mar. 22	A. 1555	Shannon	Rensselaer	Toll bridges, acquiring, bonds for
Mar. 24	A. 1574	Macdonald	Franklin	Legislature, contingent expenses
Mar. 24	A. 1579	Macdonald	Franklin	Foot and mouth disease, destroying
Mar. 27	A. 1610	Macdonald	Franklin	Census, state, taxing, expense
Mar. 31	A. 1636	Macdonald	Franklin	Albany boulevard, viaduct, reappropriation
Mar. 31	A. 1637	Macdonald	Franklin	Highways, construction, improvement, reappropriation
Mar. 31	A. 1638	Macdonald	Franklin	Highways, improvement, Essex and Warren Counties
Mar. 31	A. 1639	Macdonald	Franklin	Highways, construction, improvement, reappropriation
Apr. 1	A. 1645	Macdonald	Franklin	Bridge, Hudson River, Cohoes-Troy, acquiring
Apr. 1	A. 1646	Macdonald	Franklin	Bridge, Hudson River at Stillwater, reappropriation
Apr. 1	A. 1647	Macdonald	Franklin	Bridge, Hudson River at Waterford, reappropriation
Apr. 2	A. 1652	Davis	Montgomery	Real estate commission
Apr. 5	A. 1661	Macdonald	Franklin	Standards, state bureau, establishing
Apr. 5	A. 1662	Macdonald	Franklin	Constitutional convention commission, salaries, expenses

EXHIBIT A—*Concluded*

DATE	INT. NO.	NAME OF PROPOSER	LOCALITY OR DISTRICT FROM WHICH ELECTED	SUBJECT (SHORT TITLE)
Apr. 5	A. 1663	Macdonald	Franklin	Prison, new, commission on sites
Apr. 8	A. 1668	Macdonald	Franklin	State institutions, construction, repairs, etc.
Apr. 8	A. 1669	Macdonald	Franklin	Highway improvement, debt, interest, etc.
Apr. 8	A. 1670	Macdonald	Franklin	Barge canal, debt, interest
Apr. 12	A. 1671	Macdonald	Franklin	Highway improvement, debt, interest
Apr. 12	A. 1672	Macdonald	Franklin	Barge canal, terminal, sinking fund, transfers
Apr. 12	A. 1673	Macdonald	Franklin	Canal lands, etc., abandoned, sale, proceeds
Apr. 12	A. 1674	Macdonald	Franklin	Saratoga Springs reservoir, debt, interest
Apr. 12	A. 1675	Macdonald	Franklin	Barge canals, terminals, debt, interest
Apr. 12	A. 1676	Macdonald	Franklin	Cayuga, Seneca canals, debt, interest
Apr. 12	A. 1677	Macdonald	Franklin	Barge canal, debt, interest
Apr. 12	A. 1678	Macdonald	Franklin	Canal debt sinking fund, transfers to
Apr. 12	A. 1679	Macdonald	Franklin	Barge canals, terminals, debt, interest
Apr. 12	A. 1680	Macdonald	Franklin	Highway debt, interest payment
Apr. 12	A. 1681	Macdonald	Franklin	Palisades Interstate Park, debt, interest
Apr. 12	A. 1682	Macdonald	Franklin	Cayuga, Seneca canals, debt, interest
Apr. 12	A. 1683	Macdonald	Franklin	Saratoga Springs reservoir, debt, interest, etc.

RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT

**EXHIBIT B**

**BILLS CALLING FOR EXPENDITURES PASSED BY THE SENATE AND SENT TO THE ASSEMBLY; OR PASSED BY THE ASSEMBLY AND SENT TO THE SENATE DURING THE 1915 SESSION**

INT. NO.	SUBJECT	WHEN PASSED	WHEN RECEIVED
A. 48	\$12,000 for farm adjacent to St. Lawrence State Hospital	Feb. 3	Feb. 4 (Rec. No. 6)
S. 61	\$99,000 for commissioners of state reservation at Saratoga Springs	Feb. 8	Feb. 10 (Rec. No. 15)
A. 111	\$10,000,000 for construction and improvement of public highways	Feb. 10	Feb. 11 (Rec. No. 30)
S. 395	\$425,000 for Workmen's Compensation Commission	Feb. 22	Feb. 23 (Rec. No. 26)
A. 194	\$683,793.88 for repair of armories	Mar. 1	Mar. 2 (Rec. No. 126)
S. 406	\$360 to reimburse P. Becker for land	Mar. 2	Mar. 3 (Rec. No. 54)
A. 609	\$40,000 for improvement and repair of highways and bridges on Indian reservation	Mar. 3	Mar. 4 (Rec. No. 161)
A. 610	\$1,880,000 for state's share of cost of repairs to highways	Mar. 3	Mar. 4 (Rec. No. 141)
A. 729	\$1,542.37 collected from racing associations for expenses of State Racing Commission	Mar. 3	Mar. 4 (Rec. No. 164)
S. 16	Reappropriating \$5,000 unexpended balance of Interstate Bridge Commission	Mar. 4	Mar. 5 (Rec. No. 67)
A. 1257	Reappropriating \$5,619,412.91 for improvement of canals	Mar. 23	Mar. 24 (Rec. No. 332)
S. 497	\$150,000 for repair and improvement of canal structures	Mar. 23	Mar. 24 (Rec. No. 201)
S. 959	\$500,000 and \$1,800,000 for repair of state aid highways	Mar. 23	Mar. 24 (Rec. No. 200)
S. 960	\$1,634,277.01 for repair of state aid highways	Mar. 23	Mar. 24 (Rec. No. 199)
A. 940	Reappropriation of \$104,423.47 for N. Y. State Training School for Girls at Hudson	Mar. 24	Mar. 25 (Rec. No. 345)
S. 1254	Reappropriating unexpended balances for new highway routes	Mar. 26	Mar. 27 (Rec. No. 222)
S. 496	\$35,000 for towing facilities on barge canal	Mar. 29	Mar. 30 (Rec. No. 247)
S. 1299	\$50,000 for Commissioner of Agriculture—Suppression of insect pests	Mar. 29	Mar. 29 (Rec. No. 227)
S. 1310	\$65,000 for contingent expenses of legislature	Mar. 29	Mar. 29 (Rec. No. 226)
A. 28	\$1,324.87 for reimbursing Warren County for erroneous payment to Highway Commission	Mar. 31	Apr. 1 (Rec. No. 402)
A. 1500	\$97,000 for state's share of maintaining county roads	Mar. 31	Apr. 1 (Rec. No. 410)
A. 1508	\$5,000 Constitutional Convention Commission	Mar. 31	Apr. 1 (Rec. No. 411)
S. 1219	Reappropriating \$250 unexpended balance for monument to 25th Regiment Volunteer Cavalry	Mar. 31	Apr. 1 (Rec. No. 276)
S. 1326	\$25,000 for improving power house site, Albany	Mar. 31	Apr. 1 (Rec. No. 275)

A. 1255	Reappropriating unexpended balances for various institutions of the state	Apr. 1	Apr. 2 (Rec. No. 425)
A. 1636	Reappropriating \$94,274.30 for Boulevard in Albany Co.	Apr. 7	Apr. 12 (Rec. No. 494)
A. 1637	Reappropriating \$382,085.47 for state routes and public highways	Apr. 7	Apr. 12 (Rec. No. 495)
A. 1638	Reappropriating \$278,875.96 for construction of highways, Essex and Warren counties	Apr. 7	Apr. 12 (Rec. No. 496)
A. 1639	Reappropriating unexpended balances for state routes	Apr. 7	Apr. 12 (Rec. No. 497)
S. 1359	\$465,000 for expense of state census	Apr. 7	Apr. 7 (Rec. No. 308)
A. 1447	\$12,500 for removal of bridges over abandoned canals	Apr. 8	Apr. 12 (Rec. No. 511)
S. 1443	\$45,000 for state bureau of standards	Apr. 9	Apr. 12 (Rec. No. 334)
S. 1444	\$500,010 for salaries and expenses of Constitutional Convention	Apr. 9	Apr. 12 (Rec. No. 335)
A. 1645	Reappropriating \$100,000 for state's share of acquiring bridge between Troy and Cohoes	Apr. 13	Apr. 15 (Rec. No. 547)
A. 1646	Reappropriating \$12,500 for state's share of acquiring bridge at Stillwater	Apr. 13	Apr. 15 (Rec. No. 546)
A. 1647	Reappropriating \$100,000 for state's share of acquiring bridge at Waterford	Apr. 13	Apr. 15 (Rec. No. 545)
A. 3	Increasing appropriation for Potsdam State Normal School reconstruction by \$100,000	Apr. 14	Apr. 15 (Rec. No. 572)
A. 150	\$4,500 for improving Dry River and constructing bridge at Watervliet	Apr. 14	Apr. 15 (Rec. No. 564)
A. 304	\$125,000 for building additions for State Normal School, New Paltz	Apr. 14	Apr. 15 (Rec. No. 583)
A. 874	Emergency supply bill, deficiencies in last year's appropriations and for emergency expenditures	Apr. 14	Apr. 15 (Rec. No. 540)
A. 1103	\$3,128.82 to pay city of Lockport for assessment against state for improvement of Richmond Avenue	Apr. 14	Apr. 15 (Rec. No. 565)
A. 1313	Reappropriating \$30,000 and appropriating \$30,000 for bridge over Black and Moose rivers at Lyons Falls	Apr. 14	Apr. 15 (Rec. No. 577)
A. 1477	\$2,000 expense of improving stream from Matteawan State Hospital	Apr. 14	Apr. 15 (Rec. No. 561)
A. 1522	\$4,000 for repair of canal wall feeder in city of Oneida	Apr. 14	Apr. 15 (Rec. No. 556)
S. 1111	\$195,000 for apparatus, aids to navigation and care of barge canal	Apr. 14	Apr. 14 (Rec. No. 392)
A. 110	Reappropriating \$1,050 for extension service Morrisville Agricultural School	Apr. 15	Apr. 16 (Rec. No. 609)
A. 266	\$45,000 for construction of bridge over barge canal at Lyons, Wayne Co.	Apr. 15	Apr. 16 (Rec. No. 611)
A. 624	\$12,000 for purchase of Knox's headquarters in Orange Co.	Apr. 15	Apr. 16 (Rec. No. 605)
A. 869	\$15,000 for deepening harbor and channel at foot of Canandaigua Lake	Apr. 15	Apr. 16 (Rec. No. 610)
A. 980	\$150,000 bridge at Schenectady	Apr. 15	Apr. 16 (Rec. No. 604)
A. 1248	\$70,000 for relocating channel, Catherine Creek at Montour Falls	Apr. 15	Apr. 16 (Rec. No. 592)
A. 1256	Reappropriating unexpended balances for state departments and institutions	Apr. 15	Apr. 15 (Rec. No. 584)
A. 1262	\$20,000 for school building at Great Meadow for use of S. Dist. No. 4	Apr. 15	Apr. 16 (Rec. No. 606)

EXHIBIT B—Continued

INT. NO.	SUBJECT	WHEN PASSED	WHEN RECEIVED
A. 1403	\$2,500 for the improvement of Glen Creek, Schuyler Co.	Apr. 15	Apr. 16 (Rec. No. 593)
A. 1418	\$3,000 for lowering canal bridge at Waterloo	Apr. 15	Apr. 16 (Rec. No. 603)
A. 1419	\$5,000 for foot bridge on Cayuga and Seneca canal at Seneca Falls	Apr. 15	Apr. 16 (Rec. No. 602)
A. 1468	Annual appropriation bill	Apr. 15	Apr. 15 (Rec. No. 585)
A. 1668	Appropriations for construction, etc. of state institutions; and for grade crossing elimination	Apr. 15	Apr. 16 (Rec. No. 599)
A. 148	\$100,000 for bridge over Mohawk at Dunsback Ferry	Apr. 16	Apr. 19 (Rec. No. 629)
A. 392	\$18,000 bridge at Stillwater, Herkimer Co.	Apr. 16	Apr. 19 (Rec. No. 630)
A. 570	\$60,000 to reimburse Binghamton for expense of removing Cummings Island	Apr. 16	Apr. 19 (Rec. No. 632)
A. 1339	\$50,000 bridge at Minetto, Oswego Co.	Apr. 16	Apr. 19 (Rec. No. 634)
A. 1669	\$213,537.50 from highway debt sinking fund for interest on highway debt	Apr. 16	Apr. 16 (Rec. No. 613)
A. 1670	\$196,749.98 from canal debt sinking fund for payment of interest on canal debts	Apr. 16	Apr. 16 (Rec. No. 614)
A. 1671	\$650,000 from highway debt sinking fund for interest on highway debt	Apr. 16	Apr. 16 (Rec. No. 615)
A. 1672	Authorizing transfer to barge canal terminals sinking fund of \$336,816.51	Apr. 16	Apr. 16 (Rec. No. 616)
A. 1673	\$90,726.17 received from sale of lands, etc. for improvement of canals	Apr. 16	Apr. 16 (Rec. No. 617)
A. 1674	\$15,327.08 for interest on the Saratoga Springs state reservation debt	Apr. 16	Apr. 16 (Rec. No. 618)
A. 1675	\$412,500 for payment of interest on debt for barge canal terminals	Apr. 16	Apr. 16 (Rec. No. 619)
A. 1676	\$290,000 from canal debt sinking fund for interest on debt for canal improvements	Apr. 16	Apr. 16 (Rec. No. 620)
A. 1677	\$3,980,000 from canal debt sinking fund for interest on canal debts	Apr. 16	Apr. 16 (Rec. No. 621)
A. 1678	Authorizing transfer to canal debt sinking fund of \$112,272.17	Apr. 16	Apr. 16 (Rec. No. 622)
A. 1679	\$2,070,000 from highway debt sinking fund for payment of highway debt	Apr. 16	Apr. 16 (Rec. No. 624)
A. 1680	\$2,070,000 from highway debt sinking fund for interest on highway debt	Apr. 16	Apr. 16 (Rec. No. 624)
A. 1681	\$100,000 from Palisades Interstate Park sinking fund for payment of interest	Apr. 16	Apr. 16 (Rec. No. 625)
A. 1682	\$106,750.07 from sinking fund for payment of interest on debt for canal improvement	Apr. 16	Apr. 16 (Rec. No. 626)
A. 1683	\$119,700 for principal and interest on the Saratoga Springs state reservation debt	Apr. 16	Apr. 16 (Rec. No. 627)
S. 1518	\$300,000 for Mohansic State Hospital	Apr. 16	Apr. 19 (Rec. No. 439)
A. 180	\$30,000 for building at N. Y. School of Agriculture, Alfred University, \$11,123.38 for equipment, etc.	Apr. 19	Apr. 20 (Rec. No. 641)
A. 231	\$100,000 for bridge over Mohawk, Clifton Park	Apr. 19	Apr. 20 (Rec. No. 640)

RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT

A. 942	\$12,500 for concrete arch over 18-mile creek at Lockport	Apr. 19	Apr. 20 (Rec. No. 642)
A. 664	\$30,000 for acquisition of land at State Normal School in Chautauqua Co.	Apr. 20	Apr. 21 (Rec. No. 649)
A. 1196	\$30,000 for Buffalo State Normal and Training School	Apr. 20	Apr. 21 (Rec. No. 655)
S. 1541	\$13,000 for expense of moving state departments to new quarters	Apr. 20	Apr. 21 (Rec. No. 473)
A. 1149	\$150,000 for improving Alleghany River and Clean Creek	Apr. 21	Apr. 21 (Rec. No. 662)
S. 779	\$7,500 for representatives of state at National Exposition of Negro H. & I. Assn.	Apr. 21	Apr. 21 (Rec. No. 500)
S. 1540	\$500 to continue improving Fulmer Creek, Herkimer Co.	Apr. 21	Apr. 21 (Rec. No. 491)
A. 1554	Reappropriating \$95,048 and appropriating \$25,000 construction of bridge over Erie Canal, Yorkville	Apr. 22	Apr. 23 (Rec. No. 670)
S. 1137	\$3,654,000 for improvement of canals	Apr. 22	Apr. 23 (Rec. No. 555)
S. 1206	\$8,000 for wall along Steele's Creek, north of Erie Canal, Ilion	Apr. 22	Apr. 22 (Rec. No. 546)
S. 1265	Reappropriating \$95,048 and appropriating \$25,000 for bridge over Erie Canal	Apr. 22	Apr. 22 (Rec. No. 544)
S. 1347	\$11,000 for new steel bridge over Erie Canal	Apr. 22	Apr. 22 (Rec. No. 543)
S. 1369	\$50,000 bridge over Oswego River and barge canal at Minetto	Apr. 22	Apr. 22 (Rec. No. 545)
A. 102	\$3,500 for soldiers' plot in Cypress Hills Cemetery, Brooklyn	Apr. 23	Apr. 24 (Rec. No. 682)
A. 322	\$27,000 for new state route, Chenango Co.	Apr. 23	Apr. 23 (Rec. No. 680)
A. 497	\$2,000 bridge at Verona, Oneida Co.	Apr. 23	Apr. 24 (Rec. No. 683)
S. 364	Creating commission to study law reports and appropriating \$5,000 therefor	Apr. 23	Apr. 24 (Rec. No. 582)
S. 1020	\$3,500 for improving Cypress Hills Cemetery, Brooklyn	Apr. 23	Apr. 24 (Rec. No. 579)
S. 1571	\$10,000 for survey of N. Y. city for Constitutional convention	Apr. 23	Apr. 24 (Rec. No. 570)
S. 1625	\$5,000 for commission to investigate question of construction of bridge	Apr. 23	Apr. 24 (Rec. No. 569)
S. 1632	\$2,500 for equipping senate chamber with electrical devices, etc.	Apr. 23	Apr. 24 (Rec. No. 581)
A. 276	\$14,000 for construction of bridge over Black River canal at Rome	Apr. 24	Apr. 24 (Rec. No. 708)
A. 1663	\$10,000 for a prison sites committee to select site for farm and industrial prison	Apr. 24	Apr. 24 (Rec. No. 709)

EXHIBIT C

BRIEF OUTLINE HISTORY OF THE BILLS REPORTED BY THE  
STANDING COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS  
OF THE ASSEMBLY—1915

S. Int. No. 6r—January 14th. Appropriating \$99,000 for the objects and purposes of the commissioners of the State reservation at Saratoga Springs.

To Finance Com.

- Feb. 4. Reported. To third reading.
- Feb. 8. Passed.
- Feb. 10. In Assembly, Rec. No. 5. To Ways and Means Com.
- Feb. 18. Reported to second reading.
- Mar. 3. To third reading.
- Mar. 15. Lost. Motion to reconsider tabled.
- Apr. 15. Vote reconsidered. Passed.
- Apr. 19. To governor.
- Apr. 19. Approved. Chapter 335.

S. Int. No. 364—February 3rd. Creating a commission of twelve persons to be appointed by the Governor to propose to the Legislature a plan for reducing the accumulation of law reports, and otherwise expediting judicial procedure, and appropriating \$5,000.

To Finance Com.

- Apr. 16. Reported amended. To third reading.
- Apr. 23. Passed.
- Apr. 24. In Assembly, Rec. No. 582. To Ways and Means Com. Reported. To third reading. Passed.
- Apr. 29. To Governor.
- May 24. Vetoed.

S. Int. No. 395—February 3rd. Appropriating \$425,000 for the Workman's Compensation Commission.

To Finance Com.

- Feb. 4. Reported amended. To third reading.
- Feb. 9. Recommitted.
- Feb. 16. Reported. Restored to third reading.
- Feb. 22. Passed.
- Feb. 23. In Assembly, Rec. No. 26. To Ways and Means Com.
- Feb. 24. Reported to second reading.
- Feb. 25. Amended. To third reading.
- Mar. 4. Passed.
- Mar. 8. Senate nonconcurs. Conference committee appointed.
- Mar. 19. Vote reconsidered. Senate concurs.
- Mar. 23. To Governor. Approved. Chapter 104.

S. Int. No. 406—February 4th. Appropriating \$360 to reimburse Philip Becker for a land under water grant, village of Port Chester, purchased from the State and set aside by Supreme Court.

To Finance Com.

- Feb. 17. Reported to Com. of the Whole.
- Feb. 24. To third reading.
- Mar. 2. Passed.
- Mar. 3. In Assembly, Rec. No. 54. To Ways and Means Com.
- Apr. 23. Reported. To third reading. Passed.
- Apr. 29. To Governor.
- May 21. Approved. Chapter 698.

• EXHIBIT C

---

**S. Int. No. 420**—February 4th. Providing for the relief of the town of Belmont, Franklin County, for unpaid taxes on real property which should have been assessed as non-resident for 1912, 1913 and 1914.

To Taxation and Retrenchment Com.

- Feb. 25. Reported to Com. of the Whole.
- Mar. 3. To third reading.
- Mar. 8. Passed.
- Mar. 9. In Assembly, Rec. No. 84. To Ways and Means Com.
- Mar. 24. Reported to second reading.
- Mar. 25. To third reading.
- Mar. 31. Passed.
- Apr. 1. To Governor.
- Apr. 3. Approved. Chapter 191.

**S. Int. No. 496**—February 10th. Appropriating \$35,000 to be used by the superintendent of public works in providing towing facilities on completed portions of the barge canal system, pending the entire completion of the canal.

To Finance Com.

- Mar. 24. Reported to Com. of the Whole.
- Mar. 26. To third reading.
- Mar. 29. Passed.
- Mar. 30. In Assembly, Rec. No. 247. To Ways and Means Com.
- Apr. 2. Reported to second reading.
- Apr. 3. To third reading.
- Apr. 8. Passed.
- Apr. 12. To Governor.
- Apr. 14. Approved. Chapter 283.

**S. Int. No. 497**—February 10th. Appropriating \$150,000 for repairing and improving existing mechanical and other structures connected with the canals of the State, in addition to the fund appropriated for ordinary repairs to the canals.

To Finance Com.

- Mar. 17. Reported amended. To third reading.
- Mar. 23. Passed.
- Mar. 24. In Assembly, Rec. No. 201. To Ways and Means Com.
- Mar. 29. Reported to second reading.
- Mar. 30. To third reading.
- Apr. 1. Passed.
- Apr. 2. To Governor.
- Apr. 7. Approved. Chapter 237.

**S. Int. No. 650**—February 18th. Amending sections 120 and 123, Public Lands Law, by authorizing the commissioners of the Newtown Battlefield Reservation to acquire by condemnation or purchase such additional lands for the reservation as they deem necessary, whether adjoining such reservation or not, and reappropriating any unexpended balance of appropriation made by chapter 167, Laws of 1913.

To Finance Com.

- Mar. 17. Reported amended to Com. of the Whole.
- Mar. 22. Amended. To third reading.
- Mar. 26. Passed.
- Mar. 27. In Assembly, Rec. No. 218. To Ways and Means Com.
- Apr. 2. Reported to second reading.
- Apr. 3. To third reading.
- Apr. 6. Passed.
- Apr. 8. To Governor.
- Apr. 13. Approved. Chapter 271.



**S. Int. No. 779**—February 25th. Providing for the appointment by the Governor of a commission of five members to represent the State at the National Exposition of the Negro Historical and Industrial Association at Richmond, Va. during July and August, 1915, and appropriating \$7,500.

To Finance Com.

- Apr. 15. Amended and recommitted.
- Apr. 16. Reported. To third reading.
- Apr. 21. Passed. In Assembly, Rec. No. 500. To Ways and Means Com.
- Apr. 22. Reported. To third reading. Passed.
- Apr. 23. To Governor.
- May 21. Approved. Chapter 711.

**S. Int. No. 1020**.—March 10th. Appropriating \$3,500 for improving parking, and care of the plot in Cypress Hills cemetery, Brooklyn, set aside for the burial of survivors of the War of 1812.

To Finance Com.

- Apr. 20. Reported. To third reading.
- Apr. 23. Passed.
- Apr. 24. In Assembly, Rec. No. 579. To Ways and Means Com. Committee discharged. To third reading. Passed.
- Apr. 29. To Governor.
- May 24. Vetoed.

**S. Int. No. 1111**—March 12th. Appropriating \$195,000 to provide pontoons or other apparatus for raising sunken boats for the construction of buoys, lighthouses or other aids to navigation, for gantry cranes or tracks above lower gates in certain locks and for painting bridges, locks and other structures, for the Barge canal.

To Finance Com.

- Apr. 6. Reported amended. To third reading.
- Apr. 14. Passed. In Assembly, Rec. No. 392. To Ways and Means Com.
- Apr. 22. Reported. To third reading. Passed.
- Apr. 23. To Governor.
- May 21. Approved. Chapter 708.

**S. Int. No. 1137**—March 15th. Appropriating from the general fund, \$3,654,000 for the improvement of the Erie, Oswego and Champlain canals, as provided by chapter 147, Laws of 1903, as amended.

To Finance Com.

- Apr. 14. Reported amended to Com. of the Whole.
- Apr. 16. To third reading.
- Apr. 22. Amended. Passed under emergency message.
- Apr. 23. In Assembly, Rec. No. 555. To Ways and Means Com.
- Apr. 24. Reported. To third reading. Passed.
- Apr. 29. To Governor.
- May 21. Approved. Chapter 706.

**S. Int. No. 1219**—March 18th. Reappropriating \$250, the unexpended balance appropriated in 1913 for the erection of a monument to the Twenty-fifth Regiment, New York Volunteer Cavalry, in Battle Ground National Cemetery, District of Columbia, for the unpaid balance of the cost of construction of such monument.

To Finance Com.

- Mar. 26. Reported to Com. of the Whole.
- Mar. 29. To third reading.
- Mar. 31. Passed.
- Apr. 1. In Assembly, Rec. No. 276. To Ways and Means Com.
- Apr. 2. Reported to second reading.
- Apr. 3. To third reading.

EXHIBIT C

S. Int. No. 1242—March 19th. Reappropriating \$490,444.37, the unexpended balance of appropriation made by chapter 363, Laws of 1910, for the Palisades Interstate Park Commissioners.

To Finance Com. Committee discharged. To third reading.

Mar. 25. Passed.

Mar. 26. In Assembly, Rec. No. 211. To Ways and Means Com.

Apr. 2. Reported to second reading.

Apr. 3. To third reading.

Apr. 6. Passed.

Apr. 7. To Governor.

Apr. 12. Approved. Chapter 265.

S. Int. No. 1326—March 25th. Appropriating \$25,000 for clearing, grading and improving the site of the old power house at Hawk and Elk Streets, in the city of Albany.

To Finance Com. Committee discharged. To third reading.

Mar. 31. Passed.

Apr. 1. In Assembly, Rec. No. 275. To Ways and Means Com.

Apr. 6. Reported to second reading.

Apr. 7. To third reading.

Apr. 8. Passed.

Apr. 12. To Governor.

Apr. 17. Approved. Chapter 326.

S. Int. No. 1347—March 26th. Appropriating \$11,000 for the construction of a new steel plate girder bridge over the Erie canal at Clinton Street in the village of Whitesboro.

To Finance Com.

Apr. 20. Reported to third reading.

Apr. 22. Passed. In Assembly, Rec. No. 543. To Ways and Means Com.

Apr. 23. Reported. To third reading. Passed.

Apr. 29. To Governor.

May 21. Approved. Chapter 704.

S. Int. No. 1369—March 30th. Providing for the construction of a bridge over a portion of the Oswego river and the Barge canal at Minetto, Oswego county, to connect with a bridge to be built by the local authorities over a portion of the river, and appropriating \$50,000.

To Finance Com.

Apr. 22. Committee discharged. Substituted for A. 1339 on third reading. Passed. In Assembly, Rec. No. 545. To Ways and Means Com.

Apr. 24. Committee discharged. To third reading. Passed.

Apr. 26. To Governor.

May 21. Approved. Chapter 716.

S. Int. No. 1443—April 3rd. Adding new sections 77, 78 and 79 to the Executive Law, establishing a State bureau of standards in the office of the State Engineer and Surveyor, to be in charge of a director appointed by the State Engineer and Surveyor at \$3,600 a year. The bureau is to analyze, test and inspect materials proposed for use on buildings, or other structures and improvements constructed under the direction of a State department, board or commission, except the First District Public Service Commission and such road materials as the State highway commission desires inspected or analyzed. \$45,000 appropriated.

To Finance Com.

Apr. 6. Reported. To third reading.

Apr. 9. Passed.

Apr. 12. In Assembly, Rec. No. 334. To Ways and Means Com.

Apr. 22. Reported to third reading. Passed.

Apr. 29. To Governor.

May 20. Vetoed.

S. Int. No. 1444—April 3rd. Appropriating \$500,000 for salaries and expenses for the coming Constitutional Convention.

To Finance Com.

- Apr. 6. Reported. To third reading.
- Apr. 9. Passed.
- Apr. 12. In Assembly, Rec. Bo. 335. To Ways and Means Com.
- Apr. 13. Committee discharged. Substituted for A. 1662 on third reading.
- Apr. 14. Passed.
- Apr. 19. To Governor.
- Apr. 20. Approved. Chapter 338.

S. Int. No. 1518—April 9th. Appropriating \$300,000 for the construction of Mohansic State Hospital.

To third reading and Finance Com.

- Apr. 14. Reported. Restored to third reading.
- Apr. 16. Passed.
- Apr. 19. In Assembly, Rec. No. 439. To Ways and Means Com.
- Apr. 24. Reported. To third reading. Passed.
- Apr. 29. To Governor.
- May 21. Approved. Chapter 713.

S. Int. No. 1540—April 12th. Appropriating \$500 for continuing the work of improving Fulmer creek in Herkimer county.

To third reading and Finance Com.

- Apr. 20. Reported restored to third reading.
- Apr. 21. Passed. In Assembly, Rec. No. 491. To Ways and Means Com.
- Apr. 24. Reported. To third reading. Passed.
- Apr. 29. To Governor.
- May 21. Approved. Chapter 709.

S. Int. No. 1541—April 13th. Appropriating \$13,000 for the expense of moving office furniture and equipment of State departments and officers from present quarters to rooms provided by the trustees of public buildings, and for linoleum for the floors in the building of the New York Telephone Company in Albany under the control of such trustees.

To third reading and Finance Com.

- Apr. 14. Reported. Restored to third reading.
- Apr. 20. Passed.
- Apr. 21. In Assembly, Rec. No. 473. To Ways and Means Com. Committee discharged. To third reading. Passed. To Governor.
- Apr. 22. Approved. Chapter 350.

S. Int. No. 1625—April 19th. Appropriating \$5,000 for a commission of five members of Schenectady city officials to investigate the conditions relative to the construction of a highway bridge over the Mohawk river and Barge canal between Schenectady and the village of Scotia.

To third reading and Finance Com.

- Apr. 21. Reported. Restored to third reading.
- Apr. 23. Passed.
- Apr. 24. In Assembly, Rec. No. 569. To Ways and Means Com. Reported. To third reading. Passed.
- Apr. 29. To Governor.
- May 21. Approved. Chapter 703.

S. Int. No. 1632—April 20th. Appropriating \$2,500 for equipping the Senate Chamber with electrical devices and other conveniences.

To Finance Com.

- Apr. 23. Reported. To third reading. Passed.
- Apr. 24. In Assembly, Rec. No. 581. To Ways and Means Com. Reported. To third reading. Passed.
- Apr. 29. To Governor.
- May 24. Vetoed.

EXHIBIT C

A. Int. No. 3—January 13th. Amending chapter 400, Laws of 1911, which provided for the reconstruction of the old portion of the Potsdam State Normal and Training School by increasing from \$225,000 to \$300,000 the amount of the appropriation for that purpose.

To Ways and Means Com.

- Apr. 14. Reported. To third reading. Passed.
- Apr. 15. In Senate, Rec. No. 572. To Finance Com.
- Apr. 20. Reported amended. To third reading.
- Apr. 23. Passed.
- Apr. 24. Assembly concurs.
- Apr. 24. To Governor.
- Apr. 25. Approved. Chapter 389.

A. Int. No. 28—January 13th. Appropriating \$1,324.87 for reimbursing Warren county this amount erroneously charged to and paid by the county to the State Highway Commission in 1910 on account of the construction or improvement of county highway number 804 (Luzerne-Caldwell road).

To Ways and Means Com.

- Mar. 24. Reported to second reading.
- Mar. 25. To third reading.
- Mar. 31. Passed.
- Apr. 1. In Senate, Rec. No. 402. To Finance Com.
- Apr. 20. Reported. To third reading.
- Apr. 22. Passed.
- Apr. 23. To Governor.
- May 22. Approved. Chapter 681.

A. Int. No. 48—January 13th. Appropriating \$12,000 for purchasing the Morrison farm adjacent to the St. Lawrence State Hospital for the purposes of such hospital.

To Ways and Means Com.

- Jan. 27. Reported to second reading.
- Jan. 28. To third reading.
- Feb. 3. Passed.
- Feb. 4. In Senate, Rec. No. 6. To Finance Com.
- Mar. 25. Reported. To third reading.
- Mar. 26. Passed.
- Mar. 27. To Governor.
- Mar. 30. Approved. Chapter 138.

A. Int. No. 102—January 14th. Appropriating \$3,500 for improving and caring for the plot in Cypress Hills cemetery, Brooklyn, set aside for the burial of survivors of the War of 1812, and providing for the acquisition by the State of necessary approaches thereto.

To Ways and Means Com.

- Apr. 23. Reported. To third reading. Passed.
- Apr. 24. In Senate, Rec. No. 682. To third reading without reference. Passed.
- Apr. 26. To Mayor.
- May 1. Returned accepted. To Governor.
- May 24. Vetoed.

A. Int. No. 110—January 14th. Reappropriating \$1,050 for the extension service at the Morrisville agricultural school.

To Ways and Means Com.

- Apr. 15. Reported. To third reading. Passed.
- Apr. 16. In Senate, Rec. No. 609. Substituted for S. 72 on third reading.
- Apr. 20. Passed.
- Apr. 21. To Governor.
- May 24. Vetoed.

**A. Int. No. 111**—January 14th. Appropriating \$10,000,000 for the construction and improvement of public highways.

To Ways and Means Com.

Feb. 3. Reported to second reading.

Feb. 4. To third reading.

Feb. 10. Passed.

Feb. 11. In Senate, Rec. No. 30. To third reading without reference.

Feb. 15. Passed.

Feb. 16. To Governor.

Feb. 23. Approved. Chapter 10.

**A. Int. No. 148**—January 18th. Appropriating \$100,000 for the construction of a bridge over the Mohawk River between Albany and Saratoga counties at Dunsbach Ferry.

To Ways and Means Com.

Apr. 16. Reported. To third reading. Passed.

Apr. 19. In Senate, Rec. No. 629. To Finance Com.

**A. Int. No. 150**—January 18th. Appropriating \$4,500 for improving Dry River in the city of Watervliet, by constructing concrete culvert between Thirteenth and Fourteenth Streets.

To Ways and Means Com.

Apr. 14. Reported. To third reading. Passed.

Apr. 15. In Senate, Rec. No. 564. To third reading and Finance Com.

Apr. 20. Reported. Restored to third reading.

Apr. 21. Passed.

Apr. 23. To Mayor.

Apr. 30. Returned accepted. To Governor.

May 21. Approved. Chapter 707.

**A. Int. No. 180**—January 19th. Appropriating \$30,000 for a demonstration building for the New York School of Agriculture at Alfred University, and \$11,123.38, the amount paid into the State treasury by Alfred University from its income for the equipment and heating of buildings.

To Ways and Means Com.

Apr. 19. Reported. To third reading. Passed.

Apr. 20. In Senate, Rec. No. 641. To Finance Com.

**A. Int. No. 194**—January 19th. Appropriating \$683,793.88, being the amount heretofore assessed upon the counties in the third and fourth brigade districts for construction, alteration and repairs of armories.

To Ways and Means Com.

Feb. 18. Reported to second reading.

Feb. 22. To third reading.

Mar. 1. Passed.

Mar. 2. In Senate, Rec. No. 126. To Finance Com.

Mar. 17. Reported to Com. of the Whole.

Mar. 18. To third reading.

Mar. 22. Passed.

Mar. 24. To Governor.

Apr. 3. Approved. Chapter 179.

**A. Int. No. 266**—January 21st. Appropriating \$45,000 for the construction of a bridge over the Barge Canal at Leach Mill Road, village of Lyons, Wayne County.

To Ways and Means Com.]

Apr. 15. Reported. To third reading. Passed.

Apr. 16. In Senate, Rec. No. 611. To Finance Com.

Apr. 24. Committee discharged. To third reading. Passed.

Apr. 24. To Governor.

May 24. Vetoed.

EXHIBIT C

A. Int. No. 276—January 21st. Appropriating \$14,000 for the construction of a new iron bridge over Black River Canal at Stanwix Street, Rome.

To Ways and Means Com.

Apr. 24. Reported. To third reading. Passed. In Senate, Rec. No. 708. To Finance Com.

A. Int. No. 392—January 28th. Appropriating \$18,000 for the construction of a bridge over Twitchell Creek at Stillwater, Herkimer County, in place of the old Carthage and Lake Champlain Highway Bridge.

To Ways and Means Com.

Apr. 16. Reported. To third reading. Passed.

Apr. 19. In Senate, Rec. No. 630. To Finance Com.

A. Int. No. 574—February 8th. Appropriating unexpended balances of appropriations made by chapter 529, Laws of 1914, for salaries and expenses of the State School of Agriculture, St. Lawrence University.

To Ways and Means Com.

Feb. 11. Reported to second reading.

Feb. 12. To third reading.

Feb. 17. Passed.

Feb. 18. In Senate, Rec. No. 69. To Finance Com.

Apr. 14. Reported. To third reading.

Apr. 15. Passed.

Apr. 19. To Governor.

May 24. Vetoed.

A. Int. No. 609—February 9th. Appropriating \$40,000 for improvement and repair of highways and bridges on Indian reservations, in compliance with section 159, Highway Law.

To Ways and Means Com.

Feb. 18. Reported to second reading.

Feb. 22. To third reading.

Mar. 3. Passed.

Mar. 4. In Senate, Rec. No. 161. To Finance Com.

Mar. 17. Reported. To third reading.

Mar. 18. Passed.

Mar. 19. To Governor.

Mar. 30. Approved. Chapter 134.

A. Int. No. 610—February 9th. Appropriating \$1,880,000 for paying the State's share of the cost of repairs to highways, pursuant to sections 90 and 93 of the Highway Law, and for complying with the requirements of section 101 of such law.

To Ways and Means Com.

Feb. 18. Reported to second reading.

Feb. 22. To third reading.

Mar. 3. Passed.

Mar. 4. In Senate, Rec. No. 141. To Finance Com.

Mar. 17. Reported. To third reading.

Mar. 18. Passed.

Mar. 19. To Governor.

Mar. 30. Approved. Chapter 135.

A. Int. No. 624—February 10th. Appropriating \$12,000 for the purchase by the Land Office Commissioners of Knox's Headquarters, in the town of New Windsor, Orange County.

To Ways and Means Com.

Apr. 15. Reported. To third reading. Passed.

Apr. 16. In Senate, Rec. No. 605. To Finance Com.

A. Int. No. 664—February 10th. Appropriating \$30,000 for the acquisition by the State, from Union Free School No. 8, town of Pomfret, Chautauqua County, of certain lands in the village of Fredonia for an addition to the State normal school in the village.

To Ways and Means Com.

Apr. 20. Reported. To third reading. Passed.

Apr. 21. In Senate, Rec. No. 649. To Finance Com.

A. Int. No. 693—February 11th. Appropriating \$20,000 for construction by the superintendent of public works of a sea wall at Orient, Suffolk County.

To Ways and Means Com.

Mar. 4. Amended and recommitted.

A. Int. No. 704—February 11th. Appropriating \$750 for the acquisition by the Conservation Commission of lands in the town of Ellery, Chautauqua County, for use in connection with the fish hatchery at Bemus Point.

To Ways and Means Com.†

Apr. 17. Amended and recommitted.‡

A. Int. No. 729—February 15th. Appropriating \$1,542.37, being the amount heretofore collected by the comptroller from racing associations, for the expenses of the State Racing associations, for the expenses of the State Racing Commission for 1914.

To Ways and Means Com.

Feb. 24. Reported to second reading.

Feb. 25. To third reading.

Mar. 3. Passed.

Mar. 4. In Senate, Rec. No. 164. To Finance Com.

Mar. 17. Reported to Com. of the Whole.

Mar. 16. To third reading.

Mar. 22. Passed.

Mar. 24. To Governor.

Mar. 30. Approved. Chapter 153.

A. Int. No. 874—February 18th. Emergency supply bill, making appropriations for deficiencies in last year's appropriations and for emergency expenditures of the current year.

To Ways and Means Com.

Mar. 12. Amended and recommitted.

Apr. 6. Reported amended to second reading.

Apr. 9. To third reading.

Apr. 14. Passed.

Apr. 15. In Senate, Rec. No. 540. To Finance Com.

Apr. 19. Reported amended and recommitted.

Apr. 22. Reported amended. To third reading.

Apr. 24. Amended. Passed under emergency message. Recalled from Assembly. Amended. Repassed. Assembly concurs.

May 2. To Governor.

May 24. Approved. Chapter 726.

A. Int. No. 940—February 22nd. Reappropriating \$104,423.47, unexpended balance of former appropriations for the New York State Training School for Girls at Hudson.

To Ways and Means Com.

Mar. 18. Reported to second reading.

Mar. 19. To third reading.

Mar. 24. Passed.

Mar. 25. In Senate, Rec. No. 345. To Finance Com.

Apr. 6. Reported. To third reading.

Apr. 7. Passed.

Apr. 8. To Governor.

Apr. 17. Approved. Chapter 334.

EXHIBIT C

A. Int. No. 942—February 22nd. Appropriating \$12,500 for constructing a concrete arch over 18-Mile Creek from the east line of Pound Street to the east line of lot 6, section 14, township 14, in the city of Lockport.

To Ways and Means Com.

Apr. 19. Reported. To third reading. Passed.

Apr. 20. In Senate, Rec. No. 642. To Finance Com.

A. Int. No. 980—February 24th. Providing for the construction by the Superintendent of Public Works of a bridge over the Mohawk River and the Barge canal from the junction of State Street and Washington Avenue, in Schenectady, to Mohawk Avenue in the village of Scotia, Schenectady County. Schenectady is to pay the costs of the Schenectady approach and east abutment of the span over the Barge Canal terminal channel. Scotia is to pay the cost of the north abutment and terminal on Mohawk Avenue, and the State is to pay the balance, not exceeding \$800,000. The bill appropriates \$150,000.

To Ways and Means Com.

Apr. 15. Reported. To third reading. Passed.

Apr. 16. In Senate, Rec. No. 604. To Finance Com.

A. Int. No. 1079—March 1st. Amending section 1, chapter 707, Laws of 1913, which authorized the superintendent of insurance to prepare a revision of the Insurance Law, by extending to 1917 the time to complete and report such revision to the Legislature, and appropriating \$25,000 for the work.

To Ways and Means Com.

Mar. 11. Amended and recommitted.

Mar. 24. Reported to second reading.

Mar. 25. To third reading.

Mar. 31. Passed.

Apr. 2. In Senate, Rec. No. 427. To Finance Com.

Apr. 14. Reported amended. To third reading.

Apr. 20. Passed.

Apr. 21. Assembly concurs.

Apr. 23. To Governor.

May 24. Vetoed.

A. Int. No. 1103—March 2nd. Appropriating \$3,128.82 to pay the city of Lockport for an assessment levied against the State for the improvement of Richmond Avenue adjoining the Erie Canal in that city.

To Ways and Means Com.

Apr. 14. Reported. To third reading. Passed.

Apr. 15. In Senate, Rec. No. 565. To third reading without reference.

Apr. 16. Passed.

Apr. 19. To Governor.

May 21. Approved. Chapter 715.

A. Int. No. 1149—March 3rd. Providing for straightening, dredging and other improvements to the Allegany River and Olean Creek, to restrain and control their waters within the corporate limits of the city of Olean, and appropriating \$150,000.

To Ways and Means Com.

Apr. 21. Reported. To third reading. Passed. In Senate, Rec. No. 662. Substituted for S. 887 on third reading. Passed.

Apr. 23. To Mayor.

May 1. Returned accepted. To Governor.

May 24. Approved. Chapter 717.



A. Int. No. 1196—March 4th. Appropriating \$30,000 for the Buffalo State Normal and Training School.

To Ways and Means Com.

- Apr. 15. Reported amended to second reading.
- Apr. 20. To third reading. Passed.
- Apr. 21. In Senate, Rec. No. 655. To third reading and Finance Com.
- Apr. 22. Reported. Restored to third reading.
- Apr. 24. Passed.
- Apr. 24. To Governor.
- May 21. Approved. Chapter 712.

A. Int. No. 1244—March 5th. Appropriating \$1,634,277.01 for the maintenance and repair of highways improved or constructed by State aid, pursuant to the provisions of Article 7 of the Highway Law.

To Ways and Means Com.

- Mar. 23. Reported to second reading.
- Mar. 24. S. 960 substituted.

A. Int. No. 1245—March 5th. Appropriating \$500,000, and an additional \$1,800,000 out of funds to be paid into the State treasury in 1915 pursuant to Article 11 of the Highway Law, for maintenance and repair of highways improved or constructed by State aid.

To Ways and Means Com.

- Mar. 23. Reported to second reading.
- Mar. 24. S. 959 substituted.

A. Int. No. 1248—March 5th. Appropriating \$70,000 for relocating the channel of Catherine Creek, in the village of Montour Falls.

To Ways and Means Com.

- Apr. 15. Reported. To third reading. Passed.
- Apr. 16. In Senate, Rec. No. 592. To third reading and Finance Com.

A. Int. No. 1255—March 8th. Reappropriating unexpended balances of various appropriations made by chapter 529, Laws of 1914, for agricultural schools, Cornell University, Syracuse Forestry College and various penal, curative and charitable institutions of the State.

To Ways and Means Com.

- Mar. 24. Reported to second reading.
- Mar. 25. To third reading.
- Apr. 1. Passed.
- Apr. 2. In Senate, Rec. No. 425. To third reading and Finance Com.
- Apr. 6. Reported amended. To third reading.
- Apr. 12. Passed.
- Apr. 15. Assembly concurs.
- Apr. 19. To Governor.
- May 24. Vetoed.

A. Int. No. 1256—March 8th. Reappropriating unexpended balances of former appropriations for various State departments and institutions.

To Ways and Means Com.

- Apr. 6. Reported amended to second reading.
- Apr. 9. To third reading.
- Apr. 15. Passed. In Senate, Rec. No. 584. To third reading and Finance Com.
- Apr. 21. Reported amended. Restored to third reading.
- Apr. 24. Passed. Assembly concurs.
- Apr. 24. To Governor.
- May 24. Approved. Chapter 728.

EXHIBIT C

A. Int. No. 1257—March 8th. Reappropriating \$5,619,412.91, being the unexpended balance of an appropriation made by chapter 706, Laws of 1913, for improvements of the Erie, Oswego and Champlain Canals.

To Ways and Means Com.

- Mar. 18. Reported to second reading.
- Mar. 19. To third reading.
- Mar. 23. Passed.
- Mar. 24. In Senate, Rec. No. 332. To Finance Com.
- Apr. 6. Reported. To third reading.
- Apr. 12. Passed.
- Apr. 14. To Governor.
- May 22. Approved. Chapter 693.

A. Int. No. 1262—March 8th. Appropriating \$20,000 for the erection by the superintendent of prisons of a school building on the grounds of Great Meadow Prison for the use of School District No. 4 in the Town of Fort Ann, Washington County, upon the adoption of a proposition by the district accepting the use of such a building for the district.

To Ways and Means Com.

- Apr. 15. Reported. To third reading. Passed.
- Apr. 16. In Senate, Rec. No. 606. To third reading and Finance Com.
- Apr. 20. Reported. Restored to third reading.
- Apr. 21. Passed.
- Apr. 22. To Governor.
- Apr. 28. Approved. Chapter 442.

A. Int. No. 1313—March 9th. Reappropriating \$30,000 of the unexpended balance appropriated by chapter 246, Laws of 1913, and appropriating an additional \$30,000 for the construction of a reinforced concrete arch bridge over Black River and Moose River at Lyons Falls.

To Ways and Means Com.

- Mar. 31. Amended and recommitted.
- Apr. 14. Reported. To third reading. Passed.
- Apr. 15. In Senate, Rec. No. 577. To Finance Com.
- Apr. 20. Reported. To third reading.
- Apr. 22. Passed.
- Apr. 23. To Governor.
- May 21. Approved. Chapter 699.

A. Int. No. 1339—March 10th. Providing for the construction of a bridge over a portion of the Oswego River and the Barge canal at Minetto, Oswego County, to connect with a bridge to be built by the local authorities over a portion of the river, and appropriating \$50,000.

To Ways and Means Com.

- Apr. 16. Reported. To third reading. Passed.
- Apr. 19. In Senate, Rec. No. 634. To Finance Com.
- Apr. 20. Reported. To third reading.
- Apr. 22. S. 1369 substituted.

A. Int. No. 1418—March 12th. Appropriating \$3,000 for lowering the canal bridge on South Virginia Street, village of Waterloo, or constructing a culvert to replace the bridge.

To Ways and Means Com.

- Apr. 15. Reported. To third reading. Passed.
- Apr. 16. In Senate, Rec. No. 603. To third reading and Finance Com.
- Apr. 20. Reported. Restored to third reading.
- Apr. 21. Passed.
- Apr. 22. To Governor.
- May 21. Approved. Chapter 701.

A. Int. No. 1419—March 12th. Appropriating \$5,000 for constructing a foot bridge between north and south walls of lock No. 3, Cayuga and Seneca Canal, at Seneca Falls.

To Ways and Means Com.

- Apr. 15. Reported. To third reading. Passed.
- Apr. 16. In Senate, Rec. No. 602. To third reading and Finance Com.
- Apr. 20. Reported. Restored to third reading.
- Apr. 21. Passed.
- Apr. 22. To Governor.
- May 21. Approved. Chapter 700.

A. Int. No. 1447—March 15th. Appropriating \$12,500 for removal, by the superintendent of Public Works of highway and farm bridges spanning abandoned sections of the canals, and substituting crossing facilities on solid embankments.

To Ways and Means Com.

- Mar. 24. Reported to second reading.
- Mar. 25. To third reading.
- Apr. 8. Passed.
- Apr. 12. In Senate, Rec. No. 511. To Finance Com.
- Apr. 14. Reported. To third reading.
- Apr. 16. Passed.
- Apr. 19. To Governor.
- May 21. Approved. Chapter 702.

A. Int. No. 1464—March 15th. Appropriating from the general fund, \$4,-220,845.82 for the improvement of the Erie, Oswego and Champlain Canals, as provided by chapter 147, Laws of 1903, as amended.

To Ways and Means Com.

- Mar. 24. Reported to second reading.
- Mar. 30. To third reading.
- Apr. 12. Amended.
- Apr. 21. Recommitted.
- Apr. 22. Motion to discharge committee lost.

A. Int. No. 1468—March 15th. Making appropriations for the support of government. (Annual appropriation bill.)

To Ways and Means Com.

- Apr. 13. Reported amended to second reading.
- Apr. 15. To third reading. Passed. In Senate, Rec. No. 585. To third reading and Finance Com.
- Apr. 23. Reported amended. Restored to third reading. Recommitted.
- Apr. 24. Reported amended. Restored to third reading. Passed under emergency message. Recalled from Assembly. Amended. Repassed. Assembly concurs.
- May 2. To Governor.
- May 24. Approved. Chapter 725.

A. Int. No. 1477—March 16th. Appropriating \$2,000 toward the expense of improving the stream running from the Matteawan State Hospital lands into Fishkill Creek, to be paid to the treasurer of the city of Beacon upon certificate of the city council that the work has been completed.

To Ways and Means Com.

- Apr. 14. Reported. To third reading. Passed.
- Apr. 15. In Senate, Rec. No. 561. To Finance Com.
- Apr. 20. Reported. To third reading.
- Apr. 22. Passed.
- Apr. 23. To Governor.
- May 21. Approved. Chapter 710.

EXHIBIT C

**A. Int. No. 1500**—March 17th. Appropriating \$97,000 for the State's share of the cost of maintaining county roads, according to section 178 of the Highway Law.

To Ways and Means Com.

Mar. 24. Reported to second reading.

Mar. 25. To third reading.

Mar. 31. Passed.

Apr. 1. In Senate, Rec. No. 410. To third reading and Finance Com.

Apr. 14. Reported amended. Restored to third reading.

Apr. 20. Passed.

Apr. 21. Assembly concurs.

Apr. 23. To Governor.

May 21. Approved. Chapter 714.

**A. Int. No. 1508**—March 17th. Continuing the Constitutional Convention Commission, established in 1914, until the final adjournment of the Constitutional Convention, with full power and authority to compile and print such information and data as may be useful to the delegates to the convention, during its course, and appropriating \$5,000.

To Ways and Means Com.

Mar. 24. Reported to second reading.

Mar. 25. To third reading.

Mar. 31. Passed.

Apr. 1. In Senate, Rec. No. 411. To Finance Com. Committee discharged. To third reading. Passed.

Apr. 2. To Governor.

Apr. 5. Approved. Chapter 201.

**A. Int. No. 1522**—March 18th. Appropriating \$4,000 for the repair of the canal wall feeder on Main Street in the city of Oneida.

To Ways and Means Com.

Apr. 14. Reported. To third reading. Passed.

Apr. 15. In Senate, Rec. No. 556. Substituted for S. 1258 on third reading.

Apr. 16. Passed.

Apr. 19. To Governor.

May 21. Approved. Chapter 705.

**A. Int. No. 1554**—March 22nd. Authorizing the Superintendent of Public Works to change the plans for the construction of the bridge over the Erie Canal in the Village of Yorkville, authorized by chapter 745, Laws of 1913, reappropriating \$95,048, the unexpended balance of the appropriation of the \$125,000 made by that chapter, and making an additional appropriation of \$25,000.

To Ways and Means Com.

Apr. 22. Reported. To third reading. Passed.

Apr. 23. In Senate, Rec. No. 670. To Finance Com. Committee discharged. To third reading. Passed.

Apr. 24. To Governor.

May 10. Approved. Chapter 584.

**A. Int. No. 1579**—March 24th. Appropriating \$50,000 for the use of the commissioner of agriculture for the suppression and the control of infectious and contagious diseases or insect pests of plant or domestic animal life.

To third reading and Ways and Means Com.

Mar. 25. Reported. Restored to third reading.

Mar. 29. S. 1299 substituted.

A. Int. No. 1593—March 25th. Amending chapter 95, Laws of 1914, which enlarged the powers of the commission for the celebration of the centenary of the Battle of Plattsburg, by providing that the commission may select the site for the Thomas Macdonough Memorial, either by itself or in cooperation with the United States Government, and may acquire the site by condemnation or purchase.

To Ways and Means Com.

- Apr. 2. Reported to second reading.
- Apr. 3. To third reading.
- Apr. 7. Passed.
- Apr. 19. In Senate, Rec. No. 480. To Finance Com.
- Apr. 21. Reported. To third reading.
- Apr. 22. Passed.
- Apr. 23. To Governor.
- May 12. Approved. Chapter 616.

A. Int. No. 1610—March 29th. Appropriating \$465,000 for the expense of taking the State census as provided in the constitution and chapter 83, Laws of 1905.

To third reading and Ways and Means Com.

- Apr. 2. Reported. Restored to third reading.
- Apr. 7. S. 1359 substituted.

A. Int. No. 1636—March 31st. Reappropriating \$94,274.30, the unexpended balance of a former appropriation for the construction of a boulevard in Albany County connecting state route three, the so-called Stone Road, in the town of Bethlehem, with Delaware Avenue, in the city of Albany, and the construction of a viaduct across Normanskill.

To third reading and Ways and Means Com.

- Apr. 2. Reported. Restored to third reading.
- Apr. 7. Passed.
- Apr. 12. In Senate, Rec. No. 494. To Finance Com.
- Apr. 14. Reported. To third reading.
- Apr. 15. Passed.
- Apr. 19. To Governor.
- May 24. Vetoed.

A. Int. No. 1637—March 31st. Reappropriating \$382,085.49, the unexpended balance of an appropriation originally made by chapter 532, Laws of 1910 for the construction and improvement of state routes two and six, for the purpose of the construction and improvement of public highways in accordance with Article 6 of the Highway Law.

To third reading and Ways and Means Com.

- Apr. 2. Reported. Restored to third reading.
- Apr. 7. Passed.
- Apr. 12. In Senate, Rec. No. 495. To Finance Com.
- Apr. 14. Reported. To third reading.
- Apr. 16. Passed.
- Apr. 19. To Governor.
- Apr. 22. Recalled.
- Apr. 23. Vote reconsidered. Amended. Restored to third reading.
- Apr. 24. Repassed Assembly and Senate.
- Apr. 24. To Governor.
- May 22. Approved. Chapter 683.

EXHIBIT C

**A. Int. No. 1638—March 31st.** Reappropriating \$278,875.96, the unexpended balance of a former appropriation, for the construction and improvement of public highways in Essex and Warren Counties.

To third reading and Ways and Means Com.

- Apr. 2. Reported. Restored to third reading.
- Apr. 7. Passed.
- Apr. 12. In Senate, Rec. No. 496. To Finance Com.
- Apr. 14. Reported. To third reading.
- Apr. 16. Passed.
- Apr. 19. To Governor.
- May 22. Approved. Chapter 684.

**A. Int. No. 1639—March 31st.** Reappropriating various unexpended balances of former appropriations for the construction and improvement of portions of state routes within several counties of the state, the total reappropriation aggregating \$2,212,728.30.

To third reading and Ways and Means Com.

- Apr. 2. Reported. Restored to third reading.
- Apr. 7. Passed.
- Apr. 12. In Senate, Rec. No. 497. To Finance Com.
- Apr. 14. Reported. To third reading.
- Apr. 16. Passed.
- Apr. 19. To Governor.
- Apr. 22. Recalled.
- Apr. 23. Vote reconsidered. Amended. Restored to third reading.
- Apr. 24. Repassed Assembly and Senate.
- Apr. 24. To Governor.
- May 22. Approved. Chapter 682.

**A. Int. No. 1645—April 1st.** Reappropriating \$100,000, the unexpended balance of a former appropriation, for the State's share of the expense of acquiring the Cohoes and Lansingburg Bridge Company's bridge across the Hudson River between Troy and Cohoes.

To third reading and Ways and Means Com.

- Apr. 9. Reported. Restored to third reading.
- Apr. 13. Passed.
- Apr. 15. In Senate, Rec. No. 547. To third reading and Finance Com.
- Apr. 20. Reported. Restored to third reading.
- Apr. 21. Passed.
- Apr. 22. To Governor.
- May 24. Vetoed.

**A. Int. No. 1646—April 1st.** Reappropriating \$12,500, the unexpended balance of a former appropriation, for the State's share of the expense of acquiring the Stillwater Bridge Company's bridge across the Hudson River at Stillwater between Saratoga and Rensselaer Counties.

To third reading and Ways and Means Com.

- Apr. 9. Reported. Restored to third reading.
- Apr. 13. Passed.
- Apr. 15. In Senate, Rec. No. 546. To third reading and Finance Com.
- Apr. 20. Reported. Restored to third reading.
- Apr. 21. Passed.
- Apr. 22. To Governor.
- May 24. Vetoed.

A. Int. No. 1647—April 1st. Reappropriating \$100,000, the unexpended balance of a former appropriation, for the State's share of the expense of acquiring the Union Bridge Company's bridge across the Hudson River at Waterford.

To third reading and Ways and Means Com.

- Apr. 9. Reported. Restored to third reading.
- Apr. 13. Passed.
- Apr. 15. In Senate, Rec. No. 545. To third reading and Finance Com.
- Apr. 20. Reported. Restored to third reading.
- Apr. 21. Passed.
- Apr. 22. To Governor.
- May 24. Vetoed.

A. Int. No. 1663—April 5th. Establishing a prison sites committee to select a site for a state farm and industrial prison and appropriating \$10,000. Chapter 365, Laws of 1910 is repealed.

To Ways and Means Com.

- Apr. 21. Reported amended to second reading.
- Apr. 24. To third reading. Passed. In Senate, Rec. No. 709. To Finance Com.

A. Int. No. 1668—April 8th. Making appropriations for construction, improvements, repairs and equipment at various state institutions and for other miscellaneous constructions and improvements, including \$200,000 for grade crossing elimination in First Public Service district and \$552,000 for the Second district.

To third reading and Ways and Means Com.

- Apr. 13. Reported. Restored to third reading.
- Apr. 15. Passed.
- Apr. 16. In Senate, Rec. No. 599. To third reading and Finance Com.
- Apr. 21. Reported amended. Restored to third reading.
- Apr. 24. Amended. Passed under emergency message. Recalled from Assembly. Repassed. Assembly concurs.
- May 2. To Governor.
- May 24. Approved. Chapter 727.

A. Int. No. 1669—April 12th. Appropriating \$213,537.50 from the highway debt sinking fund for the payment of interest on the highway debt, and interest on the temporary certificates of the Comptroller issued in anticipation of the collection of revenues from the sale of bonds, for the fiscal year beginning October 1, 1914.

To Ways and Means Com.

- Apr. 13. Reported to second reading.
- Apr. 14. To third reading.
- Apr. 16. Passed. In Senate, Rec. No. 613. Substituted for S. 1549 on third reading. Passed.
- Apr. 19. To Governor.
- May 22. Approved. Chapter 689.

A. Int. No. 1670—April 12th. Appropriating \$196,749.98 from the canal debt sinking fund for the payment of interest on the debt for improvement of the Erie, Champlain and Oswego Canals, for the year beginning October 1, 1914, and interest on the temporary certificates issued by the Comptroller in anticipation of revenues from the sale of bonds.

To Ways and Means Com.

- Apr. 13. Reported to second reading.
- Apr. 14. To third reading.
- Apr. 16. Passed. In Senate, Rec. No. 614. Substituted for S. 1554 on third reading. Passed.
- Apr. 19. To Governor.
- May 22. Approved. Chapter 695.

EXHIBIT C

A. Int. No. 1671—April 12th. Appropriating \$650,000 from the highway debt sinking fund for payment for the fiscal year beginning October 1, 1915, of interest on the highway improvement debt.

To Ways and Means Com.

Apr. 13. Reported to second reading.

Apr. 14. To third reading.

Apr. 16. In Senate, Rec. No. 615. Substituted for S. 1550 on third reading. Passed.

Apr. 19. To Governor.

May 22. Approved. Chapter 688.

A. Int. No. 1672—April 12th. Authorizing the Comptroller to transfer to the Barge canal terminals sinking fund, created by chapter 746, Laws of 1911 as amended, \$336,816.51 raised pursuant to chapter 804, Laws of 1913, as the annual contribution to the Barge canal terminals sinking fund.

To Ways and Means Com.

Apr. 13. Reported to second reading.

Apr. 14. To third reading.

Apr. 16. Passed. In Senate, Rec. No. 616. Substituted for S. 1545 on third reading. Passed.

Apr. 19. To Governor.

May 3. Approved. Chapter 477.

A. Int. No. 1673—April 12th. Appropriating \$90,726.17, being the money received from the sale of abandoned lands and buildings, and from miscellaneous sources on account of the improvement of the Erie, Champlain and Oswego Canals, for the purpose of the improvement of such canals.

To Ways and Means Com.

Apr. 13. Reported to second reading.

Apr. 14. To third reading.

Apr. 16. Passed. In Senate, Rec. No. 617. Substituted for S. 1548 on third reading.

Apr. 20. Passed.

Apr. 21. To Governor.

May 24. Vetoed.

A. Int. No. 1674—April 12th. Appropriating \$15,327.08 for the payment for the fiscal years beginning October 1, 1914 and October 1, 1915, of interest on the Saratoga Springs State Reservation debt.

To Ways and Means Com.

Apr. 13. Reported to second reading.

Apr. 14. To third reading.

Apr. 16. Passed. In Senate, Rec. No. 618. Substituted for S. 1544 on third reading. Passed.

Apr. 19. To Governor.

May 22. Approved. Chapter 686.

A. Int. No. 1675—April 12th. Appropriating \$412,500 for the payment of interest on the debt for the construction of Barge canal terminals contracted under Article 7, section 4 of the State Constitution, for the year beginning October 1, 1915.

To Ways and Means Com.

Apr. 13. Reported to second reading.

Apr. 14. To third reading.

Apr. 16. Passed. In Senate, Rec. No. 619. Substituted for S. 1553 on third reading. Passed.

Apr. 19. To Governor.

May 22. Approved. Chapter 694.



A. Int. No. 1676—April 12th. Appropriating \$290,000 from the canal debt sinking fund for payment for the fiscal year beginning October 1, 1915, of interest on the debt for the improvement of the Cayuga and Seneca Canals, under Article 7, section 4, State Constitution.

To Ways and Means Com.

Apr. 13. Reported to second reading.

Apr. 14. To third reading.

Apr. 16. Passed. In Senate, Rec. No. 620. Substituted for S. 1552 on third reading. Passed.

Apr. 19. To Governor.

May 22. Approved. Chapter 692.

A. Int. No. 1677—April 12th. Appropriating \$3,980,000 from the canal debt sinking fund for the payment of interest on the debt for the improvement of the Erie, Champlain and Oswego Canals, contracted under Article 7, section 4, State Constitution, and becoming due during the fiscal year beginning October 1, 1915.

To Ways and Means Com.

Apr. 13. Reported to second reading.

Apr. 14. To third reading.

Apr. 16. Passed. In Senate, Rec. No. 621. Substituted for S. 1542 on third reading. Passed.

Apr. 19. To Governor.

May 22. Approved. Chapter 696.

A. Int. No. 1678—April 12th. Authorizing the comptroller to transfer to the canal debt sinking fund, created by chapter 391, Laws of 1909, as amended, \$112,272.17 raised pursuant to chapter 804, Laws of 1913, as the annual contribution to the canal debt sinking fund.

To Ways and Means Com.

Apr. 13. Reported to second reading.

Apr. 14. To third reading.

Apr. 16. Passed. In Senate, Rec. No. 622. Substituted for S. 1547 on third reading. Passed.

Apr. 19. To Governor.

May 10. Approved. Chapter 585.

A. Int. No. 1679—April 12th. Appropriating \$106,250 from the sinking fund under Article 7, section 4, State Constitution, for the payment of interest on the debt for Barge canal terminals becoming due during the fiscal year beginning October 1, 1914.

To Ways and Means Com.

Apr. 13. Reported to second reading.

Apr. 14. To third reading.

Apr. 16. Passed. In Senate, Rec. No. 623. Substituted for S. 1556 on third reading. Passed.

Apr. 19. To Governor.

May 22. Approved. Chapter 677.

A. Int. No. 1680—April 12th. Appropriating \$2,070,000 from the highway debt sinking fund for the payment of interest on the highway debt becoming due during the fiscal year beginning October 1, 1915.

To Ways and Means Com.

Apr. 13. Reported to second reading.

Apr. 14. To third reading.

Apr. 16. Passed. In Senate, Rec. No. 624. Substituted for S. 1546 on third reading. Passed.

Apr. 19. To Governor.

May 22. Approved. Chapter 690.

EXHIBIT C

A. Int. No. 1681—April 12th. Appropriating \$100,000 from the Palisades Interstate Park sinking fund for the payment of interest on the Palisades Interstate Park debt for the fiscal year beginning October 1, 1915.

To Ways and Means Com.

Apr. 13. Reported to second reading.

Apr. 14. To third reading.

Apr. 16. Passed. In Senate, Rec. No. 625. Substituted for S. 1555 on third reading. Passed.

Apr. 19. To Governor.

May 22. Approved. Chapter 685.

A. Int. No. 1682—April 12th. Appropriating \$106,750.07 from the sinking fund for that purpose, for the payment of interest on the debt for the improvement of the Cayuga and Seneca Canals for the fiscal year beginning October 1, 1914.

To Ways and Means Com.

Apr. 13. Reported to second reading.

Apr. 14. To third reading.

Apr. 16. In Senate, Rec. No. 626. Substituted for S. 1551 on third reading. Passed.

Apr. 19. To Governor.

May 22. Approved. Chapter 691.

A. Int. No. 1683—April 12th. Appropriating \$119,700 for the payment of principal and interest on the Saratoga Springs State Reservation debt, for the fiscal year beginning October 1, 1915.

To Ways and Means Com.

Apr. 13. Reported to second reading.

Apr. 14. To third reading.

Apr. 16. In Senate, Rec. No. 627. Substituted for S. 1543 on third reading. Passed.

Apr. 19. To Governor.

May 22. Approved. Chapter 687.

A. Int. No. 1706—April 20th. Providing for issuing \$27,000,000 state bonds, in addition to bonds heretofore authorized, for improving the Erie, Oswego and Champlain Canals, if approved in a referendum to the voters at the general election this fall. The bill also provides for a direct annual tax of five one-thousandths of a mill on each dollar of the assessed value of property subject to taxation, to raise the funds for payment of principal and interest on the bonds.

To Ways and Means Com.

Apr. 24. Reported amended. To third reading. Passed under emergency message. In Senate, Rec. No. 710. To third reading. Passed.

May 2. To Governor.

May 10. Approved. Chapter 570.

A. Int. No. 1707—April 22nd. Imposing a direct state tax aggregating one and seven-tenths of a mill on each dollar of taxable property in the state for the annual contribution to the canal, highway, Barge canal terminal, and Palisades Interstate Park sinking fund, and for a contribution to the general fund.

To Ways and Means Com.

Apr. 24. Reported. To third reading. Passed. In Senate, Rec. No. 711. To third reading without reference. Passed.

Apr. 24. To Governor.

May 24. Approved. Chapter 729.