

governor alone, in large part, it would seem, for political reasons. Its reasoning was expressed as follows:

We have felt that to make use of the Board of Public Works as a Budget Commission would have the disadvantage of dissipating personal responsibility for financial propositions, and would also run the risk of not securing party responsibility. For it is by no means certain under the conditions which exist in the state that the political party to which the Governor belonged would be in control also of the Board of Public Works. If such lack of political harmony should exist, the Commission believe that a budget system based upon the Board of Public Works would lose much in effectiveness.<sup>3</sup>

A draft of a proposed constitutional amendment to implement the commission's recommendations for an executive budget system accompanied the report. It was adopted without significant change by the General Assembly and ratified by the electorate.<sup>4</sup> The board thus came close to achieving a most substantial measure of fiscal control over all of state government; had the alternative mentioned in the party platform been accepted, the board would have enjoyed the awesome budgetary powers vested in the governor.

About this time a number of states began to restructure their administrative apparatus in order to meet more effectively the increasing demands made upon them, and a trend of sorts developed in that regard. Illinois, Ohio, Massachusetts, Washington, Nebraska, and several other states adopted reorganization schemes of one kind or another. The need was clear in Maryland as well, and so, shortly after his election in 1920, Governor Ritchie employed the Chicago engineering firm of Griffenhagen and Associates to undertake a survey of the state administrative structure and make appropriate recommendations for improvements. Why Ritchie chose an out-of-state consultant is not entirely clear; it was a decision he came to regret.

The consultant went about looking into all the various state agencies, including the governor's office. On 10 March 1921, in response to Ritchie's request (relayed through his secretary of state, Philip Perlman), Griffenhagen sent the governor an advance draft of that part of the report dealing with the executive office—primarily the governor's office, the secretary of state, and the Board of Public Works.<sup>5</sup>

The report dealt in great detail with the most routine matters—filing systems, office procedures, correspondence, and the like. But intermixed with this were some comments and suggestions to which Governor Ritchie took great exception. Some of these involved the Board of Public Works, which the consultant said should be abolished. The report stated that "the routine work of the Board of Public Works is a minor item in the work of the force [i.e., the executive office—the governor and the secretary of state] as a whole. The secretary of state as secretary of the board is at present handling its correspondence and other routine matters."<sup>6</sup>

Upon that premise the consultant suggested that the board be abolished by constitutional amendment, that its "functions with regard to public works, rent, leases, and insurance" be turned over to a new Department of Public Works, and that its "financial functions" be transferred to a proposed treasury council. This council was to consist of five persons—the governor, who would have two votes, the comptroller, who would be elected by the legislature, the director of finance (a gubernatorial appointee), and the chairmen of the House and Senate appropriations committees. The idea was an equal division of power between the executive and legislative branches, each having three votes.<sup>7</sup>

3. *Ibid.*, p. 131.

4. *Ibid.*, pp. 135-39; Acts of 1916, ch. 159.

5. Griffenhagen and Associates, "Advance Draft of Memorandum in re Organization of the Executive Department," 9 March 1921, Governor (Subject File), MdHR 8070.

6. *Ibid.*, p. 1.

7. *Ibid.*, p. 15; Griffenhagen and Associates, "Report on the Organization and Administration of the State Government," 15 April 1921, pt. 1, p. 20, Governor (Subject File), MdHR 8070 (hereafter Griffenhagen Report).