

tion of forests and wild life, regulation of banks and insurance, public utilities and administration of workmen's compensation. With the population practically at a standstill for the last twenty years, the per capita cost of state government has risen from \$2.60 to \$11.60.

In discussing the method of collecting and disbursing state funds, the report describes the improvements which have been made in the last two years in establishing a central accounting control over all state funds in the auditor's office. Annual examinations of the treasurer's and auditor's books are now made by competent accountants employed by the governor. The report recommends that a similar central control should be exercised over the revenue of the state by the auditor's office. At the present time, each department provides its own ways and means of collecting and checking the revenue and there is no standard method of central supervision for the collection of this revenue, which amounts to about three million dollars per year. Due to the practice of providing continuing appropriations and to special laws which appropriate revenue received to the departments which collect it, there is no budgetary control over about one-third of the annual revenue of the state. This money is expended without direct appropriation being made by the legislature and recommendation is made that this practice be discontinued, that all revenues collected be turned over promptly to the general fund, and that the legislature make appropriations for every governmental activity.

In conclusion some recommendations are made distinctly reactionary in character and so recognized by the board. The board points out that one method of decreasing the cost of government is to eliminate many of the activities which are now performed by the state. The repeal of all laws that support activities tending to stimulate and develop forestry, agriculture, or designed to regulate various lines of business, is suggested. Reduction in the appropriation for highways, return to the old public health system and reversion to the old system of obliging the towns to care for their own unfortunates, is suggested.

The report as a whole deals very largely with matters of finance and contains very little information which will be of value to students of state government, either in Vermont or in other states.

D. C. SOWERS.

Public Welfare Administration in Marion County, Indiana.—Marion County, Indiana, in which is situated the city of Indianapolis, is suffering from the ills which follow the attempt to manage a considerable portion of the affairs of a large urban community through the conventional institutions of county government. During the year 1920, the county commissioners caused to be made a survey of the county charitable and correctional institutions and the system of poor relief. The investigation was made by Henry C. Wright, Director of the Hospital and Institutional Bureau of Consultation, of New York City. The institutions under investigation, and concerning which a report with accompanying recommendations was made, include the county jail, the asylum for the insane, the asylum for the poor, the detention home for children and the tuberculosis hospital, as well as the system of outdoor relief.

Aside from the evils due to overcrowding in the several institutions, the most serious criticisms in the report are directed to the disposition of the insane and the administration of relief to the poor. A serious condition disclosed is that, because both the state and county asylums are crowded to capacity, within a period of two years no less than two hundred and forty-six persons suspected to be or adjudged to be insane have been incarcerated in the county jail. Though charged with no crime, these persons were confined in the jail an average period of nineteen days each.

The report recommends that at once a psychopathic service be established in connection with the state hospital in Indianapolis for the observation of cases, that the county asylum be closed and that all insane persons be committed to state institutions. It is recommended that legislation be secured forbidding the confinement of the insane in any institution except state insane asylums. This, it is believed, would remedy conditions, not only in Marion county, but elsewhere throughout the state where many insane are retained in the poorhouses. Such action would force the state to furnish the larger accommodations for those thus afflicted, which are already badly needed.

In Indiana, indoor relief is administered by the county commissioners, while outdoor relief is dispensed by the township trustee, though there is some interdependence between these authorities. In Marion county, as elsewhere through the state, especially in the cities, this system

seems to have been loosely administered and subject to serious abuses. This is especially charged in the case of the relief furnished by the trustees. It appears from an examination of the records that no recognized basis exists on which relief is given, nor do the records show the circumstances under which relief was granted, why it was discontinued, nor is it practicable, since the case books are not indexed, to know how frequently relief is extended to the same beneficiaries. Moreover, there seems to be no co-ordination of work with the activities of private agencies of relief.

The conclusion is drawn "That the machinery which was adequate for a small community has been outgrown, and is not now meeting the needs. The growth of population has so com-

plicated matters that new and better adapted machinery is imperative, if both the material and social needs are to be properly handled."

The final recommendation of the investigator is summed up as follows: "The obviously low standard of poor relief as administered in a township trustee's office, and the hampering of the work of the county commissioners due to the social problems which they must deal with, raises the question whether it would not produce better results to create a new board as an agent of the commission, whose functions it would be to administer the institutions now under their care, and to take over all of the 'overseer of the poor' work of the township trustees."

FRANK G. BATES.

Indiana University.