



A LEGISLATIVE
REFERENCE
LIBRARY
REPORT

HOW ARE STATE GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION
STUDIES ORGANIZED

Wisconsin Legislative Reference Library
State Capitol
Madison, Wisconsin

INFORMATIONAL BULLETIN 205, OCTOBER 1961

HOW ARE STATE GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION STUDIES ORGANIZED*

Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction	1
Methods of Studying Governmental Reorganization	1
Gubernatorial Reorganization Studies California, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Vermont	2
Joint Legislative-Executive Committees Missouri, New Jersey, Oregon, Washington	4
Special Legislative Interim Committees California, Hawaii, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan	5
Legislative Council Committees Alaska, Montana, Nebraska, Oklahoma	6
Legislative Fiscal Agencies Colorado	7
Table: Fiscal Services for State Legislatures	7
Wisconsin Efforts at Reorganization Griffenhagen Reports, Governor's Advisory Committee on Business Practices, State Government Operations Committee of the Legislative Council	9
Wisconsin Legislation to Study Reorganization Which Was Not Enacted	10
Permanent Legislative Committees on Reorganization of State Government	11
Footnotes	12

*Prepared by Patricia V. Robbins, Research Associate, Wisconsin Legislative Reference Library.

HOW ARE STATE GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION STUDIES ORGANIZED

INTRODUCTION

Bill No. 708, S., 1961, which has been held over for final consideration in the adjourned session of the 1961 Wisconsin Legislature, would establish a Continuing Efficiency Survey Commission to study the departmental structure of the state and to recommend to each Legislature improvements in the economy of the state. It would be a permanent commission composed of 9 members, 5 of whom would be legislators, the others being the state auditor and 3 public members appointed by the chairman of the Joint Committee on Finance. The legislative members would be the chairman of the Joint Committee on Finance and one senator and one assemblyman from each political party to be appointed by the majority leader and the minority leader of each house, respectively. The proposal requires that the legislators be the best qualified to serve on the commission.

This report describes the variety of agencies which have been created in the several states in the last decade to look into the matter of governmental reorganization. It is not intended to be all-inclusive, but rather, is meant to be representative of what has been done. Recent Wisconsin legislation in this area is also listed.

METHODS OF STUDYING GOVERNMENTAL REORGANIZATION

Governmental reorganization has been the subject of persistent study in many states in recent years. A variety of agencies has been created to pursue such studies, but, in general, their structure and composition fall into several fairly well-defined categories. At various times in history one procedure or another has been the popular one in general use.

One long-established method has been to call in a national management consultant, such as Griffenhagen & Associates or the Public Administration Service, to conduct a study. This was done in Wisconsin in the latter 1940's. It has the advantage of securing the services of expert, impartial observers unconnected with any political factions within a state, but the disadvantage of the possible lack of understanding by the consulting organization of a state's historical pattern of governmental development, including the subtle factors and traditions influencing such development. This could result in an attempt to fit the governmental structure into a rigid, preconceived formula. Then, too, there is a problem that sometimes arises when the consultants complete their work and depart, leaving no one intimately connected with the study to promote its adoption or to provide information.

In the early 1950's, following the issuance of the reports of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government (the Hoover Commission) by the federal government, a rash of "little Hoover commissions" sprang up around the nation. These were frequently commissions appointed by the Governor to conduct a grand over-all study of a state government, which made their recommendations, then disbanded. A committee of this nature can accomplish much if composed of high-caliber members supported by competent staff. There is always the risk, however, that a legislative body will look

upon studies instigated by the executive branch either with indifference or hostility, particularly if different political parties control each branch. Sometimes a commission established jointly by the executive and the legislative is created. Another method used is that in which the executive is authorized to reorganize subject to legislative approval.

As a result of a series of reorganization acts adopted by Congress beginning in 1945, expanded in 1949 and renewed by each Congress since, the President has been authorized to submit reorganization plans to Congress which would go into effect within 60 calendar days unless the latter passes a concurrent resolution disapproving the plan. Subsequently, this procedure has been adopted by several states, including New Hampshire in 1949 and Michigan in 1958. Oregon adopted it in 1959 for a specified period of time, while Pennsylvania adopted it for application only to reorganization within already existing agencies.⁽¹⁾ Such a plan was actually adopted in 1937 in Wisconsin under Governor La Follette, but was abolished in 1939 when an equally pretentious program was initiated by the Legislature. This procedure probably has the advantage of expediting reorganization programs. Presumably the executive branch is in a position to know more about the deficiencies in state administration than does the legislative branch, and this method enables it to initiate action more rapidly than can an unwieldy, part-time legislative body. Its disadvantage is that it reverses the roles of the executive and the legislative, with the legislature having veto power over the governor's legislation rather than his having such power over its legislation.

Another way of approaching such a study is by the establishment of a legislative interim committee, either under the legislative service agency - such as the legislative council - or as a separate interim committee. In a number of states legislative fiscal agencies perform a substantially similar function on a continuous basis. In Oklahoma, the entire Legislature as members of the council attempt an overview of the entire state picture each biennium. Studies under legislative auspices would presumably make the Legislature more cognizant of and sympathetic toward reorganization plans, but might cause it to encroach upon the prerogatives of the executive in supervising administration.

The remainder of this report will give some examples of methods used by specific states to study reorganization. In all probability no one method is inherently superior to the others, the success of a study depending primarily upon the political climate in any one state and the caliber of the people involved. It is worth noting too that a state will frequently use several methods and often, simultaneously.

GUBERNATORIAL REORGANIZATION STUDIES

In February 1959 the Governor of California appointed his 7-member Committee on Organization of State Government, which issued a comprehensive report the next December. The committee reviewed the development of government organization in California, analyzed its present structure, and reviewed reorganization efforts in California and other states. In September its tentative proposals were submitted to departmental officials for their comments and suggestions as well as to the Legislature. Task forces composed of key staff

people were created by the Governor to study the operational impact of the proposals. A task force report was issued prior to the publication of the committee's report.(2)

An Advisory Commission to the Governor on Reorganization of State Government was established by the Governor of Michigan, the recommendations of which he submitted to the Legislature in 1959 in the form of 7 reorganization plans. Under the Executive Reorganization Act these plans were to become effective unless vetoed by the Legislature. The commission solicited the suggestions of all interested parties and during the study of specific areas, the agencies involved were consulted. The Governor also conferred with the Senate and House State Affairs Committees on the plans.(3)

The Minnesota Self-Survey project was begun in 1955 by the Governor, who created a 15-member policy committee (including 4 legislators, 4 administrators, 4 representatives of the employe organization and 3 administrative technicians) and placed direction of the survey under the Commissioner of Administration. Thirty-three operational task forces were created to survey the administrative agencies. Each task force consisted of 5 members, one of whom was a legislator, one a budget examiner as chairman, an employe, an administrator and a technician. The task forces were to follow a work manual containing the questions which were to be answered. When their work was completed, 10 functional task forces, each consisting of 11 to 20 members, were created to analyze administrative problems on an inter-departmental basis.(4)

A different method was followed by the Governor of New York, who in January 1959 designated the Secretary to the Governor to initiate a review of governmental organization. The study was conducted by the secretary and his staff, and many of the recommendations were reviewed by department heads. The report was submitted to the Governor in December and then, with the Governor's memorandum, to the Legislature.(5)

The North Carolina Governor was authorized by law in 1953 to appoint a Commission on Reorganization of State Government, consisting of 9 members, who would report to the 1955 General Assembly. The authorization was later reenacted by the 1955, 1957 and 1959 General Assemblies. Thus it is substantially a continuing commission although recreated each biennium. The commission, when organized in 1953, made the Institute of Government at the University of North Carolina its research agency. The institute furnished the members with a handbook of state agencies and a report on the experiences of other states. The commission then limited its studies to what it thought it could accomplish in the given time and worked through subcommittees. Tentative recommendations were formulated, subject to modification after receipt of suggestions from the agency heads. Legislation was drafted for submission to the General Assembly.(6)

The Governor of Oregon created a Reorganization Advisory Committee consisting of 17 members, including 2 senators, 2 representatives and 2 former governors. The committee held 6 meetings, but did not conduct hearings or engage in any independent research. In the Governor's report to the 1961 Legislature he included his recommendations for governmental reorganization together with the proposals of the committee.(7)

The Vermont Commission to Study State Government, created by law in 1957, was appointed by the Governor, but its 7 members were to include one senator and 2 representatives. At least 2 members were to be of the minority political party. The commission was given an appropriation of \$35,000.(8) It employed an executive secretary and a part-time consultant, assigned specific research projects to several people, created an Advisory Committee on Research and Planning, composed of experts in political science and economics to assist in general research and planning, and appointed 6 task forces to study specific subjects. It also employed a professional management consultant firm (Cresap, McCormick and Paget) to make 2 studies for it. Suggestions from the Legislature and departments of state government were invited, and detailed questionnaires were sent to department heads.(9)

JOINT LEGISLATIVE-EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES

A number of states have set up joint executive-legislative study groups to consider reorganization. As was pointed out in the preceding section, some governor-appointed committees include legislators. In others the governor and the legislature each appoint members. Missouri, for example, established a State Reorganization Commission in 1953 to report in 1955, consisting of 12 members, of whom 4 were senators appointed by the President Pro Tem of the Senate, 4 were representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House and 4 were appointed by the Governor. Half of each group were to be of the minority political party. A \$40,000 appropriation was granted. The commission was authorized to use the staff of the Committee on Legislative Research of the General Assembly to conduct such research and do whatever bill drafting was desired, but the heavy regular work load of the legislative research committee made it necessary to engage outside assistance. It therefore procured a full-time staff and part-time consultants from political science departments of nearby universities. The commission held public hearings plus regular commission meetings, wherein policy matters were decided and staff work reviewed. A special group of experts was recruited to study the financial departments of the state government, and a national specialist was consulted in the area of records management.(10)

Another such joint enterprise was the Commission to Study the Organization and Operation of the Executive Branch of the State Government, created by the New Jersey Legislature in 1954 and reporting to it in January 1956. It consisted of 3 members appointed by the Governor, 3 appointed by the President of the Senate and 3 appointed by the Speaker of the General Assembly. No more than 2 from each category could be of the same political party. The commission was authorized to hold hearings, employ assistance and use the services of governmental departments. It concerned itself primarily with the preparation of complete charts of each of the state departments and recommended creation of another commission to study government reorganization.(11)

By joint resolution the Oregon Legislative Assembly in 1957 created the Legislative Interim Committee on Government Reorganization, comprised of 3 representatives appointed by the Speaker, 2 senators appointed by the President of the Senate and 4 citizens at large selected by the Governor, and directed it to report to the next

Legislative Assembly. The committee employed an executive director, met at least once a month and delegated various aspects of its studies to subcommittees. Deciding that it lacked the time to review all state agencies, it limited its activities to urgent problems and to the development of procedures which could be used for further studies. It reviewed principles of reorganization and patterns of administration in Oregon, then arrived at a group of standards to guide them. The committee also used the device of developing alternatives, then inviting agency heads to testify on them. Bills were drafted for legislative consideration.(12)

The Washington Committee on State Government Organization was created in 1951 and continued for another biennium in 1953. It was appointed by the Governor and the Legislative Council together with its Subcommittee on State and Local Government and consisted of 38 members plus 8 ex officio members. The Governor and council each contributed \$15,000 for the first biennial appropriation and \$25,000 and \$5,000 respectively for the second biennium. The committee employed an executive secretary and staff, created an executive committee of 19 members, held conferences with department heads, and appointed 6 subcommittees to study specific areas. Some subcommittee members were recruited from outside the committee membership. The subcommittees divided their subject matter into short-term and long-term projects and devoted themselves to the former for the remainder of the biennium. In 1953 the committee presented 11 bills and one joint resolution to the Legislature, but none was adopted. In the second biennium of its work the old subcommittees were abandoned, the executive committee reviewed some of the old proposals, and a new subcommittee was created to make a major study of the tax collection system.(13)

SPECIAL LEGISLATIVE INTERIM COMMITTEES

Another frequently used method for studying governmental reorganization is to establish a legislative interim committee. In the last decade California has had a series of such committees, frequently several at once. In 1949, for example, a Senate Interim Committee on Governmental Reorganization was created. A successor committee was the Senate Interim Committee on Government Organization, created in 1953. In that same year a comparable Assembly committee was established and also a Joint Legislative Committee on Governmental Reorganization. The latter consisted of 5 assemblymen appointed by the Speaker and 5 senators appointed by the Committee on Rules. It was continued in 1955. Since the 3 committees created in 1953 all had similar functions, an effort was made to avoid duplication in their work by assigning different areas to each. The joint committee appointed subcommittees to work on assigned subjects and hold hearings.(14) In 1957, still another group, the Assembly Interim Committee on Governmental Efficiency and Economy was created and was continued in 1959 for the next biennium. It also worked through a group of subcommittees.(15)

The 1959 Joint Legislative Committee on Government Reorganization created by the Hawaiian Territorial Legislature was composed of 8 senators and 8 representatives. The committee called in a number of experts on the subject and held several discussions with them in order to familiarize themselves with the general background of the

subject and review reorganization experiences of other state governments. Then they examined previous such studies in Hawaii, talked to the people in charge of them, and invited the comments of department heads on the previous recommendations. In the meantime, the committee's staff conducted studies on the programs administered by the territorial departments. Department heads were also given the opportunity to challenge the recommendations made in the staff studies. In the final report the committee set forth its conclusions and drafted a bill incorporating its proposals.(16)

The Iowa Governmental Reorganization Study Committee, made up of 3 representatives and 3 senators, was created by joint resolution in 1955 and was to report in 1957. The committee made a detailed study of the functions and administration of each agency, conducted conference hearings with department heads and drafted legislation.(17)

In 1957 by joint resolution the Kansas Legislature created the Legislative Committee on Economy and Efficiency, consisting of 3 senators and 4 representatives. The committee employed an executive secretary and studied each agency of state government. One of its recommendations called for the establishment of a continuing committee in this field, but this was apparently not accepted.(18)

Although an older committee, the Michigan Joint Legislative Committee on Reorganization of State Government, comprised of 7 representatives and 6 senators plus one representative of the Governor, might be mentioned, because of the comprehensive number of staff reports which it issued in 1950, one for each state agency. These staff reports appear to have been quite thorough.(19)

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL COMMITTEES

Although legislative councils and similar legislative service agencies are naturally always working on matters relating to the improvement of state government, sometimes a council will be specifically charged with the general over-all study of the problem of government reorganization. The Alaska Legislature, for example, by joint resolution directed the Legislative Council in 1958 to prepare a study and make recommendations for the general reorganization of the territorial government. The council's report touched upon reorganization elsewhere, trends, previous reorganization in Alaska, current structure of the government, and made recommendations.(20)

By resolutions adopted in both houses in 1959 the Montana Legislative Council was directed to study consolidation and organization of state agencies and report to the next Legislature. The council carried out this directive through 2 subcommittees--the Governmental Efficiency Subcommittee and the Budget Analysis and Finance Subcommittee, each composed of legislative members. The council formulated standards for reorganization, prepared an organization chart of the present structure, selected certain areas for detailed study, developed proposals for reorganization within these areas, and recommended that the next Legislative Council formulate a general plan for the reorganization of the executive branch.(21)

Similarly, the 1959 Nebraska Legislature directed its Legislative Council to study the functions and duties of the administrative

departments and to recommend to the 1961 Legislature ways to produce efficiency and economy in state government. The council thereupon created a Committee on State Government Reorganization of 9 of its members to conduct the study. The committee decided to concentrate on some of the more immediate problems and adopted a specific study program. During the course of its work it met with the majority of department heads and others in open meetings. (22)

The Oklahoma Legislative Council was revised in 1949 to include all legislators in its membership, and in 1951 it was specifically charged by statute "to investigate and study the possibilities for consolidations in the state government, for elimination of all unnecessary activities and of all duplication in office personnel and equipment, and of the coordination of departmental activities, and of methods of increasing efficiency and of effecting economies." Therefore, the council always has among its committees a committee on state and local government. 23

LEGISLATIVE FISCAL AGENCIES

A major method by which state legislatures have carried on a continuing survey of governmental agencies has been by means of legislative fiscal agencies. These are frequently agencies supervised by a legislative committee which work in the areas of budget analysis, study of revenues and expenditures and post-audit.

One such agency, the Colorado Joint Budget Committee, was specifically directed by the General Assembly in 1959 to study ways and means of increasing economical and efficient administration in Colorado state government and report its recommendation to the next General Assembly. The committee reviewed past efforts, made some recommendations and stressed the continuing nature of reorganization. (24)

The following table lists the legislative fiscal agencies by state together with their functions.

Table I: Fiscal Services for State Legislatures (25)

State	Staff Agency	Budget Review and Analysis	Continuous Study of Revenues and Expenditures	Legislative Post-Audit
Ala.	Department of Examiners of Public Accounts	--	--	X
Alaska	Division of Legislative Audit	--	--	X
Ariz.	Post Auditor	--	--	X
Ark.	Division of Legislative Audit Legislative Council	-- X ^a	-- X	X --
Calif.	Office of the Auditor General Legislative Analyst	-- X ^b	-- X	X --
Colo.	Joint Budget Committee	X	X	--
Conn.	Auditors of Public Accounts	--	--	X

Table I: Fiscal Services for State Legislatures (25)-Continued

State	Staff Agency	Budget Review and Analysis	Continuous Study of Revenues and Expenditures	Legislative Post-Audit
Fla.	Legislative Reference Bureau	--	X	--
	State Auditing Department	X	X	X
Ga.	Department of Audits and Accounts	--	--	X
Ill.	Legislative Audit Commission	--	X	X
	Illinois Budgetary Commission	X ^b	X	--
	Department of Audits	--	--	X
Iowa	Budget and Financial Control Committee	X ^b	X	--
Kans.	Legislative Budget Committee (Legislative Council)	--	X	--
Maine	Department of Audit	--	--	X
Mich.	Legislative Service Bureau	X	X	--
Md.	Fiscal Research Bureau (Department of Legislative Reference)	X	X	--
Mass.	Senate Committee on Ways and Means	X	--	--
	House Ways and Means Committee	X	X	--
Minn.	Legislative Research Committee	X	X	--
Miss.	Commission of Budget and Accounting	X ^c	X	--
Nebr.	Legislative Council	X	X	--
Nev.	Legislative Auditor (Legislative Council)	X	X	X
N.H.	Legislative Budget Assistant	X	X	X
N.J.	Legislative Budget and Finance Director (Law Revision and Legislative Services Commission)	X ^b	X	--
	Office of State Auditor	--	--	X
N.Mex.	Legislative Fiscal Analyst	X	X	--
Ohio	Legislative Service Commission	X	X	--
Okla.	Legislative Audit Committee (Legislative Council)	X	X	X
Oreg.	Legislative Fiscal Officer	X	X	--
Pa.	Legislative Analyst	X	X	--
	House Appropriations Committee	--	X	X

Table I: Fiscal Services for State Legislatures²⁵--Continued

State	Staff Agency	Budget Review and Analysis	Continuous Study of Revenues and Expenditures	Legislative Post-Audit
Puerto Rico	Office of Controller	--	--	X
R.I.	Fiscal Advisory Staff to House Finance Committee	X	X	X
S.Dak.	Dept. of Audits and Accounts	--	--	X
Tenn.	Comptroller of the Treasury	--	--	X
Texas	Legislative Budget Board	X ^d	X	--
	State Auditor	--	X	X
Utah	Legislative Auditor (Legislative Council)	X	X	--
Va.	Auditor of Public Accounts	--	--	X
Wash.	Legislative Budget Committee	X	X	--
W.Va.	Legislative Auditor	X	X	X

Footnotes to Table I

^aArkansas. Is the budget-making authority.

^bCalifornia, Illinois, Iowa, New Jersey. Participate in budget preparation.

^cMississippi. Is the agency which prepares the state budget.

^dTexas. Prepares the legislative budget.

WISCONSIN EFFORTS AT REORGANIZATION

In the past dozen years Wisconsin has approached the problem of studying reorganization of state government from various angles. In 1946 the Legislature authorized the Emergency Board to employ an agency to survey the state salary system and recommend ways and means to effect economy and efficiency in government (Chapter 2, Laws Spec. Sess. 1946). \$50,000 was appropriated, and Griffenhagen & Associates was hired. A series of reports, each on an individual state agency, was issued under its auspices. (26)

The Division of Departmental Research, which had originally been created as part of the Executive Department (Chapter 30, Laws 1939) was reactivated by the Chief Executive in 1949 and directed to study the operation and functions of state departments. (27)

In 1951, the Department of Budget and Accounts was authorized to hire budget analysts, whose duties included analyzing departmental budget requests and making financial studies of state agencies. (28)

When the Department of Administration was created by Chapter 228, Laws 1959, the Division of Departmental Research and the budget analysts were incorporated into the Bureau of Management within that department. It has not been customary for these various executive agencies to issue any reports on their work other than recommendations regarding appropriations set forth in the executive budget.

In 1960, the Governor appointed his nonstatutory Advisory Committee on Business Practices to study ways of improving practices and procedures of the state agencies. The committee, working through 7 task forces, each of which included among its membership state administrative personnel and a legislator, issued several reports in 1961. The reports dealt with accounting, budget control and performance evaluation, administration of the state building construction program and space utilization, building maintenance, electronic data processing, personnel administration, procurement, and improvement in state administration. (29)

These studies represent efforts of the executive branch of the government in this field. Legislative activity has revolved primarily around the work of the Joint Legislative Council. Most council studies have been concerned with specific problems of state government rather than with an over-all study. In 1955, however, its Committee on State Government Operations was created (Jt. Res. 59, S., 1955), which was continued in the 1957-59 interim (Jt. Res. 97, S., 1957) with an enlarged membership to study the administrative and budgetary structure of the state government. The first committee was composed of 3 senators and 4 assemblymen, and at least 2 of its members were to be council members, while the second interim committee consisted of 4 senators and 5 assemblymen, with 5 of the members to be also members of the Joint Committee on Finance. A budget analyst was to be released to it for the study. The reports of these committees were included in the regular Legislative Council reports for those years.

WISCONSIN LEGISLATION TO STUDY REORGANIZATION WHICH WAS NOT ENACTED

A number of bills and joint resolutions have been introduced in the Wisconsin Legislature in the past decade to study reorganization. Bills 455, S., 1953; 283, A., 1955; and 373, S. and 544, A., 1957, all proposed the legislative veto method. They would have directed the Governor to study the organization of state departments, submit reorganization plans to the Legislature, and effectuate them if the Legislature had not disapproved in 60 days. Similarly, Jt. Res. 44, S. and 69, A. of 1961 would have created a new section of the Wisconsin Constitution to permit the Governor to make changes in the organization of the administrative branch of the state. Where such changes required the force of law, he would issue an executive order which would also become effective unless disapproved by the Legislature within 60 days.

A joint legislative-executive study was proposed in Bill 488, S. and Jt. Res. 21, S., 1957, which would have created a Commission on Governmental Organization and Operation comprised of 3 members from each house (not more than 2 from each house being of the same political party) appointed as are standing committees, 6 citizen members appointed by the Governor and one member appointed by the Governor from his staff to serve as secretary. The study was to be conducted

in a 3-year period, and a detailed procedure to be followed was outlined.

Among proposals for legislative studies to be made on this subject was Jt. Res. 86, S., 1961, directing the Legislative Council to create a special committee to study the structure of the administrative branch and report in 1963.

Bill 691, S., 1959, which would have accepted a Ford Foundation grant to study ways of improving legislative services, provided for the appointment of a 7-member committee (including 2 senators and 2 assemblymen) by the Legislative Council to conduct a pilot study, one phase of which was to deal with developing new techniques and procedures for examining department appropriation requests.

Bill 142, A., 1957, would have created a permanent committee, the Joint Survey Committee on Economy and Efficiency in State Government consisting of 10 members (the Assembly and Senate chairmen of the Joint Committee on Finance or their respective nominees, one senator and 2 assemblymen appointed as are standing committees, and 5 civilian members to be chosen by the 5 legislative members) appointed for 4-year terms, which committee would report its findings and recommendations to the Joint Committee on Finance at the beginning of each regular session. Another bill introduced that year to create a continuing committee was Bill 233, A., 1957, which would have created a Joint Legislative Committee on Economy and Efficiency, consisting of 4 senators and 5 assemblymen appointed as are standing committees for 2-year terms. The other bill to create a permanent committee was the aforementioned Bill 708, S., 1961.

Jt. Res. 64, S., 1957, would have created a Committee to Study Economy in Government, composed of 2 senators and 3 assemblymen selected from the minority party by the minority party caucuses of the respective houses, and to report to the 1959 Legislature.

PERMANENT LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEES ON REORGANIZATION OF STATE GOVERNMENT

Although legislative councils and legislative fiscal agencies are permanent agencies, a brief survey of the several states did not uncover an example of any other type of continuing legislative agency specifically charged with the general, over-all study of governmental reorganization. As has been noted, some temporary committees, notably in California and North Carolina, have been recreated each biennium, and the Kansas Legislative Committee on Economy and Efficiency recommended establishment of a continuing agency.

It is interesting to note also that the reports issued by the numerous study groups in the various states in this field all have one thing in common. They indicate that the whole subject is of such magnitude that they could not cover the entire area in the usual biennium. They were generally obliged either to narrow the scope of their activities or at least to recommend that further studies be made.

FOOTNOTES

- ¹ The Council of State Governments, The Book of the States, 1960-61, p. 118-19.
- ² Governor's Committee on Organization of State Government, The Agency Plan for California, report to Edmund G. Brown, Governor, 1959, p.1-2.
- ³ Gov. G. Mennen Williams, Message to the Seventieth Michigan Legislature, February 11, 1959, p. 1-3.
- ⁴ The Minnesota Self-Survey, Reports of the Functional Task Forces and Summary Review, 1956, p. 1-10.
- ⁵ William J. Ronan, Secretary to the Governor, Proposed Reorganization of the Executive Branch of New York State Government, report to Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller and Governor's memorandum to the legislature, December 1959, p. 1, 5.
- ⁶ North Carolina, 1959 Session Laws, Jt. Res. 71; 1953 Session Laws, Res. 21. N.C. Commission on Reorganization of State Government, Organization and Methods of Research and Study, first report, 1954. ...Reports of the 1957-1959 Commission on Reorganization of State Government, 1958, p. 6-7. ...The Reports of the 1959-61 Commission on Reorganization of State Government, 1960.
- ⁷ Governor Mark O. Hatfield, Recommendations for Reorganization of the Executive Branch, State of Oregon, December 1959, p. 1,5.
- ⁸ Laws of Vermont, 1957, Act 283.
- ⁹ Vermont Commission to Study State Government, The Operation of Vermont State Government, report to the General Assembly on the results of its studies and its recommendations, January 1959, p. 9-14.
- ¹⁰ State Reorganization Commission of Missouri, Report, January 10, 1955, p. 25-31, 188-90.
- ¹¹ New Jersey Commission to Study Organization and Operation of the Executive Branch of the State Government, Report Submitted to the Legislature, January 10, 1956, p. 1-10.
- ¹² Oregon Legislative Interim Committee on Government Reorganization, State Government Organization in Oregon 1958, p. 1, 1-2.
- ¹³ Washington Committee on State Government Organization, First Report, January 1953, p. 5-8. ...Second Report, January 1955, p. 5-6.
- ¹⁴ California Joint Legislative Committee on Governmental Reorganization, Management and Fiscal Control Functions of the California Department of Finance, 1955, p. 7-8.
- ¹⁵ California Assembly Interim Committee on Governmental Efficiency and Economy, Report, 1959, p. 5.
- ¹⁶ Hawaii 1959 Joint Legislative Committee on Government Reorganization, Report on Organization of the Hawaii State Government to the First Hawaii State Legislature, August 31, 1959, p. 1-4.
- ¹⁷ Iowa Governmental Reorganization Study Committee, Report to the Fifty-seventh General Assembly, 1957, p. 1.

FOOTNOTES--Continued

- 18 Kansas Legislative Committee on Economy and Efficiency, Recommendations, vol. 1, January 1959, forward, p. 93-94.
- 19 Michigan Joint Legislative Committee on Reorganization of State Government, Staff Reports, 1950, inside cover.
- 20 Alaska Legislative Council, A Preliminary Report and Special Final Addendum on the Study Devoted to Reorganization of Territorial Government, 1958-59, p. 1.
- 21 Montana Legislative Council, The Organization and Administration of State Government, report no. 3, November 1960, p. 7-9.
- 22 Nebraska Legislative Council, Report of the Nebraska Legislative Council Committee on State Government Reorganization, November 1960, p. 2, 5-6.
- 23 Oklahoma Legislative Council, Sixth Biennial Report and Recommendations 1957-1959, December 6, 1958, p. vii.
- 24 Colorado Joint Budget Committee, Efficiency and Economy in Colorado State Government, Report to the Colorado General Assembly, March 1961, p. 1-6.
- 25 Council of State Governments, Fiscal Services for State Legislatures, 1961, p. 4-6.
- 26 Wisconsin Division of Departmental Research, Reports covering the majority of the agencies of the state government, prepared by Griffenhagen and Associates, 43 parts, 1946-47.
- 27 Wisconsin Blue Book, 1952, p. 222.
- 28 Ibid., p. 283.
- 29 Wisconsin Governor's Advisory Committee on Business Practices, Reports and Recommendations, 8 parts, 1960-61.