The Council of State Governments

STATE AND LOCAL COOPERATION IN THE WAR PROGRAM*

The last meeting of the Board of Managers of the Council of State Governments was held in Washington on December 13, 1941. Just six days before, America had been catapulted into the War—a worldwide war, and a war which all realized would tax to the limit our resources, our ingenuity, our statesmanship, and our patriotism—a war which would determine the fate of America along with the fate of the rest of the world.

At that meeting, the annual report closed with this statement:

The nation is now at War. All defense plans and programs developed over a period of the last eighteen months will be accelerated; and there will be repeated calls for action and more action all along the line of federal, state, and local government.

And, in accordance with the resolutions and actions of the Council itself and all of its component organizations and associations, we plan to devote our entire time, our entire staff, and all of our facilities to the one all important problem—the defense of America.

By way of background, and in order to appraise accurately the defense and the war situations as they have developed and the Council's participation therein, a brief review seems indicated.

DEFENSE ORGANIZATIONS

Immediately after the establishment of the National Defense Advisory Com-

*Annual Report of Frank Bane, Executive Director of the Council of State Governments.
more adequately equipped, have become a definite and important part of our defense organization.

The states have developed police mobilization plans to maintain law and order within their boundaries, and to cooperate with the Department of Justice and the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the development of ways and means for the prevention of subversive activities and sabotage.

In the congested areas, the states, through their councils of defense, have promoted and developed ways and means of fire prevention and control and plans for the evacuation of the civilian population in case of necessity. They have also organized and are now operating training courses to equip workers for industry and for civilian defense activities.

From the beginning, the states have cooperated with the Office of Production Management, now the War Production Board, and the War Manpower Commission in promoting the fullest use of all of their industrial facilities and personnel for the war effort, and in the development of sound business and economic procedures through which much of the war work can be handled by small industrial establishments.

And so, when War came, the states were organized, necessary machinery had been established and was working, and they were equipped and ready to take over the greater duties and responsibilities which were to be thrust upon them as an all-important part of the war program.

RUBBER CONSERVATION PROGRAM

These additional duties and responsibilities were not long in coming. The very day after the last annual meeting of the Board of Managers of the Council, a new problem confronted the country, the like of which America had never experienced before. America had always been, or thought it was, a "have" nation. It discovered on December 14 that with respect to one of its most critical materials it was a "have not" nation. Briefly, our source of rubber had been almost entirely cut off, and our stockpile of rubber was hardly large enough to meet the needs of the armed forces alone for a period of two years. There was the fact, and America for the first time in its history was face-to-face with rationing.

The Office of Price Administration requested the Council of State Governments to assist it and to assume the responsibility for organizing and operating in every community throughout the United States necessary machinery for conserving and allocating the largest part of the stockpile of rubber then in existence—the tires in stock, and the tires on the wheels of the country's thirty-odd million motor vehicles. This job had to be done rapidly to avoid enormous waste; and it had to be done effectively in order to avoid serious damage to the economic and transport systems.

This job was checked to the states. They organized the machinery and operated the machinery. They organized it throughout the country in the short space of three weeks; and they have operated it so effectively that as additional rationing has become necessary the same machinery has taken on the additional jobs without the repeated reorganization that has all too often characterized some parts of the war effort.

Six months after this machinery was established, on May 25, 1942, on a nationwide broadcast, the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration said:

One Sunday afternoon just one week after Pearl Harbor, we had an important meeting at the Office of Price Administration in Washington to decide how we were going to go about rationing tires. As we saw the job it would take about six months to set up the necessary machinery and organization. But the rubber situation was—and still is—so serious that we couldn't wait that long.

Tire-rationing had to go into effect immediately, which meant that we would have to do a six-months' job of organizing in about three weeks. There was one organization represented at that meeting which was confident that we could do it. Without hesitation, the Council of State Governments told us that it would have a nationwide system of local boards set up and ready to go to work by the time we were ready to begin tire-rationing.

And that is exactly what it did. Three weeks from that Sunday, the whole system of local rationing boards was set up and ready to operate. It has been operating ever since—an elo-
TRAD E BARRIERS

Long before the War, the Council of State Governments had been interested in interstate trade barriers. The elimination of such barriers had been one of its major projects since 1938. A country at war could not afford the luxury of internal trade barriers that curtailed its markets, hampered its movements, and reduced its effectiveness.

The Army, the Navy, and various other war agencies discussed this problem with the Council of State Governments upon several occasions; the Council urged that the war agencies carefully appraise the problem to determine what laws, rules, and regulations were impeding the war effort, and what solution was feasible.

The Council further suggested to the President that he appoint a small committee consisting of heads of war agencies to work with a similar committee from the states, in order to determine what the situation really was and to do something about it immediately.

On May 10, the President addressed the following letter to the Secretary of Commerce:

My dear Mr. Secretary:

As you know, divergent State laws and regulations are impeding many phases of the war effort. These impediments to full production were discussed at your conference last week between representatives of the State governments and Federal war agencies. Specific solutions must be developed.

The Council of State Governments has suggested that I appoint a committee from the war agencies to meet with the Executive Committee of the Governors' Conference and formulate these solutions.

I am appointing you chairman of the committee from the Federal Government. Other members are the Secretary of the Treasury, the Attorney General, the Under Secretary of War, the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, the Chairman of the War Production Board, the Director of the Office of Price Administration, the Director of the Office of Defense Transportation, and the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission.

I suggest that you communicate at once with Mr. Frank Bane, Executive Director of the Council of State Governments, and arrange a meeting of your committee with the Executive Committee of the Governors' Conference early next week.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

On May 20, the Executive Committee of the Governors' Conference met with the President's Committee; after thorough exploration, the President's Committee determined, and so advised the Executive Committee of the Governors' Conference, that there was only one category of state laws and regulations that was definitely impeding the war effort and for which it had a ready solution to suggest. These restrictions had to do with motor transport, and the solution suggested was the adoption by the states of uniform minimum size and weight requirements.

The War Department had adopted as its own a set of minimum requirements first developed by a northeastern regional conference of commissions on interstate cooperation.

The Executive Committee of the Governors' Conference agreed that something had to be done about this matter, and had to be done immediately. It further agreed to assume the responsibility of seeing that all of the states cooperated with the war agencies in establishing uniform motor truck standards throughout the country. Ten days later, all the states had assured the President and the war agencies that the uniform standards recommended were in effect and would continue in effect for the duration of the War.

WAR FISCAL POLICIES

It was apparent more than a year ago that the prosecution of the War would require expenditures the like of which this country, or in fact any other country, had never dreamed. Simply to preserve the United States of America was going to necessitate the expenditure of hundreds of billions of dollars. Such expenditures and tax rates necessary to support them could not but have a profound influence upon governmental policies as well as upon economic structure.

It was imperative that federal and state fiscal policies be closely coordinated in
order to insure adequate resources for the federal government in its conduct of the War, and for the states in the maintenance and operation of their organization, duties, responsibilities, and services which are in fact the very essence of democratic government.

A cooperative fiscal plan, developed by the Tax Committee of the Council of State Governments, was approved by the Executive Committee of the Governors Conference and by the Board of Managers of the Council at its annual meeting in 1941. Legislatures in session in 1942, almost without exception, followed this plan.

The Tax Committee has continued to work on this problem. Four regional meetings have been held, and the policy and program have been changed to meet rapidly changing conditions.

Later, the President of the United States moved further to implement this fiscal cooperation.

My dear Mr. Bane:

I am today asking the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Budget to represent the Federal Government on the joint Federal-state-local committee on fiscal policies and practices, which you proposed in your letter of September 1. Both these gentlemen have taken great interest, officially and individually, in the problems you propose to consider. I am sure they will be glad to work with the state and local committee established by the Council of State Governments.

On several occasions I have spoken of the importance of Federal-state-local fiscal relationships. In my Budget Message in January, 1941, I reiterated my belief that no really satisfactory tax reform can be achieved until this fiscal relationship is readjusted. In the Budget Message in 1942 I reviewed briefly the measures by which state and local governments have undertaken to reinforce the national fiscal policy for the war and post-war period. Through traditional democratic practices and within the framework of our federal system of government, we are moving steadily toward a healthier fiscal relationship. I hope the new joint committee will contribute to this progress by formulating sound and practical recommendations for legislative and administrative actions for the Federal government, for the State governments, and for the local governments.

Sincerely yours,

/J/ FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

The rubber situation did not get better. Instead, it became more critical; conflicting reports, conflicting plans, and conflicting statements did not contribute to a constructive solution. On August 6, the President appointed a Committee, consisting of Messrs. Baruch, Conant, and Compton, to make a study of the situation and to submit a report with recommendations.

The Committee reported on September 10; one of its recommendations, particularly stressed, was the necessity for reducing speed limits of motor vehicles throughout the country to thirty-five miles an hour.

Several days later, the Chairman of the Governors' Conference wired all the governors urging that necessary steps be taken to establish and enforce the thirty-five-mile speed limit in all the states. Some ten days later, the newly appointed Rubber Administrator, Mr. Jeffers, requested the Council of State Governments to cooperate with him in this matter; the Council was able to report that the rubber program was in effect already in most of the states, and would be in effect throughout the country well before the date of October 1, which he specified.

On October 1, the Council received the following telegram from Mr. Jeffers:

Greatly appreciate your telegram of today and the assistance rendered by your organization in obtaining cooperation of the various States in the matter of reducing highway speeds.

W. M. JEFFERS—War Production Board

HOUSING PROBLEMS

More recently, the Administrator of the National Housing Agency has requested the Council of State Governments to assist that organization in developing and perfecting its policies, plans, and programs to make the fullest use of existing houses, apartments, and structures in providing homes for the millions of war workers manning the production lines. In scores of congested areas throughout the United States the housing situation was so critical as to constitute a serious brake upon any all-out effort.

The Chairman of the Board of Managers of the Council of State Govern-
ments and the Chairman of the Governors' Conference agreed that the Director of the Council should give as much time as possible to this assignment, with the understanding that it would be completed prior to January 1, 1943. It was well under way, and all necessary preliminary work on the part of the Council had been done before that date.

WAR LEGISLATION

War legislation and law enforcement have been major matters of interest and concern to the Council for the past two years.

In the closest cooperation with the Department of Justice, and working through commissions on interstate cooperation in all the states, and with the assistance of the Attorneys General Association and the Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, necessary war legislation has been drafted, suggested to the states, adjusted by the states to meet their individual needs, and to a large extent enacted into law.

It is particularly interesting and significant to note again that in the beginning of the defense program a method of operation was established between federal and state governments which recognized the fact of the federated system of the government of the United States—and that, since it did, this machinery and this method of operation, as in other fields, have proceeded in an orderly manner to accomplish the most effective results.

It is also important to mention that these results have been accomplished in the states, and among the states, because of the farsighted wisdom of those who established the Council of State Governments many years ago and built it upon well-organized state commissions on interstate cooperation, composed largely of legislative leaders in all the states. These commissions were ready-made vehicles, and they have taken on defense and war assignments in a manner which must be gratifying to them and certainly is of great benefit to the country.

In reviewing the progress made in these matters, the Attorney General of the United States wrote as follows:

My dear Frank:

I was pleased to learn from your letter of May 29, 1942, that in accordance with the suggestion made at the recent meeting of the President's Committee, the Council of State Governments has expanded its facilities here in Washington in order to service more effectively the various Federal departments and agencies, especially those involved in war activities, in their relations with state governments.

The Council and the states have already been of substantial aid in the prosecution of the war. Acting in collaboration with this Department, the Council has been especially helpful in preparing and getting adopted in the various states legislative and administrative measures needed by the different Federal departments and agencies in connection with their war activities. The enlargement of your facilities here, of course, will enable this assistance to continue on an even larger scale.

It is a source of deep gratification that the states, as well as the people generally, have responded so wholeheartedly and patriotically to the emergency. You can be personally proud of the fact that now, when the aid of the states is so needed, they are better organized to render that assistance than at any time in the nation's history.

Sincerely,

/s/ FRANCIS BIDDLE

ROUTINE ACTIVITIES

Whereas war activities have had first call upon the resources, the facilities, and the staff of the Council of State Governments, the Council has continued its regular activities and has expanded its organization and its services. At the direction of the Board of Managers, it has enlarged its Washington Office, and an additional regional office has been set up, staffed, and is operating on the Pacific Coast.

The Interstate Commission, on the Delaware River Basin has reorganized its activities to meet war needs, and is continuing to demonstrate what can be done through interstate cooperation in the handling of definite and specific projects.

The Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin is now on a self-supporting basis, is well-staffed and operating effectively.

The International Board of Inquiry for the Great Lakes Fisheries, of which the Assistant Director of the Council of
State Governments was Chairman, has completed its studies, and a report with recommendations has been made to both the United States and the Canadian governments. Definite action with respect to this problem is expected from both governments in the very near future.

The Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission has likewise been organized by the states. It is entirely self-supporting—and so another project requiring the close cooperation and joint operation of the states is an accomplished fact and is executed through an effective organization.

Many interstate problems have arisen during the year—problems having to do with forestry and conservation, with banking and insurance, with reciprocity, and with boundary lines. All these problems have been the subjects of study and research and of definite constructive action by the commissions on interstate cooperation.

The Council has continued to maintain, and has recently expanded, its research and inquiry facilities, and it has maintained and expanded its publications to keep pace with increasing needs.

**THE COUNCIL AS A WAR AGENCY**

And so the Council of State Governments, established more than fifteen years ago as a governmental organization dedicated to the solution of interstate problems of peace, has become in fact as well as in theory a “war” agency. It has become a war agency which has been called upon time and time again by the national government to assist in developing and operating the war program. It has become a war agency which, it is felt, has been of inestimable value to the states as they have assumed the many and difficult problems which have arisen, and as they have ordered their affairs in such a way that all of the governments—federal, state, and local—composed of the same people—can and do present a united front against a common foe.

Many times the Council has had occasion to get in touch with the states and ask them to do things—unusual things—outside the scope of ordinary governmental functions and machinery. And many times, in its efforts to assist the federal government in the war effort, the Council has asked the states to take over, to organize, and to operate emergency tasks in record time—tasks of the utmost importance to the successful prosecution of the War and the preservation of our democratic government and economic stability.

Always—always, there have been no exceptions—the states have accepted these responsibilities, undertaken these wartime jobs, and performed these services with a spirit, speed, and effectiveness that has renewed the confidence of our people everywhere in the effectiveness of democratic government and the federated system.

The Council’s plans for next year are no different from those of the current year. They are: to do anything and everything necessary and possible to contribute its utmost to the winning of the War in the shortest possible time.
THE ORGANIZATION OF THE COUNCIL

The Council of State Governments is a joint governmental agency established by the states, serving the states, and supported by the states.

It is the secretariat for the Governors' Conference, the National Association of Attorneys General, the National Association of Secretaries of State, and the American Legislators' Association, and it works in close cooperation with the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws. It serves as a clearing house and research center for legislators, legislative reference bureaus, and for the above organizations affiliated with it. The Council maintains a central office in Chicago, an office in Washington, D. C., and regional offices in New York and San Francisco.

Problems frequently arise which are too broad to be solved by any single state, but for which federal action alone may not be suitable—sometimes because the federal government lacks the necessary constitutional power, sometimes because the problem is of regional rather than national interest, and sometimes because federal action needs to be supplemented by cooperative state action. To assist the states in performing these functions, and to facilitate the exchange of information concerning internal problems of state administration and state legislation, the Council of State Governments was organized. Founded in 1925 as the American Legislators' Association, it assumed its present name, with expanded functions, in 1935, in order to serve administrative officials as well as state legislators.

The Council has thus been a medium through which many federal-state and interstate problems have been resolved and a forum for the consideration of the increasing number of problems growing out of the war emergency: questions of manpower, civilian defense, transportation, emergency fiscal policies, rationing, water supply, interstate trade barriers, highway safety, public welfare, and post-war reconstruction and development. All of these matters have been the subject of conferences and reports which are of benefit to each of the states.

COOPERATION COMMISSIONS

The component parts of the Council of State Governments are the commissions on interstate cooperation, established in the states by legislative action or gubernatorial appointment. A close relationship is also maintained with the state councils of defense. Through these agencies the Council has demonstrated that this method of cooperation among the several states, and between the states and the federal government, is necessary, valuable, and of increasing importance in winning the War.

A typical commission on interstate cooperation consists of five members of the house of representatives, appointed by the speaker of the house, five senators, appointed by the president of the senate, and five administrative officials, appointed by the governor. One of the administrative officials is designated chairman of the entire commission. While a majority of those states which are members of the Council of State Governments adhere to this standard pattern, there are individual variations.

Relation to War Effort

Action by the Council of State Governments is undertaken at the request of the commissions on interstate cooperation or at the suggestion of the governors, secretaries of state, or attorneys general of the states. The Council has served as a point of contact between the states and the federal war agencies, with a view to aiding the federal government in every way possible in the prosecution of the War, and in making certain that the states are prepared effectively for
participation in this effort. Examples of instances in which the Council has assisted the states in the prosecution of the War include: development of Selective Service, establishment of state councils of defense, mobilization of state guards, operation of the early rationing program (tires, automobiles, and sugar), drafting of a program of suggested state war legislation, elimination of interstate restrictions hampering the war effort, formulation of wartime fiscal policies, and, in general, the furtherance of cooperation between state officials and federal war agencies such as the Army, the Navy, the War Production Board, the War Manpower Commission, and others.

Other Fields of Action

At the same time, the Council, through the cooperation commissions, and through the several organizations of public officials affiliated with it, has continued its efforts to promote interstate and federal-state cooperation on such subjects as: interstate control of commercial fisheries, conservation of water resources, pollution control, elimination of interstate trade barriers, interstate crime control, enactment of uniform state laws, settlement of boundary disputes; and other problems requiring cooperative state action. Commissions on interstate cooperation function continuously during the biennium between legislative sessions, and are prepared in advance to place before the legislatures such programs as may have been agreed upon before the rush of the sessions. Research reports and drafts of legislative proposals are made available to legislators as a part of this program.

Local Problems

In several regions where groups of states have specific problems that require continuous local attention, special interstate commissions have been created and provided with headquarters and staffs of their own. Such offices have been set up in Philadelphia and Washington, D. C., to deal with problems of river control and stream pollution. In addition, the Council’s New York and San Francisco regional offices work in close association with the cooperation commissions in those areas, assisting in the arrangement of conferences, and in general supplementing the services provided by the Chicago and Washington offices for the country as a whole.

Research Service

Over a period of years, the Council has built up an extensive interstate research and inquiry service for the use of legislators and public officials. Its primary purpose is to serve as an informational clearing house for individual public officials, state legislative reference bureaus, and legislative councils. In addition to publishing the biennial Book of the States, the Council issues a monthly magazine, State Government, devoted to governmental matters of current interest to state public officials. Special digests and research bulletins are published frequently for the benefit of state reference bureaus and legislative councils, and for the national associations affiliated with the Council. In connection with the work of the National Association of Attorneys General, the Council each week publishes a brief Digest of Opinions of particular current interest which have been rendered recently by the state attorneys general throughout the country.

CONCLUSION

Through the Council of State Governments, the states have set up machinery specifically designed to facilitate the smooth functioning of interstate and federal-state relationships, with the result that the states have played an effective part in the war program, and at the same time have strengthened our federal system and made a distinct and lasting contribution to democratic government.
CHRONOLOGICAL HISTORY OF THE COUNCIL
April, 1941—May, 1943

The following section traces the chronological development of the Council of State Governments from the date of publication of the last edition of The Book of the States, April, 1941, to the date of publication of the present volume. The 1937 edition of the book contains a record of the history of the Council, and of the American Legislators' Association, beginning with the dates of their establishment, while later editions cover the periods for which they were published. Each future volume will outline the developments of the biennium preceding its publication, as does the present book.


June 6-7. Midwest Interstate Assembly. Meeting to discuss interstate trade barriers and an agreement in respect to standards of inspection of dairy products. Stevens Hotel, Chicago, Illinois.

June 13. Northeastern Interstate Assembly. Meeting to discuss steps necessary to coordinate the work of the federal, state, and local governments in forwarding the defense program. Hotel Roosevelt, New York City.


July 7. Executive Committee of Governors' Conference. Meeting to discuss with F. H. LaGuardia, U. S. Director of Civilian Defense, the channeling of activities through the states. City Hall, New York City.

July 18-19, Southern Interstate Assembly. Meeting to discuss problems of production and the defense effort. Grove Park Inn, Asheville, North Carolina.

July 24. New York-Rhode Island Joint Boundary Line Commission. Meeting to agree upon a New York-Rhode Island boundary line between Montauk Point and Block Island. Three commission members appointed by each state.
THE BOOK OF THE STATES


September 12. Conference between officials from Iowa and Ohio to discuss problems in carrying out the motor vehicle reciprocity agreement between the two states. Offices of the Council of State Governments, Chicago, Illinois.


October 24. Executive Committee of Governors' Conference. Meeting to discuss program of conference in defense effort, and to select member for vacancy on Executive Committee. Stevens Hotel, Chicago, Illinois.


November 8. Tax Committee of the Council of State Governments, meeting with officials of the U. S. Bureau of the Budget and the Treasury Department to discuss state and local fiscal policies relative to national defense, and to develop ideas for constructive cooperation. Office of the Director of the Budget, Washington, D. C.


December 19-20. Drafting Committee of Council of State Governments met with officials of the Department of Justice and other federal agencies to draft emergency state defense legislation. Department of Justice Building, Washington, D. C.

December 22. Executive Committee of the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin. Meeting to hear reports and formulate policies governing the Commission. Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
January 9-10. Northeastern Regional Highway Safety Conference. Seventh annual meeting to discuss and approve minimum standards and maximum permissible sizes and weights for motor trucks, and trade barriers in the motor vehicle field. Hotel Roosevelt, New York City.

January 30. Fifth Eastern States Conservation Conference. Representatives from Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, and West Virginia met to determine how the states, individually, and in cooperation with the federal government, can most effectively promote better forest fire prevention, public regulation of timber cutting on private lands, extension of publicly owned forest land, and sounder systems of forest taxation to encourage continuous yield. Hotel Statler, Boston.


February 15. Conference between Executive Committee of the Governors' Conference and other Governors and Administrators to discuss HB 6559 for the extension of unemployment compensation. Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D.C.


February 27. Regional Conference on Relief and Resident Laws. Representatives from Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Vermont met to obtain a uniform program on relief and resident laws. Hotel Roosevelt, New York City.


March 5. Northeastern Regional Committee on Safety Education. Representatives from Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Virginia met to organize Committee and discuss compulsory safety education courses, bicycle regulation, and OCD plan of rewards. Hotel Pennsylvania, New York City.


April 2. Regional Committee on Forestry Problems. Meeting to discuss forest protection, regulation of cutting, forest taxation, extension of public ownership. Hotel Roosevelt, New York City.

April 11. Committee on Election Procedure of the National Association of Secretaries of State. Meeting to discuss absentee voting for men in the armed forces of the United States. Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.

May 5-7. Federal-State Conference on War Restrictions. Representatives from all states were invited to discuss impediments to the war effort. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C.


Representatives from Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, and Wisconsin met to assist the states in developing more efficient fiscal policies and to seek means for federal-state-local cooperation in developing a tax policy which will take into consideration the needs of all three levels of government. Stevens Hotel, Chicago, Illinois.

May 20. Executive Committee of the Governors' Conference with President's Committee. Meeting to discuss impediments to the war effort. Office of Secretary of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

May 20. Conference on Motor Vehicle Trade Barriers. Those who were in attendance included a Commissioner from the Office of Defense Transportation, governors' representatives, and public utility and motor vehicle commissioners from Colorado, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, and Kansas City. The meeting was called by the Council of State Governments, at the suggestion of Governor Ratner of Kansas, for the purpose of discussing the effect of ODT Orders No. 3-6 on midwest truckers and farm produce carriers. Hotel Muehlebach, Kansas City, Missouri.

June 5. First Meeting of Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission. To discuss rules and procedure for the Commission, and to plan closer cooperation. Hotel Roosevelt, New York City.

June 10. Tax Committee of the Council of State Governments. Meeting to work out an over-all tax program and to plan a series of regional conferences. Hotel Raleigh, Washington, D. C.


June 29. Meeting with Civil Service Commissioner Fleming. Called to discuss loss of state, county, and local personnel to the federal agencies and to the Selective Service. Civil Service Commission offices, Washington, D. C.


August 12. Northeastern Regional Committee on Safety Education. Representatives from Connecticut, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, and Rhode Island met to discuss model safety education law, traffic and bicycle regulation,
and the relation of education to enforcement. Hotel Roosevelt, New York City.

**September 16.** Defense Committee of Council of State Governments. Meeting to explore the problems of civilian defense, motor transport, manpower, ODT's regulation of trucks, buses, and taxis; Baruch committee report, state surpluses, and uniform war legislation. Governor's office, State Capitol, Annapolis, Maryland.

**September 18.** Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission. Representatives from Delaware, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island, South Carolina, and Virginia met to re-elect officers, and to establish executive and advisory committees and panels for the study of particular species. Hotel Roosevelt, New York City.

**October 9.** Meeting of the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws and the Council of State Governments, to work out a program of cooperation. Offices of the Council of State Governments, Chicago.

**October 15-16.** Regional Committee on Forestry Problems. Representatives from Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Virginia met to review the need for regulation, legislation, and enforcement in the field of forestry. Hotel Roosevelt, New York City.

**October 17.** Conference between Tax Committee of the Council of State Governments and Federal Tax Committee, Secretary of the Treasury, and Director of the Budget. Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.

**October 21.** Fiscal Committee of the Council of State Governments. Meeting to consider revisions of the fiscal policy. Cincinnati, Ohio.


**October 24-25.** Drafting Committee of the Council of State Governments. Meeting to discuss problems with federal representatives and to draft reports. Department of Justice Building, Washington, D.C.


**November 14.** Board of Managers of the Council of State Governments, Annual meeting. Shoreland Hotel, Chicago.

**November 21.** Eastern Regional Conference on War Legislation. Hotel Roosevelt, New York City.

**November 23-24.** National Association of Attorneys General. Thirty-sixth annual meeting. Statler Hotel, St. Louis, Missouri.


**December 8.** Southwest Regional Conference on War Legislation. Biltmore Hotel, Los Angeles.

**December 9.** Conference between Executive Committee of National Association of Attorneys General and members of the Economic Stabilization Board. To discuss with Director Byrnes application of the wage stabilization order to state and local governments. Office of the Director, White House, Washington, D.C.

**December 9-10.** Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission. To discuss reports of panels and the establishment of state systems of catch statistics. Hotel Longfellow, Baltimore, Maryland.


**December 12.** Southern Regional Conference on War Legislation. Hotel Roosevelt, New Orleans, Louisiana.

**December 18.** Northeastern Committee on Forestry Problems. Representatives from Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Virginia met to discuss with legislative advisers recommended bills,
and to adopt report to Eastern States Conservation Conference. Hotel Roosevelt, New York City.

December 23. Meeting of the Executive Committee of the Governors' Conference and members of the War Production Board, on ways and means for curtailing construction during war emergency. Social Security Building. Washington, D. C.

January 4-5. Meeting of the Drafting Committee on State War Legislation. Washington, D. C.


April 12-17. Southern Regional Conference on Postwar Problems. Hotel Biltmore, Atlanta, Georgia.

THE BOARD OF MANAGERS OF THE COUNCIL

The Board of Managers is the policy forming and governing agency of the Council of State Governments. Each of the 42 states appropriating to the support of the Council is entitled to representation on the Board, and thus to participate directly in the organization and operation of the Council of State Governments. In addition, the Council's Board has serving on it, in an ex officio capacity, or as managers-at-large, other outstanding public officials.

The delegates are usually chosen by the commissions on interstate cooperation of the states. Ex officio Managers are the five members of the Executive Committee of the Governors' Conference, the presidents of the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, the American Legislators' Association, the National Association of Attorneys General, and the National Association of Secretaries of State, and the Executive Director and the Honorary President of the Council of State Governments. In order to provide continuity, and to retain valuable members who may change their governmental position by virtue of which they are members of the Board of Managers, 10 managers-at-large are elected for staggered five-year terms.

The Executive Committee of the Board is composed of the President, who is a governor, the First Vice-President, who is a legislator, two other Vice-Presidents, an Auditor, who is a state fiscal officer, the Honorary President of the Council, and the Executive Director. The First Vice-President serves as Chairman of the Board.

As a body representing the integral parts of the Council, and responsible to them for the effectiveness of the Council's program, the Board of Managers stands as one of the most important units in the structure of the organization.
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THE SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE COUNCIL OF STATE GOVERNMENTS*

The Sixth General Assembly of the Council of State Governments once again demonstrated the ability of a strongly knit group to "think on its feet," in meeting and attempting to solve the many problems thrust upon it by the difficulties of the times—in this case, the problems of a nation at war.

Meeting in Baltimore for three days, January 24-26, some 435 delegates to the 1943 Assembly—governors, state legislators, secretaries of state, attorneys general, members of interstate cooperation commissions, and defense council officials—concentrated their attention almost entirely upon a program concerned with the prosecution of the War, from the federal as well as from the state viewpoint.

As the problems of the time dictated the subjects considered in previous Assemblies, so circumstances dictated the subjects with which the representatives to the Sixth General Assembly concerned themselves—problems involving War, and the ways in which the War affects civilian and economic stability, manpower, production, rationing, transportation, as well as legislation to facilitate state participation.

It was to make easier the solving of just such common problems that the several states of the nation joined hands a decade ago, through the Council of State Governments, in order to set up machinery for meeting unanticipated difficulties and for anticipating difficulties which would arise in the future. A brief resume of the activities of other General Assemblies, held within the last decade, will serve to indicate those problems which were thrust upon the stage by circumstance and which were met by forthright action.

The development of a rational plan for reducing tax competition and conflict between the various areas of government within the nation was the main concern of the delegates to the first "Interstate Assembly" which convened under the auspices of the American Legislators' Association on February 3, 1933, for a two-day session in Washington. This first Assembly created a suitable monument to itself in the form of an Interstate Commission on Conflicting Taxation.

While the tax problem was still in the minds of the 153 state legislators and officials from 41 states who assembled in Washington in February, 1935, the most significant development to come from this Assembly was the adoption of a plan for the Council of State Governments, an organization of the states more comprehensive in scope than the American Legislators' Association, which had originally brought the states together.

The General Assembly of 1937 gave a clear picture of the swiftly broadening field of interest of this organization of representatives of the states. Nationwide problems such as social security, crime control, legislation, and administration, as well as taxation, were studied by this Assembly.

The problem that took the spotlight and still continues to be widely discussed by the general public—that of interstate trade barriers—was the major subject considered by delegates from 46 states attending the 1939 Assembly, which met in January, in Washington, D. C. It was as a result of discussions at this Assembly that the nationwide movement for elimination of the interstate trade barriers was launched later in the spring, at the National Conference on Interstate Trade Barriers, held in Chicago.

Problems considered by the 1941 Assembly, attended by 350 delegates from 46 states, naturally revolved around the country's national defense program—a
program involving the federal, state, and local levels of government, and necessitating a program of cooperation on a scale never before attempted in the United States. The keynote of this Assembly, and of the 1943 Assembly as well, was sounded most ably by William S. Knudsen, former Director-General of the Office of Production Management, who said: "I do not know of anything that could ever be accomplished on a large scale without the cooperation of everybody. If we have faith in one another, if we have confidence in one another, and if we are willing to spend a little sweat for a year or so, then we might save a little blood later."

This theme of cooperation, upon which the Assembly of 1941 was built, was carried over to the 1943 General Assembly by the representatives of the states when they reviewed for themselves the trend of their activities for the last two years, and attempted to set a course of action that the states must follow in working for successful prosecution of the War.

The stage was set for the Sixth Assembly—the first ever held during wartime—by Governor O'Conor of Maryland, President of the Council. He outlined, in his presidential address, the part the states had taken, first, in developing the national defense program, and later, in prosecuting the War in cooperation with the federal government. The desirability of organizing state machinery and developing state activities in such a way as to participate fully and contribute their utmost to the war program was stressed particularly by Governor O'Conor. He urged also that the states see to it that whatever duties, responsibilities, and activities are transferred to Washington for war purposes be returned to the states at the expiration of the emergency. Governor O'Conor then touched upon the sentiment frequently echoed during the three-day meeting—that postwar reconstruction must be prepared for, and prepared for at once. This feeling resulted in the Council's recommendation, almost immediately after adjournment of the Assembly, the organization of state commissions on postwar reconstruction and development, and scheduling during April, 1943, a series of four regional conferences to stimulate interest in postwar problems and the development of machinery to solve them.

Under-Secretary of War Robert T. Patterson opened the discussion of present war problems when he said: "Our training program must contemplate a long war, and unfortunately there are no sound reasons to believe the War will be finished in 1943." To bear out this belief, he emphasized that the Axis has 969 divisions under arms—considerably more than have the United States, Britain, and Russia combined; that we are training men now to fight next year; and that the submarine menace is critical, with the Japs controlling most of the Pacific and the Nazis controlling practically all of western Europe.

United States Senator James E. Murray of Montana, discussing the problem of small business, warned that "ghost towns" may arise all over the nation because of the failure of war industries to rely more heavily on small businesses. Senator Murray, who is Chairman of the Special Senate Committee on Small Business, said: "Instead of small plants producing 70 per cent of our goods and big plants 30 per cent, as in peacetime, the figures are just the other way around. . . . If this spectacle of condensation of small business is permitted to continue, tens of thousands of small concerns will vanish, never to return."

He recommended that a special committee be designated to act as liaison between the Council and the new Congressional committees studying the problems of small business.

The need for building two entirely new industries in this country this year—one for the production of synthetic rubber and the other for the production of 100-octane aviation gasoline to fly the increased production of war planes—was described by Donald M. Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board. In describing the eighty billion dollar war production campaign for 1943, Mr. Nelson stated that the public must sacrifice all nonessential activities which
interfere in any way with this program. The program, under which production must be multiplied four times, is "hampered by two things in particular," he said. These are absenteeism of war plant employees and transportation of these employees to and from their work.

The round table discussion on "Prosecution of the War," held on Monday afternoon, January 25, was one of the highlights of the Sixth General Assembly. Participants included Paul V. McNutt, Chairman, War Manpower Commission; Joseph B. Eastman, Director, Office of Defense Transportation; William M. Jeffers, Federal Rubber Administrator; and James M. Landis, Director, Office of Civilian Defense.

Discussing manpower problems, Mr. McNutt said, "Provision has been made for a permanent farm labor force of 8,900,000 men and for a peak force of 12,000,000 men." These figures were reached during most of the last year, although there were spots where shortages had to be met with volunteer labor. Mr. McNutt said the farm labor placement service is now under the Department of Agriculture, because that department already has agencies to handle it.

"The first thing that has to be determined, of course, is the size of the armed forces of the United States," Mr. McNutt said. Then there must be a determination of manpower—which includes both men and women. "After you have taken out the armed forces and the demands of the armed forces, then you look to see what your commitments are. The first commitment is to transport and supply those who are in the armed forces, then our commitments under Lend-Lease to our Allies, then our obligations to our own people to make certain that we have enough food. In other words, our civilian economy must be able to support our war effort."

The possibility that the nationwide speed limit may be raised from 35 to 40 miles an hour was revealed by Mr. Eastman. Officials of truck and bus companies, Mr. Eastman said, claimed that they used more rubber and gasoline at the lower speed than they would at the higher speed and that certain buses are so geared that 35 miles an hour is a wasteful speed. He went on to say that these officials have been asked to conduct tests to prove their statements. If they are able to demonstrate satisfactorily that they are absolutely using more rubber at the lower speed, the speed limit might be changed, he said.

Mr. Landis said he considered an adequate civilian defense force absolutely essential in answer to a question from the floor as to whether the money and manpower in our defense organizations could be turned profitably to industry, now that the danger from invasion seemed practically nonexistent. He said 99 per cent of this force are volunteers and that 99 per cent of them could not be translated into industry.

The provocative opinion that Army and Navy and other government inspectors were delaying the production of essential war materials throughout the country was expressed by Mr. Jeffers, who called for the development of final and definite production demands, and asserted that those in charge of the country's plants were fully capable of carrying on from that point.

Principal speakers at the state dinner on Monday night were John G. Winant, United States Ambassador to Great Britain, and Governor Harold E. Stassen of Minnesota. Winant reviewed British methods of handling manpower, production, rationing, and kindred problems of a domestic nature. He said that Britain has found it possible to maintain an efficient war economy without imposing a ceiling on wages or freezing them. Mr. Winant said an extraordinary restrictive effect on spending, and thus on inflationary tendencies, was exercised by the present level of taxation in Britain, the amounts of workers' savings, rationing, and consumers' goods scarcities. Less than half the so-called "personal money incomes" of workers in Britain is spent on consumers' goods, he said, adding that some elasticity of wage rates has proved to be essential to an efficient war economy in Great Britain.

Governor Stassen advocated planning now for the formation of a world federation which, he said, should include
China, Russia, the British Commonwealth of Nations, the United States of America, and all of the smaller United Nations. To those who feel that such plans for international cooperation can wait until the War is won, Governor Stassen pointed out that the lessons of history say over and over again that this view is not justified. He reminded them also that our own form of government in the United States was developed only after an unusual period of public discussion concerning many different proposals and counterproposals for government.

E. De Golyer, Assistant Deputy Petroleum Administrator, and Governor J. Melville Broughton of North Carolina, spoke to the Assembly on Tuesday morning, January 26. De Golyer warned that the nation’s essential petroleum demands were approaching the limit of production capacity. He said that the production of crude oil has dropped in the face of rising demands and that military needs will probably take up the major portion of any increase in deliveries into the eastern seaboard area by underground transmission lines. Every effort is now being made to develop new sources of oil, De Golyer said, and any increase in our oil production will be earmarked for our armed forces.

Governor Broughton asserted that the states themselves are to blame for much of the growth of federal power within the original domain of the states; that an increase in federal power during the War is inevitable; and that the rights of the states would be returned after the War. In expressing this latter conviction, he reasoned that the national debt would deter any federal embarkation “upon new and costly experiments in governmental service.”

The Assembly’s speaking program was brought to a close at the Tuesday noon luncheon by Governor Leverett Saltonstall of Massachusetts, and the United States Attorney General Francis Biddle. Governor Saltonstall, speaking on “Emergency Transportation, for War,” warned that the various states must begin immediately to prepare for the dislocation and adjustment of the postwar period. He urged that all states adopt a program similar to the one which already exists in Massachusetts, where surveys are being made of labor skills, plans for conversion of industries into peacetime production are being developed, and industries are being encouraged to plan for unemployment conditions after the War. The Governor asked also that emergency powers, to be used when state legislatures were not in session, be delegated to the various governors, with the right of revocation of those powers reserved to the legislatures.

Attorney General Biddle was of the opinion that the approval of the states should be obtained when federal action conflicts with their interests. “Our fundamental peacetime concept of a dual system of government and state sovereignty should not change because of the War,” he said. “Action on a national basis is, of course, needed in many fields; but when it is taken it should be taken with the approval of the states where it affects their interests, and with due regard for their rights.” Mr. Biddle felt that the full strength of 130 million people could not be adequately mobilized except through extensive utilization of state and local governmental machinery, and he cited, as examples of how federal and state governments can work together without any usurpation of the powers of the latter by the former, the Selective Service system, the 35-mile-an-hour speed limit, and the regulation of interstate trucking so as to facilitate shipping of war materials.

Reports to the Sixth General Assembly and the resolutions adopted by it in the closing session on Tuesday afternoon, January 26, concluded the first wartime Assembly of the states. The reports covered the work of the Council’s Committees on Manpower, National Defense, Tax and Emergency Fiscal Policy, and Legislative Drafting. Resolutions adopted were concerned with state war legislation, small business, social security problems, state administration of federal emergency tax measures, child care centers, interstate trade barriers, uniform state laws, review of federal legislation, finances, and forestry.
REPORT OF THE TAX AND EMERGENCY FISCAL POLICY COMMITTEE*

The following statement of Wartime Fiscal Policies for State and Local Governments, adopted by the Board of Managers of the Council of State Governments November 14, 1942, was developed at four regional meetings of legislators and state officials from all parts of the country, and was prepared by the Tax Committee of the Council of State Governments.

It should be brought to the attention of governors, state officials, state legislators, and others concerned with the fiscal policies of state and local governments, for consideration in developing the fiscal policy in wartime and the immediate postwar period.

The advisability of permitting states and cities to build up postwar reserves where possible is re-emphasized. And also, where possible, reserves for the financing of government are recommended, so as to make it unnecessary to borrow in anticipation of tax revenues.

Special attention is directed to legislation prepared by the Drafting Committee of the Council of State Governments to carry out certain of these recommendations. This legislation is contained in the Reports on Suggested State War Legislation for 1943, issued by the Council of State Governments. The specific measures are as follows: (1) State Postwar Reserve Fund and Planning Act—Report No. 2, page 31; (2) Local Postwar Reserve Fund and Planning Act—Report No. 2, page 35; (3) Exchange of Tax Information Act—Report No. 3, page 1; (4) Investment of Public Funds Act—Report No. 3, page 3.

The states offer their cooperation to the United States Treasury Department in the administration and collection of those taxes which may be adaptable to this procedure, in order to avoid duplication and prevent confusion. The state legislators are urged to enact legislation which will permit their tax-collection agencies to contract with the Treasury Department for this purpose.

The states still desire to emphasize their willingness to cooperate with the federal government in its efforts to prevent inflation through enforcement of price ceilings, elimination of the black market, and other steps. It is again urged that the federal government utilize more fully state machinery for this purpose.

In many states, and particularly in many political subdivisions, serious problems have been created by the acquisition of hitherto taxable property by the federal government. The serious effect of the ensuing loss of revenue upon the financial condition of certain local governments is called to the attention of the Congress and the federal agencies concerned. It is requested that this General Assembly authorize the Chairman of the Council’s Tax Committee to appoint a subcommittee to meet and negotiate with the Federal Real Estate Board, now surveying this problem, for the purpose of arriving at a mutually satisfactory solution.

WARTIME FISCAL POLICIES FOR STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

All out war effort requires consistent fiscal action by federal, state, and local governments. Prosecution of the War, in the field and on the production line, is necessarily a federal responsibility, but success can be promoted and the attendant economic difficulties can be mitigated by harmonious state and local action.

State and local governments can help expedite victory through their services and their fiscal policies. They can help to make effective the national program.
of economic stabilization. They can prepare now to help cushion the economic shocks of the postwar period. These possibilities of concerted policy have been demonstrated in some measure during the first year of the War. The sum of state and local financial operations is of such magnitude, and the influence which these governments exercise is so important, that continued unity in policies would contribute to the success of the war effort and the subsequent readjustment.

The Economic Background

The War requires a transfer of more human and material resources from civilian to military ends than has ever before been attempted. Coincident with the reduction in the supply of consumers' goods, employment in war production is adding to the money income of civilians. Federal taxation and borrowing are absorbing a substantial part of those incomes and will make deeper inroads as the War continues, but money available for consumption spending still outpaces the supply of civilian goods at present prices. Until the President promulgated a comprehensive anti-inflation program in April, prices advanced substantially in spite of federal government efforts to control them. By the issuance of the General Maximum Price Regulation, the upward movement of prices was retarded, but further action was required and has recently been taken to provide more effective control of wages, salaries, and agricultural prices. Yet it has become clear that these measures require reinforcement by all other governmental policies and by private action if economic stabilization is to be maintained. Specifically, the direct controls, to be effective, require all the support that can be given by harmonious fiscal policies—federal, state, and local.

The finances of the states are not affected uniformly by the War; neither do all local governments find themselves with the same problems or the same degree of prosperity. Some states and some local governments have increased revenues and cash balances and have been faced by few new demands for services; some have increased expenditures and decreased revenues; others have tremendously increased population and service responsibilities with little added revenue. State and local governments which are the centers of war activity face the most serious financial readjustments. The variation in problems makes it difficult to suggest uniform policies in specific terms. This statement, therefore, will present only general principles which will necessarily be modified for the special circumstances in each state or locality.

Guides to State and Local Action

In the light of the foregoing considerations, we recommend that every state and local government give immediate application to the following principles and proposals, each government fitting them appropriately to its special circumstances:

1. The chief business of the state and local governments is to supply essential services which may contribute directly or indirectly to winning the War. These governments should give priority to activities which will best promote war work, postpone operations that are not essential to the war effort, and take every possible step to conserve manpower and materials.

2. It is the responsibility of the state and local governments to maintain those institutions and services which are essential to our American way of life and upon which depend our ability to win the War and to survive thereafter. These governments should therefore seek, by measures compatible with war needs, to safeguard and preserve essential activities in order that they may continue in their vital role as basic units in our government. This is imperative for public morale and effective economic functioning in this period of War; it may be even more important in the return to peace.

The utmost economy and efficiency are urgently needed. Improvements in government, long overdue in many cases, should now be pressed, not only for their own sake, but also because they will release manpower and material resources
for the successful prosecution of the War. Impairments of service should be minimized through good administrative management. Curtailment of ordinary services needs to be considered case by case, since many of these services are vital to the prosecution of the War itself, to the maintenance of civilian morale or defense, or to the preservation of the productive capacities of citizens; but all practicable curtailments should be made.

3. To the extent that present state and local tax rates yield revenues in excess of immediate needs, these should be used in ways that will harmonize with efforts to prevent inflation and at the same time will lighten the financial difficulties of the postwar period. In considerable part this “excess” is counterbalanced by undermaintenance of existing capital and deferment of construction.

Although opportunities to improve the equality and flexibility of tax systems should not be ignored, it is desirable to maintain current levels of governmental revenue in order to pay outstanding bills, retire debts, and to accumulate reserves for future use or for postwar public works, insofar as constitutional or statutory provisions would adequately protect such reserves against premature or un economical expenditure. Where tax rate reductions are considered, it is important to weigh the consequences such a release of purchasing power will have upon economic stabilization.

If all local governments were to cut taxes simultaneously, and the federal government were to increase its taxes by the same amount, inflation would be unaffected and the revenue would accrue to the jurisdiction with the greatest current need. This would also help the federal government to keep its debt at a minimum. The weakness in this solution is that not all states are likely to act simultaneously, nor is Congress likely to take their action into account. Moreover, the federal tax increase cannot have the same distribution as would the state-local decreases. Consequently, in order to avoid aggravating the problem of excess purchasing power, the state and local governments had best stabilize their tax rates and their tax systems.

The simplest and most practical disposition for surplus revenues is the use of available funds to reduce indebtedness. Very often, too, it is possible to reduce the lag in state and local financing and thus eliminate short-term borrowing. New indebtedness can be avoided by financing exclusively out of current revenues.

Where surpluses cannot be used to reduce debts, they should be set aside as reserves. Where general reserves are not authorized, special reserves may be possible, through the use of appropriations that will be available only when certain conditions are realized, such as the renewed availability of critical materials, or the ending of the War. The reserves will be increasingly required as a cushion for revenue declines during later phases of the War. If not so needed, they will be available for such public works as may have been postponed and are actually necessary. Surplus financing, properly timed, can serve the objectives of counteracting inflation now and checking deflation after the War. The reserves might be invested in United States war bonds. The issuance of United States war bonds, subject to ready liquidation and otherwise adapted to the needs of state and local reserve funds, would stimulate the creation of such funds and their investment in federal securities.

Surplus financing is a new experience for many cities and states and needs legislation to safeguard reserve funds against misapplication. Several states and cities have passed such legislation and undertaken a surplus financing program. A favorable vote on a referendum can be required as a condition for spending local reserve funds. Investment in appropriate war bonds will help to conserve state and local funds.

4. In carrying out these policies, state and local governments should adopt the following specific measures:

a. Pay off debts as rapidly as possible; where obligations have not matured or are not callable, build up sinking funds beyond scheduled requirements to counterbalance the debt;
b. Rigidly restrict both new and customary expenditures to essential war activities and necessary governmental functions;

c. Improve administrative management so as to conserve manpower and materials and minimize impairments of services;

d. Enact legislation permitting surplus financing with proper safeguards;

e. Build up reserves for emergency and postwar needs, invest them in government bonds or other appropriate securities, and provide safeguards to keep these reserves intact;

f. Maintain tax rates consistent with the objectives of the economic stabilization program and the policy of building up reserves for emergency or postwar use;

g. Remove all interstate trade barriers and other artificial hindrances to war production;

h. Convert state and local facilities, where possible, to war uses;

i. Join actively in making effective the national program of economic stabilization which is designed to control the cost of living and the costs of war production;

j. Distinguish carefully between war created state and local needs that warrant federal aid and those that should properly be met out of state and local resources;

k. Reappraise the educational system, giving special consideration to vocational training and rehabilitation and their relation to the war program;

l. Reappraise existing health, welfare, and related activities and services in the light of changed economic conditions and war needs;

m. Prepare to offset possible postwar depression by developing programs and blueprints for public works and services, and by accumulating means of financing them.

Federal Policies to Support State and Local Action

For the federal government, we recommend that the following principles be given weight:

1. The federal government, in shaping its tax and expenditure programs, should have due regard for the problems of state and local governments. Just as the state governments and the subdivisions are called upon to cooperate in implementing the war program of the federal government, so should the federal government endeavor through its policies and programs to minimize the difficulties created for them. Functions and burdens heretofore assumed by the federal government should not be transferred to the states simply to relieve the federal budget, nor should customary assistances be withdrawn without opportunity given to make necessary financial adjustments.

2. Federal expenditures should be reduced by curtailment of any present activities that do not serve the war program and by exercising in the field of war expenditures all measures of economy consistent with speedy and effective victory in the War.

3. When the war emergency passes, the federal government should manage to return to a peace economy in a manner that will not unduly shock the economic system and will avoid casting upon state and local agencies burdens greater than they can assume.

Needed Legislative and Administrative Action

Application of the foregoing policies will require legislation and continuous administrative action in the federal, state, and local governments. These recommendations can be applied in a considerable measure without prior legislative action, and we recommend their administrative application to the fullest extent permitted by existing law.

Basic authorization for a few of the recommended measures may have to be given by the Congress or by the legislatures of the several states. The following enumeration indicates some of the topics on which legislative action is needed; others may be required in individual
states. A few states already have enacted such provisions:

1. Both federal and state legislation, in so far as may be necessary, to authorize the tax administering agencies of the federal government on the one hand, and of the state and local governments on the other hand, to coordinate the administration of such taxes as it may prove feasible to coordinate. Such legislation should authorize contracts between administrative agencies to permit exchange of information and the use of one another’s facilities and personnel, subject to proper safeguards for accounting, bonding, and reimbursement.

2. State legislation authorizing the preparation of plans for the postwar period, to the extent that such preparation is now practical and will not require time and energy necessary for the war effort.

3. State legislation to establish a public works reserve for each state government.

4. State legislation to permit local governments to establish public works reserves.

5. State legislation permitting the investment of state and local government surpluses in war bonds or other suitable securities.

Cooperative Action

It is suggested, finally, that in the execution of these programs and policies there be complete and wholehearted cooperation and coordination among units of government, and that the existing firm basis for this cooperative action be further strengthened through the continuing efforts of the Joint Federal-State-Local Committee on Fiscal Policies and Practices.

---

REPORT OF THE MANPOWER COMMITTEE*

We recognize that the allocation and use of manpower is one of the most critical problems on the home front, and that it is also one in which far from satisfactory progress has been made toward solution.

We are confident that we can tender, on behalf of the states, all of their resources, the trained administrative personnel of state and local governments, and our Council of State Governments Secretariat, to assist in meeting this problem.

For this purpose, we also hereby authorize and request the Chairman of the Council of State Governments to appoint a special manpower committee to confer with the federal government and assist in definite steps to improve the handling of manpower.

We submit that the most nearly successful nationwide programs have been those which have used the federal-state-local method of operation. Examples are the programs of: Selective Service, Social Security, the Department of Justice, public roads, county agricultural agents, the earlier stages of OPA (tires, cars, and sugar rationing), and the later stages of OCD.

Those programs which ignored these principles and were entirely federal in operation were comparative failures. Examples are: the early stages of OCD, the later stages of OPA (gas and fuel-oil rationing and price control), and the present manpower administration.

Likewise, we recognize that exclusive
state operation of a national problem results in comparative failure, such as the experience with truck and transport regulations in the early stages of the War. This again was corrected when the states conformed to a uniform federal policy in the spring of 1942, and then cooperated in the administration of that policy.

Therefore, we urge that the operation of the manpower program be based on the federal-state-local line of command, with participation by each level of government, and with respect for established governmental lines of jurisdiction. As a few examples for cooperative action, we urge that a federal-state-local program be instituted:

1. To maintain adequate agricultural manpower by definite establishment as a national policy of the recognition of the necessity for keeping on the farm the trained farmer with adequate help to produce the essential food supply.

2. To register, on a voluntary basis, sixteen- and seventeen-year old youths and to train them to help on the farms—the program to be administered locally with supervision of small groups of these youths through school authorities—and to use them in peak seasons for production of fruit, vegetables, and grains.

3. To use manpower confined in prisons and reformatories not convicted of crimes of violence.

4. To promote fair employment practices without discrimination as to age, race, color, or creed.

5. To provide effective day care for children of working mothers.

6. To increase the industrial and commercial work week, which now averages 42½ hours over-all, on the basis that is not anti-labor, that it contains proper safeguards for health, and that it does not break the inflation-control price ceilings.

7. To reduce absenteeism, and to improve safety, transportation, and housing of employees.

8. To safeguard health of workers.

9. To use governmental employees in peak harvest seasons, temporarily suspending certain governmental operations.

10. To reduce the hoarding and inefficient use of manpower in some war plants.

11. To maintain the supply of labor essential for transportation and mechanical upkeep.

12. To transfer civilian production from areas short of manpower to areas with adequate manpower.

13. To utilize persons receiving old age assistance as productive manpower, particularly during harvest seasons, through removing or modifying the earning restrictions for the duration of the War.

In conclusion, we submit that there is a most urgent need for a clear-cut statement by the federal government of the over-all policies of manpower. In a desire to be helpful in the prosecution of this War to speedy victory, we ask the War Manpower Commission to meet with a committee of the Council of State Governments for the purpose of arriving at a definite statement of policy and a method of effective state and local participation in the manpower program.

In view of the fact that the legislatures of most of the states are now in session, we urge early consideration of this report.

Let a copy of this report, upon its adoption by the Assembly, be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, to the Secretary of Agriculture, and to the Chairman of the War Production Board.
THE Federal-State Conference on Law Enforcement Problems of National Defense, which was held on August 5–6, 1940, grew out of the realization that a unified program for civil protection was required, and that a calm appraisal of the problem was necessary to determine such a program. The Conference was called by the Council of State Governments, the Governors' Conference, the National Association of Attorneys General, and the Interstate Commission on Crime, with the cooperation of the Department of Justice. Two hundred and thirty representatives from 46 states, the District of Columbia, and the federal government were in attendance. This group included governors of 14 states, 26 state attorneys general, the Attorney General and Solicitor General of the United States, and other representatives of various state and federal agencies.

It was the general recommendation of this pre-war Conference that the states review their statutes in order to determine whether they had effective laws relating to sabotage, criminal conspiracy, control of explosives, control of firearms, reciprocal protection of public properties among the several states, and so on. It was also recommended that the Conference take up with the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws technical problems having to do with the drafting of appropriate laws on the above subjects.

DRAFTING COMMITTEE APPOINTED

Thereafter, a Legislative Drafting Committee of state officials was appointed to develop a state legislative program based on the above recommendations. This Committee, with the technical assistance of a special committee of the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, carefully considered the legislative recommendations of the Conference and, after consultation with recognized authorities, prepared model state legislation on sabotage prevention, control of explosives, state home guard mobilization, and the protection of interstate public properties. Unusually successful results were achieved in securing the approval by the states of this legislation and in establishing state councils of defense based on a model bill developed by the Committee.

The Drafting Committee continued its work in an advisory capacity until December, 1941. Then came Pearl Harbor!

Immediately after December 7, 1941, the Committee was reconvened at the Department of Justice on December 19–20, with representatives of the War Department, the Navy, the Office of Civilian Defense, the Department of Justice, and officials from various other federal war agencies in attendance.

At that time, in view of the fact that only eight legislatures were scheduled to meet in regular session in 1942, it was apparent that special sessions would be necessary, unless the states were placed on a war basis through the issuance of emergency proclamations by the governors. It was also evident that the Drafting Committee should have ready a program of state war legislation for both those states that met in regular session and for special sessions which might be called. It subsequently developed that only 10 special sessions were called, and that most of the states were put on a war footing through resort to legislation already on the statute books or by emergency proclamation of their governors.

Subcommittees Organized

To facilitate the work of the Drafting Committee, subcommittees were organ-
ized to consider certain subjects. A brief summary of the questions reviewed by these subcommittees, and of their recommendations, follows:

The Section on War Powers of Governors recommended that the research study then being carried on by the Council of State Governments and the Library of Congress should be completed before the drafting of legislation granting emergency powers to governors was undertaken, and that any revision of the model State Council of Defense Act should also be deferred until the results of the study were available. A special report on the Emergency War Powers of Governors was issued on January 1, 1942, by the Council and was used as a guide by many governors in putting their states on a war basis.

The Section on Economic Proposals considered questions covering a variety of subjects, including price control and rationing. But in view of the fact that congressional legislation was pending on most of the matters considered, it was decided that no state legislation was necessary at that time, and that many of the proposals could be handled more effectively through administrative action than by state legislation.

The Section on Civil Protection considered questions relating to social disease control in the vicinity of Army camps. It was the consensus of the Section that the problem was not so much one of legislation as of enforcement. In weighing the matter of absentee voting by men in service, it was decided that the drafting of a model bill on the subject would be impossible since the laws of the states differ so widely and are so complex.

COMMITTEE PREPARES BILLS

Proposed bills on the following subjects were then approved by the Committee and turned over to the Council of State Governments for legislative consideration in the states: air raid precautions, mobilization for fire defense, military traffic control, emergency health and sanitation areas, acceptance of federal grants, defense housing, and zoning for defense areas. Most of the 18 state legislatures which met in regular or in extraordinary session during 1942 adopted the proposals recommended by the Drafting Committee.

The Committee met again on March 7–8, 1942, reviewing and improving those proposals which had previously been set before governors, commissions on interstate cooperation, and legislative leaders throughout the country by the Council of State Governments. At the March meeting the Drafting Committee devoted most of its attention to preparing a proposed State Emergency War Powers Act, which took the form of an omnibus proposal, granting wide powers to governors and state defense councils, in addition to incorporating provisions from the other bills. As finally revised and approved, this measure was presented to the various legislatures by the Council of State Governments as Report No. 1, entitled Suggested State War Legislation for 1943.

The Drafting Committee reconvened on October 24–25, 1942, at Washington, D. C., to consider proposals initiated either by the states through the Council of State Governments and its Drafting Committee, or by various federal war agencies, including OCD, the Alien Property Custodian, ODT, the Federal Reserve Bank, and the War Department.

The Special War Policies Unit of the Department of Justice clears all proposals made by the federal war agencies, so that, upon presentation to the Council of State Governments for consideration, criticism, and revision, these proposals represent the uniform and collective policy of all the agencies concerned and of the President. The proposals as finally approved by the Drafting Committee of the Council of State Governments are then referred to the states for consideration. Conversely, suggested measures, directly concerned with the war effort, and initiated by the states, are cleared through the Drafting Committee to secure general agreement as to policy and purpose, and are then reviewed by the Department of Justice and the interested federal war agencies for possible suggestions. There has thus been developed and is now in effect a
two-way channel for joint cooperative action in the determination of basic national policies, with the state and local governments as equal partners both in suggesting and initiating such programs.

As a result of the October meeting of the Council of State Governments, a series of 15 proposals was suggested to the states for their consideration. These proposals were incorporated in Report No. 2, entitled Suggested State War Legislation for 1943. This report was divided into two sections, Section One containing the new proposals, and Section Two containing five measures covering individual phases of the powers dealt with in the Emergency War Powers Act (Report No. 1).

Fifteen Proposals Approved

The most important of the 15 proposals approved by the Drafting Committee is the Executive Statutory Suspension Act—a governor’s emergency measure which suggests a method for modifying or suspending the enforcement of state laws that hamper the war effort. The need for such legislation has been demonstrated time and again during the past year. Other proposals are listed below.

The Emergency Transportation Act seeks to facilitate movement of persons and property in and through the states so that the governor or other state official may cooperate expeditiously with the federal government and especially with the Office of Defense Transportation.

The Revised State Explosives Act gives the governor power to organize and maintain military forces under prescribed federal regulations for “the organization, standards of training, instruction and discipline,” rather than regulations for “discipline in training.” It also enlarges the scope of the material that the governor may requisition from the Secretary of War. A state guard has now been mobilized in 44 states (Arizona, Montana, Nevada, and Oklahoma have no state guard), and legislation patterned after the model State Guard Act has been enacted in 34 states.

The Alien Property Custodian Act simplifies service of process and notice procedures for aliens, particularly as to the property of a person within an enemy country or enemy-occupied territory.

The State Postwar Reserve Fund and Planning Act provides for the creation and maintenance of a state capital reserve fund out of which postwar state capital construction may be financed.

The Local Postwar Reserve Fund and Planning Act consists of permissive legislation authorizing local governments themselves to provide such reserves.

The Amendment to State Bank Loan Statutes would lessen restrictions upon banks to make loans to a war industry in excess of the usual loan limit.

The Licensing of Child Care Centers Act authorizes state departments of welfare, education, health, and labor to cooperate in establishing standards for adequate care of the children of working mothers. These state departments are directed to furnish advisory services and financial assistance to local authorities. Rules and regulations are prescribed for the licensing of child care centers.

The Out-of-State Physicians, Dentists, and Nurses Act helps to meet the situation in approximately 400 critical areas in the United States where there is a serious shortage of physicians.

The Emergency Aid and Welfare Services Act would broaden legislative authority to meet present and potential needs of welfare resulting from conditions of war.

War Housing Legislation is recommended where present legislation is deemed insufficient to meet existing needs and conditions.

Repression of Prostitution Legislation is included in a separate report by the American Bar Association.

Weights and Measures Legislation recommends that each state review its present laws and bring them up to the standards recommended by the National Conference on Weights and Measures.

New Proposals Issued

It was found necessary to have another meeting of the Drafting Committee, and on January 4–5, 1943, the Committee met at Washington, D. C., to consider new proposals. As a result of this gather-
ing, a Report, containing six proposals, was issued on the subject of *Suggested State War Legislation for 1943*.

The *Exchange of Tax Information Act* provides for intergovernmental cooperation in tax administration, giving state tax administrators discretionary authority to make available to similar officials of other states and of the federal government such information contained in tax reports, returns, audits, or investigations as they consider proper, provided similar privileges are granted by the other states or the federal government. This information is to be used for tax purposes only.

The *Investment of Public Funds Act* authorizes custodians of public funds to invest in federal government obligations any treasury balances not currently needed to finance the operations of the state or of the local government involved.

The *Federal Grants-in-Aid of Evacuation Act* enables the states to cooperate with the federal government in the development and execution of plans for the evacuation of civilians and care of evacuees, by authorizing the state defense council and the departments of the state participating in planning or carrying out such a program, to accept assistance available from the federal government.

*Legislation Relating to Acknowledgments by Service Personnel* is recommended to give those persons serving in the armed forces of the United States ready access to authorities empowered to administer oaths.

*Legislation Relating to Local War Housing Centers* enables municipalities to make expenditures to aid in the operation of local war housing centers.

*Legislation Relating to Acquisition of Airports* would permit condemning agencies to obtain possession of property within a few days after the institution of condemnation proceedings.

**CONCLUSION**

None of these proposals is perfect. They are all mainly suggestions or statements of principles which have been put into bill form in order to aid the states in perfecting their programs of war legislation. Certainly none of them should be introduced without careful consideration of local conditions, existing statutes, and state constitutional requirements. The proposals have received the approval of all federal agencies directly concerned with them. The National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws thought the work of the Drafting Committee so important that it appointed a special committee composed of expert draftsmen to assist in developing these proposals, and the American Bar Association has also recognized the work of the Committee by reprinting the proposals in its *Manual on Civilian Defense*.

It has been the aim of the Drafting Committee and of the Council of State Governments to have these proposals considered by every legislature, and where the need is shown, to bring about the enactment of this legislation by the state legislatures, after revision to fit local conditions.
ELEVEN years after that momentous day on which "liberty was proclaimed throughout all the land," the Founding Fathers met in Philadelphia. The infant confederation of the colonies was beset by enemies from without, and was suffering from confusion, bankruptcy, and anarchy from within. Their labors resulted in the creation of the Constitution of the United States—ordained and established by the people. The Preamble sets forth the purpose of the colonies: "... to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense; promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

Today, 156 years after the adoption of the Constitution, in another and perhaps still greater crisis, this union of states, established to protect the people against aggression from without and injustice from within, is being thoroughly put to the test.

The 13 colonies turned to the infant union to lead them out of their confusion and chaos. If that union is now to survive, it must turn to the 48 states—the children of the 13 original colonies—to defend the nation and to secure the blessings of freedom for posterity.

Possibilities have been and are present in this federal union of ours for unlimited, all out, total, global, war development through creative and productive thought and achievement.

To attain this does not require a ruthless centralization of power in Washington. On the contrary, the establishment and maintenance of a sense of unity, with an accompanying acceptance of individual responsibility for the success of every phase of our war effort, depends upon the degree to which each citizen, to the best of his ability in his own locality, is permitted to share in the administration of war policies and programs. That sense of unity, that acceptance of responsibility cannot be ordained. It will come, as it has before, only from full use of our democratic processes.

We must utilize the full machinery of our federal system and permit the states and local governmental units to play an increasingly larger part in the fighting of this War on the home front. If we do not, we shall have frustrated the democratic processes which we are striving to preserve, and shall have slowed the day of Victory!

THE PRE-WAR PERIOD

The Committee on National Defense of the Council of State Governments has been well aware of its responsibilities in this connection. We have endeavored to strengthen the national security, to do everything possible toward winning the War by making it clear to federal officers and agencies that the states and their local governments are aware of their responsibilities and capable of carrying out their assignments.

We take pride in enumerating the results of these efforts, results in which most of you have played your parts, results which all of us—as representatives of state governments—should look upon as evidence of our continuing faith in the inherent strength of our democratic system.

From the time of the establishment of the Advisory Committee on National Defense, we have assisted, first, the National Defense Committee, and later, the Office of Civilian Defense in developing state and local councils of defense in every state and in every critical military and industrial locality throughout the nation.

During the period when the Office of
Civilian Defense was being organized (somewhat uncertainly organized and poorly administered), the Council of State Governments served as the only point of contact between the states, their councils of defense, and the various federal war agencies. At that time, the Committee held numerous meetings with federal officials in an effort to clarify the OCD’s methods of operation. With the reorganization and improved administration of the OCD, the states and the state councils of defense again assumed an important part in the civilian defense picture.

The Council, at that time, through committees established to work first with General Knudsen and the Office of Production Management, and then with Donald Nelson, did much to assist these agencies in working with state governments. As a result of this activity the way was paved toward securing the aid of state governments in furthering and in handling the many critical problems of conservation of materials and of health and welfare in defense areas.

Throughout the pre-Pearl Harbor period, the Committee assisted in perfecting the war legislative program which grew out of the Federal-State Conference on Law Enforcement of August, 1940. Through our Drafting Committee, legislative proposals, including those having to do with the establishment of state defense councils, sabotage prevention, mobilization of state guards, regulation of explosives, and others, were developed and made available to the legislatures which met in 1941.

During the last half of 1941, other legislative proposals were drafted—many of them desired by national defense agencies—and the Committee was of assistance in forwarding this work in preparation for the legislative sessions of 1942. The Committee was well aware that War was not far off, and that it was imperative to have the states, in a legislative as well as an administrative way, prepared for War.

Then came Pearl Harbor! Your Board of Managers met a week later, and at that time the Committee on National Defense was reappointed. It immediately directed its full attention to war problems confronting both the states and the federal government.

The Drafting Committee was, called into extraordinary session at once, and prepared measures for civilian defense, including legislative bills on air raid precautions, blackouts, fire defense mobilization, military traffic control, regulation of health and sanitation areas, emergency war powers for the governors, war housing, and others.

At first, the Committee thought that it might be necessary for special legislative sessions to be called in almost every state, in order to place the states on a war footing. A survey was made immediately, through the staff of the Council of State Governments, of state statutory and constitutional provisions already covering the war powers of governors. As a result of that study, and on recommendation of the Drafting Committee, states were advised to review their local situations carefully before issuing calls for special sessions. It was felt that most states, through their councils of defense, and through the war powers of their governors, were quite well prepared to meet emergencies, without calling special sessions.

As a result, only eight special sessions were called throughout 1942. The states, it was clear, by being prepared in advance, were equal to the task since they had both the necessary legislation and the proper authority to handle the enormous jurisdictional and administrative problems of War.

COUNCIL ACTS ON WAR PROBLEMS

It was soon apparent that our governors and state officials, along with our great industrial leaders, understood War. What were some of their problems? How did the states and our public officials rise to meet them?

In bringing this report of the Council’s Committee on National Defense up to date, we will describe in a brief manner what we have faced, what you have faced, and how some of these problems were handled by you, as state officials, and by the officials of our federal war agencies.
Rationing and Stock Freezing

Less than a week after Pearl Harbor it was necessary to set up machinery, (1) to freeze our tires, and (2) to ration them. Tires became the most important rubber stock pile of the future. Sources of rubber were cut off and our stock pile was pitifully small. When the Executive Director of the Council of State Governments and others from the Council met with the OPA and the War Production Board on December 13, 1942, the country and its officials were faced with a totally new problem, both from the standpoint of the public and of its government. "Those at that important meeting thought that it would take six months to set up the proper administrative machinery and other details of the program. The Executive Director of the Council of State Governments said it could be done in three weeks, by using the established agencies of state and local governments—governors’ offices, state commissions on interstate cooperation, state and local defense councils, and so on. And it was done in less than three weeks. For by January 5, 1942, the freeze on rubber was lifted and OPA had begun the next step—that of rationing.

The contribution made by the Council during this period in helping to do this work should be a source of great satisfaction to us, and to all state officials. It has confirmed what we have always emphasized: that our federal system can function with amazing success when policy from Washington is clear and definite, and when the states and localities are called into partnership in carrying out and administering that policy.

Whether it is rationing or Selective Service, the nearer they are to the people, the more equitably can these critical problems be handled, and that means through state and local offices, state and local public officials.

Speed Limits and Conservation

Another example of the measuring up of the states to their responsibilities was their quick action when Rubber Administrator Jeffers asked them to establish and enforce a 35-mile-an-hour speed limit for the purpose of conserving tires and equipment. By telegraph and telephone the governors were asked to put into effect this request of the President and of Mr. Jeffers, and this was done throughout the country in record time.

The Office of Defense Transportation has frequently consulted with the Council of State Governments in developing and administering a national program of defense transportation. From the start, this has been a cooperative state and federal program. Its administration and enforcement have been decentralized and carried out with the assistance of established agencies in the states.

Interstate Restrictions

The Committee followed very closely the development and organization of the National Conference on State War Restrictions called in May of 1942 by the Department of Commerce. Members of the Committee participated in this Conference and in the national radio forum held immediately after the Conference. It was our firm conviction that, with the exception of the motor transport field, the states, as a result of the long-range program of the Council, had handled the trade barrier problem very well and had made great progress in abolishing or diminishing discriminatory barriers between states. At the Council’s suggestion, the President appointed a Federal-State Committee to probe the situation further, and to find a solution. Consultation with the heads of the war agencies confirmed our impression that motor vehicle barriers were practically the only state impediments to the war effort.

The action of the Council in arranging for the standardization of size and weight regulations, and the removal of duplicating licensing requirements throughout the country, are known to all of you. Here again, the states made good. This job of unifying motor vehicle standards was done in ten days.

The Way to Victory

That record is indisputable evidence of the soundness of the policy which the Council has advocated. The way to Victory lies in federal, state, and local cooperation. In spite of the compelling force
of this record of accomplishment, some federal agencies are "backsliding" and ignoring the lessons of the past.

At the meeting of the Board of Managers of the Council of State Governments, held in Chicago, on November 14, 1942, the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, The prosecution of this War is requiring and will increasingly require the supreme and united efforts of all of our people and all levels of government—federal, state, and local—composed of the same people; and

WHEREAS, The successful prosecution of the War requires the effective use of all of our governmental machinery no less than the effective use of our industrial machinery and agricultural resources; and

WHEREAS, The traditional American method of administering nationwide governmental enterprises and cooperative governmental services of a civilian nature has been through the use of all of our governmental machinery, with the federal government responsible for policy, program, and general supervision, the state responsible for direction and immediate supervision, and the local units responsible for operation; and

WHEREAS, This method of operation has avoided duplication, expedited action, and saved great amounts of money in wartime as in peace; now therefore be it

Resolved, First: that the Board of Managers of the Council of State Governments urges all war agencies charged with the administration of civilian war measures and with the maintenance of our home front to use, and use to the limit, all of our governmental machinery and agencies, state and local as well as federal, in the direction and operation of civilian war measures; and

Second: that the Board of Managers of the Council of State Governments, representing the states, assures the war agencies that state and local governments will make all of their facilities available, as they have in the past, for the administration of any and all activities and services necessary for the successful prosecution of the War.

Through sugar rationing—up until six months ago—the practice always was that the federal government said to the various states, "How much do you need?"; "Submit us a plan"; and grants of funds for either stenographic or clerical help and equipment were made upon the recommendations of the state administrators.

The change that has come about since that time—and it is a big change—is that instead of going from the federal government directly to the state, and nowhere else, OPA now contemplates, and in many places has already started, working down from the federal government through the various district offices scattered about the states. The federal government is staffing those offices and is not putting the primary responsibility for their organization, supervision, and immediate direction on the states, as they have in the past. That is the major change that has come about, and it makes the rationing operation a federal project rather than a federal-state-local cooperative project. In other words, the decentralized policy which we thought was firmly established is being sabotaged into a centralized system of rationing.

Therefore, there is need at this General Assembly to readopt the Resolution of November 14, 1942, and to check forcefully the centralization of rationing which can only bring irritation, additional cost, and a waste of manpower.

State War Legislation:

You will hear more about the subject of state war legislation at other sessions of this conference, but we do want to bring up to date what the Drafting Committee has been developing during the past few months. First of all, the Drafting Committee has worked directly under the Council's Committee on National Defense. Members of the Committee have attended the recent regional conferences which have been called to consider the 1943 legislative program. A number of the governors have attended and presided at the sessions, and this series of interesting meetings has had the attendance, throughout the country, of legislative leaders and defense council executives.

The Council has received the valuable assistance in this work of a special committee of the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, which is affiliated with the American Bar Association. It has also been aided by the Executive Committee of the National Association of Attorneys General, and by a representative group of practical minded state legislators from the commissions on interstate cooperation.

Through an arrangement with the Department of Justice, this Committee serves as a clearing house for various state legislative proposals in which the
states and the federal war agencies and departments are interested. This has been a state-federal project from the beginning, and through the Drafting Committee, with the help of governors, defense councils, and commissions on interstate cooperation, we have proceeded in an orderly manner to accomplish much in the legislative field. Examining our 1943 program briefly, we find our legislative proposals falling into certain categories.

The first of these categories includes legislative proposals such as the State Emergency War Powers Act and the Civilian Defense Act. These are general proposals whose principal purpose is to make the states effective agencies in fighting the War. One of these proposals is a highly controversial one—a proposal packed with headline-making material—the State-Emergency War Powers Act. There have been many occasions when it was necessary for the states to take immediate action, and there will be many, many more. These things have to be done! If they are not done by the states, the federal government or the Army will do them, with an accompanying loss to the states of authority, dignity, and respect. The Committee has preferred to meet the problems head on, as Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, Rhode Island, and several other states have met them—in an orderly manner, and through legislative action, in a democratic fashion. Such legislation enables the states to organize their machinery in a way which makes it possible to act effectively and expeditiously in any emergency. The Civilian Defense Act streamlines the defense council and civilian defense machinery.

The second group of proposals revises and brings up to date our previous State Guard Act, with amendments desired by the War Department. The State Explosives Act incorporates sensible and vital suggestions from the Bureau of Mines, the Department of Justice, and the FBI. This is an important measure for our national defense, and a protection against sabotage due to careless control of explosives. It supplements and complements the Federal Explosives Act, and we urge its enactment in all states.

The Amendment to the State Bank Loan Limitation statute is strongly recommended by the Federal Reserve Board, and it should go far to make possible the participation of local business, both small and large, in the war production program.

The Emergency Transportation Act has been carefully worked out by the Drafting Committee and the Office of Defense Transportation. It makes legal and official—for the duration—much that has been done, unofficially and through proclamation, in the transportation field, in handling speed limits, sizes and weights, reciprocity, and so on.

The Alien Property Custodian’s Office, the National Housing Administration, the Office of Civilian Defense, and the National Resources Planning Board, are other federal agencies which have assisted our Committee in developing this program.

Then there are two fiscal proposals which have been recommended in part by the Council’s Tax Committee. These, have to do with the establishment of state and local reserve funds, and the development of postwar planning and public works projects. These proposals would, if adopted by the states, postpone inflation now and set aside both funds and a schedule of projects for the rainy day we know is coming.

A series of bills covering emergency welfare services, such as evacuation and the establishment of day nurseries or child-care centers for children of working mothers, completes the program of suggested state war legislation for 1943.

We urge that you take the leadership in bringing these proposals to the attention of your legislatures. They should, of course, be designed and tailored to suit the situation in your state. They are suggestions, mainly, and are made available with the hope that you will see that your legislature has an opportunity to pass upon them.

Small Business and Manpower

There seem to us to be two additional fields of activity now urgently demanding the attention of all state govern-
ments: (1) the protection of small business; and (2) the manpower problem, with particular reference to agricultural labor. The state governments might make another great contribution to the war effort if they were to apply themselves to these two tasks. Without taking time to elaborate on either of these two pressing problems, we suggest that each presents an opportunity for creative, constructive thought and action on the part of the state governments.

Small business, in its relationship to community life, bears an analogy to local government in its relationship to the state. It is the small business man who, to a great extent, furnishes civic leadership and accepts civic responsibility. It is the small business man who is the strength of any community’s economic, social, and moral stability. The states, likewise, are dependent upon their localities for the maintenance of orderly, progressive government.

Somewhat parallel to this need is the increasingly serious necessity for the protection of our agricultural economy by assuring the maintenance of an adequate and continuing supply of farm labor. While industrial manpower problems involving the mobilization and transportation of vast stores of labor from one area to another may be most effectively handled by a federal agency, it would seem to us that in general the farm labor problem, as applied to the multiplicity of small farms, is one which must be solved by the states. Local initiative and enterprise are essential to success.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, we cannot let this opportunity pass without a humble bow to those responsible for the vigorous role being played by the states in this war emergency.

We would not be here, the states would not be so excellently equipped to handle war matters, were it not for the vision and the imagination of the Honorary President of the Council of State Governments, Henry W. Toll, of Colorado. Perhaps in his wisdom he foresaw the extreme need for this Council of State Governments in circumstances such as those we face today. Certain it is that without this coordinating leadership and without this effective channel of communication among the states, and between the states and the federal government; our federal system would not yet have come of age.

To his successor, Frank Bane, the ablest governmental organizer and administrator in the nation, the states owe much of their returning virility.

Just as we are impressed more and more with the thought that for the sake of mankind and for sheer self preservation we must, as a nation, do something to move this world away from its suicidal plurality toward some kind of unity, so over the past ten years, through the Council of State Governments, have we patiently pleaded the cause of a federal union of strongly-constituted, effective, state governments.

The verdict may well be left to history!
REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON RELIEF*

Your committee on relief has examined the situation with respect to general relief and public assistance through five regional conferences in which state legislators and public officials concerned have participated.

Out of the discussions in these conferences and related information your committee has formulated certain proposals for the consideration of this Assembly.

These proposals cover only so much of the present system of administering public relief and assistance as in our opinion urgently requires simplification or revision at the present time. They are:

1. Direct relief should be added as a category to the federal security program to be administered by the states as a part of their general shared relief program.

2. All work relief should be operated by the states as a part of the general shared relief programs. This means a transfer of administrative responsibility for work relief from the federal government to the states.

3. The relief of migratory workers or persons should be handled by the states as a part of their general relief programs, and should be reimbursable by the federal government. To facilitate this proposal the question of uniform state settlement laws should be dealt with at the earliest moment.

4. The same rate of federal reimbursement should be applied to each shared program of public assistance within any state.

5. The rate of federal reimbursement should vary among the states from a minimum of 50 per cent to a maximum of 75 per cent. The schedule upon which federal reimbursements vary should be predetermined and publicly announced.

6. All administrative costs of state and local welfare agencies operating the shared programs should be reimbursed by the federal government at the same rate as applies to other reimbursements.

7. The distribution of surplus commodities in any state should be in accordance with plans developed and mutually agreed upon by the federal government and the state agency charged with public assistance in that state.

8. Occupational training of potentially employable persons should be intensified.

9. Rehabilitation through medical care and treatment of physical defects should be intensified and should be a part of the reimbursable program of general relief.

10. There should be a continuing joint congressional committee working with state legislative and administrative groups in planning for new or modified legislation, and for the purpose of providing for research in public assistance.

11. This Assembly should provide a legislative counterpart to the joint congressional committee by a continuing committee on relief of the Council of State Governments.

Your committee believes that these proposals, if adopted, would lead to: (a) better service to needy persons, (b) more efficient administration, and (c) substantial savings to both the states and the federal government.

* This report, developed in 1941, approved by the Fifth General Assembly, and included in the 1941-1942 Book of the States, is reprinted by request, as a possible guide for state governments and for the federal government after the War.
THE COMMISSIONS ON INTERSTATE COOPERATION

The framework and machinery of the Council is made up of the commissions on interstate cooperation, and it is through them that the Council carries on its program of activities. Forty-four states are now officially cooperating in the work of the Council through such commissions. Of these, 42 have been established by legislative action, and two are official agencies appointed by the governor. Arizona, Idaho, North Dakota, and Washington have no official commissions, but these states, through their governors and legislative committees, participate actively in the work of the Council. The model bill, setting up cooperation commissions in the states by law, establishes the Council and provides for the states' membership and participation in it. In part, the bill (published in full on pages 43-44) reads: "The Council of State Governments is hereby declared to be a joint governmental agency of this state and of the other states which cooperate through it."

Most of the commissions are patterned after provisions in the model bill drafted by the Council and, with few exceptions, consist of 15 members, including 10 legislators and 5 administrative officials. Five of the legislative members constitute the senate standing committee on interstate cooperation, and 5 make up the house standing committee on interstate cooperation. These committees are appointed in the same way as are other standing committees of the legislatures. In most cases the speaker appoints the house members, the president of the senate appoints the senate members, and the governor names the administrative committee, usually from the members of his cabinet.

These committees constitute the senate council and the house council of the American Legislators' Association, and through these agencies the Council of State Governments continues to carry on the activities and the program of the American Legislators' Association, which was the parent organization of the Council.

The number of commissions and their fields of activities have expanded greatly since the first commission was established in New Jersey, in 1935. During the intervening years, and especially since the outbreak of the War, they have functioned in an increasingly effective manner and are daily demonstrating that they are capable of meeting the interstate and federal-state problems growing out of the War. Since the appointment of the Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense in June, 1940, the cooperation commissions, working through the Council, have directed their efforts first, to developing a comprehensive program of national defense, and then to assisting the federal government in every way possible in the direct prosecution of the War. In general, the achievements of the commissions have been in direct proportion to the appropriation received from their legislatures. Those commissions which have made the best record have had sufficient funds to employ an executive secretary and, in some cases, a research staff.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

The cooperation commissions in 1941 assisted the Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense in developing and establishing state and local defense councils throughout the country. From the beginning, the commissions placed their facilities at the disposal of the state defense councils, and in many states served as legislative committees for their state defense councils. Members of the commissions have served on the Legislative Drafting Committee of the Council, which in 1940-1941 carried out the legislative recommendations of the Federal-State Conference on Law.
Enforcement Problems of National Defense. As a result of this work and of the legislative activities of the cooperation commissions, model laws were adopted by the states providing for the creation of state guards, regulation of explosives, sabotage prevention, and the protection of interstate public property. As a result of this groundwork, the states were better prepared for War. Most important of all, through the adoption of this legislation, state guards were immediately mobilized after Pearl Harbor and took over the home defense while our Army was being mobilized and trained.

Since December 7, 1941, cooperation commissions have continued to handle the war legislation developed by the Council, which in turn worked through the Department of Justice and federal war agencies. This legislative program, which is described in another section of The Book of the States, is most comprehensive, including proposals providing for every conceivable emergency situation that could be faced by the states during the War. In bringing this program to the attention of the country, and especially of state legislatures, the cooperation commissions joined with state councils of defense, legislative leaders, governors, attorneys general, and representatives of the federal war agencies in a series of regional conferences held throughout the country during November and December, 1942, in preparation for the legislative sessions of 1943. As a result of this work, every state has had a chance to consider the program and to adopt such legislation as it believed necessary for the successful prosecution of the War. The seaboard states, many of them actually in combat zones, have been the first to enact much of this war emergency legislation developed by representatives of the commissions on interstate cooperation.

FISCAL POLICIES

During the past two years, representatives of the commissions have also served on the Council's Tax Committee and have helped to develop the "Statement of Fiscal Policies for Federal, State, and Local Governments," containing important recommendations which have been widely adopted by governors and state legislatures throughout the country. The commissions have played a large part in the drive to eliminate interstate barriers, particularly laws, rules, and regulations which were impeding the war effort.

Working with the Governors' Conference and a special committee appointed by President Roosevelt from the federal war agencies, the Council was able to remove restrictions having to do with motor transport which were hindering the war effort and to secure approval by the states of a set of uniform minimum size and weight requirements. These standards, first developed by a northeastern regional conference of commissioners on interstate cooperation, were approved and adopted by the War Department and put into effect throughout the country, with the assistance of the Council and the cooperation commissions. Soon after this, members of the cooperation commissions supported and assisted the governors of the states in putting into effect the 35-mile-per-hour speed limit recommended by the Baruch committee and desired by the Rubber Administrator.

TRADE BARRIERS

The commissions have continued to oppose the establishment of interstate trade barriers during the War. By action in their states, and through regional conferences, they have continued the fight which they initiated at the time of the National Conference on Interstate Trade Barriers held in April, 1939, against internal barriers to free trade. Their work has been highly effective in this field—so effective, in fact, that few new trade barriers were even considered by the legislatures meeting in 1941 and 1942, and it is apparent that during the present legislative year of 1943 the commissions will continue to be successful in opposing legislation creating trade barriers.

That this problem was not really
critical became apparent after the ad-
journment of the National Conference
called by the Department of Commerce
to consider trade barriers in May, 1942,
when committees representing the Coun-
cil met with the heads of war agencies
to determine what the trade barrier
situation really was and to do something
about it immediately. After a thorough
investigation, it was decided that the
one category of state laws and regula-
tions that seemed to be impeding the
war effort was that having to do with
motor transport. The successful han-
dling of this situation is described above.

STATE-FEDERAL COOPERATION

One great contribution of the co-
operation commissions during the War
has been the expert advice and assistance
which their chairmen and members have
given to the federal war agencies. Many
of the commissioners have personally
served on regional and state defense com-
mittees, and others have acted as state
or regional administrators in carrying
out the rationing and the civil protec-
tion programs of the national govern-
ment. "Working together for the past
few years through the Council of State
Governments, these men have become
acquainted with cabinet officers, with
federal administrators, and with mem-
bers of commissions of other states. As
a result, during this time of emergency,
many of them have been called to the
public service to assist in the prosecution
of the War.

UNIFORM LAWS

The commissions have continued to
lead the way in sponsoring uniform leg-
islation, initiating investigations, and
working closely with administrative
officials in solving the problems assigned
to them. During 1942, the Interstate
Commission on Crime was merged with
the Council. In the field of crime con-
trol, cooperation commissions for some
years have sought to secure the enact-
ment by the states of the following group
of uniform state laws for crime control:
arrest, interstate and intra-state fresh pur-
suit, extradition, rendition of witnesses,
interstate parole and probation super-
vision, firearms, and narcotics. During
the 1943 sessions of the legislatures the
cooperation commissions are continuing
to press the enactment of those proposals
which have not yet been adopted in their
states.

Through an arrangement made with
the National Conference of Commis-
sioners on Uniform State Laws, the
Council of State Governments is facilitat-
ing legislative consideration of bills
drafted by the National Conference of
Commissioners on Uniform State Laws.
The best method of bringing this about
is through the support of cooperation
commissions. Accordingly, the commis-
sions throughout the nation have given
intensive consideration to the acts
drafted by the National Conference.
Through meetings, through the work of
field representatives, and by correspond-
ence, the Council has brought together
the cooperation commissions and their
commissioners on uniform state laws
throughout the country, with the result
that a select list of uniform laws is being
sponsored by the legislative members of
the cooperation commissions in the
various states.

That this method of operation is both
practical and unusually successful is in-
dicated by the fact that in the 1941 leg-
sislative sessions, 201 of the acts were
introduced and 71 passed. This is in
comparison with the 1939 sessions, when
only 122 of the acts were introduced and
36 passed. So successful has been the
accomplishment of the cooperation com-
misions in the field that at its annual
meeting with the American Bar Associa-
tion in August, 1942, the National Con-
ference suggested that the arrangement
with the Council of State Governments
be put on a more permanent basis. This
arrangement was consummated at the
meeting of the Board of Managers of
the Council in November, 1942.

OTHER ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The Atlantic States Marine Fisheries
Commission was established by inter-
state compact during the past biennium,
with the assistance and sponsorship of
the commissions on interstate coopera-
tion. Eleven states on the eastern sea
board have ratified the compact. This type of agency, which is described in another chapter, may also prove effective in conserving the fisheries of the Columbia River and those off the Pacific Coast.

Forestry problems having to do with forest fire prevention, public regulation of cutting, extension of public ownership, and forest taxation and grants-in-aid are the concern of commissions on both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. Continuing committees have been set up both regionally and on a national basis to develop a comprehensive program for handling these specific matters, as well as to deal with other problems which have grown out of conservation conferences held by the commissions.

Boundary difficulties between Indiana and Kentucky, and between Rhode Island and New York were amicably settled during the biennium through the action of cooperation commissions in arranging conferences, conducting surveys, and drafting legislation which resulted in the adoption of interstate compacts for the formal settlement of minor points of difference previously existing between these two sets of states.

As in the past, the cooperation commissions have continued their interest in the work of the Potomac and Delaware River Commissions, which were established in part through their efforts, and on which representatives of the cooperation commissions serve. These river basin commissions are successfully handling interstate and regional questions of water supply, pollution abatement, flood control, and recreational development.

Among the particular problems concerning the states in the western area are those having to do with trade barriers, particularly restrictions hindering distribution of western agricultural products and wines. Transportation problems, especially those related to motor vehicles, have also been considered by these commissions. It is hoped that in the future commissions will be able to assist in solving some of the water resources problems in the Far West. The commissions have also been concerned with policies concerning the administration of forests, grazing lands, and fish and game.

The San Francisco office acts as a service agency for the cooperation commissions and for public officials in the West, in the same manner as the New York office assists the northeastern states, the Washington office helps many of the southern states, and the Chicago office serves the Middle West.

CONCLUSION

All organizations and agencies working through the Council, and especially the commissions on interstate cooperation, have been interested in, (1) lending every possible assistance to the federal government in the direct prosecution of the war; (2) maintaining and developing those democratic institutions on the home front which are playing so important a part in the total war effort and which should be organized, developed, and administered by state and local governments.

For the immediate future and the period after the War, cooperation commissions are joining with other agencies of the Council in carefully planning for the assumption by the states of those duties and responsibilities of a public nature growing out of the War—duties and responsibilities which should and must be assumed by the states if they are to maintain their rightful place in our American federal system.

Cooperation commissions are aware that with the return of peace many large scale governmental, social, and economic problems will demand solution, and solution in the shortest possible time:
problems of taxation and fiscal policy, of public works programming, of employment and unemployment, of the extension and administration of social services, and of education—particularly with respect to rehabilitation and vocational education. The handling of these problems and the states' responsibility for them are now being considered by cooperation commissions which are meeting with governors and other public officials throughout the country. In preparing for the postwar period, officers of the Council and representatives of the various cooperation commissions believe that now is the time for the states to develop the organization and planning which are necessary in order to avoid ill-advised action upon the return of peace. The Council believes that it is important for the states to be prepared to handle postwar problems as effectively as they have dealt with those emergency problems which have arisen during the War. Composed as they are of state administrative and legislative officials, and working closely with their governors through the Council of State Governments, the cooperation commissions are ideally qualified to serve as prime movers and points of contact with state legislatures, both in prosecuting the War and in carrying forward a program for postwar reconstruction and development throughout the country.

**MODEL ACT FOR ESTABLISHING COMMISSIONS ON INTERSTATE COOPERATION**

*An Act to Facilitate the Cooperation of This State with Other Units of Government and to Establish an Unpaid Commission for That Purpose*

**BE IT ENACTED, etc.,**

**Section 1.** There is hereby established a standing committee of the Senate of this state, to be officially known as the Senate Committee on Interstate Cooperation, and to consist of five Senators. The members and the chairman of this committee shall be designated in the same manner as is customary in the case of the members and chairmen of other standing committees of the Senate. In addition to the regular members, the president of the Senate shall be ex officio an honorary non-voting member of this committee.

**Section 2.** There is hereby established a similar standing committee of the House of Representatives of this state, to be officially known as the House Committee on Interstate Cooperation, and to consist of five members of the House of Representatives. The members and the chairman of this committee shall be designated in the same manner as is customary in the case of the members and chairmen of other standing committees of the House of Representatives. In addition to the regular members, the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall be ex officio an Honorary non-voting member of this committee.

**Section 3.** There is hereby established a committee of administrative officials and employees of this state to be officially known as the Governor's Committee on Interstate Cooperation, and to consist of five members. Its members shall be: the Budget Director or the corresponding official of this state, ex officio; the Attorney General, ex officio; the chief of the staff of the State Planning Board or the corresponding official of this state, ex officio; and two other administrative officials or employees to be designated by the Governor. If there is uncertainty as to the identity of any of the ex officio members of this committee, the Governor shall determine the question, and his determination and designation shall be conclusive. The Governor shall appoint one of the five members of this committee as its chairman. In addition to the regular members, the Governor shall be ex officio an honorary non-voting member of this committee.

**Section 4.** There is hereby established the Commission on Interstate Cooperation. This Commission shall be composed of fifteen regular members, namely:

- The five members of the Senate Committee on Interstate Cooperation,
- The five members of the House Committee on Interstate Cooperation, and
- The five members of the Governor's Committee on Interstate Cooperation.

The Governor, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall be ex officio honorary non-voting members of this Commission. The Chairman of the Governor's Committee on Interstate Cooperation shall be ex officio Chairman of this Commission. The Chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate Cooperation shall be ex officio first Vice-Chairman of the Commission, and the Chairman of the House Committee shall be ex officio second Vice-Chairman of the Commission.

**Section 5.** The said standing Committee of the Senate and the said standing Committee of
the House of Representatives shall function during the regular sessions of the Legislature and also during the interim periods between such sessions; their members shall serve until their successors are designated; and they shall respectively constitute for this state the Senate and House Council of the American Legislators' Association. The incumbency of each administrative member of this Commission shall extend until the first day of February next following his appointment, and thereafter until his successor is appointed.

Section 6. It shall be the function of this Commission:

(1) To carry forward the participation of this state as a member of the Council of State Governments.

(2) To encourage and assist the legislative, executive, administrative and judicial officials and employees of this state to develop and maintain friendly contact by correspondence, by conference, and, otherwise, with officials and employees of the other states, of the Federal Government, and of local units of government.

(3) To endeavor to advance cooperation between this state and other units of government whenever it seems advisable to do so by formulating proposals for, and by facilitating

(a) The adoption of compacts,

(b) The enactment of uniform or reciprocal statutes,

(c) The adoption of uniform or reciprocal administrative rules and regulations,

(d) The informal cooperation of governmental offices with one another,

(e) The personal cooperation of governmental officials and employees with one another, individually,

(f) The interchange and clearance of research and information, and

(g) Any other suitable process.

(4) In short, to do all such acts as will, in the opinion of this Commission, enable this state to do its part—or more than its part—in forming a more perfect union among the various governments in the United States and in developing the Council of State Governments for that purpose.

Section 7. The Commission shall establish such delegations and committees as it deems advisable, in order that they may confer and formulate proposals concerning effective means to secure intergovernmental harmony, and may perform other functions for the Commission in obedience to its decisions. Subject to the approval of the Commission, the member or members of each such delegation or committee shall be appointed by the Chairman of the Commission. State officials or employees who are not members of the Commission on Interstate Cooperation may be appointed as members of any such delegation or committee, but private citizens holding no governmental position in this state shall not be eligible. The Commission may provide such other rules as it considers appropriate concerning the membership and the functioning of any such delegation or committee. The Commission may provide for advisory boards for itself and for its various delegations and committees, and may authorize private citizens to serve on such boards.

Section 8. The Commission shall report to the Governor and to the Legislature within fifteen days after the convening of each regular legislative session, and at such other times as it deems appropriate. Its members and the members of all delegations and committees which it establishes shall serve without compensation for such service, but they shall be paid their necessary expenses in carrying out their obligations under this Act. The Commission may employ a secretary and a stenographer, if the other expenses as may be necessary for the proper performance of its duties, and it may, by contributions to the Council of State Governments, participate with other states in maintaining the said Council's district and central secretariats and its other governmental services.

Section 9. The Committees and the Commission established by this Act shall be informally known, respectively, as the Senate Cooperation Committee, the House Cooperation Committee, the Governor's Cooperation Committee and the Cooperation Commission.

(Name of State)

Section 10. The Council of State Governments is hereby declared to be a joint governmental agency of this state and of the other states which cooperate through it.

Section 11. The Secretary of State shall forthwith communicate the text of this measure to the Governor, to the Senate, and to the House of Representatives, of each of the other states of the Union, and shall advise each legislature which has not already done so that it is hereby memorialized to enact a law similar to this measure, thus establishing a similar commission, and thus joining with this state in the common cause of reducing the burdens which are imposed upon the citizens of every state by governmental confusion, competition and conflict.

Section 12. This Act shall take effect immediately.

Section 13. If any clause or other portion of this Act is held to be invalid, that decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this Act. The Legislature hereby declares that all such remaining portions of this Act are severable and that this shall have the effect of such remaining portions if the invalid portions had not been included in this Act.
NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AFFILIATED WITH THE COUNCIL

GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE

Organization: Organized in 1908. Composed of all state and territorial governors.

Purpose: To facilitate an exchange of views and experiences on subjects of general importance to the people of the several states; to promote greater uniformity in state legislation; and to attain greater efficiency in state administration.

Officers: Members of the Executive Committee for the year 1943:

Herbert R. O'Conor, Governor of Maryland, Chairman
Leverett Saltonstall, Governor of Massachusetts
J. Melville Broughton, Governor of North Carolina
John W. Bricker, Governor of Ohio
Herbert B. Maw, Governor of Utah
Frank Bane, Secretary-Treasurer

Secretariat: The Council of State Governments.

Annual Meeting: June 20-23, 1943, Columbus, Ohio. The 1942 Conference was held in Asheville, North Carolina.

Publications: Proceedings of the Governors' Conference, annual. Governors' Bulletins, summarizing proclamations, statements, administrative orders, and addresses received from the governors, issued at frequent intervals by the Council of State Governments.

Activities: Participation in the program and activities of the Council of State Governments, including its General Assembly and other national and regional conferences. Serves as a clearing house for information on administrative subjects and problems in the field of government. The Conference makes use of the research and informational facilities of the Council of State Governments; its Executive Committee serves on the Board of Managers of the Council. Individually, its members avail themselves of the inquiry service of the Council and further cooperate with it through their administrative appointees to the state commissions on interstate cooperation.
THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF ATTORNEYS GENERAL

Organization: Organized in 1907. Composed of all state and territorial attorneys general, their assistants and deputies.

Purpose: To provide clearing house facilities and machinery for cooperation among the chief legal executives of the states and territories.

Officers: For the year 1943:

- President: Thomas J. Herbert, Attorney General of Ohio
- Vice President: Francis A. Pallotti, Attorney General of Connecticut
- John M. Rankin, Attorney General of Iowa
- Greek L. Rice, Attorney General of Mississippi
- William C. Walsh, Attorney General of Maryland

Secretariat: The Council of State Governments.

Annual Meeting: Late summer or early fall, at a time and place to be selected by the Executive Committee. The 1942 conference was held in St. Louis, Missouri.

Publications: Proceedings of the Conference of the National Association of Attorneys General, annual. Digest of Opinions, containing opinions of the several state attorneys general which are of widespread interest, issued weekly by the secretariat.

Activities: At the request of individual attorneys general, the secretariat performs research services and makes available information of general interest to the members of the Association. The secretariat of the Association serves as a clearing house for opinions of the state attorneys general, with the purpose of facilitating uniformity in the interpretation of state laws through the interchange of opinions.

The President of the National Association is a member of the Board of Managers of the Council of State Governments and of the Council's Committee on Social Security Problems.
THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SECRETARIES OF STATE

Organization: Organized in 1904. Composed of all secretaries of state.

Purpose: To facilitate an exchange of views and to provide clearing house facilities and machinery for cooperation among the secretaries of state of the nation.

Officers: For the year 1943:

President: Edward J. Hughes, Illinois
Vice President: Sophia M. R. O’Hara, Pennsylvania
Recording Secretary: John E. Sweeney, Ohio
Corresponding Secretary: Jessie M. Gonzales, New Mexico
Treasurer: Walker Wood, Mississippi
John B. Wilson, Georgia
Frederic W. Cook, Massachusetts
Mike Holm, Minnesota
Dwight H. Brown, Missouri
Enoch D. Fuller, New Hampshire
Thad Eure, North Carolina
E. E. Monson, Utah

Secretariat: The Council of State Governments.

Annual Meeting: October 18-20, 1943, St. Louis, Missouri. The 1942 meeting was held in Baltimore, Maryland.

Publications: The Proceedings of the National Association of Secretaries of State, annual.

Activities: During the past year the National Association’s Committee on Election Procedure has met on various occasions with representatives of the Army, the Navy, and the Department of Justice for the purpose of making it easier for those in the armed services to vote by absentee ballot. Other active committees are those on Corporation Registration and Trade Mark Registration; the latter is investigating the possibility of handling this problem through uniform legislation rather than by compulsory registration.

The President of the Association is a member of the Board of Managers of the Council of State Governments.
THE AMERICAN LEGISLATORS' ASSOCIATION

Organization: Organized in 1925. Composed of all members of the state legislatures by reason of their office. The American Legislators' Association became a section of the Council of State Governments when the latter was established in 1933.

Purpose: To assist each legislature in performing its work more effectively, and generally to bring about an improvement in legislative conditions throughout the country.

Officers: Since the American Legislators' Association is now a section of the Council, it has no separate officers. In each of the states, the house and the senate committees of the commissions on interstate cooperation constitute the states' representation in the Association.

Secretariat: The Council of State Governments.

Publications: State Government, published monthly by the Council, is the successor to the original American Legislator, publication of the American Legislators' Association.

Activities: The American Legislators' Association, a section of the Council of State Governments, continues to maintain a clearing house for state legislative reference bureaus and legislative councils, as well as an inquiry service for legislators, and it conducts studies on legislative organizations, techniques, and personnel. It encourages the establishment of reference bureaus in those states which do not have them, and works toward the improvement and expansion of those which do exist.
THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF COMMISSIONERS ON UNIFORM STATE LAWS.

ORGANIZATION: Organized in 1892. Composed of one to five commissioners from each state, appointed by their respective governors.

PURPOSE: To promote uniformity in state laws on subjects where uniformity is deemed desirable and practicable, and to draft model laws for the states where such statutes are believed to be useful.

OFFICERS: For the year 1943:

President: JOHN CARLISLE PRYOR, Iowa
Vice President: W. E. STANLEY, Kansas
Treasurer: MURRAY M. SHOEMAKER, Ohio
Secretary: BARTON H. KUHNS, Nebraska
Chairman, Executive Committee: ROBERT T. BARTON, JR., Virginia
Acting Chairman, Executive Committee: WILLIAM A. SCHNADER, Pennsylvania

ANNUAL MEETING: Held the week before and at the same place as the annual meeting of the American Bar Association.

PUBLICATIONS: Handbook of the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, annual.

ACTIVITIES: A committee of the Conference receives suggestions as to possible topics for uniform and model legislation and approves those deemed practicable. Bills are drafted by the state commissioners; after due consideration and approval by the representatives of at least 20 states, and by the American Bar Association, the laws are released for presentation to the legislatures.

The Council of State Governments, with which the Conference has a cooperative agreement, has interested the various commissions on interstate cooperation in the uniform law program. The President of the Conference is a member of the Board of Managers of the Council of State Governments.
The following national governmental organizations are housed in the same building as the Council of State Governments, at 1313 East 60th Street, Chicago, Illinois:

AMERICAN MUNICIPAL ASSOCIATION
Earl D. Mallery, Executive Director

AMERICAN PUBLIC WELFARE ASSOCIATION
Fred K. Hoehler, Executive Director, on leave; Howard L. Russell, Acting Director

AMERICAN PUBLIC WORKS ASSOCIATION
Norman Hebden, Executive Director, on leave; Herbert D. Fritz, Assistant Director

AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
Don K. Price, Managing Editor

AMERICAN SOCIETY OF PLANNING OFFICIALS
Walter H. Blucher, Executive Director

CIVIL SERVICE ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA
James M. Mitchell, Director

FEDERATION OF TAX ADMINISTRATORS
Charles F. Conlon, Executive Director, on leave; George H. Watson, Acting Executive Director

INTERNATIONAL CITY MANAGERS' ASSOCIATION
Clarence E. Ridley, Executive Director

MUNICIPAL FINANCE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION
Carl H. Chatters, Executive Director

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF ASSESSING OFFICIALS
Albert W. Noonan, Executive Director

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF HOUSING OFFICIALS
Hugh R. Pomeroy, Director

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION CLEARING HOUSE
Louis Brownlow, Director

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION SERVICE
H. G. Pope, Executive Director