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RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN COOPERATIVE STATE ACTION

During the years 1940-1945 the forty-eight states have worked both singly and jointly to insure the defense of America and the victory of the United Nations in the great war. As unprecedented problems of rationing, price control, and the mobilization of manpower and natural resources confronted the nation, the states were called upon to assume responsibilities exceeding those borne during any previous national emergency. That the states were prepared to undertake responsibility for certain of the most vital wartime jobs is in large part attributable to the machinery which the states themselves created during the decade preceding the war. Because the Commissions on Interstate Cooperation and other organizations of state officials associated with the Council of State Governments have been the machinery through which the states have to a large extent worked together in the war effort, the sixth Book of the States begins with an account of recent developments in cooperative state action by the Executive Director of the Council. This report, originally submitted to the Board of Managers of the Council, is essentially a story of the role of the states in the period of the war. The winning of the war remained the first concern of the states in this period, but of necessity the states began to take timely measures to meet the demand of reconversion which the future was sure to bring.

STATE COOPERATION IN WAR AND RECONVERSION*

For the past four years, the Council of State Governments has been a defense and war agency. It has been so recognized by the federal government, and it has been so used by the states. To the extent of its ability and resources, the Council has attempted to facilitate in 1944, as in other years, the resolution of the states to dedicate everything they have to the supreme task of winning the war.

In this war effort the states have been eminently successful. The operation of the selective service program, the rationing program, the motor truck transport program, and the salvage, conservation, and migratory farm labor programs all bear witness to the ability of the states to organize all of their facilities and resources, and to direct them toward one common end.

The success of our governments—federal and state—in working together and in organizing and operating our civilian war programs and activities is comparable to the success that we have had on various fronts around the world, and it has contributed greatly to that success.

Our annual reports in 1942 and 1943 have described in detail these policies, plans, and programs, and their organiza-

---

*Annual report of Frank Bane, Executive Director of the Council of State Governments, for 1944.
tion and administration. Suffice it to say that these jobs are still our main jobs and will continue to have priority with all of the states until victory is assured.

Two years ago, the Board of Managers of the Council of State Governments, realizing that, whereas it is necessary in time of peace to prepare for war, it is likewise necessary in time of war to prepare for peace, authorized and directed the Council of State Governments to work with the states in developing a constructive program for postwar reconstruction that will recommend state action for encouraging and assisting business, industry, and agriculture on many fronts, for only in this way can we hope to attain and develop that "adventure in prosperity."

PUBLIC WORKS

The states will consider programs for public works, developed in such a way as to repair essential facilities that have been worn down through war use and because of lack of both materials and manpower. They will also consider the construction of needed new works, such as additional highways, public buildings, educational and eleemosynary institutions, additional hospital facilities, water works and sanitary engineering, and—in cooperation with other levels of government—the development of a large-scale housing program in order to begin that long-delayed and much-needed effort for the elimination of slums and for the providing of decent housing for that large segment of our population in need of such facilities.

In addition, there will undoubtedly be a large-scale airport program after the war. If aviation is to develop in America, airport facilities must be available throughout the country; and, whereas it is easy to over-emphasize and exaggerate the possibilities in this field, nevertheless we are to some extent in the same position today with respect to the airplane that we were forty years ago with respect to the automobile.

The building of roads contributed materially to the development of our gigantic automobile industry, that marvel of the first quarter of the twentieth century. To a very considerable extent, likewise, the building of airports will maintain and develop our aviation industry.

These postwar public works programs, being developed in the states, are in many instances organized, planned, blue-printed, financed, and ready to go. In many other instances, the programs are not this far along at the present time, but great and rapid progress is being made, and plans, programs, and bills designed to expedite this work will be submitted to practically all of the 1945 state legislatures.

These public works programs, properly timed and scheduled, will contribute ma-
terially if need should arise to that all-important task of America: insuring necessary, worth-while jobs for our people.

STATE UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION SYSTEMS

One of the major problems before the states today is the development of a comprehensive program for expanding and improving our state unemployment compensation systems.

When the Social Security Act was passed in 1935, the unemployment compensation and public assistance programs were built upon the federal-state cooperative plan that had proved so successful in the development and administration of our agricultural, highway, health, and vocational education programs.

An over-all national program was established, but administration and operation were left in the hands of the states.

For nine years, the states have administered unemployment compensation. Throughout this period, including both depression and war boom, the states have developed and improved their systems and have amended their statutes, when necessary, to meet the needs of the times.

Upon several occasions, efforts have been made by some groups and agencies to abolish the federal-state cooperative program with respect to unemployment compensation and to substitute therefor a federal plan and program administered directly by the federal government. The states have opposed this proposal for the following reasons:

1. The present system has worked well, and has provided necessary compensation for the unemployed.

2. All of our experience with respect to public services has demonstrated the desirability of operating those services to the greatest extent possible through those governmental units closest to the people if effective and economical service is to be maintained.

3. Governmental services developed and administered by local units of government can best serve the differing needs of people in different sections of this widespread country of ours.

But the states realize that the postwar period in all probability will produce problems greater than any that have hitherto confronted our unemployment compensation systems; and that it is possible that sudden and large-scale unemployment might develop for some period of time after the war. With this in mind, almost all of the states are planning at the meeting of the legislatures in January to look to their unemployment compensation systems; to see that their tax systems are geared to meet any need which may arise; to see that their reserve funds remain solvent; to extend the coverage of their state unemployment compensation systems in order to include additional groups of people; and to examine their unemployment compensation payments and the duration of such payments in order to insure that their systems, in operation in the postwar period, shall actually constitute an effective cushion against temporary unemployment. Definite suggestions for the improvement of state systems of unemployment compensation have been recommended by the Board of Managers to the states for their consideration.

VETERANS' AFFAIRS

All of the states are organizing their facilities and developing ways and means to provide opportunities and necessary care and service for their returning veterans. Many state legislatures did much in this direction in 1943; and all of the state commissions on postwar reconstruction and development have given this subject first consideration.

The Council of State Governments has been working with the states and with the federal government in an effort to develop a well-rounded, constructive program, and the states have been constantly and currently advised relative to federal legislation and administrative actions in this field, with the result that state activities have been designed to supplement national programs.

State funds have been made available and the states have organized and are organizing their facilities to provide every possible opportunity for veterans; to provide all necessary medical care and treatment; and to provide extensive and specific educational opportunities, designed to meet the particular needs of the men.
and women who will return from the armed services to civilian life; and also to provide ways and means to assist them in every way possible to re-establish themselves in our civilian economy.

To this task the states—all of them—will dedicate their resources and their facilities with pride and with enthusiasm, because they realize, in the words of the distinguished president of the Council of State Governments, Governor Saltonstall, that:

“The future of our country will rest largely in the hands of the men and women now in our armed forces. They will be the dominating force in civic affairs. We must give them the chance to complete their education, to be rehabilitated and re-trained so that they may be employed in useful work.

“We must guide them and see that they assume their responsibilities as well as enjoy their privileges. They have become experts in war. It will be our fault if they do not become experts in peace.”

The states realize that in doing this job—doing it fully and well—they will develop a postwar society in which the veteran will provide that new strength and new leadership so essential for the welfare of postwar America and the world.

EDUCATION AND SOCIAL SERVICES

If there is one thing in addition to our industrial genius for which the United States is well known throughout the world, it is for its extensive and far-flung system of public education. America has the most elaborate system of public education, from kindergarten through the university, of any country in the world. This system has been built, developed, maintained, and operated by the states; and the states are now examining their educational systems with the idea of making necessary changes and additions in order to meet more effectively the needs of their people.

Educators agree that many changes are necessary and desirable—changes which will provide additional facilities, especially in the realm of adult education and vocational training and guidance. To these problems the commissions on postwar reconstruction and development in the states, in cooperation with their educational authorities, have been directing their attention. The suggestions that will be made in this field to the coming legislatures will constitute one of the most important parts of the postwar program.

America believes in public education. It is the bedrock of our democracy, and America means to keep it strong and sound.

The commissions, in cooperation with medical, health, and welfare officials, have also developed plans for extending and improving our health and social services. Our experiences with selective service have again indicated, as they did in World War I, that America can spend to great advantage more of her energy, her time, and her resources in safeguarding the health and welfare of her citizens. No expenditures provide greater dividends.

There is a general belief that war must be followed by periods of unrest, characterized by an increase in crime. Many people believe that this is inevitable because, they say, “it always has happened.” Many things have happened in the past that need not happen again. They have happened in far too many instances because we have not carefully appraised our problems and devised ways and means to meet new and changing situations.

The Council of State Governments has had a very effective Committee on Crime Prevention and Control, and this committee has developed and submitted to the states suggestions which it is certain will eliminate many of the circumstances which in the past have been responsible for many of our difficulties.

SURPLUS WAR PROPERTY

About ten months ago, the administrator of the Surplus War Property Administration suggested to the Council of State Governments that it work with his organization in developing an administrative plan for the orderly and effective disposal of surplus war property to the states and their political subdivisions.

The Council established a technical committee composed of state purchasing agents, and this committee, working with the staff of the Surplus War Property Administration in Washington over a period of months, developed a simple operating plan to handle this work.

The plan, in essence, provided for the
organization on the federal level of four
disposal agencies that would be respon­sible for assembling, tabulating, and dis­tributing all war property declared to be
surplus by federal departments, institu­tions, or agencies; and for the designation
of or establishment in each of the states of
a central purchasing agency to handle di­rectly all purchases of surplus war prop­erty for the state itself, its departments,
and its agencies, and which would act as
the agent of the federal government, on
the one hand, and as agent of the political
subdivisions of the state, on the other, in
the disposal of such property to the polit­ical subdivisions of the state.

The plan contemplated to every extent
possible the fullest use of already existing
governmental institutions and agencies on
the federal, state, and local levels; and
every effort was made in developing this
plan to avoid the establishment of addi­tional and duplicating machinery which,
in the very nature of the problem, would
only cause difficulty and confusion.

This plan was approved by the Surplus
War Property Administration and was sub­mitted to the Governors' Conference at its
annual meeting in Hershey, Pennsylvania,
on May 30 of this year. The Governors' Con­ference approved the plan in prin­ciple and authorized the staff to work with
the Surplus War Property Administration
in developing administrative procedures
to put the plan into effect.

Since that time new congressional legis­lature has abolished the Surplus War Prop­erty Administration and has established
the Surplus Property Board. This board
has been appointed only recently, and it has
before it for early action the problem of
determining how it will proceed in dis­posing of surplus war property to govern­mental units, departments, and agencies.

If the Surplus Property Board approves
the aforesaid plan, submitted to it by the
Surplus War Property Administration, it
will probably be necessary for some of the
states to enact legislation to enlarge the fa­cilities and responsibilities of their state
purchasing departments.

THE MACHINERY OF STATE GOVERNMENT

One of the most interesting chapters in
political science has to do with the manner
in which the states—especially during the
past thirty years—have expanded their
public services and perfected their govern­mental machinery to meet the increasing
demands of our industrial economy.

In the decade following the first World
War, thirty-two of the forty-eight states
made elaborate studies of their state gov­ernments, and to a very considerable de­gree reorganized their governmental ma­chinery. It was during this period that
many of the states established their budget systems, their central accounting systems,
their personnel systems, their central pur­chasing agencies, and, in many instances,
revised and improved their legislative and
judicial procedures.

In almost every state the state govern­ment is the largest and the most important "business" in that state. And in almost all
of the states, the governors, the legisla­tures, and the various departments and agencies are now considering how the state govern­mental machinery can be improved in or­der to insure that this most important bus­iness is well organized and well adminis­tered in the postwar period.

Many states are studying their basic
law, their constitutions, the organization
of their legislatures, and their legislative
procedures, the possibility of improving
their administrative departments and agen­cies, and all of the states are devising ways
and means of making state government an
effective instrument for the doing of jobs
that have to be done and for the meeting
of needs that have to be met.

One can say, with a reasonable degree of
accuracy, that prior to 1910 the three areas
of government—federal, state, and local—
to a very large extent, had separate duties
and responsibilities with respect to govern­mental services. Each area of government
determined policy and programs in its
field, and each area administered and fi­nanced its programs directly.

There were a number of joint activities
among the states and their localities, but
the federal government did not embark
upon cooperative governmental programs
to any considerable extent until 1914.

Since that time, all three areas of gov­ernment—federal, state, and local—have increasingly developed and administered
cooperative governmental programs cov-
altering almost all of our major governmental services, such as agriculture, highway development, public health, vocational education, social security, and so forth. This movement doubtless will continue on into the future.

The instrument for implementing these cooperative governmental programs is the so-called "grants-in-aid"—grants-in-aid from the states to localities, and grants-in-aid from the federal government to the states. That has been the pattern—that, to a large extent, is the pattern—and for thirty years the pattern has fit our needs and the programs have worked out advantageously.

Within recent years, in some places and with respect to certain activities, there has been a tendency to change this pattern. In some instances, efforts have been made to establish new federal machinery to perform service jobs directly, all the way down to the individual citizen. The WPA was an example, and the ill-fated effort of the OCD late in 1941 was another.

In other instances, efforts have been made and are being made to develop a governmental pattern by which the federal government will promote, develop, and operate public services from the federal government directly with the thousands of political subdivisions within the individual states.

This is not an academic question, having to do solely with the question of political jurisdictions. This is an important, practical, immediate, operating problem. It is a question and a problem now being considered by the Surplus Property Board. It is perhaps the major question and problem now being considered by the Civil Aeronautics Authority and congressional committees in the development of a bill designed to establish and construct a countrywide system of airports. It was a major question in writing and enacting veterans' legislation. And it has been and will again be a major question and problem with respect to unemployment compensation and other social security measures.

Generally speaking, there are three questions that might be pertinent:

1. Is it desirable to maintain, to improve, to perfect, and to use the governmental machinery that we already have in this country to do our public jobs—governmental machinery which in the main has served us well, and which in the main has met the needs of changing times—rather than to establish new machinery whenever a new problem arises or whenever it is necessary to do more in an old familiar field?

2. Is it desirable to maintain local control over governmental departments, institutions, and agencies which primarily serve local needs?

3. Is it desirable to maintain, to develop, and to expand to every extent possible civilian interest in our governmental services by encouraging civilian participation? Is it desirable, as we expand government for the people, to emphasize likewise the importance of government by the people?

If these things are desirable, it will be necessary for the states and the organization of the states constantly to promote them and insist upon them as new and large-scale public programs are developed for the postwar period.

Cooperative governmental programs, operated from the federal government to the states and from the states to the local governments—to repeat—have worked, and have worked well, in an effective and economical fashion. These programs have met the needs as they have developed, and in operation they have been under the control of and responsive to the will of the people.

If this pattern is worth maintaining, we shall have to believe in it, and work for it in the months and the years to come.

CONTINUING ACTIVITIES OF THE COUNCIL

The Council of State Governments has maintained and to some extent enlarged its regular and continuing services to the states.

The Interstate Legislative Reference Bureau is used more and more every year by state legislators and by state administrative officials. The Inquiry and Research Section has expanded its facilities in order to provide more comprehensive and current services. By way of example, a number of bulletins and studies with respect to immediate and pending questions have been prepared for consideration.

Every effort has been made to maintain the excellence of the publications of the
The commissions on interstate cooperation in all of the states have been increasingly recognized as the state agencies responsible for developing and promoting interstate cooperation. And interstate cooperation itself has become an increasingly important—in fact, an indispensable—part of our day-to-day public work. Through these state commissions in interstate cooperation, interstate problems with respect to highways, motor truck regulations, unemployment compensation, interstate trade barriers, liquor control, water management, crime, parole, and probation have been handled in a manner that has become almost routine and automatic.

The special interstate projects that have been launched by the Council of State Governments—the Interstate Commission on the Delaware River Basin, the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission—all have operated with increased efficiency and to the satisfaction of all of the participating states.

The Interstate Parole and Probation Compact has now been put into effect by thirty-eight of the forty-eight states, and we hope the other ten will join in this compact at the coming sessions of their legislatures.

During the year, the Council has worked very closely with the nine states in the Missouri River Valley; and the Missouri Valley States Committee has made progress toward a comprehensive plan for developing the great river basin covering so large a part of our country.

Our field service to some extent has been expanded, and through our regional branch offices and through the Washington office much has been done to facilitate federal-state relations.

Last summer the Executive Committee of the Governors' Conference, in appraising the work of the states in wartime and looking toward the postwar period, decided to recommend to the Board of Managers and to the states that the resources of the Council of State Governments be expanded, and that each of the states very materially increase its appropriation to the Council in order to enable it to enlarge its facilities and expand its services—and in order, also, to put the Council of State Governments, the organization of the states, upon a self-supporting basis.

With that in mind, on September 6, 1944, the Executive Committee wrote to the governors of the several states. The response has been most encouraging, indicating that the states mean to do their job and to do it adequately and effectively.

At the direction of this committee, a suggested schedule of state appropriations to the Council has been developed and will be submitted to you for your consideration.

I think it is significant that as biennium has followed biennium the states have increasingly provided necessary resources to the organization designed to provide essential services to them.

This has been, perhaps, an unusual annual report, but these are unusual times. An annual report is supposed primarily to review and report upon the work of the past year. We have done that, but a very large part of this report has dealt with the future. America is looking to the future. The states are looking to the future. And the people—the same people that make up the nation and the states—are looking to the future.

The future will hold many problems for the country and for the states. Difficulties of staggering dimensions are over the horizon. But the problems and these difficulties are not commensurate with the opportunities that all of us enjoy in the United States: an opportunity to win this war, an opportunity to establish a lasting peace, an opportunity to participate in building a decent world, and an opportunity to preserve and perfect here in this country, out in our states, and down in our communities, that system of government and that way of life that has served us so well these one hundred and fifty years.
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.

The Council of State Governments has just four major objectives:

1. To do everything possible to improve state government;
2. To encourage and promote the fullest cooperation among the states in the solution of interstate problems;
3. To facilitate in every way possible federal-state relations with respect to common problems and objectives; and, particularly in recent years,
4. To place all of the resources and facilities of the states at the disposal of the nation for all-out prosecution of the war.

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 of 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.

During recent years the Council has assisted the states in promoting through the country a campaign to eliminate interstate trade barriers. It has been instrumental in the organization of interstate compacts and agreements for the use of the water of the Delaware River and the Potomac River, for the protection and development of Atlantic marine fisheries, and for the conservation and control of Great Lakes fisheries. During the defense and war periods the Council has worked closely with the states in the establishment of the selective service and the civilian defense systems and in the organization of nationwide rationing and anti-inflation programs.

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. Each of the states appropriating to the support of the Council is entitled to representation on the Board of Managers, the policy-forming and governing agency of the Council of State Governments. In addition, the Council's Board includes fifteen managers serving in an ex-officio capacity, and ten members who serve as managers-at-large.

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.
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. All forty-eight states are now officially cooperating in the work of the Council through commissions on interstate cooperation or equivalent agencies. 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 12-13) 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. Through these agencies the Council of State Governments continues to carry on 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. Some commissions have an executive secretary and a research staff.

One great contribution of the cooperation 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 committees, and others have acted as state or regional administrators in carrying out the rationing and the civil protection programs of the national government.

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.

With the end of the war many large scale governmental, social, and economic problems will demand solution, and solution in the shortest possible time. Therefore 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.
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 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.

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 Council and House Council of the American Legislator's 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, it may incur such 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.

THE BOARD OF MANAGERS OF THE COUNCIL

The governing body of the Council of State Governments, comprising forty-eight delegate members representing the forty-eight states, fifteen ex-officio members and ten-managers-at-large.

State delegate members of the Board are usually chosen by the commissions on interstate cooperation of the states and serve for a period of one year. Ex-officio managers are the nine members of the Executive Committee of the Governors' Conference, the presidents of the American Legislators' Association, the National Association of Attorneys General, the National Association of Secretaries of State, and the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, 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, ten 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.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, 1944-45

MAW, HERBERT B. Lawyer. Governor of Utah, 1941; Member, Utah State Senate, 1928-38 (President, 1934-38); Chairman, Governors' Conference, 1944-45; President, Council of State Governments.

PETERSON, C. PETRUS. Lawyer. Member of Nebraska House of Representatives, 1915 and 1917; Member of Nebraska Senate, 1919; Member of Nebraska Constitutional Convention, 1920; City Attorney, Lincoln,
Nebraska, 1915–29; Member of the Unicameral Legislature of Nebraska, 1941–43–45; Speaker of the 1945 session; Member of the Commission on Intergovernmental Cooperation, 1941–; First Vice-President and Chairman of the Board of Managers, Council of State Governments.


Rankin, John M. Lawyer. Iowa State Legislature, 1921–25; Judge, Iowa District Court, 1925–39; Attorney General of Iowa, 1940–; President, National Association of Attorneys General, 1945; Second Vice-President, Council of State Governments.

McKimbin, George B. Lawyer. Director of Finance, Illinois, 1941–45; Chairman, Board of Welfare Commissioners, Illinois, 1945–; Auditor, Council of State Governments, 1943–.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE BOARD OF MANAGERS, 1944–45

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Delegate Members</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Delegate Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Hon. Sidney W. Smyer Member of Legislature</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Hon. J. Tom Watson Attorney General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Hon. Mulford Winsor Director, Department of Library and Archives</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Hon. Adie N. Durden Member of General Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Hon. John Trueper State Comptroller</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Senator George Donart Member of Legislature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Hon. Harrison W. Call Member of Legislature</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Hon. Bernice T. Van der Vries Member of General Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Senator Vernon A. Cheever Member of General Assembly</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Hon. John M. Rankin Attorney General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Gen. Sanford H. Wadham Chairman, Commission on Interstate Cooperation</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Hon. Jess C. Denious Lieutenant Governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Hon. Burton S. Heal Chairman, Commission on Interstate Cooperation</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Hon. Kenneth H. Tuggle Lieutenant Governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Hon. Sam H. Jones Chairman, Commission on Interstate Cooperation</td>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Hon. David H. Stevens Tax Assessor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Hon. S. Denmead Kolb Member of General Assembly</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Senator Richard Bowers Member of General Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Hon. D. Hale Brake State Treasurer</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Senator A. O. Sletvold Member of Legislature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Hon. Robert G. Gillespie Representing Commission on Interstate Cooperation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Missouri
Senator M. C. Matties
Member of General Assembly

Montana
Hon. Albert H. Kruse
Commissioner of Agriculture,
Labor and Industries

Nebraska
Senator C. Petrus Peterson
Member of Legislature

North Dakota
Senator Rile R. Morgan
Member of Legislative Assembly

Ohio
Hon. Charles H. Jones
Administrator, Bureau of
Unemployment Compensation

Oklahoma
Hon. Ernest M. Black
Director of Research, Tax
Commission

Oregon
Hon. Geo. K. Aiken
Executive Secretary to the
Governor

Pennsylvania
Hon. Floyd Chalfant
Secretary of Commerce

Rhode Island
Hon. Herman D. Ferrara
Member of General Assembly

South Carolina
Senator Edgar A. Brown
Member of General Assembly

South Dakota
(Member to be appointed)

Tennessee
Judge Winfield B. Hale
Chairman, Commission on
Interstate Cooperation

Ex-Officio Members

Executive Committee, Governors' Conference:
Hon. Herbert B. Maw, Utah
Hon. Raymond E. Baldwin, Connecticut
Hon. Dwight H. Green, Illinois
Hon. Dwight Griswold, Nebraska
Hon. Robert S. Kerr, Oklahoma
Hon. Edward Martin, Pennsylvania
Hon. Herbert R. O'Connor, Maryland
Hon. Chauncey Sparkes, Alabama
Hon. Earl Warren, California

President, National Association of Attorneys General:
Hon. John M. Rankin, Iowa

President, American Legislators' Association:
Hon. Henry Parkman, Jr., Massachusetts

President, National Association of Secretaries of State:
Hon. Mike Holm, Minnesota

President, National Conference of Commissioners on
Uniform State Laws:
Hon. J. C. Pryor, Iowa

Honorary President of the Council of State Governments:
Henry W. Toll

Executive Director of the Council of State Governments:
Frank Bane

Managers-at-Large

Hon. William B. Belknap,
Kentucky
Former-President of the
American Legislators'
Association

Maj. Robert C. Hendrickson,
New Jersey
Former State Senator and State
Treasurer

Hon. George B. McKiebin,
Illinois
Chairman, Board of Welfare
Commissioners

Hon. C. H. Morrissett,
Virginia
Tax Commissioner

Hon. Herbert R. O'Connor,
Maryland
Governor

Hon. Leverett Saltonstall,
Massachusetts
United States Senator, Former
Governor

Hon. Lloyd C. Stark,
Missouri
Former Governor

Hon. Harold E. Stassen,
Minnesota
Commander, U.S.N.R.,
Former Governor

Hon. Ellwood J. Turner,
Pennsylvania
Member of General Assembly

Senator George Woodward,
Pennsylvania
Member of General Assembly

Texas
(Member to be appointed)

Utah
Senator Grant MacFarlane
Member of Legislature

Vermont
Hon. Alban J. Parker
Attorney General

Virginia
Senator W. Stuart Moffett
Member of General Assembly

Washington
Hon. Victor A. Meyers
Lieutenant Governor

West Virginia
Hon. Carl M. Frasure
Secretary to Governor

Wisconsin
Hon. Frank N. Graass
Secretary to Governor

Wyoming
Hon. Wm. "Scotty" Jack
Secretary of State

Alaska
Hon. E. L. Bartlett
Delegate to Congress
CHRONOLOGICAL HISTORY OF THE COUNCIL
May, 1943—June, 1945

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, May, 1943, to June 30, 1945, the interval covered by 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, whereas later editions cover the periods for which they were published. Each future volume will outline the developments of the biennium preceding its publication.

1943

May 17-18. Tax Committee of the Council of State Governments
Meeting to discuss payments in lieu of taxes, federal sales tax, automobile use tax, overlapping income taxes, corporation taxes, etc. Office of the Council of State Governments, Chicago, Illinois.

May 20-21. Interstate Committee on Postwar Reconstruction and Development
Meeting to develop a specific program and memoranda on postwar problems to be submitted to all the states for their consideration. Office of the Council of State Governments, Chicago, Illinois.

May 20-21. Executive Committee of the Governors' Conference

June 10. Executive Committee of the Federal-State Committee on Tax and Fiscal Relations
Meeting. Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.

June 20-23. Governors' Conference
Thirty-fifth annual meeting. Deshler-Wallick Hotel, Columbus, Ohio.

Meeting of representatives of North Carolina, Virginia, Maryland, and West Virginia with representatives of the United States Department of Agriculture and the War Manpower Commission to outline recommended plan of procedure covering interstate movement of workers. Hay-Adams Hotel, Washington, D. C.

August 6-7. Northeastern Regional Committee on Motor Truck Problems
Meeting to discuss activation of federal-state agreement and supplement governing transportation of explosives; to effect survey to determine legislation needed to complete adoption of minimum flooring plan in northeastern states. Representatives from Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, and West Virginia. Hotel Roosevelt, New York, New York.

August 16. Conference on Institutional Food Problems
Meeting of state representatives with officials of the Office of Price Administration and the Governments Division of the War Production Board to discuss Office of Price Administration restrictions in regard to food produced and used by state institutions. Office of the Council of State Governments, Washington, D. C.

August 26. Committee on Crime Control of the Council of State Governments
Meeting to discuss problems of crime control and juvenile delinquency and to develop program for handling these problems. Office of the Council of State Governments, Chicago, Illinois.

September 3. Forestry Committee of the Council of State Governments
Meeting to consider current state legislation, pending congressional legislation, current tax problems, and coordination of state and federal governmental policies in regard to forestry. Office of the Council of State Governments, Chicago, Illinois.

September 10. Tax Committee of the Council of State Governments
Meeting with federal representatives to discuss renegotiation of war contracts, payments in lieu of taxes, and coordination of federal and state taxes. Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.

September 20. Executive Committee of the Governors' Conference
Meeting. Governor's Office, Lincoln, Nebraska.
September 24-25. Regional Conference of New England and Middle Atlantic States on Postwar Problems in the States

October 1-2. Western Regional Conference on Postwar Problems.
Meeting. Palace Hotel, San Francisco, California.

October 18-20. National Association of Secretaries of State
Twenty-sixth annual meeting. Coronado Hotel, St. Louis, Missouri.

November 19. Executive Committee of Governors’ Conference
Meeting. Shoreland Hotel, Chicago, Illinois.

November 19. Interstate Committee on Postwar Reconstruction and Development
Meeting. Shoreland Hotel, Chicago, Illinois.

November 20. Board of Managers of the Council of State Governments
Annual meeting. Shoreland Hotel, Chicago, Illinois.

December 3. Forestry Committee of the Council of State Governments


January 7-8. Northeastern Regional Conference on Social Welfare and Relief Problems
Meeting to discuss problem of relief and settlement laws. Hotel Roosevelt, New York City.

Meeting. Hotel Stevens, Chicago, Illinois.

January 29-31. Technical Committee of the Council of State Governments
Meeting to develop memorandum on taxation to be submitted to the Tax Committee of the Council of State Governments. Shorland Hotel, Chicago, Illinois.

February 1. Executive Committee of Governors’ Conference
Meeting. Hay-Adams Hotel, Washington, D.C.

February 11-12. Interstate Conference on Postwar Industrial Development of the West
Representatives from California, Nevada, Oregon, and Utah. Assembly Chamber, State Capitol, Carson City, Nevada.

February 17. Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission
Meeting of the Executive Committee. Hotel Roosevelt, New York, New York.

March 10. Regional Continuing Committee on Liquor Control Problems

March 14-15. Conference of State Purchasing Committee of the Council of State Governments and Representatives of the Surplus War Property Administration
Meeting to formulate plans and procedures for the disposition of surplus property and for the purchase of such property by the states. Federal Loan Agency Building, Washington, D.C.

March 22-23. Salary Study Commission of Ohio

April 6. Committee on Fisheries Stabilization of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission

April 7. Committee on Education of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission

April 14-15. Eastern States Conservation Conference
Meeting to discuss state and interstate water resources problems. Hotel Statler, Boston, Massachusetts.

May 12-13. Subcommittee of the Ohio Salary Study Commission to Study the Salaries of County Employees
May 18. Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission

May 23-24. Forestry Committee of the Council of State Governments
   Meeting to correct and revise forestry report of the Council and to consider proposed forestry legislation. State Capitol, Atlanta, Georgia.

May 26. Meeting of Representatives of the Governors of Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia, Maryland, Delaware, and Pennsylvania with the War Manpower Commission and Extension Service of the United States Department of Agriculture
   Conference to plan recruitment of agricultural and food processing labor. Raleigh, North Carolina.

May 28-31. Governors' Conference
   Thirty-sixth annual meeting. Hotel Hershey, Hershey, Pennsylvania.

June 9. Meeting of Governors and Representatives from Maine, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Hampshire, and Connecticut with War Production Board
   Conference to discuss the manpower and wage situation in the cotton textile industry. State House, Boston, Massachusetts.

June 9-10. Midwest Conference on Postwar Agricultural Problems
   Meeting to discuss recommendations and suggestions on postwar agricultural problems made by the Interstate Committee on Postwar Reconstruction and Development of the Council of State Governments. Stevens Hotel, Chicago, Illinois.

June 18-19. Technical Committee of State Purchasing Agents
   Meeting to discuss memorandum developed by the Surplus War Property Administration for buying surplus war property. Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.

July 13. Meeting with Subcommittee of Committee for Economic Development
   Meeting to discuss unemployment compensation from standpoint of states and industry. Stevens Hotel, Chicago, Illinois.

August 4-5. Tax Committee of the Council of State Governments and Representatives of the Treasury, Budget Bureau, Joint Congressional Committee on Postwar Tax Policy, and Civil Aeronautics Board
   Meeting to discuss federal tax and fiscal policy, federal-state relations, and interstate and state problems. Treasury Building, Washington, D.C.

August 21-23. National Association of Secretaries of State
   Twenty-seventh annual conference. Netherland Plaza Hotel, Cincinnati, Ohio.

August 24-25. Regional Continuing Committee on Social Welfare and Relief Problems
   Organization meeting to draft legislation for the states and provide a means of consultation among the states with regard to federal legislation, extension of social security, and other related problems. Penn-Harris Hotel, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

September 5. Southern Regional Attorneys General Conference
   Meeting. Peabody Hotel, Memphis, Tennessee.

September 15-16. Western Regional Attorneys General Conference
   Meeting. Palace Hotel, San Francisco, California.

September 15-16. Northeastern Regional Conference on Postwar Problems in the States
   Meeting. Hotel Claridge, Atlantic City, New Jersey.

September 28-29. Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission
   Third annual meeting. Hotel Roosevelt, New York, New York.

September 29. Aviation Committee of the Council of State Governments
   Meeting with representatives of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, the Department of Justice, and the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers to revise the model act on airport zoning. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

September 29-30. Western Regional Conference on Postwar Problems in the States
   Meeting. Hotel Newhouse, Salt Lake City, Utah.

October 11. Conference on Administration of the Interstate Parole and Probation Compact
   Meeting to enable administrators to discuss and review rules and regulations governing administration of the compact. Hotel Pennsylvania, New York, New York.

October 13-14. Southern Regional Conference on Postwar Problems
   Meeting. Hotel Tutwiler, Birmingham, Alabama.

October 18. Conference of Drafting Committee of the Council of State Governments and National Association of State Aviation Officials
   Meeting to discuss legislative program. Office of the Council of State Governments, Washington, D.C.

October 20-21. Midwest Regional Conference on Postwar Problems
   Meeting. Stevens Hotel, Chicago, Illinois.
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October 24. National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws and the Council of State Governments

November 11. Drafting Committee of the Council of State Governments and the Department of Justice
Meeting to consider proposals for 1945 legislatures. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

November 19-21: National Association of Attorneys General
Thirty-eighth annual meeting. Hotel Paxton, Omaha, Nebraska.

November 28-29. Interstate Conference on Aviation and the States

November 30. Executive Committee of the Governors' Conference
Meeting. Shoreland Hotel, Chicago, Illinois.

December 2. Board of Managers of the Council of State Governments
Annual meeting. Shoreland Hotel, Chicago, Illinois.

December 2. Aviation Committee of the Council of State Governments
Meeting with officials of Civil Aeronautics Administration. Shoreland Hotel, Chicago, Illinois.

December 7-9. Western Regional Conference on War and Postwar Legislation
Meeting. Westward-Ho Hotel, Phoenix, Arizona.

December 15-16. Southern Regional Conference on War and Postwar Legislation
Meeting. Roosevelt Hotel, New Orleans, Louisiana.

December 19. Eastern Regional Conference on War and Postwar Legislation

December 29. Midwest Regional Conference on War and Postwar Legislation
Meeting. Stevens Hotel, Chicago, Illinois.


January 17. Board of Managers of the Council of State Governments
Special meeting. Hotel Jefferson, Saint Louis, Missouri.

January 20. Executive Committee of the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws
Meeting. 1313 East 60th St., Chicago, Illinois.

February 9. Aviation Committee of the Council of State Governments
Meeting. Stevens Hotel, Chicago, Illinois.

March 22. Executive Committee of the Governors' Conference
Meeting. Hotel Statler, Washington, D.C.

May 29-30. Committee of National Association of State Aviation Officials
Meeting to prepare testimony for the Association and the Council of State Governments for presentation to Congressional Committees considering aviation legislation. Washington Offices of the Council.

June 7. Interim Committee of Administrators of Interstate Parole and Probation Compact
New York Offices of the Council.

June 18-20. Committee of National Association of Attorneys General
Meeting to consider Congressional legislation of interest to states. Washington Offices of the Council.
INTERSTATE ORGANIZATIONS AFFILIATED
WITH THE COUNCIL OF STATE GOVERNMENTS

THE 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 1945-46.
Edward Martin, Governor of Pennsylvania, Chairman
Ellis Arnall, Governor of Georgia
Raymond E. Baldwin, Governor of Connecticut
Harry F. Kelly, Governor of Michigan
Robert S. Kerr, Governor of Oklahoma
Herbert B. Maw, Governor of Utah
J. Howard McGrath, Governor of Rhode Island
Chauncey Sparks, Governor of Alabama
Earl Warren, Governor of California

Secretary-Treasurer: Frank Bane, Executive Director of the Council of State Governments.

Annual Meeting: July 1-4, 1945, Mackinac Island, Michigan. The 1944 conference was held at Hershey, Pennsylvania, May 28-31.

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

Activities: Since May 13, 1908, when its first session was called to order in the East Room of the White House by President Theodore Roosevelt, the Governors' Conference has been a dynamic force in the improvement of state government, the development of effective methods of interstate cooperation, and the furtherance of the ideals and purposes of the Union of the states. The Conference participates in the program and activities of the Council of State Governments, including its General Assembly and other national and regional conferences, and 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 AMERICAN LEGISLATORS' ASSOCIATION

HISTORY: In 1925 a letter proposing the formation of a nationwide organization for interstate cooperation was mailed to 7,500 members of the 48 state legislatures by Henry W. Toll, then a member of the Colorado legislature. The organization project was presented to civic groups in Denver and throughout Colorado, and was endorsed by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws.

During 1926 legislators from Arkansas, Colorado, Ohio, Minnesota, Nebraska, Nevada, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Utah met in Denver and formally organized the Association, and during the years 1927, 1928, and 1929, conferences were held at Buffalo, Seattle, and Memphis, respectively.

In 1930 the Spelman Fund of the Rockefeller Foundation made a grant to assist the work of the Association. In April, 1930, the first issue of the magazine State Government was published, an outgrowth of a leaflet called The Legislator, which Mr. Toll had published since 1925. During this same year the headquarters of the organization were moved to Chicago, occupying quarters at 850 East 58th Street, adjacent to a number of other nationwide organizations in the field of government and public administration which later comprised the "1313" group of agencies. A one-year grant was received from the Rosenwald Foundation, the first directory of the states was published, and the fifth annual conference of the Association was held in Cleveland.

In 1933, the First Interstate Assembly was held in Washington, D.C., to consider problems then confronting the states. As the advantages of machinery for cooperative effort became increasingly apparent, the expansion of the work of the American Legislators' Association to include participation by other state officials appeared desirable. Accordingly, early in 1935 the planning board of the Association developed a plan for an interstate agency for service to all state officials, and upon the basis of this plan the Council of State Governments was established and the American Legislators' Association was included as a section of the more comprehensive organization. Today the American Legislators' Association and the Council of State Governments are substantially one organization.

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, a monthly periodical published by the Council, is the successor to The Legislator, the original publication of the American Legislators' Association.

ACTIVITIES: The American Legislators' Association, as 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 that do not have them, and works toward the improvement and expansion of those now in existence.
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 1944–45.

Mike Holm, Minnesota, President
Walker Wood, Mississippi, Vice-President
Robert S. Farrell, Jr., Oregon, Recording Secretary
Lt. Commander Thomas Elmo Jones, Honorary Recording Secretary
Rawson C. Myrick, Vermont, Corresponding Secretary
Sidney Latham, Texas, Treasurer

Executive Committee

Mike Holm, Minnesota, Chairman
Frederick W. Cook, Massachusetts
Enoch D. Fuller, New Hampshire
Thad Eure, North Carolina
John B. Wilson, Georgia
Robert A. Gray, Florida

Secretariat: The Council of State Governments.

Annual Meeting: Time and place to be selected by the Executive Committee. The 1944 meeting was held August 21–23, at Cincinnati, Ohio.

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 and the Navy 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.

1 Former Secretary of State of Maryland.
2 Resigned as Secretary of State.
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 1944-45.

JOHN M. RANKIN, Attorney General of Iowa, President
GREEK L. RICE, Attorney General of Mississippi, Vice-President
WILLIAM C. WALSH, Attorney General of Maryland
A. B. MITCHELL, Attorney General of Kansas
WALTER R. JOHNSON, Attorney General of Nebraska

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 1944 conference was held November 19-21, at Omaha, Nebraska.

PUBLICATIONS: Proceedings of the Conference of the National Association of Attorneys General (annual), Digest of Opinions, containing opinions of state attorneys general which are of widespread interest, issued weekly. Since many thousands of opinions are rendered each year, the Digest includes only those which may have a general application. The complete text of any opinion digested is furnished upon request and from time to time the Digest includes opinions in full on important current topics. An index is issued every year to render the material readily available for research purposes.

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.

1Resigned as Attorney General.
THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF COMMISSIONERS ON UNIFORM STATE LAWS

ORGANIZATION: Organized in 1892. Composed of from 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 1945.

JOHN CARLISLE PRYOR, Iowa, President
H. L. BARKDULL, Ohio, Vice-President
B. M. BENSON, South Dakota, Treasurer
BARTON H. KUHNS, Nebraska, Secretary
W. E. STANLEY, Kansas, Chairman, Executive Committee

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 committees of the Conference; after due consideration by the Conference and approval by the commissioners of at least twenty 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.

For the past three years, the Conference has been working in cooperation with the American Law Institute in drafting a uniform commercial code. That portion of the code known as the Revised Sales Act has now been completed and the project is being carried on into the field of banking law, personal property security, bills of lading, warehouse receipts, and other subjects. During the year 1944, the sum of $150,000 was subscribed by a foundation in Pittsburgh for the completion of this code, and it seems likely that another $100,000 will be available from the same source. It is planned to have this work completed by 1949.
INTERSTATE COMPACTS AND COMMISSIONS

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

During the past ten years an increasing number and variety of interstate problems have been solved by means of a compact among the interested states. Prior to 1934, the compact device was used primarily for the settlement of interstate boundary disputes and for the equitable division of the waters of the various western rivers. Beginning with the development of the Interstate Parole and Probation Compact in 1935, however, interstate compacts have also been negotiated to further interstate cooperation in the fields of the abatement of water pollution, the conservation of oil and gas, the development of interstate parks and the conservation and development of the Atlantic marine fisheries. Final congressional approval has been given to a number of these compacts and state ratification of several agreements has been secured since the publication of the 1943-44 edition of The Book of the States.

During 1943 Congress granted its consent to the Interstate Oil Compact for a period of four years beginning September 1, 1943. In the past, congressional consent to this compact has been limited to two-year periods. Iowa and Nebraska negotiated and ratified a boundary line compact in 1943 for which congressional consent was secured during the same year. The Indiana-Kentucky Boundary Line Compact, ratified by Indiana in 1943 and by Kentucky in 1942, was also approved by Congress in 1943.

The history of the Republican River Compact, which was granted final congressional consent in 1943, is an interesting one. In 1941 the states of Colorado, Kansas and Nebraska negotiated and ratified a compact providing for the division of the waters of the Republican River. A bill granting congressional approval to this compact was passed by both houses of Congress in 1942 but later vetoed by the President. It was the language of the compact itself to which the President objected because in this draft the states concerned had inserted the statement that the Republican River was not navigable. The President objected to this statement as unduly limiting federal jurisdiction but stated in his message that, if this objection were met, he would approve the bill. In his veto message, the President also requested that a representative of the federal government be appointed to work with the state officials in redrafting the compact. Accordingly, Congress in 1942 enacted a bill granting its consent to the three states to negotiate a compact and providing for the appointment of a federal representative. The new Republican River Compact, ratified by the three states in 1943 and approved by Congress and the President in the same year, omitted the declaration that the Republican River is not navigable and at the same time protected the rights of the three states by stating that the federal government will recognize "any established use, for domestic and irrigation purposes, of the waters allocated by such compact which may be impaired by the exercise of federal jurisdiction in, over and to such waters," provided that such established use is being exercised beneficially.

In 1944 Congress gave its final consent to the New York-Rhode Island Boundary Line Compact and the Belle Fourche River Compact. The latter of these agreements, entered into by North Dakota and

---

1 For a detailed chart of interstate compacts ratified from 1934-43, see The Book of the States, 1943-44, p. 51.
2 57 Stat. 383.
3 57 Stat. 494.
4 57 Stat. 248.
5 57 Stat. 86.
6 Public Law 399, 78th Congress, Chapter 362, 2d Session.
7 Public Law, 236, 78th Congress, Chapter 64, 2d Session.
Wyoming in 1943, was negotiated to promote the most efficient use of the waters of the Belle Fourche River Basin. During the past two years, several states have become parties to already existing compacts. In 1943 Pennsylvania ratified the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Compact and Connecticut, New York, and Oklahoma, which previously had authorized the Interstate Parole and Probation Compact, have now signed that instrument and thereby become active parties to it.

The Council of State Governments, which serves as the coordinating agency for the interstate activities carried on under the Parole and Probation Compact, initiated an interesting program with respect to this agreement during 1944. This compact has been ratified by thirty-nine states, and approximately five thousand parolees and many probationers are being supervised in accordance with its provisions. The Council decided that, since the compact has been in effect for ten years, it would be wise to review the compact operations and secure an expression of opinion from the several states concerning their experience in using the agreement. The Council has undertaken this study because it realizes that problems have probably arisen which were not foreseen when the agreement was drafted and that certain compact provisions, to which varying interpretations have been given, need clarification.

Other developments in the field of interstate compacts during the past two years include congressional action in 1943 granting consent to the negotiation of a compact by Tennessee, Kentucky, and Virginia for the acquisition of the lands, structures and other property in the Cumberland Gap—Cumberland Ford areas and for the transfer of title of such properties to the United States. The area referred to constitutes the Cumberland Gap National Historical Park, established by Congress in 1940. In 1944, Congress extended to June 1, 1947, the time for the negotiation of a compact among the states of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming for the division of the waters of the Yellowstone River. At the present time a bill is pending in Congress giving consent to Colorado and Kansas to negotiate a compact for the division of the waters of the Arkansas River.

Massachusetts and New Hampshire have now abrogated the Concord Compact of 1934, relating to minimum wages for women and children. The New Hampshire act became effective in July, 1943, and that of Massachusetts in January, 1945. Rhode Island, the only other state that ratified this compact, has taken no steps to abrogate it.

* Under the leadership of the New York Joint Legislative Committee on Interstate Cooperation, with the assistance of the Council of State Governments, beginning in 1937, there was held a series of annual meetings which became known as

**Prepared by Wayne D. Heydecker, Secretary-Treasurer, Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission. A full description of the organization and operation of the Commission will be found in the 1943-44 edition of The Book of the States, pp. 64-67. A comprehensive article on the Commission by Frederick L. Zimmerman, research consultant to the New York Joint Legislative Committee on Interstate Cooperation, and special adviser to the Commission, appeared in State Government, XV (August, 1942) p. 159. This article contained a discussion of jurisdictional aspects of thetery problems.
Atlantic seaboard by the development of a joint program for the promotion and protection of such fisheries, and by the prevention of the physical waste of the fisheries from any cause." The compact as drawn was careful to state that it was not intended to limit production or to fix prices or to create any perpetuate monopolies.

By 1940, at meetings in Boston and in Charleston, South Carolina, the compact was accepted in principle. At the meeting of 1941, in Boston, the final draft was approved and ordered submitted to the legislatures of the several states. In quick succession it was adopted by seven states and signed by their respective governors. These states were New Hampshire, Maryland, Delaware, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, and Rhode Island. Maine joined at a special session of the legislature in 1942, followed by South Carolina and Virginia; then Georgia and Pennsylvania followed in 1943, making twelve states in all. While these developments were taking place, the drafting committee secured the passage by the Congress of the necessary consent act only to have it vetoed by the President for a technical reason. A revised bill was introduced, passed, and signed by the President on May 4, 1942. Immediately thereafter, the Commission, with eight states as members, met and organized in New York on June 5, 1942, electing as chairman Edmund L. Dunn of Massachusetts, president of the New England Fish Exchange; as vice-chairman, Edwin Warfield, Jr., chairman of the Maryland Department of Tidewater Fisheries; and Wayne D. Heydecker as secretary-treasurer. These officers have served continuously by re-election to the present time.

The Commission, under the compact, is composed of three members from each participating state—the official in charge of the administration of marine fisheries, a member of the legislature appointed by the Commission on interstate cooperation, and a person appointed by the governor "having a knowledge of and an interest in the marine fisheries problems." Each state contributes annually to the support of the Commission a sum which is proportionate to the value of its catch as compared with the total value of the catch of the Atlantic coast. This is arrived at by a formula which, under the compact, the Commission itself has the power to vary. Acting under that power, the Commission has recently increased the minimum contribution from each state from the small sum of $200 yearly to $500. The rest of the budget required by the Commission is apportioned among the remaining member states in accordance with their catch. The Commission has a paid executive, with the title of secretary-treasurer, and an office secretary. It occupies a very modest office in midtown New York. The bulk of its funds, exclusive of salaries, is spent for travel of commissioners and expense of meetings. It has no funds other than those provided by the member states.

The Commission is advisory only. It has no power and wants none. Its strength lies in the fact that it is a part of the great movement for interstate cooperation developed during the last decade under the leadership of the Council of State Governments. It solves problems among the states by providing a favorable forum, where the representatives of states concerned can discuss such problems until solutions are reached. Under the compact, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior is the "primary research agency" of the Commission, and the members of that service, under the compact, are directed to attend its meetings. The members of the Fish and Wildlife Service have been most cooperative and their technical service has been of great assistance to the states which, of course, have also had the help of the various state biologists and technicians.

Under the compact, the Commission can only make recommendations to the several states. In doing so, only those states which have a recognized interest in a particular species may participate in the panel dealing with such species. Thus, only the lobster-producing states may vote on recommendations affecting lobster; only states concerned with shrimp may vote on policy affecting the shrimp fishery.

Under this procedure, panels have been set up consisting of all the commissioners from each state affected by a particular species. To date, there have been organized panels on the lobster, oyster, striped...
bass, blue crab, channel bass, shrimp, shad, and clam. Because some waters have regional problems involving several species, special sections of the Commission have been organized for 'Chesapeake Bay' and for the Delaware River and Bay. The Commission is now considering the utilization of the sectional meetings for four special groups: (1) the North Atlantic section—Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut, when that state joins; (2) the Middle Atlantic section—New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware, which have heretofore been called the Delaware section; (3) the Chesapeake Bay section—Maryland, Virginia, and North Carolina, when that state joins; (4) the South Atlantic section—South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida, when that state joins. Panel meetings and procedures must still be followed under the compact in the making of recommendations affecting a single species throughout its range.

While uniform legislation as to various species is not its prime objective and upon further study may be modified, the Commission, under the able leadership of Chairman Edmund L. Dunn of Massachusetts and Vice-Chairman Edwin Warfield of Maryland, and through its panels and sections, has achieved much in this and other directions:

1. The Uniform Lobster Act has been adopted by Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware.
2. The Uniform Striped Bass Act is now law in Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, and Pennsylvania, and a similar act is in force in New Jersey. Maine and Georgia have made striped bass a game fish and fixed bag limits.
3. The Reciprocal Warden Act, which evolved out of the conferences leading to the formation of the Commission, has been adopted in Maine, New Hampshire, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, and has been approved for introduction in Massachusetts and Delaware.
4. The Uniform Blue Crab Act, originally developed in Maryland and Virginia, has been adopted in New York and Delaware, and has been introduced in New Jersey.
5. Identical regulations dealing with shad in the Hudson, adopted by New York and New Jersey while the Commission was in the process of formation, have contributed greatly to the restoration of the shad run in that river, which is now up to its former peak.
6. Similar cooperation by New York and New Jersey in connection with the protection of young sturgeon will, it is believed, assist in the hoped-for restoration of that fishery in the Hudson.
7. A Uniform Channel Bass Protection Act has been developed, primarily to assist sport fishermen, and has been introduced in New Jersey. Its introduction in other states is expected in 1945.
8. Cooperation between New Jersey and Delaware, now in process, will, it is hoped, during the 1945 legislative sessions, clear up long-standing confusion and conflict of laws governing fishing in the Delaware River and Bay below Philadelphia.
9. Efforts toward the development of adequate state systems of catch statistics have made much progress recently. Maine, Massachusetts, New York, Maryland, and South Carolina have made substantial progress in this direction.
10. Through a special Committee on Fisheries Education, a bold program has been suggested, covering the grade and intermediate schools, the general public, the industry, and the training of teachers and technicians in institutions of higher learning. An extension service for the fisheries, such as that which has done so much for agriculture in the last fifty years, is included, together with suggestions for the preparation of basic materials for promoting fishery education.
11. A special Committee on Fisheries Stabilization, sometimes called "management," has defined needs and objectives, discussed present opportunities, outlined the essential parts of a program, explored its constitutionality, and outlined suggested procedure.
12. At the request of the Commission, a special study has been undertaken by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, with the cooperation of the states of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware, to discover whether the phenomenal shad runs once prevalent in the Delaware River...
can be restored and, if so, what is required of each state to achieve this result.

13. The Commission is now exploring the possibilities of artificial fertilization of impounded areas and has been corresponding with British and American experimenters.

14. The Commission has also been studying the question of pollution as it affects the fisheries, particularly clam flats, and what can be done to clear areas now closed.

Up to July 1, 1944, the Commission, under Mr. Dunn’s leadership since its formal organization in 1942, had performed its work through five meetings of the full Commission, three meetings of its executive committee, and sixteen panel, section, or committee meetings. Whatever success the Commission has had has been due not only to the assistance of the administrators but in large part to the devoted unpaid service of its legislative members and those appointed by the governors of the respective member states.

The Commission represents a new concept of intergovernmental cooperation, a joint agency of many states working in close cooperation with federal technicians on programs which the states believe will benefit their respective fisheries. It could not have achieved these ends were it not for the wholehearted assistance of the commissions on interstate cooperation in the several states, which have sponsored the Commission’s various recommendations for legislation or other state action.

Its officers believe the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, through its form of organization and method of operation, is demonstrating that results can be achieved even in so complicated a field as the coastal and migratory fisheries when men of good will from the several states are determined to accept their respective responsibilities and cooperate to fulfill them.

**Membership of the Commission**
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<tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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<td>*Ansel N. Sanborn</td>
<td>Oren V. Henderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Raymond J. Kenney</td>
<td>Commissioner of Conservation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>Dr. Raymond G. Bressler</td>
<td>*George Ward Stetson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director of Agriculture and Conserva-</td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td></td>
<td>*Elisha T. Barrett</td>
<td>Robert L. Donnell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assemblyman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>George C. Warren, Jr.</td>
<td>*Duane E. Minard, Jr.</td>
<td>George A. Moit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>President of Board of Fish and Game</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commissioners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>C. A. French</td>
<td>*Thomas B. Stockham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commissioner of Fisheries</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>William M. Davis</td>
<td>*Harry H. Mulholland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>President, Board of Fish and Game</td>
<td>*Arnold J. Stewart</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commissioners</td>
<td>Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Edwin Warfield, Jr.</td>
<td>*Albert W. Woodfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chairman, Department of Tidewater</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>Carl Veach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fisheries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Charles W. Lankford, Jr.</td>
<td>W. Collins Chilton</td>
<td>William P. Hunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commissioner of Fisheries</td>
<td>Representitive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Charles Elliott</td>
<td>j. D. Parler</td>
<td>Charles J. Griffliss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director, State Game and Fish</td>
<td>Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Department</td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
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<td>Council of State Governments</td>
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<td>John B. Wilson</td>
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* Executive Committee members.
THE INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE DELAWARE RIVER BASIN*

The activities of the Interstate Commission on the Delaware River Basin—Incodel—have been productive of a number of far-reaching and significant results since the publication of the last edition of The Book of the States. To a large extent these accomplishments are the culmination of the Commission's spade-work of previous years. That they were attained while operating on a budget voluntarily reduced shortly after Pearl Harbor as a wartime economy measure is particularly gratifying.

During the last two years Incodel has clearly proved the value of its services in coordinating the interests of the numerous agencies responsible for the detailed preparation of physical and financial programs for the development of the resources of the Delaware River Basin.

By its accomplishments Incodel is setting an example of national as well as regional interest.

WATER SUPPLY DIVERSION PROJECTS

Most significant from the regional point of view was the successful culmination of Incodel's efforts to get the states of New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania to enact an agreement for the sharing of the water of the Delaware River for municipal water supply purposes.

On May 15, 1944, Governor Walter E. Edge of New Jersey affixed his signature to Chapter 121, Laws of 1944. By his action New Jersey joined with her sister sovereignties in accepting the principle of interstate cooperation, in place of competitive litigation, for the adjustment of differences in points of view over the manner in which the flows of the Delaware River and its tributaries may be diverted for potable water supply.

A year earlier, on April 23, 1943, Governor Dewey had signed Chapter 709, Laws of New York; and only a month later, on May 21, 1943, Governor Martin approved Pennsylvania Act No. 193.

Ratification of the reciprocal legislation embodying the three-state agreement concerning water supply diversion projects puts an end to the controversy which had been going on for almost a quarter of a century in regard to the respective rights and responsibilities of the three states in this question.

Since 1920, when each of the states almost simultaneously but entirely independently had decided that the Delaware watershed was its most logical source of future water supply, every effort to find a procedure under which the respective requirements could be fulfilled had met with failure. Compact negotiations had bogged down in 1925 and 1927. Each state then insisted upon looking upon the problem from the angle which best suited its own purposes. Nor did the decision given by the United States Supreme Court in 1931, after the states had litigated for two years to the tune of about a million dollars, settle this basic question; each state found that none had benefited by this method of adjudication.

Thus, when Incodel came into existence in 1936, the question as to how, when, and where any one of the states might secure a future water supply in which a diversion was involved was still unanswered. The solution of that problem was made one of the Commission's major objectives. The approach, in contrast to previous efforts, was to have the states tackle the problem jointly, not independently, and on a friendly, cooperative, and unbiased basis.

After a slow, halting start the engineers, the members of a bill-drafting committee, and the legislators of the three states, under Incodel's leadership, carried the program forward to a successful conclusion.

The conditions of the reciprocal legislation which has been made law by the three states assure to each its equitable share of the water of the Delaware watershed, and at the same time afford protection against the possibility of an unreasonable use or diversion of water by any of them.

STREAM POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Similar practical results have come from Incodel's activities in having its four participating state governments adopt a uniform and harmonious program for the

*Prepared by James H. Allen, Executive Secretary, Interstate Commission on the Delaware River Basin.
INTERSTATE RELATIONS

control and abatement of stream pollution. This problem was handled in the same manner as the "diversion" problem. Incodel convinced the chief engineers of the four state health departments of the advantage of viewing stream pollution in the Delaware Basin as a single problem and not as four separate and distinct projects.

It was upon this approach that the reciprocal laws in which the Incodel standards for the control of pollution are embodied were adopted by the states.

At the time of the outbreak of the war more than $10 million had been expended for the construction of sewage treatment plants in compliance with the Incodel program. Since then it has been necessary, of course, to defer such work because of the more urgent need for material and manpower for war production purposes.

Nevertheless, much substantial progress has been made in the last two years, particularly in the grossly polluted section of the river bordered by Philadelphia and Camden. While these two cities had been giving lip service to the stream pollution program, no whole-hearted effort was made by them to meet their obligations until pressed by Incodel. Both cities now, however, have seen the error of their ways. They have given number one priority to the completion of their sewage collection and treatment projects in the early post-war era. Construction and financial plans, have been advanced to a point which will permit work to start immediately when material and manpower again become available.

Of importance equal to the progress made in Philadelphia and Camden is the enlightened position taken by industry throughout the Basin concerning its responsibility in stream pollution control. As a result of Incodel's efforts, anthracite coal operators in the Pennsylvania headwater regions of the Basin have begun to discontinue their practice of the past century of using streams as the depository for wastes resulting from mining operations. Other industries, too, as exemplified by the action of a nationally-recognized concern located in the Lehigh River subbasin, are taking positive steps to prevent the unreasonable use of watercourses for the disposal of their wastes.

Postwar Public Works Program

Since September, 1943, a substantial part of Incodel's attention has been devoted to postwar planning. Specifically, the commission has been engaged in an effort to influence governmental authorities to prepare plans and specifications for needed public works improvements well in advance of the time for their actual construction in the postwar period.

By reason of this activity there now exists a reservoir of almost a billion dollars' worth of economically advisable public works projects in the Basin. Blue prints are in readiness for about $400 million worth of work.

The value of such pre-postwar planning is obvious. If it should become necessary to fall back upon public works construction as a second line of defense in cushioning the effects of after-war readjustments, there will be no reason to resort to leaf-raking and other nonuseful, hastily conceived projects.

Included in the Incodel inventory are improvements for the abatement of stream pollution, for municipal and industrial water supplies, for navigation and flood control; and for soil conservation and reforestation.

One of Incodel's major responsibilities in the future will be to provide such liaison services as are necessary to secure a proper coordination of the various independent projects of the basin's many governmental agencies.

Federal-State Relationships

Incodel devoted special attention and energy in 1944 to an effort to bring about a better balance in the relationships between federal and state governments in the matter of river control and watershed development. This is a task of both regional and national significance.

Successful results are beginning to accrue from this activity. On December 22, 1944, President Roosevelt signed the National Flood Control Act (Public Law 534, 78th Congress, Chapter 665), in which is included a broad amendment, sponsored by Incodel and by water resources agencies from twenty-five other states, which requires proper recognition and respect of
states' interests in the development of the water resources of the country. By this accomplishment the first step has been won in reversing the trend which has been going on with increasing momentum during the past decade toward the complete transfer of authority over water policies from the states to the national government.

The effect of the amendment is to bring the states, by law, back into partnership with the federal government in determining the type of projects which shall be constructed within their boundaries for navigation, flood control, and related purposes.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

Delaware:
R. C. Beckett, State Sanitary Engineer
Hon. George R. Clark, Member, House of Representatives
Hon. George P. Edmonds, Member, State Senate
Hon. Burton S. Heal, Recorder of Deeds, New Castle County
W. B. McKendrick, State Highway Department

New Jersey:
Hon. Robert C. Hendrickson, State Treasurer
Dr. Charles P. Missick, State Planning Board
Hon. Duane E. Minard, Jr., Member, Assembly
Hon. Joseph C. Paul, Commission on Interstate Cooperation, Vice-Chairman
Hon. John G. Sholl, Member, State Senate

New York:
Dr. M. P. Catherwood, Commissioner, Division of Commerce
Hon. George W. Foy, Member, Assembly
Hon. Nathaniel L. Goldstein, Attorney General
Hon. John S. Thompson, Member, Assembly
Hon. Floyd E. Anderson, Member, State Senate

Pennsylvania:
Hon. Floyd Chalfant, Secretary, Department of Commerce
Hon. Weldon B. Heyburn, Member, State Senate
Hon. Franklin H. Lichtenwalter, Member, State House of Representatives
F. A. Pitkin, Director, State Planning Board
Hon. Ellwood J. Turner, Member, State House of Representatives, Chairman

Secretariat:
James H. Allen, Executive Secretary

THE INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE POTOMAC RIVER BASIN*

Since the last edition of The Book of the States, the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin has been carrying on a program for the conservation of resources within the Potomac River Basin. While the Commission was formed primarily for the purpose of controlling pollution within the Basin, it has been found that, in effect, it must plan and promote conservation measures for the resources within the Basin which affect pollution control.

During the war period, the Commission's policy has been to devote its efforts to the fundamental purposes involved in this program so that it will be ready at the end of the war to carry on an active program which will help to abate pollution.

The Commission's program can be classified under four general headings: planning, legislation, educational work, and a research program.

PLANNING

In the field of planning, the Commission, during the last two years, has made a survey of all of the available information regarding pollution and factors influencing it in the Potomac Basin. This survey included one of industrial wastes, taken through direct observations and questionnaires, and has provided much valuable information not previously available. The Commission issued a preliminary report upon the pollution conditions within the watershed based upon these data.
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Since the issuance of this report, the advisory committees of the Commission have been busy planning corrective measures for the conditions found to be present. These committees in general are attempting to formulate water quality criteria which can be used as the desirable water quality for the principal water uses. It is contemplated that the Basin will then be zoned into areas of principal water use and that the streams in these areas will then be kept up to the quality of water suggested by the criteria through enforcement by the appropriate agencies within the states of the Basin. The work of these advisory committees has progressed to the point where tentative criteria are available. No zoning of the Basin has as yet been done.

The Commission has already formulated a list of treatment works which are desirable and which can be used as postwar projects. Additional treatment works may be added to this list of projects as the quality of water desired in any area becomes available.

Legislative Program

In the field of legislation, the Commission has studied proposed federal legislation for the control of pollution and other water resources. It has carried on educational work which seems to be warranted in the case of each bill and has supported those which it favored.

In the field of state legislation, the Commission has studied the pollution legislation of the various states and, at the request of interested persons in the state of Virginia, has attempted to initiate and carry on educational work for the promotion of water control legislation within the state.

The Commission is sponsoring and carrying on educational work in connection with legislation for the completion of the Savage River Dam, which will increase the low-water flow upon the north branch of the Potomac River. This increased flow is desirable primarily for pollution control purposes. This legislation was introduced during the latter part of the last session of the Seventy-eighth Congress and will be reintroduced during the present session. It is the hope of this Commission that passage of this bill will be secured.

Educational Activities

One of the Commission's chief functions is educational work in connection with pollution control. It is only through the medium of education that the Commission can have its policies carried out by individual state agencies. In order to further this work, the Commission is continually carrying on educational work through the medium of meetings, publications, and correspondence. It has recently initiated a News Letter with the intention of including therein information of interest to persons within the Potomac River Basin.

The Commission believes that it should aid the states in the promotion of their work which is in agreement with the objectives of the Commission. In this connection, the Commission is offering aid in the way of preliminary advice to municipalities in conjunction with postwar pollution abatement projects. This work is, of course, being done in cooperation with pertinent state agencies.

Research Program

Early in 1944, the Commission sponsored a program of research upon industrial wastes for the recovery of critical materials therefrom. This program was to have been financed by a branch of the WPB, with the research work being carried out at certain universities within the states in the Potomac River Basin. While the research work under this program never actually got under way because of a change in policy in the WPB, it was the forerunner of the Commission's present research program which is just being formulated.

The Commission believes additional research is necessary in the field of industrial waste treatment before pollution abatement can be economically accomplished within the Potomac Basin. In order to further this research, the Commission believes it to be desirable that there be a clearing house for information between the different agencies studying industrial waste problems. The Commission proposes to act as a clearing house for such information and will attempt to coordinate and plan research programs and will promote and stimulate them. In addition to furthering the general knowledge upon industrial
wastes, their recovery, and their treatment, it is hoped that the Commission will obtain for itself and for the member states:
1. A desirable and convenient means of educational and promotional work in connection with waste treatment and control; and
2. A ready and convenient source of information for use by pertinent state and private agencies; and
3. A means for closer relations between industry, the regulatory agencies of the states in the basin, and the Commission.

In the future, the Commission expects to carry on more intensive work on the programs which have been initiated in the past and on any additional ones which seem to be desirable.

**MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION**

**District of Columbia:**
- HAROLD A. KEMP, Director, Division of Sanitary Engineering
- D. L. SECKINGER, M.D., Assistant Health Officer
- JAMES W. LAUDERDALE, People's Counsel, Public Utilities Commission

**Maryland**
- GOVERNOR HERBERT R. O'CONOR, Annapolis
- SENATOR L. HAROLD SOTHORON, Brentwood
- GEORGE F. HAZELWOOD, Cumberland
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**Virginia:**
- RAYMOND V. LONGB, Director, Virginia State Planning Board, Richmond
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- JOHN A. K. DONOVAN, Falls Church
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**United States:**
- ABEL WOLMAN, Consulting Engineer, Baltimore, Maryland
- RALPH E. TARBEET, Senior Sanitary Engineer, U. S. Public Health Service, Washington
- C. C. BURGER, Jr., Office of the Chief of Engineers, Rivers and Harbors Branch, Washington

**Secretariat:**
- EDWIN R. COTTON, Engineer-Secretary
  522 Transportation Building
  Washington 6, D. C.

**Counsel of State Governments:**
- FRANK BANE, Executive Director

**THE INTERSTATE OIL COMPACT COMMISSION**

In the year of its tenth anniversary, 1945, the Interstate Oil Compact Commission finds in its accomplishments much of which to be proud. It stands forth in bold relief as the nation's most notable example of the success and practicability of the compact method in the solution of perplexing interstate problems.

The thirteen oil-producing states which are now members of this "Interstate Compact to Conserve Oil and Gas" have convincingly demonstrated, by working hand in hand for the common good under the bond of this interstate oil and gas treaty, the desirability of free and voluntary cooperation between states in the solution of mutually disturbing questions, as opposed to other more rigorous and less attractive ways of effecting a solution.

One of the greatest achievements of this interstate cooperative body has been that of instilling in the minds of the public and the various branches of state and federal government confidence in the commission's aims and objectives and general approval of the voluntary collaboration method in correlating divergent state views and opinions. Probably no other board or commission of like nature in the United States receives such universal approbation as does the Interstate Oil Compact Commission.

Under the leadership of men of reasonable attitude, working always for the greatest good of the greatest number, the commission constantly seeks ways of broadening its activities and influence. One such step was the inauguration in 1943 of its nationwide educational program on the conservation of oil and gas. Outstanding effort in this program was the production of a thirty-minute sound and color movie, "Oil for Tomorrow," which graphically portrays the magnitude of the petroleum industry and the important part the conservation of oil and gas plays in the lives of all Americans. Prints of the film are available for loan at the commission's na-
national headquarters in the State Capitol, Oklahoma City, and requests for their use by interested groups are invited. To date there are forty-one prints in circulation and others are being made. Because of its popular appeal, "Oil for Tomorrow" is making a great contribution to the work of the commission and the states.

In December, 1943, the commission appointed a nine-member permanent committee on interstate affairs. Designated the "Interstate Relations Committee," it immediately launched into a study of practical methods of enhancing the commission's relations with the states, the federal government, and the public. It acts as a clearing house for general and special information concerning the commission's work, conservation functions of member states, contacts with prospective member states, and allied information of interest to the public, the industry, and departments of government. The committee has undertaken the preparation of, and now has ready for printing, a simplified handbook on oil and gas conservation. The booklet is directed principally to lay persons in the producing states, states likely to become producers, members of state legislative bodies, and state officials. It has been written in popular style and will be easily understood by those outside the industry. The book will be illustrated by drawings, cuts, and photographs and will be distributed from the commission's national headquarters.

Another important permanent committee appointed by the commission in 1943, which has proved to be most aggressive, is the Committee on Public Lands. It has conducted extensive surveys and studies of various matters and conditions affecting oil and gas conservation and development in the public domain, and has made reports to the commission which have been of inestimable benefit in formulating findings and recommendations. This committee's inquiries into public land affairs relating to oil and gas resulted in the commission's summer quarterly meeting, held in Denver, Colorado, in June, 1944, being devoted wholly to the consideration of such matters. Recommendations contained in reports of the committee have been approved by governors of public land states, as well as by members of congressional committees on public lands.

The Research and Coordinating Committee, composed of technical representatives from the regulatory agencies of the compacting states, has, during 1943 and 1944, continued its studies of specialized phases of the oil and gas industries. Prominent among its surveys, studies, and reports are its national stripper-well survey of administration of oil and gas conservation laws, a study of dual completions, a study of bottom hole pressures, and a survey of underground natural gas storage.

These and other committees, such as the commission's Legal Committee, which, after much exhaustive study and research, prepared two forms of suggested model oil and gas conservation laws recommended by the commission to all prospective or oil-producing states; the Engineering Committee, which is conducting a nationwide survey of production practices, the first such survey ever undertaken which, when completed, will include the most recent advances in production practices and a complete study of oil reservoirs; and the Regulatory Practices Committee, which is making a study of the utilization of natural gas, are all vitalizing factors behind the Interstate Oil Compact's growth.

Membership of the Commission*

Officers

GOVERNOR ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL, Chairman
J. C. HUNTER, First Vice-Chairman
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E. G. DAHLGREN, Assistant Secretary
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HIRAM M. DOW, New Mexico
SAM H. JONES, Louisiana
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The International Board of Inquiry for the Great Lakes Fisheries

At a conference held at the State Department on April 17-18, 1945, representatives from the governors of all the Great Lakes states met to review an international agreement for the conservation and development of the Great Lakes fisheries. The State Department undertook the drafting of a proposed treaty in response to recommendations made by the International Board of Inquiry which was established February 29, 1940, by an exchange of notes between the United States and Canada for the purpose of submitting recommendations for the preservation and development of the Great Lakes fisheries. Members of the Board, which submitted its report to the two governments in August, 1942, were: Hubert R. Gallagher, Chairman, Associate Director, Council of State Governments; A. G. Huntsman, Secretary, Consulting Director, Fisheries Research Board of Canada, Toronto, Ontario; John Van Oosten, U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ann Arbor, Michigan; and D. J. Taylor, Deputy Minister, Game and Fisheries Department, Toronto, Ontario.

After further revision, it is expected that the draft agreement will be presented to the Canadian government, and in the event that agreement is reached between the United States and Canada the proposed international agreement will be referred to the president for approval, and to the United States Senate for ratification.

Because of the complicated jurisdictional problems involved by reason of the fact that state governments, the Province of Ontario, and the governments of the United States and Canada are concerned, international control has been recommended by every governmental study commission, and by virtually everyone who has made an impartial investigation of the situation of the Great Lakes. For over fifty years the problem of devising uniform regulations for the Great Lakes fisheries has baffled government officials, scientists, and conservation and commercial organizations. Two earlier International Boards of Inquiry (1893 and 1908) appointed by the two countries also recommended common action through a treaty. Presidents Grover Cleveland, William H. Taft, Woodrow Wilson, and more recently Franklin D. Roosevelt urged adoption of such a treaty. Governors, United States Senators, and Secretaries of State William J. Bryan and Cordell Hull have urged consideration of a treaty. It now appears as if the wishes of these men, as well as those of the International Board of Inquiry, may at last be realized. Ratification of the treaty should help to arrest the decline in these fisheries through the enactment of measures providing for: international controls; uniform regulations and enforcement; and more effective management practices.
State-Federal Relations

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN STATE-FEDERAL RELATIONS*

One of the manifold blessings of living under a federal system of government is that the functions which society desires should be undertaken by collective action may be assigned to the most appropriate level of government—federal, state, or local. According to a recent Census Bureau report, there are 155,116 units of government in the continental United States. The services which these units perform are frequently so diversified that overlapping results, with a corresponding opportunity for cooperative effort. Further, as the popular demands on each type of unit are constantly changing, the assignment of functions among them is in a state of flux. This is true not only among types of government at the county level, but among all levels.

The economic emergency which occurred in the early thirties resulted in an expansion of governmental functions, especially at the federal level, accompanied by a correlative growth of cooperative working relations among all levels—federal, state, and local—directed toward the goal of unemployment relief, stabilization, and a broadened concept of social security. Recent years have witnessed an intensification of these relations—not, however, without setbacks—so that working arrangements for all major governmental programs are at a new high in terms of funds, energies, and accomplishments. Naturally, the war has served to intensify this cooperation, as it has been recognized universally that the federal government must have the right-of-way in proceeding with the war effort, both as to controls of some affairs formerly deemed state or local in nature, and in tapping sources of revenue to finance war costs.

The evidences of the nature, extent, and growth of federal-state interrelations are found in legislation at both the federal and state level; in judicial decisions by both federal and state courts, which have far-reaching influence upon executive and administrative policies; and in the administrative processes and policies of the respective governments. A detailed recital of much of the history of this cooperative effort has been presented in State Government and other publications of the Council of State Governments, and in a voluminous literature of recent years. It is here possible only to set forth in a summary manner some of the main facts about the principles, practices, and problems found in the field.

The interplay among levels, particularly that between the federal government and the states, is so extensive and so diversified that no person can hope to comprehend it in its entirety; it ranges from the most casual to the most complete. For those interested in a sample view of the range and extent of federal-state interrelations, perusal of the annual reports of the federal

*Prepared by C. E. Rightor, Fiscal Division, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President. The opinions expressed are those of the author and not necessarily those of the Bureau of the Budget.
Departments of Agriculture, Interior, and Labor, and of the Social Security Board and Public Health Service will prove them to be examples of an enlightening nature—and, at the same time, reassuring as to the progress being made in this field.

**Promotion of War Effort**

In proceeding with defense and, later, war plans, the federal government and the states reviewed their programs and fiscal policies to give priority to those directly related to the war effort. This was recognized by President Roosevelt in his budget message in 1942:

The fiscal policy of the Federal Government, especially with respect to public works, is being reinforced by that of State and local governments. Executive committees of the Council of State Governments and the Governors' Conference have issued excellent suggestions for harmonizing various aspects of State and local fiscal policy with national objectives. These governments are readjusting many of their services so as to expedite the war program. Many are making flexible plans for the postwar readjustment and some are accumulating financial reserves for that purpose. The larger the scale of our war effort, the more important it becomes to provide a reservoir of postwar work by business and by Federal, State, and local governments.

Common policies were formulated by the federal government, with the counsel of the states and local units. The states concentrated their efforts on analyzing and solving their own localized war problems, such as reviewing and appraising their industrial, agricultural, and mineral resources and their manpower, with a view to promoting the national interests. Broad emergency war powers were granted the governors to mobilize their military and civilian resources. Numerous statutes designed to integrate state administration with the war effort—as drafted by the Council of State Governments in cooperation with the Federal-State Relations Office of the Department of Justice—went to the states and were adopted widely; such as black-out and other air-raid precautions, public health and sanitation regulations, traffic controls attuned to the movement of troops and military matériel, and acceptance of federal grants for war purposes.

In cooperation with the War Department, the states established and have since operated the selective service system. State and local defense councils, as originally initiated by the Division of State and Local Cooperation of the National Advisory Council, were established to facilitate cooperation with federal agencies in the war program. They are responsible for the acceptance by many states of uniform motor transportation standards, maximum speed limits, and reciprocity in motor truck licensing. They have meant much in furthering the federal war programs, for example, setting up and operating the first rationing system. Unfortunately, the state-local systems of government do not enforce price-fixing and similar controls.

Early in its organization, the WPB established a division of civilian supplies (now Office of Civilian Requirements) in recognition of the needs of states and cities as consumers of critical and strategic materials in maintaining essential services on the home front.

Finally, there should be recorded the positive fiscal program so widely adopted by the states, which includes such key principles as reduction of debt and outlay expenditures, stabilization of tax rates and levies, establishment of cash reserves, etc. At the same time, the states are investing several billion dollars in federal bonds, and are doing postwar planning which contemplates coordination with federal and local public works construction, subject to general policies which Congress may fix.

These actions have had, and are having, a continuing effect upon the relations of the states with the central government and, upon the entire national economy as well. Experience dictates changes, however, as we live in a dynamic era, and programs and policies are subject to current requirements as viewed by either the states or the federal government.

**Federal Grants-in-Aid**

One of the measures of the extent of federal-state interrelations is the federal flow of funds to the states in the form of grants-in-aid. The Congress has recognized that various activities conducted by state or local governments have a national interest, and has authorized the appropriation of funds to aid in financing their cost to the extent of that interest. Such authori-
zations in the form of grants are to be distinguished from those paid to individuals or associations, which are known as subsidies. Grants may be classified for regular or emergency (war, unemployment relief, flood relief, etc.) programs.

In the case of regular grants, matching provisions usually obtain, the state being required to devote a portion of its own funds to the program. In the case of emergencies, however, the federal government finances substantially the entire cost of the services; and, further, instead of granting funds to the states, a federal agency may perform the services on behalf of the state or local governments.

The federal government has never adopted a policy of sharing its general revenues, except by specific grants; it shares receipts of certain special funds, however, which are aids similar to grants. Tabular statements of regular federal grants and shared revenues for five-year intervals since 1930 (with substitution of 1944 expenditures for 1945 estimates) follow.

REGULAR FEDERAL GRANTS TO STATES: SELECTED YEARS, 1930–1944*

(In thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1930</th>
<th>1935</th>
<th>1940</th>
<th>1944</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Welfare</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Security Board:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and aid to blind</td>
<td>$279,181</td>
<td>$429,457</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment compensation administration</td>
<td>3,338</td>
<td>3,677</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment service</td>
<td>$1,927</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Labor:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services for crippled children</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>1,488</td>
<td>1,423</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child welfare services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans Administration:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal aid to state homes</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>1,029</td>
<td>2,082</td>
<td>4,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Security Agency—Office of Administrator:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Social Welfare</td>
<td>1,321</td>
<td>3,443</td>
<td>348,723</td>
<td>476,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highways</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal-aid highway system</td>
<td>77,888</td>
<td>155,507</td>
<td>47,574</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Agriculture:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment stations</td>
<td>4,335</td>
<td>4,384</td>
<td>6,648</td>
<td>6,946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension work</td>
<td>7,540</td>
<td>8,580</td>
<td>13,438</td>
<td>13,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest-fire cooperation</td>
<td>1,383</td>
<td>1,503</td>
<td>1,988</td>
<td>5,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of forest planting stock</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest and domestic consumption of agricultural products—state welfare and school lunch and milk programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Interior:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal aid, wildlife restoration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>577</td>
<td>1,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Natural Resources</td>
<td>13,338</td>
<td>14,511</td>
<td>27,561</td>
<td>23,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health Service:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of venereal diseases</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,188</td>
<td>9,703</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance to states, general</td>
<td>9,439</td>
<td>10,840</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Labor:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternity and child health</td>
<td>4,767</td>
<td>5,948</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18,394</td>
<td>26,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Education:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges for agricultural and mechanical arts</td>
<td>2,250</td>
<td>2,550</td>
<td>5,030</td>
<td>5,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion of vocational education</td>
<td>7,386</td>
<td>9,993</td>
<td>19,385</td>
<td>20,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Printing House for the Blind</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War Shipping Administration:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State marine schools</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Education</td>
<td>10,061</td>
<td>12,804</td>
<td>24,670</td>
<td>25,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Works</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War Department—Corps of Engineers:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments to states, Flood Control Act</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airports*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total, Regular Grants</td>
<td>$102,608</td>
<td>$140,298</td>
<td>$575,255</td>
<td>$649,758</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Does not include $268 million of National Industrial Recovery and Emergency Funds.

* Prepared by C. E. Richard, Fiscal Division, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President.
THE BOOK OF THE STATES

FEDERAL REVENUES SHARED WITH STATES: SELECTED YEARS, 1930–1944* (In thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1930</th>
<th>1935</th>
<th>1940</th>
<th>1944</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Power Comm.</td>
<td>$13</td>
<td>$65</td>
<td>$19</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Agric.</td>
<td>1,565</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>1,192</td>
<td>2,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments to states,</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from national forsts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Int.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>489</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grazing, receipts</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales of public lands</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma, royalties</td>
<td>1,388</td>
<td>1,202</td>
<td>2,153</td>
<td>2,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and oil, Red River</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potash deposits,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>royalties, and rentals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona and Nevada,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia River Dam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fund, Boulder Canyon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Shared</td>
<td>$3,067</td>
<td>$2,123</td>
<td>$3,951</td>
<td>$6,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The amount of federal aid for regular governmental activities has gradually increased during this period except for 1935, when contributions for highways were largely in the form of emergency unemployment relief and public works funds. Especially during the past ten years the aid programs have grown in number.

The tables do not cover all federal grants; they are exclusive of those made directly to local units, of emergency grants in the thirties for the relief of unemployment, and of grants for defense and war purposes. Grants for war purposes are of various kinds, including those to states only and "to states and so forth" (i.e., states and their subdivisions, including educational institutions), and federal agency activities which are for the benefit of the states or their subdivisions. In the case of this type of grant, the states may be said to be acting only as agents of the federal government. It is impossible to allocate to the states a specific amount of war-related grants in any year, as part of the service may be local or federal. Expenditures in 1944 in the form of grants for war purposes were as follows (in thousands of dollars):

- Education and training, defense workers: $72,731
- Defense public works (community facilities): 135,257
- Strategic highway network: 13,528
- Access roads: 88,111
- Surveys and plans, highways: 173
- Flight strips: 3,563
- War Food Administration salaries and expenses (transferred to Extension Service): 1,816
- Emergency maternity and infant care: 29,946
- Total: $344,925

SOCIAL SECURITY

The nation has ended its ninth year of operation of the Social Security Act, which provides a broad program of federal-state cooperation in that field. Economic conditions during this period have ranged from depression and recovery to defense and war, but progress has been achieved from the point of view both of the federal agencies supervising the program—Social Security Board, Public Health Service, and Children's Bureau—and of the states.

The effects of the program on the national economy are significant. Most of the services covered by the act were formerly accepted as being local functions coupled with private effort and support, and, while later assumed in part by the states, are now participated in by the federal government. For three of the categories of public assistance—old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and aid to the blind—responsibility for administration remains with the states, but the federal government contributes aid when the states' plans are approved; the fourth category, general assistance, remains solely a state-local function. Administrative costs of unemployment compensation are financed wholly by federal grants, but payment of benefits continues to be a state function.

Federal grants for the three public assistance programs and administration of unemployment compensation are by far the largest of all grants, a place formerly occupied by aid for highways. In 1944, these grants represented nearly three-fourths of all grant, expenditures, even
though in that year the extraordinary demands for wartime workers reduced the amounts of assistance payments and unemployment benefits, well below earlier totals. Yet few states are taking full advantage of the provisions for federal matching, although many states have exceeded the matching limits for some services. The Board has suggested the desirability of revision of the matching principle to give more consideration to need. This would require, properly, that the states make similar adjustments among the localities which share assistance.

The program of old-age assistance is operating in all states under plans approved by the Social Security Board, that of aid to dependent children in all but one, and that of aid to the blind in all but four states. Unemployment insurance is in effect in all states. Several state legislatures have found it desirable to liberalize their laws relating to coverage, assistance rates, and eligibility requirements, with resultant increases in average payments for these programs. This in part reflects the favorable financial position of many of the states, and in part is a recognition of the increased cost of living which must be met by the recipients.

In response to President Roosevelt’s request, the states, recognizing that in the war emergency manpower controls should be centralized, yielded their respective employment services to the federal government on January 1, 1942; the states, however, expect this service to revert to the pre-war status when the emergency is declared ended.

The Congress, after a thoroughgoing discussion of the pros and cons, decided that it is the responsibility of the states to provide compensation for unemployment, during the reconversion period as well as in ordinary times, and enacted legislation to authorize the advancing of funds to states to support their unemployment funds if and when this proved necessary. The committee reports indicated, however, that the states needed to strengthen their unemployment compensation systems by further liberalizing the provisions relating to extent of coverage and amount and duration of benefits.

The defense and war periods have greatly intensified the load on the Children’s Bureau in its work of supervising such wartime problems as enforcement of child labor standards, maternal and infant care, juvenile delinquency, and the like. In all of these fields of activity the Bureau maintains a close cooperation with state agencies. In the case of maternal and child health services, services for crippled children, and child welfare services, all of which are supported in part by federal grants which are administered by the Children’s Bureau, that agency has continued to work closely with state health and welfare departments. In EMIC (the emergency maternity and infant care program), which provides medical, hospital, and infant care for wives and infants of enlisted men in the four lowest pay grades, and which is supervised by the Children’s Bureau, all states are cooperating and gradually adopting refinements to meet the needs of the program.

The emergency programs of NYA, CCC, WPA, and the foodstamp plan were discontinued.

During the past session of the Congress, several acts were passed to increase the benefits to service men. Although the care of veterans is initially the responsibility of the federal government, it is a subject in which the states also are vitally concerned because the returned veterans will be their citizens. In the retraining, re-employment, and welfare provisions for this group, the states will work closely with federal agencies charged by the Congress with the federal part of the program.

The existing social security program of the nation, improved as it has been since its inauguration, is not a complete or adequate one in several respects. President Roosevelt specifically pointed out certain desirable extensions and improvements. Legislation to carry out his recommendations was introduced in the past session of the Congress, but not acted upon; new measures introduced in the Seventy-ninth Congress probably will receive favorable action to some degree.

PUBLIC HEALTH

Among the many progressive laws enacted by the Seventy-eighth Congress was that relating to the Public Health Service,
which brought into a single law all the statutes on that subject which had accumulated through the past 150 years. As has been indicated for various other governmental functions, federal-state relations in the field of public health, which are both extensive and intimate, have continued in a mutually acceptable manner.

The Service consists of a corps of specialists in public health, medicine, nursing, and health research, equipped to deal with national, interstate, and international problems. Cooperation by the Service with state health agencies is being strengthened and extended from year to year. As it has been difficult for the states to recruit personnel during the war period, the Service has supplied trained officers. In such areas as communicable diseases, milk and food inspection, interstate quarantine, industrial hygiene, and venereal diseases, the Service has assisted by supplying personnel, purchasing drugs, and offering technical advice and guidance. In general, state health authorities develop and conduct their own programs, with a minimum of federal administrative control except to assure carrying out of the intent of the law.

Grant programs' of approximately $10 million each have been in operation for venereal diseases and general public health services, and the latter program recently has been supplemented with a like amount of Lanham funds. The new act definitely recognizes the need for a campaign to eradicate tuberculosis, for which a grant program of $10 million annually is authorized; the authorization probably will be implemented by an appropriation for this purpose.

The basis of public health grants merits mention. Allotments to the states are based on (a) population, (b) health needs, and (c) financial ability of the states. As the amounts are prepared and approved in a joint conference of Public Health Service with the health officials of the states, this procedure is almost an automatic assurance of cooperation between the two levels.

EDUCATION

In education, the federal government has continued to furnish the states with assistance in the form of information resulting from the collection of facts about education, national investigations of educational programs, and supervision of federal grant programs.

The largest grant program in this field currently is the war-induced education and training of defense workers, which cost $73 million in 1944. This activity, as well as vocational education, is supervised and directed at the state level by the boards of vocational education. In 1943, the national total expenditure for vocational education was $66 million, of which the federal portion was $20 million. Even though some federal grants for educational purposes do not require matching, the total expenditure for the programs, including state and local funds, is more than twice the federal grant. This condition obtains, incidentally, for most regular state activities which receive federal aid.

The personnel of the central Office of Education, in Washington, has been insufficient to serve the needs of the nation's expanding educational system—primary and secondary schools, vocational schools, and institutions of higher education—and, in his budget message for 1945, President Roosevelt had stated:

As a part of the Budget for the fiscal year 1946, I am recommending reorganization of the basic structure of the Office of Education. This reorganization will facilitate service to the States in the development of more adequate educational programs with proper emphasis on all the various aspects of education.

President Roosevelt, in the same message, also stated:

If a suitable standard (of elementary and secondary education) is to be maintained in all parts of the country, the Federal Government must render aid where it is needed—but only where it is needed.

Whether this means legislation in the nature of Senator Thomas' bill authorizing $300 million per year of federal aid, which has been reintroduced in the Seventy-ninth Congress, or at least adoption of the equalization portion of the bill, remains to be seen.

The anticipated discontinuation of the national defense program of education with the cessation of the war raises a major problem as to the manner in which this training will be carried on. Part of the
load would appear to be provided for in
the War Mobilization and Reconversion
Act, under which retraining, re-employ-
ment, vocational education, and voca-
tional rehabilitation—except as to veter-
ans—is centered in that agency; and, in
part, as to veterans, in the Servicemen's
Readjustment Act—G.I. Bill of Rights—
wherein provision is made for enabling
service men to resume their interrupted
education. In both of these laws, it is con-
templated that the respective federal ad-
ministrators will confer with state and
local agencies and officials in charge of
existing programs in order that the federal
activities may be coordinated with those
at the operating levels. With several mil-
lion students resuming an interrupted edu-
cation, large strains will be placed on the
existing buildings, facilities, faculties, and
administrators. Here, indeed, is a chal-
lenge to the educational world.

A further evidence of federal assistance
to public schools and state educational
institutions was given when the Congress
authorized the outright donation to public
school authorities of the personal property
of the NYA which had been loaned to
them. In this connection, it may be noted
that the Surplus Property Disposal Act
provides that, in the disposition of prop-
erty declared surplus, educational prop-
erty may be sold or leased to the states or
their instrumentalities and to educational
institutions. Discussion at the hearings on
this bill indicated that the Surplus Prop-
erty Board, in addition to taking into
consideration any benefit which accrued
to the United States from the use of that
property by the states, should place a
moderate price on such material.

While basic legislation authorizing the
school lunch and milk program is not con-
tained in the Department of Agriculture
Organic Act of 1944, the states should take
note that a $50 million appropriation con-
tinues to be approved by the Congress.

HIGHWAYS

Federal aid to states for highways is one
of the older, well-established aid programs,
having been in operation since 1916 and
largely expanded in 1921.

From 1920 to 1940, total highway
construction expenditures by the states
and local units averaged $1.1 billion an-
nually, including both regular and emerg-
cency work relief federal aid. This total,
incidentally, was equal to one-half of all
public construction during that twenty-
year period, while public construction was
one-third of all construction.

Since 1940, state expenditures for high-
way construction have been at a greatly
reduced rate because of shortage both of
manpower and of materials and equip-
ment, whereas the federal government has
found it necessary for military reasons to
provide funds for a strategic network of
highways and access roads. As a result of
these federal outlays, the states will re-
cieve a residual value, the amount of
which cannot be accurately estimated at
the present time. The states are accruing a
vast backlog of maintenance and construc-
tion projects, and are using a portion of
their highway funds—including federal
funds made available specifically—to pre-
pare surveys and plans for postwar con-
struction.

The Federal-Aid Road Act of 1921 es-

tablished several basic principles for federal
aid. Among them were: the requirement
that the states establish a highway depart-
ment; creation of a federal-aid system of
highways for the nation; a fifty-fifty fed-
eral-state matching of regular funds (but
not applicable for emergency aids); and
an apportionment formula, which took in-
to account equally the factors of popula-
tion, area, and mileage of star route high-
ways. Under this law an extensive national
system of highways has developed, together
with a highly effective federal-state work-

ing relationship.

Experience under the existing law, how-
ever, had been accumulating, which in-
dicated that the nation’s most pressing
highway needs were not being met satis-
factorily. Laws were introduced into both
branches of the Congress, and after careful
deliberation that body enacted—in Decem-
ber, 1944—a new federal-aid highway bill
designed to meet postwar needs for a
three-year period. This act provides for a
three-way allocation of a much greater
amount of federal aid—$500 million an-
nually, as compared with a pre-war aver-
age of about $120 million, exclusive of
work relief funds (which did not require
matching)—45 per cent of which is to be for the federal-aid highway system, 30 per cent for secondary or feeder roads, and 25 per cent for the federal-aid highway system in urban areas. One-fifth of the first year's authorization, when appropriated, may be used immediately for surveys and plans and for construction.

The formula for apportionment is revised in the case of secondary roads by substituting rural population for total population; and, in the case of urban areas, the sole factor is population in urban places of 5,000 or more. The fifty-fifty matching principle was retained. The effect of the new law, with a number of other important provisions not here reviewed, will be to alter substantially the nature of the nation's highways, in so far as the states enact the legislation required for its application. Highway construction plans for the postwar period, so far as they are now available, indicate that expenditures for this purpose will continue to represent between one-third and one-half of all estimated public construction.

Housing

During the war, there have been frequent exchanges of information and services between state governments and the National Housing Agency. The states have adopted emergency legislation developed by the agency and the Council of State Governments authorizing the use of low-rent housing projects for war workers, and the establishment of local housing authorities to manage war housing projects. The state councils of civilian defense assisted the agency in the organization of sponsoring committees for war-housing centers, and in the development of the homes use program for in-migrant war workers.

The New York State Division of Housing has worked cooperatively with local authorities and the National Housing Agency in the adjustment of its housing program to the war. As a result, the Division has received priorities from the National Housing Agency and the state-sponsored housing program has been coordinated with federal war housing operations. In California, the State Farm Production Council has assumed responsibility for making allocations of shelter units for migratory workers made available to it through the National Housing Agency.

Public Works Planning

The decision of the Congress to discontinue appropriations for the National Resources Planning Board has almost dried up the well of cooperation between the federal government and the states so far as concerns general public works planning. Two committees on postwar planning—the George Committee in the Senate, and the Colmer Committee in the House—are doing a degree of the planning formerly covered by NRPB; but broad and continuous contacts with state planning and other officials on the pattern established by the Board are no longer undertaken.

While present efforts universally are concentrated on waging and winning the war, yet it is realized by governmental units at all levels that, in the field of public construction, plans for the days to follow should be made now. A sample study of planning at the state and local levels, made by FWA and Census, showed that, except for highways, the number of projects for which engineering plans were complete was a relatively small figure. Indefiniteness of plans for financing indicates that federal aid is contemplated for a considerable proportion of the total.

The Congress, in the bill setting up the Office of War Mobilization and Reconstruction, recognized the desirability of a reserve of public works projects to be available during the transition from war to peace by authorizing an appropriation of funds to be advanced to states and their subdivisions for public works planning. President Roosevelt submitted a budget item of $78 million for this purpose, but thus far it has not been acted upon by the Congress.

No plan to provide for the coordination of the timing of public works construction by all levels of government with private construction—which experience of the twenties and thirties indicated to be highly desirable from the point of view of the national economy—appears so far to have been developed or given official recognition.

In several areas of public works, the
federal government is undertaking or has provided plans and finances for projects that involve the welfare of the states and in the construction of which the states will be concerned. Plans for highways and aviation have been mentioned; to them might be added flood control, rivers and harbors, reclamation, and soil conservation. In the recently enacted flood control bill, for example, it is specifically stipulated that the interests of the states be conserved so far as possible.

AIRPORTS

A second means of transportation—aviation—requires mention, with possibly more emphasis on future than on past federal-state relations. Civil aviation is interstate in nature and requires federal regulations with state re-enforcement. The Congress has established a supervisory agency, and some states have enacted coordinating legislation.

One of the needs of the business of aviation is airports. Existing airports have been provided by many municipalities and some states. Both before the war, through WPA and PWA funds, and later for defense and war purposes, the federal government has made investments of several hundred millions of dollars in municipally-owned and, in some instances, state-owned, airports. Federal negotiations in this connection, however, have been almost entirely with the individual airports, rather than through the state governments. As the business develops in the postwar period, question arises as to the extent that the states will participate. A tremendous expansion is predicted; hence, the question is an important one.

In the last session of the Congress, a resolution was adopted requesting the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics to report on a national system of airports. This report was presented in November, 1944, and is of concern because it proposes a 1,250 million dollar program for construction and improvement of civil airports, one-half to be financed by federal grants-in-aid over a term of years. Several bills have been introduced to give effect to that plan, providing that the federal grants may be made to states and their political subdivisions. Whatever the form of any legislation that may be enacted, it is apparent that the states will have to take legislative action to meet the conditions prescribed.

A decision by the Supreme Court, in the \textit{Northwest Airlines} case, that airline properties are taxable by all states in which they operate, led to a request by the Congress that the CAB make a study of the interstate taxation of airlines. This study is being made, and various associations of public officials are cooperating with a view to avoidance of multiple taxation. The resultant study portends much for state governments, as it provides a standard for similar problems in the future.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

Federal government consideration of the interests of the states needs to be cited in a few other instances: first, in the legislation pertaining to surplus property disposal, wherein the states and subdivisions are given a preferred position; second, legislation to continue temporarily the control and taxing of insurance by the states, which was enacted to offset the decision of the Supreme Court that the insurance business is interstate commerce; and third, the Supreme Court's refusal to review the decision of the lower courts that the income from bonds of the Port Authority of New York are exempt from federal taxation, because the Authority is a political subdivision of the states.

All of these items have an important bearing on both federal and state revenues and administration. Decisions of the Supreme Court and other federal courts, and also of the state courts, often have far-reaching effects upon functional performance at the several levels. Information on court decisions is not provided in this article, however, as it is readily available from several sources.

Numerous other topics that are of major significance in the field of federal-state cooperation undoubtedly will receive consideration by the Congress, among these being the payment of state and local taxes on government-owned-and-occupied property, urban redevelopment, and coordination of federal, state, and local taxation.

The alleged failure of the federal government to pay taxes to state and local governments on its real estate holdings is over-
emphasized. The Federal Real Estate Board, in its 1943 report, presented a classification of the 455 million acres of federally-owned property (exclusive of 366 million acres in the territories) which shows that over 90 per cent is public domain and never has been taxable. It is no novelty that Uncle Sam owns 87 per cent of the area of Nevada and 73 per cent of Arizona’s area.

Expansion of federal government activities during the past fifteen years, through the establishment of various agencies to stabilize economic conditions and for the purpose of conserving and utilizing national resources, and more recently to meet the demands of war, has meant substantial acquisitions of real property, part of which resulted in a loss to states and local units in their assessed valuations. Even so, in some instances, the Congress has authorized state and local taxation of the federally-acquired property, and in others has provided for in-lieu payments.

TVA makes in-lieu payments to the states in its area according to a diminishing percentage of its power revenues, as fixed by law. To overcome the difficulty that arose when the states retained these payments, the TVA now makes payments also to the counties in which its properties are situated, as do also the public distribution systems which purchase the authority’s power. Whether these payments are satisfactory to the states and the federal government is a problem being studied by all interests concerned.

In the case of Boulder Dam, the government recently began making annual payments of $300,000 each to Arizona and Nevada. Determination of the acceptability of this in-lieu payment may well serve as a guide in the case of similar projects, such as Grand Coulee and Bonneville. Several of the government corporations have provided regularly for payment either of taxes or in-lieu amounts on their properties.

Thus, the propriety of the federal government contributing to the support of state and local units in which it has acquired property in recent years; while of significance in limited areas, has not been wholly neglected. Attention is being given to the demands for relief, and measures are now before the Congress. Here, as in the cases affecting revenues to be distributed back to the states and their subdivisions, however, it is essential that the states continue to respect the interests of their subdivisions.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing is a brief statement, with illustrative but not exhaustive examples, of recent developments in federal-state relations. These intergovernmental relations have expanded and become more intimate for many governmental functions—and the end is not yet in sight. Additional federal aids for some functions, and new aids for other functions, are being vigorously advocated.

Where federal aid goes must go also federal control, but only to the extent that there is assurance that the objective of the Congress is realized. This may be accomplished by adoption of minimum standards of service and auditing and reporting procedures rather than by rigid administrative controls. Federal aids imply harmonious working relations between agencies and officials at both levels.

As many writers have stated, expansion of our national economy has a consonant effect on governmental functions and they have become interlevel in nature. This means that the development of interlevel cooperation, which has progressed so far so satisfactorily—but not without some disagreements even today—will continue in the future.
The war has led to an unparalleled spirit of cooperation among officials of all levels of government. As new and baffling problems have arisen, officials of federal, state, and local governments have sat down together around a table, taken stock of the situation, and decided what was necessary and how it was to be done. Together they agreed upon a program or plan; individually each worked out what his agency would do. This general pattern was followed almost everywhere in solving the emergency problems arising out of wartime conditions. In some communities, a representative of the President's Committee for Congested Production Areas was instrumental in bringing together interested officials to meet emergency situations. Leadership in the mobilization of the nation for war necessarily was taken by the national government, but the state and local governments have played a vital part. The winning of the war was everybody's business.

After the war is over, the problems will be different, but the need for intelligent, cooperative action by the states, cities, and the federal government will remain. But there is grave danger that many government officials and agencies will return to "normalcy" by going their own way, with little interest or desire to join with others in meeting new conditions and solving new problems.

The greatest problem which all units of government will face after the war, a problem overshadowing all others, is that of providing full employment. We will not be content to go back to the level of employment and income which prevailed prior to 1941. It has been estimated that ten million new jobs over those of 1940, and a national income of $140 billion, will be required to provide optimum employment after the war. The Council of State Governments, through its Committee on Postwar Reconstruction and Development, has prepared far-reaching plans for dealing with employment and related postwar problems. The states are planning to use the cushion of unemployment compensation reserves when unemployment strikes and are building up a shelf of public works plans and financial reserves to provide employment during the transition from a wartime to a peace economy.

The cities are following suit with plans for public works. They will be in a position also to encourage employment by adopting forward-looking city plans and enacting sound zoning, building, and housing codes which will facilitate large-scale private construction.

The greatest contribution which the states and the cities can make toward full

---

*Prepared by Joseph P. Harris. Abridged from State Government, XVIII, April, 1944.

employment, however, will be through the solution of new or aggravated economic and social problems, and the provision of needed services and controls required by industrial developments, shifts in population, demobilization and reconversion, and other consequences of the war. After the first World War, state and municipal services had to be stepped up to meet the needs created by the industrial expansion and rise in the general level of income. Following the present war we may expect a similar development.

After the close of the war, we may anticipate profound social and economic changes. Nearly half of the nation's manpower is being used in the war and in war industries. Yet the consumption of consumer goods and the standard of living have risen to higher levels than in any preceding period and our national income has approximately doubled. As we move gradually to a peace economy, the pent-up demand for capital and consumer goods and the accumulated purchasing power will greatly increase industrial production, thus providing jobs for a considerable number of persons released from the armed forces and war industries. It would be a mistake, however, to assume that our factories can provide the ten million or more jobs which will be needed. The great majority of released workers will have to be employed in construction, trade, agriculture, transportation, utilities, and services of all kinds. The increased volume of consumer's purchasing power cannot be spent entirely on automobiles, radios, and other manufactured products; much of it will be used to buy expanded and improved services of all kinds—from bigger and better gas stations to symphony concerts.

DEMAND FOR NEW MUNICIPAL SERVICES

The American public will not be satisfied with pre-war standards of municipal and state services. There will be a strong demand for new and improved highways and superhighways, better police protection, more recreational facilities, a greater educational program, expanded health work and hospitals, better streets, extension of social security and welfare services, libraries, art museums, low-cost housing, and a host of other services for which it is hoped the public will be able to pay out of an increased national income. The public will press for these services with little regard to whether the federal, state, or local governments furnish them. Government will be an important factor in providing the new jobs which are essential if we are to approach full employment.

The postwar period will bring many new problems with which government must deal. Revolutionary advances in transportation and communication, and the construction of networks of superhighways radiating from our cities, will hasten the process of decentralization of the population of our cities, which has already begun. The old concept of the city as a compact community is becoming obsolete. In the future, the population of even medium-sized cities may spread out over an area twenty-five miles or more from the center, with rural housing developments and suburban centers for stores, services, theaters, and clubs. For several decades there has been a marked trend of urban population in our great cities to overflow the political boundaries of the city, leaving behind a declining population, blighted areas, decreasing property values, and a city government whose boundaries are too narrowly confined and whose tax resources are too limited to deal adequately with the problems of a metropolitan community. This trend will be accelerated in the postwar period and will be extended to medium-sized and small cities.

Until the time of the first World War, the services rendered by city governments were relatively simple, consisting principally in what we may call "housekeeping" activities—water, sewers, garbage collection and removal, street cleaning, parks, and police and fire protection. In the last quarter of a century, however, the cities have been confronted with new or greatly increased social, economic, and welfare problems, which are inevitable in an industrial and urban society. Large-scale unemployment has produced or accentuated a host of attendant social problems—crime, juvenile delinquency and youth problems, housing and overcrowding, poverty, dependency, and insecurity in old age.

Today the cities are no longer primarily
concerned with public works and engineering services, which are well established. The problems which will be foremost in the postwar period will be those caused by movements of population, unemployment, reconversion, demobilization of military forces, provision for veterans and their dependents, vocational training and rehabilitation, a growing movement toward suburbanization, blighted areas, abandoned industries, declining property values in the older parts of the city, and other profound changes in urban life.

Who, we may ask, will deal with these baffling problems? Are the cities prepared to provide the increased services which will be necessary, and to exercise the controls which will be needed, or must these problems be left to the states and the federal government? If the cities are not at present able to deal effectively with the urban problems which the postwar period will bring, it is of the utmost importance that the states take stock of the situation and enact the necessary legislation. If the states do not act, they should not complain later if the federal government undertakes functions which properly belong to the states and the cities, or if the federal government comes directly to the aid of the cities, by-passing the states.

In the past the states have at times been slow in recognizing and dealing with the problems of the cities, and sometimes have been unsympathetic to their needs. This is readily understandable because, until recently, we have been an agricultural nation. The time has come, however, for the states to recognize that we have become primarily an industrial nation, and that the cities can no longer be treated as stepchildren. The problems of tomorrow are essentially urban problems; the states must cope with these problems or give way to other governmental agencies which are willing to do so.

The broad fields in which cities need state legislation and assistance in order to deal effectively with urban problems in the postwar period are discussed below under the following major subjects: (1) the financial position of the cities, (2) the legal position, (3) municipal administration, and (4) the special problems of the metropolitan area.

The Financial Position of the Cities

The cities are financially not able to meet the new demands which may be placed on them after the war, either in the expansion of old and well-established services, or in the establishment of new social and welfare activities. The general property tax, which cities have historically relied on as the principal source of tax revenue, has reached its maximum return and is already declining as a source of revenue in many communities. With the dispersion of population to the outlying sections beyond the boundaries of the city, and with the increasing obsolescence of buildings of all kinds, it may be expected that property values and assessments will show a further decline. In addition, reduced property tax limitations have been adopted in many states. The results are well known. Municipal revenues have remained relatively stable or have declined during recent years, whereas the federal government and the states, which are able to tap new sources of revenue more suitable to our modern economy, have greatly increased their revenues. In cities of 100,000 population and over, the general property tax increased from $1,474,000 in 1929 to $1,979,000 in 1939, or 34 per cent. In the meantime, state tax revenues rose from $1,107,370 in 1929 to $3,615,513 in 1939—an increase of 228 per cent.

The first and most essential step in preparing the cities to cope with postwar urban problems is to enact legislation which will put them in a sounder financial position, and thus enable them to expand their existing services where necessary, and to undertake essential new activities which may be required. For a number of years, cities have felt the pinch of limited tax resources. The general property tax still remains the only large tax available to cities generally. In a few instances, cities have been permitted to levy new taxes, but, as a rule, they have been afraid of new taxes which might drive industry or business outside their borders. Many cities have turned to special taxes of various forms to supplement the dwindling general property tax, such as service charges on refuse collection, sewer rentals, parking
meters, business license taxes, and utility taxes. New York City has adopted a sales tax, and Philadelphia, a form of income tax. A number of smaller cities have been able to solve their financial difficulties by using the profits from publicly-owned utilities. No satisfactory new source of revenue for cities has been found.

The principal forms of new taxes available to cities are taxes on individual and corporate incomes, business taxes, and excise taxes. In order to enable cities to levy such taxes, however, it is not enough for the states merely to authorize their use; state laws would have to protect the cities against competition by outside areas which fail to levy such taxes. The states might take a leaf out of federal tax laws and enact state tax laws with provision that city taxes on the same subjects up to a certain point could be offset against the state tax.

There is a growing tendency for the state to share certain tax sources with the cities. This tendency might well be fostered in many states by sharing revenues from sources such as gasoline taxes, income taxes, liquor and excise taxes, and sales taxes. The income tax is particularly suitable for sharing with the cities, for it is borne in large part by residents of cities.

Grants-in-aid to the cities have been made by the states for certain favored activities, but counties and the schools have received by far the largest part of state aids. Highways, schools, and old-age assistance have been generously supported by the states because of the strong public appeal which they have had. The cities have had to carry on their various functions with little financial aid from the states. State legislatures have not hesitated, however, to enact legislation increasing municipal services or expenditures, until in many states municipal officials have come to oppose any new legislation increasing their functions unless it carries with it new revenues.

During the present war, a number of states have made grants to the cities to carry on emergency war activities. The state of California, for example, appropriated $2.5 million in 1943 to assist the cities in civilian defense activities; it was used for police and fire protection, beds for soldiers on leave, and a wide variety of other services. The state also appropriated $500,000 to cities for workmen's compensation insurance for civilian defense workers, and the same amount for child-care centers. In 1944, California appropriated $10 million to assist cities and counties to carry on postwar planning. Michigan, New York, and other states have made similar appropriations.

In the postwar period, state aid to cities will probably be substantially increased and extended. At present, the cities receive, in one form or another, larger grants from the federal government than from the states. It would seem particularly appropriate for the states to aid the cities in providing police protection, since police officers enforce state as well as local laws, and the maintenance of law and order and prevention of crime is a state as well as a local function.

The Legal Position of the Cities

Cities are historically the creatures of the states and have only those powers expressly granted to them. The excessive interference of the state legislature in municipal government and affairs has led many of our states to adopt home-rule amendments to their constitutions. In most states, the worst forms of special legislation for particular municipalities are happily a thing of the past.

On many subjects affecting cities, the state statutes are inadequate and poorly suited to present and postwar conditions. In most states, the laws on city planning and zoning, for example, need revision. Not only is it necessary for cities to have adequate powers to plan and control new construction and housing which will take place within their boundaries, but it is equally important that the outlying districts, where the greatest development will occur, be controlled. It is time for the states to recognize that unlimited and uncontrolled land subdivision in the areas outside cities is wasteful, and to take steps to bring subdivisions under control before a building boom hits the country. What is needed are regional planning and zoning commissions whose authority is not limited to city boundaries but extends to the entire urban community and to outlying areas where suburban developments will be un-
dertaken. Regional planning commissions should have the authority to plan large-scale highways, public works, and improvements for the whole area, and to establish zones for agricultural and other purposes; thus controlling the opening up of land subdivisions.

In most states the state municipal codes need overhauling. As a rule, they are unnecessarily and unwisely restrictive in the grant of authority to cities, and do not enable cities to deal with present-day urban problems. Municipal governments cannot function effectively under inadequate and obsolete state legislation.

Municipal Administration

What is needed to strengthen the administration of cities? Regardless of the legal authority and financial position of the city, unless it is able to render economical and efficient service to the public, little progress will be made in dealing with urban problems.

Many of our cities have made great advances in municipal administration during the last quarter of a century. Modern budgetary systems, uniform accounting, centralized purchasing, civil service systems, and the increased use of men and women with technical training in city departments have become commonplace in municipal government. Many of our cities have adopted city charters simplifying the structure of city government and making it more responsible. The city manager plan is steadily expanding, and after a quarter of a century has stood the test of time as a form of organization well suited to the American tradition, and capable of giving to municipalities high standards of service, economy, and truly democratic administration.

A number of states, however, have not enacted the necessary legislation to enable cities to adopt these advances in organization and administration. The steps which are needed in a number of states to improve municipal administration include the following:

1. Liberalization of the state municipal code, with the provision of optional forms of government, so that cities may adopt the form of city government which they consider suited to their needs.

2. Enactment of a sound municipal civil service law.

3. Enactment of sound municipal finance legislation, covering budgeting, accounting, auditing, and financial reporting.

4. Repeal of detailed, restrictive legislation which prevents cities from handling their own local affairs and applying ordinary business methods to the conduct of city affairs.

5. Removal of municipal affairs from state and national politics by providing for non-partisan city elections and separating city elections from state and national elections.

Problems of Metropolitan Areas

All of our large cities are facing serious problems because of the movement of population to suburban areas outside the city limits. In the postwar period, the new residential construction in metropolitan areas will be greatest in the suburban districts, thus accelerating the suburban trend. The central city is thus left with the responsibility of providing municipal services to the older and poorer districts, without being able to levy taxes on the outlying wealthier residential districts. In addition, the cities are deprived of the leadership in public affairs of many of its ablest citizens who reside outside its boundaries. Most urban problems do not stop at political boundaries and can be dealt with effectively only by the entire urban community.

There is no simple and easy solution to the problems arising out of the tendency of cities to spill over their boundaries. Until 1900, the solution was usually for the central city to annex the outlying areas but, since the great annexation which took place in New York City about the turn of the century by act of the state legislature, there has been no other notable expansion of the boundaries of a large city in this country. Under existing state laws, it is no longer possible, except in rare instances, for cities to annex outlying urban areas whose residents are able to escape the taxes of the central city. Efforts by a number of cities to establish some form of "federated" municipal government for the metropolitan area, permitting the separate municipalities to retain their identities, have uniformly met with failure.
The metropolitan community, with its multiplicity of political units—county and city governments and special districts of one kind and another—presents a special problem, because many of the political units are too small to render effective and economical municipal service. The division of the metropolitan community into many separate and distinct local governments makes it difficult, if not impossible, to develop well-considered plans and programs for the entire community, dealing with public works, highways, transportation, water, communication, health, crime and its prevention, parks, recreation, and other subjects vital to city life.

It may be doubted whether there is any solution to the problem of the multiplicity of political units in the metropolitan area so long as the right of each municipality to retain its separate identity and all of its functions is regarded as inviolate. In business and industry, organizations are constantly subject to change, but a municipal government, once established, may go on forever, regardless of whether it has outlived its usefulness as a separate unit. Our great cities will not remain great if they are unable, because of internal division, to deal with the problems in their midst. It is time for our states to attack the problem boldly, in order to find a solution which will enable metropolitan communities to formulate plans and carry out programs of concern to the whole area.

Considerable progress can be made in dealing with metropolitan problems through the use of voluntary, cooperative arrangements. The important problems of the metropolitan community should, wherever possible, be approached jointly by officials of the state, the county, and all of the cities, so that their several programs will become a part of a larger program for the entire metropolitan community. The city of Cincinnati and Hamilton County, Ohio, have made notable progress in this direction.

The states would do well to consider the creation of metropolitan authorities to survey the industrial and economic potentials of the large urban regions, to coordinate the public works planning of federal, state, and local governments, and to work out a balanced industrial and govern-
cities to concern themselves with problems in their midst which were easily within their authority. The great majority of governmental functions today are neither federal, state, or local exclusively; they demand joint action on the part of all levels of government.

There exists a good deal of misinformation and some misconceptions about the alleged decline of the states and the usurpation of state and municipal functions by the federal government. The fact is that the state governments have never before played so active and vital a role in the life of the states. The whole character of state government has been radically changed during the last quarter of a century. Prior to the first World War, the states had only rudimentary departments or agencies dealing with highways, health, welfare, education, labor, agriculture, and the regulation of utilities and business. Unemployment compensation, public employment offices, and old-age assistance were unknown. Today, in all of these fields, the state is rendering vital services to its citizens. After this war we may expect again a trend similar to that following the last war, with the role of the states greatly increased.

It is essential for the states, if they would cope with the postwar problems, to enact forward-looking legislation dealing with employment and unemployment, social security, industry, labor, health, housing, planning and zoning, public works, conservation of resources, education, and other subjects. It is not enough, however, to enact legislation. No law is better than the administration which is accorded it. The states, like the cities, need to take stock of their administrative organization and management. In many instances, the federal government in the past has stepped in because of the administrative weakness of the states.

The states need to develop strong state departments which are able to carry on state activities and to provide technical assistance and leadership to the cities in their respective fields. Other states might follow the lead of California in authorizing state departments to provide services to the cities at cost. California recently provided that cities and counties could contract with the State Employees Retirement System to cover their employees, and also with the State Personnel Board for services in conducting examinations or other personnel activities. Several states have set up state agencies charged with providing certain technical assistance and services to the municipalities, supplementing the services rendered by functional departments. The advisability of establishing a state department or commission on municipal affairs deserves careful consideration. It could render to the cities services similar to those given to rural communities by the state departments of agriculture, and might serve in many fields as the state agency for dealing with federal programs of interest to cities.

The time is ripe for a broad, comprehensive investigation of city governments, their abilities to meet the new problems and situations of the postwar period, and their relations to the states. Again, as after the first World War, there will be new demands made upon the cities. The situation calls for greater cooperation between the states and cities. The states individually should consider the advisability of creating special commissions on municipal government to draw up and to propose needed legislation. The Council of State Governments is setting up an able interstate committee on the whole subject, to which we may look for constructive leadership and the development of a definite program.
COUNTIES and other units of rural local government, like cities and villages, are creatures of the state. As these rural units owe their existence to the state, so they receive their powers therefrom and may be deprived of those powers, and indeed of their very life, by state action. Subject to whatever limitations may be imposed by the state constitution, it is the state legislature which exercises this broad power to create and regulate local governmental units. A study of state-rural relations, therefore, resolves itself largely into an analysis of the substance and application of constitutional and statutory provisions relating to rural local government. These provisions should reflect the attitude toward the rural units both of the legislatures which enact the statutes and of the voters who elect the legislators and who approve or disapprove constitutional amendments which legislatures propose.

Yet it is not to be supposed that the state-rural relationship can be discussed solely in terms of the attitude of the state toward rural governmental units. On the contrary, the rural units, or at least their citizens and officers, exert no little influence in determining what the state's policy toward rural government shall be. Citizens of counties and townships are citizens also of the state, and participate in electing the state legislature which is to exercise regulatory authority over the subdivisions. Where, as is often the case, the county or town is the geographic unit, for legislative representation, legislators are likely to display a firm allegiance to these local governmental units and a genuine solicitation for their welfare. Moreover, in many states, the rural areas elect a majority of the members of the state legislature, even though they may not have a majority of the state's population.

Rural influence over state legislatures is also exerted through organizations of local officials. In many states, there are statewide associations of county commissioners, of township supervisors, of sheriffs, of county treasurers, and the like. These organizations are frequently active before the state legislature in seeking to promote the interests of their members and the governmental units which they serve. Some such organizations have their own official publications through which they are able to give statewide publicity to their views. It will thus be seen that state-rural relations are the result of interaction between the state's legal control over rural local government and the influence of rural governmental units and their people in determining state policy. This paper seeks to examine briefly the first of these factors, particularly as it is evidenced by state statutes and constitutional amendments. The second factor, i.e., rural influence over state policy, though significant, is less tangible and scarcely adapted to measurement and evaluation.

CHARACTER OF RECENT LEGISLATION

A survey of legal provisions relating to rural local government which have been adopted during recent years suggests that most legislative enactments and constitutional amendments in the field have been based upon one or the other of two assumptions: (1) that rural units have outlived their usefulness and should either be abolished altogether or have their powers drastically curtailed; and (2) that, although existing institutions exhibit many weaknesses, the solution of current problems lies not in the abolition of rural local units, but in their improvement and modernization. Though these assumptions may at first glance seem to be in direct conflict with one another, further exami-
nation reveals that they are actually to a large degree complementary, since the first is applied for the most part to smaller units, such as the township, and the second to larger units, especially the county. Sometimes both assumptions will seem to be intertwined in a single statute or amendment, yet in most instances it is fairly clear that one or the other predominates. Thus, it would appear that legal provisions based upon the first assumption would include those providing for: (1) abolition or deorganization of existing units; (2) transfer of local functions to the state, or from smaller to larger local units; and (3) establishment of special districts to perform functions which might be performed by existing units. Statutes and constitutional amendments based upon the second assumption, which are more numerous than those based upon the first, would include provisions for: (1) modernizing the structure of existing units; (2) granting local units greater freedom in determining their governmental structure; (3) improving local finance; (4) conferring new functions upon existing units; and (5) territorial and functional consolidation. Illustrative developments in each of these eight categories will now be considered.

**Deorganization of Rural Units**

There seems to be rather widespread agreement among students of government and public administrators that so small a unit of local government as the township is unduly costly and inefficient, and that modern facilities for travel and communication have rendered township government quite unnecessary. In about half of the states, principally in the South and West, township government has never existed, and there seems little reason for retaining, the township (as distinguished from the New England town) elsewhere. Of the states in which township government once existed, Oklahoma is the only one to effect its statewide abolition during recent years. This was accomplished in 1933 by the indirect method of a constitutional amendment depriving townships of the taxing power. Next to Oklahoma, most progress in the elimination of townships seems to have been made in Minnesota. There, some or all townships in several northern counties have been dissolved by resolution of the respective county boards. Many of these dissolutions occurred in the mid-1930’s in a period during which the statutes made mandatory the dissolution of any township in which there existed certain specified conditions relative to low assessed valuation, high tax delinquency, or widespread government ownership of real estate. Minnesota territory in which township government has been dissolved is administered by the county within which it is located. Many other states have constitutional or statutory provisions authorizing voluntary deorganization of township government, but it is only occasionally that action is taken thereunder.

In the six New England states, the unit of government corresponding roughly to the midwestern township is known as the town. The town has always been and still is a virile unit, far surpassing the New England county in importance, and there seems to have been no serious consideration of the abolition of towns in general. Nevertheless, some rural towns with low assessed valuations have found the maintenance of organized government so onerous that they have applied to the state legislature for special acts authorizing the dissolution of their corporate existence. Town deorganization has proceeded furthest in Maine, where the legislature at almost every session dissolves several towns at the request of their local inhabitants. When deorganization occurs, essential governmental services are provided within the territory concerned by state and county officials and, in a few instances, by the officers of adjacent towns. A few Vermont towns have likewise been deorganized.

Under recent legislation, any North Dakota county with less than four thousand inhabitants, and any organized county of South Dakota, may, by petition and popular vote, deorganize its governmental machinery and become attached to an adjoining organized county for judicial purposes.

**Transfer of Functions**

As an alternative to complete abolition of a given class of local governments, inefficiency and waste flowing from unduly small administrative units may sometimes
be reduced by transferring specific functions from smaller to larger units. Though proposals for such transfers are likely to meet opposition both from organizations of local officials and from those persons who see in any degree of centralization a danger to self-government, this opposition is rarely as vocal or effective as where complete dissolution or deorganization is involved. The function which, to date, has been most often transferred to larger units is that of highway maintenance. Thus, within relatively recent years, county highways have been transferred to the state in North Carolina, Delaware, West Virginia, and most Virginia counties; Indiana and Michigan have transferred township roads to the county; and Arkansas has transferred local highway administration from road-district subdivisions of the county to the county government itself.

**Use of Special Districts**

Still another practice which seems to suggest lack of legislative confidence in existing governmental units is that of establishing special districts to perform new functions instead of vesting that performance in counties or townships. Though some of these districts have been established because the function concerned involves problems which overlap the boundaries of existing units, there are other instances in which it would seem that the latter would be quite competent to perform the service. New governmental units of this nature which have recently been established in various states include wind erosion conservation districts, weed eradication districts, irrigation districts, flood control districts, mosquito control districts, citrus pest control districts, and predatory animal control districts.

One of the most recent and widespread forms of special governmental unit is the soil conservation district. Stimulated by the offer of federal assistance in carrying on soil conservation and erosion prevention work, forty-five states (all except New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and Connecticut) in the past decade have enacted legislation authorizing the establishment of soil conservation districts by the vote of local farmers. Most of these laws follow, in general, the standard act recommended by the United States Department of Agriculture. District affairs are usually in charge of a board of five members, three elected by the farmers of the district and two appointed by a state soil conservation committee. The districts have no power to tax or issue bonds, their activities being financed by contributions from cooperating farmers and from the state and federal governments. Some of these contributions are in money, while others take the form of labor, technical assistance, materials, or equipment. By December 15, 1944, 1,203 soil conservation districts had been organized in the states having enabling legislation; and these districts included approximately 3,107,451 farms which embraced 668,563,948 acres. “Memoranda of understanding” providing for federal assistance had been entered into by the United States Department of Agriculture with 1,073 of the districts.¹

**Modernization of Local-Government Structure**

Turning now to efforts to improve and modernize rural local government, we find one step in this direction in the establishment of county executive officers. Traditionally, counties have had no counterpart of the president in the federal government, the governor in the states, and the mayor or manager in cities. Administrative authority has been vested, together with such legislative power as the county possesses, in county boards of varying size. Recently, however, this situation has been remedied in some instances. Nine counties—four in Virginia, two in North Carolina, and one each in California, New York, and Montana—now operate under manager plans of government, all of which have been inaugurated within the last dozen years. Although Petroleum County, Montana, is the only small rural county in this group, its experience to date indicates that manager government, which is usually considered to be best adapted to urban or semiurban counties, can succeed under rural conditions. Some other counties have appointive executives with powers somewhat analogous to those of a manager; and a few counties, principally in the urban

¹Data supplied by Soil Conservation Service, United States Department of Agriculture.
class, have been provided with elective executives with powers similar to those of the mayor in city government. North Dakota now offers two variations of the manager plan to its counties as optional forms of government; and Oregon recently amended its constitution to permit the enactment of an optional county-manager law. Some fifty-five towns in the New England states of Maine, Vermont, Massachusetts, and Connecticut now operate under the manager plan.

Another means of modernizing county government is through the application of merit system principles to county personnel. Though the merit system has made much less progress in county than in city government, and the great majority of our counties are still fertile fields for the spoilsman, well over two hundred now operate under the merit system. Some of these have their own county civil service commissions or personnel directors and others are served by their state civil service commissions. The latter plan seems to be especially well adapted to rural counties, many of which have too few employees to justify maintaining their own personnel agencies. State legislatures are more and more requiring or permitting counties to establish merit systems, and in many states where the merit system is not applied to county personnel in general, it has been established in county welfare departments in order to qualify for federal aid for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and aid to the needy blind. Several states have recently provided that counties and other local units may, at their option, place their employees under state-administered retirement systems, and a few states have authorized the provision of group insurance for county employees.

A relatively recent development in state-local relations in the personnel field, and one of much promise, is the provision, by various state departments and educational institutions, of conferences or short courses whereby local officers and employees may receive instruction concerning their duties. Outstanding examples are the programs conducted by the Institute of Government of the Extension Service of the University of North Carolina, the Institute of Local and State Government of the University of Pennsylvania, and the Town and County Officers Training School of the State of New York. Similar in purpose, though applying to but a single class of local officials, are the programs of assistance to local tax assessors carried on in various states by their state tax commissions. In Illinois and Michigan, for example, the state commissions prepare assessors’ manuals, sponsor conferences; and have trained field men who assist local assessors with difficult appraisal problems. In various states, other state departments—such as those of health, welfare, and highways—hold state or regional conferences of local officers in their respective fields designed to serve as schools of instruction.

**Flexibility in Governmental Forms**

State constitutions and statutes in the past have tended to require substantial uniformity in the government of all counties of the state, regardless of differences in area, population, and special needs. Since the turn of the century, however, some inclination has been displayed in the direction of permitting more variety in county government and of allowing counties at least some degree of choice with respect to their governmental forms. In four states this concession to county autonomy has taken the form of a “home-rule” constitutional amendment empowering counties to draft and adopt their own charters and thereby, within specified limits, determine their own forms of government. Under such constitutional provisions, any county in Maryland, California, or Ohio, and any Texas county having not less than 62,000 inhabitants, may frame and adopt its own charter. Though one or more counties—all fairly populous—in each of the other three states have drafted charters and submitted them to popular vote, California is the only state in which county home-rule charters have actually been put into effect. Several California counties, of which Tehama and Butte may be considered as rural, now operate under such charters. Another means of granting to counties some degree of choice with respect

---

1 Missouri’s new constitution, adopted after this article was prepared, extends the home-rule privilege to counties having more than 85,000 inhabitants.
to their governmental structure is through optional-charter laws. Under this plan, the state legislature, usually after the adoption of constitutional amendments directing or authorizing such action, enacts statutes setting up two or more alternative forms of county organization and authorizing counties, at their option, to retain their existing form of government or to adopt either or any of the new forms. Thus, Virginia, in 1932, provided that counties might adopt a "county-manager" or a "county-executive" form of government. Optional-charter laws enacted by the New York legislature in 1935, 1936, and 1937, make available to counties of that state no less than sixteen alternative governmental plans. Authorized variations of some of these plans broaden still further the latitude enjoyed by counties in selecting their governmental organization. In 1941, the North Dakota legislature enacted optional-charter laws under which any county may retain its present government or adopt any of three new forms. Several other states, by constitutional or statutory provision, give counties some choice with respect to governmental organization. From the standpoint of the strictly rural county, the optional-charter plan seems more feasible than constitutional home rule, assuming that the legislature, in setting up its alternative plans, takes care to provide at least one such plan which is clearly adapted to the needs of the sparsely-settled rural county.

Financial Relations

Developments in state-rural financial relationships indicate that the state government is anxious to keep its subdivisions on a sound financial basis. This desire doubtless stems in part from the fact that financial difficulties within the local units, and especially local defaults, are likely to react unfavorably upon the credit of the state itself. Several states have recently provided for sharing with counties, on specified bases, the receipts from certain state-administered taxes. The taxes from which an apportionment to the counties is provided for in various states include sales taxes, gasoline taxes, motor vehicle license fees, state income taxes, cigarette taxes, liquor taxes, chain-store taxes, and taxes on intangibles. Sometimes the distributions are made with the stipulation that the funds be used by the counties for specified purposes, such as highways or schools; and in other instances, moneys received go to the county general fund. In either case, the purpose is to enable the local units to finance their governments with smaller property levies.

Control over local governmental units by state-administrative agencies is probably more widespread in the financial field than in any other. In some instances, this type of control extends to substantive matters of financial policy. An outstanding example of such control is the well-known "Indiana plan," under which, upon petition by local taxpayers, the state board of tax commissioners reviews proposals of local governing bodies to levy taxes or issue bonds. More numerous are provisions designed to improve financial procedure. In many states, for example, state administrative agencies prescribe accounting and budgeting forms to be used by local governments, require financial reports from local officers, and make periodic audits of local accounts. Mention may also be made of the fact that several states now permit local governments to make purchases of supplies and materials through the state purchasing agency, thereby profiting from any reduction in price flowing from larger-scale transactions.

A few states, including North Carolina, Maine, and New Jersey, have enacted what are sometimes called "receivership" laws, providing that the finances of local units in default on their bonds may be taken over, partially or completely, by a state agency and supervised by that agency until the default is terminated. New Jersey also provides for special supervision of local units which are approaching an unsound financial condition. Most states have enacted legislation authorizing their governmental subdivisions, rural and otherwise, to avail themselves of the provisions of the federal municipal debt readjustment acts.

Expansion of Local Functions

The extent to which state legislatures in recent years have augmented the powers
and functions of counties gives evidence of a continued legislative confidence in the county as a unit of rural government. New functions which have been conferred upon counties in various states, during the past decade alone, comprise a long list. Those of particular significance in rural counties include weed eradication, predatory animal control, eradication of insect pests and plant diseases, protection of forest lands and promotion of reforestation, acquisition of land for park and recreation purposes, acquisition and renting to farmers of terracing and drainage machinery, vaccination programs for prevention of hog cholera, conduct of agricultural research, maintenance of agricultural experiment stations, and the organization of county housing authorities empowered to provide rural housing facilities with federal aid.

The regulatory power of counties over territory outside cities and villages has also been broadened. Thus, counties in different states have been empowered to license and regulate, in unincorporated areas, tourist camps, dance halls, carnivals and circuses, amusement parks, liquor establishments, and billboards. Though some county zoning laws have envisaged the regulation only of built-up areas outside municipalities, several states have recently authorized county zoning of a distinctly rural nature. Wisconsin, in 1929, empowered counties to zone rural lands for agricultural, forestry, and recreational purposes. Other states which have more recently authorized all or some counties to zone rural lands include Michigan, Indiana, and Minnesota.

Beginning in their 1941 sessions, many state legislatures have authorized the establishment of county defense councils, designed to cooperate with national and state agencies and with other local councils in carrying on defense activities. A new function of particular significance during the postwar period will be that of aiding veterans and their families and dependents in securing benefits to which they are entitled under federal and state laws.

**Physical and Functional Consolidation**

If, as appears to be the case, the smallness of rural units contributes to the inefficiency and costliness of their governments, a possible means of improvement which immediately suggests itself is that of increasing the size of these units and decreasing their number through a program of consolidation. As a matter of fact, many states have long had laws permitting the voluntary consolidation of counties, of townships, and of school districts, but in practice few consolidations have been made. Local pride or petty jealousy is usually sufficient to block proposals for voluntary consolidation, and legislatures, even where they have the necessary power, hesitate to make consolidation compulsory. Most progress in the direction of consolidation has been made among school districts, yet there are still in the several states well over 100,000 such districts. With respect to counties, the need for consolidation has been widely discussed for over three decades, yet during that period the number of American counties has been reduced through consolidation by only four. Two of those eliminated were in Georgia and one in Tennessee, and the fourth was an unorganized county in South Dakota.

Inasmuch as the securing of physical consolidation of local units is extremely difficult and often impossible, an alternative which offers some of the advantages of physical consolidation presents itself in what is known as *functional* consolidation. This involves the cooperation of two or more local units in the performance of a particular function. Functional consolidation is sometimes effected through the establishment of special districts. For example, several states now provide that two or more adjacent counties may join in establishing a health district to take over the public health functions of the counties concerned, and some districts have been organized under these provisions. Another variety of functional consolidation which is gaining in popularity is the contractual form. Under this plan, two or more local governmental units enter into an agreement or contract providing either for their joint performance of the function concerned, or that one of the contracting units shall provide the service for the other unit or units involved at the expense of the latter. The contractual form of functional consolidation lends it-
self to the provision of fire protection, water supply, garbage collection, milk inspection, civil service examinations, health protection, and many other services. Several states during recent years have enacted broad enabling legislation in this field, some authorizing counties and other local units to contract together for the performance of any governmental function which is within their mutual competence. Among the states having legislation of broad scope in this field are California, Louisiana, Minnesota, Nevada, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and Wisconsin. Many other states authorize cooperation in the performance of specified functions.

**Conclusions**

On the basis of past events and present trends, some observations may be ventured with respect to probable developments in the future. It seems fairly certain that townships of the midwestern type, in at least some states where they still exist, will ultimately be either abolished or further emasculated. The number of rural school districts will be drastically reduced through consolidation. Since local inhabitants display somewhat less sentimental attachment to school districts than to counties and townships, programs of consolidation are likely to be made compulsory with respect to districts serving only a few pupils, as indeed they have already been made in some instances.

On the other hand, the primary units of rural local government—the New England town, the Louisiana parish, and the county in other states—are likely to be retained and strengthened. Constitutional and statutory provisions modernizing the governmental structure of these units, giving them more freedom of choice with respect to governmental forms, improving their finances, and broadening state-administrative supervision over them, should go far toward enabling these units to function effectively in modern society. Furthermore, these units will be strengthened by the assignment to them of their due share of new governmental functions.

Although some states may find it possible to effect programs of county consolidation, it seems unlikely that the total number of American counties will be appreciably reduced in this manner in the foreseeable future. Some of the benefits of physical consolidation will be attained through functional consolidation, for the most part of the contractual variety. Special-purpose districts, however, will continue to be used, especially where problem areas do not correspond with the boundaries of existing units. Finally, it may be suggested that the future of rural local government in the United States will depend in no small measure upon the degree of effectiveness with which the rural units, modernized or not, perform at all times the functions assigned to them. It is up to those units to demonstrate what state lawmakers, on the whole, seem to assume, viz., that the principle of local self-government in rural areas is still fundamentally sound.
GOVERNMENTAL UNITS—1942

Governmental units in the United States, as of 1942, totaled 155,116. A summary distribution of these units by types is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Governmental Unit</th>
<th>Number of Units</th>
<th>Number of States in Which Found</th>
<th>Percentage of all Units Exempt from School Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>155,116</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. government</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counties</td>
<td>3,050</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townships (or towns)</td>
<td>18,919</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipalities</td>
<td>16,220</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School districts</td>
<td>108,579</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special districts</td>
<td>8,299</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes the District of Columbia, in which are one municipality and one special district.

Of the organized local subdivisions of state areas, 3,050 are counties and 18,919 are subdivisions of counties, known as “townships” in 14 states and as “towns” in New England, New York, and Wisconsin, and occasionally also as “towns” in other township states. Actively organized municipalities, including cities, towns, boroughs, and villages, total 16,220. The largest category of governmental units by far is that of 108,579 school districts. Other special-purpose districts, hereinafter referred to as “special districts,” number 8,299. Table 1 shows the distribution of units by states.

Of the total number of local governments, 278 municipalities and 598 special districts cross county lines, and 15 special districts cross state lines. The numbers of these intercounty and interstate units are shown by states in Table 2.

The most vital governmental units—the federal government, the forty-eight state governments, and county, township, and municipal governments—exercise broad governmental functions and, taken together, comprise only a fourth of all units. Special-purpose units make up the other three-fourths. School districts alone constitute 70 per cent of the total, and special districts little more than 5 per cent. If school districts are excluded, municipalities comprise about 35 per cent, townships 41 per cent, special districts 18 per cent, and counties less than 7 per cent of the total number of governmental units.

* Abridged from Governmental Units in the United States, prepared under the supervision of E. R. Gray, Chief, Governments Division, Bureau of the Census, United States Department of Commerce, 1944.
### SUMMARY OF GOVERNMENTAL UNITS, BY STATE: 1942

(See Table 2 for number of units crossing state and county lines)

#### Region and State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region and State</th>
<th>All Governmental Units</th>
<th>Townships and Towns</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>Municipalities</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>School Districts</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>Special Districts</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States Total</td>
<td>155,116</td>
<td>3,050</td>
<td>18,919</td>
<td>16,220</td>
<td>3,332</td>
<td>12.888</td>
<td>108,579</td>
<td>8,299</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>17,085</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>4,184</td>
<td>2,144</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>1,310</td>
<td>9,369</td>
<td>1,174</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>96,495</td>
<td>1,051</td>
<td>14,067</td>
<td>7,722</td>
<td>1,099</td>
<td>6,622</td>
<td>70,297</td>
<td>2,847</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>25,130</td>
<td>1,856</td>
<td>4,756</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>3,257</td>
<td>17,064</td>
<td>2,911</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>16,305</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>1,599</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1,199</td>
<td>11,852</td>
<td>2,367</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>3,753</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>2,644</td>
<td>611</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>4,149</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>2,809</td>
<td>996</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>2,358</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>1,937</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>1,666</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>1,142</td>
<td>321</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>15,854</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1,434</td>
<td>1,57</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>12,138</td>
<td>1,042</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>3,043</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>1,182</td>
<td>229</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>7,510</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1,608</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>4,861</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>11,115</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>1,524</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>8,632</td>
<td>264</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>8,106</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1,265</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>6,207</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>10,398</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1,884</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>7,673</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>10,740</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>8,613</td>
<td>940</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>2,175</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1,932</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>8,307</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>7,009</td>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>1,143</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>8,539</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>6,064</td>
<td>675</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>6,035</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>1,14</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>4,066</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1,309</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>2,272</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>4,021</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1,389</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>1,655</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>4,518</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>2,332</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>1,844</td>
<td>258</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>5,263</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1,575</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>2,546</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>1,744</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>2,027</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>1,744</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>4,919</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1,128</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>3,423</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>7,360</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>6,159</td>
<td>309</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>1,906</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>1,148</td>
<td>429</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>8,508</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1,271</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>6,569</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes the federal government and the forty-eight state governments.
* Incorporated places having more than 2,500 inhabitants.
* The city and county of San Francisco in California and the city and county of Denver in Colorado are counted as cities and as counties.
* The following counties are counted only as cities because they are wholly or very largely consolidated with the cities indicated: Orleans Parish with New Orleans City; Suffolk County with Boston City; Bronx, Kings, New York, Queens, and Richmond counties, with New York City; Philadelphia County with Philadelphia City. The county areas of Armstrong, Shannon, Todd, Wabash, and Washington are unorganized as counties and are attached for administrative purposes to neighboring counties.
## UNITS OF GOVERNMENT

### TABLE 2

NUMBER OF GOVERNMENTAL UNITS WHICH CROSS STATE OR COUNTY LINES, BY STATE: 1942*

(Number of school districts located in two or more counties not compiled)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region and State</th>
<th>All Units</th>
<th>Municipalities</th>
<th>Special Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Urban Rural</td>
<td>Special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Units</td>
<td>Districts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>United States Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northeast</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North Central</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alabama</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arizona</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arkansas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>California</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colorado</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Florida</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Georgia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Idaho</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Illinois</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indiana</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Iowa</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kansas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kentucky</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Louisiana</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maryland</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Michigan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minnesota</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mississippi</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Missouri**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region and State</th>
<th>All Units</th>
<th>Municipalities</th>
<th>Special Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Montana**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region and State</th>
<th>All Units</th>
<th>Municipalities</th>
<th>Special Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Nebraska**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region and State</th>
<th>All Units</th>
<th>Municipalities</th>
<th>Special Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Nevada**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region and State</th>
<th>All Units</th>
<th>Municipalities</th>
<th>Special Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**New Hampshire**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region and State</th>
<th>All Units</th>
<th>Municipalities</th>
<th>Special Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**New Jersey**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region and State</th>
<th>All Units</th>
<th>Municipalities</th>
<th>Special Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**New Mexico**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region and State</th>
<th>All Units</th>
<th>Municipalities</th>
<th>Special Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**New York**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region and State</th>
<th>All Units</th>
<th>Municipalities</th>
<th>Special Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**North Carolina**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region and State</th>
<th>All Units</th>
<th>Municipalities</th>
<th>Special Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**North Dakota**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region and State</th>
<th>All Units</th>
<th>Municipalities</th>
<th>Special Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ohio**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region and State</th>
<th>All Units</th>
<th>Municipalities</th>
<th>Special Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Oklahoma**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region and State</th>
<th>All Units</th>
<th>Municipalities</th>
<th>Special Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Oregon**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region and State</th>
<th>All Units</th>
<th>Municipalities</th>
<th>Special Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pennsylvania**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region and State</th>
<th>All Units</th>
<th>Municipalities</th>
<th>Special Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Carolina</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**South Dakota**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region and State</th>
<th>All Units</th>
<th>Municipalities</th>
<th>Special Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tennessee**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region and State</th>
<th>All Units</th>
<th>Municipalities</th>
<th>Special Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Texas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region and State</th>
<th>All Units</th>
<th>Municipalities</th>
<th>Special Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utah</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Virginia**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region and State</th>
<th>All Units</th>
<th>Municipalities</th>
<th>Special Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Washington</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**West Virginia**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region and State</th>
<th>All Units</th>
<th>Municipalities</th>
<th>Special Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wisconsin</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Wyoming**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region and State</th>
<th>All Units</th>
<th>Municipalities</th>
<th>Special Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

* From Governmental Units in the United States, 1942, Bureau of the Census, United States Department of Commerce, p 11.
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**ESTIMATED POPULATION IN THE UNITED STATES—1944**

There were marked changes in the geographic distribution of the population between April 1, 1940, and July 1, 1944. As a result chiefly of internal migration, both civilian and military, the states of the South and the West gained more than four million inhabitants, whereas the states of the North lost nearly three million. The gain in the South and West was shared by all the geographic divisions in these two regions with the exception of the East South Central Division.

Changes in the population of the individual states reflect, in more detail, the shifts that have occurred in a nation at war. Twenty-two states and the District of Columbia increased in population, and twenty-six decreased. Four states (Arizona, California, Florida, and Nevada) and the District of Columbia increased by more than 20 per cent. California had the greatest numerical increase, 1,839,602, and Nevada the greatest proportionate increase 41.9 per cent. Seven states (Iowa, Minnesota, Montana, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, and Vermont) lost more than 10 per cent of their population. New York had the greatest numerical decrease, 846,252, and North Dakota the greatest proportionate decrease, 17.7 per cent.

These estimates are based partly on war ration book registration data and partly on statistics of births and deaths since the 1940 census. Allowance is made for net immigration into the United States and for armed force strength, by states. Members of the armed forces stationed outside continental United States are excluded entirely.

*Estimated as of July 1, 1944. Abridged from Series P-45, No. 2, March 10, 1945, of the Bureau of the Census, United States Department of Commerce.*

### Table 1

**ESTIMATED POPULATION IN CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES, BY REGIONS, DIVISIONS, AND STATES: JULY 1, 1944 AND 1940**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region, Division, and State</th>
<th>Population—July 1, 1944</th>
<th>Population—April 1, 1940</th>
<th>Change, 1940–44 Number</th>
<th>Change, 1940–44 Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>131,563,271</td>
<td>131,669,275</td>
<td>893,996</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeastern States:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>8,280,366</td>
<td>8,437,290</td>
<td>—156,924</td>
<td>—1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Atlantic</td>
<td>26,047,818</td>
<td>27,539,487</td>
<td>—1,491,669</td>
<td>—5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central States:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East North Central</td>
<td>26,391,645</td>
<td>26,626,342</td>
<td>—234,697</td>
<td>—0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West North Central</td>
<td>12,442,899</td>
<td>13,516,990</td>
<td>—1,074,091</td>
<td>—7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Atlantic</td>
<td>19,301,878</td>
<td>17,823,151</td>
<td>1,478,727</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East South Central</td>
<td>10,494,312</td>
<td>10,778,225</td>
<td>—283,913</td>
<td>—2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West South Central</td>
<td>13,252,758</td>
<td>13,064,525</td>
<td>188,233</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain</td>
<td>4,335,002</td>
<td>4,150,003</td>
<td>184,999</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>12,016,593</td>
<td>9,733,262</td>
<td>2,283,331</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2

**ESTIMATED POPULATION IN CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES, BY REGIONS, DIVISIONS, AND STATES: JULY 1, 1944 AND 1940**

(Minus sign (—) denotes decrease)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region, Division, and State</th>
<th>July 1, 1944</th>
<th>April 1, 1940</th>
<th>Change, 1940-44</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New England:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>2,793,600</td>
<td>2,847,226</td>
<td>53,626</td>
<td>-6.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>4,578,374</td>
<td>4,621,524</td>
<td>43,250</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>610,941</td>
<td>599,231</td>
<td>-11,710</td>
<td>-1.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>4,162,815</td>
<td>4,166,721</td>
<td>4,006</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>1,176,807</td>
<td>1,170,242</td>
<td>-6,565</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>12,632,890</td>
<td>12,579,142</td>
<td>-53,607</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>4,167,840</td>
<td>4,160,165</td>
<td>7,675</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>9,247,088</td>
<td>9,000,180</td>
<td>-246,908</td>
<td>-2.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East North Central:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>6,836,667</td>
<td>6,907,612</td>
<td>70,945</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>3,419,707</td>
<td>3,427,796</td>
<td>-8,089</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>7,729,720</td>
<td>7,897,241</td>
<td>167,521</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>5,429,631</td>
<td>5,535,106</td>
<td>105,475</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>2,975,910</td>
<td>3,137,587</td>
<td>161,677</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West North Central:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>2,508,663</td>
<td>2,792,300</td>
<td>283,637</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>2,269,759</td>
<td>2,538,168</td>
<td>268,409</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>3,269,338</td>
<td>3,784,664</td>
<td>515,326</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>528,071</td>
<td>646,935</td>
<td>118,864</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>588,620</td>
<td>647,962</td>
<td>59,342</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>1,213,792</td>
<td>1,315,834</td>
<td>102,042</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>1,774,447</td>
<td>1,801,028</td>
<td>-26,581</td>
<td>-1.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Atlantic:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>283,802</td>
<td>266,505</td>
<td>-17,297</td>
<td>-6.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>926,260</td>
<td>963,091</td>
<td>36,831</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginie</td>
<td>3,389,115</td>
<td>3,677,773</td>
<td>288,658</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>1,215,984</td>
<td>1,491,084</td>
<td>275,100</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>3,534,545</td>
<td>3,671,623</td>
<td>137,078</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>1,923,354</td>
<td>1,989,804</td>
<td>66,450</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>3,253,727</td>
<td>3,323,723</td>
<td>69,996</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>2,367,217</td>
<td>2,387,414</td>
<td>20,197</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East South Central:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>2,630,194</td>
<td>2,845,627</td>
<td>215,433</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>2,870,158</td>
<td>3,015,841</td>
<td>145,683</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>2,818,053</td>
<td>2,832,905</td>
<td>14,852</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>2,175,877</td>
<td>2,183,796</td>
<td>-7,919</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West South Central:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>1,776,446</td>
<td>1,949,387</td>
<td>172,941</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>2,532,385</td>
<td>2,563,830</td>
<td>31,445</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>2,064,679</td>
<td>2,136,544</td>
<td>71,865</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>6,876,248</td>
<td>6,414,824</td>
<td>461,424</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>464,999</td>
<td>559,456</td>
<td>94,457</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>531,572</td>
<td>542,873</td>
<td>11,301</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>257,108</td>
<td>250,742</td>
<td>-6,366</td>
<td>-2.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>1,147,259</td>
<td>1,123,296</td>
<td>23,963</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>3,312,212</td>
<td>3,311,818</td>
<td>-40</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>638,412</td>
<td>499,261</td>
<td>139,151</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>606,994</td>
<td>550,310</td>
<td>56,684</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>156,442</td>
<td>110,247</td>
<td>46,195</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>2,055,378</td>
<td>1,736,191</td>
<td>319,187</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>1,214,226</td>
<td>1,089,684</td>
<td>124,542</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>8,746,989</td>
<td>6,907,387</td>
<td>1,839,602</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>