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Interstate Relations

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN COOPERATIVE STATE ACTION*

THE COUNCIL OF STATE GOVERNMENTS has “come of age”—1946 marks its twenty-first year of operation. Organized by a few of the states in 1925; this agency established by the states; supported by the states, and dedicated to the service of the states now includes all of the states and now is the coordinating and service agency for all associations of state legislators and over-all state administrative officials. It has functioned in prosperity and depression, in war and in peace.

During the war years the Council realized that peace would bring urgent and pressing problems of reconstruction and development. Its Committee on Postwar Reconstruction and Development, working throughout the year 1943, outlined and developed a postwar program which the Council promoted in the states; and this program, extensively adopted by the states in 1944 and 1945, cushioned the impact of peace and enabled the states to operate smoothly and efficiently in the transition period.

The major problems of general interest and concern to the states and to The Council of State Governments during the current year have been: veterans’ affairs; employment security and agencies concerned with its promotion; tax and fiscal policy; aviation and the construction of airports; fitnessurance and its regulation; water resources, their use and control; health and public welfare; public works; legislative processes and procedures; state and local relations; and federal and state relations.

In all of these fields the Council and its committees have been active, and in most of them definite and specific progress has been made and comprehensive programs have been developed.

VETERANS’ AFFAIRS

In our report for 1945 we stated:
“The returning veteran has come first in all of our postwar plans. He has been our main safeguard in time of war. He will be our main reliance in time of peace.”

We stated further:
“He must have adequate and suitable employment; competent and skilled medical care; the best of educational and training facilities; necessary housing; and, above all, the full opportunity to make his contribution to the development of his country, for which he has fought so brilliantly.”

To insure these things, state programs have been developed through legislative and administrative action, and every state has in operation an agency concerned with veterans’ affairs which day in and day out has been working with these problems.

Veterans have been given priority in employment; unemployment compensation for veterans has been handled expeditiously and efficiently by state agencies; health and hospital facilities of the states have been placed at their disposal. State colleges and universities have expanded their facilities and their faculties to

---

*Annual report of the Executive Director of the Council of State Governments, submitted to the Board of Managers, December 3, 1946.
an amazing degree to insure that every veteran shall have an opportunity to pick up where he left off and complete his education. And despite innumerable obstacles and widespread confusion veterans are being housed—not adequately as we would like, but nevertheless housed.

**Employment Security**

For several years the states have been engaged in a strenuous effort to insure the return of the employment service to the states. The employment service was returned to the states on November 15, 1946.

The question—"How should our employment security programs be administered?"—was important from the standpoint of adequate service, effective operation, and economical administration; but it was even more important from the point of general public policy.

Should governmental services taken over by the national government for war purposes and in a war emergency be retained by the national government, thereby contributing to the all too prevalent tendency toward centralization and usurpation? Or—should governmental powers and governmental services be exercised and provided to every extent possible through local governments, locally administered, locally controlled, and providing the greatest degree of citizen participation?

This question has been decided in this field. The states are to administer our employment security programs, and this decision carries with it an obligation and a responsibility to do the job in such a manner as to meet the needs of employers, employees, and the general public.

In order to insure that this service would be rendered in an adequate manner and that the transfer of these services from federal to state control would be handled smoothly and expeditiously, The Council of State Governments held many conferences with state and federal officials. Four regional meetings, covering all of the states, were held during the months of August and September—immediately following passage of the bill returning the employment service to the states—with the result that the employment service is now under state control and state operation, integrated with the state unemployment compensa-
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The administration to prepare a national plan for the development of airports in the United States; authorizes the appropriation of $3,000,000 for the expenses of preliminary planning and surveys incident to the initiation of the airport construction program; authorizes the appropriation of $500,000,000 over a period of seven fiscal years to be matched by state and local governments, for the construction of airports; and permits the Civil Aeronautics Administration to deal directly with any political subdivision in the United States without reference to the states in the development and construction of airports.

The Council of State Governments, the Governors' Conference, and the National Association of Attorneys General strongly opposed this bill. While agreeing that a national airport system was necessary and desirable, and while supporting most of the major provisions of the bill in question, these organizations of state legislators and state officials pointed out that the bill as written would inevitably result in an inadequate system of public airports, inefficient administration of the airport program, and large-scale waste of public funds.

The states urged that the act establish an administrative system based upon the pattern of federal-state cooperation which has proved successful in all of the continuing cooperative programs hitherto adopted.

After a long, drawn-out controversy, however, extending over a year and a half, Congress finally passed the Federal Airport Act, Public Law 377, but with this amendment:

Sec. 9 (b) Nothing in this Act shall authorize the submission of a project application by any municipality or other public agency which is subject to the law of any State if the submission of such project application by such municipality or other public agency is prohibited by the law of such State.

In adopting this amendment Congress in effect has said to the states of the Union—if the states wish a national airport system developed in accordance with state plans and state programs; if they wish the states to participate in this very important and large-scale public works project; if they wish their political subdivisions to operate through duly established state organizations and agencies rather than directly with federal departments and bureaus the states have only to enact necessary legislation.

With this in mind, the Governors' Conference at its Annual Meeting in 1946 urged state legislatures to consider the enactment of legislation specifically requiring that federal grants-in-aid for airport construction be expended in the states only upon receiving the approval of state aviation agencies; and it further urged the Council of State Governments to continue its efforts to ensure the development of a national airport program in accordance with the long-established, successfully operated pattern of federal-state cooperation.

A number of the states have already amended their aviation laws requiring their political subdivisions to operate through regularly constituted state aviation agencies and further requiring that federal grants-in-aid for the construction of airports shall be channeled through state governments.

The Drafting Committee of The Council of State Governments has developed a suggested bill to put this policy into effect, which will be submitted to all state legislatures for their consideration.

INSURANCE REGULATION

Public Law 15, an act to express the intent of Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance, approved March 9, 1945, provides that after January 1, 1948 the Sherman Act, and Clayton Act, and the Federal Trade Commission Act as amended shall be applicable to the business of insurance to the extent that such business is not regulated by state law.

Another section of Public Law 15 provides that these acts and the Robinson-Patman Anti-Discrimination Act shall not apply to the business of insurance or to the acts in the conduct thereof until January 1, 1948.

Here again Congress has said, in substance—if the states wish to regulate the business of insurance, Congress will not intervene. But Congress has emphasized that adequate regulation must be provided by the states prior to January 1, 1948.

Your Committee on Insurance has worked on this problem throughout the year. Numerous conferences have been held with members of the All-Industry Committee and with the National Association of Insurance Commissioners; and the Insur-
Water Resources

Water resources—their use, regulation and control—have been of interest and concern to The Council of State Governments for more than a decade. The states have a primary, major, and continuing interest in the development, the use and the control of our state and interstate rivers; and it has been demonstrated conclusively that the states, through interstate cooperation, effectively organized and working closely with federal departments and agencies, can solve major problems in this field.

The Council of State Governments, together with states immediately involved, participated in the establishment and the organization of the Interstate Commission on the Delaware River Basin in 1936 and the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin in 1941. The Council has also worked constantly with the states in the Connecticut, the Ohio, the Mississippi, the Missouri, the Colorado, and the Columbia River basins. All of the states involved, with the exception of Virginia, have approved the Ohio River Sanitation Compact; and inter-agency committees consisting of representatives of the states and representatives of the federal departments concerned have been organized and are now operating in the Columbia and the Missouri River basins. The Ohio River Sanitation Compact has been approved by most of the states and requires ratification from only Virginia to become operative.

At the request of the Interstate Committee of the Missouri River Basin, and in cooperation with the Attorneys General and the Commissions on Interstate Cooperation of Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, and Kansas, The Council of State Governments has made a careful appraisal of the water laws in the four states and has developed a suggested legislative program which will enable these states to cooperate effectively with federal departments and agencies concerned in the development of flood protection works along the Missouri River Basin.

At the Board of Managers meeting in St. Louis in January, 1945, the Board established a Committee on Water Resources and directed it to study our water resources problems; to assemble, compile, and analyze data and information relative to the development and control of our water resources; to make this information available to the states; and to give wide publicity to water resources and the development thereof. The Committee has done this—through research, meetings and conferences, and through special reports and the publications of The Council of State Governments. As a result, there is more interest and more action among the states today with respect to water resources than there has ever been.

Health and Public Welfare

During the past year many of the states have made extensive studies and surveys of their health and welfare programs and their administration; and State Commissions on Interstate Cooperation have been concerned with a reappraisal of their health and welfare problems and a readjustment of state activities in these areas to conform to present-day needs and conditions.

The Northeastern Committee on Social Welfare and Relief Problems and interstate groups in other parts of the country have developed comprehensive interstate programs to facilitate effective health and welfare services. Of particular interest was the work done by the Joint Legislative Committee in New York, which made an extensive study of the welfare laws and practices in that state. This Committee submitted a general welfare program to the New York Legislature in 1946, which was enacted, giving New York one of the most modern welfare codes in the country and one of the most effective administrations.

In the Mountain states, a compact is now being developed to provide, through interstate cooperation, more effective institutional care for delinquents and defectives.

The 79th Congress passed the so-called Hill-Burton Act which enables the federal government to cooperate with the states in health and hospital surveys and in the construction of hospitals throughout the country. In order to participate in this program the states are required to establish necessary machinery and to provide funds to
match federal grants for hospital construction.

The Drafting Committee of the Council of State Governments has developed a suggested state act to conform to the standards and principles provided in the federal law, and this suggested act has been and is being discussed with state legislators and state officials at regional meetings, and will be submitted to all state legislatures for consideration.

**Public Works**

During the war years, states generally, through their planning boards, and their development and conservation commissions, explored their public works needs and developed extensive public works programs which they planned to put into effect with the end of the war.

To a very large extent these public works programs were planned, developed, and blue-printed—ready to go when conditions were favorable.

These programs are composed of projects designed to repair the capital structure of the states' institutions and agencies—depleted by strenuous war use and in rundown condition because of lack of materials and manpower—and to construct new public works necessary to meet acute needs, such as improvement and extension of highways, enlargement of penal and eleemosynary institutions, construction of sewerage treatment plants, and the extension of other state and municipal facilities.

The war has been over for more than fifteen months. The unemployment crisis, so freely and generally predicted, has not come about. Manpower is still in short supply. Construction materials are likewise scarce and may be secured in many instances only by transferring them from private use where they are badly needed. In addition, states have found that estimates developed and funds provided for many of these needed public works projects are entirely inadequate—the cost of public works has increased from $33\frac{1}{3}$ to 100 per cent and even higher, depending upon the type of project.

Many of the states, therefore, have postponed the construction of public works projects except where the need is immediate and urgent, in order to avoid competition with private industry for manpower and materials and in order to conserve public funds.

**Legislative Processes and Procedures**

It has been said often that the legislature is the citadel of democracy. It is the board of directors that establishes governmental policy—and it is the agency of government most representative of all of the people.

With the rapid growth of government, especially during the past forty years, great changes have taken place in the executive and administrative branches of government. The judiciary has also materially revised its methods of operation and expanded its facilities. But to a very large extent the legislative branches of our governments—national, state, and local—still operate under processes and procedures long outdated and not well adapted to the present-day ideal and tempo of government.

This is not a personal opinion—it is the general opinion—and within recent years strenuous efforts have been made and are now being made to revise, improve, and simplify our legislative processes and procedures.

A year ago the Council of State Governments established a Committee on Legislative Processes and Procedures. It has accumulated a great deal of information and data relative to the organization and operation of state legislatures; and it has developed a comprehensive report.

The Council of State Governments will make this report available to all state legislatures and state legislators, with the hope that the suggestions contained therein may be constructive and beneficial in improving the operation of this most important branch of our government.

**State-Local Relations**

The growth and expansion of public services have placed heavy burdens upon local governments—municipal and county. Local governments have been and are primarily responsible for the financing and administration of our school systems and our public health and public welfare programs; for public safety; and for those public works programs which are so necessary and essential to modern life.

All of these public services and public
activities have been rapidly expanding during the past twenty-five years and they are still expanding.

It has been many years since local governments were able to finance such services and activities unassisted. The system of grants-in-aid from state governments to local governments for continuing public services is an old governmental custom—established in most states long before federal grants-in-aid became an important item in public finance.

In fact, in a number of states more than 60 per cent of gross revenue collected by the states is turned back to the localities through grants-in-aid and in most of the states at least 25 per cent of state revenue is so utilized.

Despite this fact, and under existing conditions, both legal and fiscal, localities still contend that they are unable to provide necessary services within the limits of their available revenues. Throughout the country—from New York to California, and from Michigan to Alabama—strenuous efforts are being made to divert larger percentages of state-collected revenue into local treasuries.

This situation presents many questions of a legal, financial, and policy nature. Shall our state laws be changed to give localities, especially municipalities, a larger degree of home rule, more extensive taxing and borrowing capacities, and greater control generally over local finances and activities? Is the local tax base, even under the most favorable circumstances, broad enough to provide necessary funds for the services that municipalities must render in present-day government?

Must the state continue to provide larger and larger amounts for grants-in-aid to localities for specific services—or develop and expand the shared-tax system of state-collected revenue—or take over, wholly finance, and directly administer some of the services now provided by local government?

If either of the first two solutions is indicated, another query presents itself: to what extent should the state develop and enforce standards and controls; and to what extent should the state supervise public activities, administered locally but financed in large part by the states?

These and many other questions, fundamental in nature and far-reaching in effect, will confront many of the state legislatures when they convene in January.

The Council of State Governments will issue a comprehensive report on state-local relations on December 15th. This report is the result of eighteen months of extensive research and study under the direction of the Committee on State-Local Relations of The Council of State Governments. It will contain a wealth of data and material concerning the situation as it now exists, present-day trends, and suggestions and recommendations for solution of the more pressing problems. It should be of great value to state legislatures and state officials.

Federal-State Relations

The relationship between the federal government and the states has always been a major governmental problem. It is now, and it will continue to be.

The expansion of public activities, the increasing cost of government, the extension of joint programs between the federal government and the states will bring into bold relief those administrative and financial problems that have been the subjects of much discussion in recent years.

The system of grants-in-aid from the federal government to the states is an old pattern designed to insure adequate public services on a nation-wide basis. Developed early in this century, it has expanded at a rapid rate and is now used as a financial and administrative device covering at least nine major services of government and involving expenditure of billions of dollars.

The 79th Congress established grants-in-aid for three new programs—airports, hospital surveys and construction, and school lunches; and additional proposals are pending, such as a system of grants-in-aid for pollution control and general education.

The system of grants-in-aid is a very important part of our governmental processes—it is well-rooted in our governmental operations—it will probably be expanded to include additional services and larger expenditures. Involved in the administration of grant-in-aid programs are the promulgation of standards, the establishment of controls, and the organization and operation of systems of supervision which have
been the sources, in many instances, of widespread controversy between the federal government and the states.

In the realm of public service, the grant-in-aid system has become the keystone of federal-state relations.

The system has grown like "Topsy." As a public need on a nation-wide scale has become apparent, a grant-in-aid plan and program has been developed and enacted into law without relation to other similar systems already in effect. The result has been administrative confusion, overlapping of activities, and waste of public funds.

The entire system of grants-in-aid requires over-all appraisal, comprehensive research, and careful study. It is therefore suggested that The Council of State Governments undertake such a project in 1947.

In order to facilitate more efficient relationships among the states and between the federal government and the states, the Council has developed and used extensively over the past few years two mechanisms that have contributed greatly to effective federal-state operation.

In 1940, initially as a defense and emergency measure, The Council of State Governments established a Drafting Committee of State Officials. This Committee was given the task of appraising state laws in the light of the then rapidly developing situation, to determine whether the states were well equipped to handle problems of defense and potential war, and to coordinate their legislative activities with the programs of Federal Departments and Federal War Agencies.

An arrangement was made with the Department of Justice to assemble, appraise, and develop defense and war legislation suggested by the national government and to channel these suggestions to the Drafting Committee of The Council of State Governments for its appraisal and development; and the Department of Justice established a special Section on Federal-State Relations to carry on this work.

For more than six years the Drafting Committee of The Council of State Governments has continued this work, and during this period the cooperative arrangement has worked admirably.

Measures suggested by the states and the federal government have been carefully examined and carefully drafted into a suggested legislative program; and this program has been submitted to Commissions on Interstate Cooperation in the several states and through them to the state legislatures, enabling the states to handle necessary defense, war and postwar legislation in an orderly and efficient manner.

This cooperative mechanism has served us well in defense, in war, and in the transition period; and the Council expects to revise and expand the Committee to make it even more effective in the future.

The Council has worked very closely with the Budget Directors in the several states and with the Budget Bureau of the federal government. Ways and means are now being developed to facilitate in every way possible intergovernmental fiscal relationships affecting cooperative programs. Working with the federal bureau and with the budget directors in the several states, progress is being made toward simplification and uniformity, and toward the expeditious handling of joint financial problems.

The states face the future with confidence, in many respects they are more important units of government and are in better condition than ever before. They have done and are doing public jobs that have to be done; they are continually perfecting their governmental machinery to do them more effectively; and they have established and operated over a period of years this cooperative agency which has demonstrated that the states can and will work together for the good of the whole.

But the age-old and ever-new problem remains. How are we to develop and maintain necessary and adequate services upon which the welfare of all the people depends; and at the same time preserve and maintain that responsibility and accountability of government to people and the individual liberty of people without which all government becomes tyranny?

To the solution of this problem in the difficult reconstruction days ahead, the Council dedicates its energies and its facilities, in the hope that the individual states and the states working together in our Federal Union can perfect and expand our American democracy and in so doing lead the way toward world security and world peace.
THE COUNCIL OF STATE GOVERNMENTS

ORGANIZATION AND ACTIVITIES

The Council of State Governments is a joint governmental agency established by the states, for service to the states, supported by the states. The Council serves as:

1. A clearing house for information and research, serving the forty-eight states;
2. A medium for improving legislative and administrative practices of state governments;
3. An instrumentality for encouraging full cooperation among the states in the solution of interstate problems, both regional and national; and
4. A means of facilitating and improving federal-state relations.

The Council is composed of Commissions or Committees on Interstate Cooperation established in each of the forty-eight states. Typical commissions consist of ten members of the legislature and five administrative officials. Legislation establishing these commissions provides that “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.”

The Council is the secretariat for the Governors' Conference, the American Legislators’ Association, the National Association of Attorneys General, the National Association of Secretaries of State, the National Association of State Budget Officers, the National Association of State Purchasing Officials, and the Association of Administrators of the Interstate Compact for the Supervision of Parolees and Probationers.

The Council’s central office is located in Chicago. Regional offices are maintained in New York and San Francisco. Regional representatives of the Council work closely with state legislators and officials in their areas, and assist the states not only with respect to the national and regional programs of the Council but also in the solution of problems arising in individual states. The Council maintains an office in Washington, charged specifically with “facilitating and improving federal-state relations” and keeping the states currently informed of activities in the federal government of interest to the states.

The Council officially serves the following organizations of state officials:

- America’s 7,500 state legislators, organized through the American Legislators’ Association;
- Governors’ Conference, national organization of the chief executives of the states;
- The National Association of Attorneys General;
- The National Association of Secretaries of State;
- The National Association of State Budget Officers;
- The National Association of State Purchasing Officials;
- An Association of Administrators of the Interstate Compact for the Supervision of Parolees and Probationers.

The Council also cooperates in the legislative program of the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws.

In addition to serving these specific organizations, the Council’s staff provides research and technical assistance to all elective and appointive officials of the forty-eight states.

1. It undertakes research projects referred to it by state legislators and state officials. Committees of state officials working with the research staff of the Council investigate a wide variety of problems relating to state government. Special topics studied in recent years include conflicting taxation, war and postwar fiscal policy, unemployment compensation, control and use of water resources, state-local relations, and legislative processes and procedures.
2. The Council maintains an inquiry and information service available to all of the states.

3. The Council conducts an extensive publication program designed to provide full information on state government to all interested persons. Major publications of the Council are the biennial *The Book of the States*, the monthly magazine *State Government*, and the *Washington Legislative Bulletin*.

4. The Council and the state Commissions on Interstate Cooperation cooperate with the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, which sponsors legislation of importance to all the states. In recent years the Council's Drafting Committee of State Officials, in cooperation with The Department of Justice and other federal agencies and with the Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, has prepared a program of suggested acts for consideration by state legislatures.

5. The Council has assisted the states in the establishment of nation-wide and regional compacts and commissions.

6. In recent years, and particularly during the war emergency, the Council has acted as the agent of the states in organizing nation-wide programs requiring joint federal-state action. The Council has increasingly served as a means for facilitating and improving state-federal relations.

The services of The Council of State Governments may be grouped into four major categories:

1. Common intrastate problems,
2. Federal-state relations,
3. National interstate problems, and
4. Regional interstate problems.

I. Common Intrastate Problems

Each state is faced with common or similar problems in such matters as public finance, employment, veterans' affairs, legislative practices and procedures, and state-local relations. The Council of State Governments, acting through committees of state legislators and state officials, studies these problems and develops programs for consideration by the states. Suggestions by recent Committees on Tax and Fiscal Policy, and Postwar Reconstruction and Development have achieved the following results:

II. Federal-State Relations

The Council of State Governments is a channel through which federal-state cooperative programs are organized and put into effect. During World War II, the Council, at the request of the national government and in cooperation with state governments, set up a nation-wide program of civilian defense. State programs also were established for selective service, rationing, conservation and salvage, soldier-sailor voting, motor-transport regulation and a number of related matters.

III. National Interstate Problems

For the past ten years, the states have worked through the Council to prevent or eliminate interstate trade barriers.

The Council has also pioneered in the establishment of uniform criminal legislation. Forty-one states have passed uniform statutes relating to parolees and probationers, and many states have passed additional uniform laws with respect to pursuit, extradition, out-of-state witnesses, and narcotic drugs.

The Council cooperates with the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, which sponsors legislation in the fields of commercial, property, trust, tax and administrative law; evidence; veterans' affairs; and other topics.

Other nation-wide programs fostered by the Council relate to aviation, insurance,
control and use of water resources, legislative policies and procedures, and state-local relations.

IV. Regional Interstate Problems

The Council of State Governments promotes interstate agreements for the solution of regional problems.

Such regional interstate agreements include the Interstate Commission on the Delaware River Basin (Delaware, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania); the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin (Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, West Virginia, and the District of Columbia); the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission (Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, and Virginia); the Interstate Oil Compact Commission (Arkansas, Colorado, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, and Texas); the Palisades Interstate Park Compact (New Jersey and New York); and the Ohio River Sanitation Compact (Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia).

Through efforts of the Commissions on Interstate Cooperation, a number of interstate boundary disputes have been settled. The Council has also acted on behalf of the states on the International Board of Inquiry for the Great Lakes Fisheries which recommended establishment of international management of fisheries on the Great Lakes, and has assisted the Gulf and Pacific coast states in the development of marine fisheries compacts.

The Board of Managers

As an instrumentality of the states, the Council is governed and controlled by the states. Its policy-determining body is the Board of Managers, composed of forty-eight delegate members representing the forty-eight states, seventeen ex-officio members, and ten members-at-large.

A state-delegate member is chosen by each state. Ex-officio managers are the nine members of the Executive Committee of the Governors' Conference; the presidents of the National Association of Attorneys General, the National Association of Secretaries of State, the National Association of State Budget Officers, the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, the National Association of State Purchasing Officials, the Association of Administrators of the Interstate Compact for the Supervision of Parolees and Probationers; the Honorary President of the Council of State Governments; and the Executive Director. To provide continuity of membership, the Board of Managers itself elects ten managers-at-large who serve staggered five-year terms. Two managers-at-large are elected each year.

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

The Board of Managers meets annually and at special call to consider general matters of Council policy. The Executive Committee meets more frequently working with the Executive Director in the solution of day-to-day problems.

The General Assembly

The Council sponsors a biennial General Assembly which is composed of representatives of all the states. It provides a common meeting for all state legislators and officials and is a forum for the consideration and discussion of problems common to the states.

National Conferences and Regional Meetings

Each of the Associations of state officials served by the Council (the Governors' Conference, The National Association of Attorneys General, The National Associa-
tion of Secretaries of State, The National Association of State Budget Officers, The National Association of State Purchasing Officials, and An Association of Administrators of the Interstate Compact for the Supervision of Parolees and Probationers) has its own annual meeting. At these conferences, problems of importance to the specific group are discussed and policies set forth. An interchange of ideas is therefore facilitated and the machinery for interstate cooperation strengthened. Regional meetings of Commissions on Interstate Cooperation are held several times throughout the year to consider current problems requiring joint state action and to review plans and formulate policies for more effective interstate cooperation.
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Representing Commission on Interstate Cooperation

Senator M. C. Matthes
Member of General Assembly

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

Senator C. Petrus Peterson
Member of Legislature
Nevada  
HON. ALAN H. BIBLE  
Attorney General

New Hampshire  
HON. ALBERT S. BAKER  
Chairman, Commission on  
Interstate Cooperation

New Jersey  
JUDGE RICHARD HARTSHORNE  
Chairman, Commission on  
Interstate Cooperation

New Mexico  
SENATOR JOSEPH M. MONTOYA  
Lieutenant Governor

New York  
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG  
Member of Legislature

North Carolina  
SENATOR CHARLES H. JENKINS  
Member of General Assembly

North Dakota  
SENATOR RILEY R. MORGAN  
Member of Legislative Assembly

Ohio  
HON. DALE DUNFON  
Director, Department of  
Liquor Control

Oklahoma  
HON. ERNEST M. BLACK  
Director of Research, Tax Commission

Oregon  
HON. GEO. K. AIKEN  
Budget Director

Pennsylvania  
HON. ORUS J. MATTHEWS  
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  
W. R. WILDER  
Director of Taxation

Tennessee  
JUDGE WINFIELD B. HALE  
Chairman, Commission on  
Interstate Cooperation

Texas  
HON. GEORGE O. NOKES, JR.  
Member of Legislature

Utah  
HON. RENDELL N. MARBY  
Member of Legislature

Vermont  
SENATOR JOHN A. M. HINSMAN  
Member of General Assembly

Virginia  
SENATOR W. STUART MOFFETT  
Member of General Assembly

Washington  
HON. WILLIAM O. SHANNON  
Member of Legislature

West Virginia  
HON. KEVIN A. RODGERS  
Chairman, Commission on  
Interstate Cooperation

Wisconsin  
HON. HERMAN D. FERRARA  
Member of General Assembly

Wyoming  
HON. ROLAND Received  
Secretary to the Governor

Executive Committee, Governors' Conference:  
HON. HORACE HILDERETH, Maine  
HON. MILLARD F. CALDWELL, Florida  
HON. FRANK CARLSON, Kansas  
HON. PHIL M. DONELLY, Missouri  
HON. RALPH F. GATES, Indiana  
HON. WILLIAM LEE KNOUS, Colorado  
HON. EARL SNELL, Oregon  
HON. J. STROM THURMOND, South Carolina  
HON. MON C. WALLGREEN, Washington

HON. J. TOM WATSON, Florida

President, National Association of Attorneys General;  
HON. J. TOM WATSON, Florida

President, National Association of Secretaries of State;  
HON. WADE O. MARTIN, Jr., Louisiana

President, National Conference of Commissioners on  
Uniform State Laws;  
HON. ALBERT J. HARN, Illinois

President, National Association of State Budget Officers;  
HON. ROBERT M. ARMSTRONG, Nebraska

President, Association of Administrators of the Interstate  
Compact for the Supervision of Parolees and Probationers;  
HON. REUBEN C. BRUSTED, Minnesota

President, National Association of State Purchasing  
Officials;  
HON. GEORGE J. CRONIN, Massachusetts

Honorary President of the Council of State Governments;  
HENRY W. TOLL

Executive Director of the Council of State Governments;  
FRANK BANE

HON. WILLIAM B. BELKNAP, Kentucky  
Former President of the  
American Legislators' Association

HON. CARL M. FRASER, West Virginia  
Chairman, Commission on  
Interstate Cooperation

HON. DWIGHT GRISWOLD, Nebraska  
Chief, American Mission for  
Aid to Greece,  
Former Governor

HON. GRANT MACFARLANE, Utah  
Former Member of State  
Senate

HON. GEORGE B. McKIBBIN, Illinois  
Director, Army & C. Div., Office of  
Military Government for Germany,  
Former Director of  
Finance

HON. EDWARD MARTIN, Pennsylvania  
U. S. Senator, Former Governor

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR, Maryland  
U. S. Senator, Former Governor

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Massachusetts  
U. S. Senator, Former Governor

HON. HAROLD E. STASEN, Minnesota  
Former Governor

HON. ELLWOOD J. TURNER, Pennsylvania  
Member of General Assembly

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR, Maryland  
U. S. Senator, Former Governor

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Massachusetts  
U. S. Senator, Former Governor

HON. HAROLD E. STASEN, Minnesota  
Former Governor

HON. ELLWOOD J. TURNER, Pennsylvania  
Member of General Assembly
CHRONOLOGICAL HISTORY OF THE COUNCIL
June 22, 1945—December, 1947


1945

June 22-23. The Pacific Coast Conference on Interstate Cooperation
Discussions were held on aviation, prevention of trade barriers, industrial development of the west. Benson Hotel, Portland, Oregon.

July 1-4. Governors' Conference
Thirty-seventh annual meeting. Grand Hotel, Mackinac Island, Michigan.

August 2. State-Local Committee (Consultants) Meeting. 1313 East 60th St., Chicago, Illinois.


August 15. Executive Committee of the Governors' Conference
Meeting. Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C.

August 21. Executive Committee of the Council of State Governments
Meeting. 1313 East 60th St., Chicago, Illinois.

August 31. Commissions on Interstate Cooperation, Midwestern States Meeting of Chairmen. Minneapolis, Minnesota.

September 14. State-Local Relations Committee
Meeting. Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C.

September 18. Commissions on Interstate Cooperation, Southwestern States
Meeting of Chairmen. Hotel Wade Hampton, Columbia, South Carolina.

September 22. Water Resources Committee

September 22. Commissions on Interstate Cooperation, Western States
Meeting of Chairmen. Palace Hotel, San Francisco, California.

September 24. Western Attorneys General
Discussions were held on insurance problems, tidewater and submerged lands, and legal problems arising from the war's end. Palace Hotel, San Francisco, California.

October 11-13. National Association of Secretaries of State
Twenty-eighth annual meeting. Hotel Roosevelt, New Orleans, Louisiana.

October 20. Commissions on Interstate Cooperation, Southwestern States
Meeting of Chairmen. St. Charles Hotel, New Orleans, Louisiana.

October 25. Northeastern Budget Officers

October 31-November 1. Drafting Committee of the Council of State Governments
Meeting. Office of the Solicitor General, Department of Justice, Washington, D. C.

November 16. Executive Committee of the Governors' Conference
Meeting. Hotel Stevens, Chicago, Illinois.

November 16-17. Annual Meeting, Board of Managers, the Council of State Governments
Meeting to consider and act upon reports prepared during 1945; to discuss and decide questions of policy and activity for 1946. Hotel Stevens, Chicago, Illinois.

November 19-20. Western Governors' Conference
Semiannual meeting. Plains Hotel, Cheyenne, Wyoming.

November 27. Post-War Committee of the California Commission on Interstate Cooperation
Meeting. Discussion was held on reconversion problems in California. State Building, Los Angeles, California.
November 27-29. National Association of Attorneys General
Thirty-ninth annual meeting. Hotel Roosevelt, Jacksonville, Florida.

December 7-8. Southern Governors' Conference
Meeting. Hotel Roosevelt, New Orleans, Louisiana.

December 13. Board of Intergovernmental Relations
Meeting. Olympia Hotel, Seattle, Washington.

December 13-14. National Association of State Budget Officers
Organization meeting. Hotel Stevens, Chicago, Illinois.

December 21. Pre-Legislative Session Conference, Northeastern and Middle Atlantic States
Meeting to review and discuss specific drafts of suggested state legislation as recommended for consideration by the Council's Drafting Committee and by regional continuing committees and agencies. Hotel Stacy-Trent, Trenton, New Jersey.

January 4-5. Executive Committee of the Governors' Conference
Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C.

January 11. Committee on Processes and Procedures
Hotel Stevens, Chicago, Illinois.

Meeting to discuss the need for a unified program of use, development, and control of land and water resources; and the tentative conclusions and recommendations of the Council's Committee on Water Resources. Statler Hotel, Boston, Massachusetts.

Meeting. Hotel Tutwiler, Birmingham, Alabama.

February 4-5. Executive Committee of the Governors' Conference
Meeting. Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C.

February 13. Executive Committee Meeting of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission
Hotel Belmont Plaza, New York, New York.

To review the prewar program of uniformity and reciprocity developed by the Conference, to bring that program up-to-date, and to decide upon the steps necessary to bring that program to completion through adoption by the conference states. Hotel Roosevelt, New York, New York.

February 15-16: Western Regional Conference of Commissions on Interstate Cooperation
Meeting. Hotel Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah.

March 12. Eastern Regional Continuing Committee on Social Welfare
Meeting to discuss and decide on those features of the federal Social Security Act that the states in the region would like to have amended in the light of their administrative experience. State Capitol, House Caucus Room, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

March 22-23. Southern Conference of Attorneys General and the Executive Committee of the National Association of Attorneys General
Meeting. Little Rock, Arkansas.

April 4. Pennsylvania Commission on Interstate Cooperation
Meeting. Hotel Hershey, Hershey, Pennsylvania.

April 12. Western Interstate Committee on Institutional Care
Organization meeting to discuss ways and means by which the eleven western states, working together, could insure the more adequate care of its institutional population and the more economic administration of such institutions. Hotel Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah.

April 19. Western Interstate Committee on Off-Shore Fisheries
Organization meeting to discuss ways and means by which the off-shore fisheries of the states of California, Oregon, and Washington could be better utilized. Oregon Building, Portland, Oregon.

April 26-27. Midwestern Regional Conference of Commission on Interstate Cooperation
Meeting. Statler Hotel, St. Louis, Missouri.

May 16-17. Exploratory Intercoastal Fisheries Conference
Meeting. Hotel Mayflower, Washington, D. C.

May 26-29. Governors' Conference
Thirty-eighth Annual Meeting, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.
INTERSTATE RELATIONS


July 10-12. Tenth Anniversary Conference of INCODEL

August 9. State-Local Committee
Meeting. Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C.

August 13. Western Interstate Committee on Off-Shore Fisheries
Meeting to discuss proposed interstate compact on Pacific marine fisheries. Multnomah Hotel, Portland, Oregon.

August 15. Western Interstate Committee on Institutional Care
Meeting to consider possible interstate compacts on the care of the deaf, blind, etc. Hotel Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah.

August 16. Eastern Regional Conference on the Return of the Employment Services to the States
Meeting to discuss the impending return of the Employment Services to the states and to determine ways and means of strengthening state administration of Employment Services. Hotel Roosevelt, New York, New York.

August 17. Eastern Conference of Legislative Reference Bureau Directors
Meeting to discuss a new improved program of state legislative reporting to be instituted, during 1947 in cooperation with the Library of Congress. Hotel Roosevelt, New York, New York.

August 23. Western Regional Conference on the Return of the Employment Services to the States
Meeting. Clift Hotel, San Francisco, California.

August 30. Midwestern Regional Conference on the Return of the Employment Services to the States
Meeting. Hotel Stevens, Chicago, Illinois.

August 31. Midwestern Conference of Legislative Reference Bureau Directors
Meeting. Hotel Stevens, Chicago, Illinois.

September 5. New England Conference of Administrators of the Interstate Compact for the Supervision of Parolees and Probationers
Meeting to discuss and decide questions of policy and activity for 1946-47. Hotel Atlantis, Kennebunk Beach, Maine.

September 9. Southern Regional Meeting on the Return of the Employment Services to the States
Meeting. Peabody Hotel, Memphis, Tennessee.

September 14. State-Local Committee
Meeting. Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C.

September 17-21. National Association of State Aviation Officials
Meeting. Hotel Finlen, Butte, Montana.

September 19-21. National Association of State Budget Officers

September 20-21. Western Regional Conference of Attorneys General
Meeting. LaFonda Hotel, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

September 26-27. Annual Meeting of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission

October 2. First Annual Meeting of Administrators of the Interstate Compact for the Supervision of Parolees and Probationers
Meeting to discuss and decide questions of policy and activity for 1946-47. Hotel Statler, Detroit, Michigan.

October 4-5. Drafting Committee Meeting, Council of State Governments
1313 East 60th St., Chicago, Illinois.

October 10. Fish and Wildlife Service
Fisheries meeting. 1609 Masonic Temple Building, New Orleans, Louisiana.

October 18. Regional Continuing Committee on Motor Vehicle Problems

October 21. Meeting of Various State Officials to Discuss Pollution Legislation
Office of the Council of State Governments, Washington, D. C.

October 21-26. Uniform Law Commissioners

November 14-15. Pre-Legislative Session Conference, Northeastern and Middle Atlantic States
Meeting to review and discuss specific drafts of suggested state legislation as recommended for consideration by the Council's Drafting Committee and by the regional continuing committees and agencies. State House, Trenton, New Jersey.

Fortieth annual meeting. Knickerbocker Hotel, Hollywood, California.
November 20. Western Interstate Committee on Off-Shore Fisheries
Meeting to prepare final draft of Pacific Marine Fisheries Compact. Clift Hotel, San Francisco, California.

November 21-22. Western Regional Legislative Conference
Meeting. Clift Hotel, San Francisco, California.

December 2. Executive Committee of the Governors’ Conference
Meeting. Roney Plaza Hotel, Miami Beach, Florida.

December 3-4. Board of Managers of the Council of State Governments
Annual meeting. Roney Plaza Hotel, Miami Beach, Florida.

December 5-6. Gulf States Intercoastal Conference Committee
Meeting. Wildlife and Fisheries Museum, 751 Chartres St., New Orleans, Louisiana.

December 16-17. Southern Regional Legislative Conference
Meeting. Hotel Roosevelt, New Orleans, Louisiana.

January 7. Regional Continuing Committee on School Bus Standards

January 16-18. Eighth Biennial General Assembly of the States
Meeting. Edgewater Beach Hotel, Chicago, Illinois.

January 24. Regional Continuing Committee on Traffic Regulation and Control

January 31-February 1. National Association of State Purchasing Officials
Organization meeting. Hotel Stevens, Chicago, Illinois.

February 20. Twelfth Annual Conference on Highway and Motor Vehicle Problems

March 15. Council of State Governments Tax Committee
Tax Committee met with representatives of House Ways and Means Committee and Senate Finance Committee. Washington, D. C.

April 10-11. Gulf Coast Fisheries Compact

April 25. Pacific Coast Board of Intergovernmental Relations
Meeting. Fairmont Hotel, San Francisco, California.

April 26-28. Executive Committee of the National Association of State Aviation Officials

May 8. Regional Continuing Committee Chairmen of the Twelfth Annual Highway Conference

May 15. Subcommittee on Uniform Methods of Truck Registration of the Regional Continuing Committee on Motor Vehicle Problems

May 18. An Association of Administrators of the Interstate Compact for the Supervision of Parolees and Probationers—Middle Atlantic States
Regional meeting of Administrators held in conjunction with the Middle Atlantic States Parole Conference. Hotel Chelsea. Atlantic City, New Jersey.

June 2. An Association of Administrators of the Interstate Compact for the Supervision of Parolees and Probationers—Central States
Regional meeting of Administrators held in conjunction with the Central States Correction Conference, Deshler Wallick Hotel. Columbus, Ohio.
June 9-10. Southeastern Regional Conference of the Council of State Governments
Meeting. Hotel Mayflower, Washington, D. C.

July 13-16. Governors' Conference
Thirty-ninth annual meeting. Hotel Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah.

July 28-30. Midwestern Regional Conference of the Council of State Governments
Meeting. Grand Hotel, Mackinac Island, Michigan.

September 8. Western Interstate Committee on Institutional Care
Meeting. Clift Hotel, San Francisco, California.

September 9-10. Western Regional Conference of the Council of State Governments
Meeting. Clift Hotel, San Francisco, California.

September 11. Interstate Crime Compact Administrators Association
Annual meeting. Civic Auditorium, Long Beach, California.

September 11-13. National Association of State Budget Officers
Annual meeting. St. Francis Hotel, San Francisco, California.

September 17. Water Resources Committee of the Council of State Governments
Meeting. Hotel Muchlebach, Kansas City, Missouri.

September 18. National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws
Meeting. Cleveland, Ohio.

September 26-27. Joint Conference of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and of the Governors' Conference
First meeting of the House Ways and Means Committee, Senate Finance Committee, Senate and House Committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and the Governors' Conference Committee to discuss federal-state tax relations. Hotel Shoreland, Chicago, Illinois.

October 9-10. Southern Regional Conference of the Council of State Governments
Meeting. Peabody Hotel, Memphis, Tennessee.

October 19-21. Southern Governors' Conference

October 24-25. Committee to Study Grants-in-Aid
Meeting. 1313 East 60th St., Chicago, Illinois.

Annual meeting. Hotel Statler, Boston, Massachusetts.

October 30-31. Interstate Conference on Migratory Farm Labor

Meeting. Edgewater Beach Hotel, Chicago, Illinois.

December 12-13. Western Governors' Conference
Meeting. Portland, Oregon.
INTERSTATE ORGANIZATIONS AFFILIATED
WITH THE COUNCIL OF STATE GOVERNMENTS

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 1947-48.

Horace Hildreth, Governor of Maine, Chairman
Millard F. Caldwell, Governor of Florida
Frank Carlson, Governor of Kansas
Phil M. Donnelly, Governor of Missouri
Ralph F. Gates, Governor of Indiana
William Lee Knous, Governor of Colorado
Earl Snell, Governor of Oregon
J. Strom Thurmond, Governor of South Carolina
Mon C. Wallgren, Governor of Washington

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

Annual Meeting: July 13-16, 1947, Salt Lake City, Utah. The 1946 Conference was held May 26-29, at Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.


Activities: Since May 13, 1908, when its first session was called at 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 NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SECRETARIES OF STATE

Ornanzation: 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.

Wade O. Martin, Jr., Louisiana, President
Frank M. Jordan, California, Vice President
Frank Marsh, Nebraska, Secretary
William J. Storey, Delaware, Recording Secretary
Armand H. Côté, Rhode Island, Treasurer

Executive Committee: In addition to the current officers all Past Presidents of the National Association of Secretaries of State are members of the Executive Committee.

Secretariat: The Council of State Governments.

Annual Meeting: The 1947 meeting was held September 24-26, at Biloxi, Mississippi.

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

Activities: During the war years the National Association’s Committee on Election Procedure 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. Among active committees are those on Corporation Registration and Trade Mark Registration; the latter is investigating the possibility of handling this problem through uniform legislation rather than by compulsory-registration.

The president of the Association is a member of the Board of Managers of the Council of State Governments.
THE 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: Members of the Executive Committee for the year 1947-48.
J. Tom Watson, Attorney General of Florida, President
Alan H. Bible, Attorney General of Nevada, Vice President
Clarence A. Barnes, Attorney General of Massachusetts
Roy H. Beeler, Attorney General of Tennessee
J. A. A. Burnquist, Attorney General of Minnesota
Cleon Foust, Attorney General of Indiana
H. Lawrence Hinkle, Attorney General of Colorado
Hugh S. Jenkins, Attorney General of Ohio
Harry McMullan, Attorney General of North Carolina

Secretariat: The Council of State Governments.

Annual Meeting: The 1947 Conference was held October 26-28, at Boston, Massachusetts.

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.
THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE BUDGET OFFICERS

ORGANIZATION: Organized in 1945. Composed of all state and territorial budget officers, their assistants and deputies.

PURPOSE: To provide machinery for cooperation among state budget officers, to foster the more effective exercise of the function of budget administration, and to attain greater efficiency in state administration.


Robert M. Armstrong, Nebraska, President
J. H. Rester, Louisiana, Vice-President
John E. Burton, New York
H. D. Defenbacher, Ohio
Fred W. Links, California
Roger Phelps, Oklahoma
Robert H. Weir, Connecticut

SECRETARIAT: The Council of State Governments.

ANNUAL MEETING: The 1947 meeting was held September 11-13, at San Francisco, California.

PUBLICATIONS: Résumés of annual meetings and special reports of interest to state budget officers.

ACTIVITIES: At the request of individual state budget officers, the secretariat performs research services and makes available information of general interest to the members of the Association. From time to time surveys are made of existing practices and procedures in all of the states.

The president of the Association is a member of the Board of Managers of the Council of State Governments.
THE BOOK OF THE STATES
THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE PURCHASING OFFICIALS

Organization: Organized in 1947. Composed of all state and territorial purchasing officials, their assistants and deputies.

Purpose: To promote cooperation towards the more efficient exercise of the function of state purchasing and to attain greater efficiency in administration.

Officers: Members of the Executive Committee for the year 1947-48:
George J. Cronin, Massachusetts, President
Blaine Yoder, Nebraska, Vice President
Eugene A. Gump, Michigan
J. Henry McGean, Utah
Richard S. Persons, New York
Glenn R. Rumbaugh, Louisiana

Secretariat: The Council of State Governments.

Annual Meeting: Time and place to be determined by the Executive Committee. The organization meeting was held January 31-February 1, 1947, at Chicago, Illinois.

Publications: Résumés of all meetings and special reports of interest to state purchasing officials.

Activities: At the request of individual state purchasing officials, the secretariat performs research services and makes available information of general interest to the members of the Association. The secretariat has recently published reports summarizing practice with regard to inspection and analysis of state purchases and the organization and operation of state purchasing agencies.

The president of the Association is a member of the Board of Managers of the Council of State Governments.
AN ASSOCIATION OF ADMINISTRATORS OF THE
INTERSTATE COMPACT FOR THE SUPERVISION
OF PAROLEES AND PROBATIONERS


Purpose: To promote cooperation and the exchange of information among administrators of the Interstate Compact for the Supervision of Parolees and Probationers, for the effective carrying out of such compact.

Officers: Members of the Executive Committee for the year 1947-48.

Reuben C. Brustuen, Minnesota, President
Walter A. Gordon, California, Vice President
Francis R. Bridges, Jr., Florida, Treasurer
Robert G. Smith, Vermont
Glenn R. Klopfenstein, Ohio
Mrs. Edwina Mitchell, Alabama
John J. Quine, Washington
H. M. Randall, Oregon

Secretariat: The Council of State Governments.

Annual Meeting: The 1947 meeting was held September 11, at Long Beach, California.

Publications: Reports of meetings and topical reports of interest to members.

Activities: At the request of the Association the secretariat performs research services and makes available information of general interest to the members. Statistical data are being compiled regarding the number of parolees and probationers being serviced out-of-state, their state-by-state location, the returns for violation, the discharges, and other factual material.

The president of the Association is a member of the Board of Managers of the Council of State Governments.
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.

Albert J. Harro, Illinois, President
Sherman R. Moulton, Vermont, Vice President
Boyd M. Benson, South Dakota, Treasurer
Barton H. Kuhns, Nebraska, Secretary

ANNUAL MEETING: September 15-18, 1947, Cleveland, Ohio. 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.

The Conference has approximately twenty-five committees working on proposed uniform and model laws. Its major project for the past five years has been the drafting of a Uniform Commercial Code in cooperation with the American Law Institute. That portion known as the Revised Sales Act was completed in 1944, and work is far along on other portions. The expenses of preparing the code are being met from a subscription by a foundation in Pittsburgh which will ultimately total $250,000. The code should be completed by 1949.

Copies of the Handbook, committee reports, proposed drafts, and approved drafts may be obtained from the Secretary, Barton H. Kuhns, First National Bank Building, Omaha, Nebraska.
INTERSTATE COMPACTS AND COMMISSIONS

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS*

UNTIL 1934 the compact clause of the Constitution which provides that “No State shall, without the consent of Congress ... enter into any agreement or compact with another State ...”1 was the basis for interstate compacts primarily concerned with boundary disputes; the construction of interstate public services, or for the allocation of the waters of several western rivers. Since then, however, the compact device has been found increasingly useful in furthering interstate cooperation in such fields as crime control, pollution abatement, the allocation of oil production, and the conservation of fisheries resources.

During the past two years a number of states have negotiated compacts to establish interstate recommendatory commissions to handle complicated interstate problems which require continued study and legislative action by the states. The success of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Compact resulted in the negotiation of both a Pacific States Marine Fisheries Compact and a Gulf States Marine Fisheries Compact for the better utilization of the fisheries resources of those regions. Advisory commissions, similar to the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, are established under these two agreements. During 1947 the New England states also created by compact the New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission to control and reduce the pollution of the streams and waters of those states.

There are a number of reasons why an interstate advisory commission is believed to be the most satisfactory method of tackling these various interstate problems that require continued interstate cooperation to solve. An interstate commission, created by formal compact, is endowed both with prestige and a degree of permanence that might not result from a more informal agreement. A formally constituted body of this kind is also assured of the necessary appropriations allocated to the member states and its legislative recommendations are likely to carry considerable weight in the legislatures of the interested states. In addition, because the legislatures of the member states must ratify these interstate compacts, the agreements become part of the law of the state and are less likely to be challenged in the courts than might be the case with administrative agreements.

The table following is a revision of that which appeared in the 1943-44 edition of the Book of the States. It describes briefly the compacts negotiated by the states since 1934 and indicates the year of state ratification and congressional consent. It will be noted that not only have a number of new agreements been negotiated but additional states have also ratified already existing compacts.

---

1 The Constitution of the United States. Article I, Section 10, Clause 3.
2 Prepared by Mrs. Jane B. Lynch, former staff member, Council of State Governments.
THE BOOK OF THE STATES

INTERSTATE COMPACTS 1934–1947

NAME
Colorado River Compact
Crime Compact of 1934
Pennsylvania and New Jersey Toll Bridge Compact
Tri-State Pollution Compact

SUBJECT
For equitable division of the waters of the Colorado River and establishing an interstate commission
Interstate supervision of parolees and probationers
Creation of Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission for acquisition of interstate toll bridges on the Delaware River
Creation of Sanitation District to deal with pollution in New York Harbor

STATE RATIFICATION
Arizona, 1944
California, 1925
Colorado, 1925
Nevada, 1925
New Mexico, 1925
Utah, 1925
Wyoming, 1925
Alabama, 1940
Arizona, 1937
Arkansas, 1937
California, 1939
Colorado, 1939
Connecticut, 1943
Delaware, 1937.
Florida, 1941
Idaho, 1941
Illinois, 1937
Indiana, 1937
Iowa, 1937
Kansas, 1947
Kentucky, 1939
New Jersey, 1934
Pennsylvania, 1931
Pennsylvania, 1931
Pennsylvania, 1934
New York, 1943
North Dakota, 1941
Ohio, 1937
Oklahoma, 1943
Oregon, 1937
Pennsylvania, 1937
Rhode Island, 1937
South Dakota, 1947
Tennessee, 1939
Utah, 1937
Vermont, 1937
Virginia, 1938
Washington, 1937
West Virginia, 1939
Wisconsin, 1940
Wyoming, 1939

CONSENT OF CONGRESS
1928
45 Stat. 1057

CITATION
45 Stat.

Pennsylvania and New Jersey Toll Bridge Compact
Creation of Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission for acquisition of interstate toll bridges on the Delaware River

Pennsylvania, 1931
New Jersey, 1934

amended, 1947
amended, 1947

1935
1947

49 Stat. 932

49 Stat. 1058

Pub. Law 355
86th Cong.
Chap. 480
1st Sess.

6 Consent to repair and replace bridges and to issue bridge revenue bonds for this purpose.
## Interstate Relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>State Ratification</th>
<th>Consent of Congress</th>
<th>Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interstate Oil Compact</td>
<td>Allocation of state petroleum production ²</td>
<td>Alabama, 1945</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>49 Stat. 939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arkansas, 1941</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Colorado, 1935</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Florida, 1945</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Georgia, 1946</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Illinois, 1939</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indiana, 1947</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kansas, 1939</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kentucky, 1942</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Michigan, 1939</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Montana, 1945</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Mexico, 1935</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New York, 1941</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco Compact of 1936</td>
<td>Regulation and control of tobacco production</td>
<td>Virginia, 1936</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>49 Stat. 1239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York and Vermont</td>
<td>Construction of bridge across Lake Champlain</td>
<td>New York, 1928</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>45 Stat. 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont Agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vermont, 1927</td>
<td></td>
<td>49 Stat. 736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of Parkways</td>
<td>Authorizes any two or more states to negotiate compacts for planning, developing, improving, and maintaining any park, parkway, or recreational area</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>consent for</td>
<td>1472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Recreational Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Further approval of Congress required)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollution Control</td>
<td>(New England Pollution Compact)</td>
<td>(Further approval of Congress required)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² Must be reenacted either every two or four years if state to participate.
* Georgia became Associate Member because of prospect of oil production.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>State Ratification</th>
<th>Consent of Congress</th>
<th>Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohio River Valley Sanitation</td>
<td>For the control and reduction of the pollution of the streams of the Ohio River drainage basin</td>
<td>Indiana, 1939; Illinois, 1939; Kentucky, 1940; New York, 1939; Ohio, 1939; West Virginia, 1939</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>49 Stat. 1490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Control Compacts</td>
<td>Authorizes any two or more states to enter into compacts or agreements in connection with any project or operation authorized by Secs. 5, 6, and 7 of Act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1572) for flood control or prevention of damage, destruction, or injury to property by reason of floods upon interstate streams and for purpose of providing funds, as agreed upon by states and approved by Secretary of War, for construction and maintenance, payment of damages and purchase of rights-of-way, lands, and easements in connection with such project or operation.</td>
<td>(Connecticut and Merrimack River Compacts) * 1936</td>
<td>(Further approval required) 1936</td>
<td>49 Stat. 1571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concord Compact of 1934</td>
<td>Compacts for minimum wages for women and children</td>
<td>Massachusetts, 1934; abrogated, 1945; New Hampshire, 1935; abrogated, 1943; Rhode Island, 1936</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>50 Stat. 633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palisades Interstate Park</td>
<td>Establishment of park and recreational systems in New York and New Jersey</td>
<td>New York, 1900, 1937; New Jersey, 1900, 1937</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>50 Stat. 719</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Ratification to go into effect when New York, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia enter compact as parties and signatory states.
* Ratification to go into effect when New York, Ohio, Virginia, and Pennsylvania enter compact as parties and signatory states.
* Congressional approval withheld in 1937 because Federal Power Commission believed compacts went beyond the purpose and intent of Flood Control Act. (Senate Committee on Commerce, Rept. 955, 75th Congress, 1st Sess.)
* Unless all money and work under direction of Secretary of War.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>NAME</strong></th>
<th><strong>SUBJECT</strong></th>
<th><strong>STATE RATIFICATION</strong></th>
<th><strong>CONSENT OF CONGRESS</strong></th>
<th><strong>CITATION</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potomac Valley Pollution and Conservation Compact of 1937</td>
<td>Creation of conservation district for prevention of pollution</td>
<td>District of Columbia, 1940 (by joint resolution of Congress)</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>50 Stat. 884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maine, 1937</td>
<td>(Further approval of Congress required)</td>
<td>54 Stat. 748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Virginia, 1940</td>
<td>(Approval granted)</td>
<td>50 Stat. 538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine-New Hampshire Interstate Bridge Authority</td>
<td>Creation of authority with power to construct, maintain, and operate bridge between Portsmouth, New Hampshire, and Kittery, Maine</td>
<td>Maine, 1937</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>50 Stat. 865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Hampshire, 1931</td>
<td>(permission to amend)</td>
<td>59 Stat. 502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pymatuning Lake Compact</td>
<td>Establishment of recreation district, for conservation of water, with concurrent penal jurisdiction of lake</td>
<td>Ohio, 1937</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>52 Stat. 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pennsylvania, 1937</td>
<td>1945 (permission to amend)</td>
<td>58 Stat. 117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellowstone River Compact</td>
<td>Authorizes compact among Montana, Wyoming, and North Dakota for the equitable distribution of the waters of the Yellowstone River</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>50 Stat. 551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Further approval required)</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>54 Stat. 399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(North Dakota added)</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>58 Stat. 117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Time of negotiation extended to June 1, 1947)</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>52 Stat. 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Lakes Fisheries Compact</td>
<td>For uniform regulation of fishing in the Great Lakes and connecting waters by any two or more of the states of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin</td>
<td></td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>(Further approval of Congress required)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>State Ratification</td>
<td>Consent of Congress</td>
<td>Citation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware River Vehicular Tunnel</td>
<td>Authorizes New Jersey and Pennsylvania to make compacts for construction, maintenance, and operation of vehicular tunnel under Delaware River</td>
<td>New Jersey, 1937 (authorized)</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>52 Stat. 1163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri-Iowa Boundary Agreement</td>
<td>Agreement between Iowa and Missouri establishing boundary between the two states</td>
<td>Missouri, 1939 Iowa, 1939</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>53 Stat. 1345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Grande Compact</td>
<td>For use of the waters of the Rio Grande above Fort Quitman, Texas</td>
<td>Colorado, 1939 New Mexico, 1939 Texas, 1939</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>53 Stat. 785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Missouri River Compact</td>
<td>Authorizes Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming to make compact for division of waters of the little Missouri River</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>54 Stat. 382 (Further approval of Congress required)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York-Rhode Island Boundary Line Compact</td>
<td>Settlement of boundary line between New York and Rhode Island</td>
<td>New York, 1943 Rhode Island, 1942</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>58 Stat. 672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>SUBJECT</td>
<td>STATE RATIFICATION</td>
<td>CONSENT OF CONGRESS</td>
<td>CITATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana-Kentucky Boundary Line Compact</td>
<td>Establishes a boundary between Indiana and Kentucky</td>
<td>Indiana, 1943 Kentucky, 1942</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>57 Stat. 248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican River Compact</td>
<td>Authorizes compact among states of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska for the division of the waters of the Republican River</td>
<td>Colorado, 1943 Kansas, 1943 Nebraska, 1943</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>(Further approval of Congress required) 1943 (Approval granted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa and Nebraska Boundary Compact</td>
<td>Agreement between Iowa and Nebraska establishing a boundary between the two states</td>
<td>Iowa, 1943 Nebraska, 1943</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>57 Stat. 494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland Gap National Historical Park</td>
<td>Authorizes compact among 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</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>57 Stat. 85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belle Fourche River Compact</td>
<td>Compact between South Dakota and Wyoming to promote the most efficient use of the waters of the Belle Fourche River Basin</td>
<td>South Dakota, 1943 Wyoming, 1943</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>(Further approval of Congress required) 1944 (Approval granted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas River Compact</td>
<td>Authorizes compact between Colorado and Kansas for the division of the waters of the Arkansas River</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>59 Stat. 53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costilla Creek Compact</td>
<td>Authorizes a compact between Colorado and New Mexico to provide for the equitable division and apportionment of the use of the waters of Costilla Creek</td>
<td>Colorado, 1945 New Mexico, 1945</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>Pub. Law 408 79th Cong. Chap. 328 2nd Sess.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 In 1942, a congressional act approving the Republican River Compact, ratified by three states in 1941, was vetoed by the President because the compact stated that the Republican River was not navigable. The compact was redrafted, omitting this statement, and subsequently ratified and approved.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>STATE RATIFICATION</th>
<th>CONSENT OF CONGRESS</th>
<th>CITATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bear River Compact</td>
<td>Authorizes states of Utah, Idaho, and Wyoming to negotiate compact for division of waters of Bear River and tributaries</td>
<td></td>
<td>1946 (Further approval of Congress required)</td>
<td>Pub. Law 537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>79th Cong. Chap. 609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80th Cong. Chap. 407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st Sess.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49 Stat. 1490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80th Cong. Chap. 316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st Sess.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snake River Compact</td>
<td>Authorizes states of Idaho and Wyoming to negotiate compact for the division of the waters of the Snake River and its tributaries</td>
<td></td>
<td>H. R. 3603 pending, House Committee on Public Lands, August, 1947</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The activities of the Interstate Commission on the Delaware River Basin—Incodel—have continued to be productive of far-reaching and significant results during the period since the publication of the 1945-46 edition of The Book of the States.

In the interval, Incodel has covered much additional ground in forwarding its primary objective of coordinating the interests of the numerous governmental and private agencies responsible for the preparation of physical and financial programs for the development and conservation of the resources of the Delaware River Basin.

Incodel continues to set an example of national as well as regional interests.

**STREAM POLLUTION ABATEMENT**

During the period of war, while materials and manpower were being diverted to wartime needs, Incodel made a special effort to secure the preparation of plans and specifications for advisable public works improvements well in advance of the time for their actual construction in the postwar era.

Special consideration was given to projects for the correction and abatement of stream pollution. From these efforts, a reservoir of $100,000,000 worth of economically feasible projects in the basin was developed.

It is gratifying to report that construction of these improvements now is underway. The example was set by the city of Philadelphia—the major offender—when, in the spring of 1947, it awarded a contract for the building of the initial stage of its sewage treatment project. This action set the stage for the inauguration of a $100,000,000 four-state program. It was followed later in the year by the commencement of work on the Incodel $35,000,000 joint federal-state-industry project to clean up the Schuylkill River, the largest tributary of the Delaware. For over a hundred years, this stream had been permitted to be a depository for the wastes from anthracite mining operations with the result that at the time of commencement of the Incodel project, some thirty million tons of coal culm and silt had accumulated in the bed and on the banks of this waterway.

Through Incodel's leadership, the cooperative three-way program for the restoration of the river was adopted. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania was called upon to take the lead by requiring coal operators to discontinue their past malpractices and by initiation of a dredging program to clear the upper section of the river.

The anthracite industry is cooperating fully, the larger of the operators already having installed reclaiming plants. The Commission was instrumental in getting Congress to direct the Army Engineers to review a previous survey of the problem, the results of which were unfavorable in respect to federal participation. Incodel insisted that completion of the work should be economically beneficial to the federal government by eliminating or substantially reducing the expense of maintaining the navigable channels in the lower river caused by the progressive washing of the material down stream. This contention was confirmed by the 1945 review and resulted in the subsequent authorization of federal participation in the project.

The action taken by Philadelphia and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania started off a chain of related pollution abatement improvements costing $20,000,000, extending throughout the entire length and breadth of the Delaware watershed.

The Commission has approved a postwar time schedule for all pollution correction works. The largest project—Philadelphia's—is to be completed by 1951. Comparable units in the smaller municipalities of the basin will be required to be built before that time.

The solution of the pollution problem in the Delaware watershed will result in manifold benefits. It will stimulate the use of the Delaware River as a highway of commerce. It will enhance the usefulness of the waters of the region for municipal and industrial water supply, the restoration of shad and other fish life, recreation, the protection of lower bay oyster industry, and many other purposes. It will improve—

*Prepared by James H. Allen, Executive Secretary, Interstate Commission on the Delaware River Basin.
working conditions along, and appreciate the value of, river front properties. It will permit Philadelphia to continue to use the Delaware as a safe and satisfactory source of municipal water supply as long as its officials deem that course to be advisable.

**WATER SUPPLY DIVERSION PROJECTS**

As reported in the last edition of *The Book of the States*, through the inspiration of Incodel, the states of New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey enacted in 1944-1945, identical and reciprocal legislation for the sharing of the waters of the Delaware River and its tributaries for municipal water supply purposes.

The three states at the present time are concentrating upon a program to strengthen the advantages of this agreement. On a friendly basis, they expect to ask the United States Supreme Court to add its stamp of approval to all future water supply diversion projects in the operation of which the states are agreed upon procedures. The objective of this program is to permit the developer in any of the states to proceed expeditiously with the financing of an approved project.

**SOIL CONSERVATION**

In January, 1946, Incodel initiated a comprehensive program designed to bring about a more effective coordination of activities on the part of various agencies of federal, state, and local governments and of private organizations dealing with the problem of soil erosion. This work has been tremendously successful. It has resulted in the approval and adoption of unified projects throughout the entire watershed. Such work had been fairly well advanced in New York, New Jersey, and Delaware before Incodel entered the field but had bogged down badly in Pennsylvania. Within a period of a little over a year, this situation was corrected and, in a substantial portion of the Pennsylvania section of the watershed, programs now are in operation.

**FOREST CONSERVATION**

Incodel also is directing a considerable part of its attention to the problem of conserving the forest resources of the Delaware Basin. To that end, it has engaged the services of an additional staff member trained in forestry through whose efforts a comprehensive six-point program is being executed. The program consists of measures for:

1. Continued and expanded forest protection
2. Development of educational programs
3. Promotion of reforestation
4. Extension of farm forestry
5. Increased research
6. Establishment of community forests

At the present time, a special effort is being made to prevail upon Congress to provide sufficient funds for the establishment of a forest research experimental station in the Delaware Valley. If successful, the states will join hands with the federal government in finding practical means for the restoration of thousands of acres of land wasted as the result of ruthless and careless practices of the past.

**PORT AND TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES**

A special undertaking upon which Incodel has just embarked is to work out a practical action plan for the promotion of the use of the navigable section of the Delaware River below Trenton as a highway of commerce, and a similar program relative to the construction of additional bridges and tunnels across the Delaware River for the improvement of inter-communication between Pennsylvania and New Jersey, including the extension of such river crossings into the areas directly served in Philadelphia and Camden. It is expected that this assignment will result in the adoption of additional legislative agreements between the states designed to promote and extend the future growth and prosperity of the region.

**FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONSHIPS**

The last issue of *The Book of the States* reported that successful results were beginning to accrue from the campaign in which Incodel participated in 1944 and 1945 to bring about a better balance in the relationship between federal and state governments in the matter of river control and watershed development. Such results since have become an actuality. The law of the land now provides that all future federal flood control and navigation projects shall
be formulated in consultation and cooperation with state governments.

In 1946, Incodel directed much of its attention toward tempering the efforts of advocates of centralization to smother the country with federally controlled regional authorities. It urged that programs which provide for effective coordination among long established agencies of federal and state government should be given a fair opportunity to prove their value. This suggestion helped in bringing about the creation of inter-agency committees in the Missouri and Columbia River Basins.

It is Incodel's firm conviction that the continued development of this nation can be furthered best by the establishment of acceptable national land and water policies which are administered in accordance with a practical plan for the establishment of acceptable relationships among federal, state, and local governmental units.

Membership of the Commission

Delaware:
R. C. Beckett, State Sanitary Engineer
Hon. Ralph S. Keenan, Member, House of Representatives
Hon. Raymond B. Phillips, Member, State Senate
Wm. A. McWilliams, State Highway Department
Hon. Burton S. Heal, Recorder of Deeds, New Castle County

New Jersey:
Hon. Robert C. Hendrickson, State Treasurer
Hon. Amos F. Dixon, Member, Assembly
Hon. Alfred, B. Littell, Member, State Senate
Hon. Joseph C. Paul, Commission on Interstate Cooperation
William T. VanderLipp, Dept. Economic Development

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. Orus J. Matthews, Secretary of Commerce
Hon. Weldon B. Heyburn, Member, State Senate
Hon. Franklin H. Lichtenwalter, Speaker, 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*

The Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin was created by compact for the primary purpose of controlling and abating pollution in the Potomac River Basin. It has found that the use and conservation of all the natural resources are so interrelated that it must, of necessity, in planning a basin-wide pollution abatement program, consider and coordinate all plans for the use and conservation of natural resources of the area.

The Commission was organized just shortly before the beginning of World War II. Realizing that municipalities and industries could not carry forward construction work during the period of hostilities it devoted its efforts, during the war, to preparing a basin-wide program for pollution control which could be initiated as soon as conditions again became normal.

Thus the Commission has devoted its efforts to the amassing of fundamental data, the establishment of water quality criteria, the preparation of a basin-wide abatement plan, the procurement of adequate pollution control legislation by the states of the basin, and the promotion of detailed planning by communities needing sewers and sewage treatment works.

WATER QUALITY CRITERIA AND AREA CLASSIFICATION MAP

Since the last edition of The Book of the States the Commission, through its Technical Committee, has prepared and recommended to the states of the Potomac Basin for their use within the basin, criteria on water quality and an area classification map which designates areas in which each minimum classification will apply. The governors of the states of Maryland and
West Virginia, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and the president of the board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia have already formally signed a statement accepting and adopting, upon the behalf of these signatory bodies, the criteria and classification map. The water quality criteria and area classification map establish a guide, to be used only by state water control agencies, of minimum water quality conditions that are obtainable in any area of the basin in the next few years. They are not to be considered as fixed standards for use by municipalities and industries, since the Commission is already receiving the classification map with the objective of revising procedures and areas. It is the intention of the Commission that the states themselves may wish to establish a higher water quality than that indicated by the area classification map. Where complete information is available and conditions warrant, it is believed that these criteria will provide a uniform measure of stream quality for use in the Commission's pollution abatement program.

**WATER QUALITY SAMPLING PROGRAM**

Since the Commission has found that there is little information available at the present time as to the quality of the water of streams throughout the basin, the Commission has initiated a water quality sampling station program in which the states, municipalities, industries, and schools are actively participating.

The Commission is coordinating the work and will summarize and publish the information obtained. Sampling will be carried on at least during critical periods in all of the principal streams of the basin and it is expected that the information obtained will be the basis for revisions in the area classification map as conditions needing correction become apparent.

**MUNICIPAL AND INDUSTRIAL PLANNING FOR ABATEMENT WORKS**

The Commission's program of encouraging municipalities to prepare detailed plans for sewage treatment works has now progressed to the point where most of the larger communities have completed plans for enlargement of existing treatment plants or construction of new treatment facilities. This is particularly true in the Washington metropolitan area where all political subdivisions have—either completed these plans or are preparing them at the present time. When financial conditions stabilize and the construction of these plants is completed, the minimum requirements recommended for the Washington area will be met.

The Commission, through its newly appointed Industrial Committee, has been cooperating with the industries of the basin in studying their problems in the abatement of pollution. Many of the industries are investigating means of treating their wastes where necessary. During the last year one large plant has completed new treatment works which will remove pollution. This plant formerly discharged to one of the larger tributaries of the Potomac.

The Industrial Committee has made a survey of the industries discharging wastes to the basin, including information on methods now used to abate these wastes together with plans for future treatment of harmful discharges.

**LOCAL REGIONAL PLANNING**

Recently the Commission has attempted to encourage the formation of regional planning groups where political subdivisions of the states have similar problems. In the Cumberland, Maryland, area the Upper Potomac River Board, an unofficial group composed of representatives of some of the industries and municipalities in the area, has enlarged its membership to include all of the interests of the area. A similar group is now being formed in the Washington metropolitan area.

It is planned to have these agencies study the needs of the area, and attempt to coordinate the plans of each political subdivision with those proposed by other agencies.

In cooperative activities of this nature the Commission has already been instrumental in bringing the District of Columbia and the Washington Sanitary Suburban District together in an agreement whereby the District of Columbia will treat all of the sewage of the Washington Sanitary Suburban District's Anacostia drainage area. The flow of this stream is so
small during dry weather periods, that a complete treatment plant would not provide acceptable conditions. The new agreement proposes to convey the sewage from this area to the District treatment plant on the Potomac where treatment would be provided. When the necessary sewers are constructed this agreement will aid materially in cleaning up the Anacostia and the Washington metropolitan area and will provide a stream which will be sufficiently clean to allow the immediate area to be developed as a recreational facility.

**Other Water Resources Planning**

Any program for pollution control will be affected by and have some effect upon plans for other water resources. The Commission is attempting to coordinate other basin-wide natural resources programs with its activities in pollution control. It is hoped that by so doing eventually a basin-wide program for the use and conservation of all of the natural resources can be evolved.

At present the Commission is considering such coordination only to the degree to which each project is affected or affects pollution abatement.

**Legislative Program**

As in the past the Commission has been vitally interested in any proposed federal pollution legislation or other legislation affecting water resources. It has been carrying on an educational program throughout the basin which has presented to the public the policy of the Commission so far as such legislation is concerned. The Commission believes that the greatest possible use should be made of existing authorities and facilities for the control of water pollution. There is need for a federal agency to coordinate the activities of the states, to stimulate them, and to carry on investigations and research. Such agency should not have enforcement powers. These should be left with the states and interstate groups.

In line with the above policy the Commission has endorsed H.R. 315, the Spence Bill, now before the 80th Congress. This bill in general agrees with the Commission's policy.

In the field of state legislation the Commission is of the belief that while it is vitally interested in each of the basin states having adequate pollution control legislation it should not recommend specific legislation other than to indicate the need for certain types which may from time to time become desirable.

An example of this policy is the action which the Commission took in aiding interested persons to initiate water control laws which create state water control boards for Maryland and Virginia. These boards have sufficient powers to provide for control and abatement of pollution.

All of the states of the basin now have laws, which, while not the same, provide for adequate control and abatement of pollution. Since the last edition of this publication, West Virginia has revised its pollution legislation and reorganized its Water Commission. The state of Pennsylvania has initiated, through its Sanitary Water Board, a very energetic program for the abatement of sanitary and industrial pollution.

**Publicity and Educational Program**

Since the Commission has no enforcement powers except through the state agencies, one of the Commission's functions is that of publicity and education in the promotion of its program for pollution abatement. This is being done by all of the methods available to the Commission, including speeches before public groups, news articles, and from time to time published reports on basin conditions, technical information, and the policies of the Commission.

The News Letter has been continued, being distributed at approximately three-week intervals. The publication contains news of Commission activities and information of interest to persons connected with pollution control and abatement. This News Letter is not only circulated within the basin but also to interested persons throughout the United States.

**Research Program**

The Commission believes additional research is necessary in the field of waste treatment, especially industrial wastes, before pollution abatement can be economically accomplished within the Potomac Basin. In order to further this research the Commission believes it desirable that there
be a clearing house for information between the different agencies studying waste problems. Accordingly the Commission has started a library of waste treatment information and is keeping a bibliography of all material published on this subject. This information is available to interested persons upon request.

A Waste Treatment Guide has been prepared by the commission's industrial committee. This summarizes the known methods of treating wastes of all kinds and will shortly be published and distributed.

While the Commission does not propose to do research work itself, it does plan to promote and stimulate such work and in this connection has planned several projects in which other organizations are interested and which should soon be in operation.

It is the hope of this Commission that this program will not only further the general knowledge of waste treatment but will also prove a means for closer cooperation between industry, the regulatory agencies of the states in the basin, and the Commission.

**THE INTERSTATE OIL COMPACT COMMISSION**

During the past two years, the Interstate Oil Compact Commission has experienced its greatest period of effectiveness in promoting and encouraging the conservation of petroleum and its essential products.

The twelve-year-old Compact Commission naturally spent the first few years of its life in laying the groundwork for its working program, but all recent efforts have been directed toward execution of the basic ideas and principles laid down in the charter and which are fundamental to the Compact and its existence.

With its motto, "Dedicated to the Conservation of Oil and Gas," the Interstate Oil Compact Commission was organized September 12, 1935, to vitalize the provisions of the Interstate Compact to Conserve Oil and Gas which, earlier in the year, had been approved by the legislatures of six states (New Mexico, Oklahoma, Kansas, Colorado, Texas, and Illinois) and ratified by the Congress on August 27, 1935.

Today the Commission's membership consists of nineteen oil and gas producing states and one non-producing associate member. In those states are produced more than 90 per cent of the nation's gas and 80 per cent of the crude oil. The states of Montana, West Virginia, Alabama, and Florida ratified the Compact during 1945. Tennessee and Indiana joined in the early part of 1947.
A voluntary, cooperative association of oil and gas producing states, the Compact Commission has for its sole purpose the promulgation of rules, regulations, and projects to conserve the nation’s oil and gas by the prevention of physical waste.

LEGAL ACTIVITIES

While the Compact Commission is strictly an advisory body, without power of compulsion, the progress that has been made in state oil and gas conservation laws since formation of the Compact is a forceful attestation to the power of cooperative endeavor. During the past two years, many states have strengthened their conservation laws; and entirely new statutes have been enacted in some states. Both Oklahoma and Kansas strengthened their laws during the 1945 legislative sessions. Improved statutes were introduced early during the 1947 sessions in several states.

States of Alabama, Florida, and North Carolina enacted modern, up-to-date oil and gas conservation statutes during 1945. In these states, suggestions and recommendations of the Compact Commission were followed and many provisions of its suggested laws were adopted verbatim. Representatives of the Compact’s headquarters office and the Legal Committee appeared in those states at invitation of state officials for the purpose of assisting in preparation of laws which were later enacted.

Realizing that if conservation is to be fully effective it must start simultaneously with the first oil or gas production, the Commission has aided and encouraged the enactment of oil and gas conservation statutes in many states that have no petroleum production. An example of this is the state of Georgia where a most efficient oil and gas conservation statute to control exploration and development was enacted in contemplation of future production. Enterprise citizens of that state, taking an active interest in conservation, conferred numerous times with Compact Commission representatives and officials. The state’s request for Compact membership resulted in amendment of the by-laws in 1946 to provide for associate membership by states without oil or gas production but with good prospects thereof, and Georgia became the first such member.

The Legal Committee studies all legal aspects of conservation, has prepared three suggested oil and gas conservation statutes, with the idea they may be helpful to public officials in states desiring to draft or amend their laws. These statutes have been revised to embrace the latest concepts of conservation, published in pamphlet form, and widely distributed.

Recognizing that adequate rules and regulations are equally as important in a conservation program as the law itself, the Commission’s Legal and Regulatory Practices committees early began a study of model rules and regulations, making the results available to all states. In practically all states, rules and regulations have been amended. Where non-existent, they have been promulgated, using extensively those suggested by the Regulatory Practices Committee. The model rules and regulations are an object of continuing study, and now are in process of revision to embrace newer development in conservation practices.

TECHNICAL ACTIVITIES

Numerous surveys concerned with secondary recovery, pressure maintenance, natural gas, stripper wells, and other subjects related to conservation have been made by the Commission’s committees. The Research and Coordinating Committee has taken the lead in much of this work. Studies related to well spacing and its effect on conservation, underground gas storage, and unitized operation of oil fields now are being conducted by this committee. During 1946, the Committee submitted a report on allocation of production within oil pools, discussing factors most widely used as bases for such allocation and drawing certain conclusions regarding factors commonly used. Study of natural gas pressure bases also was completed in 1946, the Committee recommending adoption by all conservation agencies of a uniform pressure base of 14.65 p.s.i. in reporting natural gas production.

Reports and forms used by all state conservation agencies have been studied by the Regulatory Practices Committee and standardized uniform forms and reports drafted for the use of all such departments.
A book containing results of an exhaustive study of the best engineering principles in oil and gas production now is being prepared by the Engineering Committee, which is composed of the nation's outstanding petroleum engineers. Compilation and summary of established engineering principles and sound conservation practices, prepared by this committee, have received universal approval of the industry and its engineers.

**Statistical Studies**

Through reports and studies prepared by its Economics Advisory Committee, the Commission keeps constantly informed concerning all factors affecting the statistical and economic position of the petroleum situation. This committee, composed of top-notch petroleum economists of the nation, reports directly to the Commission, but its studies are made available to officials of all member states and the industry in general. Forecasts of anticipated demand prepared by this committee have proved within 1% to 2% of accurate and have been most helpful to state officials in long-range planning.

Current statistics relating to the industry's economic situation are contained in the Commission's monthly *Statistical Bulletin*. Here are incorporated data deemed helpful to state officials in fixing allowable rates of production and in making adjustments essential for the prevention of waste.

**Educational Activities**

A broad educational program designed to emphasize the benefits derived from the conservation of oil and gas, placed in effect slightly more than two years ago, is now reaching its effective stage. The program adopted by the Commission embraces use of motion pictures, film strips, booklets, radio, charts, and exhibits.

The first step in this program was production of a 30-minute sound and color motion picture, *Oil for Tomorrow*, which portrays the story of America's oil, its production and use from prehistoric origin to the present day, emphasizing the necessity of conservation. The Commission owns twenty prints which are available for free showing and are kept in constant circulation. Some seventy-five prints have been purchased by schools, state and industry groups. The film had been shown 4,400 times to about 425,000 people to December, 1946.

A handbook on oil and gas conservation, *Oil in Your Future*, published in 1946, discusses in non-technical language various scientific facts relating to petroleum pointing out the need for conservation. Designed primarily for school and college use, the booklet is available to all state officials, legislators, business groups, and others interested in the broad question of conserving an irreplaceable natural resource. Already 20,000 copies have been printed.

The Commission's monthly newsletter, *Compact Comments*, summarizes highlights of conservation activities, the Commission's program, and work of various state and industry groups tending to establish more efficient production practices.

Numerous articles relating to technical or legal aspects of oil and gas conservation have been prepared or encouraged by the Commission's staff. In addition, the headquarters office has obtained publication of hundreds of articles in magazines, trade journals, and newspapers seeking to foster and strengthen the broad principles of conservation. Several radio programs outlining the Commission's program have been presented.

The *Quarterly Bulletin*, published following each regular Commission meeting, contains all addresses and papers delivered at the meetings and often technical and legal studies presented, but not read, are published in full in the Bulletin. This publication is distributed free to all requesting it and is sent to some 4,000 people in all 48 states.

All studies and reports of the Commission's committees and sub-committees are published and distributed without cost to state and industry representatives and other interested persons.

**Meetings Provide Forum**

The Commission holds quarterly meetings to conduct studies of methods and practices for prevention of physical waste in oil and gas production and for discussion of questions directly or indirectly affecting oil and gas conservation. (During the war, some meetings were omitted.)
Widely attended by state officials and industry representatives, these meetings feature a formal program and open forum discussions. Through the open forum there has been frank and free discussion and review of problems of the states and industry relating to conservation. Here the best thinking is available to all, even the smallest producer. Outstanding engineers, lawyers, economists, and technicians are brought to the Commission's roundtable where the results of their private studies and experiments are presented for information and discussion of the entire petroleum and natural gas industry.
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<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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THE ATLANTIC STATES MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION

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 the Eastern States Conservation Conferences, to which the commissions on interstate cooperation of the Atlantic coastal states sent official delegates. By 1940, these annual meetings had agreed upon a program originated by Frederick L. Zimmermann, 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 contains a discussion of jurisdictional aspects of fishery problems.
mann, research consultant of the New York Joint Legislative Committee on Interstate Cooperation, and agreed to by a drafting committee of representatives from a number of other states. In short, this consisted of a proposed treaty or compact among the coastal states, to be assented to by the Congress, as provided in the Federal Constitution, to create a joint commission to promote "the better utilization of the fisheries, marine, shell, and anadromous, of the 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 or 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, and Connecticut and Florida in 1945, making fourteen states in all. While the earlier of 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 contributed 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 in 1944 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 has no funds other than those provided by the member states and occupies offices in midtown New York.

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 movement for interstate cooperation developed since 1935 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 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 were set up consisting of all the commissioners from each state affected by a particular species. There were organized originally 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 were organized for Chesapeake Bay and for the Delaware River and Bay. So useful were these sections that the Commission later authorized sections covering the whole coast; (1) the North Atlantic section—Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut; (2) the Middle Atlantic section—New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware which were first called the Delaware Bay 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. 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 leadership of Chairman Edmund L. Dunn of Massachusetts and former 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, Delaware, and Maryland.

2. The Uniform Striped Bass Act establishing a minimum size of 16 inches to the fork of the tail, 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 and New Hampshire has prohibited commercial netting. Maryland is giving protection to this fish through its management program and Virginia has increased its size limit to 12 inches overall and set a 25 pound daily limit per angler.

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, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania.

4. The Uniform Blue Crab Act, originally developed in Maryland and Virginia, has been adopted in New York and Delaware.

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 later surpassed 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 was developed, primarily to assist sport fishermen, but action in the northern states has been deferred until the states farther south where this fish is more important take action.

8. Efforts to bring about effective cooperation between Delaware and New Jersey with respect to concurrent fishing laws on Delaware River and Bay have failed so far but will be continued.

9. Similar efforts in respect to the common fisheries of the Potomac River, shared by Maryland and Virginia, have resulted in an agreement between the Commissioners of those two states to create a joint commission with authority to undertake rehabilitation of the common oyster bars and to promulgate regulations with respect thereto but neither state has yet enacted legislation to give effect to such recommendations.

10. Efforts toward the development of adequate state systems of catch statistics are yielding results. Maine, Massachusetts, New York, Maryland, and South Carolina have made substantial progress in this direction.

11. 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.

12. 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. Maryland already had in operation such a program and New York is now considering similar action.

13. At the request of the Commission, a special study has been made 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. These studies reveal that lack of oxygen at certain points in the river is the critical factor which kills young shad fry on their way to the sea. Under concurrent pollution-control statutes already enacted, New Jersey and Pennsylvania, it is believed, will be able to require treatment of wastes sufficient to remedy this situation but it will necessarily take several years.

14. The Commission has explored the possibilities of artificial fertilization of impounded areas and has been corresponding with British and American experimenters.

15. The Commission has also been studying the question of pollution as it affects the fisheries, particularly shellfish areas and what can be done to clear areas now closed. Out of this effort has come a new committee of seventy-five persons on Sanitation in the Industry which will also deal with pollution control. The steering committee of this large committee is now attempting to outline standards and procedures to submit to the larger group. When approved by the Commission, it is expected that these standards and procedures will be recommended to the member states for adoption.

16. The Commission in collaboration with the Council of State Governments sponsored an Exploratory Intercoastal conference in Washington in May, 1946, attended by representatives of the Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coasts. Out of this grew recommendations for a permanent Intercoastal Conference Committee and for the creation of interstate commissions on the Gulf and Pacific coasts. The Commission’s Secretary-Treasurer, Wayne D. Heydecker, and Adviser, Frederick L. Zimmerman, have been assisting officials of the other two coasts in perfecting the compacts drafted for those areas. In both of these drafts are included suggestions for the extension of state jurisdiction over contiguous offshore fisheries along the lines suggested by the Intercoastal conference. The Atlantic Commission through a special committee is considering possible amendments to its own compact for the same purpose.

Whatever success the Commission has had has been due not only to the assistance of the administrators but in large part to the loyal, 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Administrator</th>
<th>Legislator</th>
<th>Governor's Appointee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Richard E. Reed, Commissioner, Sea and Shore Fisheries</td>
<td>Cleveland A. Sleeper, Jr., Representative</td>
<td>Carroll B. Peacock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>Ralph G. Carpenter, Director, Fish and Game Department</td>
<td>Edward J. Hopley, Representative</td>
<td>Oren V. Henderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Archibald K. Sloper, Commissioner of Conservation</td>
<td>George Ward Stetson, Representative</td>
<td>Edmund L. Dunn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>Dr. Raymond G. Bressler, Director, Agriculture and Conservation</td>
<td>Raymond A. McCabe, Senator</td>
<td>Vacancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Dr. John E. Flaherty, President, Board of Fisheries and Game</td>
<td>James G. Hammond, Representative</td>
<td>John R. Bindloss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Perry B. Duckerv, Commissioner, Department of Conservation</td>
<td>Elisha T. Barrett, Assemblyman</td>
<td>Robert L. Doxsee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Frank J. Valgenti, Member, Fish and Game Council</td>
<td>Nathaniel C. Smith, Assemblyman</td>
<td>Charles A. Aspenberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Charles A. French, Commissioner of Fisheries</td>
<td>Thomas B. Stockham, Representative</td>
<td>Vacancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>William M. Davis, President, Board of Fish and Game Commissioners</td>
<td>Howard H. Dickerson, Senator</td>
<td>M. Haswell Pierce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>John E. Clark, Chairman, Department of Tidewater Fisheries</td>
<td>Louis L. Goldstein, Senator</td>
<td>Carl L. Veach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Charles M. Lansford, Jr., Commissioner of Fisheries</td>
<td>W. Collin Chilton, Representative</td>
<td>William P. Hunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Col. J. M. Witsell, Chairman, Board of Fisheries</td>
<td>J. D. Parler, Senator</td>
<td>Charles J. Gehlmann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Charles N. Elliott, Director, Game and Fish Department</td>
<td>Charles L. Owen, Representative</td>
<td>Vacancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>J. Tom Hurst, Supervisor, Board of Conservation</td>
<td>William J. Hendry, Representative</td>
<td>Vacancy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Council of State Governments

Chairman: Edmund L. Dunn, President
Vice-Chairman: John R. Bindloss
Executive Director: Wayne D. Heydecker
Boston Fish Pier, Boston, Massachusetts

Secretary-Treasurer:

*Executive Committee members.
PACIFIC STATES MARINE FISHERIES COMPACT

The mutual responsibility of California, Oregon, and Washington for the conservation of the Pacific offshore fisheries was emphasized at the meeting of the Commissions on Interstate Cooperation of the Eleven Western States in February, 1946. A committee was appointed composed of two members from each of the interested Commissions on Interstate Cooperation to develop means for interstate cooperation in the formulation of uniform regulations, uniform application of such regulations, and of research relating to fisheries development.

During the course of several meetings, the committee drafted, analyzed, and revised a tri-state compact which was adopted in November, 1946. It was modeled after the Atlantic Marine Fisheries Compact.

The stated purpose of the compact is to promote the better utilization of fisheries of mutual concern to the states, and to develop a joint conservation program.

The compact establishes the Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission to which the signatory states appoint one or more representatives. The commission is empowered to recommend the coordination of the police powers of the several states to promote and protect the fisheries. To that end, the commission can draft, and after consultation with commercial fishermen, recommend to the governors and legislative branch of the signatory states legislation dealing with the conservation of fisheries.

The commission may also recommend to the signatory states the stocking of the waters of such states.

The fisheries research agencies of the states act in collaboration as the official research agency of the Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission.

The commission does not have plenary powers. It is essentially an investigating and research body with authority to submit specific recommendations to the respective states.

The statute authorizing the compact was signed by the governors of Washington and Oregon early in 1947, and by the governor of California on July 17. The federal consent statute was signed by the President on July 24.

The actual organization of the Pacific Marine Fisheries Commissions is expected to take place early in 1948.

GULF STATES MARINE FISHERIES COMPACT

Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas are in the process of organizing an interstate fisheries commission for joint promotion, development, and conservation of coastal fisheries in the Gulf of Mexico. Two states, Alabama and Florida, adopted the Gulf States Compact during 1947 legislative sessions.

Interest in the compact method among the states bordering on the Gulf was stimulated by the national Intercoastal Fisheries Conference held at Washington in May, 1946. Subsequently, delegates representing conservation departments and seafood commissions from Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas met in New Orleans on October 10, 1946, in response to a call by the Council of State Governments to initiate plans for establishing a Gulf Fisheries Commission.

A further exploratory interstate meeting, attended by state legislators, state conservationists, and representatives of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, was held at New Orleans on December 5-6, 1946. In discussing and developing a proposed compact, the conference was assisted by representatives of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission. A tentative draft compact was adopted and a continuing conference committee with one delegate from each of the five Gulf states appointed.

On April 10-11, 1947, representatives of the Gulf states met in New Orleans for final action. Legislators, attorneys general, and representatives of conservation agencies, Commissions on Interstate Cooperation, and fishing interests endorsed a final draft and recommended it for approval.
INTERSTATE RELATIONS

by their respective states and the Congress. The Conference also extended the life of the continuing committee until such time as the compact commission is organized.

The Gulf Compact establishes a continuing interstate fisheries commission, similar to the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission and the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission. Each member state is to have three representatives on the compact commission.

The commission is empowered to inquire into and report on methods, practices, circumstances, and conditions relative to physical waste and the prevention of depletion of the Gulf fisheries. It is empowered also to recommend the coordination of state police power and to draft and recommend legislation to further the basic purposes of the compact. The United States Fish and Wildlife Service is designated the primary research agency of the commission, cooperating with comparable agencies in each one of the compacting states.

At the close of 1947, a consent act was pending in the federal Congress. Plans have been made for submission of the Compact in Mississippi and Louisiana during 1948 and in Texas during 1949.
CRIME COMPACT*

With the single exception of The Constitution of the United States—an agreement among all the states, ratified by all the states—more of the states are signatories to the Interstate Compact for the Supervision of Parolees and Probationers than to any other formal agreement calling for coordinated effort and cooperative practices.

Of course, everyone is "opposed" to crime, just as everyone is "in favor of" the sanctity of the home and the inviolability of contracts. But the fact that forty-one states have, by legislative and executive action, ratified a compact calling for formal participation in a reciprocal program for the supervision of parolees and probationers is, nonetheless, a notable achievement.

The interstate "commuting criminals" of the decade preceding the war, who took advantage of every legal device affording protection by state lines, were effectively stopped by a combination of federal-state enforcement machinery developed under a Uniform Crime Control Program.

As a part of this program, and as an integral part of criminal justice, probation and parole had become increasingly difficult to administer. Having as its prime purpose the protection of the community through the rehabilitation of those convicted of crime, state parole and probation administrators were finding that in literally thousands of cases such rehabilitation could be better accomplished by the transfer of the parolee or probationer to another jurisdiction, because of the existence of a family in another state, better opportunities for employment there, or for other sound reasons.

To answer this need, the Interstate Compact for the Supervision of Parolees and Probationers was drafted and signed, in September of 1937, by twenty-five states. Sixteen additional states have since become signatory: Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, Nevada, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Texas are, at present, non-participants.

RULES AND REGULATIONS

Early in the development of administrative procedures under the interstate compact, it was decided to develop rules and regulations, as well as suggested forms standardizing operations, for the mutual benefit of all participating states. Months of meticulous work followed, in the development of separate sets of uniform administrative procedures and practices for probation and parole cases. In July, 1938, these Rules and Regulations were submitted to the Compact Administrators of the signatory states and were approved.

Machinery and record forms are recommended for obtaining the state-to-state permission that is required to authorize any person convicted of an offense in one state to transfer his residence to another state, upon his receiving probation or parole; the receiving state agrees to send periodic reports to the sending state covering the present residence of the probationer or parolee, his type of employment, name of employer, his general conduct and progress, as well as his attitude toward supervision; the receiving state agrees to apply the same standards of supervision to out-of-state probationers and parolees as it does to its own cases; prompt notice of violation of probation or parole is called for and provisions for returning such violators to the sending state for sentencing, re-sentencing, or completion of the full legal term of incarceration are outlined.

It was recognized, in Section 8 of these Rules and Regulations, that the practicalities of day-to-day operations would probably require revision and amendment of the administrative machinery. A means for amending the Rules and Regulations was established.

*Prepared by Joseph H. Hagan, Director of Parole, Probation, and Correctional Services in Rhode Island.
In Practice

There have been suggestions, from time to time, for specific changes in the procedures and forms. The questions raised have had to do with such matters as: (1) Should Section 7 of the Probation Rules be amended to eliminate the collection of court costs or fines by a receiving state? What should be done to encourage probation officers to cooperate in the collection of such expense? (2) Should another section be added to the parole rules having to do with the notification of release of parolees? (3) Should the regulations insist that a waiver of extradition be included in the conditions of probation or parole to be signed by the convicted offender before being permitted to go to another state? (4) What should be done to encourage the more extensive use of the model forms provided for use in interstate parole and probation cases? How can they be simplified? (5) Should an effort be made to have the states concentrate on exchanging quarterly reports? Monthly reports? (6) Should a regulation be drafted making it mandatory for a parolee charged with a serious felony to be prosecuted in the state wherein his most recent alleged felony was committed?

On a broader base, there have been infrequent but insistent complaints and criticisms with respect to the handling of specific cases, either by the receiving or sending state. There is an occasional charge of a state's "unloading" parolees and probationers without seeking the permission of any state as a "receiver." There have been occasions when an interpretation of the Compact, or of its Rules and Regulations, might more gracefully have been made by a disinterested third person or group.

In 1944, at the Annual Conference for the Administrators of the Interstate Compact for the Supervision of Parolees and Probationers, an interim committee was appointed to study the Compact's Rules and Regulations, with instructions to report back to the next annual meeting with its recommendations.

The major recommendation made by that Committee, at our meeting in 1945, called for the establishment of an Interstate Compact Administrators Association, to provide the means and the machinery whereby questions of policy, compact interpretation, administrative regulation, could be officially and continuously acted upon.

Structure

Patterned after the formal statements creating similar organizations of public officials (although greatly and constructively simplified in form and verbiage) the Constitution of the Interstate Compact Administrators Association establishes as its objectives: "to bring the officers, appointed by the Governors of the respective states signatories to the Interstate Compact for the Supervision of Parolees and Probationers into an Organization for the furtherance of mutual acquaintance, to exchange information, and to cooperate together for the effective carrying out of the Compact and the rules and regulations promulgated thereunder, and to secure uniformity in interpretation, practice, and procedure."

Its membership is comprised, ex officio, of the several administrators of the states, including not more than one deputy or assistant administrator. Associate members, comprising other deputies and assistants, are permitted.

In addition to the usual officers, an Executive Committee of the four officers and five other members is provided for, to undertake the business management and operation of the Association.

The burden of work for and in behalf of the Association is devolved upon a Council of five members which constitutes a standing committee on rules and regulations. The Council is to be the clearing house for all matters that may arise under the rules and regulations and the adopted forms. In order to secure uniformity in procedure and practice, any administrator may, at any time, request advice as to the Council's interpretation or opinion on the Compact, its Rules and Regulations, or on administrative practice. A majority opinion of the Council is needed to establish such rulings.

Acting upon the request of the Association, the Council of State Governments has agreed to supply secretarial services to the Administrators Association.

Having cleared away organizational matters incidental to the formation of this
new Association, the administrators of the Interstate Compact for the Supervision of Parolees and Probationers are now preparing to move ahead.

We are hopeful that this continuing organization will prove to be an additional stimulus to interstate cooperation in the fields of probation and parole.

STATES OPERATING UNDER-COOPERATIVE UNIFORM CRIME CONTROL LEGISLATION OR COMPACTS—As of June, 1947

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States</th>
<th>Interstate Fresh Pursuit</th>
<th>Interstate Fresh Pursuit</th>
<th>Extradition</th>
<th>Out-of-State Witnesses</th>
<th>Enabling Legislation</th>
<th>Compact</th>
<th>Law of Arrest</th>
<th>Firearms</th>
<th>Narcotic Drugs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The states listed with stars in the table have adopted the model acts, recommended by either the Interstate Commission on Crime or the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws or similar legislation.
The past two years, covering roughly six months of fighting and one and a half years of readjustment to peacetime conditions, are replete with accomplishments and implications in the area of state relationships with the federal government and its agencies. An ample review would extend “across the board” to substantially all the functions of government.

It is possible here only to indicate trends established by events of note in legislative, review and action, particularly by a Congress that was in session for all but a few months of the entire period, and by action of the Executive and the Judiciary. This properly must be supplemented by action at the state level. The product is in large part an abridgment of what has been published, in various bulletins and reports of the Council of State Governments, augmented by glimpses of the federal budgets and reports and of state reports.

In legislative matters of mutual concern to the states and the federal government, the procedure developed during the past six years jointly by the Council of State Governments through its Drafting Committee of State Officials and the Department of Justice through its Federal-State Relations Section, has filled a gap heretofore neglected in an area alive with problems pressing for solution.

The 79th Congress, which adjourned August 2, 1946, took action on several fronts of concern to the states of the Union. Among these are the Legislative Reorganization and the Employment Acts. The latter established the continuing policy of the federal government, with the cooperation of industry, agriculture, labor, and state and local governments, to coordinate and utilize all its plans, functions, and resources to promote free competitive enterprise and maximum employment. A council of Economic Advisers to the President was set up, and this body in exercising its powers was directed to consult with state and local governments and other groups.

In transmitting his first Economic Report to the Congress, in January, 1947, the President stated:

The federal government is engaged in several programs of grants-in-aid to state and local governments involving large amounts of money and further programs are planned. These programs, particularly those related to health and education, public works, and road and airport construction, contribute greatly toward bringing all sections of the country up to the levels of productivity consistent with American standards of living.

I have asked the Council of Economic Advisers to cooperate with the Bureau of the Budget and other federal agencies concerned, and with state and local advisory committees, to undertake a study of federal grants to state and local governments to determine to what extent revised standards for the distribution of these grants may take into account more fully the needs for support that exist in various parts of the country.

The proposal for a study of federal grants was also made in the Senate, but failed of passage.
Among the other subjects acted on by the Congress, in addition to those discussed separately under the heading of "Grants," were those creating the Retraining and Reemployment Administration, to coordinate the activities of all federal and state agencies dealing with problems of retraining, reemployment, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation; providing that the states should retain the power of regulating the insurance business until January 1, 1948; adoption of the state absentee ballot for servicemen’s voting; and authorizing federal participation in the improvement and protection of shore lines.

Not all the measures before the Congress were approved, as would be expected. Among those that fell by the wayside, after receiving consideration, were such problems as federal aid to elementary and secondary education, extension of social security to employees of state and local governments, water pollution control, a broader housing program, and the local taxation of federal property. The disposal of surplus war property, one of the major postwar problems, was given extensive consideration. Efforts to effect an acceptable solution resulted in various reorganizations, and portions of the task were shunted from one agency to another, finally being lodged with the War Assets Administration. One of its unsolved problems is the return of approximately 700 military airports to the states or municipalities, on recommendation of the CAA. Action was taken to give priority to state and local units in this disposal problem, but not always to the entire satisfaction of the latter.

A report on multiple taxation of the aviation industry was published as a House document, but action to avoid multiple taxation was taken by neither the federal government nor the states. Several decisions in the field of taxation were announced by the courts, including the right of the states to tax machinery owned by the RFC, under certain conditions, and the right to levy real estate taxes on property sold on the installment plan by the federal government to a private purchaser. The question of whether the federal government or the states should have the rights to oil deposits in offshore tidelands was still before the Supreme Court.

It should be noted, in addition to the official commissions mentioned elsewhere, that the President has announced his appointment of committees on universal military training and on higher education. The President also was responsible for a highway safety conference, and endorsed the juvenile delinquency conference held late in 1946, in which the states and many cities participated and offered their cooperation to aid on this problem. President Truman sent a message to the governors asking their cooperation and assuring them they would be welcomed at the White House to discuss problems of mutual interest. One development of a cooperative nature is the federal assistance offered the State Budget Directors Conference, held at Asheville in the fall of 1946. In response to the President’s request that the states withhold all but the most urgent public works, in order to facilitate housing for veterans, the replies evidenced definite compliance accompanied by directives to that end. These items are cited as evidence of the range of governmental services in which progress is made by cooperative state and federal action. Government—especially big government—with its checks and balances, sometimes appears to move very slowly—yet progress it does.

**Federal Grants-in-Aid**

The range of programs and the dollar value represented by federal grants-in-aid comprises one of the most satisfactory measures of federal-state fiscal relations during any period. Grant programs originate from the recognition by the Congress that certain activities conducted by states or local governments are clothed with a national interest, and funds are consequently authorized to aid in financing their cost to the extent of such interest. Authorizations for such purposes are to be distinguished, of course, from those for payments to individuals, associations, and other private groups, which may be termed subsidies.

Grants may be classified as regular (or ordinary) and emergency (war or unemployment relief, etc.). Regular grants are usually in cash, and in most instances the state is required to match the federal payment as well as comply with other condi-
ations stipulated by the legislation. In the case of emergency grants, the federal government finances substantially the entire cost of the facility or service. Further, a federal agency may supply the facilities or service on behalf of the state or local government; in this event, the grant is in kind rather than in cash.

The federal government has adopted a policy also of sharing certain types of receipts with states and subdivisions, and these shared revenues are a type of grant. Tabular statements of expenditures for regular federal grants to states and of shared revenues for five-year intervals 1930 through 1945, and estimated expenditures for 1947 are presented in Tables 1 and 2.

The data are arranged in accordance with a new functional classification recently adopted by the Budget Bureau cooperatively with the Treasury Department and the General Accounting Office (but which, unfortunately, is not uniform with that commonly used by state and local governments), and the major programs are discussed briefly in the order of presentation. Data for 1947 are supplied to reflect more nearly currently the effect of legislation enacted by the 79th Congress on federal-state fiscal relationships.

In examining the programs classed herein as grants, it should be borne in mind that there is no universal agreement as to what constitutes a "grant," as there are several other types of federal payments to states, including contractual agreements, reimbursements, and the like. Examination of the financial reports of a state as to its manner of recording the receipt of federal funds will make this clear.

An example of federal payments to states not included in Table 1 is the supply and distribution of farm labor program—in which the state acts as an agent of the federal government, rather than conducting such activity as one of its ordinary operations. The table omits, of course, grants made solely to local units, although these may merit recognition by the state. Omitted also are grants for the war emergency, which for the most part are being discontinued. The amount of such payments, plus a residue of grants for relief purposes, during the fiscal year 1946, was as follows (in thousands):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency maternity and infant care</td>
<td>$36,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community facilities, defense public works</td>
<td>54,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension Service—transfer from War Food Administration</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic highway network</td>
<td>8,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access roads</td>
<td>18,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway surveys and plans</td>
<td>1,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flight strips, highways</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and training, defense workers</td>
<td>2,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, war emergency</td>
<td>$120,880</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Liquidation of Public Works Administration  | 4,220    |
Highway funds, NIR, Acts of 1933, 1934, and 1935 emergency relief | 3,180    |

Total, emergency relief                       | 7,400    |
Grand total, emergency purposes               | $128,280 |

**Veterans' Services and Benefits**

Table 1 shows that, except for the long-established annual payments for state homes for disabled soldiers and sailors, the programs under this heading are recent, an outgrowth of the war. The program providing for supervision of on-the-job training emphasizes the fact that, since education is acknowledged to be a state function, its success and relative economy are responsibilities of the several states. The service was authorized by Public Law 679, adopted in August, 1946.

About the same time a law was enacted authorizing the Federal Works Agency to provide needed educational facilities, other than housing, to educational institutions furnishing courses of training or education to veterans. While some non-public schools and colleges are recipients of this service, it is desirable to classify the activity as a grant, especially as all institutions—public and private—receiving the facilities are under the supervision of a state educational agency.

State administration of veterans' unemployment benefits became operative under the provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944. Here, again, while
the federal government meets the cost of the benefits, it is desirable that the states maintain an alert job counseling service for the veterans, in order to assure a maximum of effectiveness in results and economy of the program.

**Social Welfare, Health, and Security.**

This functional group includes a diversity of grant programs, which, in the aggregate, accounted for three-fourths of all federal funds paid over to the states in the form of regular grants in 1945. Even under the changing conditions existing in postwar 1947, the group will account for over one-half of such payments; this, though some of the newly authorized services in this category are just getting under way.

In the social welfare group, administered by the Social Security Administration (formerly a Board), the three categorical aids have not been broadened as yet to provide general assistance, but for the five quarters beginning October, 1946, through December, 1947, the Congress liberalized the rates of individual payment so that the states will pay less than one-half the total assistance expenditures. The new maximum for federal government participation is $45 per month for both old-age assistance and aid to the blind, and for aid to children it is $24 for the first child and $15 for each additional child in the same home. Under the formula adopted, the federal share is two-thirds of the first $15 of monthly payments of old-age assistance and of aid to the blind, and one-half of the remainder up to the federal maximum share of $25; in the case of aid to dependent children, the federal share is two-thirds of the first $9, and half of the remainder up to the federal maximum of $13.50 for the first child and of $9 for each additional child. A minor improvement also may be noted, namely, that for administrative costs of old-age assistance, one-half will be met from federal funds, instead of 5 per cent of the grant. These revisions mean more federal money to the states during the period because, to a large extent, the latter have acted to increase the payments to the needy.

In connection with the Congressional hearings on this subject, consideration was given to the adoption of the principle of variable grants—i.e., grants measured by need and fiscal ability of the state, the latter based on per capita income payments—for the several welfare services, but acceptance was deferred at least for the present in favor of the higher level of payments. Numerous bills designed to extend both the coverage and benefits of these services were introduced into both sessions of the 79th Congress and, while not enacted, the thoroughgoing discussions undoubtedly advanced the cause of a broader social security plan. The House report entitled "Issues in Social Security" is to be followed by a companion study authorized by the Senate.

The President's reorganization plan number two transferred the Children's Bureau from the Department of Labor to the Federal Security Agency, effective midsummer 1946. The Congress, in the act affecting the special assistance programs, also raised, on a permanent basis, the authorizations for the three programs supervised by this Bureau. The total for the three services is now $22 million, plus an additional $1 million for administration. Thus, the states are in position to receive more than twice the amount of federal funds formerly available annually for child care.

The vocational rehabilitation program, established after the end of World War I (1920), affords an interesting example of how a federally aided service grows—and the peak is not yet. The second World War, with its attendant problems of manpower-supply and rehabilitation of servicemen, led to the greatly strengthened amendments of 1943, although veterans' groups succeeded in obtaining a separate law, so this act is limited to civilians and to rehabilitating for employment. Federal funds meet the entire costs of administration and vocational guidance and placement, while services purchased for clients, i.e., medical treatment, prosthetic appliances, vocational training, etc., for other than war disabled civilians are paid for on an equal matching basis. The growth of the activity, both in number receiving attention and in range of services, means that the states are also increasing this item in their budgets.
The health of the people of the nation has continued to receive more and more attention during recent years, not only through the cooperation of the Public Health Service with the states, but as well by the states and their local health districts directly. The federal grant for general assistance to the states has increased two-fold during the past decade, while the social disruptions of the war emphasized the necessity for controls of venereal diseases to be intensified. When one remembers that federal funds for these public health activities are matched 100 per cent by federal or local funds, it becomes evident that the annual aggregate expenditures are substantially higher.

Beginning in 1945, the problem of eliminating tuberculosis has received the blessing of a federal grant, and, with the expenditure of at least an equal amount by the states or subdivisions, it is being gradually stepped up. The last Congress inaugurated two other public health programs—hospital and construction activities, and mental health service—both of which acts were signed by President Truman in the summer of 1946. An initial grant of $2,350,000 was appropriated for surveys by the states of their hospital needs and plans for hospital construction. The Congressional authorization of $75 million for each of five years for construction purposes will be implemented by appropriations in later years. A Federal Hospital Council was appointed by the Surgeon General for counseling purposes, and the states generally are proceeding with their surveys. In the case of both the initial surveys and the construction costs, the act provides that the federal share is limited to one-third.

The act promoting research and treatment for psychiatric disorders expanded, by amendment of the Public Health Service Act, a type of work already being conducted on a limited scale by that service. It also provided for grants to the states to aid in maintaining such activity and for training personnel, with the usual provision that the states must "match" the federal outlay.

Housing and Community Facilities

The only grant entered under this heading is that for federal advances—i.e., loans to state and local units for the preparation of advance planning of public works. In authorizing these advances, the Congress recognized the merit of having created a reservoir of fully planned useful public works, especially at the state and local levels, to serve as a stabilizing influence in the construction industry and subject to economic conditions. It was definitely understood that whenever the planned facilities were constructed, the advances should be repaid; further, responsibility by the federal government for financing the capital costs was specifically disavowed. Under these conditions, some might term the program a "loan-in-aid" rather than a grant; it remains true, however, that only with such advances could much of the public works planning have been done. By the end of 1946, advances of $50 million had provided planned public works estimated to cost over $1.5 billion, only a portion, however, of which was by state governments. In addition, over $800 million of federal-aid highways had been planned.

Omission of any grant programs for housing does not mean that cooperative relationships do not exist in that field. Housing needs are so urgent that it is the responsibility of all levels of government to help meet them, and recognition of this fact brings its own results. It is a question of concept whether the veterans' re-use housing program, involving over $400 million in 1946 and 1947, should be classified as a grant—although not included in the tabulation. The Federal Public Housing Authority is providing temporary housing for distressed veterans and servicemen by cooperative arrangements with local governments, educational institutions (some, of course, state agencies), local public agencies, and nonprofit organizations. Thus, the states are affected by the federal activities within their jurisdictions. Regional and local expediers of the program have worked closely with state and local agencies to effectuate maximum results.

Many states have enacted legislation to permit the state and local agencies to provide or cooperate in providing veterans' housing, by supplying sites, facilities, etc. Some of the laws authorize local participation required under federal law to obtain
federal aid, and in some instances, to spend local funds for the purpose. Further, some states have, appropriated funds supplementing federal and local funds for temporary housing.

The federal program of low-income housing, conducted by FPHA directly with local housing agencies, to which grants-in-aid totaling about $8 million annually are paid, also is of direct concern. New York, in fact, has a parallel program. The federal program has been held back because, first, the war, and now high costs and materials scarcity. Expansion of the program, and also that of urban redevelopment, was contemplated in the W-E-T bill, which passed the Senate unanimously in the last session but was held up in the House. While federal assistance in some form may be forthcoming ultimately for both of these important issues, the major incentive and support for them must rest with the states.

EDUCATION AND GENERAL RESEARCH

Authorization was approved by the last Congress to expand vocational education gradually from approximately $22 million to $36 million, but as it was not possible to determine to what extent firm commitments might be made by the states to match the additional funds, the expenditure data in the tabulation make no provision for its immediate growth. This program, of course, is distinct from the education of veterans which is supervised by Veterans' Administration. It is realized that part-time training and work experience programs for occupational adjustment of youths and adults, including persons demobilized, will be essential. A Presidential Commission on Higher Education is actively engaged in a study of this aspect of the broader field.

A single year's program was authorized to permit the Office of Education to make payments to the states for education of the public in food conservation, the results of which it is hoped will be of lasting value. The Federal Works Agency was voted a final $7 million to maintain schools in war congested areas originally provided through the Lanham Act.

In the disposal of surplus war commodities, arrangements were made to give special discounts to public educational institutions and health agencies to enable them to acquire equipment particularly useful to them.

AGRICULTURE AND AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

The gradual growth in amount of grants for extension work results from the 1945 amendment which authorized an annual increase of $4 million through the fiscal year 1948, only a portion of which is matched by the states. A new research and marketing act was approved in 1946, authorizing a greatly extended program to reach a minimum of $61 million by 1951 for cooperative research on utilization of agricultural commodities and for improvement of distribution and marketing of products. A portion of the amount will be for grants to states through their experiment stations and extension services, but the activity will not get under way until fiscal-1948.

The largest item in this group is the school lunch program which, while it has operated since the early forties, was finally recognized in 1946 by the passage of the National School Lunch Act. Under this law the program is financed by its own appropriation whereas it formerly was financed from "section 32" funds, i.e., an amount equal to 30 per cent of customs duties collected during the preceding calendar year and made available for exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities. Of the sum appropriated, except $10 million, 75 per cent is apportioned among the states on the basis of (a) number of school children 5 to 17 years of age and (b) need for assistance as indicated by per capita income of the states; $10 million is apportioned for non-food assistance; 3½ per cent is for administration; and the remainder is available to the Secretary of Agriculture for direct purchase of foods to be distributed to the schools. The federal dollar is matched equally by a state dollar until 1951; for 1951 through 1955, it is matched by $1.50, and thereafter $3, from state sources. This program is classified under Social Welfare, Health, and Security by federal agencies.

Section 32 funds continue to be used to purchase agricultural commodities dis-
tributed through state welfare agencies, and this activity is classified herein as a grant in kind.

TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATION

This second largest of the grant classes consisted almost solely, until recently, of the highway-aid programs, but with the signing of the Federal Airport-Aid Act in May, 1946, that program was added.

Table 1 shows wide fluctuations in the amount of funds granted for the regular highway projects. In 1930, three-fourths of all regular grant funds were for highways; in 1935, the amount was down to 30 per cent, because nearly all highway construction was financed from emergency relief funds. By 1940, the social security programs had entered, to reduce permanently the proportion of all grant funds going into highways; and again in 1945, the war emergency had the effect of slowing down the "regular" program while attention was centered on the strategic network and access roads. With the war's end, the three-year postwar construction of $1.5 billion authorized by the 1944 act is getting under way.

The Federal-Aid Airport Act was adopted after long drawn-out arguments in both branches of the Congress as to its terms, procedure, and amount. It provides for the preparation of a national system of airports and authorizes $500 million over a 7-year period for development of public airports and $3 million for surveys and plans. Of the sums appropriated for development, 75 per cent is apportioned to the states on the basis of population and area (land and water); the remaining 25 per cent is a discretionary fund to pay the United States' share of projects as decided by the Civil Aeronautics Administrator. Federal funds must be matched by the sponsors, which may be any public body.

Initial appropriations were made of $45 million for airports and $3 million for surveys, which are under way. The Civil Aeronautics Administration has released its plan for development of smaller airports to the extent of funds available. No major airports are included in this plan, as time has not permitted approval by the Congress, as is required by the law. It also issued regulations governing the procedure for project sponsors, after changes based on criticisms of state and local officials.

LABOR

A national system of public employment offices was established in 1933 and operated by the states until, at the request of President Roosevelt, it was transferred to federal control on January 1, 1942, for the duration of the war. With the end of the war, one of the major issues between the federal government and the states was the return of the service to the states.

Late in 1945, the Congress, after hearings, provided, in a legislative rider to a recommit bill, for its return within 100 days. President Truman pocket-vetoed the bill, however, on the ground that the service would be disrupted—although favoring return of the system at a proper time—and because of the method followed by the Congress. Prior to its adjournment in the summer of 1946, the Congress provided in the Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill for its return on November 15, and the measure was approved. The work of these offices was extended to include job counseling and placement service for veterans. Close cooperation between these offices and those administering unemployment compensation is assured by joint procedures of the Department of Labor and the Federal Security Agency.

It is possible that the National Guard should be included in the list of federal grants under the initial functional classification, National Defense. This service is in process of reorganization on a peacetime basis, and the exact fiscal relationship to be maintained with the states is not known at the moment. The federal budget shows grants of only $48,000 in 1946 and $22 million in 1947.

To those interested in knowing the distribution of federal funds state by state, the latest year's data are published annually in the Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury. Similar data, not so detailed, are available in the state series of reports published by the Government's Division of the Census Bureau. The figures for the fiscal year 1946 are available in B-X 266, Grants-in-Aid and Other Federal Expenditures within the States, published, May, 1947, by the Council of State Governments.
### Table 1

**Regular Federal Grant Payments to States:**

**Selected Years, 1930–1947***

(In thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function and Agency</th>
<th>1930</th>
<th>1935</th>
<th>1940</th>
<th>1945</th>
<th>Estimated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Veterans’ Services and Benefits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans’ Administration: Federal aid to state homes, in the on-the-job training program</td>
<td>$575</td>
<td>$487</td>
<td>$979</td>
<td>$1,194</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans’ Administration: Grants to states for supervision of establishments engaged in the on-the-job training program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Works Agency—Bureau of Community Facilities: Veterans’ educational facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Works Agency—Bureau of Community Facilities: Grants to states for administration of veterans’ unemployment and self-employment benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Veterans’ Services and Benefits</strong></td>
<td>$575</td>
<td>$487</td>
<td>$979</td>
<td>$1,194</td>
<td>$70,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Welfare, Health, and Security</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Security Agency—Social Security Administration: Old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and aid to the blind</td>
<td>279,181</td>
<td>401,400</td>
<td>615,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Bureau: Child-welfare services</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,488</td>
<td>1,363</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maternal and child health services</td>
<td>4,767</td>
<td>5,486</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Services for crippled children</td>
<td>3,291</td>
<td>3,619</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: Payments to states and territories, Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>1,029</td>
<td>2,082</td>
<td>7,155</td>
<td>14,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health Service: Control of venereal diseases</td>
<td>4,188</td>
<td>9,482</td>
<td>12,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control of tuberculosis</td>
<td>9,439</td>
<td>10,913</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General assistance to states</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hospital and construction activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Social Welfare, Health, and Security</strong></td>
<td>746</td>
<td>1,029</td>
<td>362,771</td>
<td>475,427</td>
<td>730,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing and Community Facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Works Agency—Bureau of Community Facilities: Public works advance planning</td>
<td>22,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education and General Research</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Security Agency—Office of Education: Vocational education</td>
<td>7,386</td>
<td>9,997</td>
<td>19,835</td>
<td>19,811</td>
<td>20,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Food conservation, payment to states</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Payments to states and territories</td>
<td>4,335</td>
<td>4,384</td>
<td>16,848</td>
<td>6,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Works Agency—Bureau of Community Facilities: Maintenance and operation of schools</td>
<td>2,550</td>
<td>2,550</td>
<td>5,030</td>
<td>5,030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Security Agency—American Printing House for the Blind: To promote education of the blind</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Education and General Research</strong></td>
<td>10,011</td>
<td>12,622</td>
<td>24,530</td>
<td>24,956</td>
<td>32,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agriculture and Agricultural Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Agriculture—Extension Service: Payments to States and Territories</td>
<td>7,540</td>
<td>8,580</td>
<td>18,458</td>
<td>18,715</td>
<td>27,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Experiment Stations: Payments to states and territories</td>
<td>4,335</td>
<td>4,384</td>
<td>6,848</td>
<td>6,972</td>
<td>7,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production and Marketing Administration—Exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities: School lunch program</td>
<td>2,550</td>
<td>2,550</td>
<td>5,030</td>
<td>5,030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Purchase of commodities for distribution through state welfare and other authorized agencies</td>
<td>117,817</td>
<td>8,333</td>
<td>31,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Agriculture and Agricultural Resources</strong></td>
<td>11,875</td>
<td>12,964</td>
<td>143,123</td>
<td>81,862</td>
<td>143,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Resources Not Primarily Agricultural</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Agriculture—Forest Service: Forest-fire cooperation</td>
<td>1,383</td>
<td>1,503</td>
<td>1,988</td>
<td>5,946</td>
<td>7,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm and other private forestry cooperation</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Interior—Fish and Wildlife Service: Federal aid in wildlife restoration</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>1,415</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Natural Resources Not Primarily Agricultural</strong></td>
<td>1,463</td>
<td>1,547</td>
<td>2,655</td>
<td>7,473</td>
<td>9,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Prepared by C. E. Rightor, Fiscal Division, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President.
### Table 1—Continued

**REGULAR FEDERAL GRANT PAYMENTS TO STATES: SELECTED YEARS, 1930-1947**

*In thousands*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function and Agency</th>
<th>1930</th>
<th>1935</th>
<th>1940</th>
<th>1945</th>
<th>1947 Estimated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation and Communication</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Maritime Commission: State marine schools</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal aid secondary or feeder roads</td>
<td>18,355</td>
<td>13,453</td>
<td>18,547</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elimination of grade crossings</td>
<td>29,522</td>
<td>5,547</td>
<td>5,522</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public lands highways</td>
<td>2,128</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal aid postwar highways</td>
<td>130,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal-aid airport program</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Transportation and Communication</strong></td>
<td>77,948</td>
<td>13,453</td>
<td>133,047</td>
<td>33,998</td>
<td>183,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Labor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Labor—U.S. Employment Service: Grants to states for public employment offices</td>
<td>1,927</td>
<td>3,367</td>
<td>42,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand total, Regular Grants</strong></td>
<td>102,608</td>
<td>44,029</td>
<td>693,072</td>
<td>624,510</td>
<td>1,234,055</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Loans-in-aid, to states and local governments.*


*Does not include $272 million National Industrial Recovery and emergency funds.*

---

### Table 2

**FEDERAL REVENUES SHARED WITH STATES: SELECTED YEARS, 1930-1947**

*In thousands*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function and Agency</th>
<th>1930</th>
<th>1935</th>
<th>1940</th>
<th>1945</th>
<th>1947 Estimated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Resources Not Primarily Agricultural</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Power Commission: Payments to states</td>
<td>$13</td>
<td>$65</td>
<td>$19</td>
<td>$27</td>
<td>$24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Interior—Bureau of Land Management: Payments to states from receipts under Grazing Act</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>480</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments to Oklahoma from royalties, oil and gas, south half Red River</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments to states from receipts under Mineral Leasing Act of 1920</td>
<td>1,388</td>
<td>1,202</td>
<td>2,153</td>
<td>4,086</td>
<td>3,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Interior—Bureau of Reclamation: Payments to states from potash deposits, royalties, and rental, Act 560577</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Interior—Bureau of Reclamation: Colorado River Dam fund, Boulder Canyon project (Boulder Dam) payments to Arizona and Nevada</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>War Department—civil functions:</strong> Corps of Engineers: Payments to states, Flood Control Act of 1938</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee Valley Authority: Payments to states, etc., in lieu of taxes</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>2,145</td>
<td>1,650</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Agriculture—Forest Service: Payments to states from National Forests fund</td>
<td>1,565</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>1,192</td>
<td>4,139</td>
<td>3,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments to school funds, Arizona and Nevada</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Revenues Shared with States</strong></td>
<td>3,049</td>
<td>2,123</td>
<td>4,478</td>
<td>11,830</td>
<td>10,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Prepared by C. E. Rightor, Fiscal Division, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President.*
State-Local Relations

During the recent war period the problems of state-local relations were largely subordinated to the all-consuming task of winning the war. Differences between state and local officials gave way to cooperation in meeting whatever situation arose, and there can be no doubt that the all-out war effort of the United States was greatly aided by the teamwork of the state and local governments. Many problems on the state-local level which in the normal course of events would have been tackled and in some instances perhaps solved are with us today because they have of necessity been neglected over the last several years.

Since the war came to a close, we have been made increasingly cognizant of the need to turn our attention once more to the study of government and government problems on the state and local level. Certain functions of the state were taken over by the Federal Government during the war and some of these are now being returned to the states. During the same period the states assumed many additional duties, some of which were normally carried on by local government, and now there is a tendency to turn some of these matters back to the local units. The need for cooperation between the states and local government units in settling problems today is just as great and just as desirable as it was during the war and it is to be hoped that this same spirit of cooperation will continue in the years ahead. In fact, the success of most any state-local program is dependent upon the close and friendly relationship of state and local officials. Furthermore, a successful state-local program in many cases depends in part upon federal assistance, and it is equally desirable that the Federal Government and the states work together on coordinated plans for the welfare of the whole people of the country.

Over the last dozen years we have heard a great deal about the declining importance of the states in the lives of the people in contrast to the increasing importance of the Federal Government. It has even been suggested that the states give way to an administrative reorganization of the United States upon a regional basis with greater emphasis than ever before upon the federal jurisdiction and a corresponding decline in the area of state authority. We have been told that the states either can not or will not meet vital social and economic problems facing our people and that we must in consequence look to the Federal Government whence cometh all things good.

Since the close of the war, however, we are once more turning to the states for assistance in meeting our problems in the conviction that such matters can be handled better by governments that are closer to the people. The states are no longer on the defensive in their relations with the Federal Government and they are becoming increasingly active in the preservation of their dignity and rights. Many of them

*Prepared by Carl M. Frasure, Head of the Department of Political Science, West Virginia University.
have over the past several years developed more extensive programs of public health, public education, aid to agriculture, industrial safety for workers, and labor conciliation services. More recently such matters as public housing, particularly for veterans, have taken on increasing importance at the state level. More and more, the people are expecting the state to aid them in the solution of problems that are obviously state-wide in many cases. The states, therefore, have never been more important than they are today and they promise to be even more so in the period immediately ahead.

In all of these matters and in many more the states have a very real responsibility to their people. Perhaps too often in the past we have justified federal encroachment upon what heretofore had been the domain of the states by declaring that it was necessary since the states refused to act or could not act in meeting their own problems. In other words, if the states are slow to move in attempting to solve matters of concern to the people, we may expect that the people will turn to the Federal Government for legitimate assistance. State governments are under obligation, therefore, to take all necessary action to protect the welfare of the people, and if they fail in their responsibility federal intervention is inevitable and it will be welcomed.

As time goes on we can take for granted that the people will demand increased services from one governmental unit or the other. This was true after World War I and it is true today. If their wants are not satisfied by the unit of government closest home they are going to appeal to some higher authority for assistance. Expansion of the cost of government is inevitable. Improved methods of transportation, good roads, streets, and airports, better schools, and higher health standards are being demanded by people everywhere. State legislatures generally in 1947 have responded to public opinion on these and many other matters, with the result that every indication points in the direction of improved facilities for travel, better schools, and a more healthy people in the future. And furthermore the people appear to be perfectly willing, wherever necessary, to be taxed to provide these improved and increased services.

Generally speaking the states are in excellent financial condition to go forward with a legislative program calling for larger expenditures for services to the people. Most of them have followed the sound policy over the past several years of accumulating a surplus in the treasury during good times in order to meet the needs of a declining prosperity later on. Unfortunately the cities are not in as favorable a financial position as the states, which again emphasizes the fact that the continued close cooperation between the states and local governments is essential to provide the most efficient administration of the taxpayer's dollar.

With the war economy at an end and millions of people available for employment in peacetime industries we are faced with perhaps our most important internal problem in attempting to maintain a high standard of employment. Thus far we have succeeded in meeting this problem beyond our fondest dreams of two or three years ago. At that time, we estimated that perhaps as many as six or eight million people would be unemployed within a year or two following the close of the war. Fortunately this situation has not arisen, and instead we are developing a peacetime economy that promises considerable employment and stability for an indefinite period of time. This fact has made it possible for states to continue to conserve a part of their war-gained surplus and to spread out over a much longer period a public-works program to provide needed employment. At the same time, the states' unemployment compensation funds, built up during the war years, have remained on a sound financial basis and are mostly available to meet the need which may be created by a recession or depression in the future.

Education

As we noted above, the people are demanding improved and increased services now that the war is over. This is seen perhaps most clearly in education on both the secondary and college or university level. A greatly expanded educational program has marked the short period since the close of hostilities. The new federal education bill for veterans has more than anything else spearheaded this educational move-
ment. Colleges and universities are trying to take care of enrollments that far exceed their facilities to provide the best educational program. To meet these student demands tremendous building projects, despite the high costs of construction, are under way in most institutions of higher learning. Teaching staffs have been somewhat augmented but still the classroom load is very heavy for staff members. All this has necessitated greatly increased expenditures with the money spent by public colleges and universities coming from state treasuries. Present indications are that most states are meeting this veteran "back to college" movement even though the quality of education provided may not in all cases be comparable to that which the institutions would offer under more nearly normal circumstances.

The veteran education program has also made itself felt in the secondary school systems of the states with the great problems here being the demands for larger salaries for teachers and the increased costs for current expenses and plant expansion. In many states the cost of the secondary school program is met largely by state appropriations and there is a growing tendency for the people to look to the state for increased funds for their school system. Local government units would have difficulty in many states in raising the required revenue to meet the growing needs of their schools. The local property tax is their largest single source of revenue and they have just about exhausted its possibilities. Some cities are resorting increasingly to a variety of local taxes on business and certain types of sales such as cigarettes and liquor. Even so, local government units must look to the states for a considerable share of the money needed to meet their educational problems.

During the war, school repair and building programs practically came to a halt. Now with the return of the veteran to the public schools and the normal increase in school attendance we are faced with inadequate physical facilities to meet everyday needs. This situation is intensified by the introduction in many cases of a more elaborate curriculum which often requires classroom and shop space out of proportion to the number of students taking such courses.

We are faced, therefore, with a tremendous backlog of building needs. In meeting this problem local government is not only handicapped by inability in some instances to get necessary materials but by the high cost of building construction and equipment. Here again, with limits upon the ability of local government to increase its revenue, it must look to the state for assistance.

Close cooperation between the state and local units of government can go a long way in solving the educational problem but any program of assistance should incorporate certain fundamental principles. Unless the state makes it clear that there is a limit to the financial assistance which local government can expect, it is inevitable that the demands upon it for funds will grow as time goes on. Very soon the local units will learn to go to the state with outstretched hands for aid in meeting any and all financial needs. Unless the state has unlimited funds at its disposal, and none has, state services must inevitably suffer because of the growing demands of local government. The state might well determine its own ability to aid the local units financially and then translate this ability into a minimum program at state expense. A definite program of state assistance would aid materially in stabilizing local finance. The needs of the local schools beyond the minimum prescribed by the state would then be met by local taxation. Any minimum state program, however, must recognize that the cities and counties are relatively weak financially and that they have very few sources from which to supplement their present finances.

The state has a real responsibility to aid the local units in establishing the best school system possible but there is a limit to the assistance which the state can provide. This limit should be determined and become the guiding principle in any state-local school aid program. Once the amount of state aid has been determined it will be possible to move toward a greater stabilization of state as well as local finance.

With state assistance to local government units some control must be exercised by the state over the expenditure of the money provided. Yet this control should be limited as far as possible. The state
should do no more than lay down certain broad principles of expenditure control and minimum standards with the fundamental responsibility for the educational program left to the local school authorities. If educational policy comes finally to be centralized at state capitol's we should naturally expect that the pride and interest of the people in their school system will decline. Local autonomy must be and can be preserved even with a considerable degree of financial assistance from the state to local government units.

At the present time, we are faced with another aspect of this grant-in-aid problem. 'All indications point toward federal assistance for the public schools of the country in the near future. Many people are fearful that such assistance will be accompanied by a degree of federal control that will tend finally to destroy the independence of our public school system. They point to certain other federal programs, some of which are in effect today, as evidence that Federal Government aid means government control with the states having very little discretion in the administration of the program within their borders.

To me this does not seem to be a necessary corollary of national government assistance to programs that benefit a large number of our people. In the first place federal aid to education should be channeled to the states with some designated state agency assuming the responsibility for allocating such aid to the local units on the basis of an educational program formulated by the respective states. Federal aid to education must be kept free of federal dictation or it will not only destroy the basic purpose for which such assistance is granted but it will prove to be unacceptable to the states. Federal assistance for roads provides us with a pattern of government cooperation that must be followed in principle in any program of national assistance to the public schools of this country.

HEALTH AND HOSPITALS

The Hill-Burton Hospital Act passed by Congress in 1946 sets up a pattern of federal-state cooperation similar to that incorporated in the national highway grant-in-aid program. Under the Hospital Act the Federal Government requires only that the states maintain minimum standards of organization and operation of all hospitals receiving financial assistance under the act. The state itself is to determine these minimum standards.

The Hill-Burton Act is one recognition of the fact that the health standards in the United States generally are far below the level which we have a right to expect in this wealthy country. People are beginning to demand of government greater protection of their health. The war generally and particularly the high percentage of rejections in the draft because of physical defects have made us much more health conscious. Yet many states are doubtless unable financially to provide adequate health standards for their people and the assistance of the Federal Government is necessary. This offer of aid on the part of Uncle Sam should be welcomed, particularly since the Federal Government has recognized the practical independence of the states in the spending of the money and the administration of the hospitals that profit from the expenditure.

Another health problem that is of increasing concern to the people everywhere is medical and hospital insurance. At the present time a great number of privately owned and operated health plans are in operation throughout the country. In most states these medical and hospital insurance plans are subject to some legislative regulation in order to protect the interests of the policy holder. Perhaps more than 25,000,000 people are now covered to a greater or lesser extent in their medical and hospital needs. Even if we add to this number the many millions of persons covered by industrial health plans, a large proportion of our people are without adequate medical and hospital facilities. And they are beginning to demand a program that will provide them with at least some protection against major medical and hospital expenses in the future.

Such a plan will require the annual expenditure of many hundreds of millions of dollars. It is recognized that the people in the lower income groups cannot possibly provide for themselves even the most elementary health needs and that financial assistance from some source is necessary. This must come either from the states or the Federal Government. The economic re-
sources of some of the states preclude the expenditure of large sums of money for over-all health needs so that once more it appears necessary to look to the Federal Government for assistance.

In any program developed in Washington, however, certain principles should be incorporated. The Federal Government should recognize only the states in the allocation of money for medical and hospital purposes. This is necessary for the development of some uniform health plan in the states. Also federal control over the expenditure of the money should be limited to the principle incorporated in the Hill-Burton Hospital Act.

AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT

Another problem of growing intergovernmental concern is that of airport construction. It can be taken for granted that this matter will loom larger and larger in the budgets of certain levels of government in the years ahead of us. Very few local government units are financially capable of building adequate airport facilities, with the result that they must look to higher levels of government. In many cases the states will be able to help solve this financial problem but in other instances the aid of the Federal Government will be essential.

This fact raises once more the problem of control by the federal and state governments over the financial assistance rendered to lower units of government. In addition, under the present federal grant-in-aid program for airports the national government is permitted to deal directly with local government units unless state legislation specifically forbids such units of government from going directly to the Federal Government for aid in airport construction. In this case federal funds are channeled from Washington to the states and then on to local governments. This is a very desirable principle in any program of federal aid to local units since it makes possible in this case the states, developing their own airport construction plans on a state-wide basis. Legislation is now before Congress which would require that all federal aid to airports be channeled through the states.

With increased importance of the states in federal grant-in-aid programs, we should expect greater emphasis upon local government in financial assistance by the states to local units. It is just as important that the states recognize the dignity of local government in their financial relationships as it is for the Federal Government to recognize the dignity of the state in its grant-in-aid programs. As a consequence more responsibility revolves upon the states and local units respectively to improve their administration of money for various programs coming from outside sources. Expenditure controls should be reexamined for more efficient use of grants-in-aid and personnel policies should be revised in many states with greater emphasis upon merit and less upon politics in the selection of all employees, both state and local.

Some states today have no merit system except that forced upon them by the Federal Government through various health and welfare programs and unemployment compensation. Such merit systems even if efficiently operated cover only a small percentage of all state employees; on the local level politics predominates in the selection of most employees regardless of their duties.

As the people demand more services from their government, local, state, and national, government is inevitably going to get bigger rather than smaller. We may expect, moreover, that the people as they become more conscious of the part that government plays in their daily lives, are also going to insist upon a more efficient operation of government services in order that their tax dollar will go even farther in providing their needs. This must mean the improvement of civil service as it now exists and its extension to additional classes of state and local employees. Civil service is not perfect in its methods of selecting employees for government positions, but our experiences with it have certainly led to the conclusion that civil service, if efficiently administered, is far superior to the spoils system.

With the increase of Federal Government aid to the states for various types of programs and a consequent expansion of state assistance to the localities, the need for a greater coordination of the activities of the state and local units of government becomes more obvious. How this coordination is to be achieved is a problem still to be solved. There would seem, however, to be a great
deal of merit in the suggestion that there be created at the state level a department of local affairs or at least that a bureau devoted to local matters be set up in some already established state department. At the risk of criticism that a new department would be just another spending unit to waste the taxpayer's money it would appear that an entirely new department has considerable merit over the proposed creation of a bureau which might well become submerged beneath the major activities of the department of which it is a part.

A department of local affairs would have the major responsibility of developing a program of cooperation between state and local officials on all matters that involve the two levels of government. It would serve as a clearing house for the local official who has a matter to "take up" with the state but is a bit bewildered as to what agency or official to contact. A department of local affairs should collect, and make available, information from every source on questions of concern to local government units. It would have no powers to force any action on the part of local officials but, serving in an advisory capacity only, it could bring about some degree of unity in local activities that are of mutual concern.

At the present time in most states a number of agencies have certain functions that involve local government. This can only result in a great deal of inefficiency in overlapping relationships, and confusion on the part of local officials in dealing with state government. A department of local affairs could eliminate most of these difficulties by assembling in the office a statement of the functions of the various state agencies and their relations to local government and making such information available to local officials. In a very short time local government would begin to look to a state department of local affairs for a helping hand in its contacts with officials and department on the state level.

The state is superior legally to local government and it is much stronger financially. The responsibility for taking the initiative in the development of an efficient system of state-local relations, therefore, rests with the state. Failure to assume this responsibility must mean generally chaotic conditions in the enforced relations between the state and local government and therefore a weakened government, particularly on the local level.

The most significant study of state-local relations during recent years was that published by the Council of State Governments late in 1946. This work was the product of a committee appointed by the Council and instructed to study the whole field of state-local relations. The report is a comprehensive survey of the problem from many angles and is a storehouse of information for the scholar and the layman in this increasingly important level of governmental relationships.

According to the committee, there are four major problem areas in the state-local level of government. The first deals with finances, the second with functions, the third with legal relationships, and the fourth deals with the multiplicity of local units of government.

The problem of finances is considered from the standpoint of the complaint so often heard from local officials that localities cannot finance their ever-growing functions upon a rigid tax base. In considering the matter of functions, the committee stated its viewpoint that the maintenance of local discretion is important to democracy and to democratic procedures. In the legal relationship of state and local units the essential problem, according to the committee, is the restriction placed upon the activity of local government by state constitutions and legislation. The problem of overlapping and unnecessary units of local government is one upon which more has been said and less done than perhaps any other phase of governmental organization and activity.

The report brings out clearly the great increase in the activities and expenditures of state and local governments during recent years and some of the difficulties which have accompanied this expansion of services at the state-local level. In view of the fact that conditions vary from state to state no over-all solution of most of these

1 State-Local Relations, Council of State Governments, Chicago, 1946.
difficulties is practicable, but the committee has offered certain general conclusions that should be given serious consideration by state and local officials.

In the words of Frank Bane, Executive Director of the Council, the report "describes state-local relations as they actually exist. Because of state-by-state variations and ever-changing patterns of development, the achievement of this task was difficult and the descriptions are subject to correction."

"... The Committee has no panacea for the complex problems of state-local relations. Rather it has set forth a series of propositions designed to stimulate thinking and study about state-local problems, to encourage the cooperation of state and local officials in the solution of their common difficulties, and to indicate possible solutions to some of the most pressing problems."

The reception accorded the Council’s report on state-local relations by legislators and state and local officials has been most encouraging. It is an indication that we may expect more serious thinking by responsible persons in this very important field of government in the years ahead of us. Much remains to be done to place state-local relations on a firm foundation.

Another recent contribution to the field of state-local relations, although covering only one state, is the Report of the Commission on Municipal Revenues and Reductions of Real Estate Taxes, published by the state of New York in 1946, and popularly referred to as the Moore Report after the chairman of the committee, Frank C. Moore. This commission was created by the New York Legislature to study the relationships, financial and otherwise, existing between the state and units of local government and make recommendations for the improvement of these relationships. The primary objectives of this commission were: (a) To bring about stability of public finance, state and municipal; (b) to improve the present system of state and local fiscal relationships and to eliminate inequities in the distribution of financial assistance to local government; (c) to bring about effective real estate tax reduction, and (d) to inform our citizens of the extent of financial assistance by the state to its subdivisions. The commission recommended the adoption of a “permanent” program of financial assistance to local government in New York state and the reduction of the real property tax for the benefit of the homeowner and the renter. The recommendations of the Moore Report have been enacted into law in New York.

A high light of the Moore report is the large number of charts that help to make more clear the fiscal relationships of government in the state of New York.
GOVERNMENTAL UNITS*

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</th>
<th>Percentage of All Units Except School Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>155,116</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. S. government</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States</td>
<td>3,050</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townships (or towns)</td>
<td>18,919</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipalities</td>
<td>16,220</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School districts</td>
<td>108,579</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special districts</td>
<td>8,299</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes the District of Columbia, in which are one municipality and one special district.
* Less than .05 of 1 per cent.

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*

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region and State</th>
<th>All Governmental Units</th>
<th>Counties</th>
<th>Townships and Towns</th>
<th>Number Municipalities</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>School Districts</th>
<th>Special Districts</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>
</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>50,935</td>
<td>1,051</td>
<td>14,667</td>
<td>7,721</td>
<td>1,099</td>
<td>5,662</td>
<td>70,297</td>
<td>2,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>25,130</td>
<td>1,486</td>
<td>14,756</td>
<td>6,736</td>
<td>3,099</td>
<td>3,727</td>
<td>17,061</td>
<td>1,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>16,305</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1,599</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1,199</td>
<td>11,852</td>
<td>2,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td>275</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>379</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>3,705</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td>374</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,544</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>4,149</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td>286</td>
<td>167</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,809</td>
<td>996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>2,358</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td>239</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,937</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td>267</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
<td>470</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td>222</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>1,666</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>152</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>126</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>13,247</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1,434</td>
<td>1,137</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>12,138</td>
<td>1,042</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>1,949</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1,608</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>4,056</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>11,115</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>1,524</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>8,632</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td>285</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td>229</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td>194</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>140</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>482</td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>312</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44</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>6,270</td>
<td>8</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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td>220</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td>222</td>
<td>250</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>949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>2,175</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1932</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>223</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>221</td>
<td>70</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>195</td>
<td>24</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>431</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td>355</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>4,066</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1,399</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>2,272</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>5,021</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1,339</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>1,655</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td>499</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>4,518</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>2,332</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>193</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>159</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>5,263</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1,575</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>2,546</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>2,057</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td>241</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td>190</td>
<td>25</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td>206</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td>149</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>254</td>
<td></td>
<td>637</td>
<td>196</td>
<td></td>
<td>441</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>201</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>176</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>239</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>206</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
<td>14</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td>205</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>8,508</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1,271</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>6,560</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>47</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 not 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, Brooklyn, New York, Queens, and Richmond counties, with New York City; Philadelphia County with Philadelphia City.
* Counties not organized as governments.
* The county areas of Armstrong, Shannon, Todd, Washabaugh, and Washington are unorganized as counties and are attached for administrative purposes to neighboring counties.
### Table 2

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

(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>All Municipalities</th>
<th>Special Districts</th>
<th>All Units</th>
<th>All Municipalities</th>
<th>Special Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>United States Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>598</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northeast</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North Central</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>277</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>194</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alabama</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arizona</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arkansas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>California</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colorado</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Florida</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Georgia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Idaho</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Illinois</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indiana</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Iowa</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kansas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kentucky</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Louisiana</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maryland</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Michigan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minnesota</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mississippi</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Missouri</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Montana</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nebraska</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Hampshire</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Jersey</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Mexico</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New York</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North Carolina</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North Dakota</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ohio</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oklahoma</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oregon</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pennsylvania</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Carolina</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Dakota</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tennessee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Texas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utah</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Virginia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Washington</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West Virginia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wisconsin</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wyoming</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercounty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A great westward movement of civilian population in the United States occurred between April 1, 1940, and July 1, 1946. This movement resulted in an estimated increase of about 3,281,000, or 33.9 per cent in the Pacific states: California, Oregon, and Washington. The over-all increase in the remainder of the United States was estimated at about 3,712,000, or only 3.0 per cent of the 1940 civilian population in this area.

The largest gain for an individual state was about 2,485,000 for California. Other states with large increases include Michigan, with a gain of about 797,000; Ohio, with 594,000; Washington, with 435,000; Texas, with 419,000; Oregon, with 361,000; and Florida, with 358,000.

In twenty-seven states the changes between April 1, 1940, and July 1, 1946, were relatively small, the 1946 civilian population differing 5 per cent or less from the 1940 civilian population of the states. In five additional states there were large relative losses, ranging up to a loss of 16.3 per cent for North Dakota. Of the remaining sixteen states and the District of Columbia, six states increased between 5 and 10 per cent, five increased between 10 and 20 per cent, and five states and the District of Columbia increased more than 20 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.

The excess of births over deaths for the United States during this period was about 9,160,000, indicating an average increase in population from this source of almost 1,500,000 persons per year. Despite this high level of natural increase, seventeen states lost civilian population, partly because some persons who had entered the armed forces were still in service on July 1, 1946, or had died before that date, but largely because there was a large volume of interstate migration. Twelve other states, in which the civilian population increased between April 1, 1940, and July 1, 1946, had a net out-migration of population not quite so great as their natural increase.

In this total of twenty-nine states, there was a net civilian out-migration of more than 4,500,000 persons. In the remaining nineteen states and the District of Columbia, there was a net civilian in-migration of more than 5,300,000 persons between April 1, 1940, and July 1, 1946. The difference between these figures, approximately 800,000, represents the excess of immigrants over emigrants.

The interstate shift of about 4,500,000 civilians is actually a balance that represents, on the one hand, the excess of immigration over out-migration for the states which gained population through migration, and, on the other hand, the excess of out-migration over in-migration for the states which lost population through migration. The gross number of interstate migrants, or persons whose state of residence on July 1, 1946, was different from their state of residence on April 1, 1940, was far larger than this net figure.

### Table: Estimated Population of the United States Excluding Armed Forces Overseas and Estimated Civilian Population, by Regions, Divisions, and States: July 1, 1946, and April 1, 1940

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region, Division, and State</th>
<th>Total Population Excluding Armed Forces Overseas</th>
<th>Civilian Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 1, 1946 (Census)</td>
<td>April 1, 1940 (+ or Decrease (—), 1940-46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region:</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States:</td>
<td>139,893,406</td>
<td>+8,224,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Northeastern States:</td>
<td>37,114,552</td>
<td>+1,137,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The North Central States:</td>
<td>41,908,528</td>
<td>+1,765,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The South:</td>
<td>42,337,580</td>
<td>+1,671,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The West:</td>
<td>17,532,746</td>
<td>+3,049,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The South Atlantic States:</td>
<td>9,044,765</td>
<td>+607,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The West Virginia Central States:</td>
<td>28,069,847</td>
<td>+30,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The West:</td>
<td>28,545,678</td>
<td>+1,019,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Northeastern States:</td>
<td>13,362,850</td>
<td>-154,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The South Atlantic:</td>
<td>19,099,215</td>
<td>+1,275,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The West South Central:</td>
<td>10,650,766</td>
<td>-127,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The West:</td>
<td>4,275,303</td>
<td>+125,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Pacific:</td>
<td>13,257,443</td>
<td>+3,524,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England:</td>
<td>876,213</td>
<td>+28,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire:</td>
<td>516,735</td>
<td>+25,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine:</td>
<td>352,998</td>
<td>-2,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts:</td>
<td>4,500,254</td>
<td>+273,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island:</td>
<td>744,986</td>
<td>+31,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>1,905,319</td>
<td>+254,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Atlantic:</td>
<td>13,741,836</td>
<td>+262,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York:</td>
<td>10,023,750</td>
<td>+123,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey:</td>
<td>4,304,261</td>
<td>+144,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England:</td>
<td>8,716,855</td>
<td>+609,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey:</td>
<td>3,767,311</td>
<td>+439,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois:</td>
<td>8,028,453</td>
<td>+111,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan:</td>
<td>6,064,899</td>
<td>+526,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin:</td>
<td>3,168,158</td>
<td>+40,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (+) or Decrease (—), 1940-46:</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The values in the table represent changes in population from 1940 to 1946, with increases shown in parentheses and decreases shown in brackets. The per cent change is calculated based on the 1940 population.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West North Central:</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>2,821,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>2,843,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>3,776,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>547,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>547,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>1,275,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>1,801,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Atlantic:</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>286,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>2,186,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>843,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>2,985,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>1,807,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>3,640,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>1,909,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>3,128,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>2,340,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East South Central:</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>2,745,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>2,997,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>2,807,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>2,099,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West South Central:</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>1,884,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>2,549,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>2,224,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>6,959,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain:</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>478,477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>472,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>262,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>1,137,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>526,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>622,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>135,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific:</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>2,254,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>1,452,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California</td>
<td>9,250,727</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>