Section I
INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

1. Interstate Relations
2. State-Federal Relations
3. State-Local Relations
THE COUNCIL OF STATE GOVERNMENTS

1. ORGANIZATION

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

1. A medium for improving legislative, administrative, and judicial practices within the States.
2. An agency for encouraging full cooperation among the States in solving interstate problems, both regional and national.
3. A means of facilitating and improving Federal-State relations.

In brief, the Council exists to serve governmental progress in the individual States, among the States working together, and by the States in their relations with the Federal government.

The Council is composed of Commissions or Committees on Interstate Cooperation, established in all forty-eight States as official entities of the State governments. A typical Commission consists of ten members of the Legislature and five administrative officials. Legislation which created the Commissions provides:

"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 Commissions work for cooperative governmental action on numerous fronts. They are the bases on which the Council rests. (Memberships of the Commissions in the individual States are listed among the contents of pages 472-577.)

The States themselves govern and control the Council. Its policies are determined by a Board of Managers, comprising forty-eight delegate members representing the forty-eight States, nineteen ex-officio members, and ten members at large.

Each State selects its own delegate members. Ex-officio Managers are the nine members of the Executive Committee of the Governors' Conference; the presiding heads of eight other State organizations representing executive, legislative, and judicial branches of government; the Honorary President of the Council; and its Executive Director. To provide continuity of membership, the Board itself elects ten Managers at Large who serve five-year, staggered terms.

The Board meets annually and at special call to consider Council policy. It has an Executive Committee which meets more frequently and works with the Executive Director for solution of numerous problems. The Executive Committee comprises the President of the Council, who is a Governor; the First Vice-President, who is a legislator and who also serves as Chairman of the Board of Managers; two additional Vice-Presidents; the Auditor, who is a State fiscal officer; the Honorary President of the Council; and the Executive Director.

The Executive Committee appoints the Executive Director, subject to the Board's approval. He selects all members of the Council staff, and they operate under his direction and supervision.

Together with its responsibility to all
the State governments in all their branches, the Council is the secretariat for a number of groups composed of separate categories of officials representing different functions. It is the secretariat for America's 7,500 State legislators, organized through the American Legislators' Association; the Governors' Conference; the Conference of Chief Justices; the National Association of Attorneys General; the National Association of Secretaries of State; the National Association of State Budget Officers; the Legislative Service Conference; the National Association of State Purchasing Officials; and an Association of Administrators of the Interstate Compact for the Supervision of Parolees and Probationers. The Council has a cooperative arrangement with the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws and works closely with other organizations serving State government.

Because of its activities for many State associations and its day-to-day work with individual officials and legislators, the Council is in a position to bring to the service of each a wide grasp of the problems of all.

The Council has its central office in Chicago, eastern and western regional offices in New York and San Francisco, and another office in Washington, D.C. Regional representatives, working from the central and regional offices, cooperate closely with State legislators and officials in their areas. The Washington office is charged specifically with responsibility for "facilitating and improving Federal-State relations" and for keeping the States currently informed of activities of the Federal government which interest the States.

2. ACTIVITIES

As the responsibilities of modern government grow, the States increasingly are working together—for progress in their own internal affairs, for solution of problems that cross State lines, and for improved Federal-State relations.

The Council of State Governments, as the agency of the States, contributes to the realization of these goals by:

- Conducting major research projects and publishing the results.
- Maintaining an inquiry-and-information service available to all the States.
- Serving as a clearing house through which the States exchange their own information.
- Holding national and regional meetings—these range from a biennial General Assembly of the States to frequent working panels or conferences on particular questions—in which State officials and legislators survey common problems and take common counsel.
- Acting as secretariat for various interstate organizations.

The Council's publications, in addition to special research reports on individual subjects, include The Book of the States and the monthly magazine of State affairs, State Government.

Service for Intrastate Progress

Most of the work of every State government necessarily is concentrated on its internal affairs. But this does not mean working in isolation. Almost every home task of every State has its counterparts in other States. Through meetings, publications, and informal communication fostered by the Council of State Governments, the experience of all States in these matters is shared.

If, for example, a given State is considering introduction of a new governmental technique, or adoption of a new public service, or improvement of an old one, it can learn through the Council what other States have done about similar problems, with what results. It can judge from experience what practices have worked best elsewhere. Individual States repeatedly obtain such information from the Council or at its meetings.

Certain intrastate problems, moreover, are perennial for all States or assume special significance for all at certain times. The Council undertakes special studies of such subjects, often at the specific direction of the Governors' Conference.

Thus, the Council in recent years has made extensive studies in the fields of public school education, mental health programs, highway safety and motor truck regulation, State governmental reorganization, legislative processes and procedures,
judicial systems, and State-local relations. On each of these and other subjects the Council has published reports for official and public use, ranging from brochures to such major volumes as The Forty-eight State School Systems, The Mental Health Programs of the Forty-eight States, and Highway Safety—Motor Truck Regulation. One of the current studies of the Council is on higher education in the States, and a resulting report will be published in 1952. In some instances, studies are conducted by research specialists under Council supervision; in others, by members of the Council's staff; in still others, by special Council committees assisted by staff members.

Such common counsel among the States, through the Council, has contributed to steady progress in the organization, procedure, and public service of State governments throughout the Union.

Service for Interstate Action

Numerous problems that confront government call for interstate action. The States are adding new programs to meet these needs while improving projects already in existence. Much of the Council's work is directed to the service of the States in this broad field.

Functional areas of interstate agencies and agreements include higher education, civil defense, disaster relief, management of river valleys, coastal fisheries, oil conservation, regional institutions for care of the handicapped, and interstate problems of crime control, probation, and parole. Some of the agencies and organizations comprise a large number of States, some two or more States that adjoin each other. Many have been created through interstate compact, others through less formal arrangements. The Council of State Governments and the Commissions on Interstate Cooperation have assisted in studies and conferences that led to the establishment of many of them. They continue to aid them in fulfilling their functions.

In addition, the Council serves the States continuously in a variety of common tasks not performed by separate interstate agencies. For many years the States have worked successfully through the Council to prevent or eliminate interstate trade barriers. They are working through it for greater uniformity in regulation of interstate highway traffic, including sizes and weights of trucks. The Council as noted, cooperates with the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, which sponsors legislation in various fields. In recent years, the Council's Drafting Committee of State Officials, in consultation with other groups, has prepared and sponsored a series of suggested legislative acts dealing with subjects on which uniform or similar State laws could serve the public interest. Many of these now are on the statute books.

Service in Federal-State Relations

In war and peace, Federal-State cooperation has been increasing through the last decade. The Council of State Governments is a principal channel through which this has been fostered and through which specific Federal-State programs have been devised, then put into effect.

During World War II the Council cooperated with the United States government and governments of the States in setting up our nationwide system of civilian defense. Similar cooperation led to State programs for selective service, rationing, conservation and salvage, soldier-sailor voting, motor transport regulation, and other related matters. Since the war the Council has continued to encourage and facilitate Federal-State cooperation through numerous means, including studies of Federal grants-in-aid, overlapping taxes, and other intergovernmental problems, followed by conferences with Federal officials and members of Congress on these subjects. An extensive study by the Council, requested by the national Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, served as a basis for that Commission's recommendations on Federal-State relations. In 1950 and 1951, as international tensions mounted, the Council again assisted in preparing a nationwide program of civil defense, based on State operation, and in helping the States to coordinate their action in that program. The Council issues at frequent intervals the Washington Legislative Bulletin, to inform State officials and legislators of
actions in the Nation's capitol with particular bearing on State activities.

Our democratic system requires self-reliance and strength at each level of government—State, local, Federal. It also requires cooperation between all levels. The Council works for the healthy operation of both those principles.

Service to the Public

In the larger sense, all of the Council's activities are directed to the public service. It was created by the States to assist them for that over-all purpose. The Council contributes directly, moreover, particularly through its publications, to citizen information on State governmental affairs; thus it stimulates increased interest in them. Its reference works, its monthly journal, and its special studies are in use in public libraries, schools, and universities throughout the Nation. Groups of citizens concerned with various pressing civic problems—education, public welfare, highway traffic, public taxation, governmental efficiency, and many others—study them.
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THE BOARD OF MANAGERS OF THE COUNCIL OF STATE GOVERNMENTS

Membership, 1951

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

President
Hon. Frank J. Lausche
Governor of Ohio

Second Vice President
Hon. Gordon M. Tiffany
Attorney General
New Hampshire

First Vice President and
Chairman of the Board of
Managers
Hon. Bernice T. Van der Vries
Member of General Assembly
Illinois

Third Vice President
Senator Alonzo F. Hopkin
Member of Legislature
Utah

State Delegate Members

Alabama
Hon. D. W. Hodo
Director of Finance

Arizona
(Vacancy)

Arkansas
Hon. Tom Allen
Member of Legislature

California
Senator Jesse M. Mayo
Member of Legislature

Colorado
Senator Donald P. Dunklee
Member of General Assembly

Connecticut
Hon. Richard Martin
Director of Water Commission

Delaware
Hon. Clayton Hoff
Chairman, Commission on
Interstate Cooperation

Florida
Hon. Charles L. Clark
Executive Assistant to
the Governor

Georgia
Hon. George L. Smith, II
Member of General Assembly

Idaho
Hon. David Doane
Member of Legislature

Illinois
Hon. Bernice T. Van der Vries
Member of General Assembly

Indiana
Senator John W. Van Ness
Member of General Assembly

Iowa
Hon. Robert L. Larson
Attorney General

Kansas
Hon. Fred Hall
Lieutenant Governor

Kentucky
Senator Louis Cox
Member of Legislature

Louisiana
Hon. Bolivar E. Kemp
Attorney General

Maine
Senator Clarence S. Crosby
Member of Legislature

Maryland
Hon. John R. Reeves
Secretary of State

Massachusetts
Senator Richard H. Lee
Member of General Court

Michigan
Hon. D. Hale Brake
State Treasurer

Minnesota
Senator: A. O. Sletvold
Member of Legislature

Mississippi
Senator G. Lawrence Adams
Member of Legislature

Missouri
Senator John W. Noble
Member of General Assembly

Montana
Hon. Alfred R. Anderson
Commissioner of Agriculture,
Labor and Industries

Nebraska
Senator Earl J. Lee
Member of Legislature

Nevada
Hon. J. E. Springmeyer
Secretary, Legislative
Council Bureau

New Hampshire
Hon. Gordon M. Tiffany
Attorney General

New Jersey
Hon. Warren N. Gaffney
Commissioner of Banking and
Insurance

New Mexico
(Vacancy)

New York
Hon. Elisha T. Barrett
Member of Legislature

North Carolina
Hon. Charles H. Jenkins
Chairman, Commission on
Interstate Cooperation

North Dakota
Hon. Roy A. Holand
Member of Legislative Assembly

Ohio
Hon. Robert L. Moulton
Director of Commerce

Oklahoma
Hon. Joe Dunn
Chairman, State Tax Commission

Oregon
Hon. George H. Flagg
Public Utilities Commissioner

Pennsylvania
Hon. Norman Wood
Member of General Assembly
Rhode Island
Hon. Herman D. Ferrara
Member of General Assembly

South Carolina
Senator Edgar A. Brown
Member of General Assembly

South Dakota
Hon. W. R. Wilder
Director of Taxation

Tennessee
Hon. Robert G. Allison
Budget Director

Texas
Hon. John Ben Shepperd
Secretary of State

Utah
Senator Alonzo F. Hopkin
Member of Legislature

Vermont
Hon. Alvan J. Parker
Chairman, Commission on Interstate Cooperation

Virginia
Hon. J. Maynard Magruder
Member of General Assembly

Washington
Hon. Charles W. Hodde
Member of Legislature

West Virginia
Hon. Carl M. Frasure
Chairman, Commission on Interstate Cooperation

Wisconsin
Hon. Frank N. Graass
Member of Legislature

Wyoming
Hon. Everett T. Copenhaver
State Auditor

Ex-Officio Members

Executive Committee, Governors' Conference:
Hon. Val Peterson, Nebraska
Hon. John S. Battle, Virginia
Hon. John W. Bonner, Montana
Hon. Frank J. Lausche, Ohio
Hon. John Lodge, Connecticut
Hon. Douglas McKay, Oregon
Hon. Dennis J. Roberts, Rhode Island
Hon. Allan Shivers, Texas
Hon. Dan Thornton, Colorado

Chailman, Conference of Chief Justices:
Hon. John T. Loughran, New York

President, National Association of Attorneys General:
Hon. Roy H. Beeler, Tennessee

President, Legislative Service Conference:
Hon. C. G. Hall, Arkansas

Managers-At-Large
Hon. Millard F. Caldwell
Former Governor of Florida
Hon. Frank Carlson
U. S. Senator, Former Governor of Kansas
Hon. Richard Hartshorne
Federal District Judge, Former Chairman, Commission on Interstate Cooperation, of New Jersey
Hon. Lester C. Hunt
U. S. Senator, Former Governor of Wyoming
Hon. Goodwin J. Knight
Lieutenant Governor of California
Hon. William Preston Lane, Jr.
Former Governor of Maryland
Hon. Grant MacFarlane
Former Member of State Senate of Utah
Hon. Edward Martin
U. S. Senator, Former Governor of Pennsylvania
Hon. Harold C. Oertel
U. S. Representative, Former Chairman, Commission on Interstate Cooperation of New York
Hon. C. Petrus Peterson
Former Member of Legislature of Nebraska

President, National Association of State Budget Officers:
Hon. Earl L. Berg, Minnesota

President, Association of Administrators of the Interstate Compact for the Supervision of Parolees and Probationers:
Judge Henry H. Hunt, Connecticut

President, National Association of State Purchasing Officials:
Hon. William E. Stevenson, Oregon

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

Executive Director of the Council of State Governments:
Frank Bane
CHRONOLOGICAL HISTORY OF THE COUNCIL
January, 1950—December, 1951


1950

January 13-14. Commissions on Interstate Cooperation of Southern States (meeting to consider Drafting Committee proposals in 1950—Suggested State Legislation)
Atlanta Biltmore Hotel, Atlanta, Georgia.

January 19-20. Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission
Tampa, Florida.

January 19. Commission to be created by the Northeastern Interstate Forest Fire Protection Compact
Hotel Statler, Boston, Massachusetts.

January 20. Interstate Conference (on gypsy moth control)
Hotel Statler, Boston, Massachusetts.

January 24-25. Conference (on state-local relations)
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

January 26. Special Committee of the Interstate Commission on the Delaware River Basin
New York, New York.

January 30-31. Western Interstate Committee on Institutional Care
Wilton Hotel, Long Beach, California.

February 14. Executive Committee Meeting of the National Association of Attorneys General

February 15. Crime Conference (called by United States Attorney General McGrath in which the National Association of Attorneys General participated)
Washington, D.C.

February 17-18. Western Interstate Committee on Highway Policy Problems
Hotel Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah.

February 24. Joint Meeting of Budget Officers and Bureau of the Budget
Washington, D.C.

February 25. Executive Committee Meeting of the Conference of Chief Justices
1313 E. 60th, Chicago, Illinois.

March 7. Lake Tahoe Continuing Committee
Sacramento, California.

March 10-11. Western Governors' Conference Committee on Education
Denver, Colorado.

March 14-16. Migratory Farm Labor Committee
Fort Sumter Hotel, Charleston, South Carolina.

March 16-17. Legislative Continuing Committee on Crime Conference
Washington, D.C.

March 24. Joint Meeting of the Massachusetts and New Hampshire Commissions on Interstate Cooperation
Manchester, New Hampshire.

April 10. Mental Health Study—Technical Advisory Committee
Hershey, Pennsylvania.

April 14-15. Southwestern States Motor Truck Conference
Skirvin Hotel, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

April 28-29. Technical Advisory Committee of Governors' Conference Committee on Western Regional Education
Hotel Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah.

May 4-6. Interstate Oil Compact Commission (Spring Quarterly Meeting)
Biloxi, Mississippi.
May 12-13. Meeting on Uniform Commercial Code (sponsored jointly by California Commission on Uniform State Laws and California Commission on Interstate Cooperation)
State Building, San Francisco, California.

May 22-25. National Association of State Budget Officers, Annual Meeting
Copley Plaza Hotel, Boston, Massachusetts.

June 8-9. Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, Ninth Annual Meeting
Old Point Comfort, Virginia.

June 9-10. Executive Committee of the National Association of Purchasing Officials
Chicago, Illinois.

June 13. National Association of Insurance Commissioners
Quebec, Canada.

June 18-21? Governors' Conference Annual Meeting
Greenbrier Hotel, White Sulphur Springs, West Virginia.

June 26-28. Annual Executive Conference of New York's Joint Legislative Committee on Interstate Cooperation
Lake George, New York.

July 7-8. Western Interstate Committee on Highway Problems
San Francisco, California.

July 17. Northeastern Interstate Forest Fire Protection Commission
Boston, Massachusetts.

July 19-20. Interstate Commission on the Lake Champlain Basin
Westport, New York.

July 27-28. Technical Advisory Committee on Regional Education in the West
San Francisco, California.

July 29. Legal Committee on Regional Education in the West
San Francisco, California.

August 7-8. Midwestern Regional Conference of the Council of State Governments
Grand Hotel, Mackinac Island, Michigan.

August 8. Interstate Crime Compact Administrators Meeting (on out-of-state incarceration of parole and probation violators and detainers)
Hotel Roosevelt, New York, New York.

August 10. Regional Continuing Committee on Rabies
New York, New York.

August 11. Joint Meeting on Liquor and Banking (Pennsylvania and New York Commissions on Interstate Cooperation)
State Capitol, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

September 8. Executive Committee of the Governors' Conference
1313 E. 60th, Chicago, Illinois.

September 11-12. Nevada-California Conference on Lake Tahoe Problems
Brockway, California.

September 11-12. Annual Meeting of Interstate Commission on the Delaware River Basin
Shawnee on the Delaware, Pennsylvania.

September 11-13. Southern Regional Conference of the Council of State Governments
Arlington Hotel, Hot Springs National Park, Arkansas.

September 15-17. Second Annual Meeting of the Conference of Chief Justices
Richmond, Virginia.

September 18-21. Annual Meeting of the National Association of Purchasing Officials
Hotel Viking, Newport, Rhode Island.

September 21. Legal Committee on Regional Education in the West
Brown Palace Hotel, Denver, Colorado.

September 21-22. Northeastern Regional Conference on Civil Defense
Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York, New York.

September 28-30. Legislative Service Conference
Library of Congress; Washington, D.C.

October 2-5. Annual Meeting of the National Association of State Aviation Officials
Radisson Hotel, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

October 8. Fifth Annual Meeting of the Association of Administrators of the Interstate Compact for the Supervision of Parolees and Probationers
Hotel Statler, St. Louis, Missouri.

October 19-20. Drafting Committee of the Council of State Governments
Washington, D.C.

October 21. Western Interstate Committee on Highway Policy Problems
La Fonda Hotel, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

October 21. Western Interstate Committee on Agriculture
La Fonda Hotel, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

October 22. Western Interstate Committee on Institutional Care
La Fonda Hotel, Santa Fe, New Mexico.
October 23-24. Western Regional Conference of the Council of State Governments
La Fonda Hotel, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

November 10-11. Western Governors' Conference
Brown Palace Hotel, Denver, Colorado.

New York, New York.

November 17. Northeastern Interstate Committee on Civil Defense of the Council of State Governments
Hotel Roosevelt, New York, New York.

November 26-28. Southern Governors' Conference
Fort Sumter Hotel, Charleston, South Carolina.

November 30. Meeting of the Governors of the Missouri Valley States
North Platte, Nebraska.

December 2. Committee on State Mental Hospital Budgets
Chicago, Illinois.

December 6. Board of Managers of the Council of State Governments
Edgewater Beach Hotel, Chicago, Illinois.

December 7-9. Tenth General Assembly of the States
Edgewater Beach Hotel, Chicago, Illinois.

December 9-12. National Association of Attorneys General, Annual Meeting
Roney Plaza, Miami Beach, Florida.

January 13. Wyoming-Colorado Commissions on Interstate Cooperation
Cheyenne, Wyoming.

January 13. Committee on Mental Hospital Budgets
Trenton, New Jersey.

January 26. Executive Meeting of the Governors' Conference on Civil Defense
Blackstone Hotel, Chicago, Illinois.

February 2. Regional Meeting on Interstate Civil Defense Compact (Council of State Governments in cooperation with Missouri Commission on Interstate Cooperation)
St. Louis, Missouri.

February 12. Governors' Conference Executive Committee (meeting with Federal Officials regarding Civil Defense)
Washington, D.C.

February 24. Executive Council of the Conference of Chief Justices
1313 E. 60th, Chicago, Illinois.

March 8. Michigan-California Commissions on Interstate Cooperation
Lansing, Michigan.

March 30. Executive Committee of the National Association of Attorneys General
Washington, D.C.

May 11-12. Advisory Committee for Study of Higher Education
Blackstone Hotel, Chicago, Illinois.

June 8. Executive Committee of the Legislative Service Conference
1313 E. 60th, Chicago, Illinois.

June 15. Regional Continuing Committee on Social Welfare
New York, New York.

June 15. Midwestern Meeting of Attorneys General
1313 E. 60th, Chicago, Illinois.

June 16. Executive Committee of the Governors' Conference
Washington, D.C.

June 22. Organizational Meeting for Interstate Civil Defense and Disaster Compact (Northeast States)
Hotel Roosevelt, New York, New York.

June 29-30. Advisory Committee on Higher Education
Chicago, Illinois.

July 6-7. Western Association of Attorneys General
Palace Hotel, San Francisco, California.

July 9-10. Midwestern Regional Conference of the Council of State Governments
Hotel Duluth, Duluth, Minnesota.

July 17. Annual Meeting of the Northeastern Interstate Forest Fire Protection Commission
Boston, Massachusetts.
August 5-8. Annual Meeting of the National Association of Attorneys General
Olympic Hotel, Seattle, Washington.

August 16-17. Sixth Annual Meeting of the Association of Administrators of the Interstate Compact for the Supervision of Parolees and Probationers
Edgewater Beach Hotel, Chicago, Illinois.

August 29-30. Interstate Commission on the Lake
Champlain Basin, Basin Harbor, Vermont.

September 6-7. Annual Meeting of the Atlantic State Marine Fisheries Commission
Hotel Roosevelt, New York, New York.

September 10-13. Annual Meeting of the National Association of State Purchasing Officials
Broadmoor Hotel, Colorado Springs, Colorado.

September 13-15. Annual Meeting of the Conference of Chief Justices
Roosevelt Hotel, New York, New York.

September 17-18. Annual Executive Conference of the New York Joint Legislative Committee on Interstate Cooperation
Fort William Henry Hotel, Lake George, New York.

September 20. Regional Meeting on Reciprocity Problems of Motor Buses
Albany, New York.

September 20-22. Southern Regional Conference of the Council of State Governments
Kentucky Dam Village State Park, Kentucky.

September 30-October 3. Annual Meeting of the Governors' Conference
Gatlinburg, Tennessee.

October 4-6. Annual Meeting of the Legislative Service Conference
Hotel Schroeder, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

October 12-13. Western Interstate Committee on Highway Policy Problems
Olympic Hotel, Seattle, Washington.

October 15-18. Annual Meeting of the National Association of State Budget Officers
Blackstone Hotel, Chicago, Illinois.

October 25-26. Drafting Committee of State Officials

October 29-30. Interstate Commission on the Delaware River Basin
Pocono Manor, Pocono, Pennsylvania.

October 29-30. Advisory Committee on Higher Education
Hershey Hotel, Hershey, Pennsylvania.

November 11-13. Southern Governors' Conference
Hot Springs, Arkansas.

November 15-16. Northeastern Regional Highway Conference
Hotel Roosevelt, New York, New York.

November 30-December 2. Western Governors' Conference
Hotel Multnomah, Portland, Oregon.
GOVERNORS’ CONFERENCE


Purpose: The Governors’ Conference is an organization for improving State government, working with those problems that overlap State lines and require interstate cooperation, and facilitating Federal-State relations with respect to cooperative governmental problems.

Officers: Members of the Executive Committee for 1951-52:
Val Peterson, Governor of Nebraska, Chairman
John S. Battle, Governor of Virginia
John W. Bonner, Governor of Montana
Frank J. Lausche, Governor of Ohio
John Lodge, Governor of Connecticut
Douglas McKay, Governor of Oregon
Dennis J. Roberts, Governor of Rhode Island
Allan Shivers, Governor of Texas
Dan Thornton, Governor of Colorado

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

Annual Meeting: September 30–October 3, 1951, at Gatlinburg, Tennessee. The 1950 Conference was held June 18-21 at White Sulphur Springs, West Virginia.


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.
CONFERENCE OF CHIEF JUSTICES


PURPOSE: To provide for the exchange of ideas and information on the operation of the judiciary in the States, and for consultation between their highest courts concerning the improvement of the administration of justice.

OFFICERS: Members of the Executive Council for 1951-52:
- JOHN T. LOUGHRAN, New York, Chairman
- J. E. HICKMAN, Texas, Vice-Chairman
- HUGH R. ADAIR, Montana
- PHIL S. GIBSON, California
- W. W. HARVEY, Kansas
- HAROLD H. MURCHIE, Maine
- A. B. NEIL, Tennessee

SECRETARIAT: The Council of State Governments.

ANNUAL MEETING: September 13-16, 1951 at New York, New York.

ACTIVITIES: The Conference provides a forum for ideas and suggestions to improve the organization and procedures of State courts. Special committees study and report on procedural practices. The secretariat undertakes such research as the Conference requests.

The Chairman of the Conference 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 1951-52:
- ROY H. BEELER, Tennessee, President
- PRICE DANIEL, Texas, Vice-President
- EUGENE COOK, Georgia
- RALPH A. DUNHAM, South Dakota
- HAROLD R. FATZER, Kansas
- FRANCIS E. KELLY, Massachusetts
- WILLIAM E. POWERS, Rhode Island
- ROBERT E. SMYIE, Idaho
- GORDON M. TIFFANY, New Hampshire
- SMITH TROY, Washington
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SECRETARIAT: The Council of State Governments.

ANNUAL MEETING: August 4-8, 1951, at Seattle, Washington.

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. The complete text of any opinion digested is furnished on request; from time to time the *Digest* includes opinions in full on important topics. An annual index facilitates use of the material for research.

ACTIVITIES: The secretariat performs research services and makes available information of general interest to members of the Association. The secretariat also serves as a clearing house for opinions of the Attorneys General to facilitate uniformity in the interpretation of State laws.

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

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SECRETARIES OF STATE

ORGANIZATION: Organized in 1904. Composed of all Secretaries of State.

PURPOSE: To provide clearing-house facilities for cooperation among the Secretaries of State.

OFFICERS: For 1951-52:

- C. G. HALL, Arkansas, President
- WESLEY BOLIN, Arizona, Vice-President
- EARL T. NEWBRY, Oregon, Treasurer
- BEN W. FORTSON, Georgia, Secretary
- H. B. McDOWELL, Delaware, Corresponding Secretary

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 1951 meeting was held September 12-15, at Portsmouth, New Hampshire.

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

ACTIVITIES: One of the oldest of State organizations, the National Association fosters cooperation among all Secretaries of State in meeting similar problems. The annual meetings provide a mutually helpful exchange of information and suggestions. Committees of the Association handle particular problems. Among active committees are those on Corporation Registration, Trade Mark Registration, and Uniform Election Laws.

The President of the 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.

OFFICERS: Members of the Executive Committee for 1951-52:
EARL L. BERG, Minnesota, President
H. D. DEFENBACHER, Ohio, Vice-President
CLIFFORD R. BARNES, Kentucky
JAMES V. JORDAN, Alabama
EDWARD B. LOGAN, Pennsylvania
T. H. MUGFORD, California
ROGER PHELPS, Oklahoma

SECRETARIAT: The Council of State Governments.


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

ACTIVITIES: The secretariat performs research services and makes available information of general interest to the Association's members. From time to time surveys are made of existing practices and procedures in all of the States. A special committee cooperates with a similar group from the U. S. Bureau of the Budget in developing procedures and systems for the administration of grant-in-aid programs in the States. The President of the Association is a member of the Board of Managers of the Council of State Governments.

LEGISLATIVE SERVICE CONFERENCE

ORGANIZATION: Organized in 1948. Composed of legislators who are officers of legislative service agencies, legislative librarians and reference officials, legislative research officials, statutory and code revisors, legislative drafting officials, and others designated by the Conference.

PURPOSE: To cooperate for more effective service to the Legislatures and to aid in improving legislative procedures.

OFFICERS: Members of the Executive Committee for 1951-52:
FREDERIC H. GUILD, Kansas, President
CHARLES TOM HENDERSON, Florida, Vice-President
HORACE E. FLACK, Maryland
WILLIAM P. LEONARD, New York
ARTHUR Y. LLOYD, Kentucky
HERRN NORTHCUIT, Arkansas
MRS. BERNICE T. VAN DER VRIES
INTERSTATE RELATIONS

SECRETARIAT: The Council of State Governments.

ANNUAL MEETING: October 4-6, 1951, at Madison, Wisconsin.

PUBLICATIONS: Studies and reports of interest to legislative reference agencies, officials, and librarians; and The Legislative Research Checklist.

ACTIVITIES: The secretariat performs research services and makes available information of interest to the members. Legislative procedures in the States are surveyed from time to time.

The President of the Conference is a member of the Board of Managers of the Council of State Governments.

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 for the more efficient exercise of State purchasing and for greater efficiency in administration.

OFFICERS: Members of the Executive Committee for 1951-52:
- WILLIAM E. STEVENSON, Oregon, President
- JOHN W. BUSH, Ohio, Vice-President
- J. STANLEY BIEN, Michigan
- FRANK P. FREE, Vermont
- EDGAR G. LUBY, New York
- CARL F. PARKER, Arkansas
- BLAINE YODER, Nebraska

SECRETARIAT: The Council of State Governments.


PUBLICATIONS: Résumés of meetings and special reports of interest to purchasing officials.

ACTIVITIES: The secretariat performs research services and makes available information of general interest to the members. It publishes reports on practice in inspection and analysis of State purchases and the organization and operation of 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 Compact, for its effective implementation.

OFFICERS: Members of the Executive Committee for 1951-52:
Henry H. Hunt, Connecticut, President
Glenn R. Klopfenstein, Ohio, Vice-President
Francis R. Bridges, Jr., Florida, Treasurer
Harry C. Dupree, New York
Campbell LeFlore, Oklahoma
Harvey Long, Illinois
H. M. Randall, Oregon
Robert G. Smith, Vermont

SECRETARIAT: The Council of State Governments.

ANNUAL MEETING: August 16-17, 1951, at Chicago, Illinois.

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

ACTIVITIES: The secretariat performs research services and makes available information of general interest to the members.

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

THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF COMMISSIONERS ON UNIFORM STATE LAWS

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

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

OFFICERS: For 1951-52:
Martin J. Dinkelspiel, California, President
Paul W. Brosman, United States Court of Military Appeals, Vice-President
Boyd M. Benson, South Dakota, Treasurer
Barton H. Kuhns, Nebraska, Secretary
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:
Joe C. Barrett, Arkansas, Chairman
Walter P. Armstrong, Jr., Tennessee
James C. Dezendorf, Oregon
Willard B. Luther, Massachusetts
R. Jasper Smith, Missouri

ANNUAL MEETING: September 8-13, 1951, at San Francisco, California.

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.

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

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 last two years have brought increasing activity in the compact field. The Interstate Compact for the Supervision of Parolees and Probationers has become the first to receive ratification by all forty-eight States. Several other compacts have had additional ratifications or amendments. A number of new compacts, some in well-tried fields and at least one in a new field, have come into effect. And perhaps most important for future development, the past two years have witnessed a trend toward use of compacts for provision of joint educational or institutional services among the States.

**Educational and Institutional Compacts**

For a number of years some States have been giving thought to possible cooperation in the construction and operation of joint institutions, particularly in order to have better ones at more reasonable cost. These considerations bore earliest fruit in the western States, where reciprocal legislation permitting incarceration of certain types of prisoners in institutions of sister States has had some use. However, it remained for the Southern Regional Education Compact (effective since 1949) to dramatize the broad possibilities of this kind of cooperation. (See article on pages 263–264.)

Eleven western States, together with Alaska and Hawaii, became interested in a plan for similar cooperation in higher education, especially but not exclusively on the graduate and professional level. By its terms, the Western Regional Education Compact becomes effective when ratified by any five of the jurisdictions involved. Colorado, Montana, New Mexico, Oregon, and Utah ratified the compact in 1951. In addition to the importance of the services to be rendered under it, the compact is significant as the first in which the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii are specifically named as original eligible parties. The Civil Defense Compact of 1951, however, also contemplates membership by the Territories, although they are not listed by name.

An amendment to the Interstate Compact for the Supervision of Parolees and Probationers provides for cooperative use of State institutions in particular circumstances. The basic compact, in effect since the mid-thirties, makes it possible for parolees and probationers to be sent to States other than those of conviction and to be supervised by the receiving States. This has been an important advance, having introduced flexibility in the treatment of parolees and probationers to permit their living in jurisdictions where rehabilitation could proceed most advantageously. However, a difficulty has been encountered when it has become necessary to reincarcerate a person supervised under the terms of the compact, particularly when he has been sent to a distant State. The only possible procedure has been to return the prisoner to the jurisdiction in which he was sentenced, often at considerable cost and inconvenience, or to ignore his violation. The Out-of-State Incarceration Amendment (ratified in 1951 by Utah, Idaho, and Connecticut) makes it possible to incarcerate a parolee or probationer in the State where he is found.

Some consideration has been given to other arrangements for cooperative use of institutions. A proposed compact among Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont (so far ratified only by Maine) contemplates construction and operation of joint institutions. Although plans for its use are most specific in the mental and correctional fields, the proposed agreement also is significant in that it may be used by the party States to erect and operate other educational and welfare institutions.

*Prepared by Frederick L. Zimmermann and Mitchell Wendell, members of the faculties of Hunter College and American International College, respectively, and authors of *The Interstate Compact Since 1925.*
Civil Defense

Civil defense and related fields have been an entirely new area of compact activity. Most of the protective and welfare activities are lodged in the States and their political subdivisions, and the need for interstate cooperation in civil defense is obvious. Accordingly, an Interstate Civil Defense Compact was drafted in the autumn of 1950 by the ten northeastern States and the Federal Civil Defense Administration. It has served as the national model and has been adopted verbatim or in substantial degree by a number of States.

The compact provides for mutual aid among the party States in time of attack. It establishes a committee of the civil defense directors or similar officials of the various States. It permits membership by any and all States, the District of Columbia, Territories and possessions of the United States and neighboring foreign countries, and States and Provinces thereof. The compact provides for the duties, rights, immunities, and privileges of the civil defense forces of an aiding State when answering a request in another State, provides for any liability that may occur, and establishes a basic principle as to costs—but permits such costs to be assumed by the Federal government or the aiding State, or to be provided for by supplementary agreement among two or more States. It establishes a definite formula as to costs and responsibilities in connection with evacuees and provides that a State receiving aid will honor the licenses of out-of-state professional and other skilled personnel. The compact contemplates the elaboration of mutual aid and other defense arrangements through supplementary agreements. New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania have ratified a compact providing for reciprocal assistance by their military forces in an emergency and for powers, duties, rights, privileges, and immunities of the members of such forces outside their own States. The agreement also provides for fresh pursuit of insurrectionists, saboteurs, or enemies, by the military forces of one State into another.

Regional Compacts

The steady increase in the number of water compacts continued during 1950-51. Oklahoma, Texas, and New Mexico ratified one providing for allocation of the Canadian River’s waters. Like many recent water compacts, it establishes an interstate administrative agency, the Canadian River Commission. Creation of such joint administrative bodies is one of the characteristics of modern compacts, although it was almost unknown before establishment of the Port of New York Authority in 1921. The Canadian River Compact provides for a Commissioner representing the United States together with one from each signatory State. The United States member, whom the President is requested to designate, “shall be the presiding officer of the Commission but shall not have the right to vote . . . .”

Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming entered into the long delayed Yellowstone River Compact. It states that “no Commission or administrative body is necessary to administer this Compact or divide the waters of the Yellowstone River Basin as between the States of Montana and North Dakota” but establishes a commission to administer its provisions as between Wyoming and Montana, with one representative from each of these States and one to be selected by the United States Geological Survey. The United States representative is to act as Chairman, and in event of failure of agreement by members from the two States, “shall have the right to vote upon the matters in disagreement and such points of disagreement shall then be decided by a majority vote of the representatives of the states of Wyoming and Montana and said member selected by the Director of the United States Geological Survey, each being entitled to one vote.” Arbitral arrangements are contained in at least three recent compacts, those for the Arkansas, Snake, and Yellowstone rivers.

An outstanding development was amendment by Pennsylvania and New Jersey of the Delaware River Bridge Joint Commission Compact of 1931, between those two States, changing the name of the body to the Delaware River Port Authority and enlarging its powers. The supplemental compact creates a joint agency for construction and operation of common facilities in the Philadelphia-Camden interstate.
area, similar to the New York-New Jersey Port of New York Authority and the St. Louis Bi-State Agency created by Missouri and Illinois in 1949. It is significant that the St. Louis and Philadelphia bodies have been created within the last two years, although until that time there had been no action in other interstate metropolitan regions following the Port of New York Authority precedent. One notable feature of the Philadelphia authority compact is that it includes, among the new agency's purposes, the establishment and operation of "... a rapid transit system for the transportation of passengers, mail and baggage between points in New Jersey communities within the Port District and within a thirty-five mile radius of the City of Camden, New Jersey, and points within the City of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania and intermediate points." The authority is required to procure the specific approval of the Legislatures of the two States before proceeding with such a project. Nevertheless, inclusion of the provision further emphasizes the rich potentialities of such compact agencies. In this connection, development of compactual arrangements in the Delaware River Valley, a heavily settled interstate boundary area, is significant. New Jersey and Pennsylvania, by supplemental compact in 1951, amended the previous Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission compact to extend the jurisdiction of that body south to the Philadelphia county line. In effect, this means that the Toll Bridge Commission's jurisdiction will cover the Delaware River boundary between New Jersey and Pennsylvania north of the area under the jurisdiction of the new port authority. Another 1951 compact authorizes the Turnpike agencies of those two States to maintain and operate a bridge across the Delaware River in order to form a connection between the two turnpikes. This agreement does not create an interstate body but delegates power to the two State turnpike agencies to enter into agreements for administration. A proposed compact among the four Delaware river States—Delaware, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania—establishing an interstate agency to plan, construct, finance, and operate an integrated system of water supply and river flow control centering in the upper Delaware was—ratified by Delaware and New Jersey and is now under consideration in New York and Pennsylvania. Final ratification would complete a broad pattern of interstate compacts for planning and development of this river basin.

Dyer v. Sims

Litigation has not been important in the compact field on very many occasions. This has indicated that on the whole States have performed their obligations. However, absence of judicial consideration left many questions of compact law without clear, authoritative answers. For this reason, the case of State ex rel. Dyer v. Sims, decided by the United States Supreme Court in April, 1951, is of unusual interest.

The State Auditor of West Virginia had disallowed a warrant calling for release of funds appropriated for the Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission, an interstate agency created by compact. Refusal was on the ground that West Virginia's ratification of the compact was invalid under the State constitution because it delegated power to an agency outside the State and because the Legislature could not bind itself to make appropriations for future support of the commission. The highest court of West Virginia upheld the Auditor, but the U.S. Supreme Court reversed the decision.

Although the three opinions gave somewhat divergent reasons, the nine Justices were unanimous in holding that West Virginia had properly ratified the compact and that she was bound thereby. Accordingly, it now is settled that a State may delegate powers to an interstate agency of which it is a member and may assume long range financial obligations under compacts, provided only that there are no clear and specific provisions of the State constitution to the contrary. The tenor of the decision also indicates that compacts will be sustained wherever possible and will be afforded protection as contracts secured against impairment under the Obligations of Contract Clause of the United States Constitution.

The effect of this decision is to broaden the potentialities of interstate compacts for establishment of joint State agencies and
integration of administration. It well may
give impetus to the marked trend of recent
years towards more frequent, and broader
use of compacts.

**REFERENCE SOURCES ON INTERSTATE COMACTS**


**NEW RATIFICATIONS OR AMENDMENTS TO EXISTING INTERSTATE COMPACTS—1950-1951**

<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>Crime Compact</td>
<td>Interstate supervision of parolees and probationers</td>
<td>48 states</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>48 Stat. 909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Georgia, 1950</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>North Carolina, 1951</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Texas, 1951</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Idaho, 1951</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Utah, 1951</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate Oil Compact</td>
<td>Conservation of oil and gas by prevention of physical waste</td>
<td>22 states</td>
<td>Additional four year extension in process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arizona (associate member), 1951</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendment No. 1 Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Compact</td>
<td>Permits States to establish joint regulation of common fisheries</td>
<td>Massachusetts, 1948</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Public Law 721, 81st Cong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maine, 1949</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Hampshire, 1949</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rhode Island, 1949</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pennsylvania, 1949</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>North Carolina, 1949</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Jersey, 1950</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Connecticut, 1951</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Massachusetts, 1947</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New York, 1949</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rhode Island, 1947</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vermont, 1951</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Hampshire, 1951</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeastern Interstate Forest Fire Protection Compact</td>
<td>Mutual aid in forest fire prevention and control</td>
<td>7 states</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>63 Stat. 271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rhode Island, 1950</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendment Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission Compact</td>
<td>Extends territory over which commission has jurisdiction</td>
<td>New Jersey, 1951</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pennsylvania, 1951</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### New Interstate Compacts 1950–1951

<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>Canadian River</td>
<td>Allocates waters and establishes Canadian River Commission</td>
<td>New Mexico, 1951</td>
<td>Oklahoma, 1951</td>
<td>In process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellowstone River</td>
<td>Allocates waters of Yellowstone River and establishes Montana-Wyoming interstate commission</td>
<td>Montana, 1951</td>
<td>North Dakota, 1951</td>
<td>Wyoming, 1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Defense</td>
<td>Mutual aid in Civil Defense and related matters</td>
<td>Connecticut, 1951</td>
<td>Delaware, 1951</td>
<td>Massachusetts, 1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Montana, 1951</td>
<td>New Hampshire, 1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Jersey, 1951</td>
<td>New York, 1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pennsylvania, 1951</td>
<td>Rhode Island, 1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tennessee, 1951</td>
<td>Texas, 1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vermont, 1951</td>
<td>Connecticut, 1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Delaware, 1951</td>
<td>Maine, 1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maryland, 1951</td>
<td>Massachusetts, 1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Montana, 1951</td>
<td>New Hampshire, 1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Jersey, 1951</td>
<td>New York, 1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pennsylvania, 1951</td>
<td>Rhode Island, 1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tennessee, 1951</td>
<td>Texas, 1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vermont, 1951</td>
<td>Connecticut, 1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Delaware, 1951</td>
<td>Maine, 1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maryland, 1951</td>
<td>Massachusetts, 1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Montana, 1951</td>
<td>New Hampshire, 1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Jersey, 1951</td>
<td>New York, 1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pennsylvania, 1951</td>
<td>Rhode Island, 1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tennessee, 1951</td>
<td>Texas, 1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vermont, 1951</td>
<td>Connecticut, 1949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New York, 1951</td>
<td>New Jersey, 1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pennsylvania, 1951</td>
<td>New Mexico, 1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oregon, 1951</td>
<td>Utah, 1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Aid Compact</td>
<td>Provides for mutual military aid in an emergency</td>
<td>New York, 1951</td>
<td>New Jersey, 1951</td>
<td>Pennsylvania, 1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware River Port Authority</td>
<td>Amends Delaware R. Bridge Joint Comm. Compact to establish port authority for planning, development, operation of joint facilities</td>
<td>New York, 1951</td>
<td>New Jersey, 1951</td>
<td>Pennsylvania, 1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern Regional Education Compact</td>
<td>Provides for establishment, financing, and operation of programs of higher education at existing institutions or new ones</td>
<td>Colorado, 1951</td>
<td>Montana, 1951</td>
<td>New Mexico, 1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnpike Compact</td>
<td>Authorizes turnpike agencies to build and operate bridge connecting turnpike systems</td>
<td>New Jersey, 1951</td>
<td>Pennsylvania, 1951</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut River Compact</td>
<td>Provides formula for contributions by downstream States to payments in lieu of taxes and reimbursement for economic loss to political subdivisions where flood control reservoirs are</td>
<td>Connecticut, 1949</td>
<td>Vermont, 1951</td>
<td>New Hampshire, 1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Massachusetts, 1951</td>
<td>Massachusetts, 1951</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE DELAWARE RIVER BASIN

The Interstate Commission on the Delaware River Basin—Incodel—to make a survey to determine the feasibility and advisability of constructing an integrated water project within the basin. The design was, among other purposes, to meet the combined prospective water supply needs of political subdivisions and metropolitan areas in the three States.

In accordance with the acts, the commission, on January 15, 1951, filed with the Governors and Legislatures of the three States a full report of its proceedings, findings, and recommendations. The report also was filed with the Governor and Legislature of Delaware.

As the first step in carrying out its assignment, the commission had contracted with Malcolm Pirnie Engineers, New York City, to make the necessary engineering investigations. The consulting engineers presented their final report to the commission at its annual meeting on September 11, 1950, and the commission adopted its recommendations in principle.

The project recommended by the consulting engineers is, in the commission's judgment, a great conservation program. It is designed to meet two cardinal purposes: (1) to provide adequate, satisfactory sources of water supply to areas of need in each of the States in which the Delaware River flows, particularly New York City, Northeastern New Jersey, and Philadelphia; and (2) to increase substantially the volume of flow in the river during periods of drought which now occur almost every summer and fall, to the serious detriment of everyone depending upon the Delaware for recreation, municipal and industrial water supply, disposal of treated wastes, and numerous other beneficial uses.

In the report filed with the Governors and Legislatures of the four States in January, 1951, supplemented by a communication two weeks later, Incodel requested the Legislatures to take a series of steps to implement the project, including enactment of an interstate compact creating an administrative agency to be known as the Delaware River Basin Water Commission.

A proposed compact to accomplish this objective was passed by the New Jersey and Delaware Legislatures. New York adjourned its 1951 session without taking final action. In Pennsylvania it was decided that consideration should be withheld pending an independent appraisal to determine whether Pennsylvania's interests were adequately safeguarded. A special committee, appointed by Governor Fine, is at work on this task.

Incodel is firmly convinced that the solving of problems of utilization of water resources of interstate river basins through interstate cooperation is far superior to other alternatives. It will continue its best efforts for applying this solution to the problem of sharing the waters of the Delaware River Basin.

In addition to its activities to gain acceptance of the water project, Incodel has continued its over-all program for the development and conservation of the natural resources of the Delaware River Basin. Its basin-wide stream pollution program was materially advanced during 1950–51. It also has made further strides in securing adoption of practical programs and measures for the conservation of the soil and various forest resources of the Delaware River Basin.

OFFICERS OF THE COMMISSION, 1951

Francis A. Pittkin, Director, Pennsylvania State Planning Board, Chairman
Charles R. Erdman, Jr., Commissioner, New Jersey Department of Conservation and Economic Development, Vice-Chairman
Floyd E. Anderson, State Senator of New York, Vice-Chairman
Raymond B. Phillips, former Senator, State of Delaware, Vice-Chairman
James H. Allen, Executive Secretary

Commission Headquarters
Broad Street Station Building, Philadelphia 3, Pennsylvania

*Prepared by James H. Allen, Executive Secretary, Interstate Commission on the Delaware River Basin.
CREATED by Congressional compact to abate and control pollution in the Potomac Valley, the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin has found the use and conservation of natural resources to be so interrelated that the pollution abatement program requires a broad concept for adequate basin planning.

Currently celebrating its tenth year of activity, the commission has concluded that there is need for enlarging its scope of activities. Provision for an increase in supporting funds is the next step in its progressive program. Its aim is to develop a comprehensive abatement program which will take into account all conservation problems affecting or affected by pollution.

During the last biennium, the commission added another committee to its advisory groups—the Wildlife and Recreation Committee, to consider the recreational values and wildlife problems connected with pollution abatement and make appropriate recommendations to the commission. The committee comprises citizens drawn from State, local and private conservation circles.

Other committees serving in an advisory capacity and helping to spread the abatement message to ever-increasing numbers are the Technical Committee, whose function it is to plan the details of an abatement program; the Industrial Committee, whose membership advises the commission on industrial waste problems; the Local Governments Committee, which provides information with respect to municipal programs related to pollution abatement; and the Land Committee, which aids the commission in developing soils pollution control programs.

The commission is furthering its research programs in the fall of 1951 by establishing an additional project at the Johns Hopkins University, on acid mine drainage. Continuing through the summer water sampling seasons was the Industrial Waste Investigation of the Upper Potomac River Area. A report on the 19-months investigation was to be released toward the end of 1951.

*Prepared by Edwin R. Cotton, Director, Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin.

OFFICERS OF THE COMMISSION, 1951

Harry Gard Knox, Chairman
George F. Hazelwood, Vice-Chairman
Oliver Gasch, General Counsel
D. L. Seckinger, M.D., Treasurer

Edwin R. Cotton, Director

COMMISSION HEADQUARTERS

202 Transportation Building, Washington 6, D.C.
DEVELOPMENTS relating to the Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission were highlighted by the decision of the United States Supreme Court on April 10, 1951, relating to West Virginia's participation in the eight-state compact for pollution control. During the year in which this question was under discussion the commission proceeded, nevertheless, in advancing important elements in its regional campaign for clean streams. These included: adoption of water-quality objectives; activation of industry committees concerned with waste control measures; technical studies on streams; and the promotion of valley-wide educational programs.

Fair progress in catching up on municipal sewage-treatment requirements can be reported at the end of this third year since formation of the commission. Information from the eight States (Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia) shows that 39 per cent of the wastes from 8.5 million people in the valley is now receiving some form of treatment and that new plants under construction will serve another 8 per cent. Final plans have been completed and approved for further plants.

Consideration of the compact by the highest tribunal in the Nation resulted from a 3–2 decision of the West Virginia Court of Appeals, which ruled that the compact's ratification by the State Legislature was unconstitutional. The United States Supreme Court reversed the State court, stating that no obligations were created in conflict with the West Virginia constitution. The Supreme Court gave a complete stamp of approval to the pooling of police powers by the States for regulation of waste discharges. A second significant point in the ruling is that questions of an interstate compact's interpretation go beyond the jurisdiction of State courts and can be resolved by action from the highest court of the Nation.

Bacterial-quality objectives, establishing minimum standards for drinking and bathing water in the Ohio River, have been adopted by the commission. These provide a sound basis to enable it to reach decisions on acceptance limits and control of bacterial contamination. Heretofore the task was complicated by wide divergence of viewpoints and standards throughout the Nation.

Of even broader significance to establishment of water-quality standards is a project the commission launched recently by contract with the Kettering Laboratory of Applied Physiology in Cincinnati. Here is being undertaken an investigation of the potential toxicity of substances in water, with specific reference to their chronic effects. For example, no one knows just what may be the physiological or other hazards from use of water containing phenols, chlorides, and a host of other substances. The commission wants answers to such questions. It knows that industry, too, needs such answers for the ultimate perfection of its waste treatment program.

The commission is particularly gratified with the work of its "industry-action" committees. A little more than a year ago the commission met independently with the steel producers, chemical-brine industries, distillers, and metal-finishing industries in the Ohio valley. Each of these groups has established an action committee of the commission. They have been hard at work—in conjunction with the commission staff—in promoting joint research, development of standards, the preparation of manuals of waste-treatment practice, and promotion of treatment installations within their own plants. In June, 1951, an exploratory conference was held with representatives of the coal mining industry.

Claiming substantial attention during the past year has been a determination of stream conditions and measures for their improvement. For example, a survey was made of the Ohio River from Pittsburgh to Cairo. This investigation involved simultaneous sampling around-the-clock of a 963-mile stretch of the river at thirty-six points, over a twelve-day period. Such an undertaking is unique and was made possible by the participation and intimate coordination of sixteen agencies. An in-
vestigation on the Muskingum River to appraise the effects of hardness and chloride contamination from brine waste disposal has been made and is now in the report stage. These findings coupled with other studies, will provide the basis on which future policy decisions regarding chloride limits may be evaluated.

How fast the actual installation of treatment works can proceed depends in large measure on the allocation of materials for construction. The commission asserts that pollution abatement projects are in the national interest since they are designed to conserve water resources so urgently needed to maintain and expand industrial production.

OFFICERS OF THE COMMISSION, 1951
C. W. Klassen, Chairman
E. Blackburn Moore, Vice-Chairman
F. H. Waring, Secretary
Robert K. Horton, Treasurer
Edward J. Cleary, Executive Director and Chief Engineer

COMMISSION HEADQUARTERS
414 Walnut Street, Cincinnati 2, Ohio

THE BOOK OF THE STATES

THE Interstate Sanitation Commission is a Tri-State agency established by New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut with the consent of Congress. It was created in 1936 to control the future pollution and abate the existing pollution in New York Harbor and adjacent waters.

The commission's jurisdiction, encompassed in the Interstate Sanitation District, is about fifty miles across, extending from Sandy Hook, New Jersey, through New York Bay and up the Hudson River to the northerly Westchester and Rockland County lines. It extends eastward in Long Island Sound to New Haven on the Connecticut shore and Port Jefferson on the north shore of Long Island. On the ocean front of Long Island the district extends to Fire Island Inlet. It does not include any inland waterways, comprises only the tidal waters, and, in New Jersey, is limited to the mouths of the principal rivers.

The commission is composed of five members from each of the three States. The Tri-State Compact under which it functions gives the commission authority to prescribe, by order, a reasonable date on or before which each municipality or other entity discharging sewage into the Interstate Sanitation District shall be treating such sewage in accord with the standards specified in the compact. It provides that the order may prescribe the specific progress that shall be made at certain definite times prior to the final date, and that the courts of the several States shall have jurisdiction to enforce against any person, corporation, municipality, or other entity any and all compact provisions.

Notwithstanding its powers, the commission's members have attempted to attain their objectives by cooperation rather than coercion. In this, the commission has been eminently successful, and between 1936 and the beginning of World War II, it succeeded in obtaining the construction of pollution control works to provide for almost 50 per cent of the sewage being discharged into the district. During that time it was not necessary in a single instance to appeal to the courts for enforcement of a commission order. Following World War II, however, although the policy of cooperation continued eminently satisfactory, there were some evidences of municipalities which defied the commission's authority and necessitated its bringing suit for mandatory injunction. In the very first such case the defendant, a group of New Jersey municipalities, appealed the decision of the lower court to the Supreme Court of the State of New Jersey. The commission was upheld. In every other case it has brought into court, the decision has been in its favor.

Now under construction are treatment works of such capacity that, when they are completed, approximately 75 per cent of all sewage discharged into the Interstate Sanitation District will be treated adequately. As a result of presently-existing orders, it is contemplated that there will be no raw or untreated sewage discharged into the district by 1959 if no unusual conditions arise.

*Prepared by Seth G. Hess, Director and Chief Engineer, Interstate Sanitation Commission.
The Tri-State Compact charges the commission to accomplish its objectives with the least possible injury to investments already made in sewage treatment plants within the district. The commission is granted discretion in affording a reasonable time to effect such changes or additions to existing plants as may be necessary to meet the standards. There still remains a program of some magnitude in the matter of changes and additions to plants necessary to conform to the compact's standards, and that is the next phase of the commission’s program.
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NEW ENGLAND INTERSTATE WATER POLLUTION CONTROL COMMISSION*

In 1947, the New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Compact was ratified by the Legislatures of Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island and approved by Congress. In November of that year was held the organization meeting of the New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission, established by the compact for its administration. Thus was inaugurated a new phase of pollution control of inland and tidal waters in New England.

New York and Vermont ratified the compact in 1949, and New York became a signatory that year. The Vermont legislation required certain amendments before that State could become a formal member, and during the 1951 session its Legislature enacted the amendments. New Hampshire ratified the Compact in 1951.

The compact's genesis can be ascribed to studies by the New England Conference of State Sanitary Engineers, which over a period of years devoted a great deal of time and thought to interstate pollution control. It recognized that where interstate waters are concerned, a single State could not wholly control pollution and that the compact approach was logical.

The compact is built around a classification of interstate waters according to their highest use, based on physical, chemical, and bacteriological standards of quality. The signatory States agree to submit to the commission their classifications of interstate waters and, upon approval, to establish programs of treatment of sewage and industrial wastes to bring about the improvements required to meet the classifications. Each signatory State pledges to provide for abatement of existing pollution and for control of future pollution of interstate inland and tidal waters and to place and maintain them in a condition consistent with the highest classified use of each body of water.

Success depends on the cooperation of the States. The commission has no power to issue orders or to finance or construct treatment works. There is no provision for establishment of an elaborate technical organization, such work being carried on by the existing State agencies with coordination by the Secretary of the commission. The Compact provides that no action of the commission imposing any obligation on any signatory State shall be binding unless a majority of that state's members shall have voted in favor.

The commission is composed of five members from each signatory State, appointed by the respective Governors. It includes representatives from the fields of public health, municipal management, industrial management, and fish and wildlife conservation. A very important adjunct to the commission is the Technical Advisory Board, consisting of the heads of the technical divisions of the water pollution control agencies of the signatory States. In January, 1950, the commission employed a Secretary to be in administra-
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*Prepared by Joseph C. Knox, Secretary, New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission.*
tive charge of its activities, and offices were established at Boston.

The commission has adopted tentative standards prepared by the Technical Advisory Board for various classifications of water use. Studies are in progress to develop specific and detailed interpretations of the standards. Tentative classifications of interstate waters according to present condition have been made by each of the signatory States.

It was recognized in establishing the compact that, should Federal water pollution control legislation be enacted, the compact would afford the facilities for successful coordination between the States and the Federal government. Since enactment of the Federal Water Pollution Act in 1948, the commission has worked in close cooperation with the Federal Security Agency in all matters of water pollution control within the compact area.

During the past two years, with the aid of grants under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, the commission has sponsored industrial wastes surveys and research, especially in connection with textile wastes, at Wesleyan University in Connecticut, the University of Rhode Island, and Tufts College in Massachusetts.

The water pollution control problem confronting the New England area is the result of industrial expansion and extensive population growth through several decades when the public was indifferent to abuse of our waterways. The compact provides the mechanism whereby the States can meet the problem through a long-range program to be carried out in well-coordinated steps.
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ARTICLE VIII of the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact—an agreement relating, among other things, to the apportionment of the consumptive use of the water of the Colorado River system among the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming—provides for the Upper Colorado River Commission as its administrative body. The compact was executed at Santa Fe, New Mexico, in October, 1948. It was ratified by the Legislature of each of the five States and consented to by Congress. The commission was formally organized in August, 1949, at Salt Lake City, Utah.

The commission is composed of one commissioner representing the United States and one each from Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. Headquarters are at 520 Rood Avenue, Grand Junction, Colorado.

The commission's authority includes the following: to construct, operate, and maintain water gauging stations; to make estimates to forecast water run-off on the Colorado River and any of its tributaries; to engage in cooperative studies of their water supplies; to collect, analyze, and report data as to stream flows, storage, diversions, and use of the waters of the Colorado and any of its tributaries; to make findings as to the quantity of water of the Upper Colorado River system used each year in the Upper Basin and in each State thereof; to make findings as to the quantity delivered at Lee Ferry during each water year; to make findings as to the necessity for and extent of curtailment of use required, if any, in order that the flow at Lee Ferry shall not be depleted below that required by the compact; to make findings as to the quantity of reservoir losses and as to the share chargeable to each State. It also is authorized to make findings of fact in event of extraordinary drought or serious accident to the irrigation system in the Upper Basin, whereby delivery of water which the Upper Basin may be required to deliver in order to aid in fulfilling treaty obligations of the United States to Mexico becomes difficult. It is

*Prepared by John Geoffrey Will, Secretary and General Counsel, Upper Colorado River Commission.
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to report such findings to the Governors of the Upper Basin States, the President of the United States, the United States Section of the International Boundary and Water Commission, and such other Federal officials and agencies as it may deem appropriate, so that the water allotted to Mexico may be reduced in accordance with the terms of the treaty.

Thus the commission's powers have a semi-judicial as well as an engineering character.

Finally, one of the major purposes of the compact and therefore of the Commission is to "secure the expeditious agricultural and industrial development of the Upper Basin..."

In addition to routine activities, the maintenance of close contacts with State and Federal agencies concerned in its work, the collection, refinement, and analysis of hydrological data, and the maintenance of a public relations program, the commission has prepared and submitted to the President's Water Resources-Policy Commission its views on national water resources policy and has submitted to the Secretary of the Interior the case for authorization of the Echo Park dam and reservoir and Split Mountain dam. It has submitted to the Board of Directors of the National Reclamation Association its views on the report of that organization's Basin Development Committee. And it has coordinated comments by affected Upper Basin States on the Department of the Interior's report on the Colorado River Storage project and participating projects.
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THE ATLANTIC STATES MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION*

This commission was organized in 1942 under an interstate compact assented to by Congress and now embracing fifteen signatory States. Each is represented by three commissioners, the administrator of fisheries, a legislator appointed by the Commission on Interstate Cooperation, and a citizen appointed by the Governor.

In its early years the commission organized panels on particular species. Later it replaced them with sections covering specific portions of the Atlantic Coast. These sections have proved more effective and have assisted the development of teamwork among the States. For some species uniform laws have been found desirable, and under the commission's leadership uniform minimum-size statutes have been adopted by many States for striped bass, lobsters, blue crabs, and fluke.

The North Atlantic Section took an active part in the preparation for and negotiation of the International Convention on the fisheries of the Northwestern Atlantic and in the enactment of implementing legislation. This section is currently concerned with hard and soft clam studies carried on by the Fish and Wildlife Service, under Federal appropriations, sponsored by the commission. It also is studying lobsters, the trash fishery, and minimum-size regulations.

The Middle Atlantic section has concerned itself with the restoration of the shad, particularly in the Hudson and Delaware rivers. This problem also affects the other three sections, and all are following the pilot studies in the Hudson River.

The Chesapeake Bay section has brought about cooperation between Maryland and Virginia in the creation of the Chesapeake Bay Hydrographic Institute. Cooperative Federal-State studies of the blue crab, shad, and croaker are progressing.

The South Atlantic section, over the last six years, has pressed for agreement upon the coordinated shrimp program evolved by it. Local opposition, however,
has prevented its full adoption by any of the four interested States. A full-scale Federal-State cooperative fishery research program is under consideration.

In 1950, Congress consented to an amendment to the compact which had been adopted by Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and North Carolina. Connecticut adopted the amendment in 1951: It permits two or more States to delegate to a special section of the commission, composed of their own commissioners, such power as they may desire to confer for the management of a fishery shared by them in common. Except for such permissible and limited delegation of power, permitting joint action, the commission is advisory only. It functions by reporting recommendations to the several State governments and to Congress. Much of the commission's work in 1950 and 1951 was devoted to the compilation of information relating to previous action by the comp- pacting States to identify, appraise, and correct pollution that is or may be harmful to the marine fisheries. Preliminary reports have been completed for almost all of the coastal States.

The advice of the commission staff has been sought by representatives of other coasts in the formation of their respective interstate coastal commissions. Officers of the commission likewise participated in the recent Bermuda Oceanic Fisheries Conference, which may lead to further international cooperation and perhaps ultimately to another treaty.

OFFICERS OF THE COMMISSION, 1951
JOHN B. BINDLOSS, Stonington, Connecticut, Chairman
CHARLES W. LANKFORD, JR., Exmore, Virginia, Vice-Chairman
WAYNE D. HEYDECKER, 22 West First Street, Mount Vernon, New York, Secretary-Treasurer

COMMISSION HEADQUARTERS
22 West First Street, Mount Vernon, New York

THE PACIFIC MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION*

The Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission was created in 1947 when a compact was entered into by the States of California, Oregon, and Washington, with the approval of Congress. The compact was designed to promote the conservation and better utilization of the fisheries which are of mutual concern in all those ocean areas over which the three States, jointly or separately, now have or may hereafter acquire jurisdiction.

The commission itself has no regulatory powers. It is essentially an investigating and coordinating body, with authority to recommend to the signatory States such methods and practices as may be deemed necessary for the conservation of the various marine fisheries. The fishery research staffs of the member States are designated by the compact to act, in collaboration, as the official research agency of the commission. In addition, cooperative studies by the research staffs of the Fisheries Research Board of Canada, the Alaska Department of Fisheries, and the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service supplement the commission's investigations and extend the coastwise range of such work.

One of the commission's first undertakings was the collection of all available research and statistical data and other facts pertinent to the marine fisheries of the Pacific Coast of the United States. This material was a basis for recommended regulations for several of the fisheries and a guide in formulation of a coordinated marine fisheries research program.

The data obtained from this survey emphasized the long-felt need for management of the offshore salmon troll fishery. Therefore, in 1948, recommendations were made by the commission to the signatory States for the coordinated regulation of this fishery. By 1950 these recommendations were adopted by the three States and the Territory of Alaska—a significant accomplishment in the direction of the coordinated coastwide management of our marine fisheries. Not only does it contribute to the conservation of the species; it demonstrates that such management can be achieved through the wholehearted cooperation of all concerned. Research is being continued on this fishery to observe the

effects of these regulations and to gather additional data on which to base further regulations should they prove necessary for management of the offshore salmon fishery.

In 1950, studies of the sablefish were intensified. In view of the declining production of this fishery and the limited knowledge available concerning the species, an extensive program of sablefish research was inaugurated. Other species and fisheries under study include albacore, sardines, soupfin shark, and the bottom fishes taken by the otter trawl fishery.

During negotiations with Costa Rica and Mexico leading to the formation of tuna treaties between those countries and the United States, representatives of the commission acted in an advisory capacity to the United States Department of State.

Under the rules and regulations for the conduct of business adopted by the commission, the chairmanship is rotated annually among the three States. In practice the offices of Vice-Chairman and Secretary likewise are rotated.
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**Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission Resume of Activities***

The 1950-51 edition of *The Book of the States* told of the preliminary work of the Gulf States and of Congress, with the cooperation of the Council of State Governments, in causing the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission to become a reality. It also described the mission of this fisheries body.

To expedite progress regular meetings have been held quarterly (henceforth they will be on a semiannual basis) and have been rotated from State to State the better to acquaint industry and interested organizations and individuals with the commission's work and to obtain local information as to needs of the marine fisheries. The compact States are Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas.

The commission has concluded eight regular and three special meetings. From the signing of the compact at Mobile, Alabama, in July, 1949, to and including a meeting at Pensacola, Florida, in April, 1951, its record has included the following:

- It has completed its organizational structure and operating directives and established a headquarters office, at New Orleans.
- In cooperation with the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and with the commission's committees and industry, it has completed research essential to the development of Gulf exploratory fishing and biological research programs. Likewise it has witnessed the initiation by the Service of these two long-range programs through the establishment of shore offices and laboratories as bases from which the Fish and Wildlife Service exploratory fishing vessel "Oregon" (Pascagoula) and FWS biological research vessel "Alaska" (Galveston) operate.
- It has received favorable action upon recommendation for the continued operation of the Fish and Wildlife Service research laboratory at Pensacola, where investigations designed to develop the oyster industry of the coastal States are in progress.
- Substantial progress has been made in the gathering of catch statistics by the compact States.
- The commission has completed inquiry into the laws and regulations governing the inshore fin fishes, of primary importance to commercial and sports fishermen and in view of the need for additional biological information to properly manage such fisheries, it has requested the Governors and Legislatures of the compact States to consider the introduction of needed research programs.
- It has progressed in a study of the shrimp fisheries of the Gulf seaboard to the point

---

*Prepared by W. Dudley Gunn, Secretary-Treasurer, Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission.*
of printing recommendations for the regulation of this valuable fishery and distributing them to the Legislatures and marine fisheries administrators.

It has recognized the desirability of reciprocal fisheries agreements among the compact States and has requested the Governors and Legislatures to consider enactment of statutes to permit such reciprocation.

As the central coordinating agency for the marine fisheries of the Gulf States, in matters involving their development and in prevention of physical waste through improper utilization, the commission at all times has numerous subjects under consideration. This brief sketch has dealt only with major progress to date.
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THE INTERSTATE OIL COMPACT COMMISSION*

THE SAME PROBLEMS presented to the petroleum industry during the past two years in the national defense program have been presented to the Interstate Oil Compact Commission and the member States. The commission has been working with the appropriate Federal agencies, keeping them advised as to the problems of the member States in oil and gas conservation during the emergency.

Two surveys have been made at the direction of the commission chairman to determine the amount of excess producible ability in the member States in case it is needed. The last survey showed that this producible reserve had fallen to 435,000 barrels per day as of May 1, 1951.

One new associate member has been added, Arizona, on the application of Governor J. Howard Pyle. This raises the total membership to twenty oil and gas producing States, with two associate States not yet producing oil and gas.

Legal Activities: The commission’s Legal Committee has continued its studies of new oil and gas conservation legislation and court decisions. It has completed its work on a suggested form of oil and gas conservation statute and this has been approved by the commission. In several instances the statute has been used by Legislatures during their recent sessions. The Legal Committee, in cooperation with the Mineral Section of the American Bar Association, compiled a report on legal activities of the States and of the Federal government; and this has been printed and distributed.

Secondary Recovery Activities: The Secondary Recovery Advisory Committee and the Secondary Recovery Division have made great progress in accumulating project and reserve figures throughout the Nation. Committees have been or are being formed in all of the States to assist in this. Reports now have been issued on Arkansas, Illinois, and Kansas, and should be issued soon on four or five other States. The Director of the division, working with two other associations, has brought up to date the National Stripper Well Survey.

Other Technical Activities: A book prepared by the Engineering Committee, Oil and Gas Production, An Introductory Guide to Production Techniques and Conservation Methods, is being distributed.

The Research and Coordinating Committee, in addition to other work, has been studying well spacing and the controlling factors. Outstanding men in State conservation agencies and the industry have appeared before it, and given it the benefit of their views.

The Regulatory Practices Committee has continued its valuable studies of problems presented to the regulatory agencies, including new methods in testing gas wells and the rules and regulations promulgated by the various regulatory authorities.

The Public Lands Committee has advised the commission of all problems affecting production and leasing of public lands.

Educational Activities: The commission

*Prepared by Lawrence R. Alley, Assistant Executive Secretary, Interstate Oil Compact Commission.
considers one of its primary functions to be education for conservation. It has issued a number of studies, including those mentioned above. In the past year it prepared a number of pamphlets on conservation that have received wide distribution. These are in addition to its regular publications—its monthly newsletter and statistical summary, Compact Comments, and the Quarterly Bulletin.

Among the pamphlets was one entitled Saving Your Oil, which included statements by the Governors of all member States setting out the State conservation programs. In the preface it was estimated that 5 billion barrels of oil already produced resulted from the States' programs and that 5 billion barrels in reserve would not have been there except for these programs.

A sound and color motion picture produced by the commission in 1944, "Oil for Tomorrow," is still having a very large showing. It is estimated that it has been shown to some 2 million people.

Meetings: Quarterly meetings are held in the member States upon the invitation of the Governor of one of the States. One feature is that at each meeting an open forum is held at which everyone is invited to say anything that in his mind affects the conservation programs of member States.

The commission's headquarters office is in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. A small staff prepares its publications and is always ready to assist either member States or the general public.
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NORTHEASTERN FOREST FIRE PROTECTION COMMISSION*

The Northeastern Forest Fire Protection Compact resulted from the public demand for better coordinated fire protection beyond State lines after the serious forest fires in the Northeast during the fall of 1947.

The States which entered the compact (all, in 1949 or 1950) are Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and New York. Under the compact's articles any adjoining State, or Province of Canada is eligible to join.

The compact's purpose is to promote prevention and control of forest fires in the northeastern region of the United States and adjacent areas in Canada by development of integrated plans, maintenance by the member States of adequate forest fire fighting services, and provision for mutual aid in fighting forest fires. It provides for establishment of a central agency, The Northeastern Forest Fire Protection Commission, to coordinate the services of member States and perform such common services as they deem desirable.

Each State joining has three members. One is the State Forester; the second, a member of the Legislature, designated by the Committee on Interstate Cooperation; the third designated by the Governor.

It is the duty of the commission to ascertain methods, practices, and conditions for prevention and control of forest fires, to coordinate the forest fire plans and the work of appropriate agencies of the member States, and to facilitate aid by the member States to each other in fighting forest fires.

The commission is to formulate and, in accordance with need, revise a regional forest fire plan for the entire region. Each State is to provide its own plan and integrate it into the regional one. More than one month prior to any regular meeting of the Legislature in any signatory State, it presents to the Governor and Legislature any recommendations it may believe needed for legislation by that State in furthering the compact's purposes.

The commission consults with and advises the appropriate administrative agencies of the member States on forest fire problems and recommends adoption of such regulations as it deems advisable.

Any two or more member States may designate the commission as a joint agency to maintain such common services as they deem advisable for forest fire prevention. Representatives of the United States Forest Service may attend meetings.

Methods of furnishing aid and paying the cost, including liabilities for injuries or death, are well defined in the compact. The cost of the commission is prorated to the States on the basis of area of forest land and cost of protection.
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Palisades Interstate Park Commission*

In 1900, the Commissioners of the Palisades Interstate Park, the predecessor of the present Palisades Interstate Park Commission, was formed by the joint, cooperative action of New Jersey and New York. The original board of commissioners was authorized to preserve and maintain the natural beauty of the Palisades, which was threatened by quarries actually in the process of demolishing them. Later the commission’s authority was extended into New York State as far north as Newburgh and westerly to the Ramapo Mountains.

In 1937, a compact between New York and New Jersey, approved by Congress, provided for creation of the Palisades Interstate Park Commission as a joint, corporate, municipal instrumentality of the two States, with appropriate rights, powers, duties, and immunities; for the transfer to the commission of certain functions, jurisdiction, rights, powers and duties, together with the properties of the bodies politic created in 1900; and for continuance of the Palisades Interstate Park for public use and enjoyment.

There are ten commissioners, five appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the Senate of each State. All commissioners serve without pay. The term is five years and until a successor is appointed and has qualified.

Since its creation in 1900, the commission has acquired additional areas in New York and New Jersey, and it now exercises jurisdiction over a chain of eleven parks in both States. They are the Palisades in New Jersey, including the world famous Palisades of the Hudson River, comprising approximately 1,800 acres, and ten parks in New York State. There are approximately 46,000 acres of the Palisades Interstate Park in New York, which, when combined with the acreage in New Jersey, brings the total of the Palisades Interstate Park in both States to about 48,000 acres.

Along with acquisition of park lands, the commission adopted a policy of providing a maximum of recreational facilities for the public. Facilities for picnicking, baseball, fishing, boating, camping, horseback riding, hiking, swimming, soft ball, and other field games are available. In winter, there are skiing facilities for the novice and more advanced skiers, competitive day and night ski jumps on a 50-meter hill, skating and toboggan rides.

Since World War II, the development of public recreation facilities has not kept pace with demand, and consequently all of these facilities have been taxed to capacity. However, plans have been completed and construction is under way on a number of new recreational areas.

The Palisades Interstate Parkway is the most important project in hand at present. Construction is proceeding on this scenic 43-mile length of parkway in both States, and it is expected that several sections will be open to traffic in the near future.
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THE Port of New York Authority is the self-supporting, corporate agency of the States of New Jersey and New York. Operating without burden to the taxpayer, it was created in 1921 by treaty between the two States to deal with the planning and development of terminal and transportation facilities, and to improve and protect the commerce of the Port District.

The authority's Lincoln and Holland Tunnels and George Washington Bridge spanning the Hudson River, and its Bayonne and Goethals bridges and Outerbridge Crossing connecting Staten Island and New Jersey, join the States into one vast industrial, residential, and recreational area.

The bi-state agency's terminal facilities include the Port Authority Building at 111 Eighth Avenue, Manhattan, housing the Union Railroad Freight Terminal; the Port Authority Grain Terminal at Gowanus Bay, Brooklyn; La Guardia Airport and New York International Airport in New York City; Newark Airport and Teterboro Airport in New Jersey; Port Newark; New York Union Motor Truck Terminal and Newark Union Motor Truck Terminal, largest in the world; and the world's largest bus terminal, the Port Authority Bus Terminal in Manhattan.

To date the authority has issued bonds for financing and refunding purposes totaling $696,701,258, of which $248,925,000 are outstanding. Its investment in its sixteen facilities totals $375 million.

Charged by statute-with the protection of port commerce, the authority appears before such regulatory bodies as the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and the United States Maritime Commission. It maintains branch offices in Washington, Chicago, and Cleveland in the interest of promoting movement of commerce through the Port of New York.

New York International, La Guardia, and Newark Airports are operated by the authority under fifty-year leaseholds from the cities of New York and Newark, respectively. Since assuming responsibility for them, as well as Teterboro Airport, the agency has spent and committed to spend $75 million by the end of 1951 on improvements at its regional airports.

At Port Newark, also under a fifty-year leasehold from Newark, the authority already has spent approximately $8.9 million on its $11 million capital improvement program.

To facilitate the flow of traffic at its Hudson River crossings, it has spent approximately $91 million on approaches, including the Fourteenth Street Viaduct in New Jersey and the 178th Street and 179th Street tunnels in Manhattan.

On March 8, 1951, the authority released plans for construction of a third tube to the Lincoln Tunnel, to be built south of the existing twin tubes, which is estimated to cost $85 million and will provide an added capacity of 50 per cent, or 8.5 million vehicles annually, at the tunnel. To be completed in 1957, it will double the peak-hour capacity.

Atop the sixteen-story Port Authority Building at 111 Eighth Avenue, New York, the agency built the metropolitan area's first roof-top landing platform to accommodate its Bell helicopter, which expedites travel of Port Authority commissioners and executives between this building and the authority's terminal and transportation facilities. In June, 1951, it accepted from the City of New York a permit to use Pier 41, East River, as an emergency landing site for Authority and other helicopters.

The Port Authority commissioners, six from each State, are appointed by the Governors of New Jersey and New York. They serve without pay for overlapping terms of six years.

OFFICERS OF THE AUTHORITY, 1951

Howard S. Cullman, Commissioner from New York, Chairman
Joseph M. Byrne, Jr., Commissioner from New Jersey, Vice-Chairman
Austin J. Tobin, Executive Director

COMMISSION HEADQUARTERS

111 Eighth Avenue at 15th Street,
New York 11, New York

*Prepared by Lee K. Jaffe, Director of Public Relations, Port of New York Authority.
The Bi-State Development Agency was established on September 20, 1949, when representatives of the States of Missouri and Illinois signed a compact pledging them to "faithful cooperation in the future planning and development" of the Missouri-Illinois Metropolitan District, "holding in high trust for the benefit of the people and of the nation the special blessings and natural advantages thereof." The signing had been authorized by legislative action of the two States. The compact has been approved by Congress.

The agency is administered by a board of ten commissioners, five appointed by the Governor of each State. Each commissioner’s term is five years. They serve without pay.

The compact creates the "Missouri-Illinois Metropolitan District" and designates that it shall include the City of St. Louis and the counties of St. Louis, St. Charles, and Jefferson in Missouri; and the counties of Madison, St. Clair, and Monroe in Illinois. Within this district the agency has two types of functions. First, it is empowered to construct, maintain, own, and operate bridges and/or tunnels, airports, and terminal facilities; second, to make plans for submission to the communities involved, for coordination of streets, highways, parking areas, terminals, water supply and sewage and drainage facilities, recreational facilities, land-use patterns, and other matters in which joint or coordinated action will be generally beneficial.

The agency can charge and collect fees for use of such facilities as it may own; it can issue bonds on the security of the revenues to be derived from such facilities and upon property owned by the agency. It has no taxing powers and is prohibited from taking any action which will affect the finances of any governmental subdivisions. No meeting of the board may be held unless a majority of the commissioners of each State be present, and no action is valid unless approved by a majority of those present from each State.

Missouri and Illinois through appropriations by the Legislatures share equally in the cost of maintaining the office and staff, but have furnished no funds for capital investment.

At the joint request of the United States Public Health Service, Missouri State Board of Health, and Illinois Sanitary Water Board, the agency acts as sponsor for a survey of chemical and biological pollution of the Mississippi River in the vicinity of St. Louis.

It has completed an exhaustive study of St. Louis County sewers and has presented specific recommendations with respect to physical requirements as well as the economic aspects.

It is acting as sponsor for a coordinated, area-wide survey of highways.

It has completed a report on the engineering, economic, and financial features of a river-rail, harbor, and wharf project. As a result, the agency has entered a contract with a large industry which provides for construction of the needed facility, the industry providing a temporary construction loan to be repaid through issuance of agency revenue bonds. The industry also has agreed to an arrangement which will guarantee adequate operating income. Plans are under way for construction of harbor and wharf facilities on the new Chain of Rocks Canal just north of St. Louis. This will be the first revenue producing facility owned by the agency.

The agency’s long-range policy will be to attempt acquisition of ownership of all existing bridges across the Mississippi River, and thereafter consolidate their operation. Profits from the bridge operation, together with savings from joint operation and tax savings, will be used to match State and Federal allotments for super-highway construction.

Among other activities is cooperation in civil defense preparation of a preliminary comprehensive plan for development of the district, and preparation of adequate, area-wide base maps.

The metropolitan district as defined under the compact contains some 3,000 square miles and about 225 municipalities and 750 local taxing districts with a popu-
loration of 1,750,000. The agency's future task is great and its possibilities unlimited.

OFFICERS OF THE COMMISSION, 1951
LEIF J. SVERDRUP, Chairman
C. M. ROOS, Vice-Chairman
DELOS C. JOHNS, Member Executive Committee
MILTON M. KINSEY, Chief Engineer
JANE W. JONES, Secretary to the Commission

COMMISSION HEADQUARTERS
915 Olive Street, St. Louis 1, Missouri

PROBATION AND PAROLE COMPACT

During the past two years Georgia, North Carolina, and Texas have ratified the Interstate Compact for the Supervision of Parolees and Probationers. Thus every State now is signatory.

State probation and parole officers long have recognized that rehabilitation of those convicted of crime frequently can be facilitated by transfer of a parolee or probationer to another jurisdiction where chances of a successful readjustment are greater. Formerly, without a binding interstate agreement, literally thousands of such persons lived outside the State of their offense, free from enforceable supervision.

The Interstate Compact for the Supervision of Parolees and Probationers was developed to answer this need. It supplies essential protection to the public by providing legal means and administrative machinery for maintaining supervision of offenders who have been transferred to another jurisdiction under the terms and conditions of the compact.

The compact serves many practical purposes. It serves the negative function of facilitating capture of criminals who have violated the terms of their freedom; it performs the positive function of encouraging rehabilitation by permitting transfer to a receptive environment. The compact calls for interstate cooperation along a wide front in the fields of probation and parole. It provides a simple method of granting and controlling interstate transfers of probationers and parolees.

Favorable court decisions continue to support the legal and constitutional basis of the compact. During the past three years these have been handed down in

See page 18 for a description of An Association of Administrators of the Interstate Compact for the Supervision of Parolees and Probationers.
The tenor of relationships between State governments and the Federal government and its agencies has undergone a substantial shift in emphasis during the past two years. In the last edition of *The Book of the States*, the article on State-Federal relations (written in mid-1949) paid particular attention to developments that were looking toward a more balanced intergovernmental fiscal structure. The recommendations of the Hoover Commission, cooperative action by the Governors' Conference and committees of Congress, and data contained in the report of the Council of State Governments on Federal grants-in-aid all were cited in this regard. Since then the worsening international situation, the Korean campaign, and the impact of inflation on the domestic economy have stilled talk of Federal tax reduction; tremendous amounts of money are being diverted to national defense; extensive cooperative programs of civil defense have been authorized; and more Federal funds have been directed into public assistance activities.

The postwar upward spiral of Federal grants-in-aid to State and local governments has continued unabated. Immediately following World War II, the level of such expenditures was somewhat under a billion dollars per year. By 1948, the figure had increased by 50 per cent, and each succeeding year has witnessed an increase measured by the hundreds of millions. Detailed recent figures on Federal-aid expenditures will be found in Table 1 at the end of this article.

Civil Defense

Intense interest in programs of civil defense was manifested at the State and national levels during 1950. The National Security Resources Board, the Federal agency at that time for civil defense planning, issued a "blue book" on civil defense, setting forth a comprehensive plan and program for organization and operation. The plan was the culmination and condensation of civil defense thinking that had been going on for ten years. The conclusions were derived from experience in the nations that were "civil defense laboratories" during World War II, and recognition was given to the strong points, as well as weaknesses, of past civil defense experience in the United States. As a case study of intergovernmental cooperation, the following summary of responsibilities enumerated by the National Security Resources Board in its report is worth quoting:

"Federal Responsibility—The responsibility of the Federal Government is to establish a national civil-defense plan with accompanying policy, and to issue informational and educational material about both.

United States Civil Defense, pp. 5-6, National Security Resources Board, Washington, 1950."
INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

The Federal Government will provide courses and facilities for schooling and training, provide coordination of interstate operations, furnish some of the essential equipment, and advise the States concerning the establishment of stockpiles of medical and other supplies needed at the time of disaster. In matters of civil defense, the Federal Government will deal directly with the State, i.e., with the Governor, or if he so delegates, with the civil-defense director.

"State Responsibility—The responsibility of the State government is to provide leadership and supervision in all planning for civil defense, and direction of supporting operations in an emergency. The State is the key operating unit. It is the 'field army' of civil defense. Its counties or cities are its 'divisions.' When one or more divisions are hard hit, the remaining ones are sent in for support—over and above the capabilities of local self-help and mutual aid. In addition, the State should participate in interstate planning and operations in collaboration with the Federal Government, provide supervision, instructors, and facilities for appropriate training programs, assume its share of financial responsibility, and accept and allocate such Federal funds, supplies, or equipment as may be provided for the counties, cities, and towns.

"Local Responsibility—The responsibility of the city or county is to operate its civil-defense system under appropriate ordinances under the guidance of the State, and make such mutual-aid pacts and other arrangements with neighboring communities as are considered necessary; also provide adequate staff and facilities for training, assume its share of financial responsibility, and participate in the State program of organized mobile support."

During 1950 and 1951, much was done to make that a reality. All of the States enacted basic civil defense statutes, based in large part on a cooperatively developed model act carried in the suggested legislative program of the Council of State Governments. One of the last actions of the 81st Congress was to pass the "Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950," signed into law early in 1951. A uniform interstate civil defense compact was developed for consideration by all the State Legislatures meeting in 1951, and it was approved by a great many of them. Each of the States is cooperating extensively with the Federal Civil Defense Administration, headed by Former Governor Millard F. Caldwell. Further details of this intergovernmental program will be found in a separate article on civil defense (page 358), and the civil defense interstate compact is treated more comprehensively in the article on interstate compacts (page 20).

SOCIAL SECURITY

The 81st Congress, by enactment of the Social Security Act Amendments of 1950, made far-reaching changes in the Nation's social welfare program. Many of the revisions have particular significance for State-Federal relations. For the first time, State and local employees may be covered under the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance program—but only if the State passes enabling legislation, if the governmental jurisdiction elects to have its workers covered, and if there is not already an existing public retirement system. This, of course, leaves many gaps in governmental worker coverage under OASI, since the existence of a prior State or local plan automatically precludes participation by the employees of a governmental unit with such a plan. Although most State Legislatures have passed the necessary enabling legislation to authorize this limited coverage, the States increasingly are recommending that Congress further amend the Social Security Act to permit the States and their political subdivisions to use OASI as a supplement to other retirement benefits available for their workers.

Public Assistance

The 1950 Social Security Act amendments made four important changes in the State-Federal program of public assistance. Perhaps most important was the addition to Federal grants-in-aid of a new category—grants to the States for needy persons who are permanently and totally disabled. Most persons in this category previously had been eligible only for "general relief," to which no Federal funds could be allocated. State plans for the new category
were well under way by the middle of 1950.

Another important change was designed to remedy a gap in aid to dependent children. The 1950 amendments permit the relative with whom a dependent child lives to be a recipient of public assistance matched by Federal funds.

Third, the Federal government will match State expenditures for assistance to aged and blind persons in certain types of public medical institutions. A condition required is designation of a State agency that will be responsible for establishing and maintaining standards of those institutions in which assistance recipients are cared for.

Finally, Federal funds were made available for direct payments by the States to hospitals, doctors, or other persons furnishing medical care. Previously, medical payments could be made only in cash to the actual recipient, which prevented working relations between the welfare agencies and medical groups in providing medical assistance.

Employment Security

The Social Security Act also was amended, at the request of State officials, to limit partially the power of the Secretary of Labor over State programs of unemployment compensation. In effect, his authority to declare State law and administration out of conformity with Federal requirements (and thus to withhold Federal grants for administrative costs) was modified. By mid-1951, the States’ unemployment trust fund reserves had increased to almost $7.5 billion.

Other Developments

The amendments of 1950 did not ignore provisions dealing with grants to States for child welfare services, maternal and child health, and services for crippled children. Grants for child welfare services were increased to an authorization annually of $10 million, almost three times the previous authorization; the authorized grant for services to crippled children was doubled, up to $15 million annually; and a substantial increase was approved for the maternal and child health program.

As this is written (in July, 1951), the United States Senate has just approved two further changes in the Social Security Act—one designed to increase monthly assistance payments under the four categories of Federally-aided relief, the other to permit States to publicize the names of persons receiving public assistance under the State-Federal program. Both proposals had been opposed by the President and the Federal Security Agency, but the amendment regarding publicity was precipitated by action taken at the 1951 legislative sessions in a number of States. Final disposition of the two amendments remains in doubt.

Education

Congressional action in 1950 authorized substantial Federal aid for construction and operation of school facilities in areas overburdened by such Federal activities as atomic plants or military bases. A three-year school construction assistance outlay, moreover, is estimated at $350 million, with matching by the States. It has been estimated that approximately 900 school districts will benefit from one or the other of the two acts.

The oft-debated question of Federal aid for general education has continued to bog down in Congress. Bills for the purpose passed the Senate in both the 80th and 81st Congresses, only to die in the House, principally because of a controversy as to whether funds should be made available to religious schools. As the 82nd Congress got under way, bills again had been introduced in both House and Senate, to provide an initial outlay of $300 million per year in Federal grants for operational assistance. Early action was not expected.

Forestry

During 1950, Congress expanded its program of cooperative forestry grants to include the provision of forest-management services for private forest landowners. Previous legislation had restricted such services to farm owners. Federal funds for the new program must be matched dollar-for-dollar by State appropriations.

The Northeastern Interstate Forest Fire Protection Compact now has been ratified by all six New England States plus New York, and preliminary approval has been given by the Canadian Province of New
Brunswick. At mid-1951 there was pending in Congress a bill to grant specific consent to participation in the compact by neighboring provinces of Canada. If and when the necessary approval is secured, this will be the first interstate-international compact ever to have been effectuated.

Tidelands

For a number of years the dispute over title to submerged lands has been one of the most controversial aspects of State-Federal relations. Decisions adverse to California, Texas, and Louisiana have been handed down by the United States Supreme Court, holding that national defense and international affairs give the Federal government a paramount right to such lands. It has been recognized, however, that Congress has the ultimate right to determine where ownership shall vest. Legislation quitclaiming the lands to the States was passed by the 79th Congress but was vetoed by the President. Similar bills were introduced in the 80th and 81st Congresses and did not pass.

During the 1951 session of the 82nd Congress, the tidelands issue was up again, this time with two alternative solutions under consideration. The House bill, introduced by Representative Walter of Pennsylvania, would give the States title to submerged lands for a distance of three miles beyond the low-tide water mark. Texas, however, would have title to lands farther from the coastline, because of particular conditions under which she joined the Union. Federal title would be retained on the remaining distance to the edge of the continental shelf, the States receiving a percentage of oil royalties derived from this zone. This bill received a favorable report from the Judiciary Committee and was passed by the House on July 30 by a margin of 265 to 109.

A considerably different joint resolution was offered in the Senate as an “interim” measure pending permanent legislation. Under this proposal, the Federal government would retain title to all submerged lands but would give a share of the royalties to bordering States. From the States' point of view, the House measure was clearly more favorable. The crucial question, in practical outlook, was whether a sufficient majority of both houses of Congress could be mustered to over-ride the expected veto by the President.

Water Resources

During 1950, Congressional approval was given to the first omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bill since 1946. An authorization act only, to be carried into effect it requires subsequent appropriations for specific projects. Of considerable interest to the States was the publication, early in 1951, of the President’s Water Resources Policy Commission—a lengthy, three-volume report on comprehensive policies and planning to conserve and develop the Nation’s water resources.

The President recommended legislation to establish a New England-New York Natural Resources Study Commission. Upon failure of Congress to approve the proposal, the President by executive order set up a Federal Interagency Committee to accomplish the same purpose. The committee’s final report is not expected before 1953. The Governor of each of the seven affected States was invited to designate a person to represent him on the committee in an advisory capacity.

The St. Lawrence Seaway project came in for another round of hearings in 1951, with the States split in their views as to its advisability. As in the past, the authorization bill was killed by Congress. An attempt by the State of New York to go ahead with the power development features of the project had been blocked in 1950, when the Federal Power Commission rejected New York’s plan for a cooperative project with Ontario. The State is expected to carry its fight to the courts, if necessary, in its attempt to carry out the mandate of the Legislature.

Highways

Congress in 1950 continued the pattern of Federal aid for highways set forth for postwar construction in the Highway Act of 1944. An authorization of $500 million for each of the fiscal years 1952 and 1953 was approved: 45 per cent for projects on the regular Federal-aid highway system, 30 per cent for secondary and feeder roads, 25 per cent for Federal highways in urban areas exclusively.
National defense needs have led the Bureau of Public Roads to ask the cooperation of State highway departments in reexamining programs of work not yet advertised for contract. The Department of Commerce has recognized that important projects on the Federal-aid primary, secondary, and urban systems contribute to national defense and are worthy of consideration for high priorities. Moreover, the States have made it clear to Federal defense transportation officials that overloading of our highway systems by the waiving of reasonable load limits should not be the national policy during the defense period.

Another meeting of the President’s Highway Safety Conference was held in Washington in June, 1951. Need was reiterated for greater uniformity among the States with respect to their traffic laws. In this connection, the study by the Council of State Governments, *Highway Safety—Motor Truck Regulation* was used by most of the States during 1950–51 as a guide to improve their laws and administration concerning highway safety programs.

**STATE LEGISLATION**

Procedures have been developed during the past dozen years which permit the States and the Federal government to cooperate in developing proposed State legislation of mutual concern. The medium through which this is accomplished is the Drafting Committee of State Officials, served and staffed by the Council of State Governments. (See page 143). Among important State-Federal proposals in the 1951 program of suggested State legislation were draft bills of a basic State civil defense act, an interstate civil defense compact, an enabling act to permit coverage of State and local employees under Federal Old-Age and Survivors’ Insurance, and legislation on hospitalization of the mentally ill, stream pollution control, brucellosis control, application of insecticides, deferred posting for banks, and slum clearance.

**OTHER SUBJECTS**

Congress during 1950 and the State Legislatures during 1951 revised their laws to facilitate voting by the large numbers of eligible men and women now in service. The Federal Housing Act, passed late in 1949 and amended during 1950, provided a long-range program of public low-rent housing with assistance to local housing authorities. This was implemented at the State level by legislation in a number of States in 1951. The same pattern was followed in development of State militia units: Congress in 1950 amended the National Defense Act to permit States to create State Guards to replace National Guard units called into active Federal service and authorized the Secretary of Defense to provide arms, ammunition, clothing, and equipment for such units. Many States enacted legislation creating State Guards in 1951, and negotiations were entered into with the Department of Defense to speed up the availability of arms and equipment.

No action was taken by the 81st Congress in 1949 or 1950 with respect to proposals for a national agency on intergovernmental relations, although bills on the subject were reported favorably in the Senate. On March 15, 1951, a proposal of similar nature was introduced in the 82nd Congress as S.1146, calling for a “temporary national bipartisan commission to be known as the National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.” Composed of twelve persons (four to be named by each of the following: the President, the presiding officer of the Senate, and the presiding officer of the House), the proposed commission would make recommendations to Congress on such matters as allocation of functions to the various levels of government, allocation of revenue sources, the problem of tax immunities, and means of adjusting grants-in-aid and tax sharing so as to guide their more effective use. As this is written (July, 1951), although a number of other bills have been introduced, S.1146 appears to have the best chance of floor action.

After more than ten years of hearings and the introduction of several hundred bills in Congress, action continued to drag in the field of providing a more rational system of payments in lieu of taxes on federally owned property. Of particular interest to counties and municipalities, a solution to this problem probably will
### Table 1

**INDIVIDUAL STATE RECEIPTS OF FEDERAL AID**  
1915-1950  
(In thousands of dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>1915</th>
<th>1925</th>
<th>1937</th>
<th>1941</th>
<th>1948</th>
<th>1950</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2,850</td>
<td>7,378</td>
<td>10,739</td>
<td>24,548</td>
<td>32,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>4,932</td>
<td>5,312</td>
<td>11,929</td>
<td>14,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2,195</td>
<td>3,607</td>
<td>5,078</td>
<td>21,915</td>
<td>32,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>4,504</td>
<td>33,588</td>
<td>64,246</td>
<td>119,454</td>
<td>179,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1,662</td>
<td>9,742</td>
<td>13,260</td>
<td>23,338</td>
<td>34,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1,113</td>
<td>4,474</td>
<td>10,707</td>
<td>11,057</td>
<td>19,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>2,023</td>
<td>1,922</td>
<td>2,846</td>
<td>4,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1,437</td>
<td>2,761</td>
<td>8,265</td>
<td>31,810</td>
<td>42,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3,116</td>
<td>6,087</td>
<td>12,077</td>
<td>31,719</td>
<td>49,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1,334</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>5,768</td>
<td>9,298</td>
<td>11,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4,672</td>
<td>37,110</td>
<td>38,016</td>
<td>59,126</td>
<td>93,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>4,009</td>
<td>9,002</td>
<td>21,103</td>
<td>26,895</td>
<td>32,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>2,314</td>
<td>14,244</td>
<td>16,439</td>
<td>26,895</td>
<td>38,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>13,282</td>
<td>12,163</td>
<td>27,035</td>
<td>32,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2,370</td>
<td>8,144</td>
<td>10,558</td>
<td>24,081</td>
<td>36,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1,169</td>
<td>8,237</td>
<td>12,397</td>
<td>26,355</td>
<td>78,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>1,325</td>
<td>4,874</td>
<td>4,937</td>
<td>8,566</td>
<td>13,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>6,383</td>
<td>8,083</td>
<td>12,980</td>
<td>18,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1,242</td>
<td>21,659</td>
<td>27,239</td>
<td>41,268</td>
<td>59,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>4,160</td>
<td>18,900</td>
<td>27,735</td>
<td>59,170</td>
<td>75,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>5,577</td>
<td>21,639</td>
<td>19,283</td>
<td>35,256</td>
<td>41,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2,504</td>
<td>14,631</td>
<td>9,419</td>
<td>22,085</td>
<td>29,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>4,617</td>
<td>16,942</td>
<td>26,283</td>
<td>49,420</td>
<td>71,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1,402</td>
<td>7,334</td>
<td>6,443</td>
<td>10,920</td>
<td>15,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1,832</td>
<td>11,321</td>
<td>9,924</td>
<td>16,337</td>
<td>19,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1,871</td>
<td>3,582</td>
<td>3,144</td>
<td>4,071</td>
<td>7,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>2,607</td>
<td>3,258</td>
<td>3,974</td>
<td>6,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>2,365</td>
<td>13,029</td>
<td>16,145</td>
<td>23,702</td>
<td>32,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3,060</td>
<td>7,355</td>
<td>5,079</td>
<td>11,774</td>
<td>15,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>5,894</td>
<td>41,363</td>
<td>59,918</td>
<td>94,791</td>
<td>127,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2,586</td>
<td>11,040</td>
<td>13,099</td>
<td>28,543</td>
<td>41,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1,133</td>
<td>7,633</td>
<td>4,745</td>
<td>8,455</td>
<td>12,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>3,510</td>
<td>23,108</td>
<td>41,368</td>
<td>58,632</td>
<td>80,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>3,238</td>
<td>16,060</td>
<td>18,458</td>
<td>49,043</td>
<td>64,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1,126</td>
<td>8,767</td>
<td>8,212</td>
<td>19,094</td>
<td>22,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>4,279</td>
<td>27,292</td>
<td>47,984</td>
<td>76,313</td>
<td>94,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>4,225</td>
<td>3,733</td>
<td>6,328</td>
<td>8,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1,874</td>
<td>6,274</td>
<td>6,583</td>
<td>18,953</td>
<td>24,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2,283</td>
<td>6,961</td>
<td>5,911</td>
<td>9,952</td>
<td>13,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>2,574</td>
<td>6,567</td>
<td>10,698</td>
<td>29,931</td>
<td>46,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5,322</td>
<td>33,856</td>
<td>32,136</td>
<td>84,099</td>
<td>110,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1,784</td>
<td>5,337</td>
<td>6,162</td>
<td>10,938</td>
<td>12,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>2,153</td>
<td>2,758</td>
<td>4,905</td>
<td>6,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2,361</td>
<td>7,733</td>
<td>9,212</td>
<td>15,706</td>
<td>21,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1,441</td>
<td>14,306</td>
<td>12,902</td>
<td>38,293</td>
<td>45,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>6,584</td>
<td>8,917</td>
<td>15,994</td>
<td>15,683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>10,096</td>
<td>16,186</td>
<td>25,788</td>
<td>42,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>6,561</td>
<td>5,710</td>
<td>7,211</td>
<td>12,049</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** | $5,356 | $113,642 | $546,807 | $1,311,542 | $1,398,948 | $1,960,114

**Source:** Bureau of the Census.
### Table 2

**FEDERAL AID TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS—1950-1952**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function, agency, and program</th>
<th>1950 Actual</th>
<th>1951 Estimate</th>
<th>1952 Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRANTS-IN-AID</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans' Services and Benefits:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid to State homes</td>
<td>$3,355,405</td>
<td>$3,900,000</td>
<td>$4,095,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision of on-the-job training</td>
<td>3,801,146</td>
<td>4,830,000</td>
<td>4,114,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of unemployment and self-employment benefits</td>
<td>7,468,395</td>
<td>3,540,923</td>
<td>2,586,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Services Administration: Veterans' educational facilities</td>
<td>622,919</td>
<td>30,718</td>
<td>6,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, veterans' services and benefits</td>
<td>15,277,865</td>
<td>12,301,641</td>
<td>10,801,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Security, Welfare and Health:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Security Agency:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational rehabilitation</td>
<td>24,037,294</td>
<td>20,792,553</td>
<td>23,212,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public assistance</td>
<td>1,125,417,659</td>
<td>1,280,692,349</td>
<td>1,400,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child-welfare services</td>
<td>330,065</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal and child health services</td>
<td>138,089</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services for crippled children</td>
<td>102,336</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency maternity and infant care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal and child welfare</td>
<td>22,216,345</td>
<td>29,090,724</td>
<td>33,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of venereal disease</td>
<td>13,366,733</td>
<td>10,705,600</td>
<td>9,625,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of tuberculosis</td>
<td>6,761,263</td>
<td>6,350,000</td>
<td>6,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General public health assistance to States</td>
<td>14,081,128</td>
<td>13,500,500</td>
<td>13,340,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disease and sanitation control, Alaska</td>
<td>737,117</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>630,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital construction</td>
<td>55,658,184</td>
<td>140,000,000</td>
<td>136,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portion going to private nonprofit institutions</td>
<td>(47,309,650)</td>
<td>(112,000,000)</td>
<td>(95,200,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys and programs for hospital construction</td>
<td>159,834</td>
<td>192,000</td>
<td>206,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health activities</td>
<td>3,293,697</td>
<td>3,200,000</td>
<td>3,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Heart Institute</td>
<td>1,749,484</td>
<td>1,790,000</td>
<td>1,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Cancer Institute</td>
<td>3,246,056</td>
<td>3,200,000</td>
<td>3,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water pollution control</td>
<td>995,427</td>
<td>1,004,573</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water pollution control, plan preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid to medical education and local health services (proposed legislation)</td>
<td>7,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Services Administration: Liquidation of Public Works Administration</td>
<td>83,065,841</td>
<td>83,100,000</td>
<td>83,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, social security, welfare, and health</td>
<td>1,354,655,651</td>
<td>1,594,133,375</td>
<td>1,621,707,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing and Community Development:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and Home Finance Agency:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slum clearance and urban redevelopment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-rent housing program—annual contributions</td>
<td>7,121,489</td>
<td>9,151,550</td>
<td>15,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans' re-use housing</td>
<td>2,312,572</td>
<td>795,150</td>
<td>566,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Services Administration: Defense public works, community facilities</td>
<td>264,331</td>
<td>727,928</td>
<td>707,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Civil Defense Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, housing and community development</td>
<td>9,918,592</td>
<td>10,674,628</td>
<td>123,274,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education and General Research:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Security Agency:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education of the blind</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational education</td>
<td>26,359,591</td>
<td>27,023,883</td>
<td>27,167,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts</td>
<td>6,010,000</td>
<td>5,030,000</td>
<td>5,030,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education of children on Federal property and in areas especially affected by Federal activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance and operation of schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State surveys of school constriction needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance and operation of schools, community facilities</td>
<td>7,098,609</td>
<td>7,550,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General aid to elementary and secondary education (proposed legislation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, education and general research</td>
<td>38,613,200</td>
<td>70,930,883</td>
<td>472,072,883</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The Budget for Fiscal Year 1952, p. 996, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President.
* Deduct.
### INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

#### Table 2—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function, agency, and program</th>
<th>1950 Actual</th>
<th>1951 Estimate</th>
<th>1952 Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRANTS-IN-AID—Continued</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Agricultural Resources: Department of Agriculture: Cooperative agricultural extension work</td>
<td>$31,145,018</td>
<td>$32,287,511</td>
<td>$31,899,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural experiment stations</td>
<td>12,243,512</td>
<td>12,418,294</td>
<td>12,453,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Marketing Act of 1946: Cooperative projects in marketing</td>
<td>1,339,582</td>
<td>1,430,000</td>
<td>1,350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of surplus agricultural commodities</td>
<td>50,000,000</td>
<td>76,000,000</td>
<td>56,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commodity Credit Corporation: Donation of commodities</td>
<td>11,547,461</td>
<td>60,603,330</td>
<td>59,917,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, agriculture and agricultural resources</td>
<td>106,275,573</td>
<td>182,739,135</td>
<td>182,130,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Resources:</strong> Department of Agriculture: State and private forestry cooperation</td>
<td>9,465,906</td>
<td>9,888,821</td>
<td>9,890,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of the Interior: Wildlife restoration</td>
<td>7,490,752</td>
<td>8,706,803</td>
<td>9,486,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish restoration and management</td>
<td></td>
<td>860,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, natural resources</td>
<td>16,956,658</td>
<td>18,595,624</td>
<td>20,236,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation and Communication:</strong> Department of Commerce: Federal-aid highway system</td>
<td>7,025,012</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>1,558,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal-aid secondary or feeder roads</td>
<td>3,477,559</td>
<td>1,600,000</td>
<td>1,030,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elimination of grade crossings</td>
<td>10,155,389</td>
<td>8,237,814</td>
<td>5,211,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal-aid postwar highway construction</td>
<td>400,189,712</td>
<td>406,094,732</td>
<td>408,770,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic highway network (national defense)</td>
<td>1,105,043</td>
<td>331,950</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys and plans, roads (national defense)</td>
<td>1,025,585</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency relief, highways, grade-crossing elimination, etc.</td>
<td>488,015</td>
<td>381,046</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War and emergency damage, roads, Territory of Hawaii</td>
<td>2,028,719</td>
<td>3,600,000</td>
<td>2,230,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal-aid airport program</td>
<td>33,432,770</td>
<td>33,507,000</td>
<td>45,555,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State marine schools</td>
<td>157,760</td>
<td>167,500</td>
<td>180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, transportation and communication</td>
<td>465,086,254</td>
<td>459,440,062</td>
<td>466,025,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Labor:</strong> Department of Labor: Unemployment compensation and employment service administration</td>
<td>207,616,574</td>
<td>159,362,276</td>
<td>159,420,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public employment office employment service functions</td>
<td>860</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, labor</td>
<td>207,617,434</td>
<td>159,362,276</td>
<td>159,420,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General government:</strong> District of Columbia: Federal contribution</td>
<td>12,000,000</td>
<td>10,800,000</td>
<td>12,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, grants-in-aid</td>
<td>2,276,381,227</td>
<td>2,518,977,624</td>
<td>3,003,670,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHARED REVENUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET LOANS AND REPAYABLE ADVANCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total, grants-in-aid, shared revenues, loans and repayable advances</td>
<td>2,268,808,423</td>
<td>2,271,167,966</td>
<td>3,176,512,124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The accompanying Tables, 1 and 2, summarize Federal grant-in-aid expenditure trends. Table 2 is the more detailed, showing individual program grants as set forth in the Federal budget document for the fiscal year 1952. It indicates actual expenditures for the fiscal year 1950, and estimates for 1951 and 1952. Moreover, Table 2 includes grants-in-aid to local governments as well as States and a number of other expenditures not usually listed in the category of grants. Table 1 shows the total amount of Federal aid received by individual States over a period of selected years, as reported by the United States Bureau of the Census. Although not strictly comparable, both tables clearly indicate the extent to which Federal grants-in-aid have been expanding in the past few years.²

²For further analysis of Federal-Aid programs, see Federal Grants-in-Aid, Council of State Governments, Chicago, January, 1949.
STATE-LOCAL relations during 1949–51 were marked by developments in the field of home rule, a sharp reduction in the number of school units, the problem of adequate local finances, and questions of state legislative and administrative supervision of the policy decisions of local government.

LOCAL UNITS AND AREAS

The number of units of local government has changed considerably in the last decade. In 1942 the Census of Governments reported 155,116 units of government in the United States, 108,579 of which were school districts organized independently from municipalities, towns, or township, or counties.¹ By 1951 thousands of school districts had been eliminated, mostly small rural districts employing only one or two teachers. About 25,000 units, or about a quarter of those existing in 1942, were abolished.

Among leaders of the movement to enlarge school districts have been Illinois, with a nine-year reduction of over 6,500; Kansas, with more than 3,100 eliminated; Oklahoma, more than 2,100; Texas, about 1,800; New York, about 1,500; and Arkansas, more than 1,000. Although many different methods have been used in the various States to bring about larger school districts, by far the most popular has been the so-called Illinois system. Under this plan, the State Legislature provides for creation of State and county survey committees. Committees in each county study school district units and recommend any changes they deem desirable. If enlarged school units are proposed, a favorable majority of voters casting ballots on the proposition in each entire proposed school unit is sufficient for its establishment.

The number of towns and townships has declined, also. An unsuccessful attempt at legislating townships out of existence was made in Missouri during the last biennium, but several counties in Missouri, Minnesota, and elsewhere have abandoned township government. Individual townships have voted themselves out of existence in some midwestern States. Legislatures have tended to keep hands off the issue of abolishing townships, preferring to let counties or individual townships decide the matter for themselves. The most the Legislatures have done is to transfer power to perform certain services from townships to the counties. During the last biennium, however, there was not much legislation of this type.

The number of incorporated municipalities continues to increase. This is particularly true in large urban centers, where ring after ring of suburbs complicates metropolitan-wide problems. The 1950 census indicated that suburban population is increasing at a much faster rate than that of the central cities. Yet, no State

---

¹Prepared by Edward W. Weidner, Associate Professor of Political Science, Michigan State College.
legislature has established an over-all policy for metropolitan government.

One state, New Mexico, established a new county during the last biennium. Los Alamos County was created because of a great increase in population growth due to atomic energy installations in the area.

A trend towards special, separate authorities is in evidence in several States. Pennsylvania has been a leader in the municipal "authority" field, under its flexible 1935 law. Under this law more than 100 municipal authorities have been in operation during the last biennium.

**HOME RULE**

There were many legislative developments during 1949–51 that extended home rule to more cities and counties than ever before. While definitions of local home rule vary widely, in the broadest sense of the term progress was reported in almost every phase of home rule. Some Legislatures extended it to cities or counties by a simple legislative act. This was the case with the 1951 Georgia Legislature, which passed a home rule law for municipalities. The 1951 Maryland Legislature refused to approve a general constitutional municipal home rule proposal, but it did provide for home rule in legislative-granted charters. Six cities already have been granted such basic laws. In Connecticut the Legislature granted home rule to towns, cities, and boroughs, especially in regard to certain of their powers and certain questions of consolidation of local governments.

In two States constitutional home rule was extended. Rhode Island held a constitutional convention in 1951, during which a self-executing provision for home rule for cities and towns was proposed. This amendment to the constitution was approved by the voters. The 1950 Louisiana Legislature proposed a constitutional amendment giving New Orleans a home rule charter. Again, this was approved by the voters, the same year.

Many counties and cities still refused to make use of the home rule powers granted them. It is estimated that more than one-third of the counties could have the manager plan either through their own or their Legislatures' actions. Yet, very few of them have made attempts in this direction. Actually, many county and municipal officials have opposed home rule from time to time. This was true during the last biennium of certain municipal officials of the League of Third Class Cities in Pennsylvania and of some officials in Indiana, Illinois, Rhode Island, and Connecticut. For these and other reasons provisions to extend home rule have been defeated or delayed in some States. Home rule was defeated in the 1949 Arkansas legislature. In the State of Washington a proposal to strengthen the constitutional home rule provisions in that State failed in 1951.

Perhaps the three most notable local applications of home rule during 1949–51 were in New Orleans, Philadelphia, and St. Louis County (Missouri). In the case of New Orleans and Philadelphia, home rule was secured only after a long legislative and political contest. The significance of the St. Louis County home rule charter lies in the fact that at least some urban counties are beginning to make use of home rule provisions. Except for a number of counties in California, constitutional county home rule remains limited in practice to one or two counties in Maryland and Missouri.

Important progress has been made in the last biennium in legislation permitting local governments one or more options in forms of government. In Illinois the council-manager plan is now an option for all municipalities of 500,000 inhabitants or less. Previous to the 1951 Legislature, only cities of less than 5,000 were permitted this alternative. The controversy over the matter was of long standing. The 1951 Arizona Legislature permitted municipalities of that State to adopt the manager plan by ordinance. Previously they had been permitted to do this only by formal charter amendment. The most extensive optional charter legislation passed during the biennium was the New Jersey 1950 local government law, which provided fourteen optional charters for municipal government. Included in the fourteen were six varieties of the strong mayor plan, four of the council-manager plan, and four designed for small municipalities of 12,000 inhabitants or less. In addition to these options, there were broad alternatives as to the powers that cities may exercise.
The one major reversal in optional legislation for cities was the abolition of proportional representation as a future alternative for Massachusetts' municipalities. The Legislature took this action in 1949.

The counties of Virginia were provided a third optional form of government by the 1950 legislature. Named the “county board form,” in comparison with the other options, it provides for somewhat fewer changes in the predominant pattern of existing county government in the State. The 1951 Nevada Legislature approved a law permitting all counties with more than 10,000 population to adopt the county manager form of government.

In some states each legislative session has continued to present a maze of special enabling legislation for local governments on a wide variety of subjects. Most of this is of a permissive variety. With recent legislation, forty-six States now permit some or all of their counties and townships to enact rural zoning ordinances.

There continued to be disagreement between State and local authorities over the scope of power granted to local governments. Thus in certain States members of county governing bodies recently have criticized States for what they claim is the stripping of county welfare boards of authority in the policy determination field. The county welfare boards, it was contended, should be allowed to determine such things as need.

Although there is still much work to be done, the developments in home rule and optional forms legislation during the last biennium have been in accord with recommendations by the Committee on State-Local Relations of the Council of State Governments. In 1946, the committee recommended in its report, State-Local Relations, that all States should make the three major forms of city government available to cities and that constitutional home rule should be extended.

**Other Aspects of State-Local Relations**

During the last few years the trend has continued toward the extension of State facilities and services to local governments on a voluntary basis. The effect of such extensions is to permit small units of government to operate various activities on a much more economical and effective basis than otherwise would be the case. It enables them to make use of the economies of scale that States can obtain through employment and continual use of specialized personnel and equipment. Two examples of this kind of activity are the Washington counties that increasingly have joined the employee retirement plan adopted by the Legislature in 1947 and the Connecticut agreement of two years later, providing police services on a mutual agreement basis to the towns by the State. Four towns had accepted such services from the State by early 1950. They are provided with a fully trained State police officer with full equipment.

The several States continued to grapple with State-local fiscal problems in the last biennium. No other State has yet given as much leeway to local governments in tax matters as Pennsylvania did in 1947. Yet, there has been a continual increase in state-shared taxes and grants-in-aid. (See the following article, “State Aid to Local Governments,” beginning on page 51, and accompanying tables.) Some special problems have arisen in regard to grants-in-aid. Some of these have been administrative, most prominently a problem in adequate local budget control and a difficulty in planning future expenditures and services. Just as the States have had difficulty, in some instances, in controlling departments that receive extensive grants-in-aid from the national government, so local councils, budget officials, managers, and mayors sometimes have had difficulty in controlling departments receiving large State grants-in-aid. In cases of grant-in-aid provisions requiring new services or matching with local funds, planning has been much more difficult for local officials.
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STATE AID TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

IN 1950*

**Fiscal** aid paid to local governments by the forty-eight State governments amounted to $4 billion in fiscal 1950. Of all State general expenditure, State aid made up 30.4 per cent.

As shown in the chart on page 52, State aid to local governments has risen materially in recent years, more than keeping pace with the rate of increase in State revenue. Total State aid in 1950 considerably exceeded the sum of all State government expenditure—including aid—in 1932, sixteen years earlier.

**State Aid Defined**

The term “State aid to local governments” is used here regarding amounts, other than loans, paid from State funds to local governments for their use in performing specified functions or for their general financial support. Thus defined, State aid includes both grants-in-aid and local shares of taxes imposed and collected by the State, and redistribution to local governments of Federal aid received by States.

State governments may “aid” local governments in various ways other than by actual payment of money to them. Such “aid,” however, is not reflected in this report. Thus, the definition stated above excludes the following:

1. Non-fiscal assistance by a State to local governments in the form of advisory or other services or aid in kind (e.g., free provision of commodities, textbooks, etc., or loan of equipment).

2. Assumption by a State of direct operating responsibility for functions traditionally performed by local governments (e.g., direct maintenance by the State of North Carolina of a basic nine-month public school term and, in several States, provision of local streets and highways or of general relief).

3. Joint State-local activities, involving State expenditure of the State’s share of costs directly for goods, services, or public assistance payments rather than in the form of payments to local governments.

4. Contribution by a State to trust funds it administers for the financing of retirement benefits to local government employees.

5. Shares of State-imposed taxes which are collected and retained by local governments.

The items above do not constitute State aid as here considered, because no funds actually pass between a State and its local governments. However, certain items for which money actually passes from a State to its local governments are also excluded from State aid, because they involve agency or contractual service relations.

**Classification of State Aid**

**By Type of Receiving Government**

Five major types of local government are to be distinguished. These are:

1. Counties.

2. Cities, which include all incorporated places having powers of general government, thus including units known locally as villages, boroughs, and towns (except in New England States and in New York and Wisconsin) as well as “cities.”

3. Townships, which include units locally called “towns” in the New England States and in New York and Wisconsin.

4. School districts, which include only those units of school administration that have status as independent units of local government rather than as administrative segments of State, county, city, or township governments.

5. Special districts, which include districts and authorities established for the performance of a single function or a designated combination of specific functions,

*Adapted from Bureau of the Census, State Aid to Local Governments and Compendium of State Government Finances in 1950.*
and which have status as independent units of government rather than as administrative segments of State, county, city, or township governments.

To school districts was paid $1,567 million of the $4 billion distributed as State aid in 1950. In addition, some amounts of State aid for school purposes were distributed to those county, city, and township governments which themselves operated and maintained public schools.

A total of $1,115 million in State aid was paid to counties in 1950, $1,046 million to cities, $69 million to townships, and $14 million to special districts.

Certain State aids are distributed in such a manner that information is not available as to amounts allocated to particular types of governments. Those aids for which no breakdown by type of receiving government can be shown amounted to $201 million in 1950.

Summary figures are shown by States in Table 2, in which emphasis has been placed on separating, as far as possible, amounts of aid paid to each type of government.

### By Purpose of Aid

State aid is provided both for general financial support of local governments and for support of designated functions performed by local governments. Also, the local application of some State aid is limited to specified purposes which are multi-functional in nature (e.g., public works and employee retirement systems).

By far the largest segment of aid to local governments is for support of public schools. Nearly half of all State aid in 1950 was for education—the amount so provided being $1,982 million. For public welfare and for highways, $773 million and $576 million respectively were supplied in 1950.

Other designated purposes together accounted for $194 million of State-aid expenditure, and nearly one-eighth—$486 million—of State aid was made available without explicit restriction for general financial support of local governments.

State expenditures for aid to local governments are summarized by major function in Table 3.

### By Source of Funds

There is widespread interest in sources of State aid. However, no summary classification by source is attempted here, because of technical difficulties and the fact that information is not available as to amounts allocated to particular types of governments.
that data so presented might easily be misinterpreted.

Some items lend themselves readily to direct classification by source—e.g., a specific share of a State tax which is passed on to local governments, either directly as collected or after payment into a fund which is devoted solely to State aid. At the other extreme, of course, are grants payable from a State “general fund” fed by numerous revenue sources. An intermediate situation involves aid payable from a special fund which in turn is fed by two or more earmarked revenue sources. Aid amounts so payable are sometimes directly or indirectly determined by the amounts flowing into the fund, rather than—as is commonly true of “general fund” grants—by specific-amount appropriations. However, such resources lose their exact source identity when deposited to the fund.

There are, thus, serious technical obstacles to a valid statistical classification of aid amounts by source, other than one ending with a large category comprising “multiple source” items. Even more important, figures so classified would be subject to possible misinterpretation, by tending to exaggerate interstate differences. For example, they would suggest a major difference, rather than only one of fund structure and accounting method, as between State A, where sales tax revenue is paid into a general fund from which various grants to local government are payable, and State B, where similar amounts of aid are payable directly from sales tax revenue as received or deposited into a special fund.

Such exaggeration of interstate differences could be avoided only by some procedure for statistical allocation of aid amounts paid from multiple sources, which in turn would involve questionable assumptions in many instances.

STATE-AID FORMULAS

Particular programs of state aid to local governments involve various means by which (a) the total amount available for a particular fiscal year or biennium is established; and (b) the shares payable to various individual governments are determined.

Setting of Total Amount

The amount of some items of State aid is set by a specific appropriation of such a nature that a particular total sum named will be distributed without diminution or modification.

At the other extreme are aid items whose total amount is not explicitly determined, or even limited, in advance. One example of this type is the distribution of a specified share of some particular State revenue source, with the actual current amount of aid determined by the yield of that source. Another example is the “open-end” authorization of whatever amount is needed to meet the requirements of a particular distributive formula.

Between the absolutely fixed and the completely indeterminate types of aid provisions are numerous gradations and combinations of methods. Thus, a specified share of some revenue source may be authorized for aid, but with the total sum for the current period limited also by a specific-amount appropriation. Again, a definite amount may be appropriated as a maximum, subject to reduction by the operation of a distributive formula or by administrative action.

Basis of Distribution

The bases for determining individual governments’ shares of a particular grant or shared tax are also extremely varied.

The term “shared tax” has sometimes been applied strictly to specified portions of State taxes distributed back to local governments of origin without restriction as to use. On the other hand, some aid thus distributed on a source basis is limited to particular functions or purposes.

More generally, aid for the support of specific local government functions is distributed with reference to some measure of local need or activity (e.g., for education—school-age population, enrollment or attendance, or actual local expenditure; for highways—miles of roads, number of vehicles, or particular local requirements; for public welfare programs—actual or estimated local expenditures).

A broad measure of need finds expression in formulas based on local population and applied to the distribution of money for general local government support.
For many aid programs using a measure of local need, some standard of local financial effort or ability is also applied, aiming at a degree of "equalization" as between relatively poor and more prosperous local units. A contrasting principle is applied where a "floor" is provided in terms of a minimum amount of aid payable to each local governmental unit involved. Finally, some aid programs provide an identical amount to all local units of a particular type.

**INTERSTATE COMPARISONS**

Tables 2 to 4 afford a basis for comparing amounts of aid to local governments provided by individual States. It is important that such comparisons take adequate account of the aid concept employed, and of the great variations which exist in the pattern of State-local responsibility for particular governmental functions throughout the Nation. Thus, State A directly provides public schools, local highways, or public assistance; State B grants to its local governments funds for local performance of these functions under State supervision. The total cost to each State may be similar, although involving a different form of State expenditure.

Hasty conclusions and interpretations must therefore be avoided in this area, and interstate comparisons can be made only with caution and, usually, some qualification. Conclusions can be drawn only by considering the whole area of State-local relations and the economic, historical, and political factors affecting them.

### TABLE 1

**SUMMARY OF STATE AID TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS: 1942–1950**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Purpose unspecified</th>
<th>For specified purposes</th>
<th>Per capita</th>
<th>As per cent of total general revenue of state governments</th>
<th>As per cent of total general revenue of local governments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>$4,011</td>
<td>$486</td>
<td>$1,982</td>
<td>$773</td>
<td>$576</td>
<td>$27.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>3,544</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>1,728</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>24.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>3,167</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>1,490</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>22.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>2,549</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>1,129</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>18.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>2,044</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>15.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>1,848</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>13.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>1,807</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>13.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>1,746</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>13.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>1,740</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>13.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*State fiscal years ending June 30 of the calendar year specified, or during the preceding 12 months.

**NOTES:**

- Including amounts for specified purposes not shown here.

**Table 1 Notes:**

- Based on total population as of July 1 of the preceding year excluding armed forces overseas.
### GENERAL EXPENDITURE FOR STATE AID, BY TYPE OF RECEIVING GOVERNMENT AND BY STATE: 1950

(Amounts not segregable by type of government, which are preponderantly for a specified type, are included under that type)

(Dollar amounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>1950</th>
<th>1949</th>
<th>Per cent change</th>
<th>Counties</th>
<th>Cities</th>
<th>School districts</th>
<th>Townships(a)</th>
<th>Other (b)</th>
<th>Combined and unallocable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>$4,011,471</td>
<td>$3,544,253</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>$1,114,820</td>
<td>$1,045,566</td>
<td>$1,566,694</td>
<td>$59,471</td>
<td>$13,695</td>
<td>$201,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>37,982</td>
<td>37,002</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>7,971</td>
<td>2,838</td>
<td>26,982</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>22,908</td>
<td>22,922</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>9,008</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>11,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>407,009</td>
<td>407,961</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>184,028</td>
<td>79,081</td>
<td>227,225</td>
<td>6,675</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>69,427</td>
<td>67,465</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>43,573</td>
<td>15,972</td>
<td>9,882</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>7,063</td>
<td>5,705</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>1,228</td>
<td>2,830</td>
<td>3,715</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>46,388</td>
<td>47,230</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>8,637</td>
<td>2,871</td>
<td>46,806</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>137,275</td>
<td>138,464</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>24,440</td>
<td>29,818</td>
<td>53,916</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>28,377(c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>116,377</td>
<td>103,019</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>47,493</td>
<td>10,446</td>
<td>58,346</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>58,404</td>
<td>47,230</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>8,637</td>
<td>2,871</td>
<td>46,806</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>137,275</td>
<td>138,464</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>24,440</td>
<td>29,818</td>
<td>53,916</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>28,377(c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>25,766</td>
<td>25,472</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1,235</td>
<td>1,767</td>
<td>22,764</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>101,162</td>
<td>102,212</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>6,622</td>
<td>8,021</td>
<td>67,409</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>9,369</td>
<td>8,190</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,657</td>
<td>1,712(f)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>78,147</td>
<td>63,029</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>45,360</td>
<td>32,624</td>
<td>163(g)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>179,066</td>
<td>134,339</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>178,991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>251,192</td>
<td>234,620</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>10,739</td>
<td>42,686</td>
<td>140,569</td>
<td>12,798</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>44,193(h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>95,085</td>
<td>79,679</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>46,970</td>
<td>6,657</td>
<td>41,428</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>47,628</td>
<td>42,963</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>41,437</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>6,078</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>47,628</td>
<td>42,963</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>41,437</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>6,078</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>6,940</td>
<td>3,965</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>6,361</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>29,680</td>
<td>26,971</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>27,121</td>
<td>1,688</td>
<td>871</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>3,144</td>
<td>2,326</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2,284</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>2,127</td>
<td>2,138</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>2,057</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>65,980</td>
<td>62,061</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>25,905</td>
<td>13,198(f)</td>
<td>(f)</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>26,704(j)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>20,905</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>572,912</td>
<td>460,855</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>89,268</td>
<td>39,500</td>
<td>75,183</td>
<td>15,978</td>
<td>2,045</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>39,794</td>
<td>27,694</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>31,197</td>
<td>2,547</td>
<td>5,444</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,040(g)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>9,835</td>
<td>9,945</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>8,767</td>
<td>5,444</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>230,018</td>
<td>214,849</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>56,542</td>
<td>36,930</td>
<td>95,433</td>
<td>7,718</td>
<td>33,959(g)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>65,860</td>
<td>47,234</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>22,006</td>
<td>3,771</td>
<td>40,083</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>33,946</td>
<td>30,740</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>8,947</td>
<td>3,618</td>
<td>21,381</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>142,359</td>
<td>130,244</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>9,183</td>
<td>23,860</td>
<td>111,521</td>
<td>6,895</td>
<td>894</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>12,660</td>
<td>11,035</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,979</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,690</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>46,938</td>
<td>42,370</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>13,034</td>
<td>2,241</td>
<td>31,496</td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>4,411</td>
<td>3,965</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>1,183</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>2,395</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1,467(g)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>76,019</td>
<td>70,389</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>51,848</td>
<td>17,304</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>124,134</td>
<td>119,212</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>10,408</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>113,300</td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>18,300</td>
<td>17,375</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1,945</td>
<td>1,425</td>
<td>14,936</td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>5,944</td>
<td>5,306</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>301</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>5,440</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>58,530</td>
<td>54,980</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>39,465</td>
<td>19,065</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>132,551</td>
<td>114,035</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>45,794</td>
<td>14,084</td>
<td>72,432</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>136,338</td>
<td>130,470</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>54,154</td>
<td>58,102</td>
<td>45,055</td>
<td>4,684</td>
<td>21,478(k)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>9,373</td>
<td>6,611</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>4,823</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>3,774</td>
<td></td>
<td>613(d)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Includes "towns" for the New England States and New York and Wisconsin.
(b) Consists of special-purpose districts such as flood control, urbanization, and other districts, boards of supervisors, airports authorities and the like.
(c) Consists of $26,421 thousand paid to cities of Chicago, townships, and counties without township organization, and to villages and non-county townships.
(d) Paid to all taxing units.
(e) Consists of $1,421 thousand paid to cities, school districts, and other special districts, and $5,869 thousand paid to all taxing units.
(f) An amount for townships; (or towns) is included in the amount for cities.
(g) Paid to cities and counties.
(h) Consists of $43,550 thousand paid to counties and cities and $1,643 thousand paid to all taxing units.
(i) Amount of school aid paid to the cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul, which operate their own school systems, included in the amount for school districts.
(j) Paid to cities and townships operating school systems and to independent school districts.
(k) Paid to cities operating school systems and to independent school districts.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Purpose unspecified</th>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Debt service only</th>
<th>Total(a)</th>
<th>General relief</th>
<th>Old-age assistance</th>
<th>Aid to dependent children</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Hospitals and institutions for the handicapped</th>
<th>Other and unallocable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$4,011,471</td>
<td>$485,876</td>
<td>$1,982,137</td>
<td>$576,342</td>
<td>$59,475</td>
<td>$772,901</td>
<td>$189,363</td>
<td>$384,363</td>
<td>$175,454</td>
<td>$33,222</td>
<td>$42,369</td>
<td>$118,624(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>96,440</td>
<td>8,183</td>
<td>10,046</td>
<td>14,721</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,014</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>17,317</td>
<td>4,766</td>
<td>898</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>22,908</td>
<td>8,622</td>
<td>11,100</td>
<td>3,047</td>
<td></td>
<td>32,982</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>37,982</td>
<td>5,193</td>
<td>20,982</td>
<td>5,373</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>100,170(c)</td>
<td>54,241(c)</td>
<td>42,331</td>
<td>2,660</td>
<td>8,133</td>
<td>77,235(d)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>497,009</td>
<td>12,468</td>
<td>227,557</td>
<td>68,786</td>
<td></td>
<td>549,251</td>
<td>1,115</td>
<td>41,596</td>
<td>4,048</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>1,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>59,427</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>9,882</td>
<td>10,811</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35,008</td>
<td>2,875</td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>31,982</td>
<td>4,067</td>
<td>10,121</td>
<td>1,036</td>
<td>1,036</td>
<td></td>
<td>35,008</td>
<td>2,875</td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>7,663</td>
<td>6,315</td>
<td>7,808</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>342</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,808</td>
<td>399</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>67,943</td>
<td>2,897</td>
<td>50,081</td>
<td>12,413</td>
<td>11,483</td>
<td></td>
<td>50,081</td>
<td>399</td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2,494</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>58,404</td>
<td>1,396</td>
<td>49,225</td>
<td>4,817</td>
<td></td>
<td>51,666(e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>7,408</td>
<td>1,396</td>
<td>4,390</td>
<td>1,623</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>137,275</td>
<td>34,871</td>
<td>78,346</td>
<td>25,371</td>
<td></td>
<td>187,234</td>
<td>6,150</td>
<td>26,303</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,309</td>
<td>2,246</td>
<td>3,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>116,377</td>
<td>2,793</td>
<td>58,346</td>
<td>26,371</td>
<td></td>
<td>126,134</td>
<td>6,150</td>
<td>26,303</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,309</td>
<td>2,246</td>
<td>3,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>80,879</td>
<td>25,318</td>
<td>25,477</td>
<td>30,084</td>
<td>4,048</td>
<td>104,965</td>
<td>3,091</td>
<td>19,029</td>
<td>3,091</td>
<td>3,091</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>63,015</td>
<td>8,774</td>
<td>20,339</td>
<td>4,048</td>
<td>4,048</td>
<td>97,368</td>
<td>3,091</td>
<td>19,029</td>
<td>3,091</td>
<td>3,091</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>25,766</td>
<td>24,402</td>
<td>1,357</td>
<td>1,357</td>
<td>1,357</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>101,162</td>
<td>23,649</td>
<td>67,614</td>
<td>6,872</td>
<td>228</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>9,369</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>5,985</td>
<td>2,177</td>
<td></td>
<td>608</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>78,147</td>
<td>10,540</td>
<td>32,647</td>
<td>20,391</td>
<td></td>
<td>132,458</td>
<td>2,133</td>
<td>4,527</td>
<td></td>
<td>157</td>
<td>1,516</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>179,056</td>
<td>71,835</td>
<td>25,657</td>
<td>3,077</td>
<td></td>
<td>184,732</td>
<td>5,679</td>
<td>59,977</td>
<td>10,085</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>1,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>251,192</td>
<td>49,252</td>
<td>140,559</td>
<td>42,750</td>
<td></td>
<td>303,501</td>
<td>6,888</td>
<td>1,730</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>95,088</td>
<td>7,571</td>
<td>41,428</td>
<td>10,589</td>
<td></td>
<td>137,091</td>
<td>4,065</td>
<td>3,195</td>
<td></td>
<td>367</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>41,023</td>
<td>6,291</td>
<td>24,855</td>
<td>14,044</td>
<td>3,047</td>
<td>68,074</td>
<td>1,072</td>
<td>26,099</td>
<td>5,978</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2,473</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>40,977</td>
<td>1,419</td>
<td>44,532</td>
<td>1,007</td>
<td>1,007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>788</td>
<td>431</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>6,940</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6,361</td>
<td>420</td>
<td></td>
<td>420</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>420</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Amounts (in thousands)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>29,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>3,144</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>2,322</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>65,980</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>20,905</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>572,912</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>39,784</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>9,345</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>230,018</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>65,860</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>33,946</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>142,359</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>12,069</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>40,946</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>4,421</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>70,619</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>174,134</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>18,306</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>5,944</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>58,550</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>132,551</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>46,838</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>136,538</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>9,373</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Includes amounts for activities not shown separately, totaling $10,251 thousand for aid to the blind and $1,147 thousand for other public welfare.
(b) Includes segregable amounts as follows: $63,479 thousand for public safety, $14,241 thousand for sanitation, $13,709 thousand for retirement of local government employees, $3,856 thousand for airports, and $3,909 thousand for public housing.
(c) Aid paid for the period March 1 to June 30, 1950. From July 1, 1949 to February 28, 1950, old-age assistance and aid to the blind were directly administered by the State and expenditure is shown as for operation.
(d) Includes $59,580 thousand for public safety and $14,315 thousand for sanitation.
(e) Segregation not available.
### Table 4

**PER CAPITA AMOUNTS OF STATE AID TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS, AND RELATION OF STATE AID TO STATE GENERAL REVENUE, BY STATE: 1950**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Per capita general expenditure for aid to local governments</th>
<th>Per cent paid to local governments is of general revenue excluding unemployment compensation taxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specified purpose:</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>$27.16</td>
<td>$3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>$32.10</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>$31.55</td>
<td>11.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>$20.70</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>$47.34</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>$55.19</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>$10.95</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>$24.02</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>$25.36</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>$17.38</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>$12.95</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>$15.91</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>$29.87</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>$31.70</td>
<td>9.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>$33.82</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>$9.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>$38.42</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>$10.36</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>$33.41</td>
<td>4.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>$37.55</td>
<td>15.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>$40.06</td>
<td>7.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>$32.61</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>$22.94</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>$12.56</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>$12.32</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>$23.12</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>$19.77</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>$4.44</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>$13.78</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>$33.08</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>$38.55</td>
<td>8.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>10.09</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>$16.37</td>
<td>9.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>$28.77</td>
<td>5.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>$30.99</td>
<td>18.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>$22.74</td>
<td>9.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>$13.68</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>$16.02</td>
<td>6.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>23.43</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>$7.14</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>$21.62</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>$16.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>$27.04</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>$16.20</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>$17.76</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>$58.86</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>$34.17</td>
<td>23.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>$41.05</td>
<td>15.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>$33.96</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on estimated population, July 1, 1950, excluding (a) Less than 1/20 of 1 percent. (b) Less than 1/2 of 1 cent.*
Section II

CONSTITUTIONS AND ELECTIONS

1. Constitutions
2. Elections