

The important thing is for us as Chief Executives of the States to be prepared for what the future may hold. With a multitude of emergency problems already looming ahead of us, and our brief experience in 1917-1918 to guide us, certain things have been done, some of which might be outlined.

Federal law enforcement related to defense has been turned over to the FBI and to the Special Defense Unit of the Department of Justice. And, last summer, Governor Vanderbilt, then Chairman of the Governors' Conference, and I, as a member of the Council of State Governments, the National Association of Attorneys General, the Interstate Commission on Crime, and the Department of Justice in organizing the Federal-State Conference on Law Enforcement Problems of National Defense.

Officials were called to Washington to consider the many critical law enforcement problems which were arising as a result of the defense program. The conference was attended by representatives of forty-six states, including fourteen Governors, twenty-six State Attorneys General, the Attorney General and the Solicitor General of the United States, representatives of the War, Navy, and Labor Departments and of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and other State and Federal officials.

I have attended a great many conferences, both official and otherwise, and it is no exaggeration to say that those in attendance at this Federal-State Conference last August exhibited an earnestness and singleness of purpose unsurpassed by the membership of any other conference within my experience. The Governors took a most active part in making this National meeting the outstanding success it was.

In accordance with recommendations made in the reports, a committee was selected to draft model State Acts on certain subjects which the Conference concluded should be covered by State Legislation. The Committee prepared and recommended for passage to the forty-odd States whose legislatures were to meet this year, Model Acts dealing with organization of State Guards, the control of explosives, close pursuit, interstate protection of public property and and the prevention of sabotage. These acts were forwarded to the various States for such action as their respective legislatures deemed proper.

I am glad to report that many of the State Legislatures acted favorably on these measures. States have established Councils of Defense, patterned after the model recommended by the agencies which took part in the Conference. Also, the majority of States enacted the Model Bill providing for State Guards; a number have passed the Anti-Sabotage Act; twelve, the Control of Explosives Act; and certain states have approved the Act dealing with the protection of interstate public property, and the Pursuit Act, which were of limited application.

While preparation for National Defense is primarily the duty of the Federal Government, yet the States have duties to perform in connection with National Defense, and the Defense Program cannot be fully successful without the performance of these duties by the States. I should like to quote from a recent speech by the Attorney General of the United States, in which he said:

"In the United States the primary burden of crime control must be carried