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OPENING BUSINESS SESSION

The Tenth Annual Meeting of Administrators was held at the Hotel Fort Des Moines, Des Moines, Iowa, on September 25-26, 1955. Approximately 65 persons attended the meeting, including representatives from 36 states.

The meeting convened at 1:30 P.M. on Sunday, September 25. Mr. Chew of Virginia, President of the Association, welcomed the group and paid tribute to the Association's past presidents and other members who had contributed to the Association's development. He pointed out that the Association had come a long way since its early meetings when Administrators demanded that their sister states follow the letter rather than the spirit of the Compact, and he said that the Association's Annual Meetings had been exceedingly valuable in permitting Administrators to discuss their differences and come to an understanding of each other's problems. He called the attention of the group to the matter of interstate supervision of probationers and pointed out that Judges were not always at fault when they ignored compact procedure in sending men out of state. Because of work overloads states are sometimes slow in replying to requests for investigation. It is often essential for the probationer to leave for the other state immediately and this tempts the Judge to send him before supervisory arrangements are completed. Mr. Chew expressed the hope that the Association would put forth real effort to see if the courts and the administrators could work together to solve the interstate probation problem.

At the conclusion of his address, Mr. Chew thanked the Association for the privilege of serving as its President, and, after a roll call of the states, he called upon Mr. Bridges of Florida, the Association's Treasurer, for his Annual Report. Mr. Bridges reported that at the end of the fiscal year (June 30, 1955) the Association had expended $1187.13 and had a balance of $1462.59. This report was referred to the Auditing Committee.

The group agreed to dispense with the reading of the Minutes of the Ninth Annual Meeting. The minutes were approved as printed in the agenda. Brevard Crihfield of the Council of State Governments presented the Annual Report of the Secretariat. The report was approved without change and a copy is attached (see Exhibit I).

Mr. Chew appointed the following committees: RESOLUTIONS: Mr. Fails, Idaho, Chairman; Messrs. Tocander, Minnesota; Niillar, New York; McIlwain, Connecticut; Stephens, Alabama. NOMINATING: Dr. Giordani, Pennsylvania, Chairman; Messrs. Bixby, New Jersey; Randall, Oregon; Patterson, Colorado; Ball, Arkansas. AUDITING: Mr. Neissner, Nebraska, Chairman; Messrs. Bunker, Missouri; Woodhull, Vermont.

SUNDAY AND MONDAY DISCUSSION SESSIONS

ACCEPTANCE AND INVESTIGATION

Washington's Conditional Discharge

Dr. Hayner of Washington said that his state's law required that individuals be supervised until their maximum expired. There is a Conditional Discharge from Supervision under which a person may travel to any state he wishes to. Washington is forced to use the Conditional Discharge in some cases, but only 1% go out of state in this manner.
RETAIiING CASES

Fees

The group discussed fees incurred in the return of prisoners and exorbitant bills from certain local officials were described. It was pointed out that certain fees could not be blamed on the sheriff or peace officer since many counties use the fee system as a method of paying their officials, and fees are often written into the law. It was agreed that Compact Administrators who received high bills should see if the other State's Compact Administrator could get them reduced, and it was further agreed that Compact Administrators in states where high fees were charged should attempt to work with their state peace officers' association to see if some improvement could be made.

Retaking Cases from Federal Institutions

Mr. Grisfield reported a conversation with Mr. Bennett of the Federal Bureau of Prisons. According to Mr. Bennett there is no federal rule requiring wardens to turn prisoners over to local officers instead of state officers. Federal prisons can give at least a week's notice of release to states which have placed detainers, and states whose officers arrive in time may get their prisoner directly from the warden instead of picking him up at the sheriff's office. The group opinion was that some Federal wardens were unaware of the situation and should have it called to their attention. It was agreed that administrators who were having difficulty getting their prisoners directly should inform the warden of Mr. Bennett's statement and get in touch with Mr. Bennett if further difficulty occurs. In this connection Mr. Mailer of New York pointed out that one court had held that custody was lost if the prisoner was not turned over directly to the officials of the extraditing state.

Identification

It was agreed that requirements for identification of the sending state's officers vary from state to state and that retaking officers must conform to these requirements. It was suggested, however, that an officer should not have to go before a court unless the prisoner insisted that this be done.

Duration of Sending State's Jurisdiction

There was general agreement that the length of a new sentence in the receiving state had no bearing on the sending state's right to retake a case once the new sentence had been served. The group discussed the legality of retaking prisoners whose parole had been revoked. Dr. Wendell, the Association's legal counsel said that revocation of parole had different meanings under the various state laws, and that it might be wiser to refer to "suspension of parole" or "delinquency status" when writing the receiving state to insure that the prisoner could be retaken under the compact.
JOINT RETURN OF VIOLATORS

Mr. Cregfield explained that the joint return plan allowed agents of one state to return prisoners for another state, thus permitting states to combine trips and save travel expenses. He said that Compact Administrators in some states already had authority to deputize such agents, and that a model deputization act was available for administrators who needed to secure the authority from their legislatures. A roll call was taken and it was indicated that at least eight states had enacted the model deputization act, that several other states were of the opinion that they had necessary deputization power, and that a few additional states were interested in cooperative returns even though they were not certain of their existing powers to deputize out-of-state agents. Sunday evening a group of the interested states met to discuss ways and means of placing the cooperative return program in operation. At that meeting it was agreed that the Secretariat would poll all member states to get a definitive list of those interested in participating in any cooperative plan, that the Secretariat would circulate the names of such interested states, that the Attorney General of such states would be asked to review the draft of a single revised model contract for them to enter, and that the Secretariat would provide such a revised contract in the near future. It was the tentative thought of this evening meeting that a small "test run" should be attempted, with perhaps California in the west and New York in the east acting as "information centers".

STAND. EDIZATION OF SIZE OF FORMS

No rule was made on this subject, but some Administrators expressed the hope that states would use 8 1/2 x 11 paper for their forms if it was at all convenient. Legal size paper does not fit well into standard filing cases and forms smaller than 8 1/2 x 11 are apt to get lost.

JUVENILE COMPACT

Mr. Cregfield explained that the Interstate Compact on Juveniles provided for out-of-state supervision, return of escapes, and the making of supplementary agreements for cooperative institutionalization of special types of juveniles. He reported that the Compact had already been adopted by eleven states and Hawaii and would probably be ratified in at least two other states this year. The ratifying states will exchange formal documents within the next few months and the compact will then be in operation. Although Congress is expected to pass a bill consenting to the compact early in 1956, such consent is not thought to be necessary for the operation of this type of compact among the states. The main advantage of the consent bill would be to clarify the status of Hawaii. Mr. Cregfield reported that Judge Beckham of Florida had objected to the compact because it did not give the state finding the juvenile the right to immediately send him home at the expense of his home state. Mr. Cregfield pointed out that this question was thoroughly debated at the conference which drafted the compact.

A roll call was taken regarding prospects for ratification of the compact. A number of Administrators said that the compact would be ratified during their next legislative sessions. Mr. Cregfield said that the Council of State Governments had a draft available of a model Enabling Act. He pointed out that the enabling act could be tailored to fit individual state needs, but the text of the compact itself should not be altered. The group discussed a suggestion that the adult compact administrator should serve as the juvenile compact administrator. The consensus
appeared to be that this was a matter for each state to decide for itself, based upon the particular organization prevailing in such state.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF ATTORNEYS GENERAL

Mr. Crifield promised to distribute copies of the resolutions adopted at the recent annual meeting of the National Association of Attorneys General.

DETAINERS

Mr. Scovel Richardson, Chairman of the Federal Parole Board, said that the Board would now parole to detainers, although it would not do so unless the parolee was otherwise a good risk. In cases where the detainer is not picked up the Board does not release the man until an adequate parole plan is worked out for him. He asked the group if the states would be willing to give the Board an estimation in advance as to what might happen on particular detainers, and the Administrators appeared to be willing to try to do this. Mr. Richardson said that the Board was happy with the cooperation shown by the states, and he said that he was anxious to try to work out any problems the states might bring to his attention.

Mr. Falls of Idaho pointed out that many of his state's detainers were merely requests for information about discharge. Idaho needs to know what has happened to a particular prisoner so that his file can be closed when he has served an adequate amount of time in another jurisdiction's prison. He said that this type of Idaho detainer should not be misinterpreted as a request to hold the prisoner. It was agreed that states placing this type of detainer should be careful to specify its purpose and inform the other jurisdiction that they do not wish to have the prisoner held in close custody for them.

Mr. Giardini, Mr. Bunker and others spoke against the practice of holding prisoners in close custody because of detainers. Mr. Giardini reported that Pennsylvania had been selecting candidates for minimum security prisons on an individual basis, and that this plan had worked very well despite the fact that some of the persons selected had detainers pending against them or were in prison for very serious crimes.

A general discussion of the detainers problem ensued. Mr. Hoffman reported that Ohio was placing detainers and then dropping them at the last minute. He read some correspondence from Mr. Klopfenstein of Ohio in which Ohio's detainer policy was set forth. A show of hands was taken and the vote was unanimous that officials should not lodge detainers if they do not intend to do anything about them. There seemed to be general agreement that the compact administrator of the receiving state should be notified when a prisoner is being released to face a detainer in his state. It was reported that some states were telling prisoners against whom they had placed detainers to go wherever they wanted on release from prison, and that parole supervision would be arranged when they arrived.

U. S. v. Candelaria

Mr. Crifield described the Candelaria case briefly. In this case the prisoner was facing a local detainer for exactly the same crime for which he had received his Federal sentence. When the local officials refused to drop the detainer, the Federal Judge released Candelaria from his Federal sentence. In doing so the Judge
pointed out that Candelaria should not face the deprivations caused by the detainer during his Federal sentence and then serve another sentence for exactly the same crime. He quoted at length from the Report of the Joint Committee on Detainers to support his opinion that the local officials' refusal to drop the detainer was unjustifiable.

Proposals for Legislative Action on Detainers

Mr. Crihfield said that Mr. Bennett of the Federal Bureau of Prisons had transmitted the Candelaria case to the Secretariat with the suggestion that the problem of detainers might again be investigated. As a result a small informal meeting was held and tentative drafts were made of an interstate compact on detainers, an amendment thereto regarding juveniles, and legislation regarding parole to detainers, mandatory disposition of detainers, and merger of sentence. Mr. Crihfield said that the detainers' proposals and other interstate correctional problems would be discussed at a meeting in January to be sponsored jointly by the New York Joint Legislative Committee on Interstate Cooperation, the American Correctional Association and the National Probation and Parole Association. It was agreed that the Executive Committee should serve as the Compact Administrator's official representatives at the conference. Mr. Crihfield said that invitations would undoubtedly also be sent to the other members of the Association and he hoped that everyone would come who could. It was agreed that the Secretariat should send out a questionnaire regarding detainers' problems faced by the states. The questionnaire is to be drafted by the Executive Committee.

AMERICAN BAR FOUNDATION SURVEY OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE

Sanford Bates, Probation, Sentence and Parole consultant for the survey, explained that the American Bar Foundation expected to study the police, court administration, prosecution and probation and parole in their relationship to criminal justice. There will be a pilot survey in Wisconsin and thereafter 15 states will be studied. Mr. Bates said that the survey group needed adequate criteria for measuring the parole and probation systems they would study, and he asked the Administrators' assistance in defining the elements of a satisfactory system. He distributed a tentative draft entitled "Statement of What Constitutes a Satisfactory Parole System" and he asked the group to review it and send their comments to him in care of the American Bar Center, 1155 E. 60th Street, Chicago, Illinois. He said that a probation statement would be distributed later.

OUT OF STATE INCARCERATION

Amendment to the Parole and Probation Compact

Mr. Crihfield explained that the out-of-state incarceration amendment to the Compact would permit administrators to incarcerate parole violators in the receiving state instead of bringing them back to the sending state for re commitment. Such incarceration would be at the discretion of the administrator. He could retake the violator instead of using the amendment if he wanted to. The amendment has been adopted by Connecticut, Idaho, Utah and New Jersey, but Mr. Crihfield reported that it had not yet been used by these states because their violators had all been in states which had not ratified the amendment (the Amendment cannot be used unless both of the states involved are signatory). In response to a question from the floor, Mr. Crihfield said that the Compact Amendment provided that the parole hearing could
be held in the receiving state instead of the sending state. He pointed out the Chapter IV of the "Manual for Administrators" was devoted to the Amendment and would answer many of the legal questions which might be in the minds of the group. Mr. Fails of Idaho urged the other Administrators to work toward their states' entry into the compact. He said that ratification of the Amendment would be a great asset even if its provisions were not used since the knowledge that they could be incarcerated in the receiving state would prevent many individuals from violating their supervision.

SOUTH CENTRAL INTERSTATE CORRECTIONS COMPACT

Mr. Crihfield said that the South Central Interstate Corrections Compact (relating to incarceration of women prisoners) had been ratified by Tennessee. It is expected that the other south central states will ratify it during the 1956 and 1957 sessions.

PROBATION

Mr. Will Turnbladh of the National Probation and Parole Association discussed the extent and quality of probation in the United States and the amount of state participation. He said that all criminal courts should have probation and related services and probation officers should be included in the over-all planning of correctional systems. The National Probation and Parole Association expects to study probation this winter, and it will welcome participation and assistance from the Compact Administrators.

COMPLAINT OF THE DALLAS COUNTY PAROLE BOARD

Mr. Crihfield read a letter from Major K. E. Moss, Secretary of the Dallas County Parole Board. Major Moss had complained about certain points of compact operation. The group agreed that Texas should send a representative to the Annual Meetings so that a better understanding could be reached about mutual problems.

POLICIES REGARDING AGENDA

Mr. Caravan of New York pointed out that most technical problems of compact operation had been resolved at earlier meetings and he suggested that the Association should discuss and do research on more general problems of probation and parole. It was agreed that the Association was not equipped to do large-scale research and that this should be left to other organizations. There was a consensus, however, that an annual review of current developments of interstate interest would be most helpful, and it was suggested that the National Probation and Parole Association should be asked to present such a summary at future annual meetings.

RELEASE NOTICES

Mr. Fails of Idaho asked sending states to make a point of sending release notices to Receiving State Officials instead of sending them directly to the parolee.
FINAL BUSINESS SESSION

1955 EDITION OF THE HANDBOOK ON INTERSTATE CRIME CONTROL

Mr. Cridfield described the contents of the revised edition of the Handbook and said that each administrator would receive his quota of complimentary copies in the fairly near future. He said that additional copies would be purchased by the Administrators for $1.00, and the price to others would be $2.00.

NEXT ANNUAL MEETING

A vote was held for the information of the Executive Committee and the preference was to meet in Los Angeles just before the convening of the Congress of Corrections in 1956. It was agreed that the Juvenile Compact Administrators should be invited to attend the meeting.

REPORT OF THE AUDITING COMMITTEE

The Report of the Auditing Committee was heard and unanimously approved. This Report is attached (see Exhibit C). Mr. Bridges was commended for his long and fine service as Treasurer.

REPORT OF THE RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

The report of the Resolutions Committee was heard and unanimously approved. This report is attached (see Exhibit B).

OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Lester of California said that the California Parole Hearings were to be televised and that this had been decided upon after careful consideration of all the factors involved.

Mr. Wright of Montana asked the forbearance of the Association for a few months. Montana is 60 days behind in interstate correspondence because the staff has been occupied by the revision of Montana's parole system.

The Secretariat agreed to prepare and distribute a left-right listing of those in the photograph which was taken before the Annual Luncheon. (The report is enclosed with these Minutes).

REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE

The Report of the Nominating Committee was heard and unanimously adopted. This Report is attached. See Exhibit D.

Mr. Chow turned the gavel over to Mr. Stephen of Alabama, the Association's new President.

The Meeting adjourned at 2:15 on Monday, September 26.
The years—as they seem to have a habit of doing—roll on, and this year marks the Tenth Annual Meeting of our Association. It is also the tenth year in which the Council of State Governments has had the rather considerable pleasure of serving as your Secretariat. As you know, we serve in a similar capacity for many groups of state officials, including the Governors, the Attorneys General, the Chief Justices, the Legislative Service Agencies, and a number of others, but none of these other groups gets down to cases more expeditiously nor takes home more valuable information as a result of the annual meetings. We salute you for your outstanding illustration of interstate cooperation at work and we want you to know what a pleasure it is to work with you.

At this time we would like to summarize briefly the activities and operations of the Association during the period since the last annual meeting, and to indicate some of the pending matters that will be carried forward in the near future:

(1) At last year's meeting, the Association formally changed the style of its name to "Parole and Probation Compact Administrators' Association"—still a formidable title, but a substantial reduction in length from the previous two-paragraph title of "An Association of Administrators of the Interstate Compact for the Supervision of Parolees and Probationers." You may be wondering, as you have read the newsletters during the past year, if in fact the change of name did go through since we have been continuing to use up the supply on hand of our mimeograph letterhead paper. We did this for purposes of economy, but the supply has now gotten down to a point where we will junk the remaining sheets, and beginning with the distribution of the minutes of this 10th annual meeting you will be receiving mimeographed materials under the new style designation. With regard to our letterhead bond, we shall switch over and order it under the new title by not later than next year's annual meeting.

(2) Last year we reported to you that we were endeavoring to gather a master central file of each state's basic act entering into the compact, but that several of the states had not as yet transmitted a copy to us. Our file is still incomplete, and we urge the following states to send the material in to us at their early convenience: Delaware, Idaho, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Mississippi, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Virginia, Washington and West Virginia.

(3) During the past year there have been reported to us three favorable court decisions on the constitutionality of the compact, and as usual, no unfavorable decisions. The decisions were as follows: *La. ex rel DuPont v. Grosch*, from the highest court in Louisiana; DuPont was arrested on a new charge in Louisiana, the receiving state, and he absconded to the sending state, Illinois. An Illinois court permitted Louisiana to take him back to try him on the new charge. He was acquitted and then Illinois sought to retake him under the compact as a parole violator. The court held that Illinois had acted properly in sending DuPont back to Louisiana to stand trial since, under the terms of the compact, the receiving state had jurisdiction over him while a criminal charge in that state was pending against him. The court also held that jurisdiction reverted to Illinois, the sending state, once the criminal charge had been disposed of, and hence Illinois was permitted by the Louisiana Supreme Court to return DuPont as a compact parole violator.
The Mississippi Supreme Court, in the case of Stone v. Robinson, held that Louisiana could retake Stone without revoking his parole. The court also held that Stone could be removed despite the fact that a criminal charge was pending against him in Mississippi as long as Miss. did not object.

A lower court in New York, in the case of People ex rel Marro v. Ruthazer, ruled on the question of whether the term of parole had expired and held that such a claim must be tested in the sending state (North Carolina) rather than in New York. The interesting thing about this case is the fact that no issue was raised about Marro being returned from a third state. New York was not the receiving state, but the state to which Marro absconded from compact supervision.

In each of the above cases, the constitutionality of the compact was attacked without success. We have sent details on all three of the cases for inclusion in your Manual for Administrators.

(4) A new Roster of Administrators has been prepared and will be found under Tab 3 in your agenda folder. Will each of you please check your own state's listing and leave a note with Miss. Parks in case the telephone number is missing or if there is any correction of any kind to be made. Those of you who want a bulk supply of the roster should let us know today, if possible, so that we can put in a single large order and save some money.

(5) The minutes of last year's annual meeting contain the following excerpt:

"It was pointed out that some unnecessary fees are caused by the policy of releasing federal prisoners to local officials who then turn them over to the state official who wants them. In order to eliminate the fees paid to these local officials, the Secretariat was directed to discuss the matter with Mr. James Bennett to see if federal law or policy needs to be changed so that prisoners can be turned over directly to state officials."

Your Secretariat conferred with Mr. Bennett in Washington regarding this matter and we are glad to report that the Federal Bureau of Prisons declares that it is always willing to release federal prisoners directly to state officials. There is no "policy" in effect that prisoners must be released to a local sheriff. Apparently, many states seem to file their detainers with the local authorities instead of with the federal institution. If the state will file its detainer with the head of the particular federal institution, the prisoner may be released direct to the state officers. The only problem is knowing exactly when the prisoner will be released so that the state officer can be on hand at the proper time. Mr. Bennett indicated that the federal prison can give approximately a week's advance notice of the exact time.

Also, in connection with the problem of fees incurred in the process of retaking prisoners, you will recall that the members agreed last year to come along to this annual meeting fortified with a file record of problem areas so that we could discuss the matter in detail. An agenda item is listed for this purpose.

(6) A year ago this Association expressed its interest in the development of a new and expanded edition of the Handbook on Interstate Crime Control. The interest was backed up by formal action authorizing the expenditure of $500 toward the liquidation of the supply of the 1949 edition plus an additional $500 to be paid to the Council of State Governments toward printing costs of the new edition. We are glad to report that final copy went to the printers at the end of June, but less glad to report that the usual delays have been faced in getting the supply of actual copies
back. The proofing of legal annotations has partially caused this delay but we hope
3 to be mailing you your supply of copies in the near future. As you know, each
administrator will receive 10 copies without charge and he may purchase additional
copies at a discount rate of 50% — or one dollar per copy. We do hope that many of
you will, as some of you in the past have done, secure an adequate number of copies
to distribute to the various state and local officials who should be more familiar
with the contents of the Handbook.

7 You will note that the agenda contains an appropriate listing for discussion of
the new Interstate Compact on Juveniles. Our more detailed comments thereon can
await the development of the agenda, but we do want the record to show that this
Association played a leading part in the development of the compact on juveniles and
that last year's annual meeting was an essential prologue to the subsequent inter-
state conference which put the final touches on the document.

8 The problems of detainers have plagued us for years and have been discussed at
almost every one of our annual meetings. A half dozen years ago this Association
took the lead in forming the Joint Committee on Detainers, representing the major
groups in the country concerned with this matter. During the past year we informally
reconstituted the old committee to work on the subject anew, and you will find cer-
tain agenda items which reflect the work done recently. It is our hope to continue
this informal committee during the next few months, leading to a major interstate
conference on correctional problems to be sponsored by the New York Joint Legisla-
tive Committee on Interstate Cooperation early in 1956. We hope that many of you
will be able to attend, and certainly each of you will receive an invitation in due
time.

9 For several years this Association has gone on record in favor of extending the
coverage of the compact to include the territories and possessions of the United
States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. As we
reported last year, the 83rd Congress failed to take any action on bills introduced
for this purpose. On March 28 of this year a bill, H.R. 5274, was again introduced
in the House of Representatives and there is adequate time available for the 84th
Congress to take action. We suggest that you communicate with your Congressional
delegations urging that action be taken without further delay.

10 In past years we have given you a current report on the status of reciprocal
support legislation among the states. We are now happy to report that every one of
the 48 states plus 5 territories and possessions have now enacted the Uniform Recip-
rocal Enforcement of Support Act or its equivalent. Only the District of Columbia
remains outside the fold. An important conference on the operation of these laws,
which will be of considerable interest to probation officials, will be held under
the sponsorship of the Council of State Governments in Portland, Oregon on Thursday
and Friday, October 27-28 at the Multnomah Hotel. We hope that many of you, espe-
cially those from the Western States, will try to sit in on the meeting. Please let
us know if you desire further information about that meeting.

11 At the moment we are running well behind last year's record in getting in the
statistical reports from you with regard to movement of parolees and probationers.
In fact, only about half of the states have sent in their reports. Will you please
make every effort to send those in promptly when you get back home, since publica-
tion must await your cooperation.
(12) At the last three annual meetings it has been found helpful if the group will express an informal opinion as to the best time and place for the next annual conference. This matter is listed for discussion at the final business session and we are certain that the new Executive Committee will appreciate your joint and collective thoughts and suggestions.

Once again, we enjoy very much working with all of you in the Association. We are glad to find that the advance registration for this Tenth Annual Meeting shows the largest number of states ever to attend, and we hope that in years to come this growing number will move right up to 100%.
RESOLUTIONS
TENTH ANNUAL MEETING

I.

WHEREAS, the attendance at the 1955 meeting of the Compact Administrators is the largest in history, which may be due in part to the generous response by the Governors of the respective states in approving their representation;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Secretariat be instructed to write the Governors of each state represented expressing appreciation for their representation at the conference; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the policy adopted for 1955 be continued.

II.

WHEREAS, one of our long standing members and present Vice President, J. C. Copeland, because of ill health has been forced to retire from active participation as Compact Administrator for Indiana;

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Secretariat be instructed to express the regrets of the Association that it no longer has the benefits of his advice and counsel, and inform him that the members of the Association wish him the best of health and success in his new position.

III.

WHEREAS, Walter A. Gordon, a past president of this Association, has for the past 10 years given unstintingly of his time and efforts to advance the objectives of this Association; and

WHEREAS, the President of the United States has now commissioned him as Governor of the Virgin Islands; and

WHEREAS, his membership and leadership in this Association will be greatly missed;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that this Association instruct the Secretariat to express sincere appreciation to Walter A. Gordon for his long, faithful and effective service to this Association and further to wish him every success and happiness in his new field of public service.

IV.

WHEREAS, the State of Texas has been a member of the Parole and Probation Compact Administrators' Association for some years but has not been represented at our annual conferences and benefited by the discussion of our mutual problems;

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Secretariat be requested to convey to the Governor of Texas the Association's recommendation that if at all possible, Texas be adequately represented at the next annual conference.
WHEREAS, thorough pre-sentence study, selection for probation, and the opportunity for the receiving state to make investigations and furnish reports to the sending state are vital to the effective operation of the Interstate Compact and to the supervision of out-of-state probationers;

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Parole and Probation Compact Administrators' Association request the Council of Judges of the National Probation and Parole Association to study this matter and bring their findings to the attention of the criminal courts throughout the country.

WHEREAS, the Council of State Governments and the Association's legal consultant have continued their splendid, efficient and invaluable service to this Association continuously throughout the year;

BE IT RESOLVED, that our Association recognize and extend its deep appreciation to Brevard Crihfield, Jane Parks and Mitchell Wendell for their devoted service.
REPORT OF THE AUDITING COMMITTEE

We, the undersigned auditors, have examined the accounts of Francis R. Bridges, Jr., Treasurer of the Interstate Compact Administrators Association, and find that the receipts and disbursements are in accordance with his annual report as submitted at the annual meeting.

We attach herewith a statement from Fred N. Lowry, Vice President and Cashier of the Capital City National Bank of Tallahassee, Florida, which verifies the balance to the credit of the Interstate Compact Administrators Association as being $1462.59 as of June 30, 1955.

Signed: Richard C. Heissmer
John V. Woodhull
Auditors
Donald W. Bunker
Des Moines, Iowa, September 26, 1955

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

CAPITAL CITY NATIONAL BANK

of Tallahassee
Tallahassee, Florida
June 30, 1955

Mr. Francis R. Bridges
P. O. Box 1107,
Tallahassee, Florida

Dear Mr. Bridges:

This is to advise you that the balance in the name of Interstate Compact Administrators Association account at the close of business June 30 is $1462.59.

Yours very truly

FRED N. LOWRY
Vice Pres. & Cashier