## ATTENDANCE LIST -- PAROLE AND PROBATION COMPACT MEETING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>L. B. Stephens *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Walter Hofmann *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>W. P. Ball *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Sidney Diemon, Calif. Youth Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fred Finsley *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Roberts, Calif. Youth Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heman Stark, Juvenile Compact Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ben Stein, Calif. Youth Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walter T. Stone, Deputy Parole Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James D. Tante, Member, Adult Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roy Votaw, Deputy Probation Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>James P. Ekings, Supervisor, Interstate Compact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wayne Patterson *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Marie C. Smith, Juvenile Compact Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard C. Donnelly, Yale University Law School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charles M'Craith, representing Harry Lugg *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Francis R. Bridges, Jr. *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Bill Kimborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Herman P. Fails *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>T. Edward Austin *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kenneth R. Absher, Illinois Youth Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russel Higgins, Division of Supervision of Parolees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>George F. Denton, Deputy Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul L. Myers *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ernest Timpany, Dept. of Correction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Edith Agazzi, Representing Russ Bobzin *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Curvey P. Landry, Deputy Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Warden Allen L. Robbins, Maine State Prison, representing Norman U. Greenlaw *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Martin P. Davis *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Albert Carter, Probation Agent and Juv. Compact Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>William F. Farley, Deputy Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>A. Whittier Day, Juvenile Compact Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas R. Jones *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T. F. Telander, Deputy Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>J. Floyd Lee *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Don Bunker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Ted Cupit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>Robert Johnson, State Parole Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard T. Smith *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>F. Lovell Bixby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Harold Canavan, Senior Parole Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lee B. Mailler *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Means Compact Administrator
North Carolina: George W. Randall *
Ohio: Rowland Lutz *
John Shoemaker, Juvenile Compact Administrator
Oklahoma: Campbell LeFlore *
Oregon: E. M. Randall *
Pennsylvania: Paul J. Gernert *
Rhode Island: Jos. H. Hagan *
Jake Goldenberg, Secretary, Parole Board
South Carolina: J. C. Todd *
Tennessee: Charles W. Crow *
Texas: Mrs. Blackburn, Admin. Assistant, Board of Pardons and Paroles
    representing Jack Ross *
Vermont: John V. Woodhull *
Virginia: Charles F. Chew *
           J. Luther Glass, Juvenile Compact Administrator
Washington: Van Hinkle, Juvenile Compact Administrator
           James D. Skaggs *
Wisconsin: Delmar Huebner, Deputy Administrator
           William A. Platz, Assistant Attorney General
Wyoming: Norman G. Baillie *
Puerto Rico: Lucas F. Serría Cordova, Deputy Probation Administrator
            Hilario de Páez, Deputy Parole Administrator
            Angel M. Umphierre *

OTHERS:

Sanford Bates, Consultant, American Bar Association
E. R. Cass, General Secretary, American Correctional Association
B. E. Crilfield, Eastern Representative, Council of State Governments
Robert R. Hannum, Osborne Association
Dr. Norman S. Hayner, Professor of Sociology, University of Washington
Lewis Grout, Chairman, Youth Division, U. S. Board of Parole
Jane Parks, Council of State Governments, New York
Milton Rector, National Probation and Parole Association
George J. Reed, Chairman, U. S. Board of Parole
Colonel Ernest H. T. Schechinger, Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Army
E. Ireston Sharp, Philadelphia
Dr. Mitchell Wordell, Springfield, Mass.

* Means Compact Administrator
OPENING BUSINESS SESSION

The Twelfth Annual Meeting of Administrators was held at the Hotel Morrison in Chicago on August 17-18, 1957. About 75 persons attended the meeting, including representatives from Puerto Rico and 37 states.

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m. by Herman P. Fails of Idaho, President of the Association. Mr. Fails gave a brief opening address in which he especially welcomed the Juvenile Compact Administrators who were attending the meeting. Mr. Fails spoke with favor of the growing tendency among parole and probation compact administrators to be interested in the "spirit rather than the letter" of the compact and he expressed appreciation of the consideration shown by the larger states to smaller states which could not always provide services and funds for return on an equal basis. Mr. Fails concluded his remarks by expressing the Association's feeling of loss at the deaths of Compact Administrators Richard Meissner of Nebraska, Carl D. Norman of Kentucky and John A. Payne of Mississippi.

After a roll call of the states, the Association heard the Annual Report of its Treasurer, Francis R. Bridges, Jr. of Florida. Mr. Bridges reported that the Association had expended $1469.14 during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957 and he said that the balance in the Treasury on July 1, 1957 was $1148.48. Mr. Bridges reported that all states had paid their 1956-57 dues. Mr. Bridges' report was referred to the Auditing Committee.

The Association agreed to dispense with the reading of the minutes of the 1956 meeting.

Brevard Crihfield of the Council of State Governments presented the Annual Report of the Secretariat. This report is attached, see Exhibit A.

Mr. Fails appointed the following committees: RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE: Mr. Fred Finley, California, Chairman; Messrs. Ball, Arkansas; Smith, New Hampshire; Hofmann, Arizona; Gernert, Pennsylvania. NOMINATING COMMITTEE: L. B. Stephens, Alabama, Chairman; Messrs. Woodhull, Vermont; Chew, Virginia; Bunker, Missouri; Randall, Oregon. AUDITING COMMITTEE: Edward C. Cupit, Nevada, Chairman; Messrs. Davis, Massachusetts and Crow, Tennessee.

Ewari R. Cass welcomed the group on behalf of the American Correctional Association.

Milton Rector presented a report by the National Probation and Parole Association regarding recent parole and probation developments of interest to Compact Administrators. Mr. Rector described a number of his organization's new publications. A list describing these publications is attached. See Exhibit D. Mr. Rector called attention to the fact that the National Probation and Parole Association was working on a Model Act on Correctional Administration, in addition to considering the matter of registration of felons, and the question of who should collect uniform administrative reporting statistics. Referring to the Compact Administrators' request that the Advisory Council of Judges work toward improving probation procedure under the Compact, Mr. Rector said that the Advisory Council would include this matter in the "leadership material" being developed for distribution to all judges. He also said that a guide manual had been developed for Juvenile Compact Judges and that a series
of institutes is being held at which Compact problems and decisions will be reported. Mr. Rector also described NFPA's "Citizen Action Program", and he reported several changes in state parole and probation laws.

DISCUSSION SESSIONS

PROBATIONERS AND COOPERATION WITH THE COUNTIES

Mr. Chihfield called the attention of the group to the importance of the work being done by the National Probation and Parole Association in spreading information about the Compact. Mr. Carter suggested that the National Probation and Parole Association might also assist by enlisting the support of judges in a drive to get funds for the return of probationers. Mr. Zakin of Colorado expressed the belief that Compact Administrators should attempt to maintain a flexible attitude in regard to violations of the compact rules and regulations by judges. He pointed out that the most important goal is to get judges to use the Compact, and he said that insistence on rigid adherence to the rules at this point might discourage them. He said that county judges in Colorado had told him that it was exceedingly difficult to prepare all of the necessary papers in connection with investigation requests 30 days in advance of a probationer's arrival in the sending state, and he suggested that the Administrators might consider a plan whereby the judge would merely be asked for a travel permit and a waiver in the case of a probationer going back to his state of residence, with the other material being sent along afterwards. The group discussed the problem of holding probationers in the sending state until receipt of the investigation report. Several Administrators reported that their courts would do this in the case of a person to be put on probation in a state which was not his state of residence, but they said that the general practice was to permit probationers to return to their state of residence immediately without waiting for a report from the proposed receiving state. The point was made that since the judge would probably send the resident home with or without the compact, it was better for the public safety to accept supervision of a resident sent home in advance of the investigation request than to have the resident sent home without any notification at all to the receiving state. The attention of the group was called to the fact that Iowa judges incorporate an order in the Judgment Entry directing the sheriff to return the probationer when his probation is revoked by the judge of the district court or the Iowa Board of Parole. This insures that Compact violators will be returned. In this connection Dr. Wendell called attention to the fact that the Order should direct the sheriff "to cause the return" of the probationer instead of directing the sheriff himself to return him. The latter might prevent use of the cooperative return plan. Mr. Carter of Massachusetts suggested that Administrators who could not supervise probationers should attempt at least to furnish the service of directing requests for probation supervision to the proper authorities.

JOINDER OF NEW JURISDICTIONS

Mr. Chihfield reported that the signed Puerto Rico Compact documents had been received by the Secretariat and he said he hoped that the Hawaii documents would be received soon. He gave a state-by-state report of action regarding joinder with Hawaii and Puerto Rico, and said that an up-to-date report would be published with the next Compact Newsletter. The Compact will be effective between Hawaii, Puerto
Rico and those states which have returned signed documents to the Secretariat as soon as the Hawaii and Puerto Rico documents are transmitted to the Governor of such states. He asked each Administrator who had not already done so to seek either an Attorney General's Opinion or legislation defining the word "states" to include the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the several territories and possessions. Mr. Umpierre, Puerto Rico's Compact Administrator, called attention to the fact that "Commonwealth" is translated as "a free associated state" in Puerto Rico. He expressed Puerto Rico's intention to make the Compact work as effectively as possible and he said that his office was anxious to know of every case sent to Puerto Rico and would make every attempt to investigate and supervise each case. At the conclusion of the meeting a Resolution was adopted commending Puerto Rico and Hawaii for their action in joining the Compact. The resolution also urged Alaska, the Virgin Islands and the District of Columbia to join. See Resolution V, page 14.

JUVENILE COMPACT

Mr. Crihfield reported that the legislatures of 22 States and Hawaii had adopted the Compact, and he said that the Wyoming legislature had adopted Article X, relating to supplementary agreements.

Herman G. Stark of California, 1956-57 President of the Association of Juvenile Compact Administrators, gave a brief report about his group's annual meeting, which had been held the day before.* He called especial attention to the fact that there had been a discussion of the success of probation supervision under the adult compact, and he said that the consensus had been that the Compact had contributed much to probation. Mr. Stark reported that real progress was being made under the Juvenile Compact because of the help of the Administrators of the adult compact. He told the group that the Juvenile Compact Administrators had reported to their Executive Committee a consensus in favor of holding their 1958 meeting in Miami Beach with the National Probation and Parole Association, and he expressed the hope that the adult compact group and the Juvenile Compact Administrators would be meeting in the same place. He said that Ven R. Hinkle of Washington had been elected as President for 1957-58.

Mr. Crihfield said that the Administrators of the two Compacts would probably find it practical to work closely together in many states because of the variances in age jurisdiction over juveniles.

At the conclusion of the meeting a resolution was adopted offering support and cooperation to the Juvenile Compact Administrators and urging Parole and Probation Compact Administrators to work for ratification of the Juvenile Compact if their states had not yet joined. See Resolution IV, page 13.

RULES, REGULATIONS AND FORMS

QUARTERLY AND MONTHLY REPORTS. The group discussed the use of the Quarterly Progress and Conduct Report (Parole and Probation Form IV). It was agreed that a copy of the running chronological record, which may be sent quarterly to the receiving

*Summaries of the Juvenile Compact Administrators' meeting may be secured from the Council of State Governments, 522 Fifth Avenue, New York 36, New York
state in lieu of Form IV, was easier to prepare and often provided more adequate information than Form IV. It was pointed out that extra copies of each file entry could be made at the time the original entry was made so that the carbons could be sent to the receiving state every three months with little difficulty. The group agreed by formal motion, that there was no objection to substitution of chronological reports for Form IV. It further agreed that Form IV would be retained as an official form for the use of the few receiving states which preferred to send this form instead of the running case record. The Secretariat was directed to revise the Tables on Quarterly and Monthly Reports in the Administrators' Manual. (Copies of the Tables are being sent to all Administrators with the Minutes of the meeting so that each state may inform the Secretariat of changes in its listing.) The group postponed a suggestion of Mr. Powers of Wisconsin that a standard monthly reporting form be devised. The group felt that action should not be taken on this suggestion until the monthly reporting table was revised and information available as to the number of states still requiring monthly reports from individual parolees or probationers.

Form III (Waiver of Extradition): The Association voted unanimously to change the first part of Form III to read as follows:

"I _______ in consideration of being granted (Parole) (Probation) by the _______ and especially being granted the privilege to be under supervision in the State of _______, hereby agree:"

This change was made so that the form will be valid if it is signed in the receiving state. It was agreed that present supplies of Form III could be used up before states made this amendment on their printed forms, with the understanding that the correction would be made by hand if the waiver was signed in the receiving state instead of the sending state.

The Secretariat was directed to take a mail ballot among the Out of State Incarceration States as to whether a similar change should be made in the Out of State Incarceration Waivers.

OUT OF STATE INCARCERATION

There was a brief discussion of several proposed changes in the Out-of-State Incarceration forms, and it was agreed that a vote on these changes should be postponed until the Secretariat could send a mail ballot to the six states involved. Dr. Wendell stressed the importance of completing the technical procedures required under the Amendment, such as the official designation of "compact institutions" and the signing of the contract. He said that these steps should be taken as early as possible to avoid delays when states had cases arising under the amendment. He called attention to the fact that recent difficulty between Idaho and New Jersey in attempting to use the amendment in the Fogge case had not been caused by any defect in the amendment, but had resulted from the fact that the Idaho warden had not received proper forms from New Jersey. He called the attention of the group to the fact that the Amendment and the Rules, Regulations and Forms used thereunder had been carefully drafted to cover all constitutional questions which might arise, and he said that some of the seemingly superfluous procedures, such as the designation of compact institutions, were included in the Amendment for constitutional reasons. In response to a question from Mr. Bunker, Mr. Mailler of New York said that states which require parole hearings before re-incarceration could designate the receiving state's parole
board as their agent, and Dr. Wendell added the comment that this provision of the Amendment would supersede a prior state law on the subject in regard to cases coming under the Amendment. The comment was made that some states had funds to return their violators and preferred to return them instead of incarcerating them out of state, but Mr. Crilfield suggested that such states might adopt the amendment anyway for the benefit of other states which might want to use it more extensively.

MODEL PENAL CODE

Lee Mailler of New York described the work done by the Executive Committee regarding the American Law Institute's tentative draft No. 5 of the Model Penal Code. He reminded the group that the 1956 meeting had expressed strong opposition to certain aspects of the code, particularly the philosophy that parole should be considered as a right. As a result, he said, representatives of the Association's Executive Committee, the American Correctional Association and the National Probation and Parole Association's Advisory Council of Judges met with representatives of the American Law Institute on December 22-23, 1956 to discuss the Code and apparently reached agreements on many basic points. (A summary of the December 22-23 meeting is attached. See Exhibit E.) However subsequent developments indicated that the American Law Institute's Committee did not intend to adhere to the agreements. In view of this, representatives of the Executive Committee, the National Probation and Parole Association and the American Correctional Association met and agreed that the Model Parole and Probation Act should be brought up to date and a Model Correction Law should be formulated so that something would be available to recommend to the states in contrast to the Code. Mr. Mailler pointed out that the American Law Institute had been given funds to continue its work for another five years, and he asked the Association to empower the Executive Committee to watch for new developments and alert the Association to any attempt to introduce the present draft of the Code in state legislatures. He said that the Association owed a vote of thanks to Sanford Bates of New Jersey for calling its attention to the serious deficiencies in the present draft of the Code.

Mr. Bates spoke briefly on the Code, calling particular attention to sections which make release on parole mandatory unless specific criteria set up in the law are present. He pointed out that good behavior in prison does not always imply good behavior on parole, and he said the parole board must be free to protect the public by refusing to grant parole unless it feels the parolee is a good risk. Mr. Bates also called attention to the May 1957 decision of the United States Court for the District of Columbia in Moore v. Reid. In this case the Court discharged a parolee who had not had counsel at his parole hearing, as provided by District of Columbia law. Mr. Bates pointed out that the court should have ordered a new hearing with counsel instead of discharging the parolee, and he expressed the hope that courts would not use Moore v. Reid as precedent. Mr. Reid of the United States Board of Parole said that Moore v. Reid would not be appealed in view of the fact that the violation of District of Columbia Law might cause the Supreme Court to uphold the lower court's decision, thus encouraging the trend embodied in the case.

There was additional discussion of the Model Penal Code, and Mr. Finsley called attention to the fact that Members of the American Law Institute had claimed that parole and probation officials could not get together as to what should be in the Model Penal Code. The following motion was adopted unanimously:
"That this body go on record: expressing thanks to Sanford Beses, Lee Mailler, George Reed, and others for their vigilance in watching the model penal code; concurring in the objections expressed by these gentlemen in regard to the draft; and empowering the Executive Committee to continue to act on behalf of the Association at any subsequent meeting that may be called to consider actions of the American Law Institute regarding the Model Penal Code."

Mr. Reed suggested that the Association should be represented at the general meeting of the American Law Institute. He pointed out that most of the members were corporation lawyers who might not be familiar enough with correctional problems to realize the dangers embodied in the code.

DETAINERS

Federal Policy: Mr. Reed said that the U.S. Parole Board Rules were being revised, but he assured the Association that the Board's present policy, which permits parole to detainers, would be maintained. He also said that the Board was trying to keep detainers under constant review so that they might be cleared as quickly as possible.

Legislative Proposals: There was discussion of state legislation which has been enacted with respect to mandatory disposition of detainers within the state, the Intrastate Detainers Agreement, parole to detainers, and merger of sentence. A summary of such action is contained in the report of the secretariat (attached, Exhibit A.) At the conclusion of the meeting, the Association adopted a resolution urging favorable legislative consideration of the act on disposition of detainers within the state and of the detainers agreement (see Resolution VI, page 14.) In this connection, Mr. Cribbfield pointed out that legislation of such a technical nature requires full assistance and support from state and local bar associations if there are to be widespread enactments.

Merger of Sentence Compact: Dr. Wendell called attention to the fact that a Merger of Sentence Compact had been mentioned at the last meeting and he said a draft could be worked out if the Association desired it. He said that such a compact would permit the consolidation of sentences imposed upon a prisoner for crimes in different states, with perhaps a single state court doing the sentencing. Mr. Huebner of Wisconsin said that the Central States Corrections Association would be glad to assist the Compact Administrators to solve problems of detainers and return of violators. Mr. Rector said that the National Probation and Parole Association's Advisory Council of Judges would also be glad to assist. The following Motion was adopted unanimously:

"That it is the desire of the group that a study be made of a compact on merger of sentence by Dr. Wendell with the cooperation and assistance of related groups."

Committee on Return Principles: Mr. Finsley of California called attention to the disadvantages of bringing a parolee back to serve his unfinished sentence after he has served a lengthy term for a new crime in the receiving state. He pointed out that such a person would probably no longer have any ties in the sending state. He
offered a motion that the Association should establish a committee to work out a set of principles regarding types of cases which should be returned. Mr. Haeber of Wisconsin said that one difficulty regarding detainers and returns lay in the fact that many states did not have a single person or agency empowered to make all decisions regarding compact cases. Mr. Randall of Oregon said that attempts should be made to secure the cooperation of parole boards and judges regarding returns. Mr. Jones of Minnesota noted that care should be taken not to reward prisoners for new crimes by discharging them from their former sentences. Mr. Finsley agreed with this, but he said he did not envision a plan which would reward prisoners or which would be binding on any state. He said he was thinking of a set of guides which would indicate categories of prisoners which might be left in the receiving state if all of the factors in the case warranted it. He expressed the opinion that the set of principles should be placed in the hands of parole boards for their consideration and independent decision as to whether or not the principles should be followed in individual cases. It was pointed out that parole boards and other agencies making such decisions would need very complete information about a prisoner before an intelligent decision could be made. Attention was called to the fact that interpretations of the compact and the compact rules and regulations lay within the realm of the Association's Council. Dr. Wendell suggested that the Merger of Sentence Compact and Mr. Finsley's proposal should be studied by the same group or that liaison be established between the two groups because of the close relationship between the two proposals. The following motion was adopted unanimously:

"That the Council of this Association be asked to consider the problem of working out broad rules wherein men in another jurisdiction may not have to return to the sending state to complete sentences; and that the Council be directed to work with Dr. Wendell and the groups working on the Merger of Sentence Proposal."

A question was raised regarding the authority of the Compact Administrators to bind agencies within the state which did not lie within the Compact Administrator's jurisdiction. However, it was pointed out that this would not be an issue since the principles would be recommendatory only.

Recommendation of the Central States Corrections Association regarding Detainers:

The group discussed the Central States Corrections Association's recommendation that states placing detainers give 60 days advance notice of intended disposition thereto. It was pointed out that such notice could not be given unless the state placing the detainer knew of the prisoner's impending release from prison or impending parole. Mr. Randall of Oregon pointed out that lack of notice of release was often the fault of the clerk of the penitentiary -- particularly in cases where prisoners are released directly and not paroled. The following was the consensus of the group:

"We agree with the recommendation of the Central States Corrections Association, but note that it is unworkable unless a 60 day advance notice of the first eligible release date is given to the state placing the detainer along with information as to adjustment so that correspondence may begin regarding possibilities for the disposition of the detainer, depending on the action of the parole board. Copies of detainers, and notices of release to face detainers should be sent to the Compact
Administrator as well as the prison authority or other official who would ordinarily receive such material. There is need to fix responsibility on some individual for sending notification of impending release."

Statistics on Detainers: Mr. Fails of Idaho read parts of a table on detainers which is kept in Idaho. The table provides a ready record of the length of time each detainer has been outstanding, brief notes as to information received as to proposed disposition, and a record of final disposition. Mr. Fails recommended that each state keep such a table since it presents a birds-eye view of the situation and encourages review of detainers.

VIOLATIONS AND RETURNS (See also discussions on detainers pages 6 to 8.)

Direct Pick-up from Federal Institutions: Mr. Crihfield called attention to the fact that Mr. James Bennett of the Federal Bureau of Prisons had assured the Association that state officers who arrive in time for prisoners' release dates might pick the prisoner up at the federal institution instead of having to pick him up at the local sheriff's office. A number of Administrators reported that prisoners had been turned over to the sheriff during the year. Mr. Reed said that he would discuss this matter with Mr. Bennett. The following motion was adopted unanimously:

"That the Association express disappointment that the agreement we thought had been reached does not appear to have been kept; and that we urge that an official order be issued to all wardens by the Bureau of Prisons clarifying the situation."

In connection with this discussion, Mr. Randall suggested that Administrators should get in touch with Mr. Bennett three or four months in advance if they wished to have prisoners transferred to prisons more accessible to retaking officers. Mr. Bridges suggested that letters to Mr. Bennett regarding transfer or pick-up should be marked "personal".

Arrest of Violators: The Secretariat was directed to print copies of the Massachusetts and New York Acts on this subject as a guide for states wishing to enact such legislation. Copies are attached. (See Exhibit C.)

Excessive Fees Charged in Connection with Return of Violators: A few Administrators reported difficulty and Mr. Crihfield reminded the group that it had been suggested in previous years that excessive bills be sent to the Compact Administrator of the State involved to see if he might be able to help.

Cooperative Return of Violators: It was reported that the following states had legislation or existing authority permitting the deputation of out of state agents for the return of violators: California, Colorado, Kansas, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin.

Mr. Crihfield reported that Cooperative Return Contracts have been signed by New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Tennessee and Utah. It was agreed that the Secretariat would send contracts and signature pages to all states with deputation
legislation. Mr. Stone of California said that his Governor would not sign the contract but he told the association that the California Administrator may designate agents of other states as California agents, and pay their expenses one-way immediately upon arrival with the prisoner. He said he believed such an agent would be covered by California's general state insurance policy, although this had not been ruled officially.

Decision as to Whether to Ask Sending State to Retake Violator: The group discussed a suggestion of Mr. Hukins that the Compact Administrator should make the final decision on whether to ask the sending state to retake a case. He pointed out that field men are often not aware of the complexities involved in the return of a case. The consensus was that this was desirable wherever possible.

Lack of Funds to Return Cases: Mr. Huebner of Wisconsin suggested that states who knew they could not afford to retake a violator should advise the receiving state of this fact. He pointed out that the receiving state lost face when it locked up a violator and then had to release him because the sending state advised it could not retake him. Mr. Bridges of Florida added the comment that states should be especially careful not to discharge violators who are imprisoned in the receiving state and then send them letters congratulating them on successful completion of their parole.

ARRANGEMENTS FOR SUPERVISION

Supervision of Misdemeanants: The following paragraph from the minutes of the Association's 1950 Meeting was read to the group:

"There was a general discussion of items under section IV A of the Agenda relating to misdemeanants. Mr. Crihfield pointed out that misdemeanants were covered under the Compact since the Compact applies to anyone convicted of crimes or offenses. Several delegates expressed the opinion that they would prefer not to become involved in the supervision of all misdemeanor cases, and there seemed to be general agreement that there was no need for the Association to urge that all misdemeanor cases be sent to the office of the Administrator of the receiving state. The consensus seemed to be, however, that when requested to do so, the Administrators should undertake supervision."

It was agreed that the consensus reached at St. Louis "stands without objection".

Advance Investigation Requests: Mr. Randall of Oregon suggested that proposed receiving states should not be expected to begin investigations more than 60 days in advance. In response to a question from the floor he said that he was not referring to information needed while an individual is in the institution, but to investigations of the proposed job and home set-up. The consensus appeared to be that reports would be due out of date if prepared sooner, and it was recommended that Administrators should not mail their investigation request more than 60 days in advance lest they be misplaced or forgotten at the time the 60-day period commences.

Central States Corrections Association regarding Confidentiality of Records: The Association agreed that reports from parole agents should not fall into the hands of prisoners and reaffirmed its 1954 resolution on this subject.
VISITS

The group discussed the Central States Correction Association's Recommendation that the issuance of visiting permits for job-finding purposes be considered unethical. The secretariat was directed to place the following material from Chapter 2 of the "Manual for Administrators" upon the record.

"Section 4 of the Parole Rules and Regulations states, '.... the receiving state is authorized in appropriate cases to grant the parolee (probationer) permission to make temporary visits out of the receiving state, not exceeding fifteen days'. Except for the temporary fifteen day release established by this rule, the parolee or probationer should not be permitted to leave unless and until the original sending state has approved and the Compact requirements in Article I of the Compact have been met.

"Before a parolee or probationer is given permission to visit in another state careful attention should be given to the following official policies which were agreed to at the Seventh Annual Meeting:

"a. The fifteen day rule regarding visits applies to intrastate parolees and probationers as well as to interstate cases.

"b. Advance notice of visits should always be sent to the state to be visited if the Administrator of that state has indicated that he desires such notification. (see Chapter 2, Page 37, table III A for list of states desiring notification).

"c. If the parolee or probationer wishes to use the fifteen day permit to secure employment in the other state, this matter should be handled in a spirit of mutually agreeable procedures that do not violate the principles of the Compact.

"Visits to the Sending State: It was suggested at the Seventh Annual Meeting that visits to the sending state should be handled carefully since such a visit might mean that the parolee would be re-entering his former criminal environment, and it was pointed out that the sending state should be given ample time to voice its objections."

It was agreed that all Administrators should review Table IIIA, as described above, and inform the Secretariat if any change should be made in their state's listing. Mr. Hofmann of Arizona asked that his listing be changed from "Yes" to "No". (Copies of Table IIIA are being distributed to all administrators for review with these minutes.)

COOPERATION UNDER THE COMPACT

The group discussed and agreed with the suggestion of the Central States Corrections Association that "special agreements by bordering states for supervision of parolees are desirable and much can be accomplished by the regular exchange of ideas through meetings arranged with parole supervisors of bordering states."

Mr. Hofmann of Arizona called for individual treatment of parolees and probationers, and constant effort to make a better job of rehabilitation.
Mr. Falls of Idaho suggested that a carbon of the discharge papers should always be sent to the Compact Administrator of the Receiving State so that he will not be embarrassed by attempts to supervise a person who is no longer on parole.

PATTERNS IN PRISONER BACKGROUNDS

Dr. Norman S. Hayner read highlights from a paper prepared for the Criminology Section of the American Sociological Society. The paper described characteristics which appear to be common to specific types of criminals. Dr. Hayner asked the Administrators to let him know whether or not their experience with different types of criminals confirmed the results of his research. Copies of the paper were distributed at the meeting, and those who did not attend may secure copies from Dr. Hayner at the University of Washington, Seattle 5, Washington.

DURATION OF PROBATION AND PAROLE

The secretariat was directed to send all administrators pages 7-10 of Appendix B of the Manual so that their states' listings might be corrected. (Copies of this Table are being sent to all administrators with these minutes for review.) The group discussed a suggestion of the Central States Correction Association that states with long parole periods release interstate parolees from supervision after they had served a time commensurate with parole and probation periods usually served in the receiving state. It was pointed out that previous discussions had revealed that many states could not legally discharge the parolee or probationer until his time was up, but the consensus was that sending states should agree to minimum supervision of such cases wherever feasible.

FINAL BUSINESS SESSION

Next Annual Meeting: It was reported that the National Probation and Parole Association would meet in Miami Beach, Florida on May 18-21, 1958, the American Correctional Association would meet September 7-12 in Detroit, and the Central States Corrections Association would meet May 7-10 in Des Moines, Iowa. It was noted that the Juvenile Compact Administrators had expressed an informal preference for holding their next Annual Meeting in conjunction with the National Probation and Parole Association at Miami Beach. No consensus was reached by the Parole and Probation Compact Administrators on this matter and the decision was left to the Executive Committee.

Report of the Auditing Committee: The Report of the Auditing Committee was heard and approved. This Report is attached. See Exhibit B.

Report of the Resolutions Committee: The report of the Resolutions Committee was heard and unanimously approved. See pages 13-15 for the text of the Resolutions adopted.

* After the meeting a ballot was sent by mail to the Executive Committee and the Committee voted to hold the meeting on September 6-7 at the Hotel Statler in Detroit.
Report of the Nominating Committee: The following officers, selected by the Nominating Committee were unanimously elected by the Association to serve during 1957-58:

President: Lee B. Mailler, New York
Vice-President: W. P. Ball, Arkansas
Treasurer: Francis R. Bridges, Jr., Florida
Secretariat: Council of State Governments

Executive Committee (in addition to the officers):
Herman Fails, Idaho, Chairman Paul J. Gernert, Pennsylvania
L. B. Stephens, Alabama Charles P. Chev, Virginia
Wayne Patterson, Colorado John V. Woodhull, Vermont

Council:
Donald Bunker, Missouri, Chairman Campbell LaFlore, Oklahoma
Fred Finsley, California Charles W. Crow, Tennessee
Edward C. Cupit, Nevada

Executive Committee Expenses: It was agreed that Executive Committee Expenses in connection with work on the Model Penal Code could be paid from the Association’s Treasury.

The following motion was unanimously agreed to:

"That this Association and the Administrators here gathered express appreciation to Dr. Wendell for his enthusiasm and grasp of questions concerning Compacts and other legal matters concerning the Association; and that the Association also thanks Mr. Croxfield and Miss Parks."

Mr. Fails turned the gavel over to Mr. Mailler, and after brief remarks by each, the meeting adjourned.
RESOLUTIONS

I

WHEREAS, the Administrators of the Interstate Compact for the Supervision of Parolees and Probationers have been privileged to enjoy a vital and warm association with their fellow Administrators, Richard C. Meissner of Nebraska, Colonel Carl D. Norman of Kentucky, and John A. Payne of Mississippi; and

WHEREAS, their spirit of friendliness and helpfulness in regard to supervision of interstate cases has been of immeasurable assistance in the rehabilitation of many parolees and probationers;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that this Association express its deepest sadness at the death of these valued friends, and its gratitude for the lasting contributions they have made to the goals of this Compact.

II

WHEREAS, the Parole and Probation Compact Administrators' Association has continued its steady growth leading to more effective cooperation between the states; and

WHEREAS, the efficient accomplishment of its basic responsibilities has been made possible by the excellent leadership of its officers and the services extended by its secretariat staff members of the Council of State Governments;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the membership of this Association express its sincere appreciation to these persons for their contributions to our organization.

III

WHEREAS, the National Probation and Parole Association has continued its helpful interest in the problems of the Parole and Probation Compact Administrators' Association; and

WHEREAS, this interest has been implemented by the active help and support to this organization through the last several years;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Parole and Probation Compact Administrators' Association express its sincere thanks and appreciation to the National Probation and Parole Association.

IV

WHEREAS, the Association of Juvenile Compact Administrators has held its second annual meeting just prior to the Twelfth Annual Meeting of the Parole and Probation Compact Administrators' Association; and
WHEREAS, there are still many states that have not yet ratified the Juvenile Compact;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this Association profer its full cooperation and support to the Juvenile Compact Administrators' Association; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that early ratification be urged by the Administrators of states in which the Juvenile Compact has not been ratified.

V

WHEREAS, at the Eleventh Annual Meeting of the Parole and Probation Compact Administrators' Association a resolution was passed urging early ratification of the Interstate Compact for the Supervision of Probationers and Parolees by Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia; and

WHEREAS, Hawaii and Puerto Rico have ratified this Compact; and

WHEREAS, Puerto Rico has sent representatives to the Twelfth Annual Meeting of the Association;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that this Association voice its commendation to the Governors and legislatures of Hawaii and Puerto Rico for these accomplishments; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that Alaska, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia be urged to take early action ratifying this Compact.

VI

WHEREAS, the Parole and Probation Compact Administrators' Association, in cooperation with the Council of State Governments, the American Correctional Association, the National Probation and Parole Association, and others, has developed draft legislation for the disposition of detainers within states and a model compact known as the "Agreement on Detainers" for disposition of detainers between states or between a state and the federal authorities; and

WHEREAS, the problem of long-standing detainers has for years been serious, affecting correctional administration and the proper implementation of parole as well as rehabilitation of offenders;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the Parole and Probation Compact Administrators Association that congratulations be extended to the states which during the 1957 legislative sessions enacted these important legislative proposals, and that the remaining states be urged to enact the same at their earliest opportunity; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Congress of the United States be respectfully requested to enact similar legislation bringing the Federal Government into the Agreement on Detainers as a full party.
VII

WHEREAS, the Association has for several years been developing data concerning the use of detainers on parole violators serving terms in the prisons of other states; and

WHEREAS, it is felt opportune and necessary that such data and the consensus of thinking of the Compact Administrators be crystallized into statements of policy;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the President of this Association be requested to appoint a working committee to accomplish this end.
EXCERPTS FROM SECRETARIAT'S REPORT - 1957

Here is a report of action resulting from last year's resolutions:

Resolution I: We were directed to suggest that Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands and the District of Columbia take steps to ratify the Compact. We did this, and as you know, Puerto Rico enacted Senate Bill 97 authorizing the Governor to execute the Compact. Similar action was taken by Hawaii through Act 236 of 1957. We also were in touch with Alaska, the Virgin Islands and the District of Columbia but with less success. During the year we asked all of you to secure Attorney General's opinions or legislation defining the word "states" to mean and include the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico and the several territories and possessions for purposes of the Compact. In July we sent blank execution documents to all states to be signed by the Governors of those states eligible to participate with Hawaii and Puerto Rico. These documents are still coming in.

Resolution II recommended that all States join the Juvenile Compact, and you will be glad to know that 22 States and Hawaii have the necessary legislation. In addition one State, Wyoming, has adopted a part of the Compact (Article X, relating to supplementary agreements). The optional Article XVI was adopted by only two states (Colorado and Florida). Another optional amendment, the so-called rendition amendment, was adopted by Florida and Rhode Island. A number of Juvenile Compact Administrators are with us today, and we will have a report later about their annual meeting, which was held yesterday.

Resolution III suggested that the Compact Administrators might seek the aid of the Commissions on Interstate Cooperation in securing enactment of legislation sponsored by the Association. The Commissions have been of great assistance to the Council of State Governments, and we hope that all of you will remember to call on them next year if you need help with any bills sponsored by the Association.

Resolution IV directed us to express appreciation to Dr. Norman Hayner for his years of service as Washington's Compact Administrator. We transmitted this resolution to him. During the year Dr. Hayner prepared a most interesting report on prisoners' backgrounds for the Criminology Section of the American Sociology Section, and, at President Fail's suggestion, we have asked Dr. Hayner to give a brief summary of the highlights of his paper. We have also asked him to provide copies of the paper to each administrator, and these will be distributed later in the day.

Resolution V directed us to thank the Governor of Texas for the fine Texas representation at last year's meeting. This resolution was transmitted. We are pleased to note how much interest has developed in the Association's Annual Meetings over the years. While some states cannot always afford to send a representative, we have had, at one time or another, depending on the location of the meeting, representation from every state. We think this is a tribute to the fine spirit of giving and taking and the active interest of all of you take in the sessions. We don't know of any group where there is such energetic participation and faithful attendance until the final gavel drops.

Resolution VI called for a conference between the Association's Executive Committee and the American Law Institute's Committee on the Model Penal Code. Such a meeting was held, and Lee Mailler of New York, who headed the Association's delegation, will give you a report.
RECENT LEGISLATION

During the year we have been trying to assemble information regarding enactments of legislation of interest to the Compact Administrators, and here is a brief run-down.

The Interstate Detainers Agreement was adopted by Connecticut and New York and is still pending in a few other states.

There is legislation for Mandatory Disposition of Detainers within the State in California, Maine, Michigan, New York, North Carolina, Oregon and Pennsylvania. Later in the day we will have a discussion of these proposals and we hope you will let us know if there has been any additional legislative action regarding these bills, the parole to detainer proposal, or merger of sentences. You will recall that we touched on the possibility of a merger of sentence compact last year. Dr. Wendell will discuss the feasibility of such a compact.

As you know, the Out of State Incarceration Amendment was ratified by New York and Colorado this year, bringing the number of participating States to six. Wyoming ratified the amendment, but accidentally added it to the old four-state supervision compact which existed before our Compact became effective. Because of this error, the Attorney General has ruled that the amendment cannot be used with any of the signatory states. He has informed us that even Colorado, who was a member of the old Compact, cannot participate with Wyoming since Colorado's action amended only the current compact, not the four-state compact. We will discuss the Out of State Incarceration amendment later in the day, and we will ask the Administrators of the Out of State Incarceration states to review some changes in the forms used under the amendment. We believe that the amendment is a valuable addition to the compact since it will permit Administrators to save the cost of returning violators in many instances. Now that New York and Colorado have joined, there will be more opportunities to use the amendment, and we hope that the discussion during the meeting will lead you to have it ratified the next time your legislature is in session.

The Act concerning deputization of out of state agents for joint return of violators was adopted by a number of states, and joint return contracts are now in effect between New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Tennessee and Utah. Later in the day we will ask for reports from the rest of you as to whether or not your state plans to join the contract.

The Uniform Criminal Extradition Act was adopted by Connecticut, and Colorado's Extradition act was amended to bring it into closer conformity with the current version of the act.

The South Central Corrections Compact was ratified by Arkansas (Tennessee is already signatory).

OTHER MATTERS

As to projects referred to us by last year's meeting, we have the following report:
We were directed to revise Chapter 1 of the "Manual for Administrators", and copies of the new edition, which includes Juvenile Compact information, telephone numbers and TMX numbers, have been distributed to all of you. We hope to have ready fairly soon after this meeting, pages covering new information for Hawaii and Puerto Rico.

We were directed to ask the Army Air Force Clemency and Parole Board to appoint cooperative and advisory members of this Association, and our old friend Harry Dupree was appointed. Colonel William J. Bacon, Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Army was also appointed, and his place has recently been taken by Col. Ernest H. T. Schechinger.

The only new court decision about the compact which has come to our attention during the year is the case of Madden v. State, heard in the Alabama Court of Appeals. This case was reported in Compact Newsletter 48. Briefly, the court held that the prisoner could not demand to be kept in Alabama to face an Alabama charge if Alabama was willing to let his sending state (Florida) retake him. Since this case was similar to a Mississippi Supreme Court decision already printed in the Administrators manual, we did not distribute copies.

We had expected another Supreme Court decision in a Florida-Michigan case involving bail for out of state parolees which was reported in Compact Newsletter 46. However, Francis Bridges informs us that this case was dropped.

You will recall that we discussed last year a Utah Attorney General's Opinion regarding liability for injuries to prisoners being transported under the cooperative return of violators program. This opinion was distributed for inclusion in your manuals, and reference will be made to it next time we send out revised material for the chapter on Joint Return of Violators.

A new Roster of Administrators has been prepared and will be found under tab 3 of your agenda folder. Will each of you please check your state's listing and turn in a slip at this meeting if there are any corrections to be made?

In past years we have given you a report on reciprocal support legislation. As you know, all the states and territories have enacted this legislation, and Congress just enacted it for the District of Columbia, although the legislation will not be effective there until money is appropriated to carry out the purposes of the act. Those of you who have the 1955-56 Reciprocal Support Manual will want to know that a 1957 Supplement was issued in January, and we plan to get out a new edition at the end of this year. The Sixth Annual Reciprocal Support Conference will be held in Hot Springs, Arkansas on October 3-5 and we will be delighted to have any of you attend who are interested.

We reported last year that the Commissioners on Uniform Laws were working on legislation regarding restoration of civil rights, paternity proceedings, and rendition of witnesses. The Commissioners met in July and took final action on one of these proposals -- to be known as the Uniform Rendition of Prisoners in Criminal Proceedings Act. All of you will be receiving the full text in our report on Suggested Legislation for 1958.
As you know, two fine Administrators, John Payne of Mississippi and Colonel Carl D. Norman of Kentucky died during the year. Some of you may not yet have heard of the recent death of our old friend Richard D. Meissner of Nebraska. We would like to suggest that this information be referred to the Resolutions Committee so that suitable resolutions can be prepared for consideration by the Association. Many of you were good friends of William Barnes of the Connecticut Prison Association, and you will want to know that we have already written a message of sympathy to Mrs. Barnes in the name of the Compact Administrators.
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 M. 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 $1,148.48 as of July 1, 1957.

Signed: Ted Cupit, Nevada
       Martin P. Davis, Massachusetts
       Auditors Charles W. Crow, Tennessee
       Chicago, Illinois, August 18, 1957

CAPITAL CITY NATIONAL BANK

of Tallahassee
Tallahassee, Florida
July 2, 1957

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

Dear Mr. Bridges:

This is to certify that the balance of Interstate Compact Administrators Association as of July 1, 1957 was $1,148.48.

Yours very truly,

(signed)

FRED M. LOWRY
Vice Pres., & Cashier

FNL:sc
ARREST OF VIOLATORS

New York Act (Paraphrased Excerpt)

Section 216 of the Correction Law is hereby amended to read as follows:

Section 216. Violation of Parole. If the parole officer having charge of a paroled prisoner or a prisoner received under the (compact) shall have reason to believe that such person has violated the terms of his parole, such parole officer shall report such fact to the state division of parole and thereupon a warrant shall be issued for the retaking of such person and for his temporary detention or return to a designated prison. The retaking, detention or reimprisonment of any such prisoner may be further regulated by rules and regulations. Such warrant shall constitute sufficient authority to the peace officer to whom it is issued and to the person in charge of any jail or lockup to whom it is exhibited to hold in custody the prisoner retaken pursuant thereto.

Massachusetts Act, Chapter 239, Laws of 1937

".........If the administrator of this compact believes that a parolee received under the provisions of said compact has lapsed or is about to lapse into criminal ways or company or that he has violated the conditions of his parole in an important respect, said administrator shall notify the parole board. Thereupon the parole board shall issue a warrant for the retaking of such parolee and for his temporary custody or detention for a period not exceeding ten days pending action by the sending state to have said parolee returned. The retaking or detention of any such parolee may be further regulated by the rules of said board not inconsistent with this section. Such warrant shall constitute sufficient authority to the parole officer or to the peace officer to whom it is issued and to the superintendent, master, jailer or any other person in charge of any jail, prison, house of correction, lockup or place of detention to whom it is exhibited who shall hold in temporary custody the prisoner retaken pursuant thereto."
NEW PUBLICATIONS OF THE
NATIONAL PROBATION AND PAROLE ASSOCIATION
1790 Broadway
New York 19, N. Y.

NPPA Journal - (Published quarterly-
from July) Subscription - $3.00
Single Copy - $1.00

NPPA News - (Published bimonthly-
from September) Subscription - $1.50
Single Copy - .35

Probation and Parole Directory, 1957 ......................... $2.75

Salaries of Probation and Parole Officers, A tabulation; mimeo .. .50

Parole in Principle and Practice, 1957, 186 p. cloth ............ $2.00

cloth ...................... $2.00

Guides for Juvenile Court Judges, 1957 (Advisory Council of Judges)
142 p. cloth ................ $2.00

Standards for the Detention of Children and Youth, 1958 ......... $1.00

PAMPHLETS AND LEAFLETS

(Single copies free; quantity rates furnished on request.)

Wanted: Someone to Trust, 1957

Jail Is No Place for Children in Trouble, 1957

Your Community Should Count...to 10, 1957

Breaking the 'Somehow' Barrier, 1957

Why Judges Can't Sleep (Reprint--Saturday Evening Post, 1957)

What's Our Line? About NPPA (Reprint, Community 1957)

A Reporter At Large (Reprint, New Yorker 1957)