MINUTES—THIRTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING

Detroit, Michigan

September 6-7, 1958

TABLE OF CONTENTS

REGISTRATION LIST.................................................. 1
OPENING SESSION..................................................... 1
DISCUSSION SESSION................................................ 2
  Detainers and Multiple Offenses................................. 2
  Return Principles.................................................. 4
  Cooperative Return of Violators................................. 4
  Release of Federal Prisoners to Sheriffs........................ 5
  Extradition Fees................................................... 6
  Waiver of Extradition............................................ 6
  Patterns in Prisoner Backgrounds................................ 7
  Employment of Parolees............................................ 7
  Cooperation by the Courts........................................ 8
  Cash Bonds.......................................................... 8

BUSINESS SESSION................................................... 9
  Next Annual Meeting.............................................. 9
  Report of Auditing Committee................................... 9
  Report of Resolutions Committee................................ 9
  Report of Nominating Committee................................ 9

TEXT OF RESOLUTIONS................................................ 10
ANNUAL REPORT OF THE SECRETARIAT............................... EXHIBIT A
TEXT OF ANNUAL REPORT OF AUDITING COMMITTEE.................... EXHIBIT B
REGISTRATION LIST

ALABAMA: L. B. Stephens, Board of Pardons and Parolees
ARIZONA: Walter Hofmann, Chairman, Board of Pardons and Parole
ARKANSAS: W. P. Bell, Director, Board of Pardons, Parolees & Probation
CALIFORNIA: Fred Finesl, Adult Authority
            Joseph Spangler, Administrative Officer, Calif. Adult Authority
            Everett Porter, California Adult Authority
            Roy Votaw, Deputy Administrator for Probation
COLORADO: James Eakin, Supervisor, Interstate Matters
         Edward W. Grout, Executive Director, Department of Parole
CONNECTICUT: Charles McGrath, Field Director, Connecticut Prison Association
FLORIDA: Francis R. Bridges, Jr., Florida Parole Board
IDAHO: H. P. Fails, Secretary, Board of Correction
       Ray W. Wooten, Youth Rehabilitation Section
ILLINOIS: T. Edward Austin, Supt. Division of Supervision of Parolees
INDIANA: George F. Denton, Deputy Administrator
IOWA: R. W. Bobzin, Secretary, Iowa Board of Parole
KENTUCKY: Mrs. Jean Hahn, Correspondent, Interstate Compact
MAINE: John J. Shea, Director, Division of Probation and Parole
MARYLAND: Wallace Reid, Director, Dept. of Parole and Probation
MASSACHUSETTS: C. Eliot Sands, Deputy Commissioner of Probation
               (Representing A. Carter, Compact Agent for Probation)
MICHIGAN: W. F. Bardley, Deputy for Parole
MINNESOTA: Thomas R. Jones, Chairman, State Board of Parole & Probation
          T. F. Telander, Deputy Administrator
          H. E. Hanson, Superintendent, Out of State Cases
MISSOURI: George N. Elder, Chairman Board of Probation & Parole
         Donald V. Cline, Deputy Administrator
NEW HAMPSHIRE: R. T. Smith, State Director of Probation
                Robert Johnson
NEW JERSEY: F. Lovell Bixby, Alternate Administrator and Director of
              Correction & Parole
NEW YORK: Harold Canavan, New York State Division of Parole
          Stanley Cleveenger, Deputy Compact Administrator for Parole
          Mitchell Wendell, Research Consultant, New York Joint Legislative
          Committee on Interstate Cooperation.
NORTH CAROLINA: George Randall, Chairman, Parole Board
OHIO: Rowland R. Lutz, Chief, Bureau of Probation & Parole
      John Shoemaker, Juvenile Compact Administrator
OKLAHOMA: Campbell LeFlore, Pardon & Parole Officer
OREGON: H. M. Randall, Director of Parole and Probation
        L. W. Mallett, Chairman, State Board of Parole and Probation
PENNSYLVANIA: Paul J. Gernert, Chairman, Pennsylvania Board of Parole
SOUTH CAROLINA: J. C. Todd, Director, Probation, Pardon & Parole Board
TENNESSEE: Charles W. Crow, Board of Pardons & Parole
VERMONT: John V. Woodhull, Director, Probation & Parole
VIRGINIA: Charles P. Chew, Director, Probation & Parole
WASHINGTON: Stephen C. Way, Assistant Attorney General
            James D. Skaggs, Chairman, Washington State Board
            Van R. Hinkle, Juvenile Compact Administrator of Prison Terms
            & Parole
WISCONSIN: Garrett Heyns, Director, Department of Institutions
           Sanger B. Powers, Director, Division of Corrections
OTHERS:
Sanford Bates, New Jersey  
Edw. Cass, American Correctional Association  
Harry C. Dupree, Chairman, Army and Air Force Clemency Board  
Earle W. Gilkey, Supervisor, Interstate Parole Section,  
District of Columbia Parole Board  
Robert R. Hannum, The Osborn Association, N.Y.C.  
H. G. Moeller, Deputy Assistant Director, Federal Bureau of Prisons  
Milt Rector, National Probation and Parole Association  
Colonel Ernest H. T. Schechinger, Special Assistant to the  
Secretary of The Army  
Leo Selignan, Memphis, Tennessee  
Will Turnblad, Director, National Probation & Parole Association  
Roberta Wright, President, American Correctional Association  

COUNCIL OF STATE  
GOVERNMENTS:  
Brevard Criffield, Executive Director  
William Frederick, Eastern Representative  
John Reilly, Midwestern Representative  
Jane Parks
OPENING BUSINESS SESSION

The Thirteenth Annual Meeting of Administrators was held at the Hotel Statler in Detroit, Michigan on September 6–7, 1958. About 65 persons attended the meeting, including representatives from 32 states.

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 A.M. by Mr. W. P. Ball of Arkansas. Mr. Ball read a letter from the Association's President, Lee Mailler, explaining that he had suffered a coronary attack and was retiring as Compact Administrator and Chairman of the New York State Parole Board. After paying tribute to Mr. Mailler for his contributions to the Association as Compact Administrator, Mr. Ball introduced the new Eastern Representative of the Council of State Governments, Mr. William Frederick. Mr. Frederick said that he considered the Secretariatship of the Association to be one of the most important duties of the Council of State Governments' Eastern Office, and he expressed the hope that all Administrators would call on him whenever they had suggestions as to how the Council might assist in furthering the purposes of the Compact.

Mr. Ball made a brief speech in which he cited some of the accomplishments of the Association. He pointed to the necessity for continued cooperation between compact administrators, and he expressed the hope that the Association would have as much success in its current efforts to solve detainers problems as it had had in other areas in the past.

After a roll call of the states, the Association heard the Annual Report of its Treasurer, Mr. Bridges of Florida. The President was directed to refer this report to the Auditing Committee.

The Association voted to dispense with the reading of the Minutes of the Thirteenth Annual Meeting.

Mr. Frederick presented the Annual Report of the Secretariat. This report was approved by the Association. A copy is attached. See Exhibit A.

Mr. Ball appointed the following committees:

Resolutions Committee: F. Lovell Bixby, New Jersey, Chairman; Messrs. Clevenger of New York, Eardley of Michigan, Lutz of Ohio, Powers of Wisconsin;

Auditing Committee: Campbell LeFlore, Oklahoma, Chairman; Messrs. Bobzin of Iowa and Jones of Minnesota;

Nominating Committee: James P. Eakins, Colorado, Chairman; Messrs. Denton of Indiana, Randall of Oregon, Skaggs of Washington, Todd of South Carolina.

Mr. E. R. Cass, General Secretary of the American Correctional Association, introduced Mr. Roberta Wright, who greeted the Compact Administrators in his capacity as President of the American Correctional Association.

Mr. Will Turnblash, Director of National Probation and Parole Association, reported to the group on parole and probation activities of interstate interest. He pointed out that parole and probation officers have a strong ally in the National Probation and Parole Association’s Advisory Council of Judges. The Advisory Council of Judges believes in a strong career parole system. It has
energetically supported the belief that courts should have adequate probation services as an integral part of the administration of justice, and it has been working with the American Law Institute in an attempt to improve the parole and probation provisions of the Model Penal Code. The Advisory Council of Judges is not satisfied with the term provisions of the Code and it is developing provisions which will define the "dangerous offender" in such a way that this group may be treated separately under the law. The provision will be submitted to the American Law Institute and the Council of State Governments. The Advisory Council of Judges publication, Guides for Sentencing, has been distributed to 5000 criminal court judges, and institutes are being held on this subject. The advisory Council also has been working actively to acquaint judges with the role of the bench in regard to the compact. During its final business session, the Association adopted a Resolution thanking the Advisory Council of Judges for its vigorous support of probation and parole services. See Resolution II, Page 10.

Mr. Turnbladh said that citizen action programs can also provide much support for parole and probation officers. Experience has demonstrated that top flight lay leadership can be attracted to these programs. Groups such as the Osborne Association can render a great service in regard to the prison aspects of rehabilitation. Mr. Turnbladh pointed out that organized action assured the appointment of a trained parole head in one state, and he stated that those interested in good parole and probation services can rally support if they have a definite program and know where they are going.

DISCUSSION SESSIONS.

DETAINERS AND MULTIPLE OFFENSES

Interstate Detainers Agreement: Mr. Frederick said that the Interstate Detainers Agreement had been adopted by Connecticut, New Jersey and New York. Reports from delegates from these states indicated that there had been very few cases under the Agreement so far, partly because of its newness and partly because some prisoners who might use it prefer to "let sleeping dogs lie". There have been no protests from courts about the law. Delegates from New Hampshire, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania and Wisconsin reported that their states might ratify the agreement in 1959. Dr. Wendell of New York and Mr. Frederick of the Secretariat both offered their assistance to any states wishing explanations of the agreement or other aid regarding introduction of the bill, and Mr. Frederick asked all states to report introductions of the enabling legislation to the Secretariat.

Mandatory Disposition of Detainers Within the State: The following states were reported as having adopted this act: California, Connecticut, Iowa, Maine, Michigan, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, and Pennsylvania. Mr. Clevenger of New York reported that most of the cases initiated by prisoners in his state had gone by default. In Arkansas and Oklahoma, detainers are cancelled if not acted on in two terms of court. Virginia and Vermont reported that they were able to get along without the act because of informal systems of cooperation under which prisoners are transferred to prisons close to the jurisdiction which has placed the detainer. The bill may be introduced in Alabama, Wisconsin, in 1959. Mr. Gernert said the act had been working well in Pennsylvania. There was some difficulty in Pennsylvania's county jails, but the act is operating successfully now that an effort has been made to inform courts and district attorneys about it. Mr. Gernert said that a few prisoners had absconded while on the way to trial, but he expressed the belief that the advantages of the act far outweighed the disadvantages. Dr. Bixby of New Jersey said that his state was fortunate in having a standing committee of county...
judges who could be kept informed of problems regarding detainers and other correctional matters.

**Parole to Detainers:** Most administrators appeared to have authority to parole to detainers under existing statutes.

**Detainers -- General Discussion:** Mr. Fails of Idaho and Mr. Eskins of Colorado called attention to the fact that their requests for 60-day notice of release should not be treated as detainers. Mr. Finley of California suggested that all states should attempt to make early decisions as to the disposition of their detainers. Mr. Lutz of Ohio said that such a decision could not be made in all cases because of the need to have information about the man's adjustment in prison. Mr. Finley said that he recognized the fact that action on some detainers would have to be delayed, but he said that states could probably decide immediately about certain types of cases; for instance cases of non-residents who have only a few months to serve on their old sentence probably can be left in the new state unless there are special reasons for a return. Mr. Hoffman of Arizona commented that a prisoner's good behavior in prison was not always a reliable indication of adjustment. Mr. Lutz called attention to the fact that the dropping of detainers might make prisoners feel that they were being rewarded for their new crimes. The comment was made that the use of requests for 60-day release notices might prevent this since they will indicate to the prisoner that, while the detainer has been dropped, he may be retaken if he does not adjust successfully in prison.

**Merger of Sentence:** Dr. Mitchel Wendell of the New York Committee on Interstate Cooperation reported to the Association on the feasibility of merger of sentence. Before presenting his report he called attention to the invaluable assistance provided by Mr. Sol Rubin of the National Probation and Parole Association in reviewing and making suggestions for revision in the preliminary draft of his report. Dr. Wendell's report pointed out that the drafting of legislation to permit intrastate merger of sentence as a fairly simple legal problem. Interstate merger of sentence poses difficult constitutional problems, but the possibility is that such problems can be solved by careful draftsmanship. There are two approaches to merger of sentence. One is the "consolidation of sentence" method under which one court would try and sentence an individual on the various charges pending against him within and without the state. This would probably require an interstate compact. Another approach is the "series of crime" method which would define a series of related offenses or a series of offenses of given severity as a single crime which might be prosecuted in any of the states in which a part of the series occurred. The "series crime" approach would be procedurally much simpler than the "consolidation of sentence" approach. Copies of Dr. Wendell's report, which was distributed to all administrators in advance of the meeting, may be secured from the Secretariat.

There was a general discussion of various legal points connected with merger of sentence. It was suggested that efforts to promulgate interstate merger of sentence proposals might be premature. It was noted, however, that enactment of intrastate merger of sentence might provide a useful background of experience on which to base an interstate proposal. The group agreed that the matter of merger of sentence should be given further review at the next annual meeting. A resolution was adopted thanking Dr. Wendell for his report and asking him to give further study to merger of sentence on an intrastate and interstate basis and make recommendations to the next annual meeting. See Resolution III, page 10.
RETURN PRINCIPLES

Mr. Finsley of California presented a tentative report which he had drafted for the Association's Council regarding return principles. The report pointed out that four types of action which might be taken in regard to compact violations and suggested types of cases which fell under each category. Copies of Mr. Finsley's report, which was distributed to all administrators in advance of the meeting, may be secured from the Secretariat.

Attention was called to the fact that no comments had been received from the Association's Council regarding the tentative draft. The following suggestions were made regarding revision of the draft:

1. There should be a caution that discretion must be used to avoid a return to "sundown Parole";
2. Provision should be made for communication between the sending state and the receiving state;
3. Something should be added regarding the sending state obligation to retake a case when the receiving state feels this is essential, and something should be added regarding action when the sending state declines to retake.

The suggestion was also made that Point 1 of the report be changed from "That it is the spirit of the Interstate Compact which is more important than the letter" to "That the spirit of the compact is most important if we are to work together".

Mr. Bridges of Florida pointed out that the Compact Administrator should be notified when supervision is dropped because of incarceration in the receiving state. Mr. Lutz said that the compact administrator of the sending state must be given adequate information to enable him to decide whether or not to place a detainer on the violator. Attention was called to the fact that parole statistics should take into account the fact that discharge came because of a new violation rather than successful completion of parole.

A motion was adopted unanimously that "The Report on Return Principles be referred to the Association's Council for restudy and rephrasing". It was noted that the return principles were not intended to be binding on any state but would merely serve as guides.

COOPERATIVE RETURN OF VIOLATORS

Mr. Frederick reported that California, Colorado, Kansas, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Utah, Washington and Wisconsin had authority to deputize out of state agents. He said that Michigan, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Tennessee and Utah had signed the cooperative return contract. Officials from New York reported that the cooperative return program would operate more effectively if there were a central source of information about impending trips among the contracting states. They also noted that New York requires that two officers accompany a prisoner.

Mr. Fails reported that Idaho, Oregon, and Washington aid each other in returns by bringing wanted men to the state border.
SUNDAY - - - OPENING SESSION

Mr. Ball introduced Mr. Brevard E. Crihfield, Executive Director of the Council of State Governments, and thanked him for the fine job he had done for the Association while Eastern Representative of the Council of State Governments. There was a standing vote of recognition.

Mr. Ball read a proclamation by Governor McFarland regarding the Reverend Walter Hoffman's service to the state of Arizona. There was a standing vote of recognition.

RELEASE OF FEDERAL PRISONERS TO SHERIFFS

The group heard a letter from James V. Bennett, Director of The Federal Bureau of Prisons to Mr. Bridge of Florida. The letter stated that federal prisoners may be released directly to state officials of the state in which the prison lies, but federal prisoners may not be released directly to agents who come from other states to retake them. In such cases, the prisoner must be picked up at the office of the local sheriff since the Federal Bureau of Prisons feels that this is the best way at present to safeguard the prisoner's right to oppose extradition. Several members of the group expressed the view that release to Sheriffs was legally unnecessary. It was pointed out that the prisoner who wished to oppose extradition could petition for a writ of habeas corpus at the time the warden turned him over to the state official just as easily as he could when the sheriff turned him over to the state official. It was also noted that a prisoner who has been incarcerated in a federal prison while under interstate supervision has already waived his right to extradition not only from the state of supervision but also from all states party to the compact. Thus, while he would have to be allowed to go before a judge to petition for a writ of habeas corpus, the petition would in all probability be denied. Mr. Stephens of Alabama expressed concern over the possibility that maximum security prisoners would have to be released to minimum security local jails if the Federal Bureau of Prisons continued its policy. Mr. Hoffman of Arizona asked why state extradition laws would apply to a non-resident federal prisoner involuntarily brought to federal prison grounds within the state. A question was also raised as to the difference in authority held by state officials and United States Marshals. United States Marshals, it was pointed out, can retake a prisoner directly from state prisons and there is apparently no danger of violation of his right to test the Marshal's authority to remove him from the state. Mr. R. G. Moeller, Deputy Assistant Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, addressed the group on behalf of Mr. Bennett. He said that Mr. Bennett was anxious to be of assistance in every way possible, and he called attention to the fact that prisoners could sometimes be transported to prisons in their home states under 18 U.S Code 405, if the request were made to the Federal Bureau of Prisons at least 60 days in advance. He said that the policy regarding release to sheriffs was based on a wish to comply with state extradition laws, and to avoid charges that the Federal Bureau of Prisons had conspired in the "spiriting away" of prisoners in violation of such laws.

A motion was adopted requesting Mr. Frederick, Mr. Chev, and Mr. Reed, to make an appointment with Mr. Bennett, and if possible to get a communication addressed to the Secretariat regarding the Bureau's policy. Mr. Frederick asked all administrators to write to him regarding their experience in retaking federal prisoners, and he asked especially that these reports distinguish between cases being retaken from federal institutions within the state and cases being retaken from federal institutions in other states.
In response to a question from Mr. Jones of Minnesota, Mr. Moeller said that federal prisoners could be transported to lodge and board in state prisons under 18 US Code 405. He pointed out, however, that such return must have the color of law. In other words, it must conform to the provision in 18 US Code 405 which states that such "return shall be in the public interest". The Association directed that this matter be discussed with Mr. Bennett to get a determination as to types of cases which might be returned to their home states in this fashion. The group also directed that the appointment with Mr. Bennett include a discussion of parole to detainers and a discussion of detainers on conditional releases, with particular regard to the question of who has jurisdiction over men released on good time.

**EXTRADITION FEES**

The group discussed a resolution of the Central States Corrections Association which requested the Council of State Governments to propose the abolition of such fees. The consensus was that it would be inappropriate for the Association or the Council of State Governments to question extradition fees. It was agreed, however, that extradition fees should not be charged on compact cases since the states have waived the use of extradition proceedings under the compact. A motion was adopted stating that the Association's Council should consider itself free to take any steps which seem wise to secure the elimination of extradition fees on compact cases.

**WAIVER OF EXTRADITION**

The group discussed a resolution of the Central States Corrections Association which suggested that the sending state ask the Attorney General of the receiving state for assistance when compact violators oppose return. No action was taken on this resolution since there was general agreement that this procedure was already in use. It was noted that the local District Attorney is often willing to assist retaking officials in presenting the compact to the presiding judge, and attention was called to the fact that the Receiving State Administrator, who is usually of great assistance when compact violators oppose return, may also be willing to help out with regard to non-compact cases.

The group discussed a report from New Mexico's Compact Administrator, Dr. Brown, that his office had adopted a policy of getting executive authority for extradition just before sending retaking agents to the receiving state in cases where the receiving state's sheriff advises that the violator refuses to waive extradition and is contesting the validity of the original compact waiver. It was pointed out that there should be no question as to the validity of the compact return procedure since the United States Supreme Court's refusal to review the Tenner Case (317 U.S. 597). Discussion at the meeting indicated that the waiver was usually honored, but the Secretariat was directed to send out a questionnaire bringing up to date the table on this subject in the Parole and Probation Compact Manual. It was agreed that instead of continuing to resort to extradition, compact administrators should attempt to have the compact tested in court in areas where the waiver is not honored. It was also suggested that compact administrators in states where there are such difficulties should ask their Attorney-General for a formal opinion regarding the validity of the compact return procedure. A number of attorneys General have already handed down such opinions.

Mr. Frederick said that it might be possible to have this matter discussed at the next Annual Meeting of the National Association of Attorneys General. He pointed out that this group had offered to file amicus curiae briefs when the compact was tested in higher state courts.
Mr. Clevenger of New York called attention to the fact that the Attorney General of New York had ruled that a Compact waiver of extradition is binding whereas an ordinary waiver of extradition is not always valid. He also reported that the compact return procedure had been incorporated in his state's parole and probation rules, which have the force of law.

Mr. Hoffman of Arizona reported that he had been informed that a provision of the Arizona Constitution prevented the use of the compact provisions regarding return. He commented that there appeared to be some doubt in his state that the right to extradition might be waived. Dr. Wendell asked Mr. Hoffman to send him the provision of the Arizona constitution in question. Mr. Dupree pointed out that the legality of waiving constitutional rights had been questioned many times in the early years of the compact and there had never been an unfavorable higher court decision. He suggested that doubts as to the constitutionality of the compact return procedure might be eliminated in Arizona if Mr. Hoffman would pick a case to test on appeal. Dr. Wendell pointed out that the National Association of Attorneys General would undoubtedly be willing to file an amicus curiae brief with the Arizona Supreme Court in regard to such a case.

PATTERNS IN PRISONER BACKGROUND

Former Compact Administrator Dr. Norman S. Hayner reported to the Association on a study he is making of characteristics of selected offender types. He said that he would welcome any comments the Administrators might send to him. Copies of Dr. Hayner's paper were distributed at the meeting and additional copies may be secured from Dr. Hayner at the University of Washington.

EMPLOYMENT OF PAROLEES

The group discussed a request by Mr. Palmary of Delaware for suggestions as to ways of encouraging employment of parolees. It was agreed that Compact Administrators could obtain much aid and advice from national and state prisoner's aid associations. Mr. Hannum of the Osborne Association told the group that his group would welcome questions on this subject. (The address of the Osborne Association is: 114 E. 50th Street, New York 16, New York). Mr. Hannum commented that it was important to place "skills" rather than "ex convicts". Dr. Hayner reported that studies in Washington had indicated that many employers would be willing to hire parolees if they were contacted by parole officers. Mr. Turnblad of the National Probation and Parole Association said that his group's citizen action committees were working on the problem of employment and he said that his organization was sending pamphlets on the subject to selected industries in St. Louis with the aid of the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce.

Attention was called to the fact that the headquarters' offices of national industries might have to approve the hiring of parolees by local branches. Mr. Gernert of Pennsylvania distributed some material used in Pennsylvania to encourage employment of parolees. He said that Pennsylvania's program had been very successful and he said there was a need for close cooperation between prisons and parole agencies in the development of employment plans. Mr. Randall of Oregon called attention to the fact that the AFL-CIO has national and local committees which are attempting to assist in the development of employment opportunities for parolees and probationers.

There was a discussion of whether or not states should refuse to accept supervision of parolees and probationers who do not have a guarantee of employment. Mr.
Dupree reported that New York and Pennsylvania had developed a successful cooperative arrangement several years ago under which parolees and probationers were permitted to come into the state for two weeks to look for employment. If employment could not be found, the sending state took the individual back. Several administrators expressed the belief that rigid demands for guaranteed employment should be avoided, particularly in the case of residents whose best rehabilitative prospects are usually in their home state. No definite agreement was reached on employment and the Secretariat was directed to place this subject on the Agenda for the Fourteenth Annual Meeting.

COOPERATION BY THE COURTS

There was a general discussion of ways in which courts could be encouraged to use compact procedures in sending probationers out of state. Mr. Jones of Minnesota and Mr. Finley of California reported on favorable results achieved by the making of speeches before district judges associations and the holding of special judges meetings on the compact. Mr. Turnbladh called attention to the fact that the Advisory Council of Judges welcomed requests for aid from the Administrators Association and he expressed the hope that the Association would continue to keep the National Probation and Parole Association informed of ways in which the Advisory Council of Judges might help. Mr. Germert of Pennsylvania said that he would send each Compact Administrator a copy of a brochure which the judges of his state had helped to prepare.

There was a discussion of whether or not states should make use of the compact mandatory. Attention was called to several instances in which probationers, who were sent home without knowledge of the home state administrator, committed crimes of violence. The following suggested act, based on Section 1205 of the California Penal Code, was reviewed:

"No parolee or probationer shall be released to enter another state unless and until his case has been referred to the /insert name of enacting state/ Administrator, Interstate Compact for the Supervision of Parolees and Probationers, pursuant to /title of state enabling act/".

A question was raised as to whether or not such an act would compel the channeling of misdemeanor cases through the Compact Administrators office. It was suggested that misdemeanants might not be covered by the compact since a misdemeanor is usually conceived of as a non-extraditable offense. However, it was noted that the compact probably does include misdemeanors since it uses the generic word, "offense" and includes all cases for which there has been a conviction. Attention was called to the fact that states might wish to add provisions to clarify the fact that juvenile parole and probation cases need not be channeled through the Parole and Probation Compact Administrator unless the juvenile has been "convicted" on an adult charge.

CASH BONDS

It was reported that Florida, Iowa, Georgia, and Maryland, use cash bonds in some instances. They are usually used when parolees or probationers are going long distances for supervision, and the states which require cash bonds consider them to be an additional incentive for good behaviour. The bond requirement is ignored if a good parole risk wishes to go out of state and cannot raise the amount of the bond.
FINAL BUSINESS SESSION

Next Annual Meeting: The group voted to recommend to the Executive Committee that the Fourteenth Annual Meeting be held in Miami Beach in conjunction with the meeting of the American Correctional Association. 1/

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


Report of Nominating Committee: The following officers were elected by the Association to serve during 1958-59:

President: W. P. Ball, Arkansas
Vice President: Sanger Powers, Wisconsin
Treasurer: Francis R. Bridges, Jr., Florida
Secretariat: Council of State Governments

Executive Committee (in addition to the officers):

Herman Fails, Idaho, Chairman Paul J. Cernart, Pennsylvania
Charles Crow, Tennessee Charles P. Chew, Virginia
R. W. Bobzin, Iowa Rowland R. Lutz, Ohio

Council:

L. B. Stephens, Alabama, Chairman Farrant L. Turner, Hawaii
Walter Hoffman, Arizona Fred Finsley, California
Campbell LeFlore, Oklahoma

There was a standing vote of appreciation to Mr. Ball for his service as chairman of the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 2:00 P.M.

1/ The Executive Committee has voted to hold the Fourteenth Annual Meeting at the Americana Hotel, Miami Beach, Florida, August 29-30, just prior to the 1959 Congress of Corrections.
RESOLUTIONS

I.

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Secretariat is requested to send the following telegram to Lee Mailler of New York over the signature of Mr. Ball:

"The officers and members of the Association regret your inability to be here and to preside at the meeting of the Association. They express every good wish for your happy retirement."

II.

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Compact Administrators express appreciation to the Advisory Council of Judges of the National Probation & Parole Association for its judicial leadership and vigorous support of probation and parole services as indispensable instruments in the administration of justice in America.

III.

RESOLVED: That the Administrators' Association wishes to express its thanks to the New York Committee on Interstate Cooperation for continuing to make Dr. Mitchell Wendell available as the Association's legal consultant, and especially requests that during the coming year he give further attention to the problem of merger of sentence on an intrastate and interstate basis with a view to making such recommendations as such further study may indicate.
The following is a report on our activities during the year and the status of the Association's projects.

We have done our best to complete the exchange of documents between the states and Hawaii and Puerto Rico. Thirty states have now joined with Hawaii and twenty-eight states have joined with Puerto Rico. As you know, eligibility to participate in the Compact with Hawaii and Puerto Rico depends on your own state's definition of the word "states" as used in the Compact. The Attorneys General of some states have ruled that Hawaii and Puerto Rico are included in the word "states", but some of the Compact Administrators have informed us that their legislature must redefine the word before the compact can be signed. This requirement became national news during the year when Nathan Leopold requested permission to serve his parole in Puerto Rico. Illinois could not sign the Compact with Puerto Rico because the Illinois legislature had not redefined the word "states" during its 1957 session. As a result Nathan Leopold could not be sent to Puerto Rico under the Compact and informal supervisory arrangements had to be made for him. We will discuss the matter of joinder with Hawaii and Puerto Rico during this meeting, and if any of you have questions we hope you will raise them then.

As you know, Alaska, the Virgin Islands and the District of Columbia are also eligible to join the Compact. Your 1957 resolution (Resolution V) concerning joinder by these jurisdictions was transmitted to appropriate persons in the Virgin Islands and the District of Columbia. Alaska was not in session during 1958, but we will attempt to have the compact ratified there next year.

Enabling legislation for the Juvenile Compact, which your Association helped to develop, was adopted this year by Michigan, Louisiana and Mississippi—making a total of twenty-five state ratifications since the promulgation of the Compact in 1955. We expect many additional ratifications next year. Your 1957 resolution (Resolution IV) offering your cooperation to the Juvenile Compact Administrators was transmitted to the President of their Association, and we have also used it in discussing the compact with officials of non-signatory states.

The Interstate Detainers Agreement, which your organization also helped to develop was ratified this year by New Jersey. Connecticut and New York adopted it last year. Your 1957 resolution urging joinder by the federal government was transmitted, but no action was taken.

At the 1957 meeting you adopted a motion asking Dr. Wendell of the New York Committee on Interstate Cooperation, to prepare a report on Merger of Sentence. This report, which was distributed to all Administrators in advance of the meeting, will be discussed later. You will notice that a copy is included in the Agenda under the tab marked "Background Material". We would like to take this opportunity to thank Mr. Sol Rubin of the National Probation and Parole Association for his cooperation in reviewing and making suggestions for revision in the original draft of this memorandum.

You also adopted a motion asking the Association's Council to prepare a set of principles regarding the return of violators. Fred Finley of California took the major responsibility for carrying out this project, and copies of his preliminary draft were sent to all of you before the meeting. The draft will be discussed today, and you will find a copy of it in your agenda under the tab marked "Background Material."

Your motion of last year regarding release of federal prisoners to sheriffs was
sent to Mr. James Bennett of the Federal Bureau of Prisons in February. We have had no reply from Mr. Bennett on this subject. We invited Mr. Bennett to attend this meeting, and we hope that a representative of his office will participate in the discussion of federal release to sheriffs which is scheduled on the Agenda.

As you directed, we printed as an attachment to the 1957 minutes copies of the Massachusetts and New York Acts permitting arrest of violators without waiting for a warrant from the sending state. During the year we sent you an opinion of the Attorney General of Arkansas upholding this type of arrest. On the other hand, the Attorney General of Missouri recently ruled that Missouri officials must have a request from the sending state to arrest a violator. We hope that you will notify us if your state adopts such legislation, or if there are any Attorney General opinions or court decisions on this subject.

Joint return contracts were sent for signature to all states with legislation authorizing deputization of out of state agents. A contract covering parolees only was signed by Michigan. New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Tennessee and Utah have signed contracts covering both parolees and probationers. This matter is on the Agenda for discussion later in the day and at that time we will ask for reports as to the prospects for additional signatures.

During the 1957 meeting you asked us to bring up to date tables IIIA, B, and C in Chapter 2 of the Parole and Probation Compact Manual and the table on Termination of Parole in Appendix B. This has been done, and revised tables have been distributed to you with our August newsletter. We also distributed insert pages for the manual covering the revision in the Waiver of Extradition you made at the 1957 meeting. During the year the administrators of states which have ratified the Out of State Incarceration Amendment revised the form for Out of State Incarceration Waivers, added a new Form VI and made a few other minor changes in other Out of State Incarceration Forms. A new chapter 4, which included the revised forms, was sent to you with newsletter 53. A new page on extradition fees was added to Appendix C.

There have been no new court decisions this year.

During the year we sent you all copies of "Suggested State Legislation--Program for 1958". This publication contained the text of the Interstate Detainers Agreement, the Juvenile Compact and several other acts concerning crime control.

In past years we have given you a report on reciprocal support legislation. As you know this legislation is now in effect in all jurisdictions of the United States, including the territories and the District of Columbia. A new reciprocal support manual was published this year, and we will be glad to send a copy to any Administrators who want one. The Reciprocal Support Conference will be held in Miami Beach, Florida at the Roney Plaza Hotel, November 19-21 and we will be delighted to have any of you attend who are interested.

A new Roster of Administrators will be found under tab 3 of your Agenda. A new edition will be sent out at the end of this month. You may want to make the following corrections in the July Roster: Mr. Edward W. Grout has replaced Wayne Patterson as Colorado Compact Administrator, and Mr. Ramon Perez De Jesus, Chairman of Puerto Rico's Parole Board, has replaced Mr. Angel Umpierre as Compact Administrator for Puerto Rico.

If you want to correct your listing in any way, or if you haven't let us know how many copies of the roster you will need, please give Jane a note during the meeting.
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 Godfrey Smith, President of the Capital City National Bank of Tallahassee, Florida, which verifies the balance to the credit of the Interstate Compact Administrators Association as being $1,599.06 as of July 1, 1958.

Signed: Campbell LeFlore - Oklahoma
        Tom R. Jones - Minnesota
        Auditors  Russell Bobzin - Iowa
        Detroit, Michigan, September 7, 1958

CAPITAL CITY NATIONAL BANK

of Tallahassee
Tallahassee, Florida
July 2, 1958

Mr. Francis R. Bridges, Jr., Treasurer
Interstate Compact Administrators Association
Box 1107
Tallahassee, Florida

Dear Francis:

This letter will confirm our telephone conversation of July 1 in which you asked for the balance in the Interstate Compact Administrators Association's account as of June 30, 1958. Our records indicate a balance of $1,599.06. Should there be any way in which we can be of assistance in the future please call on us.

Sincerely yours,

(Sgd.) Godfrey

Godfrey Smith