PAROLE AND PROBATION COMPACT ADMINISTRATORS' ASSOCIATION

MINUTES OF THE EIGHTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING

Portland Hilton Hotel

Portland, Oregon

August 25, 1963

THE COUNCIL OF STATE GOVERNMENTS

36 West 44th Street
New York, New York 10036

November, 1963
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REGISTRATION LIST</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPENING BUSINESS SESSION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH THE COMPACT</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATIONAL PAROLE INSTITUTE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURT DECISIONS RELATING TO FEDERAL PAROLE REVOCATION HEARINGS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE-PAROLE INVESTIGATIONS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUARTERLY REPORTS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIGHT TO ARREST VIOLATORS</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROCHURE</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXAS FEE PROBLEM</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPORT OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON CRIME AND DELINQUENCY</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DETAINERS</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORMS FOR EMPLOYERS</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIFFERENCES IN PAROLE PERIODS</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL BUSINESS SESSION</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX A - TREASURER'S REPORT</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX B - REPORT OF THE SECRETARIAT</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX C - RESOLUTIONS</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REGISTRATION LIST

ALABAMA
*L. B. Stephens, Executive Director, Board of Pardons & Parolees

ARIZONA
* Walter Hofmann, Chairman, Board of Pardons & Parole

ARKANSAS
* W. P. Ball, Director, Board of Pardons, Parole & Probation

CALIFORNIA
* Fred Finsley, Member, Adult Authority
  Tully McCrea, NCCD, Western Regional Office
  Roy Votaw, Adult Authority

COLORADO
* Edward W. Grout, Executive Director, Department of Parole
  James P. Eakins, Department of Parole

FLORIDA
Francis R. Bridges, Jr., Florida Parole Board

IDAHO
* Saul H. Clark

ILLINOIS
* George J. Stampar, Superintendent, Division of Supervision of Pa
  Parolees
  William D. Meyering, Chief Parole Officer

IOWA
* R. W. Bobzin, Secretary, Iowa Board of Parole

KENTUCKY
* W. Parker Hurley, Administrative Director of Probation & Parole
  Marshall E. Swain, Commissioner, Department of Corrections
  Mr. Libby M. Gardner, Department of Probation & Parole

MAINE
* John J. Shea, Director, Division of Probation & Parole

MARYLAND
* Paul C. Wolman, Director, Department of Parole & Probation

MASSACHUSETTS
C. Eliot Sands, Deputy Commissioner of Probation

MINNESOTA
T. F. Telandr, Director of Field Services, Division of Adult
  Corrections

MISSOURI
* George N. Elder, Chairman, Board of Probation & Parole
  J. Raymond Bills, Secretary, Board of Probation & Parole
  Ben Stuart, Member, Board of Probation & Parole

MONTANA
* W. E. Shaffer, Director, State Board of Pardons

NEBRASKA
Mrs. Loretta A. Walker, Administrative Assistant

NEW JERSEY
Salvatore J. Russomello, Deputy Director, Division of Correction
  & Parole
  Dr. F. Lovell Bixby, Consultant on Probation
  Sanford Bates

NEW MEXICO
* Dr. Manuel N. Brown, Director, Board of Probation & Parole

NEW YORK
R. J. Wright, Member, Board of Parole
  Robert R. Hannon, Director of Vocational Placement, The Osborne
  Association, Inc.
OHO
* Rowland R. Lutz, Chief, Bureau of Probation & Parole

OREGON
* H. M. Randall, Director of Parole & Probation
  Jack Wiseman, Board of Parole & Probation
  D. K. Walker, Administrative Assistant, Board of Parole & Probation
  John W. Darby, Regional Director, Board of Probation & Parole
  Fred A. Kramer, Regional Director, Board of Probation & Parole
  Don C. Lovell, Regional Director, Board of Probation & Parole
  W. Don Moore, Regional Director, Board of Probation & Parole
  Robert E. Jones, Board of Probation & Parole
  M. J. Balkorich, Regional Director, Board of Probation & Parole

PENNSYLVANIA
* Paul J. Gernert, Chairman, Board of Parole

SOUTH CAROLINA
* J. C. Todd, Director, Probation, Pardon & Parole Board
  Steve Stockhous, Probation, Pardon & Parole Board

TENNESSEE
* Don W. McGehee, Director, Division of Probation & Parolees
  C. B. Mallory
  Harry Avery

TEXAS
* Ray Williams, Director, Division of Parole Supervision
  Vincent O'Leary, National Parole Institutes

UTAH
* W. Keith Wilson, Chief Agent, Department of Adult Probation & Parole

VERMONT
Robert G. Smith, Warden

VIRGIN ISLANDS
* Louis Hoffman, Virgin Islands Parole Board
  Lionel A. Todman, Chief Probation & Parole

VIRGINIA
* Charles P. Chew, Director of Parole

WASHINGTON
* Harris G. Hunter, Chairman, Board of Prison Terms & Paroles
  Garrett Heyes, Director, Department of Institutions

WEST VIRGINIA
J. Alexander Creasey, Board of Probation & Parole

WISCONSIN
Delmar Huebner, Chief of Field Services

FEDERAL
Reed Cozart, Pardon Attorney, Department of Justice
  George Reed, Member, U. S. Board of Parole

COUNCIL OF STATE
William L. Frederick

GOVERNMENTS
Jane Parks
  Mitchell Wendell
OPENING BUSINESS SESSION

The Eighteenth Annual Meeting of the Parole and Probation Compact Administrators’ Association was held in Portland, Oregon at the Portland Hilton Hotel on August 25, 1963. Approximately 60 persons attended the meeting including delegates from 33 jurisdictions, federal advisory members and guests.

The meeting was called to order at 10 A.M. by Compact Administrator Fred Finsley of California, the Association's President. After an invocation and roll call H. M. Randall of Oregon, the host state's Compact Administrator, welcomed the group. Mr. Finsley then made a brief address in which he recalled some of the Association's early history and pointed to its achievements through the years. In the course of his remarks Mr. Finsley called attention to the fact that the Association's success in overcoming the seemingly insurmountable problems it encountered during the early years was largely due to the cooperative spirit of the Compact Administrators and their efforts to make the Compact work despite the fact that there were many difficulties. Mr. Finsley also pointed out that solutions to problems and agreements made at previous meetings are set forth in the Parole and Probation Compact Manual. He suggested that Administrators should review the Manual before attending each annual meeting in order to be conversant with the positions which have been taken by the Association on various issues.

After Mr. Finsley’s address, the delegates referred the Report of the Treasurer to the Auditing Committee. The report is attached. See Appendix A.

The minutes of the 1962 annual meeting were approved without change.

Mr. William L. Frederick of the Council of State Governments presented the Annual Report of the Secretariat. The report is attached. See Appendix B.

Mr. Finsley then announced the following committee appointments: Resolutions Committee: George J. Stampar, Illinois, Chairman; R. U. Bobzin, Iowa; Manuel N. Brown, New Mexico; Louis Hoffman, Virgin Islands; Loretta A. Walker, Nebraska; Nominating Committee: Francis R. Bridges, Jr., Florida, Chairman; W. P. Ball, Arkansas; Charles P. Chew, Virginia; Paul J. Gernert, Pennsylvania; H. M. Randall, Oregon; L. B. Stephens, Alabama. Auditing Committee: Paul C. Wulman, Maryland, Chairman; Edward W. Grout, Colorado; Roberts Wright, New York.

FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH THE COMPACT

Mr. Telander of Minnesota called attention to the fact that the Oklahoma Compact Administrator announced in a letter to all Administrators, dated August 24, 1961, that his office would no longer accept requests for investigation or supervision of probationers. He pointed out that some Compact Administrators appear to be having difficulty in arranging for supervision of probationers by county officials. He asked if Oklahoma's failure to provide for interstate probation supervision could be construed legally as withdrawal from the Compact.

Dr. Mitchell Wendell, the Association's Counsel, gave the following explanation. A state cannot withdraw from the Compact by failing to observe the Compact's provisions. Withdrawal from the Compact can only be accomplished by the taking of the steps set forth in Article 7. Failure to fulfill Compact obligations represents breach of contract, not withdrawal. It would be possible for the other member states to bring suit against a non-performing state in order to secure judicial enforcement of the Compact. There is already some precedent for this with regard
to other compacts. However, it probably would be advisable to attempt to solve
the problem informally first by means of appropriate representations to
Oklahoma officials. Informal negotiations are customary before litigation and
they often eliminate the need for court action.

There was a general discussion of the Oklahoma problem and other situations
in which states have refused to supervise probationers. Attention was called to
the fact that the Oklahoma Administrator based his refusal on the fact that he
lacked the personnel to provide probation service. It was noted that personnel
shortages exist in many states. It was suggested that Compact Administrators
should make some effort to assist other states with probation cases despite this
problem, at least to the extent of suggesting other possibilities when no state
or local service is available. One Administrator pointed out that some of the
problems involved in providing interstate supervision might be solved if
Administrators would avoid itemizing the interstate caseload in their budgetary
requests. He said that legislators who are unfamiliar with the Compact might
feel that interstate service is unimportant and reduce the appropriation
accordingly. He also expressed the belief that Administrators should avoid the
tendency to think of interstate cases as a separate category with less right to
supervision than intrastate cases. He pointed out that an Administrator's duties
under the Compact are equally as important as his intrastate duties.

Mr. Finsley called attention to the fact that the Association discussed the
Oklahoma problem at the 1961 Annual Meeting and decided to take no action in order
to give the Oklahoma Compact Administrator time to find ways to remedy the
situation. The group agreed, by motion, that the Resolutions Committee should
draft a resolution directed to the Governor and other appropriate Oklahoma
officials setting forth the facts and requesting them to take steps to alleviate
the situation. During the Final Business Session such a resolution was adopted (See
Resolution 1, Appendix C.)

Compact Administrator Hofmann of Arizona called the group's attention to the
fact that the Association had adopted a resolution expressing disapproval of his
failure to make arrangements for probation supervision. He explained that Arizona
does not have a centralized probation system and judges at the county level resent
any intrusion by the state since they have been fighting attempts to centralize
probation. The Secretariat was directed to send a list of Arizona County probation
officers to all Compact Administrators.

The group also discussed the fact that judges in many states are still sending
probationers to other states without giving officials there any advance notice or
an opportunity to investigate. Reverend Hofmann suggested that failure to give
the receiving state an opportunity to investigate might be caused by the fact that
investigation reports are not always returned promptly. Mr. Finsley called
attention to the fact that California, by statute, permits judges to order a short
jail term as a condition of probation in order to permit time for investigation.

Mr. Gernert of Pennsylvania pointed out that problems may also arise because
judges are unfamiliar with the terms of the Compact. He reminded the group that
the Attorney General of Pennsylvania ruled in 1960 that persons sent out of state
in violation of the residence, employment and consent provisions of the Compact
are "outright releases" and may not be forced to return under the Compact. 1

There was a general discussion of steps which might be taken to solve the
problems involved in interstate supervision of probationers. A number of sugges-
tions were made. These included holding meetings of judges to explain the purposes

1 This opinion is reprinted in the Parole and Probation Compact Manual. See
Appendix A, page 60.
of the Compact, scheduling discussions of the Compact at other appropriate meetings, requesting assistance from such groups as the Advisory Council of Judges, adopting statutes requiring the channelling of all Compact cases through the Compact Administrator's office, and making informal efforts to encourage uncooperative judges and other officials to follow the terms of the Compact. The Secretariat was directed to write a letter to the Advisory Council of Judges requesting that group's assistance in educating judges.

NATIONAL PAROLE INSTITUTE

Compact Administrator Francis R. Bridges, Jr. of Florida, the Association's representative on the National Parole Institute, reported on this subject. A summary of his remarks follows.

The purpose of the National Parole Institute is to provide regional training institutes for parole board members. The National Council on Crime and Delinquency, the United States Parole Board, the Association of Paroling Authorities and the Council of State Governments cooperate in this program. The Council of State Governments has designated the Parole and Probation Compact Administrators' Association as its representative so a member of the Association is selected each year to serve as a member of the Committee for the Institute. At present three Compact Administrators are members since Mr. Gernert of Pennsylvania is the National Council on Crime and Delinquency's representative and Mr. Chew of Virginia is the representative of the Association of Paroling Authorities.

Two regional pilot institutes were conducted last year and there will be five additional Institutes during 1963 and 1964. One of the Institutes will be nationwide in scope and will include parole administrators.

At the conclusion of his remarks Mr. Bridges called upon several parole board members who had attended the Institutes. They expressed the view that the Institutes were among the most profitable meetings they had ever attended.

COURT DECISIONS RELATING TO FEDERAL PAROLE REVOCATION HEARINGS

Mr. George J. Reed, a member of the United States Board of Parole, discussed this subject. A summary of his remarks follows:

During the last few years some federal courts, particularly the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, have interpreted federal statutory law in a way which limited the discretion of the United States Board of Parole and required the development of certain new procedures regarding violation hearings.

One main area of litigation concerned the right to counsel at revocation hearings. Decisions in such cases as Robins v. Reed by the District of Columbia Court of Appeals led the Board to permit counsel at revocation hearings despite the fact that other Circuits ruled that counsel was not necessary. It should be noted that decisions upholding the right to counsel at federal hearings are based on statutory law not a constitutional right under the Sixth Amendment.

The matter of witness also has been at issue. Reed v. Butterworth led the Board to modify its rules to permit the appearance of voluntary witnesses at violation hearings.


On April 11, 1963 the Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia handed down a decision known as Hyser v. Reed in which eight cases were consolidated for argument. Federal revocation hearings were challenged on grounds of failure to: provide counsel for indigents; specify the charges adequately; provide for cross examination and confrontation; permit examination of confidential records of the Board; provide compulsory process to obtain witnesses for the parolee; and hold a hearing in the district where the alleged violation occurred. The court upheld the Board on all of these issues except the right to a hearing in the district where the violation occurred. On this point the court stated that the violator must be given a preliminary interview by an officer appointed by the Board before he is conducted to a federal prison. The court also stated that upon being taken into custody the parolee must be lodged in a place of detention as near as reasonably possible to the place of violation. In addition the court set forth certain standards concerning the warrant which is used to arrest the violator. The Board has decided not to appeal; however, the other side has filed a petition for certiorari regarding the issues on which the Board was upheld.

The decision indicates that the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia may not carry further its trend toward expanding the doctrine of due process and viewing parole as a matter of right. However it should be noticed that the Board was careful to provide the elements of fair play during the hearings which were challenged.

**PRE-PAROLE INVESTIGATIONS**

Compact Administrator Chew of Virginia reported that some states have refused requests for pre-parole investigations. He explained that the refusals have been based on lack of staff and the belief that Compact Administrators should not request investigations unless they plan to send the parolee to a state for supervision. Mr. Chew pointed out that it is difficult for a parole board to make an appropriate decision about parole when background material is unavailable because an individual has spent his entire life in some other state. He also pointed out that states which make pre-parole investigations for other states often benefit since they usually become the receiving state. By making the investigation they lessen the possibility that a poor parole risk will be sent to them for supervision.

The consensus appeared to be that Compact Administrators should try to cooperate by making pre-parole investigations since the number of requests states receive each year is very small. Compact Administrator Hofmann of Arizona pointed out that Administrators should be careful to specify the type of information they need and to provide the investigating state with adequate information regarding such things as addresses of relatives and former employees.

**QUARTERLY REPORTS**

Compact Administrator Chew reported that his state has been having difficulty securing quarterly reports despite the fact that the Compact Rules and Regulations entitle states to such reports if they desire them. He also said that variations in reporting periods from state to state cause confusion. He suggested that the Association should consider returning to uniformity.

There was a general discussion of the value of quarterly reports. No agreement was reached on this point; however, the consensus appeared to be that the Rules and Regulations should remain as they are so that Compact Administrators may secure quarterly reports if they desire them. The Secretariat was directed to revise and distribute new tables on quarterly reports for the Parole and Probation Compact
Manual. The Secretariat was also directed to include in the tables information about any additional reports states require.

RIGHT TO ARREST VIOLATORS

Marshall E. Swain, Commissioner of Kentucky's Department of Corrections, reported that a number of lower court judges in Kentucky and some other states have ruled that receiving state officials do not have authority to arrest technical violators for the sending state. He asked if the Compact should be amended to provide such authority. Attention was called to the fact that Appendix A of the Parole and Probation Compact Manual contains texts or summaries of several court decisions and a number of opinions of Attorneys General which uphold the right of the receiving state to arrest violators. Most of the opinions hold that a violator may be held upon request by the sending state pending receipt of a warrant, but a few indicate that a warrant may be necessary before the arrest can take place. One opinion, by the Attorney General of Arkansas, holds that the receiving state may detain a violator temporarily without a request until the sending state can be notified of the violation. Mr. Ray W. Williams, Director of Texas' Division of Parole Supervision reported that the Texas Criminal Court of Appeals ruled that a parolee from another state who is under supervision in Texas may be held in custody by the Texas Compact Administrator until a revocation warrant can be obtained from the sending state and held without bail while the sending state is in the process of returning him.1

The consensus appeared to be that the Compact need not be amended to permit arrest. The suggestion was made that Compact Administrators should attempt to secure favorable opinions from their Attorneys General and use the favorable opinions which are already in existence to convince judges that arrest of violators be receiving states is legal.

One of the Compact Administrators asked if Compact officials can arrest individuals without a warrant when they have not been under Compact supervision. Dr. Mitchell Wendell, the Association's counsel, said a warrant is necessary in order for officials of one state to arrest an individual on the basis of an alleged crime in another state.

BROCHURE

Mr. Frederick reported that the Juvenile Compact Administrators had authorized the expenditure of funds to pay an individual skilled at writing public relations material to prepare a brochure about the Juvenile Compact. He suggested that the Parole and Probation Compact Administrators might want to take similar action. Compact Administrator Elder of Missouri made the following motion, which was adopted unanimously:

"I move that the President of the Association and the Secretariat be authorized to arrange for the preparation of a brochure on the Interstate Compact, that after the brochure is approved by the Executive Committee it be made available in quantity to each Administrator for distribution in his state and that the Executive Committee be authorized to approve necessary expenditures of funds for the preparation and distribution of such a brochure."

1 Ex parte James R. Contrell, 362 S. W. 2d 115
TEXAS FEE PROBLEM

Mr. Frederick explained that Compact Administrator Denton of Indiana had reported by letter that a Texas probationer under Compact supervision in Indiana had been ordered by the Texas court to pay a probation service fee of $2 a week to the Wichita County, Texas, Probation Department. Mr. Denton's letter expressed disapproval of such fees, especially when the probation service is actually being rendered by another state and suggested that Compact Administrators should refuse to supervise cases where fees were demanded. Mr. Williams of Texas explained that the fee policy was not set by the state. He said that certain counties in Texas had decided that fees for intrastate probationers were necessary in order to support probation services, and Wichita County had decided to make the fees apply to interstate cases as well as intrastate cases. He noted that the fees were based on ability to pay.

There was a general discussion of the advisability of changing fees. Several Administrators suggested that a fee system might be preferable to inadequate probation service. It was also noted that judges have discretion to set the conditions of probation, and should be permitted to establish a fee as a condition of out of state probation.

On the other hand a number of Administrators expressed disapproval of the fee system as a method of providing funds for probation service and expressed the fear that this policy might spread. Dr. Wendell pointed out that the receiving state should not be asked to collect the fee even though the sending state might have a legal right to establish such a fee and collect it directly from the probationer. He also mentioned that he would question a receiving state's right to establish a fee for supervision of out of state probationers under the Compact.

In response to a question from the floor, Mr. Williams explained that the new Wichita County rule could not be considered an *ex post facto* condition of probation since Texas law permits alteration of probation rules after probation is granted.

The Association agreed by motion that the question of fees should be referred to the Association's Council with the request that recommendations be made to the next Annual Meeting of the Association.

Attention was called to the fact that the National Council on Crime and Delinquency might have a compilation of material on probation fee systems.

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON CRIME AND DELINQUENCY

Mr. Milton Rector, Director of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency reported on some of his organization's activities. A summary of his remarks follows:

Material recently published by NCCD includes a Model Sentencing Act, a revised Parole and Probation Salary Survey, an International Bibliography on Crime and Delinquency and a bibliography on Current Projects on Crime and Delinquency. The latter three publications will be published annually. A book on the law of corrections is being prepared. It will be available in December from West Publishing Company. Other material which is now available or in process includes Guides for Parole, a study of uniform parole reporting and a Model Act on Correctional Services. The Model Act is intended as a substitute for the Model Penal Code which contains some provisions which do not have the wholehearted support of parole and probation officials.
NCCD's other activities include development of training and study programs in cooperation with other groups. One such program, the National Parole Institute, is already in operation and is producing some interesting new concepts regarding training. On the federal level NCCD is working closely with the President's Committee on Delinquency and Youth Crime, the National Service Corps study team and the Administrative Office of the United States Courts. It is also working with a Committee of the U. S. Judicial Conference on the development of a national academy for parole and probation officers.

A Commission for the National Institute on Crime and Delinquency has been established to develop plans for the Annual Institute and to encourage regional activity. A meeting of the Commission will be held in October.

**DETAINEERS**

Mr. Frederick reported that the Agreement on Detainers is working well among the states which have joined it. He expressed the hope that other states would ratify the Agreement soon. Attention was called to the fact that California, Montana and Nebraska joined the Agreement in 1963, bringing the total number of member states to nine.

**FORMS FOR EMPLOYERS**

Mr. Hannum of the Osborne Association suggested that the Compact Administrators might want to review at some future meeting or refer to the Association's Council the question of lack of uniformity as to forms required by the states for employers.

**DIFFERENCES IN PAROLE PERIODS**

Mr. Holman of Maryland pointed out that the maximum parole period in the receiving state might often be much shorter than that of the sending state. He asked if the receiving state should be expected to supervise a Compact case beyond the time it would supervise its own parolees. The consensus was that the receiving state must continue supervision until the sending state agrees to discharge or make some other disposition of the case. Attention was called to the fact that state laws regarding parole periods may prevent the sending state from discharging an individual even though the receiving state has reported that he no longer needs supervision.

**FINAL BUSINESS SESSION**

Mr. Edward R. Cass, former General Secretary of the American Prison Association, was elected unanimously as an honorary life member of the Association.

Mr. Bridges of Florida was designated as the Association's representative to the National Parole Institute.

The Association voted to express a preference to the Executive Committee for holding the 1964 Annual Meeting on Saturday, August 29 in conjunction with the meeting of American Correctional Association which is scheduled for August 30-September 4 in Kansas City.\(^1\)

Compact Administrator Holman of Maryland reported that the Auditing Committee had reviewed the Annual Report of the Treasurer and found the figures to be correct.

---

\(^1\)After the Final Business Session the Executive Committee met and officially approved Saturday, August 29 in Kansas City as the time and place of the next annual meeting.
However, he said that some of the documents necessary for a proper audit were unavailable since the Treasurer had expected to bring them to the meeting but had then been unable to attend. Mr. Wolman said the Auditing Committee recommended that the report be considered adopted after the Treasurer submitted the necessary documents to the new President. This recommendation was approved unanimously.

Compact Administrator Stampar of Illinois presented the Report of the Resolutions Committee. This report was adopted unanimously. The Resolutions are attached. See Appendix C.

The group voted unanimously to request the Executive Director of the Council of State Governments to continue to provide the services of his organization as Secretariat for the Association.

Mr. Bridges of Florida presented the report of the Nominating Committee. The following officers were elected unanimously:

- President: George N. Elder, Missouri
- Vice President: Edward W. Grout, Colorado
- Treasurer: Martin P. Davis, Massachusetts
- Secretariat: Council of State Governments

Executive Committee (In addition to the officers)
- Fred Finsley, California, Chairman
- George J. Stampar, Illinois
- Loretta A. Walker, Nebraska
- John J. Shea, Maine
- Paul C. Wolman, Maryland
- Francis R. Bridges, Jr., Florida

Council
- H. M. Randall, Oregon, Chairman
- Keith Wilson, Utah
- W. P. Ball, Arkansas
- L. Stanley Clevenger, New York
- Delmar Huebner, Wisconsin

Mr. Finsley presented the gavel to Mr. Elder. As his first official act, Mr. Elder presented Mr. Finsley with a certificate in recognition of his leadership of the Association.

At 5 pm the meeting adjourned.
### APPENDIX A

**Treasurer’s Report July 1, 1962 to June 30, 1963**

#### SAVINGS ACCOUNT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASH RECEIPTS</th>
<th>DISBURSEMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1962-63 Membership Dues - Oklahoma and Wyoming did not pay dues. The following states paid associate fees in addition to their regular dues: California ($10); Louisiana; Massachusetts; New Jersey; New York; North Carolina; Pennsylvania; ($5)

| Luncheon Fees, 1962 Philadelphia Meeting | 48.75 | Balance on Hand, Warren Inst. for Savings as of 7-1-63 (See Statement Attached) | 3190.8 |

| Interest on Savings to July '62 | 26.30 |
| Interest on Savings to October '62 | 30.71 |
| Interest on Savings to April '62 | 64.72 |

**TOTAL ACCOUNTABILITY** | **4090.83** | **4090.83**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASH RECEIPTS</th>
<th>DISBURSEMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance July 1, 1962</td>
<td>Letter Service, Mimeographing (See Statement Attached)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>231.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferred from Warren Inst. for savings, August, 1962</td>
<td>Postage Stamps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferred from Warren Inst. for Savings, October, 1962</td>
<td>Clerical Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ACCOUNTABILITY</strong></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL ACCOUNTABILITY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Treasurer
APPENDIX B

Report of the Secretariat

First I would like to give a brief report on progress with regard to matters you discussed at your last annual meeting.

As you will recall you adopted two resolutions advising Congress that you would oppose any congressional consent bill which gave Congress or its committees unlimited access to the files of Administrators of the Parole and Probation Compact or the Agreement on Detainers. No such bills have been introduced during the present session of Congress. We will continue to watch the introductions and we will take appropriate action whenever it becomes necessary.

Last year you directed us to send copies of the 1962 Annual Report on the Interstate Movement of Parolees and Probationers to all Governors. We sent these out recently along with a brief explanatory letter.

We have not heard of any new court decisions concerning the Compact. If there are any you have not sent to us, we hope that you will do so.

Most states have signed the Compact with Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. The following states need legislation to do so: Alabama, Illinois (for Puerto Rico only) Indiana, Iowa, Maryland, Mississippi, North Dakota, Washington (for the Virgin Islands only). The following states have the necessary statutory authorization but have not signed: Georgia, Illinois (to sign with the Virgin Islands) and Kansas. We have not received a report from Texas.

Hawaii adopted legislation this year forbidding the sending of parolees and probationers to other states without referring the case to the Hawaii Compact Administrator. The Hawaii act also requires parolees and probationers who are being sent from Hawaii for supervision in other states to post bond.

To bring you up to date with regard to Compacts in fields related to your own, West Virginia, Delaware and North Carolina ratified the Juvenile Compact this year, bringing the total number of member states to 37.

California, Montana and Nebraska ratified the Agreement on Detainers. Nine states now are party to this Compact.
RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION I

SUPERVISION OF PROBATIONERS IN OKLAHOMA

WHEREAS, every state has ratified the Interstate Compact for the Supervision of Parolees and Probationers and by doing so has pledged itself to cooperate with all other states in the supervision of parolees and probationers; and

WHEREAS, a letter of August 24, 1961 to all Compact Administrators from W. J. Bynum, Oklahoma Compact Administrator, advised that due to a lack of facilities and personnel his office could no longer supervise probationers for other states, and said letter offered no alternatives by which other states could secure supervision of probationers sent to Oklahoma under the Compact; and

WHEREAS, the Parole and Probation Compact Administrators' Association considered this situation at its 1961 and 1962 annual meetings but took no action in the hope that it might be clarified by remedial action in Oklahoma, but no such action has occurred and other states continue to be hampered in making arrangements for supervision of probationers in Oklahoma;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Parole and Probation Compact Administrators' Association at its Eighteenth Annual Meeting on August 25, 1963 that the Association express its utmost concern with regard to this situation to the Governor of Oklahoma with the hope that His Excellency could take necessary steps to alleviate this situation; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that copies of this resolution be forwarded by the Secretariat to the Governor of Oklahoma with an appropriate letter of transmittal, with a copy to the Oklahoma Compact Administrator and the Chairman of the Oklahoma Commission on Interstate Cooperation.

RESOLUTION II

HOST ADMINISTRATOR

WHEREAS, the State of Oregon through its Compact Administrator H. M. Randall, has done an outstanding job in making the members of the Compact Administrators' Association welcome to the state; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Randall and his committee made it possible for the members to enjoy an outstanding meeting place;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this Association express to Mr. Randall and his committee its sincere appreciation for a splendid job; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Secretariat be instructed to write a letter of appreciation to Mr. Randall, and send copies to the Governor of Oregon and the Chairman of the Oregon Parole Board.
RESOLUTION III

ASSOCIATION PRESIDENT

WHEREAS, Fred Finsley was one of the original members of this Association, and through the years has contributed much toward its growth; and

WHEREAS, he has provided outstanding leadership as President during the past year;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that this Association express its deep appreciation to Fred Finsley for the many contributions he has made to its work.

RESOLUTION IV

PORTLAND - HILTON HOTEL

WHEREAS, the management and employees of the Portland Hilton Hotel have provided excellent accommodations and service for our meeting and have been helpful in many other ways;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this Association express its sincere appreciation to the Portland Hilton Hotel.

RESOLUTION V

COUNSEL

WHEREAS, Dr. Mitchell Wendell has rendered such valuable service in initiating and preparing drafts of legislation for improvement in the Interstate Compact and likewise has made such significant contributions by his counsel at various meetings;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this Association express to Dr. Wendell its sincere appreciation for his services.

RESOLUTION VI

SECRETARIAT

WHEREAS, The Council of State Governments through our Secretariat Mr. William L. Frederick and his Assistant, Miss Jane Parks, have been of such value in offering leadership, guidance and service to our Association;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this Association express to our Secretariat and Miss Parks and to The Council of State Governments through the Secretariat our most sincere appreciation for the services they have rendered.