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OPENING BUSINESS SESSION

The Twentieth Annual Meeting of the Parole and Probation Compact Administrators' Association was held at the Sheraton Plaza Hotel in Boston, Massachusetts on August 21, 1965. Approximately fifty-five Compact Administrators, deputies and other officials attended. A list of registrants is attached as Appendix A.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 A.M. by the President of the Association, Compact Administrator Edward W. Grout of Colorado.

Massachusetts' Compact Administrator, Martin P. Davis, welcomed the group on behalf of his state and the City of Boston. He described some of Massachusetts' correctional facilities, including a seventy-bed hospital at one correctional institution which has an "AA" rating from the American Medical Association and is utilized for treatment of individuals from all of Massachusetts' prisons. He also described a new reformatory for 250 women at Framingham which is of special interest because it is designed in the light of advanced correctional theories. It is set up in cottage style and the inmates are encouraged to participate in decorating plans and contribute ideas regarding the running of the institution.

Mr. Grout gave the Annual Report of the President. He pointed to the success of the organization as an instrument for interstate cooperation and he called attention to the role the Association had played in solving problems in related areas such as the adverse effect of detainers and the lack of machinery for supervision of juveniles and return of runaways. He expressed the belief that the Compact "has proved its utility beyond question in providing methods for salvaging human beings and deterring further crimes by those on parole and probation." He urged the members of the Association to attempt to secure full cooperation in their states for the Joint Commission on Manpower and Training because of the great need for development of sources of trained personnel for the parole and probation field.

After a roll call, Compact Administrator Saul Clark of Idaho presented a summary of the Annual Report of the Treasurer. The Report, which was referred to the Auditing Committee, is attached as Appendix B.

The minutes of the 1964 Annual Meeting were approved.

Mr. William L. Frederick, Eastern Regional Director of The Council of State Governments, presented the Annual Report of the Secretariat. This Report is attached as Appendix C.

Mr. Grout appointed the following committees: Resolutions Committee: George Denton of Ohio, Chairman; Russell G. Oswald, New York; Don McGhee, Tennessee; Charles P. Chew, Virginia; H. M. Randall, Oregon. Nominating Committee: Fred Dickson, California, Chairman; Louis Hoffman, Virgin Islands; J. Curtis Moore, South Carolina; Salvatore J. Russofello, New Jersey; T. F. Telanders, Minnesota. Auditing Committee: Ray W. Williams, Texas, Chairman; Joseph Sengler, California.
DISCUSSION SESSION

REVIEW OF CHAPTER 2, SECTION II OF THE MANUAL

The following persons served as panelists: Dr. Manuel Brown, New Mexico; L. Stanley Clevenger, New York; Joseph S. Coughlin, Wisconsin; W. Parker Hurley, Kentucky; H. M. Randall, Oregon; John J. Shea, Maine.

The panelists discussed the contents of Section II of Chapter 2 as revised through 1964 which had been submitted to them in advance of the meeting. There was general agreement that the Chapter reflected the current thinking of the Association regarding eligibility and arrangements for supervision under the Compact.

In connection with the review of Section II, the group discussed several problems relating to eligibility and acceptance for supervision. The discussion is summarized below.

Synanon, Lexington and Halfway Houses

A question was raised as to the possibility of arranging for supervision of drug addicts in the Synanon program in California. Compact Administrator Dickson reported that he is unwilling at present to accept responsibility for placing or supervising cases in the Synanon program. Thus far, the California Adult Authority has been unsuccessful in its attempts to secure statistical evidence of the success of the program. It has not been possible to reach any agreement with Synanon which would permit California to maintain its customary standards of supervision. Mr. Dickson said that the organization had received wide publicity and apparently had been viewed with approval by several psychiatrists who investigated it. However, he pointed out that the status of a parolee or probationer is different from that of an addict who has not been convicted. The state is responsible to the public for a person who has been placed on probation or parole. At present those who fail at Synanon appear to be dropped from the program with no provision for further supervision. Until California can clarify these matters and be assured that it will be able to keep currently informed of a supervisee's behavior, it cannot advise other states to send supervisees to Synanon. In the course of the discussion, one of the delegates reported that a New Jersey Legislative Committee had completed a report on Synanon.

There was a brief discussion of similar problems which arise when parolees or probationers enter the federal hospital for drug addicts at Lexington. The Kentucky Compact Administrator's agents are not permitted to enter the hospital for supervisory purposes. Since commitments are voluntary, parolees and probationers may leave the hospital even though their treatment is not completed. State officials have no authority to direct hospital officials to detain an individual for treatment.

There was general agreement that Compact Administrators should attempt to make judges aware of the disadvantages of granting probation to drug addicts for the purpose of entering Lexington, Synanon or other facilities which do not have cooperative arrangements for probation supervision or permit patients to leave without consent. Attention was called to the fact that many persons who are familiar with the problem of drug addiction feel that addicts should be treated in or near the community in which they intend to live instead of in a distant facility which is inaccessible in times of crisis.
There was a brief discussion of Dismas House in Missouri, a religious institution which offers shelter and work to impoverished parolees. Compact Administrator Elder of Missouri said he has no control over the activities or decisions made at Dismas House since it is a private facility. He suggested that Compact Administrators should refrain from allowing parolees and probationers to make plans to reside at Dismas House, unless there are exceptional reasons for doing so and the Missouri Compact Administrator had been consulted. He pointed out that Missouri could not place itself in the position of accepting supervision of large numbers of individuals with low employment potentials.

There was general agreement that Compact Administrators should attempt to discourage private institutions and organizations from offering post-prison programs directly to individual inmates, parolees or probationers. Such correspondence should be sent to wardens or parole and probation officials in order that they may weigh the suitability of the program in the light of the individual's needs and the feasibility of arranging Compact supervision. It was also agreed that the sending state should ask the receiving state for a confidential appraisal of any private facility to which a supervisee might be sent. Attention was called to the fact that Administrators should be cautious about printing and distributing appraisals of the private facilities in their states since unfounded judgments, however sincere, might be considered libelous.

The group asked Mr. Frederick to see if he could have the Chief Justices of the fifty states consider the problems which arise when judges release probationers to private facilities without consulting the Compact Administrator. Mr. Frederick said he would try to do so.

"Sundown"Probation

Compact Administrator Gernert of Pennsylvania pointed out that some judges are still releasing convicted persons with orders to leave the state immediately and without any supervisory arrangements. He suggested that the Compact Administrators should bring this matter to the attention of the Attorneys General by resolution or otherwise. He pointed out that such probationers are beyond the jurisdiction of the court once they have left the state.

Employment

Attention was called to several surveys concerning adjustment of parolees who are released for supervision before they secure employment. The surveys indicate that such parolees adjust as well as those who have obtained employment before leaving prison. In fact, one survey indicated that the adjustment record was slightly better for those released without employment. Mr. Gernert of Pennsylvania reported that surveys in his state indicated that many parolees leave the job they have secured before parole within two or three weeks. He said that prisoners without jobs are granted parole by Pennsylvania, but he pointed out that careful consideration is given to the individual's employment potential and the availability of employment in the area in which he plans to live.
The discussion revealed that many Compact Administrators are willing to accept supervision of individuals who have not found jobs as long as work is available and the person is capable of finding employment. In some cases, Compact Administrators will accept persons who have private incomes and do not plan to work, provided that employment is not considered to be essential to the individual's rehabilitation. Many Administrators are willing to assist out-of-state supervisees to secure work. In at least one state, Minnesota, the services of a full-time employment agent are available.

Supervision of Misdemeanants

Requests for Supervision of Non-resident as Residents

Mr. TELANDER of Minnesota said that he had received some requests for supervision "as a resident" for persons who had just arrived in the state, or who had only distant relatives in the state. He asked the Compact Administrators to avoid such terminology and to adhere to the definition of "resident" set forth in Article I of the Compact.

Travel Permits

Mr. Hurley of Kentucky called attention to the excessive length of time required to secure permission for a parolee to enter another state for purposes of looking for employment or otherwise. He urged that procedures for issuance of travel permits be speeded up.

Inadequate Placements

Mr. Hurley said that problems sometimes arise because the placement suggested by the sending state for a receiving state's resident is inadequate. It was suggested that the receiving state should advise the sending state of this fact.

NATIONAL PAROLE INSTITUTE AND THE PAROLE REPORTING PROJECT

Mr. Francis R. Bridges, Jr. of Florida, the Parole and Probation Compact Administrators' Association's representative on the Advisory Council of the National Parole Institute, reported that the Institute had sponsored several special institutes for members of parole boards and their key personnel during the year.
He said that one more institute will be held this year and others will be held in the future. In the course of his remarks, Mr. Bridges paid tribute to Mr. Vincent O'Leary, the original director of the institutes, for his leadership in getting the program on its way. Mr. Bridges called attention to the fact that two Compact Administrators, Mr. Gernert of Pennsylvania and Mr. Chew of Virginia, are members of the National Parole Institute's Advisory Council. He then introduced Mr. Don Godfredson, Director of Research of the National Parole Institute, who described the Uniform Parole Reporting Project. A summary of Mr. Godfredson's remarks follows.

The Uniform Parole Reporting Project is an out-growth of the National Parole Institutes. It represents an attempt to develop a reporting system which can be used throughout the states to gather meaningful statistics. A group of representatives from paroling agencies have agreed tentatively upon a set of codes and definitions. As a pre-pilot study, eight paroling agencies have been asked to use the system on a monthly basis for selected cases. The information has come in well and the system appears to be workable.

The National Institute of Mental Health has asked for a pilot study. It is possible that user seminars will be held not only to furnish information, but also to provide a forum for the contribution of ideas about ways of improving the system and new ways of utilizing it.

It is important that an accurate, understandable reporting system be developed so that adequate assessments can be made of various aspects of parole. For instance, a good reporting system might be utilized to provide some answers to the question raised by the Administrators regarding the need for securing employment before parole and the success of treatment methods used by agencies such as Synanon.

At the conclusion of Mr. Godfredson's remarks, the Association authorized the President to reappoint Mr. Bridges of Florida as the Association's representative on the National Parole Institute.

At its final business session, the Association adopted a resolution in support of the National Parole Institute and the Uniform Parole Reporting Project. See Resolution I, Appendix D.

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON CRIME AND DELINQUENCY

The report for NCCD was given by Mr. Vincent O'Leary, Executive Assistant. He expressed the regrets of NCCD's Executive Director at not being able to attend. He told the group that he had decided to report on only the projects in which the Association might have a special interest since the scope of NCCD's activities has become too broad to be encompassed in a brief talk. He also said that one of NCCD's major interests, the establishment of the Joint Commission on Manpower and Training, would be discussed later by Mr. Charles Prigmore. A summary of Mr. O'Leary's remarks follows.

NCCD has a contract with the National Institute for Mental Health to provide abstracts on matters relating to crime and delinquency. These abstracts are published in the International Bibliography on Crime and Delinquency. The abstracts are
also being put into automatic data processing machinery. The major problem at present is that of evaluation. It would be difficult for the average correctional or juvenile official to assess the validity of the reference material presented by the machines. There may be flaws in research methods or faulty conclusions made in the abstracts which are not easily identifiable. Since the National Institute of Mental Health does not want to become involved in passing judgment on the studies which are abstracted, the Research Council is attempting to work out a method of providing reasonable evaluations.

The experience of the National Parole Institutes indicated that many of the problems faced by parole boards apply generally to correctional administration. One such problem is that of training and increasing use of specialists. During the year NCCD ran programs concerning appropriate organizational patterns and the development and use of special skills for correctional personnel in Texas and Kentucky. It also made a special study of the Oregon correctional system.

A survey is being made of training resources in the states for parole and probation officials and police. NCCD also is working with the Department of Justice on the implementation of the Law Enforcement Assistance Act, which is pending in Congress. While most of the funds under the Act will be allocated to law enforcement assistance, a substantial sum will be available for the correctional field. NCCD will keep the states informed about projects for which grants may be secured.

NCCD also is concerned with the relationship between the Economic Opportunity Act and the correctional field. The major problem here appears to be identification of appropriate projects for funding and submission of applications in acceptable form.

The Citizen Action Program is continuing new programs have been started in Connecticut and Illinois.

NCCD's Ford Foundation grant has been renewed with the understanding that the money can be used to develop new sources of funds for the purpose of expanding NCCD's services. Formerly, the Ford grants could only be used to bridge the gap between budget and maintenance of existing programs.

RETURN OF PAROLEES

Mr. Bridges of Florida called attention to the fact that a number of states had refused to retake violators from his state during the year. He reminded the group that the Compact would suffer if this practice continued.

One of the delegates pointed out that many problems arise when the receiving state requests return instead of prosecuting on new charges. The fact of an arrest is not conclusive evidence of guilt; and in some states, such as Kansas, the label "problem parolee" is not accepted as cause for revocation.
Mr. Clevenger of New York reported that his state makes great efforts to retake supervisees when requested to do so by the receiving state. He said, however, that there is some reluctance to spend travel funds for the return of supervisees who are close to the terminal date for supervision. Dr. Wendell, the Association’s Counsel, reminded the group that this problem might be solved by the Out-of-State Incarceration Amendment. The Amendment permits the sending state to direct the receiving state to incarcerate a violator in a receiving state’s prison. It is in force only between states which adopt it. Dr. Wendell said that only eight states are party to the Amendment. He suggested that other states might wish to consider joining if the matter of terminal dates is a problem. Use of the Amendment is not limited to cases of supervisees who are reaching their terminal dates, but it could be most helpful in such cases.

Mr. Stephens reported that one of his out-of-state supervisees had been ordered by a court to return at his own expense to show cause why his probation should not be revoked. The Compact Administrator’s office was not informed that the court was issuing the order. Mr. Stephens expressed the view that courts should consult the Compact Administrator before issuing such orders.

AMERICAN CORRECTIONAL ASSOCIATION

At the request of the Chair, Dr. E. Preston Sharp, General Secretary of the American Correctional Association, addressed the group. Dr. Sharp said that he had been appointed on a full time basis in June. He told the group that he would like to arrange to consult with the Association’s Secretariat about ways in which his organization might assist the Compact Administrator.

PSYCHOLOGICAL TYPES IN THE CORRECTIONAL POPULATION

Dr. Manuel Brown reported on several studies of the extent of psychosis and psychoneurosis in prison populations.

A study of prisoners in Washington classified about 13% as "neurotic" and less than 5% as psychotic.

A 1961 study by Messinger and Apfelberg\(^1\) of 57,000 persons involved in felonies who were given psychiatric examinations at the Psychiatric Clinic of the Criminal Division of the New York Supreme Court (New York County) indicated that only 1 to 2% were psychotic, and less than 1% were categorized as psychopathic or sociopathic. Of the 57,000 persons, 25 to 30% had been addicted to drugs, however, they had already passed the withdrawal stage, at least to the point of being able to function, although in a criminal way. None of the group had to be hospitalized when arrested.

A 1965 report by Messinger and Zitrin\(^2\) on 4,500 drug addicts seen at the same clinic between 1954 and 1960 revealed no cases of overt psychosis and only


two cases of clinical psychoneurosis. (The authors do not classify as psycho-
neurotic persons who have personality disorders leading to delinquency or poor
adjustment. This category is reserved for those who have sought medical at-
tention to a significant degree or those whose symptoms have been severe enough
to prevent gainful work.) About 44 percent were listed as psychopathic or socio-
pathic. The remainder were classified as having lesser character disorders, ex-
cept for three persons who were considered "adjusted". The authors take the view that
psychologically or psychiatrically oriented programs for psychopaths are des-
tined to fail. They suggest that addicted and non-addicted criminal psychopaths
should be considered sociological problems and treated in a correctional background.

PROBATION PROGRAMS FOR MISDEMEANANTS

Mr. Grout said that he had received an inquiry about state probation programs
for misdemeanants. He asked the members of the Association to write to him about
programs in their states.

RIGHT TO DETAIN INTERSTATE SUPERVISEES WITHOUT A REQUEST FROM THE SENDING STATE

In response to a question from the floor, Dr. Wendell said opinions of courts
and Attorneys General have varied as to the need for a request from the sending
state before an arrest. There are one or two opinions upholding the right of the
sending state to arrest on its own initiative, but there are also several opinions
indicating that a request is necessary and several indicating that a warrant is
required. Dr. Wendell said that the right to arrest is a matter of internal state
law. If an official may detain an intrastate parolee on his own initiative, he has
the power, at least in theory, to arrest an interstate supervisee. Under the Com-
pact, the same standards of supervision apply to interstate supervisees as apply
for the receiving state's own supervisees.

One of the delegates asked if the Compact should be amended to assure uniform
practice in this regard. Dr. Wendell said that he would not advise this step be-
cause of the difficulty of securing nationwide enactments. He pointed out that
adoption of such a provision by even one state could be used as a basis for claims
that Compact officials do not believe that the power to supervise granted by the
Compact includes the power of arrest.

Members of the New York delegation pointed out that the Compact is interpreted
by New York's internal law to include the power to arrest out-of-state supervisees.

LIMITS ON TIME DURING WHICH PAROLEES AND PROBATIONERS MAY BE HELD

Mr. Grout of Colorado reported that his state enacted legislation in 1965 to
limit the time during which a Colorado violator may be held to 15 days within the
state and 30 days outside the state. The hearing must be held during these periods.
Mr. Grout explained that the limit for out-of-state cases had been set at 30 days to assure ample time for making travel arrangements. He said that Colorado would attempt to remove its violators as quickly as possible despite the fact that the legislature has authorized the 30 day hold.

CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF SUPERVISEES

Dr. Wendell of The Council of State Governments called attention to the way in which the courts have expanded the concept of procedural due process for those accused of crime. He pointed out that the protective attitude of the courts has been flowing rapidly into the area of parole and probation, and he suggested that the Compact Administrators should take prompt steps to assure that Compact procedures will continue to be valid. A summary of his remarks follows.

The Compact was drafted at a time when the principle that a grant of parole or probation was a privilege rather than a right was undisputed. Since there was no right to parole or probation there was no consequent right to any particular supervisory procedures. Today the legal status of the parolee or probationer is not so certain. Most courts continue to hold that release on parole and probation is a privilege; moreover, the federal courts have ruled that there is no federal constitutional right to parole and probation. However, more and more judges are beginning to insist that some elements of due process be afforded to supervisees. There is a tendency toward the view that the right to "fair play" is inherent in parole and probation statutes. Federal supervisees have already been granted the right to preliminary hearings, with witnesses, at the site of violation and the right to bring witnesses and counsel to board hearings. It is probable that some courts will follow the new federal decisions with regard to state parolees and probationers. It should also be noted that some of the decisions have been close, with strong minority opinions that additional aspects of due process should be provided.

If state parolees and probationers are given the right to hearings at the site of violation or other procedural rights, there will be technical problems in Compact cases in addition to difficulties caused by distance and expense. The Administrators will either have to find ways of solving these problems or circumvent them procedurally. For instance, it may be possible to construct a satisfactory legal record by having the prisoner request supervision out of state and then knowingly waive any procedural rights he may have in favor of a privilege he considers more advantageous, namely Compact supervision.

At the conclusion of Dr. Wendell's remarks, a number of delegates expressed the view that the Association should study the Compact carefully in the light of the present legal situation. Compact Administrator Reed of Nevada called attention to the need for uniformity in revocation proceedings. He pointed out that some states do not even require a revocation hearing.

The following motion was adopted:

"The 1965-66 President is directed to appoint a Committee which will consider the establishment of uniform revocation procedures; review allied areas, especially those related to the continued successful operation of the Compact; and report any proposals it develops to the Association."
RELEASE BY PERSONS OTHER THAN PAROLE AND PROBATION OFFICIALS

Attention was called to the fact that the tentative revision of the American Correctional Association's "Standards" contains a provision which would give the Commission of Corrections the right to release a prisoner prior to his parole hearing for reasons of compassion or to seek employment. Mr. Dickson of California said his state's 1965 legislature had enacted a similar provision but added language requiring approval of the Adult Authority. Mr. Sharp of the American Correctional Association told the group that the pre-parole release provision would be discussed at the Congress of Corrections on August 24.

The consensus appeared to be that prisoners should not be permitted to leave prison temporarily or permanently before their parole hearing unless the state's paroling authority agrees. Members of the group pointed out that the public is unaware of the distinction between parolees and pre-parole releases and tends to blame parole authorities for offenses committed by pre-parole releases. It was also noted that such persons should be under some type of supervision and that parole authorities are best equipped to investigate and be aware of elements of risk in the pre-parole release plan.

CRIMINAL INFILTRATION IN PAROLE BOARDS

Mr. Gernert of Pennsylvania reported that Mr. J. Edgar Hoover's March 4th testimony before the Subcommittee on Appropriations contained allegations that the membership or staff of some state parole boards contained criminal elements. Mr. Gernert said that he had written to Mr. Hoover to inquire about the situation and had received a reply indicating that there was no difficulty in Pennsylvania, and reporting that officials in problem states had been notified. Delegates from Florida and Nevada said that they had written similar letters and received similar replies. Mr. Grout asked if any delegates had been informed that there were criminal elements in their parole system. No delegate reported having received such a communication.

MANPOWER AND TRAINING IN THE CORRECTIONAL FIELD

Dr. Charles S. Prigmore, Executive Director of the Joint Commission on Manpower and Training, reported on this subject. A summary of his remarks follows:

The Joint Commission on Manpower and Training is the outgrowth of a June, 1964 conference at Arden House which was held to discuss manpower and training needs in the field of corrections. Representatives of approximately 60 organizations attended the meeting.

The Joint Commission was incorporated in March of 1965. It is tax exempt and may accept grants from non-governmental organizations. One such grant has already been received.

Representative Green has introduced H.R. 2263 in Congress to provide about four-fifths of the necessary funds. After passing the House, the bill was amended
In the Senate to provide for administration of the grants, with the approval of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, by a National Advisory Council on Manpower and Training. 1/

It was the consensus at Arden House that membership in the Commission should extend to certain groups outside the correctional field, for instance the AFL-CIO, Adult Education Association of the United States, and other groups which might contribute to the solution of manpower and training problems. The membership of the Commission now totals eighty.

It is important for the Commission to secure the support of the National Governors' Conference. Hopefully, arrangements can be made for the Commission to report to the Governors' Conference when it has prepared its recommendations.

It also would be most helpful if the Association could communicate with the President asking him to stress the importance of correctional manpower and training as a factor in crime control. So far, Mr. Johnson's speeches and press releases have tended to stress law enforcement assistance. 2/

The Joint Commission on Manpower and Training hopes that there can be a continuous interchange of information and assistance between the Commission and the Compact Administrators.

At the conclusion of Dr. Prigmore's remarks, Compact Administrator Oswald of New York complimented Dr. Prigmore on the skill he had used in helping the Joint Commission to achieve its primary organizational goals.

**BROCHURE FOR JUDGES**

Compact Administrator Chew of Virginia suggested that the Association should publish a brochure designed for the special purpose of acquainting judges with procedures and obligations under the Compact. He expressed the view that the Association's present brochure may be too general to give judges the guidance they need in dealing with probation cases.

Mr. Frederick pointed out that the Association would probably have to hire a person skilled in public relations to write such a brochure. The following motion was adopted unanimously.

"It is agreed that the Association, through its President, Secretary and Executive Committee, should consider publishing a brochure directed specifically toward judges, which will deal with procedures and obligations regarding interstate probationers."

1/ At the time this page was written, H.R. 2263 as amended had passed the House and was awaiting signature by the President.

2/ On August 27, 1965 the Secretariat, at the direction of the Executive Committee, sent a message to the President on this subject.
Mr. Grout turned the gavel over to the Association's new President, Mr. Davis. Mr. Davis made a brief speech in which he asked the Compact Administrators to give careful consideration to the many new questions which had been raised during the meeting so that they might come to the 1966 meeting prepared to take definite positions. He then presented Mr. Grout with a certificate honoring him for his leadership as President.

At 4:50 P.M. the meeting adjourned.

Note: A pamphlet concerning the history of the Parole and Probation Compact Administrators' Association, prepared by Mr. Grout of Colorado, was distributed at the meeting. Copies may be secured from the Secretariat.
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Salvatore J. Russoniello, Deputy Director, Division of Corrections and Parole

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

NEW YORK
*Russell G. Oswald, Chairman, Board of Parole
Harold V. Canavan, Supervising Parole Officer, New York State Division of Parole
L. Stanley Cleveinger, Administrative Director, New York State Division of Parole
Roberts Wright, Commissioner, New York State Board of Parole

NORTH CAROLINA
*Marvin R. Wooten, Chairman, Parole Board
H. A. McGlamery, Deputy Administrator for Probation
W. C. Williams, Deputy Administrator for Parole

OHIO
*George F. Denton, Chief of the Adult Parole Authority

OREGON
*H. M. Randall, Director of Parole and Probation

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

SOUTH CAROLINA
*J. Curtis Moore, Director, Probation, Pardon and Parole Board

TENNESSEE
*Don McGehee, Director, Division of Probation and Parole

TEXAS
Ray Williams, Administrative Director, Board of Pardons and Paroles

VERMONT
*Rudolph H. Morse, Director, Probation and Parole

VIRGINIA
*Charles P. Chew, Director of Parole
James E. Hargroves, Interstate Supervisor

VIRGIN ISLANDS
*Louis Hoffman, Chairman, Parole Board
WEST VIRGINIA
John W. Mastin, Deputy Director to the Commissioner of Public Institutions

WISCONSIN
Joseph S. Coughlin, Chief of Administrative Services, Division of Corrections

FEDERAL ADVISORY MEMBERS
Reed Cozart, Pardon Attorney, Department of Justice

OTHERS
J. Alex. Edmison, Q. C., National Parole Board, Canada
Earle W. Gilkey, Supervisor, Interstate Unit, District of Columbia Board of Parole
Don Godfredson, Director of Research, National Parole Institutes
Robert R. Hannum, The Osborne Association, Inc.
Vincent O'Leary, Executive Assistant, National Council on Crime and Delinquency
Dr. E. Preston Sharp, General Secretary, American Correctional Association
Charles S. Pagram, Executive Director, Joint Commission on Manpower and Training

COUNCIL OF STATE GOVERNMENTS
William L. Frederick, Eastern Regional Director
Jane Parks, Assistant to William L. Frederick
Elizabeth Sicherman, Secretary
Mitchell Wendell, Counsel
# FINANCIAL REPORT - JULY 1, 1964 to FEBRUARY 23, 1965

## SAVINGS ACCOUNT - WARREN INSTITUTION FOR SAVINGS

### CASH RECEIPTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance, July 7, 1964</td>
<td>$3,896.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964-65 Membership Dues Paid (See Statement Attached)</td>
<td>$1,315.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Savings to July, 1964</td>
<td>$40.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Savings to Oct., 1964</td>
<td>$44.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Savings to Jan., 1965</td>
<td>$42.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance in Checking Account transferred to Warren Inst. for Savings from First National Bank of Boston</td>
<td>$3.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DISBURSEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to Checking Account, First National Bank of Boston, August 12, 1964</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to Checking Account, First National Bank of Boston, November 3, 1964</td>
<td>$705.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to First National Bank of Boston, Checking Account, November 10, 1964</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check issued by Warren Inst. for Savings to Council of State Governments; Reimbursement for payment to University of Chicago, Printing Dept. for printing of brochure on the Compact</td>
<td>$985.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL ACCOUNTABILITY** $5,341.25

--

# CHECKING ACCOUNT - FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF BOSTON

### CASH RECEIPTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance, July 1, 1964</td>
<td>$166.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferred from Warren Inst. for Savings, Aug. 12, 1964</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferred from Warren Inst. for Savings, Nov. 4, 1964</td>
<td>$705.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferred from Warren Inst. for Savings, Nov. 10, 1964</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DISBURSEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John C. McDonald Insurance Agency (Bond in behalf of Martin P. Davis)</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage Stamps</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council of State Governments (Reimbursement for Mailing Charges)</td>
<td>$27.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolland Studio - 45 (8 x 10 prints)</td>
<td>$55.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council of State Governments-Postage</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.A. Burkhardt - Brochure on Compact</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exec. Committee, Dinner &amp; Ann. Lunch</td>
<td>$252.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-half of Mitch Wendell's Expenses for Travel &amp; Hotel</td>
<td>$79.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genovese Press - Mimeographing &amp; Multigraphing (See statement attach)</td>
<td>$432.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council of State Govts. - Expenses by Secretariat, 7/1 to 9/15/64</td>
<td>$145.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical Services (Eileen O'Neill)</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Charges - First Nat'l Bank</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bal., in Check, Acct. transferred to Warren Inst. for Savings</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL ACCOUNTABILITY** $1,936.42

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7-9-64</td>
<td>$1068</td>
<td>Multigraphing</td>
<td>$44.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-24-64</td>
<td>$1100</td>
<td>Mimeographing</td>
<td>195.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-26-64</td>
<td>$1099</td>
<td>Mimeographing</td>
<td>100.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-28-64</td>
<td>$1156</td>
<td>Multigraphing</td>
<td>12.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-17-64</td>
<td>$1193</td>
<td>Multigraphing</td>
<td>80.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$432.25</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(For Council of State Governments)
PAROLE AND PROBATION COMPACT ADMINISTRATORS' ASSOCIATION

FINANCIAL STATEMENT
March 22, 1965 - June 30, 1965
SEE ATTACHED FORMER TREASURER'S REPORT PRIOR TO ABOVE DATE

SAVINGS ACCOUNT - IDAHO FIRST NATIONAL BANK, BOISE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cash Receipts</th>
<th>Disbursements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance as of March 22, 1965</td>
<td>Balance of Savings Account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 2985.65</td>
<td>June 30, 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Savings, June, 1965</td>
<td>$ 3015.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ACCOUNTABILITY</td>
<td>$ 3015.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHECKING ACCOUNT - IDAHO FIRST NATIONAL BANK, BOISE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cash Receipts</th>
<th>Disbursements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance on March 22, 1965</td>
<td>Genovese Press, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 200.00</td>
<td>Printing, March 22,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1965, Inv. #1384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Genovese Press, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Printing, March 22,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1965, Inv. #1325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Genovese Press, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Printing, May 24,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1965, Inv. #1750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance on Hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 30, 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ACCOUNTABILITY</td>
<td>$ 200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>AMOUNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALABAMA</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALASKA</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARIZONA</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARKANSAS</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>35.00 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLORADO</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONNECTICUT</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELAWARE</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORIDA</td>
<td>35.00 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGIA</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAWAII</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDAHO</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILLINOIS</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIANA</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOWA</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KANSAS</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENTUCKY</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUISIANA</td>
<td>30.00 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAINE</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARYLAND</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASSACHUSETTS</td>
<td>25.00 (Parole)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.00 (Probation)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHIGAN</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINNESOTA</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSISSIPPI</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSOURI</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTANA</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL $1315.00

* Regular Dues ($25.00) Plus Associate Membership Fees ($5.00 each)
** Unpaid

crg/nya/100
August 1965
APPENDIX C

SECRETARIAT'S REPORT

The following is a report on our activities as Secretariat during the year and other matters of interest to the Association.

The brochures on the Compact which you ordered were published and distributed during the year. One copy was sent to each Administrator, and bulk supplies were sent to Administrators who requested them. As you know, each Administrator may have as many free copies as he needs. Of the 25,000 you ordered, over 8,500 have been supplied to Administrators who requested them. We have a list with us in case you want to know if your state ordered any copies. The brochure does not contain language which dates it so it will be a useful document for general distribution by Administrators over the years.

Last year you asked us to distribute the California and Hawaii statutes which required that compact cases going to other states be channelled through the Compact Administrator's office. These statutes were distributed as Appendix E to the 1964 Minutes. Tables IV and IVa, regarding intensity of supervision and reporting requirements were distributed for Chapter 2 of your Manual in November with Newsletter 65.

You may be interested in the progress of two other Compacts which you helped to develop; the Juvenile Compact and the Agreement on Detainers. Kansas, Texas and Wyoming joined the Juvenile Compact this year, bringing the total membership to 41 states. Iowa, Maryland, North Carolina and South Carolina joined the Agreement on Detainers, bringing the number of members to thirteen.

Congress has been working on the problem of providing help to the states in developing manpower for the correctional and law enforcement fields. It also has been considering the problem of law enforcement assistance. We will have reports on the congressional bills during the meeting.

As you know, there has been a rapid expansion in the requirements of due process in criminal cases in the past several years. While the most recent federal cases still make a distinction between trials and parole and probation hearings, and still hold that there is no federal constitutional right to a hearing, there appears to be a growing tendency to insist upon "fair play" for those charged with violations. Federal parolees already have been given the right to retain counsel and to have a preliminary hearing, with witnesses, at the site of violation. There have been strong dissents in cases such as Heyser v. Reed in which four judges insisted that the majority's view of fair play did contain adequate procedural safeguards for those charged with violations. This growing concern for fairness indicates that we should reappraise our Compact procedures to see what we need to do to insure the lawfulness of compact returns if the courts rule that Compact supervisees must be given hearings at the site of violation, and if additional elements of due process are called for in future decisions. Dr. Wendell will discuss this subject with you in more detail later in the day.

In Newsletters 65 and 66 we summarized a number of court decisions and Attorney General's Opinions specifically on the Compact. Since you already have the newsletters, we will not review them now. You may be particularly interested in the decisions mentioned in Newsletter 66 which uphold the right to retake cases from states which are not the receiving state.

It would be most helpful if all of you would send us copies of, or at least circulate to, any cases arising under the Compact. Our staff time is too limited to permit us to maintain a continuous check on this subject, and it is apparent that a number of decisions have been handed down which were not reported to us.
In June we sent you blanks for reporting the Interstate Movement of Parolees and Probationers for the year ending June 30, 1965. So far we have only heard from about one-third of the states. We would appreciate it if those of you who haven't sent in the completed forms would do so as soon as possible.

Those of you who deal with non-support cases may be interested to know that a new Reciprocal Support Manual was published in November, 1964. Copies can be ordered from us or our Chicago office at $1.50 a copy.
RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION I

WHEREAS, the Parole and Probation Compact Administrators' Association has been one of the co-sponsors of the National Parole Institute Program and has witnessed the impressive benefits derived from this Program; and

WHEREAS, a uniform parole reporting study has been initiated and is in development stage;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that this Association go on record as strongly favoring the continuance, furtherance, and expansion of these Programs.

RESOLUTION II

WHEREAS, the annual meeting of the Parole and Probation Compact Administrators' Association is the only opportunity each year for the administrators to join together and resolve problems of mutual interest and importance;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Secretariat continue to urge the Governors of the several states to assure representation at the Association's annual meeting.

RESOLUTION III

WHEREAS, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts through its Compact Administrator, Martin P. Davis, has done such a splendid job in making the members of this Association welcome to the Commonwealth; and

WHEREAS, he has provided assistance to our President;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Parole and Probation Compact Administrator Association expresses its deep appreciation to Martin P. Davis for his many contributions.

RESOLUTION IV

WHEREAS, Dr. Mitchell Wendell has rendered valuable service by initiating and preparing drafts of legislation for improving the Interstate Compact for the Supervision of Parolees and Probationers and likewise has made significant contributions by his counsel at various meetings of this Association;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Parole and Probation Compact Administrator Association expresses to Dr. Wendell its deep appreciation for his services.

RESOLUTION V

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

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Parole and Probation Compact Administrator Association expresses to the Council of State Governments and its staff our most sincere appreciation for the services rendered.
RESOLUTION VI

WHEREAS, the Association notes the retirement of J. C. Todd of South Carolina, and the pending retirement of L. Stanley Clevenger of New York; and

WHEREAS, both men have rendered invaluable services over the years to the Association and their respective states;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that this Association expresses our appreciation for their faithful and valuable service and requests the Secretariat to forward a copy of the resolution to the members.

RESOLUTION VII

WHEREAS, Francis C. Reagan, a longtime member of the Parole and Probation Compact Administrators Association passed away since our last meeting;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that this Association expresses its deep sense of loss over his passing and instructs the Secretariat to forward a copy of the resolution to the New Hampshire Department of Probation.