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OPENING BUSINESS SESSION

The Twenty-first Annual Meeting of the Parole and Probation Compact Administrators’ Association was held at the Lord Baltimore Hotel in Baltimore, Maryland on August 27, 1966. Approximately seventy-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, Martin P. Davis of Massachusetts. Compact Administrator Paul C. Wolman of Maryland welcomed the group on behalf of his state.

Mr. Davis gave the Annual Report of the President. He expressed the opinion that the Association was one of the most effective organizations in the field of corrections. He reported that the Executive Committee had held two meetings during the year and had taken the following action:

1. The word “retirement” in the Association’s constitution was interpreted to include persons who are still in state service but who are no longer Compact Administrators. Such persons may become non-voting associate members of the Association.

2. The Association’s Treasurer was directed to make a token contribution of $200 to the Joint Commission on Manpower and Training.

3. The Executive Committee appropriated $1000 toward the printing of The Handbook on Interstate Crime Control and $500 for research. Only $75.00 of the latter sum was spent. Each Compact Administrator will receive 20 free copies of The Handbook.

4. A number of suggestions were sent to Vincent O’Leary for consideration by the President’s Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice.

5. It was agreed that the Association should not publish a special brochure for judges since the Association already has a brochure which can be distributed to judges.

Compact Administrator Saul Clark of Idaho presented the Annual Report of the Treasurer. The report, which was referred to the Auditing Committee, is attached. See Appendix B.

The Minutes of the 1965 Annual Meeting were approved without change.

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.

DISCUSSION SESSION

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF SUPERVISEES

Mr. Davis called attention to the fact that all Compact Administrators had received copies of a proposed new form called "Application for Compact Services"
and a draft act relating to out-of-state revocation hearings. He reported that the Committee recommended the new form for adoption by the Association. He said that it had not taken a position with regard to the draft act. He then asked the Association's Counsel, Dr. Mitchell Wendell, to discuss the problems which the Committee had been considering and the proposed remedies. A summary of his remarks follows.

At the 1965 Annual Meeting the delegates discussed recent court decisions dealing with the rights of parolees, probationers and persons accused of crime. Since the trend of the decisions appeared to be toward expansion of the rights of such persons, it was agreed that Compact procedures should be reviewed to determine whether any legislative or administrative action should be taken to avoid unfavorable court decisions about the Compact. Accordingly, the Association established a Committee on Constitutional Rights of Supervisees.

The Committee held two meetings during the year. It decided there were two main areas in which the Association might wish to take action.

The first area concerns the differences among states in supervisory standards and procedures. When the Compact was drafted it was generally agreed that parole was a matter of grace. This is probably still the prevailing view, but today the view that a person who is granted parole or probation acquires certain rights has a number of strong adherents. If supervisory standards and procedures in the states are demonstrably different, or if specific statutory or judicial rights come to prevail in some states and not in others, equal protection issues may be raised concerning Compact cases. Some courts may begin to hold that what is necessary in intrastate cases in necessary in interstate cases.

The "Application for Compact Services" form was designed to avoid such rulings. It provides the court with evidence that the supervisee knew there would be differences in supervisory standards and procedures if he chose to use the Compact. It will show that he decided that disadvantages resulting from such differences would be outweighed by the benefits of Compact supervision. He specifies his reasons for wanting to go to the receiving state on the form, thus providing the court with evidence that there were specific advantages which led him to decide to ask for Compact supervision.

The second area which the Committee considered was that of revocation hearings. At present, revocation hearings in Compact cases take place in the sending state. Some courts are beginning to intimate that revocation hearings are lacking in "fair play" if they do not include some of the elements of due process such as access to witnesses and confrontation of accusers. Some courts are suggesting that there may be a right to a hearing at the site of the violation.

The Committee studied the draft of a Parole and Probation Hearing Act to solve these problems. Under the Act the sending state could decide that the revocation hearing should take place in the receiving state and request the receiving state's officers to hold a hearing, as agents for the sending state.

The Committee did not reach agreement as to the wisdom of sponsoring such an Act. There were differences of opinion as to how far the courts might go in setting forth requirements for revocation hearings. The fear was expressed that sponsorship of the Act might lead to demands for similar treatment for intrastate cases. In
many states at present, parole is still strictly a matter of grace and supervisees are not entitled to any of the elements of due process at revocation hearings if they are entitled to hearings at all.

At the conclusion of Dr. Wendell's remarks, the group discussed the proposed Application for Compact Services form. Dr. Wendell stressed the fact that states should continue to use the Compact waiver form, (Form III, Agreement to Return). The Application for Compact Services is an additional form, not a substitute for the waiver.

In response to questions from the floor, Dr. Wendell said there was no reason why states could not print the Application for Compact Services form and the waiver on the same sheet of paper. He also said that a new Application for Compact Services form should be completed if a supervisee is transferred from the receiving state to a third state.

A motion was made, seconded and unanimously adopted to make the Application for Compact Services form an official Compact Form. A second motion was adopted to amend the Compact Rules and Regulations accordingly.

A copy of the "Application for Compact Services" form is attached as Appendix D.

The group discussed the proposed Parole and Probation Hearing Act.

In response to a question from the floor, Dr. Wendell said that the Act does not provide for counsel for the indigent, although it entitles the supervisee to his own counsel. He said that the law is still unsettled with regard to the matter of counsel for indigent supervisees, although a number of states by law or administrative action now permit supervisees to bring counsel to hearings.

Mr. Davis asked the delegates if their states permitted counsel at parole hearings. Counsel is permitted in the following jurisdictions: Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Maryland, Missouri, Nevada, North Carolina (on post revocation hearings), Rhode Island (under certain conditions), South Carolina, Tennessee (under certain conditions), Utah, Vermont, Virgin Islands (under certain conditions), Washington and West Virginia.

The Secretariat was directed to find out how many states permit counsel at parole and probation hearings. The Secretariat was also directed to inquire as to whether the hearings at which counsel is permitted are adversary hearings.

It was agreed that the Association should not sponsor the Parole and Probation Hearing Act until more information had been gathered regarding state procedural requirements for hearings. A motion was made, seconded and unanimously adopted to lay the act on the table until the next Annual Meeting. A motion also was adopted to continue the Committee on Constitutional Rights of Supervisees.

Mr. Oswald of New York expressed the view that each Administrator should discuss the proposed act with legislators and executive officials and come to the next Annual Meeting prepared to vote on the basis of reactions in their own state.

During the Final Business Session the Secretariat was directed by resolution to do a study or otherwise provide information regarding the effect of new legal developments in parole and probation. See Resolution I, Appendix E.
POLICIES REGARDING TERMINATION OF PROBATION AND PAROLE

Mr. Wooten of North Carolina pointed out that his state's law requires a supervisory period of at least twelve months. This amount of supervision is required even if the sentence is less than twelve months. Mr. Bobzin of Iowa reported that his state had a similar rule. The Secretariat was directed to collect information regarding the minimum and maximum supervisory periods in the states.

DISCHARGE WHEN PROGRESS REPORTS INDICATE ADJUSTMENT IS UNSATISFACTORY

Mr. Frederick read a letter from Compact Administrator Powers of Wisconsin which pointed out that some states discharge supervisees despite the fact that the receiving state has called attention to the need for continued supervision. One of the delegates noted that the sending state may not have a choice if there is a maximum period for parole supervision. It was agreed that the sending state has a legal right to make the final decision regarding discharge; however, it also was agreed that there should be cooperation in these matters.

REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMISSION ON MANPOWER AND TRAINING

Compact Administrator Edward Grout of Colorado, the Association's representative on the Joint Commission, gave this report. A summary of his remarks follows.

Ninety organizations are participating in the Joint Commission on Manpower and Training. The Commission was established because of the need for adequate personnel for good law enforcement. The field of corrections has a long history of professional neglect, although there has been some improvement in the last ten years. Good staffing is the key to success in corrections. It is more important than programs and buildings.

The Joint Commission is the outgrowth of a June 1964 meeting at Arden House. At that meeting it was agreed that coordination of the views of experts in many different fields was needed to find solutions to the manpower problem. Bills to provide funds for the Joint Commission were introduced in Congress in 1965 by Representative Green, Senator Clark and others. As a result, Congress adopted the Correctional Rehabilitation Study Act of 1965. This Act provided for a $2,100,000 grant. One quarter of the funds must come from private sources. The Joint Commission was established to make a three-year study. There are no plans for it to become a permanent body.

The Joint Commission has set up nine task forces to gather data from the nation. It is working very closely with educational institutions to get new curricula established in corrections. An attempt will be made to encourage young people to enter the field. The reasons why they are not doing so at present will be studied. A recruiting program has begun. Advice and assistance will be sought from experts.

Since the Joint Commission must raise one quarter of its budget, it would be helpful if the Compact Administrators would let the Joint Commission know of any possible sources of funds.
At the conclusion of Mr. Grout's remarks, a delegate asked if states were losing valuable staff members to research groups which can offer high salaries. Mr. Grout pointed out that it is necessary for the Joint Commission to offer high salaries to certain persons because it is difficult to persuade highly skilled persons to accept a temporary job.

The Association voted by motion to name Mr. Grout as its representative to the Joint Commission for the next three years.

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL PAROLE INSTITUTE

Mr. Francis R. Bridges, Jr., of Florida, the Association's representative to the National Parole Institute, gave this report. In connection with his remarks he asked Mr. Don Gottfredson, Director of Research of the National Parole Institute, to report on the Uniform Parole Reporting Project. A summary of Mr. Bridges' and Mr. Gottfredson's remarks follows.

Mr. Bridges: The National Parole Institute has an appropriation for a two-year training program for parole board members and their staffs. It has already held about eleven training institutes and more are planned. One of the Institute's projects is the development of a uniform parole reporting system. A pilot program has already been established.

Mr. Gottfredson: Last year a feasibility study for the Uniform Parole Reporting Project was completed. Since then the Project has received a three-year grant from the National Institute of Mental Health. Twenty agencies are contributing data to the Project. It is hoped that more agencies will begin to participate soon.

A planning meeting has been held to define terms. Those involved with the Project decided that it would be better to have a simple questionnaire and more state participation instead of a questionnaire requiring numerous details about parolees. Only one item, concerning the alcoholic problem, has been added to the basic list.

Questionnaires regarding parole policies will be sent out soon. Several conferences are planned. The staff of the Project expects to ask a number of additional parole agencies to participate. It would be helpful if Administrators would volunteer to furnish data instead of waiting to be asked.

At the conclusion of Mr. Gottfredson's remarks, the Association adopted a motion unanimously designating Mr. Bridges as the Association's representative on the National Parole Institutes.

During the Final Business Session a resolution in support of the National Parole Institute was adopted. See Resolution II, Appendix E.

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES

Mr. Davis appointed the following committees: Resolutions: Edward W. Grout, Colorado, Chairman; Mr. Lawson, Florida; Mr. Wilson, Utah; Mr. Bobzin, Iowa;
Mr. Sands, Massachusetts. Nominating Committee: Charles P. Chew, Virginia, Chairman; Mr. Elder, Missouri; Mr. Stephens, Alabama; Mr. Randall, Oregon; Mr. Ball, Arkansas. Auditing Committee: Curvey P. Landry, Louisiana, Chairman; Mr. Wooten, North Carolina.

REQUIRING BONDS FOR PERSONS GOING OUT OF STATE FOR SUPERVISION

Mr. Wolman of Maryland reported that parolees who are going to distant states for supervision are required to post bond covering their own return fare and the round trip fare of a retaking officer. The money is held in the State Treasury. No interest is paid, but the amount of the bond is returned when parole terminates. Exceptions to the bond requirement are made for parolees who are good risks but who do not have sufficient financial resources to post bond and for parolees going to nearby states. The bond requirement has saved Maryland a good deal of money in return costs.

Mr. Bobzin said that Iowa pays interest on bonds posted by its parolees going out of state. A large fund has accumulated because of the accrual of interest on bonds left by absconders.

REPORT OF THE AMERICAN CORRECTIONAL ASSOCIATION

Dr. E. Preston Sharpe, General Secretary of the American Correctional Association, gave this report. A summary of his remarks follows.

The American Correctional Association has held a series of workshops under the Law Enforcement Assistance Act. A number of institutes have been held to review the implications of new ideas in the field, such as work release.

A number of new funds are available in the correctional field. It is important to use such funds well and to respond to the public interest in corrections. A recent survey indicated that a large percent of the public feels that correctional institutions are not doing enough in terms of rehabilitation programs.

It is most important that there be a dialogue between corrections officials and parole and probation officials regarding rehabilitation in general, and the many new ideas which are being put forth in the area of corrections. An attempt is being made to secure a grant for a national institute to provide for an exchange of ideas between the two groups and to help define the roles of each.

CONDITIONS FOR ACCEPTANCE OF CASES

Mr. Stephens called attention to the tradition of cooperation in acceptance of cases. He pointed out that under the compact an individual must be a resident of the receiving state or have his family residing there and be able to obtain employment. Otherwise he cannot be sent without the receiving state's consent.
There was a general discussion of the matter of obtaining employment. A number of delegates expressed the view that the receiving state should assist parolees and probationers from other states to find jobs.

Attention was called to the fact that some state laws require prospective parolees to have jobs before leaving prison. Dr. Wendell said such laws did not apply to persons coming from other states for supervision under the Compact. It was noted that in 1959 the Association officially affirmed the view expressed by Dr. Wendell.

Mr. Denton of Ohio called attention to the fact that receiving states occasionally refuse to accept supervision of a resident because the individual had previously failed on parole in the receiving state. There appeared to be agreement that both the sending and receiving state should attempt to cooperate and decide such cases on an individual basis.

Mr. Dickson of California emphasized the importance of advising the receiving state's Compact Administrator when there are disagreements between officials over acceptance of cases.

SECTION III OF CHAPTER 2 OF THE MANUAL

It was agreed that Section III of Chapter 2 of the Parole and Probation Compact Manual, as brought up to date by the Secretariat, should be printed and distributed to the Compact Administrators.

DRAFT STATUS OF PAROLE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

Mr. Elder of Missouri pointed out that the difficulty of obtaining and retaining adequate parole and probation staffs is being increased by the fact that parole and probation officers are not exempt from the draft. Some states with low salary levels are having difficulty attracting suitable candidates for their parole and probation service. Often such candidates must be passed over because it is not feasible to train persons who may be drafted within a few months. Another delegate pointed out that parole and probation services are at a disadvantage in competing for employees when other occupations, such as teaching, offer draft exempt status. The Association requested Mr. Grout to discuss the matter of draft status with the Joint Commission on Manpower and Training.

BARRING OF PAROLEES AND PROBATIONERS FROM THE ARMED FORCES

There was general agreement that the Federal Government should be more liberal in its rules regarding entry of parolees and probationers into the armed forces. Attention was called to the fact that the Association of Paroling Authorities would be considering a resolution on this subject. The Association agreed that this resolution should be supported.

CONFIDENTIALITY OF RECORDS

Mr. Bridges of Florida called attention to the need for impressing staff members with the importance of following the rule that records of parolees and probationers and reports from other states be kept confidential.
Mr. Vincent O'Leary gave this report. A summary of his remarks follows.

The program of the President's Commission may have a significant effect for Compact Administrators. The staff of the Commission is talking with many groups in an attempt to get a feedback of ideas. The Commission's Report will be ready early in 1967. It is most important that the suggestions in the report be implemented.

The Commission has eighteen members with the Attorney General as Chairman. The staff is divided into a number of task forces. The subjects being studied include: assessment of the amount and sources of crime; administration of criminal justice, including the area of misdemeanors; the use of science and technology; organized crime; narcotics; and corrections.

The Corrections Task Force is headed by Kim Nelson. The National Council on Crime and Delinquency is doing a survey which will provide background information for the task force on a variety of subjects such as the number of persons on parole in the states and facilities and services available in correctional institutions including county jails. The task force also has studies underway on such subjects as misdemeanants, federal corrections, manpower and training, and employment opportunities for parolees.

There is a tremendous lack of research and information in the corrections field. The area of intergovernmental relations needs study with regard to the respective roles of the states and the federal government and the matter of grants.

Substantial emphasis must be placed on the community as a focal point for intervention.

The President's Commission is anxious to receive suggestions and ideas from the Parole and Probation Compact Administrators.

At the conclusion of Mr. O'Leary's report, Mr. Frederick told the Association that the Executive Committee had already made the following recommendations to the President's Commission:

1. Passage by Congress of legislation making the District of Columbia party to the Compact.
2. Grants and other assistance to the states to help them conform to the Uniform Reporting System.
3. Grants to the states for training correctional personnel, particularly at the middle management level.
4. Provision for regional institutes in the field of corrections with funds for travel, expenses, etc.
5. Grants in aid for salaries of correctional officers as is done in the field of public welfare.
NCCD INSTITUTES ON PROBATION

Mr. O'Leary reported that NCCD had received a two-year grant from the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance for the establishment of institutes on probation. The institutes will be devoted mainly to management and administration. They will be held on a regional basis. An attempt will be made to develop a national probation reporting system.

FINAL BUSINESS SESSION

The Administrators indicated a preference for holding their 1967 Annual Meeting in conjunction with the Congress of Corrections. *

Mr. Landry of Louisiana reported for the Auditing Committee that the Treasurer's accounts were in order. The Association approved the report unanimously.

Mr. Grout of Colorado presented the Report of the Resolutions Committee. This report was adopted unanimously. The Resolutions are attached as Appendix E.

Mr. Chew of Virginia presented the Report of the Nominating Committee and the following officers were elected unanimously:

President -- T. F. Telande, Minnesota
Vice President -- R. W. Bobzin, Iowa
Treasurer -- Saul H. Clark, Idaho

Executive Committee
Martin P. Davis, Massachusetts
Fred R. Dickson, California
Charles H. Lawson, Florida
J. Curtis Moore, South Carolina
John J. Shea, Maine
Paul C. Wolman, Maryland

Council
George F. Denton, Ohio
Louis Hoffman, Virgin Islands
Russell G. Oswald, New York
George J. Reed, Nevada
Keith Wilson, Utah

Mr. Davis turned the gavel over to Mr. Telande. As his first act in office Mr. Telande presented Mr. Davis with a certificate from the Association honoring him for his leadership as President.

At 3:30 P.M. the meeting adjourned.

* At the Executive Committee Meeting, which was held immediately after the Association's meeting adjourned, the Executive Committee voted to hold the 1967 Annual Meeting in Bal Harbour, Florida on August 19. The Congress of Corrections will be held in Bal Harbour August 20-25.
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## TREASURER'S REPORT

PAROLE AND PROBATION COMPACT ADMINISTRATORS' ASSOCIATION

### FINANCIAL STATEMENT

June 30, 1965 - July 1, 1966

SAVINGS ACCOUNT - THE IDAHO FIRST NATIONAL BANK
Boise, Idaho

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASH RECEIPTS</th>
<th>DISBURSEMENTS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance July 1, 1965</td>
<td><strong>Transferred to Checking Account</strong> $100.00</td>
<td>$3,015.50</td>
<td><strong>The Idaho First National Bank</strong> Boise - July 6, 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership Dues August 4, 1965</td>
<td><strong>Transferred to Checking Account</strong> 100.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td><strong>The Idaho First National Bank</strong> Boise - September 9, 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferred from checking Account to Savings</td>
<td><strong>Transferred to Checking Account</strong> 400.00</td>
<td>800.00</td>
<td><strong>The Idaho First National Bank</strong> September 14, 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho First National Bank, November 29, 1965</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Savings December 31, 1965</td>
<td><strong>Transferred to Checking Account</strong> 200.00</td>
<td>42.80</td>
<td><strong>The Idaho First National Bank</strong> Boise - September 29, 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership Dues January 13, 1966</td>
<td><strong>Transferred to Checking Account</strong> 200.00</td>
<td>170.00</td>
<td><strong>The Idaho First National Bank</strong> Boise - June 30, 1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership Dues for 66-67 June 15, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td>510.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(See attached statement)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Savings June 30, 1966</td>
<td><strong>Balance in Savings Account</strong> 3,522.60</td>
<td>59.36</td>
<td>$4,622.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ACCOUNTABILITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$4,622.66</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1965-66 Membership Dues Paid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>30.00 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>35.00 *</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>30.00 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware **</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>30.00 *</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>35.00 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>30.00 *</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>30.00 *</td>
<td>Virgin Islands **</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 1,295.00

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

### 1966 - 67 Membership Dues Paid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>5.00</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>Louisiana</td>
<td>30.00 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</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>Montana</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Regular Dues (25.00) Plus Associate Membership fees (5.00) **Total $510.00
## FINANCIAL STATEMENT

June 30, 1965 to July 1, 1966

CHECKING ACCOUNT - THE IDAHO FIRST NATIONAL BANK, BOISE, IDAHO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASH RECEIPTS</th>
<th>DISBURSEMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance July 1, 1965</td>
<td>Council of State Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 106.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferred from Savings July 6, 1965</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferred from Savings August 9, 1965</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Membership-Florida August 26, 1965</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two meals from 1965 Adm. Luncheon</td>
<td>13.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferred from Savings September 14, 1965</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferred from Savings September 29, 1965</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferred from Savings October 11, 1965</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership Dues November 15, 1965</td>
<td>310.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership Dues November 29, 1965</td>
<td>505.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership Dues December 27, 1965</td>
<td>255.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership Dues-Feb. 17, 1966</td>
<td>31.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return Premium for Martin P. Davis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond #3142629 - $6.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership Dues April 21, 1966</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership Dues May 18, 1966</td>
<td>175.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ACCOUNTABILITY</td>
<td>$2,421.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SECRETARIAT'S REPORT

Since our last Annual Meeting there have been several court decisions on the Compact. These were described in Newsletters 67 and 68 so I will not summarize them now. It is interesting to note that two of the decisions, Commonwealth v. Kaminsky and State v. Wingo, upheld the right of a sending state to return a Compact supervisee from a state which is not the receiving state.

In July of 1966 we sent a new Index to Appendix A to all persons who have Parole and Probation Compact Manuals. The decisions I have just mentioned are summarized in the Index along with all of the other opinions on the Compact that we know about. We would appreciate it very much if you would send us copies of any court decisions or opinions of Attorneys General in your state concerning the Compact. We would like to keep the Association informed of all legal developments.

A new edition of The Handbook on Interstate Crime Control has just been published. Twenty free copies have been sent to each Administrator. Additional copies of the Handbook are available at $3.00 a copy. We have a supply of order forms here in case you want one.

While we are on the subject of publications, I would like to point out that we still have free copies of the brochure on the Compact available. Many Administrators have found it helpful to send the brochure to judges and all other appropriate officials in their states; so if you would like a large supply feel free to ask for it.

You may be interested in the progress of two other compacts which your Association helped to develop. Since your last Annual Meeting, Alabama and Maryland have ratified the Interstate Compact on Juveniles, bringing the total number of members of that Compact to 43. Hawaii and Massachusetts ratified the Agreement on Detainers, bringing the total number of member states to 15.

Incidentally, there will be a meeting on the Agreement on Detainers tomorrow afternoon at 1:30 P.M. in Parlors B, C and D of the Embassy Room. You are all invited to attend.

You may be interested to know that a Compact on Mentally Disordered Offenders has been developed by the Midwestern Governors' Conference. It provides for cooperative institutionalization and aftercare of such offenders. It also permits cooperative research and personnel training programs, and it contains provisions establishing procedures for clearing detainers against mentally disordered offenders. These provisions were included because the Agreement on Detainers specifically excludes persons who have been adjudged to be mentally ill. Although the Compact was developed by the Midwestern States, it is open for membership on a nationwide basis. However, the Compact will not go into effect until two of the Midwestern States have joined.

I would like to remind all of you who have not done so to send in your statistics on the Interstate Movement of Parolees and Probationers. Blanks for reporting these figures were sent to you in June.
PAROLE AND PROBATION FORM V

APPLICATION FOR COMPACT SERVICES

(In triplicate: one copy to be given to inmate; one copy each to sending and receiving state)

TO: __________________________ (paroling authority or probation granting authority)

I, __________________________, hereby apply for supervision as a parolee or probationer pursuant to the Interstate Compact for the Supervision of Parolees and Probationers. I understand that the very fact that supervision will be in another state makes it likely that there will be certain differences between the supervision I would receive in this state and the supervision which I will receive in any state to which I am asking to go. However, I urge the authorities to whom this application is made, and all other judicial and administrative authorities, to recognize that supervision in another state, if granted as requested in this application, will be a benefit to me and will improve my opportunities to make a good adjustment. In order to get the advantages of supervision under the Interstate Compact for the Supervision of Parolees and Probationers, I do hereby accept such differences in the course and character of supervision as may be provided, and I do state that I consider the benefits of supervision under the Compact to be worth any adjustments in my situation which may be occasioned.

In view of the above, I do hereby apply for permission to be supervised on [parole][probation] in __________________________, for the following reasons:

[State]

I [have read the above][have had the above read and explained to me], and I understand its meaning and agree thereto.

Signature __________________________

Witnessed by __________________________

Date __________________________

csg/nyo/1400e
August 1966
RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION I

WHEREAS, the trend of recent court decisions increasingly raises questions as to the adequacy of present procedures and the need for new procedures in the administration of criminal justice; and

WHEREAS, considerable attention has been given to the effects of these developments on pretrial and trial proceedings, but relatively little attention has been given to their effects on the parole and probation aspects of the administration of criminal justice; and

WHEREAS studies of the legal problems connected with this field on an individual state by state basis do not promise to produce a body of knowledge sufficiently applicable to the common problems likely to be faced by all states;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Parole and Probation Compact Administrators' Association, meeting in Baltimore, Maryland, August 27, 1966, recognizes a need for an analytical study and evaluation of the implications of this trend for the successful administration of parole and probation both on an interstate and an intrastate basis; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this Association requests the Council of State Governments to explore, and if possible to arrange for, the securing of such a study with the cooperation of this Association and as many other organizations of state officials as may be interested in such a cooperative endeavor.

RESOLUTION II

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, the initial stage of the Uniform Parole Reporting Study has demonstrated its feasibility;

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

RESOLUTION III

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 IV

WHEREAS, the State of Maryland through its Compact Administrator, Paul Wolman, has done such a splendid job in making the members of this Association welcome to the great State of Maryland; and

WHEREAS, he has provided valuable assistance to our President;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Parole and Probation Compact Administrators' Association expresses its deep appreciation to Paul Wolman for his many contributions.

RESOLUTION V

WHEREAS, Dr. Mitchell Wendell has rendered immeasurable 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 Administrators' Association expresses to Dr. Wendell its deep appreciation for his services.

RESOLUTION VI

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 Administrators' Association expresses to The Council of State Governments and its staff our most sincere appreciation for the untiring services rendered.