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SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS

The Sixth Annual Meeting of Administrators of the Interstate Compact for the Supervision of Parolees and Probationers was held at the Edgewater Beach Hotel, Chicago, Illinois, Thursday and Friday, August 16-17. Approximately 55 people attended the meeting, including compact administrators or their alternates from 29 states. The Association's Annual Luncheon was held on Thursday, August 16. The Honorable Burnice T. Van Der Vries, Chairman of the Board of Managers of the Council of State Governments and Chairman of the Illinois Commission on Intergovernmental Cooperation, was the luncheon speaker.

OPENING BUSINESS SESSION

The meeting opened at 10:00 a.m. with a brief address by Mr. Walter Gordon of California, President of the Association. Mr. Gordon said that the fact that 43 states were now members of the Compact was an indication that the states recognized that crime problems transcended state boundaries, and he pointed out that the compact administrators had a duty not only to see that the legal provisions of the compact were carried out but also to administer the compact with tolerance and understanding so that differences in state laws and policies would not disrupt the operation of the compact. He added that the Administrators Association could be a vehicle for the solution of many pressing interstate problems and particularly mentioned certain phases of the detainers problem which should be considered. Mr. Gordon thanked those associated with the Compact for their cooperation during the year and concluded by paying a special tribute to those who had helped to found and develop the Compact. In this connection Mr. Grihfield of The Council of State Governments read a letter of greeting from Judge Richard Hartshorne of New Jersey, one of the founders of the Compact.

Mr. Francis Bridges of Florida, Treasurer of the Association, then presented his Annual Report. He stated that as of the end of the fiscal year (June 30, 1951) the Association had expended $1,684.02 and had a balance of $1,706.43. This report was received with thanks and referred to the Auditing Committee.

Mr. Brevard Grihfield of the Council of State Governments then presented the Annual Report of the Secretariat. This report was accepted with a vote of thanks. (A summary of the report is attached—See Appendix, page 1).

The HIMs of the 1950 meeting were approved and the following Committees were appointed to serve during the 1951 meeting: RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE: Mr. Hagan of Rhode Island, Chairman; Dr. Hayner of Washington; Mr. Everott of Mississippi; Mr. LeFlore of Oklahoma; Mr. Jack of Minnesota. NOMINATING COMMITTEE: Mr. Smith of Vermont, Chairman; Mr. Bell of Arkansas; Mr. Todd of South Carolina; Mr. Klopfenstein of Ohio; Mr. Long of Illinois. AUDITING COMMITTEE: Mrs. Talm of Kansas, Chairman; Mr. Copeland of Indiana; Dr. Johnson of North Carolina.

THURSDAY DISCUSSION SESSION

THE COMPACT AND CIVIL DEFENSE

The Association voted to recommend the following procedures regarding the use of the compact in a civil defense emergency. It should be noted that these procedures are set forth only as a guide and that the Association feels that each
administrator is free to lay his own plans as he sees fit, accepting as many or as few of the suggestions listed below as he cares to.

(1) It should be assumed that, in the event of a civil defense emergency requiring evacuation, all parolees and probationers—not just those being currently supervised under the compact—will be handled in accordance with these suggested procedures.

(2) It is recommended that evacuated parolees and probationers be required to notify their own parole or probation officers as soon as possible before or after evacuation.

(3) It is recommended that evacuated parolees and probationers be required to notify promptly the parole or probation officers of the locality in the state to which they are evacuated, or to notify the Compact Administrator of that state.

(4) It is recommended that each Compact Administrator act as a clearing-house within his state for the eventual return of dislocated parolees and probationers to supervision in their home state.

(5) It should be kept in mind that a main objective of civil defense authorities is to prevent undue migration of persons away from a stricken area, for the reason that able-bodied workers are necessary to repair the community and to keep it functioning.

In addition to the recommendations made above, the following recommendations were approved:

(a) It is recommended that consideration be given to furnishing identification cards to parolees and probationers.

(b) It is recommended that each compact administrator inform his state civil defense administrator of his plans for handling parolees and probationers in a civil defense emergency.

(c) Some administrators feel that, at the proper time, parolees and probationers should be given the names and addresses of at least their neighboring compact administrators so that they will have someone to report to if they are evacuated and can't get in touch with their own parole and probation officials. It was agreed that the Secretariat should be prepared to print cards containing the names and addresses of the 48 compact administrators. Administrators who wish to receive supplies of these cards in the event of an emergency should send an estimate of the number needed to the Council of State Governments at 522 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York. These estimates should be sent as soon as possible. The cards will not be printed unless a civil defense emergency seems imminent, but it will be necessary to know the number needed in order to have arrangements set up and ready to go at the printers.

ASSISTANCE BY ATTORNEYS GENERAL

Mr. Criffield read a resolution which had recently been adopted by the National Association of Attorneys General urging that each Attorney General confer
with his state’s compact administrator for the purpose of developing jointly an education program on the Compact. (A copy of this resolution is attached, see Appendix, page 3). A discussion of the resolution ensued and the Resolutions Committee was asked to draft a resolution which would cover some of the major types of assistance desired from the Attorney General. This resolution was later submitted and approved unanimously. (See Resolution II, Appendix, Page 7). In addition, it was suggested that each compact administrator be prepared to raise any other questions on which he needed assistance when conferring with his attorney general.

ASSISTANCE BY CHIEF JUSTICES AND OTHER GROUPS

The group discussed the need for assistance from the Conference of Chief Justices and the Resolutions Committee was asked to draft a resolution, to be submitted to the Chief Justices at their annual meeting, asking the Chief Justices to assist in familiarizing lower courts with the compact. Later this resolution was submitted and adopted. (See Resolution V, Appendix, Page 8). Later in the meeting a resolution was also approved directing the Secretariat to use its good offices to secure closer contact with the International Association of Chiefs of Police and the newly formed Association of Prosecuting Attorneys. (See Resolution IV, Appendix, Page 8).

INTERSTATE ASSISTANCE ON EXTRADITION

In connection with the foregoing discussions the topic of mutual assistance on extradition hearings arose. The consensus appeared to be that most administrators would be willing to represent a fellow administrator at an extradition hearing, particularly if the administrator was in a distant state. It was pointed out that formal extradition proceedings were not necessary under the compact so that this type of assistance would apply mainly to cases in which the Compact was not involved. However, it was agreed that the compact administrators could often be helpful where a parolee or probationer had to be extradited and it was therefore suggested that Attorneys General and Governors might wish to consult with their state’s compact administrators on such cases. It was suggested that administrators notify the administrator of the asylum state when they planned to extradite an individual and thought they might need help.

RETAKING OF ABSCONDEES WHO HAVE NOT ENTERED COMPACT CHANNELS

Several administrators reported that they were using the Compact procedures to rotate intrastate parolees and probationers who fled the state. In most of these states individuals sign a waiver of extradition along with their parole agreement, and it is the feeling of the Administrators who are using the Compact in this fashion that, as long as the individual has signed a waiver of extradition, the simplified Compact procedure for retaking may be used. It was noted that Article 3 of the Compact, which covers retaking, does not specifically state that the individual must be an interstate case; that the only language tying Article 3 in with the rest of the compact is the use of the terms “sending” and “receiving” states; and that the definitions of these terms, as contained in Article (1) of the Compact are rather flexible. Opinions varied on this subject and it was agreed that the matter should be referred to the Association’s Council for study. It was suggested that those interested in using the Compact for this purpose might wish to bring the matter up at the conference with their attorney general mentioned previously.
1. Mr. Oakfield reported that the problem of detainers had been referred to the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws with the suggestion that the Commissioners consider the feasibility of uniform legislation on the subject. A discussion of detainers ensued and Commissioner Bates of New Jersey recommended that Attorneys General and other officials be urged to clear up all pending cases before a man begins his sentence. President Gordon reported that under California law a man can write to the District Attorney asking for trial on cases pending against him and receive immunity from prosecution if the District Attorney does not take action within a certain period. It was agreed that the Secretariat should distribute copies of this law to all members of the Association. Mr. Lundgren of Massachusetts pointed out that it might be inadvisable to limit the use of detainers too strictly since they were sometimes used to insure that dangerous criminals could be kept in custody even if they were able to obtain release from their present sentence by political or legal maneuvering. However it was agreed that detainers were often used indiscriminately and the consensus appeared to be that the Administrators should study the feasibility of a statute of limitations or a law such as the California law. It was suggested that consideration be given to both the interstate and intrastate aspects of this problem.

2. Mr. Walter Urich of the Federal Parole Board discussed federal policy regarding detainers. He reported that the Federal Parole Board would, in some instances agree to have state and federal sentences served concurrently and that on numerous occasions the Federal Parole Board had been willing to withdraw its detainers and permit state authorities to assume full responsibility for cases. He also added that the Board often made inquiries regarding state detainers to see if such detainers could be lifted. However he specified that the Board would not grant parole simply to permit an inmate to start service of another sentence. While he stated that the existence of a detainer did not absolutely bar a prisoner from a parole hearing, the implication was that prisoners with detainers pending against them were automatically denied parole at the usual time and made to serve a much longer portion of their sentences. Commissioner Bates reported that the policy of the Board had apparently grown out of a 1930 ruling of the Attorney General of the United States which held that parole was based on "honor" and that parole could therefore not be served in a prison. The feeling was expressed that the policy of the Federal Parole Board was in opposition to modern correctional practices and philosophy and that the presence of a detainer should not excuse the Federal Parole Board from giving careful and just consideration to the record and potentialities of each individual prisoner. It was pointed out that the States were now successfully working out joint plans for prisoners with detainers pending against them, and it was suggested that the time had come for the Federal Parole Board to review its present policy with an eye to instituting similar cooperative programs. A motion was adopted directing President Gordon to appoint a committee of three together with the Secretariat to hold a conference with the Federal Parole Board to see if a cooperative program could be worked out. President Gordon appointed Commissioner Bates of New Jersey, Mr. Dupree of New York, and Mr. Hagan of Rhode Island to this Committee. Mr. Hagan was chosen as chairman. Later in the meeting a resolution was also approved calling upon the Attorney General of the United States to appoint a federal representative to meet regularly with the compact administrators for the purpose of working out solutions to common problems. (See Resolution III, Appendix, Page 3).

3. The group then discussed Wisconsin's system of paroling to detainers under the Compact. The Wisconsin system operates in the following fashion. Then a Wisconsin prisoner is ready for parole, but has a detainer pending against him from
another state, Wisconsin asks the other state to accept the individual for supervision under the interstate compact, even though such supervision may include a period of institutionalization. Wisconsin feels that, in this way, she retains jurisdiction over the prisoner and can retake him or at least can be sure that he receives some parole supervision if he is acquitted in the detaining state. Opinions varied on this subject. Certain administrators felt that the arrangement would be valuable because it would mean the sending state retained jurisdiction and could retake a man who was acquitted. On the other hand, it was suggested that such a system used the Compact for a purpose for which it was not intended. This subject was referred to the Association's Council for study. Mr. Copeland mentioned that the Indiana Attorney General had ruled that conditional releases could be granted permitting the retaking of a man if he was acquitted in another state.

RULES, REGULATIONS, FORMS AND REPORTS

Statistics on the interstate movement of parolees and probationers: It was agreed that henceforth these statistics should be annual instead of semi-annual. The group voted to use the fiscal year instead of the calendar year. Since statistics have already been compiled by the Secretariat for the first half of fiscal 1952, the association will be asked to send in reports for the second half of fiscal 1951 (January 1 to June 30, 1951) before the annual reporting system starts. After this last set of semi-annual reports is in, no reports will be due until June 30, 1952. The reports due on June 30, 1952 should cover the period from July 1, 1951 to June 30, 1952.

Quarterly and monthly reporting. No action was taken on the suggestion that monthly reports be abandoned. It was the sense of the meeting, however, that sending states could drop this requirement if they cared to do so. A letter from Mr. Bunker of Missouri was read stating that Missouri would be willing to accept rather complete violation reports as a substitute for quarterly reports and it was agreed that administrators who wished to enter into such special agreements with each other could do so. It was emphasized, however, that the reports called for in the rules and regulations should not be eliminated without the mutual consent of the administrators involved. It was suggested that administrators who are planning to drop the requirement that monthly reports be sent to them should make a specific statement as to the type of information they would expect to receive as a substitute.

In connection with the discussion of reporting the suggestion was made that compact sessions should be scheduled at all regional parole and probation meetings so that small groups of administrators could make arrangements to try out new ideas on a regional basis, reporting the results at the Association's Annual Meeting.

Violation reports. The group discussed the need for prompt violation reports. It was pointed out that it was much easier to find an absconder if his disappearance was reported immediately, and it was suggested that administrators report violations when they occurred instead of waiting until the quarterly report went out. Mr. Dupre stressed the importance of sending a complete and accurate account of the violation, including the date and the time it occurred.

Forms. The opinion was expressed that an effort should be made by all administrators to use the forms approved by the Association in connection with compact cases. A motion to appoint a committee to review and simplify the forms now in use was defeated.
Amendments to the Rules and Regulations. It was voted to add the following new language to section 3 of the Parole and Probation Rules. (New language is underlined):

Section 3, Paragraph 2, Parole Rules. "The foregoing however, is not to be construed as preventing two or more states signatory hereto from agreeing among themselves for either more frequent reporting or less frequent reporting concerning their respective parolees."

Section 3, Paragraph 2, Probation Rules. "The foregoing, however, is not to be construed as preventing two or more states signatory hereto or appropriate judicial or administrative authorities thereof from agreeing among themselves upon either more frequent reporting or less frequent reporting by their respective probationers."

THE ADMINISTRATORS MANUAL ON INTERSTATE CRIME CONTROL

It was agreed that the following things should be added to the state pages the next time there is a general revision of the manual:

1. State law or policy with respect to forfeiture and restoration of civil rights;
2. State law or policy with respect to the length of time required with a good parole record before eligibility for discharge from parole;
3. The name of persons to write to concerning the interstate supervision of a juvenile. It is suggested that administrators who ask to have their state pages mimeographed because of other changes send this information along to the Secretariat as well.

UNIFORM LAWS ON PROBATION

Mr. Griffield reported that the National Probation and Parole Association was working on Uniform laws on probation and would welcome any and all suggestions from compact administrators concerning items to be covered.

ROUND TABLE ON OPERATIONAL PROBLEMS

Mr. Long of Illinois reported that his office was having difficulty with the Chicago police over two matters: (1) The fact that other states ask the Chicago police to trace and apprehend absconders and then do not retain them. (2) The fact that other administrators are getting in touch with Mr. Long instead of the Chicago police in response to wire from the police saying that fugitives have been apprehended. Mr. Long suggested that other states deal directly with the Chicago police, especially where a compact parolee or probationer is not involved.

The group reviewed a suggestion made at the Regional Parole and Probation Conference in Atlantic City to the effect that parolees and probationers should be sent to the receiving state as soon as possible after arrangements have been made for supervision. Certain administrators reported that this was sometimes impossible. For instance, in Oklahoma, parolees must be signed by the governor and are therefore delayed whenever he is absent. In Washington and Massachusetts this matter is governed by statute and the administrators must sometimes wait the expiration of a certain period of time before sending the man out.

Mr. Griffield read a letter from Mr. Knott of West Virginia explaining the difficulty he was having in placing parolees and probationers because of the
present hiring policy in the coal mines. It was agreed that the Secretariat should distribute this letter to all members of the Association, with the understanding, however, that the directive to distribute the letter did not indicate that the Association felt that a state was not obligated to accept its own residents for supervision under the compact.

The Thursday Discussion Session adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

FUGITIVE FELON ACT

Mr. Crittfield reported on the Federal Fugitive Felon Law as passed in 1834 and amended in 1946 (18 U.S.C. 1073). This act makes it a federal offense to move or travel in interstate or foreign commerce to avoid prosecution, custody or confinement for certain offenses or to avoid giving testimony. (A copy is attached. See Appendix, page 4). It was suggested that this act might be used to bring the F.B.I. in on certain cases on which they would not ordinarily work. There was some confusion on the meaning of certain language in the act and the Secretariat was directed to ask federal officials for an interpretation as to whether travel in private automobiles would be considered travel in interstate commerce and as to the meaning of the language regarding the place in which the trial should be held.

REPORT OF THE RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

All resolutions were adopted unanimously. The resolutions are attached. See Appendix, pages 7 & 3).

OUT OF STATE INCARCERATION

Mr. Crittfield reported that the States of Idaho, Utah and Connecticut had adopted the out-of-state incarceration amendment. He reviewed briefly the method in which the compact documents should be exchanged and it was agreed that the Secretariat should send letters on this subject to each of the three administrators involved.

Mr. Fails of Idaho commented that Idaho and Utah had already entered into an arrangement for the out-of-state incarceration of some prisoners. He explained the arrangement as follows: "Because of our indeterminate sentence, we were able to hold for some time the men wanted by Utah. Then the Idaho Board decided to release them, they were informed that if they did one more year, Utah would drop her hold and when they were released by us, they would be reinstated on parole by Utah; Idaho will grant them a final release. Under such an arrangement, they were of course doing time for Idaho as well as for Utah. Had their sentence expired, we would not have been able to hold them; under the amendment we could."

In response to questions from the floor, the following statements were made regarding the out-of-state incarceration amendment:

1. Only states which passed legislation ratifying the amendment could use it. States which did not ratify it would not be expected to participate. Moreover, use of the amendment would be optional. If an administrator in a state which had passed the amendment preferred to rotate a violator instead of incarcerating him in the receiving state, he would be perfectly free to do so.
2. Under the amendment the sending state pays for the cost of incarceration, but any two states wishing to do so can make special agreements for some other arrangement. These arrangements must be made before the prisoner is incarcerated in the receiving state, otherwise the standard arrangement will prevail.

3. Bookkeeping will probably be simple. The receiving state can send periodic bills to the sending state covering incarceration charges at the agreed rate. There will be no need to have a central bookkeeping agency to service all the states.

4. A state may designate all of its institutions as "compact institutions" so that a parolee or probationer may be incarcerated in any existing institution in the state. The language regarding "compact institutions" is included in the amendment for legal reasons only. There is no need to build or reserve an institution for the sole purpose of incarcerating compact cases.

There was some discussion of the feasibility of using a simple reciprocal act which would permit administrative agreements for out-of-state incarceration, and a motion was approved asking the New York Committee on Interstate Cooperation to further study the matter and prepare a report indicating the pros and cons of the compact amendment method and simple reciprocal legislation. It was noted that a reciprocal act had been used by New Hampshire and Vermont in their agreement for the out of state incarceration of women prisoners. Mr. Griffield pointed out that the re-incarceration of a parolee or probationer was a different matter and involved delicate questions of civil rights which had been given careful consideration by the experts who drafted the present amendment, and he suggested that those administrators who wished to enter out of state incarceration agreements should go ahead with plans to have the amendment introduced. Assemblyman Barrett, Chairman of the New York Committee on Interstate Cooperation agreed to try to have his committee's report in the hands of all administrators well in advance of the 1952 legislative sessions so that there would be no confusion as to which type of bill the Association was sponsoring. It was agreed that Professors Wendell and Zimmermann should be asked to begin work on the drafting of rules, regulations and forms to be used under the amendment and a motion was approved agreeing that the Secretariat should ask the Executive Committee to grant an honorarium to Professor Wendell when he worked on Compact matters in the future.

In connection with the discussion on out-of-state incarceration several similar proposals were brought to the attention of the delegates. Mr. Griffield mentioned that in addition to the New Hampshire-Vermont agreement for out-of-state incarceration, a western out of state imprisonment agreement had been ratified by several states. He also mentioned that Maine, New Hampshire and Vermont had worked out a compact to permit the building of a tri-state institution for delinquents and psychopaths. This compact also permits the building of a variety of other joint institutions. Commissioner Bates mentioned that it would be helpful to have a joint institution for the treatment of drug addicts.

CLEARING HOUSE FOR THE RETURN OF VIOLATORS

Mr. Griffield reported that replies to the Secretariat's questionnaire on the central clearing house indicated that 13 administrators favored the idea of a trial by a small group of states and that 5 did not favor it. The Secretariat's memorandum on this subject was discussed. Mr. Harrison of Michigan reported that the
central states were willing to work on the plan and a notion was adopted approving a trial by the central states. The central states administrators expect to hold a small meeting to work out a skeleton plan and discuss technical questions (such as the need for extra reimbursement to agents for the extra work involved, and the amount of money to be paid by each state for clearing house services). After this meeting the central states administrators will probably ask their attorneys general to sit with them for the purpose of working out legal questions such as liability for injury and the right of state officials to designate out-of-state agents as their officers.

DUTY OF SENDING STATES TO RETAKE VIOLATORS

There was general discussion of the problem of retaking violators. The consensus was that careful consideration should be given to the wishes of the receiving state in this regard. Mr. Copeland of Indiana reported that the Attorney General of Indiana had held that interstate cases must be retaken if the receiving state requested it. It was suggested that receiving states who feel compelled to ask that an interstate parolee be retaken for apparently minor violations explain to the sending state the special problems and pressures which make the continuation of supervision unfeasible. Mr. Falls of Idaho pointed out that a receiving state should be cognizant of the fact that mishandling of an interstate case might be a boomerang since the individual would probably drift back to his relatives in the receiving state after release even if the sending state retook him while he was on interstate parole. The suggestion was made that two administrators who could not agree upon the desirability of retaking a violator might consider asking the Association's Council for arbitration on the case.

EXTRADITION FEES AND FEES CHARGED FOR HOLDING VIOLATORS

Mr. Griiffield reported that the Secretariat was revising its list of extradition fees charged by the states and that this list would be distributed to all Administrators.

The group discussed the ruling of the Attorney General of Virginia that board and other charges incurred while a violator was being held in jail pending the arrival of retaking officers from the sending state were the responsibility of the state of Virginia. A motion was adopted expressing approval of this opinion. It was pointed out that it is sometimes possible for the compact administrator of the receiving state to make special arrangements regarding the elimination or reduction of fees charged by local officials and it was recommended that the sending state's officers get in touch with the receiving state's compact administrator when retaking a case from a locality which was in the habit of charging fees.

IDENTIFICATION OF THE SENDING STATE'S OFFICER

The statement was made that the proper person to pass upon the credentials of the retaking officer of the sending state was the official of the receiving state who had custody of the individual to be retaken. It was suggested that any retaking officer who had difficulty in this regard get in touch with the Compact Administrator of the receiving state.
JUVENILES

Mr. Griffield reported that, although the Compact was not considered to cover juveniles who had not been convicted, many administrators were willing to arrange for the supervision of such juveniles. He referred the group to Table I at the end of Chapter 2 of the "Manual For Administrators" for a breakdown of state attitudes on this subject. Commissioner Bates pointed out that Title 5 of the Federal Social Security Act, as amended in 1950, permitted the use of welfare funds for the return of juveniles.

FINAL BUSINESS SESSION

It was agreed that the Secretariat might ask the executive committee to approve reimbursement for complimentary copies of the Handbook on Interstate Crime Control which are distributed in connection with work on Association Business.

The group approved the following recommendation for the consideration of the Executive Committee regarding the setting of the location and date for the Seventh Annual Meeting: (1) It is suggested that the meeting be held in Chicago. (2) It is suggested that the meeting be held on the third day and second day before the convening of the Congress of Corrections in Atlantic City in order that western delegates who wish to attend the Congress will be able to make both meetings in one trip. (3) It is suggested that some consideration be given to the idea of holding the meeting in a hotel in downtown Chicago.

The Report of the Auditing Committee was heard and approved. This report is carried on page 5 of the Appendix.

The Secretariat was directed to cast one ballot for the candidates recommended by the Nominating Committee. The report of the Nominating Committee is attached. See Appendix, page 6.

A motion was adopted thanking the guests at the meeting for their attendance and participation. Mr. Barrett and Mr. Wise expressed their appreciation at being invited to attend. Judge Hunt made a brief speech of thanks regarding his election. A motion was adopted requesting that past president Gordon write to the Council of State Governments expressing the satisfaction of the Association with the services of Mr. Griffield and the staff.

At 2:00 the meeting adjourned.
summary of the 1951 annual report of the secretariat

"This is a banner year for the Interstate Parole and Probation Compact. The Association and its secretariat can take justifiable pride in the fact that we now have the first interstate compact which has been duly ratified and is in effect in every state of the Union.

"We should like to report very briefly to you at this time on some of the major activities of the Secretariat since our last meeting and on the manner in which we have attempted to carry out your directives. A more detailed report on many of these items will be presented to you as we come to them in the discussion section of the agenda.

"(1) One of our major projects during the past year — and I may add, by all means the most expensive — has been the preparation and distribution to you of the new Manual For Administrators. As you know, this is a loose-leaf manual which is intended primarily as a tool for administrators and as a supplement to the well known Handbook on Interstate Crime Control which we last printed in 1949.

"(2) You will recall that we spent considerable time at the last annual meeting in discussing the proposed Out-of-State Incarceration Amendment to the compact. The secretariat subsequently revised the amendment in accordance with suggestions made at the meeting, and the Association's Council approved its distribution to each administrator for such action as he might care to recommend in his own state. In connection with the drafting of this addition to the compact, and in many other ways, the Secretariat wishes to express its gratitude to Professors Mitchell Wendell and Frederick Zimmermann for their unstinting assistance and helpfulness.

"(3) Another subject discussed at length last year was the eternal problem of detainers. At that time we had before us alternative proposals prepared by Professor Wendell, but it was clear that there was little likelihood of the compact administrators being able to work out a solution to the broad problems of detainers on their own initiative. Moreover, the Joint Committee on Detainers which we sponsored some three years ago had not been able to bring about a meeting of the minds among various groups as to needed legislation in this field. Accordingly, your secretariat has referred this matter to the President of the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws requesting the assistance of that body. We have been informed by President Barkdoll that the CSSL committee on scope and program is studying this matter and will report upon it at their annual meeting in September.

"(4) At last year's meeting a resolution was adopted calling upon the Federal Parole Board to 'work out some procedure whereby they may, in suitable instances, consider federal inmates for parole to detainers or for concurrent supervision with other jurisdictions.' The full text of such resolution is contained in your bound agendas, together with a detailed reply from Mr. Walter Ulrich of the Federal Parole Board. Discussion of this matter is scheduled on the agenda.
"(5) Last year you directed the secretariat to investigate the possibilities of uniform laws on probation. We found that the National Probation and Parole Association was working in this field, and we were advised that they would welcome suggestions from the compact administrators as to the type of model bill that should be drafted.

"(6) A proposal which has intrigued many administrators has been the suggestion that a central clearing house might be established for the more economical return of parole and probation violators. Last year you directed the secretariat to study the feasibility of this proposal. All of you have seen our preliminary report on this subject, and copies are also contained in the bound agendas together with a summary of the views of about half of the administrators on the information set forth in the secretariat's report.

"(7) You will note in the agenda that the Secretariat is suggesting that the administrators consider the possibility of shifting to an annual, rather than semi-annual, printing of statistics on the interstate movement of parolees and probationers.

"(8) Another matter that should be debated and decided here is the question of whether we will continue the practice of meeting for two days rather than one, as in the past, and whether we should hold our meeting independently of other national meetings. Based on your reactions as to the success of this year's meeting here in Chicago, we should appreciate an expression of opinion by the Association to guide us in planning future annual meetings.

"(9) Several months ago your President communicated with the Secretariat raising the question of the evacuation and disposition of parolees and probationers in the event of a civil defense emergency. Our memorandum on this subject is contained in the bound agenda, and we should like to discuss in detail with you at a later point the feasibility of the suggested procedures set forth therein. In passing, you will all be interested to know that a great many of the states have now entered into and ratified a uniform interstate civil defense compact. We have copies here of the model civil defense compact and we shall be glad to provide copies for any of you who are interested.

"(10) For a number of years we have been discussing the problem of supervising juvenile offenders on an interstate basis, and it has become clear that the compact does not generally apply because it refers solely to convicted persons. For this reason you directed us last year to confer with the American Law Institute to see if that body would have any interest in the development of a separate agreement to cover juveniles. We have done this, and the matter is now under advisement by the American Law Institute.

"(11) Your Secretariat has made a special effort this year to interest the National Association of Attorneys General in problems that the compact administrators face. We are glad to report that this matter was taken up in detail a few days ago at the annual meeting of the state Attorneys General. You will note that this is listed on your agenda for discussion and action.

"(12) We reported last year that some thirteen states had enacted reciprocal legislation to enforce the support of dependents. With the assistance of the NCUSL, we are now able to report that 37 states and two U.S. possessions have enacted legislation of this type. As most of you know, these new laws may go a long way to solve some of the problems that probation officers constantly face, since so many of their cases deal with non-support.

"(13) The Council of State Governments recently published a book on interstate compacts by Professors Zimmermann and Wendell. We are planning to send each Compact Administrator a copy."
Resolution of the National Association of Attorneys General

VIII
ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERSTATE PAROLE AND PROBATION COMPACT

WHEREAS the Interstate Compact for the Supervision of Out-of-State Parolees and Probationers now has been ratified by all of the forty-eight States; and

WHEREAS this important interstate crime control agreement daily is proving its effectiveness through the cooperative supervision of thousands of parolees and probationers; and

WHEREAS the operation of the compact is hampered in some instances because local courts and officials are not familiar with the compact procedures and methods;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the National Association of Attorneys General that the Attorney General of each State be urged to confer with the official compact administrator for his State for the purpose of developing jointly an educational program which will effect widespread familiarity with the purposes and procedures of the compact.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that each Attorney General give consideration to the issuance of an opinion reciting the validity of the compact's basic provisions which have without exception been upheld by the highest state courts.
Federal Fugitive Felon Act

(Public Law 591 — 79th Congress)

(Chapter 735 — 2d Session)

(S. 496)

AN ACT

To make it a criminal offense for certain escaped convicts to travel from one State to another.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IN CONGRESS ASSEMBLED, That the Act entitled "An Act making it unlawful for any person to flee from one State to another for the purpose of avoiding prosecution or the giving of testimony in certain cases", approved May 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 782; 18 U.S.C. 408e), be, and it hereby is, amended to read as follows:

"That it shall be unlawful for any person to move or travel in inter-state or foreign commerce from any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or the District of Columbia, with intent either (1) to avoid prosecution, or custody or confinement after conviction for murder, kidnapping, burglary, robbery, mayhem, rape, assault with a dangerous weapon, or extortion accompanied by threats of violence, or attempt to commit any of the foregoing, under the laws of the place from which he flees; or (2) to avoid giving testimony in any criminal proceedings in such place in which the commission of a felony is charged. Any person who violates the provision of this Act shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment for not longer than five years, or by both such fine and imprisonment. Violations of this Act may be prosecuted only in the Federal judicial district in which the original crime was alleged to have been committed or in which the person was held in custody or confinement."

Approved August 2, 1946
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