REGISTRATION LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALABAMA</td>
<td>*L. B. Stephens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| CALIFORNIA     | *Walter A. Gordon  
O. H. Close, Youth Authority  
Ervis W. Lester, Member Adult Authority  
Walter T. Stone, Chief State Parole Officer  
Roy Votaw, California Youth Authority |
| COLORADO       | *Wayne K. Patterson  
James P. Eakins, Supervisor Interstate Compact |
| CONNECTICUT    | *Harry H. Lugg                                                     |
| DELAWARE       | *Percival R. Roberts                                               |
| FLORIDA        | *Francis Bridges                                                   |
| GEORGIA        | *Charles A. Pannell                                                |
| IDAHO          | *Mark H. Maxwell                                                   |
| INDIANA        | *J. C. Copeland  
Oscar C. Crawford, Deputy Attorney General |
| IOWA           | *R. W. Bobzin                                                     |
| KANSAS         | *Irma C. Walsh                                                    |
| KENTUCKY       | *Colonel Carl D. Norman                                            |
| LOUISIANA      | *Curvey P. Landry                                                  |
| MAINE          | *Gerald E. Murch, Chief Parole Officer                             |
| MASSACHUSETTS  | Albert B. Carter, Commissioner of Probation  
*Martin P. Davis  
Sen. Harold R. Lundgren |
<p>| MICHIGAN       | *Gus Harrison                                                     |
| MINNESOTA      | *T. F. Telander, Deputy Administrator                              |
| MISSOURI       | *Donald W. Tucker                                                  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Name and Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEVADA</td>
<td>Edward C. Cupit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HAMPSHIRE</td>
<td>Richard T. Smith, Robert A. Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW JERSEY</td>
<td>Sanford Bates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW YORK</td>
<td>Harold V. Cannavan, Senior Parole Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*H. Stanley Cleveger, Chief Parole Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H. M. Fauer, Chief Parole Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philip Heimlich, City-wide Director, Youth Counsel Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edward J. Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH CAROLINA</td>
<td>Dr. Clarence H. Patrick, Board of Paroles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHIO</td>
<td>Glenn R. Klopfenstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OKLAHOMA</td>
<td>Campbell Leflore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OREGON</td>
<td>*H. H. Randall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chas. H. Ruggins, Chairman, State Parole &amp; Probation Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENNSYLVANIA</td>
<td>*C. I. Giardini, Supt. Parole Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHODE ISLAND</td>
<td>Joseph H. Hagen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH CAROLINA</td>
<td>J. C. Todd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENNESSEE</td>
<td>Charles J. Crow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERMONT</td>
<td>John V. Woodhull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIRGINIA</td>
<td>Charles P. Chew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST VIRGINIA</td>
<td>Dana C. Eakle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASHINGTON</td>
<td>Norman S. Hayner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WISCONSIN</td>
<td>Russell G. Oswald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHERS</td>
<td>F. A. Roberts, Supervisor, Catholic Rehabilitation Service,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federation of Catholic Charities, Inc., 2112 St. Lawrence Boulevard, Montreal 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Albert Virgin, Director of Rehabilitation, Department of Reform Inst., Province of Ontario, Toronto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hilton Rector, National Probation &amp; Parole Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. E. Crihfield, Eastern Regional Office, Council of State Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jane Parks, Eastern Regional Office, Council of State Governments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Cooperator Administrator or his representative
HUTIES OF THE EIGHTH ANNUAL MEETING
Toronto, Canada, October 10-11, 1953

The Eighth Annual Meeting of Administrators of the Interstate Compact for the Supervision of Parolees and Probationers was held at the King Edward Hotel, Toronto, Canada on October 10-11, 1953. Approximately 60 persons attended the meeting, including compact administrators or their representatives from 35 states.

OPENING BUSINESS SESSION

The meeting convened at 12:00 noon on Saturday, October 10. The President of the Association, Glenn Klopfenstein of Ohio, welcomed the delegates and guests in a brief opening statement. He expressed the belief that the Administrators Association was one of the most helpful and important organizations in the correctional field and he stressed the importance of maintaining the cooperative attitude which has made the Compact and the Association a success.

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, 1953) the Association had expended $1217.87 and had a balance of $1135. This report was referred to the Auditing Committee.

Brevard Crihfield of the Council of State Governments presented the Annual Report of the Secretariat. This report was approved without change, and copy is attached. (See Appendix A). The group voted to dispense with the reading of the Minutes of the Seventh Annual Meeting. The minutes were approved as printed in the agenda.

Mr. Klopfenstein appointed the following Committees: RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE: Chairman, Mr. Randall, Oregon; Messrs. Bridges, Florida; Copeland, Indiana; Norman, Kentucky; Smith, New Hampshire. NOMINATING COMMITTEE: Chairman, Mr. Gordon, California; Mrs. Walsh, Kansas; Messrs. Roberts, Delaware; Stephens, Alabama; Oswald, Wisconsin. AUDITING COMMITTEE: Chairman, Mr. Chev, Virginia; Messrs. Clevenger, New York; Hayner, Washington.

SATURDAY AND SUNDAY DISCUSSION SESSIONS

Congressional Consent for Joinder of Puerto Rico, Territories and Possessions.

Mr. Crihfield reported that a bill to permit Puerto Rico to join the compact (H.R. 5699) had been introduced in Congress and referred to the House Judiciary Committee. He also reported that a letter had been sent by the Secretariat to Chauncey Reed, Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, requesting that the bill be amended to cover Hawaii, Alaska and the District of Columbia as well. The group agreed that all Administrators should write to members of their Congressional delegations (particularly the members of the House Judiciary Committee) in support of
H. R. 5699 and the suggested amendment. The Secretariat was directed to furnish all Compact Administrators with a list of the members of the House Judiciary Committee.

Cooperation by Federal Agencies

The group discussed cooperation by the United States Parole Board with regard to detainers and other matters. Some administrators reported that they had developed satisfactory working relationships with the Board; others reported that they were still having difficulties. The group agreed that the federal government should appoint two representatives, one from the field of parole and one from the field of probation, who would be charged with the duty of attending the Association's Annual Meetings. The Secretariat was directed to try to secure these appointments, either by official action of the Attorney General of the United States or by Congressional legislation on the subject.

"Manual for Administrators"

Mr. Crippen described the type of material to be found in the "Manual for Administrators", pointing out that it contained up-to-date, comprehensive material on all important aspects of compact operation. He suggested that Administrators who were not familiar with the contents of the "Manual" might find it profitable to make a special effort to look this publication over when they returned to their offices.

Mr. Bunker of Missouri reported that many of the inquiries he received from other Administrators during the year were already answered by the "Manual", and he suggested that all Administrators should refer to the "Manual", particularly to the tables at the end of Chapter 2, before asking other administrators for information as to state policies. The group then reviewed and approved the August, 1953 revision of Chapter 2 of the "Manual", with the amendments noted in succeeding pages of these minutes. (Corrected Chapter 2 pages, covering these amendments will be distributed to all Administrators by the Secretariat).

Mr. Crippen pointed out that all administrators were responsible for filing corrections in their table listings with the Secretariat, and that all of the tables could be presumed to be correct until further notice from the Secretariat. A correction was made in Table III, column 3, for Minnesota. The word "Yes" was changed to "No".

Compact Documents

It was agreed that each administrator should check his state's archives to be sure that his state possessed photostatic copies of the compact ratification documents from each of the member states. While the citations and dates the documents were signed are printed in the Handbook on Interstate Crime Control and might be accepted as evidence of membership in the Compact, the photostatic copies of the documents are preferable. Copies of missing ratification documents can be secured from the Secretariat.

Obligation to retake violators

Dr. Gierdini suggested that there should be some flexibility in regard to the return of violators. He cited the example of a parolee who has no ties in the sending state and very strong ties in the receiving state, and he expressed the opinion that the sending state would be justified in showing some reluctance to return such an individual if he were imprisoned for a new crime in the receiving
state toward the end of the sending state's parole period. The consensus appeared to be that concurrent parole would be preferable in such cases, but there also seemed to be general agreement that the spirit of the compact should lead the sending state to retake such cases if the receiving state insisted. The Secretariat was directed to correct Chapter 2 of the "Manual to include reference to the fact that the receiving state should give due consideration to the question of residence and family ties before requesting the sending state to retake a case.

Detainers

The discussion of concurrent parole arrangements for violators who commit crimes in the receiving state led to a discussion of the problems created by detainers placed against such violators. Detainers are still a serious obstacle to effective rehabilitation programs in many states. It was agreed that members of the Association should attempt to maintain the following procedure regarding detainers placed against parolees who have been incarcerated in other states:

1. The receiving state should send full information to the sending state regarding such things as the nature of the crime, the length of the new sentence, and so forth.

2. If the sending state files a detainer, the detainer should be accompanied by a letter indicating generally what the policy of the sending state might be when the individual is released from prison. (The group recognized that the sending state probably could not make a definite decision at the time the detainer was filed, but it was felt that some indication could be given as to the circumstances under which the sending state might drop its detainer or agree to concurrent parole.

3. Each case should be handled on an individual basis.

Mr. Bridges of Florida reported that parolees under his jurisdiction had been returned by another state directly to the Florida State Prison with no notification to him. The group agreed that the Administrator should be notified when a parolee or probationer under his jurisdiction is released to a detainer.

Residence and Employment Qualifications

A question was raised as to whether the sending or receiving state had the right to decide upon the accuracy of statements regarding residence and employment. It was decided that two Administrators who could not agree upon the facts should refer their dispute to the Association's Council, and the Secretariat was directed to include reference to this decision in the "Manual for Administrators." The Secretariat was also directed to strike the words, "even if the consent of the receiving state is not necessary" from paragraph 2 on page 6 of Chapter 2 of the "Manual for Administrators."

There seemed to be a consensus that Administrators should try to avoid rigid demands that the express terms of the compact be followed. The group recognized that all Administrators had a strict duty to observe the rights of other states regarding the Compact, but it was the feeling of the group that much of the Compact's success had resulted from the willingness of Administrators to cooperate. Therefore, there was general agreement that an attempt should be made to decide cases on an individual basis wherever possible.
It was proposed that the compact provision regarding residence be interpreted to refer only to the state in which the person last lived for more than a year. This suggestion was rejected because the group felt that it would destroy the flexibility of the provision and discourage Administrators from deciding cases on an individual basis. Similarly, a request for interpretation of the word "family" brought general agreement that no rigid categories should be fixed. An interpretation agreed to at an earlier meeting, that the sending state has the right to determine who shall be paroled, was reaffirmed.

Conditional Release

There was a brief discussion of conditional release. There seemed to be some feeling in the group that conditional release should be discarded as a correctional practice. Mr. Griefeld reported that conditional release may be included in the model law which the National Probation and Parole Association is drafting. Mr. Griefeld asked about the status of conditional release under the Compact, and the discussion revealed that conditional releases are considered to be parolees for purposes of the Compact. It was suggested that, as a precaution, the National Probation and Parole Association should include language specifying this fact in the model legislation it is drafting, if conditional release is included therein.

Discharge of Parolees while under Supervision in the receiving state

Mrs. Walsh of Kansas asked about the Compact status of individuals who are discharged by the sending state before the expiration of their sentence. It was agreed that the receiving state could not continue the supervision of any such individual since the receiving state would no longer be acting as "agent" for the sending state. The Secretariat reported that the Association's Legal Counsel felt that receiving state officials who forced such an individual to remain under supervision might be civilly liable. It was agreed that, while the receiving state loses control over a discharged interstate parolee, the sending state retains jurisdiction and can retake such an individual as long as he signed a valid waiver of extradition before leaving the sending state, and as long as "discharge" does not mean "release from jurisdiction" under the law of the sending state.

Identification of Officers

The group discussed requirements regarding the identification of officers who come from the sending state to retake a case. The discussion revealed that these requirements vary. Often the sending state's officer merely presents his credentials to the custodial official of the locality in which the prisoner is held, but in some places the prisoner cannot be released until the officer's credentials are approved by a judge. It was suggested that states sending officers to retake a case should pave the way by notifying the receiving state well in advance that the officers are coming, and by including specific information as to the time and place at which the officers expect to pick the man up. This would lessen the danger that the prisoner might be released to imposters and it would also give the receiving state time to make arrangements which might be necessary to avoid delays in transferring custody at the expected time.

Waiver of Extradition

The group discussed *Boston, Administratrix, et al. vs. Causey, Administratrix*, a 1952 Oklahoma Supreme Court decision in which a sheriff, Ray Boston, and his helper, Nick Feoli, were held civilly liable for the death of a prisoner who was
killed in Oklahoma while being brought from Arizona to Illinois to answer charges of embezzlement. Mr. LeFlore of Oklahoma reported that this decision of his state's Supreme Court had not affected his state's policies in any way, and it was agreed that this case did not affect the compact or establish any new precedent in regard to waivers of extradition. It was also agreed, however, that this case demonstrated the need for careful adherence to legal requirements when returning prisoners from other states. Mr. Griffield read a memorandum from Dr. Mitchell Wendeil, the Association's Legal Consultant, concerning precautions to be observed in returning prisoners from other states. A summary of the major points of the memorandum follows:

1. Language of the waiver and provisions of state law: The waiver signed in the Oklahoma case covered only the custodial officer in Arizona and did not protect the Illinois agents; moreover, it was poorly drafted. When a Compact case is being retaken, there should be no difficulty as long as the prisoner signed an official compact waiver form before leaving the sending state; but administrators should be exceedingly careful if they are using other waiver forms, especially if they are returning prisoners who are not under the compact. It would be well for administrators to check with their Attorney General to be sure (1) That any waiver forms they are using, other than the Compact Waiver Form, are valid, adequate legal documents which will protect their deputies from civil liability; (2) that there is legislation in existence which will permit such deputies to act out-of-state; (3) that there is nothing in state law forbidding waivers of extradition.

2. Person before whom waiver must be signed. In the Oklahoma case, the waiver should have been signed before a judge. If the prisoner is waiving his right of extradition in return for some suitable consideration, such as parole, or the right to go to another state, the waiver need not be signed before a judicial official. A parolee going out of state under the compact, for instance, need not go before a judge to sign his waiver because he has received a suitable consideration in return for waiving his rights. He has been given a choice and has decided that the right of extradition means less to him than the privilege of leaving the sending state. If a fugitive has been apprehended in another state, however, and agrees to waive extradition without receiving a suitable consideration in return, the waiver will not contain any evidence that he was given a choice, and a court might hold that his rights were invaded when he was removed from the state of custody without extradition. It is unsafe to remove such a prisoner unless he waives extradition before a judge of the custodial state. In this connection, it should be noted that the "consideration" should be given at the same time as the right is waived. If, through some oversight, a Compact parolee has not signed the waiver of extradition before leaving the sending state, he should be brought before a judge to sign the waiver when he arrives in the receiving state, or, at the very least, the waiver should be recorded so that the consideration is "permission to remain in the receiving state" rather than permission to leave the sending state.

There was a consensus that, as a precaution, parolees and probationers should be asked to sign a waiver of extradition before they are permitted to visit out-of-state. It was also agreed that printed or stamped signatures on a waiver of extradition would probably not be acceptable in court.

The Compact Waiver Form was amended to include "any jurisdiction in or outside the United States". (see Form III, revised Chapter 3 of the Manual For Administrators, attached.)
Return of Violators

The group reviewed and approved the Memorandum and Forms on the Joint Return of Violators as published in Chapter 5 of the "Manual for Administrators". The group also approved suggested legislation to permit the deputation of out-of-state agents. Mr. Crippen told the group that the legislation would be submitted to the Council of State Governments' Drafting Committee of State Officials so that it could be considered for inclusion in the Council's Program of Suggested State Legislation for 1954. Mr. Crippen agreed that the Secretariat would get in touch with the Compact Administrator before doing any active work toward getting the bill through the legislature in any particular state.

There was a general discussion of the ways in which the return of prisoners might be expedited. The following suggestions were made:

1. States may wish to cooperate by bringing the prisoner to a more accessible place within the state, perhaps to the border itself, when officers are coming from another state to pick up the man. (Some states are already cooperating in this fashion.)

2. The federal government sometimes cooperates by transferring prisoners to prisons in more convenient locations when state officers are coming to pick them up. Some administrators reported good cooperation by federal authorities in this regard, others reported that they had had no cooperation. The Secretariat was directed to bring this matter to the attention of the federal representatives to be appointed by the Attorney General.

3. In lieu of deputation and acting as agent, states may wish to pool their forces, each sending along one officer. This would still involve joint planning of trips.

4. States planning to pick up a man should try to give at least 60 days notice to the state of custody so as to allow time for a transfer to more convenient place. The notice should also indicate the time and place at which the state would find it most convenient to pick the man up.

The Secretariat was directed to find out if there is a federal statute requiring federal officials to return a man to the state or area from which he was taken into federal custody. There was a brief discussion of the possible helpfulness of the Federal Fugitive Felon Act. Mr. Crippen called the attention of the group to the fact that the text of the act was printed in Chapter 2 of the "Manual for Administrators". It was agreed that the act, which is rarely used for the return of absconding state parolees or probationers at the present time, might be very helpful in the future if federal authorities will agree to cooperate. Mr. Crippen suggested that this matter might be brought to the attention of the representatives to be appointed by the Attorney General.

Out of State Incarceration

There was a brief discussion of the Out-of-State Incarceration Amendment. Mr. Crippen reported that the text of the amendment, along with a legal memorandum and forms were included in Chapter 4 of the "Manual for Administrators". Recalling the group that the Association had given approval to this material at the 1952 meeting,
he reported that the Rules, Regulations and Forms carried in Chapter 4 were new official since they had received the necessary number of votes of approval from the states signatory to the amendment. He pointed out that the Amendment could not be a very effective device until more states ratified it, and he asked that all states give consideration to ratifying it at an early date.

Western Compact Administrators Meeting

Dr. Haynor of Washington gave a brief report on the meeting of western Compact Administrators at the time of the meeting of the Western Parole Association. It was agreed that such regional meetings were invaluable and should be continued as a regular practice.

Arizona

A letter from Compact Administrator Hoffmann of Arizona was read. It was the consensus of the Association that the Arizona administrator was doing his best to cooperate.

Correction regarding dues

The Secretariat was directed to correct the Association's constitution as printed in the "Manual for Administrators" with regard to dues. The section correctly reads as follows:

"III. DUES

The dues shall be twenty-five dollars for each active member, and five dollars for each associate member.

All dues shall be payable on or before the annual meeting."

Revision in Forms and Amendments to Rules and Regulations

The group reviewed a set of proposed official forms which had been drafted by the Association's Council as a substitute for the set of official forms in the Handbook on Interstate Crime Control. A proposed uniform arrest warrant was rejected because the group felt that this matter could best be handled by state law. Several other forms were rejected because past experience indicated that they would not be used. The group revised and approved four mandatory forms and two optional forms. The text of these forms will be found in the attached copy of Revised Chapter 3 of the "Manual for Administrators". The group also approved an amendment to Section 2 of the Parole and Probation Rules respectively to incorporate the change in the list of official forms. The text of the amendment will be found in the copy of Chapter 3 at the end of these minutes.

Statistics on the Interstate Movement of Parolees and Probationers

The Secretariat was directed to continue the compilation of statistics regarding the interstate movement of parolees and probationers on an annual basis, using the same reporting blanks as have been used in the past. It was agreed that Administrators should try to mail their completed reporting blanks to the Secretariat at an earlier date.
Annual Meeting

The group discussed the time and place of the annual meeting for the information of the Executive Committee (under the Association's Constitution, the Executive Committee selects the time and place of the Annual Meeting). Several suggestions were considered, as follows:

1. A meeting in Philadelphia on Saturday and Sunday, October 23 and 24, just prior to the convening of the Congress of Corrections.

2. A meeting in Chicago on Saturday and Sunday, October 23 and 24.

3. A meeting at the New Ocean House, Swampscott, Massachusetts, immediately before or after the meeting of the National Probation and Parole Association. This would mean the dates would be either Friday and Saturday, September 17-18 or Thursday and Friday, September 23-24.

No consensus could be reached and the Secretariat was directed to refer all of these suggestions to the Executive Committee.

Report of the Auditing Committee

The report of the Auditing Committee was heard and unanimously approved. This report is attached. (See Appendix B) The Auditing Committee also suggested informally that states having large delegations at the meeting might want to limit the number of delegates attending the luncheon on a complimentary basis. There was unanimous agreement that Mr. Bridges, the Association's Treasurer should be commended for his long record of service to the Association.

Report of the Resolutions Committee

The group heard and approved unanimously the Report of the Resolutions Committee. This report is attached. (See Appendix C) The Resolutions Committee suggested informally that it would be helpful if the Secretariat provided badges at the next annual meeting.

Report of the Nominating Committee

The group heard and approved unanimously the report of the Nominating Committee. This report is attached. (See Appendix D).

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 P. M. on Sunday, October 11.
The Council of State Governments, your secretariat, once again is pleased to have the privilege of reporting to the annual meeting of parole and probation compact administrators. If the advance registration for this meeting was accurate, it looks very much as though we will top even last year's record attendance. Moreover, we have in attendance this year a large number of new administrators who have never before attended one of the annual working sessions and for this reason we hope particularly that there will be a full and free discussion of mutual problems that need solution. This lays upon the shoulders of the "old-timers" who have been coming to these meetings for years a greater responsibility to share their knowledge and experience with the newer members.

Your secretariat would like at this time to report briefly to you with respect to the major activities of the Association since the last annual meeting, with special reference to items that were marked for interim study and consideration when we met a year ago. Before doing this, however, we should like to draw your attention to the fact that our Vice-President, Bob Smith of Vermont, found it necessary to resign his post during the course of the year when he entered a new field of activity in his state. I know that all of you will join in wishing Bob the greatest success in his new work.

(1) We have no new and important state high court decisions to report this year which affect the validity of the compact. Perhaps this is an indication that the body of court decisions already built up, and uniformly favorable to the compact, has reached the point where it is no longer deemed worthwhile to attack the compact. In any event, you may rest assured that we will stand ready (with the full backing of the National Association of Attorneys General) to aid any of you who might run into constitutional questions in the courts of your state. You may be interested, as we were, to find that cases affecting the compact are beginning to be initiated in the federal courts. For example, we distributed to you a few months ago a summary of the decision in U.S. ex rel MacBlain v. Burke, in which the federal courts took favorable judicial notice of the compact. Our old friend, Judge Hartshorne, who is now a federal district court justice in New Jersey, has also had occasion to uphold the compact in certain minor cases which have been brought before him. Very recently we were advised that North Carolina had successfully overcome the first court attack on the compact in that state. The case — In re Savera — was heard before the Supreme Court. We will see that the decision is printed for inclusion in the Legal References section of the Administrators Handbook.

(2) You will recall that we discussed the interpretation of certain sections of the McCarran Act at last year's meeting. This matter has now been clarified, and the points in question are covered in the new "Digest of Interpretations" which comprises Chapter 2 of the Manual For Administrators.

(3) Last year the Association went on record by resolution as favoring action by the Congress of the United States to permit joinder in the compact by the territories and possessions of the United States and the District of Columbia. A bill to partially accomplish this purpose, H. R. 5699, was introduced early this year, but was found to mention only Puerto Rico. Pursuant to the resolution which you adopted last year we communicated with the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee urging that the terms of the bill be broadened to include the other jurisdictions just mentioned. It would no doubt considerably enhance the chances of passage of this measure if each of you would write to the Congressional delegation from your own state, urging favorable action on H.R. 5699 if it is amended to include Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands and the District of Columbia.
(4) You will recall having directed the secretariat to prepare a list of Canadian parole and probation officials who might assist the compact administrators in arranging cooperative supervision of cases in that country. The National Probation and Parole Association and the Canadian Consulate in New York City very kindly provided us with the desired information, and we forwarded it out to all of you to be inserted at the end of Chapter 1 of the Manual for Administrators.

(5) The secretariat was directed to prepare an up-to-date list of the states desiring notification of visits by parolees or probationers from other states. This information was duly gathered and may be found in Table III-A of the new "Digest of Interpretations".

(6) At last year's annual meeting there was considerable discussion on reporting requirements, and the secretariat was requested to prepare a complete listing of states which have dropped the requirement for monthly reports back to the sending state by individuals under supervision. This list will be found in Table III-B of the new "Digest of Interpretations". You also referred for study the matter of lengthening the present quarterly reporting requirement to perhaps six months. This matter was reviewed by the Association's Council and that body recommended that the quarterly requirement remain, with provision for bilateral agreements between administrators who wish to lengthen the reporting period. You will find in Table III-C of the new "Digest of Interpretations" a detailed summary of the attitudes of the various administrators on this subject. Some states will continue to insist on the quarterly report, but others will find it possible to make different arrangements acceptable to the respective administrators.

(7) One of the biggest jobs authorized last year was a study for general revision of the parole and probation forms. We have prepared, and your Council has approved, a new set of forms. In addition to revisions, deletions and additions, the forms contemplate these two new features:

(a) combination forms covering both parole and probation
(b) optional forms whose use will not be mandatory

This whole subject will be covered in detail at an appropriate point on the program and hence will not be described in detail at the present moment. We hope that definitive action will be taken, pro or con, on the proposals for revision.

(8) For several years the compact administrators have been discussing the possibility of cooperative action to permit the joint return of violators. Last year it was decided to prepare a specific proposal for such a program and to develop rules and forms which could be used in its operation. The Association's legal consultant, Dr. Wendell, has prepared the necessary legal documents to accomplish this cooperative plan of operation. A complete report on the subject will be found in your bound agenda, and the program has been arranged so that there will be ample time for discussion of the proposals. Your secretariat also would appreciate your comments on a draft proposal for model state legislation which would enable the administrators to enter into such cooperative arrangements if they wish to do so.

(9) To our knowledge, the state of New Jersey this year is the only additional state to ratify the Out-of-State Incarceration Amendment to the compact. The states of Connecticut, Idaho and Utah had previously ratified this formal amendment. As you know, full details on methods of implementing the amendment are contained in the Manual for Administrators. It may be that the administrators from these states will wish to meet informally to discuss plans for the operation of the amendment in and between their states.
(10) You will note that this report has referred several times to the "new" Digest of Interpretations. The compilation of this revised and expanded Digest has been another of the secretariat's major tasks during the past year. Since it contains so much information of a definitive nature on so many subjects, we hope very much that all of you will have checked it carefully so that we can make some sort of official pronouncement here with regard to approval of the new Digest.

(11) As most of you know, the old printed brochure which briefly described the purposes and operation of the compact went out of print during the past year. Pursuant to authorization at last year's annual meeting, the secretariat brought the brochure up to date recently and made it available in quantity to the several administrators.

(12) At a recent regional meeting of the administrators, attention was called to a 1952 decision of the Oklahoma Supreme Court which appeared to cast doubt on the validity of the use of a waiver of extradition. While the case does not affect the compact, it was felt that the issues raised would be of considerable interest to all of you. Text of the decision will be found in part 2 of your bound agenda, and we have secured a number of comments thereon from the Association's legal consultant.

(13) We have been advised that the National Probation and Parole Association is making good progress toward a revised model statute governing state parole and probation systems. Your secretariat is prepared to lend all possible assistance in securing careful consideration of such a model statute by the Council of State Governments' Committee on Legislation which develops programs of suggested legislation for the attention of legislators, governors, commissions on interstate cooperation, and others.

(14) Your secretariat has prepared during the past year an article on the compact which appeared in the June 1953 issue of FEDERAL PROBATION, the quarterly journal of correctional philosophy and practice. We assume that all of you received copies. If you did not, please advise us and we shall see that you receive one.

In conclusion, and as we have said so many times in the past — it is one of the very great pleasures of the Council of State Governments to be associated with all of you folks as secretariat. We hope that you will always keep in mind that we are here to serve you in any and every way that we can, so don't hesitate to call on us to do your bidding.

Respectfully submitted,

B. E. Griinfield
For the Secretariat
REPORT OF THE AUDITING COMMITTEE

We, the undersigned auditors, have examined the accounts of the Honorable Francis R. Bridges, Jr., Treasurer of the Association of Administrators of the Interstate Compact and find that receipts and disbursements are in accordance with his annual report as submitted at the annual meeting. Our treasurer is to be commended for the fine work he has done.

We attach herewith a statement from the Capital City National Bank of Tallahassee, Florida, verifying the balance on hand to the credit of the Association as being $1,395.44 as of July 1, 1953.

Signed: Charles P. Chew
        L. S. Clevenger
        Auditors
        Norman S. Hayner
        Toronto, Canada, October 11, 1953

CAPITAL CITY NATIONAL BANK
of Tallahassee
Tallahassee, Florida
July 1, 1953

Mr. Francis R. Bridges
P. O. Box 1107
Tallahassee, Florida

Dear Mr. Bridges:

This is to certify that the balance standing in the name of the Interstate Compact Administrators Association as of July 1, 1953 was $1,395.44.

Sincerely yours,

(Sig. Fred N. Lowry)
FRED N. LOWRY
RESOLUTIONS

I

WHEREAS, it continues to be the sincere conviction of the Compact Administrators Association that regular attendance at the annual meetings of this association has effectively reduced the areas of friction and has furthered closer cooperation between states, which in turn has proven of financial profit to the respective states and has improved the supervision of parolees and probationers with all of its attendant benefits;

BE it resolved, that this Association respectfully requests the Governor of each state to assure representation of his state at the 1954 Annual Conference of this organization.

II

WHEREAS, the Compact Administrators Association is of the opinion that the inclusion of the territories and possessions of the United States, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia would be a forward and necessary step in its development;

Therefore Be It Resolved, that the Secretariat be directed to use its good offices to gain the amendment and passage of H.R. 5699 so that all territories and possessions of the United States, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia will be included in the Interstate Compact for the Supervision of Parolees and Probationers,

Be It Further Resolved, that each Administrator vigorously strive to secure the support of his congressional representatives to the end that passage of this bill will be assured.

III

Be It Resolved, that the Compact Administrators express their appreciation to President Glenn Klopfenstein, to the Association officers for 1952-53, to the members of the various committees which have been active during the past year, and to the Secretariat staff for the able and conscientious direction given the Association.
REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE

PRESIDENT:
Hal Randall of Oregon

VICE PRESIDENT:
Charles Chew of Virginia

TREASURER:
Francis Bridges of Florida

SECRETARIAT:
The Council of State Governments

MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL:
J. C. Copeland of Indiana, Chairman
L. B. Stephens of Alabama
Donald Bunker of Missouri
Joseph Hagan of Rhode Island
Alfred Loos of New York

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:
(In addition to the officers)
Irma Walsh of Kansas
Gordon Jaeck of Minnesota
Norman Hayner of Washington
Percival Roberts of Delaware
Glen Klopfenstein of Ohio
Carl Norman of Kentucky

Respectfully submitted:

Signed: Walter A. Gordon, Chairman
        Percival R. Roberts
        Russell G. Oswald
        L. B. Stephens
        Irma C. Walsh
MANUAL FOR ADMINISTRATORS
CHAPTER 3. RULES, REGULATIONS AND FORMS

(October, 1953 Revision—all earlier pages should be destroyed)

This Chapter of the Manual is given over to amendments made in the Rules, Regulations and Forms since the printing of the Handbook on Interstate Crime Control in 1949. In 1953 the tables carried in the Handbook were completely revised and Section 2 of the Parole and Probation Rules respectively were amended. Previously, Section 3 of the Parole and Probation Rules respectively had been amended in 1952. A complete set of the revised official forms and the texts of the amendments to Sections 2 and 3 of the Parole and Probation Rules will be found in this Chapter. The text of the Rules and Regulations, as they stood in 1949, will be found in the Handbook on Interstate Crime Control on the pages indicated below. Interpretation and discussion of the Rules, Regulations and Forms will be found under appropriate headings in Chapter 2 of this Manual.

INDEX

I. RULES AND REGULATIONS

| Parole Rules and Regulations as of 1949 | Handbook 54 |
| Probation Rules and Regulations as of 1949 | Handbook 62 |
| Amendments to Section 2 | Manual 1 |
| Amendments to Section 3 | Manual 1 |

II. FORMS

Complete set of official forms, as approved 1953:

| Parole and Probation Form I (Investigation Request) | 2 |
| Parole and Probation Form II (Report of Sending State upon Parolees or Probationer being sent to another jurisdiction) | 3 |
| Parole and Probation Form III (Agreement to Return) | 4 |
| Parole and Probation Form IV (Progress and Conduct Report) | 5 |
| Parole and Probation Form A (Reply to Investigation Request) | 6 |
| Parole and Probation Form B (Report of Violation) | 7 |
I. RULES AND REGULATIONS

Amendments to Section 2

The Eighth Annual Meeting of the Administrators Association amended Section 2 of the Parole and Probation Rules and Regulations to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. The forms in reference to (1) investigation request, (2) information when subject is sent to receiving state, (3) agreement to return, and (4) progress and conduct report, and reports attached and hereby made part of these rules and regulations and are to be used for the purpose indicated. The following forms, attached hereto, are optional: Reply to investigation request and report of violation. Whenever the receiving state accepts a person for supervision, the sending state shall, when available, send to the receiving state two recent photographs and one photostatic copy of fingerprints or fingerprint classification of subject."

Amendments to Section 3*

At the Sixth Annual Meeting of the Administrators Association the Administrators voted that the following language be added to Section 3 of the Parole and Probation Rules: (New language 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 therefrom agreeing among themselves upon either more frequent reporting or less frequent reporting by their respective probation...""

* For discussion of the reporting requirements mentioned in Section 3, see Chapter 2 of this Manual, "Reporting", page 10.
II. FORMS

PAROLE AND PROBATION FORM I

INVESTIGATION REQUEST

(Insert title and address of official in sending state)

TO: __________________________ DATE REQUESTED: ________________

PAROLE ___ PROBATION ___ (check one) OUR FILE NO. ________________

Ref: __________________________________ Inst. & No. ________________

Address __________________________________ Race ______ Age ______ Sex ______

Offense __________________________________ Date Convicted ______

Received ________________ Sentence ________________ County ______

Parole or Probation period ________________ Maximum Sentence Expires ______

Release Date __________________________

MORE OFFER __________________________

EMPLOYMENT __________________________

________________________________________________________________________

(Click proper description)

Te desire to transfer this person on (parole) (probation) to your state

(a) ( ) As a resident (c) ( ) He has employment
(b) ( ) Family resides in your state (d) ( ) With your consent

OTHER POINTS __________________________

________________________________________________________________________

CASE SUMMARY AND CRIMINAL RECORD ARE ATTACHED HERETO.

Reply should discuss, among other things, suitability of prospective residence, employment, family, environment, attitude of receiving state and other pertinent facts.
PAROLE AND PROBATION FORM II

REPORT OF SENDING STATE UPON PAROLEE OR PROBATIONER
BEING SENT TO ANOTHER JURISDICTION

(Insert title and address of official in sending state)

TO: .................................................. DATE: .............

PAROLE _____ PROBATION _____ (check one)

Re: .................................................. Inst. & Number: .........

The above mentioned (will depart) (has departed) from .................
by (Method of transportation) on (date) ......................................
and was instructed to report (in person) (by letter) to:

Enclosed please find: (check appropriate items)

1. ( ) Copies of classification material
2. ( ) Photographs
3. ( ) Finger Prints
4. ( ) Certificate of Parole
5. ( ) Probation or Parole Agreement
6. ( ) Waiver of Extradition Form (Form III)
7. ( ) Other material described below

Please acknowledge receipt of this material and send arrival report as soon as possible.
PAROLE AND PROBATION FORM III

AGREEMENT TO RETURN

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

SENDING STATE ______________________ RECEIVING STATE ______________________

RE ______________________

I, ______________________, in consideration of being granted (parole) (probation) by the ______________________ and especially being granted the privilege to leave the state of ______________________ to go to ______________________, hereby agree:

1. That I will make my home with ______________________ (name and address) ______________________, until a change of residence is duly authorized by the proper authorities of ______________________ (receiving state) ______________________.

2. That I will comply with the conditions of (parole) (probation) as fixed by both the states of ______________________ (sending state) ______________________ and ______________________ (receiving state) ______________________.

3. That I will, when duly instructed by the ______________________ return at any time to the state of ______________________.

4. That I hereby do waive extradition to the state of ______________________ (sending state) ______________________ from any jurisdiction in or outside the United States where I may be found and also agree that I will not contest any effort by any jurisdiction to return me to the state of ______________________ (receiving state) ______________________.

5. Failure to comply with the above will be deemed to be a violation of the terms and conditions of (parole) (probation) for which I may be returned to the state of ______________________ (sending state) ______________________.

DATED ______________________

SIGNED ______________________

Witnesses:

____________________

On the _____ day of ________ 19 ______, permission was granted to the above person to reside in the state of ______________________ and to be supervised by ______________________.
PAROLE AND PROBATION FORM IV

PROGRESS AND CONDUCT REPORT

(Insert title and address of official in receiving state)

TO: ........................................ DATE OF REPORT: .............

........................................ DATE FORWARDED: .............

REF: .................................... NO. _______ STATE _______

Address of Parolee or Probationer:

Name and Relationship of Others in Home:

Contact Dates:

Marital Status:

Employer - Address:

Is Subject's Record Known to Employer:

Type of Work - Hours - Wages

Conduct, Progress and Attitude:

Interstate Compact Administrator

For: __________________________

By: __________________________

(Note: According to the rules and regulations the above form should be sent to the sending state by the receiving state on a quarterly basis unless specific other arrangements have been agreed to by the two administrators. For such arrangements, please contact the receiving state's Compact Administrator.)
PAROLE AND PROBATION FORM A*

REPLY TO INVESTIGATION REQUEST

(Insert title and address of official in receiving state)

TO: ..........................................................  DATE: ..............................

RE:

Pursuant to your request of _______________ (date)________ the above case has been investigated by this office and our report is attached.

This state (agrees) (does not agree) that it shall be competent for this person to reside here while on (parole) (probation) for the following reasons:

1. He (is) (is not) a resident of this state within the meaning of the compact.

2. He (does) (does not) have his family residing here.

3. He (does) (does not) have employment here.

4. This state hereby (gives) (does not give) its consent to the above person residing here while on (parole) (probation).

5. Additional Comments:

The above person shall report immediately upon arrival (in person) (by letter) to:

Interstate Compact Administrator

For:  __________________________________________

By:  __________________________________________

* The receiving state obviously must make some kind of reply to Form B, the request of the sending state for a pre-transfer investigation. The above Form A is given here for the guidance of states which may wish to produce a similar form originally developed by the sending state. It may be desirable to construct a separate form for each state.
PAROLE AND PROBATION FORM E

REPORT OF VIOLATION

TO: ............................................  FROM: .............................................

PAROLE ____ PROBATION ____ (check one)

RE: ............................................  DATE: .............................................

CASE NO. .................................

Date arrested \ Should sending state forward warrant?
  absconded
  misbehavior began)  Yes      No

If arrested, give specific charge... Is return recommended? ............... 

................................................ Should return be attempted under in-

There held in custody.................. terstate compact? .........................

................................................ Charge upon which convicted........... Will subject waive extradition? ...........

................................................ Has he signed a waiver? ............... 

Date of conviction...................... Will supervision be continued if sub-

Name of  Address ject is not returned? ............... 

court.........................................

Judge who heard case...............Give specific date sending state's of-

............................................. ficer should arrive to take prisoner

Specific sentence given.............. and hour of the day......................

............................................. Give name, address and phone number

Name and address of institution to of officer to be contacted upon arrival

which committed..........................

Please give selector over age if necessary. If blank, ignore.