<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Registration List</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALABAMA</td>
<td>*L. B. Stephens, Executive Director, Board of Paroles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARIZONA</td>
<td>*Walter Hofmann, Chairman, Board of Parole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>*Walter A. Gordon, Chairman, Adult Authority&lt;br&gt;Sidney Diamond, Probation Consultant&lt;br&gt;Fred Finsley, Adult Authority&lt;br&gt;T. C. Keer, Youth Authority&lt;br&gt;Ben E. Stein, Youth Authority&lt;br&gt;Roy C. Vetaw, Youth Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLORADO</td>
<td>*Wayne K. Patterson, Executive Director, Board of Parole&lt;br&gt;H. A. Turner, Member of Parole Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONNECTICUT</td>
<td>*James J. McIlduff, Supervisor of Parole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORIDA</td>
<td>*Francis R. Bridges, Jr., Parole Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGIA</td>
<td>*Charles A. Pannell, Chairman, State Board of Pardons &amp; Paroles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDAHO</td>
<td>*H. P. Fails, Secretary, Board of Correction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILLINOIS</td>
<td>Judge Thomas E. Kluczynski, National Council of Juvenile Court Judges&lt;br&gt;Judge Frank H. Bicek, National Council of Juvenile Court Judges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOWA</td>
<td>*R. W. Sobzin, Secretary, Board of Parole&lt;br&gt;Edith Agazzi, Deputy Interstate Compact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KANSAS</td>
<td>*Irma C. Walsh, Secretary, Board of Penal Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENTUCKY</td>
<td>*Harold R. Sagraves, Asst. Administrator, Div. of Probation &amp; Parole&lt;br&gt;Alma Anderson, Correspondent, Interstate Parole Compact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARYLAND</td>
<td>*James M. Hopbron, Director of Parole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHIGAN</td>
<td>*William F. Beard, Parole Director&lt;br&gt;Fred C. Bates, Director of Probation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIRGINIA</td>
<td>*F. F. Fulender, Assistant Director, Board of Parole&lt;br&gt;*Curtis S. Johnson, Chairman, State Board of Parole</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MISSOURI: *Donald W. Zunker, Secretary, Board of Probation & Parole
General Lewis M. Keans, Chairman, Board of Probation & Parole

NEBRASKA: *Richard C. Neissner, Chief Parole Officer

NEVADA: *Edward C. Cupit, Chief Parole & Probation Officer

NEW YORK: *Lee B. Mailler, Chairman, N. Y. State Div. of Parole
Harold Canavan, Senior Parole Officer
L. Stanley Clevenger, Administrator Director, Div. of Parole
Milton Rector, Div. of Parole, National Probation & Parole Assn.
Kitchell Wendell, Research Consultant, N. Y. State Joint
Legislative Committee on Interstate Cooperation

NORTH CAROLINA: *Johnson Matthews, Board Member

OHIO: *Glenn R. Klopfenstein, Chief, Bureau of Probation & Parole

OREGON: Charles H. Huggins, Chairman, Parole & Probation Board
*H. M. Randall, Director, State Board of Parole and Probation

PENNSYLVANIA: *G. I. Giardini, Superintendent of Parole Supervision

RHODE ISLAND: *Walter W. Sidwick, Probation & Parole Division

TENNESSEE: *Charles W. Crew, Executive Secretary, Board of Pardons & Paroles

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

VERMONT: *John Woodhull, Director, Probation & Parole

VIRGINIA: *Charles P. Chew, Director of Parole
P. C. Shields, Executive Secretary, Virginia Parole Board

WEST VIRGINIA: *Dana C. Elde, Chairman, Board of Probation & Parole

WASHINGTON: *Norman S. Hayner, Member, Board of Prison Terms & Paroles

WISCONSIN: *Quentin Fern, Director of Probation & Parole

U.S. BOARD OF PAROLE: Scoovel Richardson, Chairman

COUNCIL OF STATE GOVERNMENTS:
B. E. Cribfield, Eastern Regional Office
Jane Parks, Secretary, Eastern Regional Office
William Frederick, Research Director, Chicago Office
Mary Proctor, Secretary to Exec. Director, Chicago Office
Herbert Wiltsee, Southern Representative
Marvin Fast, Midwestern Representative

*Compact Administrator or his representative
MINUTES OF THE NINTH ANNUAL MEETING
Chicago, Illinois, October 23-24, 1954

OPENING BUSINESS SESSION

The Ninth Annual Meeting of Administrators was held at the Hotel Blackstone, Chicago, Illinois on October 23-24. Approximately 60 persons attended the meeting, including representatives from 32 States.

The meeting convened at 10:00 A.M. on Saturday, October 23. The President of the Association, Mr. Randall of Oregon, welcomed the delegates and guests. Mr. Randall's speech contained much valuable historical material about the compact and the association; excerpts from his address are attached (See Exhibit A).

Francis Bridges of Florida, Treasurer of the Association presented his Annual Report. He stated that as of the end of the fiscal year (June 30, 1954) the Association had expended $1060.72 and had a balance of $1455.70. 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 Exhibit B)

The group agreed to dispense with the reading of the Minutes of the Eighth Annual Meeting. The minutes were approved as printed in the agenda.

Mr. Randall appointed the following committees:— RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE: Chairman, Mr. Gordon, California; Mr. Patterson, Colorado; Mr. March, Maine; Mr. Bunker, Missouri; Mr. Form, Wisconsin. NOMINATING COMMITTEE: Chairman, Mr. Stephens, Alabama; Mr. Kessler, Nebraska; Mr. Wilson, Utah; Mr. Crow, Tennessee; Mr. Woodhall, Vermont. AUDITING COMMITTEE: Chairman, Dr. Giardini, Pennsylvania; Mr. Bobzin, Iowa; Mr. Hofmann, Arizona.

SATURDAY AND SUNDAY DISCUSSION SESSIONS

ARRANGEMENTS FOR SUPERVISION

Parole to Merchant Marine

The group discussed the desirability of permitting parolees to serve in the Merchant Marine. The discussion revealed that a number of states occasionally permitted parolees to serve in the merchant marine. Some administrators expressed the belief that such permission should not be granted directly from the institution. It was pointed out that regular supervision could not be given to such individuals, although the agencies supervising such individuals can maintain some contact by asking the parolee to report by mail, and by verifying the individual's continued good conduct with the employer. The Association agreed that permission to serve on parole in the Merchant Marine should only be granted in selected cases, and only if the individual had been a merchant seaman (with papers) before his commitment.

The group also discussed the desirability of using the Compact to supervise such cases. Mr. Finley pointed out that the individual would probably have to spend some time in port waiting for a ship, and he suggested that it would be well to arrange Compact supervision for parolees whose home port would be in another
state. It was agreed that the Compact Administrator should be notified in such cases and that Compact Supervision could be used where it seemed appropriate because of the individual's family ties, and other factors.

**Convicted Military Personnel**

The group discussed a resolution of the Western Probation and Parole Association regarding the Compact status of convicted military personnel. The resolution called the attention of the Compact Administrators to the fact that military personnel may be away from home on military duty long enough so that some administrators might consider them disqualified as residents. It was agreed by the Compact Administrators that "mere physical presence in another state for military service does not change residence for purposes of the Compact".

**Investigations**

**Opportunity to Investigate.** The group reiterated a principle agreed upon at earlier meetings, that the Compact Administrator should be given an opportunity to investigate before an individual is permitted to come to a receiving state to seek employment. The group discussed the question of whether or not a parolee must have both a family and a job in the receiving state to qualify as a resident. It was agreed that no rigid rules should be applied and that each case should be determined on its own merits.

**Time Required to Make Investigations.** It was agreed that administrators should acknowledge investigation requests, report on the progress of the investigation at appropriate intervals, and complete investigations as promptly as possible.

**Confidentiality of Records.** This discussion arose when Mr. Randall reported that investigating agents sometimes informed the parolee's family that he would be home, despite the fact that the receiving state had not yet agreed to supervise. In connection with the discussion, Mr. Pannell of Georgia informed the Administrators that unfavorable comments in investigation reports had occasionally been revealed to the parolees and probationers they concerned. The group reiterated the firm policy agreed to in 1948, that information in pre-parole reports must be kept confidential, and the group agreed, in addition, that Administrators should notify those in charge of records that they were confidential. At the end of the meeting a Resolution was adopted on this subject. See Resolution II, Exhibit E.

**Investigation Requests by New York.** Mr. Mailler of New York reported that, as a result of reorganization in his department, an attempt was being made to clear old records on absconders. He stated that New York would, for a short time, be requesting a larger number of investigations than usual since an attempt was being made to arrange supervision for some individuals who had rehabilitated themselves after absconding.

**Information to be Included in Investigation Requests.** Mr. Randall pointed out that much needless correspondence would be eliminated if Administrators would send adequate information with their investigation requests. The group agreed that Administrators should either use the official form, or, if substituting other documents, make certain that the information called for in the official form is contained in the papers transmitted with the investigation request. It was suggested that it might be helpful if Administrators would include specific directions as to how to find homes of parolees and probationers in rural areas.
The Compact Administrator should be notified in such a way that the Compact Supervision could be used where it seemed appropriate because of the individual's family ties, and other factors.

Military Personnel

The group discussed a resolution of the Western Probation and Parole Association calling for the creation of a compact status of convicted military personnel. The resolution called attention to the Compact Administrators to the fact that military personnel may be away from home on military duty long enough so that some administrators might consider them disqualified as residents. It was agreed by the Compact Administrators that "mere physical presence in another state for military service does not change status for purposes of the Compact".

Opportunity to Investigate

The group reiterated a principle agreed upon at earlier meetings, that the Compact Administrator should be given an opportunity to investigate before an individual is permitted to come to a receiving state to seek parole. The group discussed the question of whether or not a parolee must have a family and a job in the receiving state to qualify as a resident. It was agreed that no rigid rules should be applied and that each case should be determined on its own merits.

Time Required to Make Investigation

It was agreed that administrators should acknowledge investigation requests, report on the progress of the investigation at reasonable intervals, and complete investigations as promptly as possible.

Confidentiality of Records

This discussion arose when Mr. Randall reported that on occasion agents sometimes informed the parolee's family that he would be coming to a receiving state. Despite the fact that the receiving state had not yet agreed to supervise, in discussing the discussion, Mr. Pannell of Georgia informed the Administrators that unfavorable comments in investigation reports had occasionally been revealed to parolees and probationers they concerned. The group reiterated the firm policy of in 1948, that information in pre-parole reports must be kept confidential. The group agreed, in addition, that Administrators should notify those in charge of parolees that they were confidential. At the end of the meeting a Resolution was adopted on this subject. See Resolution II, Exhibit B.

Investigation Requests by New York

Mr. Mailor of New York reported that, as a result of reorganization in his department, an attempt was being made to clarify old demand letters. He stated that New York would, for a short time, be requesting number of investigations into parolees who had been supervised for some individuals who had rehabilitated themselves after parole.

Investigation to be Included in Investigation Requests

Mr. Randall pointed out that if correspondence would be eliminated if Administrators would send information with their investigation requests. The group agreed that Administrators should either use the official form, or, if substituting other documents, that the information called for in the official form is contained in the transmission with the investigation request. It was suggested that it might be useful if Administrators would include specific directions as to how to parolees and probationers in rural areas.
There was a brief discussion of problems of juvenile supervision under the Interstate Parole and Probation Compact. There was a consensus that many of these problems might be solved by a juvenile compact, and the group turned to a discussion of a tentative draft of such a compact which had been prepared by the Council of State Governments.

Proposed Juvenile Compact. Mr. Randall introduced Judge Frank H. Block and Judge Thomas E. Kluczynski who were attending the conference as representatives of the National Conference of Juvenile Court Judges. Judges Block and Kluczynski made brief statements stressing the need for interstate action regarding juveniles. Both judges also expressed the belief that federal funds for the return of runaways should be made more accessible. Following the statements by Judges Block and Kluczynski, Mr. Cribbfield presented the proposed Compact. He explained that the juvenile compact would be entirely separate from the adult compact, but he said that there was a general feeling that the Administrators Association could be of great assistance in getting the juvenile compact underway. The group then reviewed the juvenile compact draft and made the following suggested changes, among others:

1. The definition of "juvenile" in Article I was transferred to Article III, which relates to non-delinquent juveniles. This was done so that the provisions of the compact relating to juvenile delinquents would not be mistakenly applied to non-delinquent juveniles. The age of non-delinquent juveniles to be covered by Article III was raised from 18 to 21, and the definition was also amended so that persons entitled to the legal custody of juveniles would be included with guardians and parents in the Article.

2. The definition of "delinquent juvenile" in Article I was amended to provide that a delinquent juvenile, to be covered by the Compact, must still be subject to the jurisdiction of the court which adjudicated him delinquent.

3. The provision of Article IIIa, regarding residence in the receiving state was clarified. A child may be sent to a receiving state if his "parent, guardian or person entitled to legal custody" is residing in the receiving state.

Article IIIa was amended so that the return of a juvenile to the sending state would require the concurrent agreement of both the sending and receiving states. This was done to prevent the indiscriminate return of juveniles to states far from their homes and family ties.

4. The remuneration provisions in Article X were amended so that the obligations of a state would continue after remunation until all cases were discharged or retook. Supplementary agreements were also included in the remuneration clause.

At the conclusion of the discussion of the provisions of the Compact, Mr. Cribbfield expressed the hope that it would be ratified by some clusters of states so that the provisions of the compact could go into operation and be tested. It was agreed that the final draft of the compact should be submitted for clearance to such groups as the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges, the American Public Welfare Association, the National Probation and Parole Association, and the Parole and Probation Compact Administrators Association before it was proposed to the states for ratification. Mr. Cribbfield said that this would be done and that the draft would be cleared and submitted to the states in time for the 1955 sessions. At the close of the meeting, the Association adopted a resolution reaffirming its interest in a juvenile compact and expressing appreciation for the attendance of Judges Block and Kluczynski. See Resolution IV, Exhibit B.
STANDARDS OF SUPERVISION

Combined federal and state supervision. The group discussed the extent of state supervision necessary when the individual is also under federal supervision. The consensus appeared to be that an individual sent for supervision under the compact should be given the customary amount of supervision by the receiving state regardless of whether or not he is also receiving federal supervision.

Transfer to a third state. As at previous meetings, the group agreed that an individual should not be permitted to move from the receiving state to a third state without the approval of the original sending state. It was also agreed that it was best legally for the original sending state to fill out all of the necessary documents regarding the transfer.

Quarterly reports. The group reiterated the policy agreed to at previous meetings, that quarterly reports should be sent in promptly where sending states still require them. It was noted that a carbon copy of the running case record may be sent in lieu of the quarterly report. The record contains all the information called for in the quarterly report.

VIOLATORS, DETAINING AND ARREST

Bail. The consensus appeared to be that, upon request of the sending state, the receiving state administrator might make recommendations regarding bail for those arrested while under Compact supervision.

Arrest by parole officers. There was a brief discussion of whether or not parole officers had authority to arrest absconders from other states. It was agreed that this usually depended on state statutes and therefore varied from state to state.

Fees. The group discussed the exorbitant fees charged by some sheriffs and other officials in connection with the return of violators from federal and state prisons. Several suggestions were made, as follows:

1. When a compact administrator receives an exorbitant bill from an official in another state, the bill should be sent to the compact administrator of that state in the hope that he will be able to have the bill adjusted.

2. If the individual is in a federal prison, an attempt can be made to have him transferred to a prison closer to the state which wants him. Such a transfer should be requested from Mr. James Bennett of the Bureau of Prisons 90 days in advance.

It was pointed out that some unnecessary fees are caused by the policy of releasing federal prisoners to local officials who then turn them over to the state official who wants them. In order to eliminate the fees paid to these local officials, the Secretariat was directed to discuss the matter with Mr. Bennett to see if federal law or policy needs to be changed so that prisoners can be turned over directly to state officials.

It was agreed that all administrators should maintain a file of fees which they pay in the process of returning prisoners during the coming year. Such records are to be brought to the annual meeting so that the association can have a clearer idea of the main trouble spots.
Identification of Officers. Dr. Giardini of Pennsylvania reported that Pennsylvania officers frequently had to go to court to identify themselves when retaking violators. Mr. Crinfield pointed out that states varied as to requirements for identification, some states requiring identification before a judge and others requiring only the presentation of papers to the officer in custody of the prisoner. The consensus appeared to be that identification before a judge did not cause any particular difficulty, and no action was taken on this subject. All states reported that their officers could now usually retake their cases without going to court over extradition questions. In this connection, Mr. Crinfield emphasized the importance of using the Compact "waiver of Extradition" form. He pointed out that many favorable court decisions had been based on the existence of a waiver of extradition signed by the parolee before he left the sending state.

Cooperative return of violators. Mr. Crinfield called the attention of the Administrators to the "Act to Permit Deputization of Out of State Agents" which is printed on Page 11 of Chapter 5 of the Manual for Administrators. He reported that the bill had been vetoed in one state on the grounds that it did not contain authorization for a proper state officer to enter into contracts and that it did not provide necessary review of fiscal arrangements by a state fiscal officer. The group approved the following new Section 3 which had been drafted to remedy the defects mentioned above:

(In the text of the suggested legislation insert the following new Section 3 and renumber the present Section 3 as Section 4.)

1. Section 3. The [insert title of official designated in Section 1] is hereby authorized, subject to the approval of the chief state fiscal officer, to enter into contracts with similar officials of any other state or states for the purpose of sharing an equitable portion of the cost of effecting the return of any person who has violated the terms and conditions of parole and probation as granted by this state.

Mr. Crinfield stated that the new Section 3 would be carried in the Council of State Governments' program of suggested state legislation for 1955. He said, however, that the Council's regional representatives would clear with the Compact Administrator in each state before recommending the amendment to the state's Commission on Interstate Cooperation.

FEDERAL COOPERATION

Mr. Scovel Richardson, new Chairman of the United States Board of Parole, made a brief statement in which he announced that a federal representative would attend future meetings, and in which he pointed out that changes had been made in federal policy regarding detainers. A letter setting forth this policy from Dr. Paul Tappan, former Chairman of the Board of Parole, was read. This letter is attached, see Exhibit C. Mr. Richardson expressed the wish of the United States Board of Parole to cooperate as fully as possible with the Administrators, and he asked the Administrators to cooperate by providing the Board with as much information as possible as to the nature of detainers pending against federal prisoners. There appeared to be
a consensus that, despite some difficulties, relationships between the Board and state officials were improving. At the end of the meeting a Resolution was approved expressing appreciation for the Attorney General's appointment of representatives, the Federal Parole Board's statement of change of policy regarding detainers, and Mr. Richardson's attendance. See Resolution III, Exhibit E.

Transportation of Prisoners. Mr. Crinhfield reminded the group that the Secretary had directed to find out if there was a federal statute requiring that a person be returned to the area from which he was taken into federal custody. He quoted the text of 18 U.S.C. Sec. 4058 as follows:

"(a) Whenever any federal prisoner has been indicted, informed against, or convicted of a felony in a court of record of any State or the District of Columbia, the Attorney General shall, if he finds it in the public interest to do so, upon the request of the Governor or the executive authority thereof, and upon the presentation of a certified copy of such indictment, information or judgment of conviction, cause such person, prior to his release, to be transferred to a penal or correctional institution within such State or District.

If more than one such request is presented in respect to any prisoner, the Attorney General shall determine which request should receive preference.

The expense of personnel and transportation incurred shall be chargeable to the appropriation for the 'Support of United States Prisoners'.

"(b) This section shall not limit the authority of the Attorney General to transfer prisoners pursuant to other provisions of law."

Mr. Crinhfield also read a portion of a letter from a representative of the United States Department of Justice which explained that it was the policy of the Federal Bureau of Prisons to return prisoners to the place of residence or conviction whenever practical, although there is no statute compelling this. (Whether or not this service is provided by the Bureau usually depends on the cost. In the usual case transportation can be arranged to coincide with trips by marshals who are transporting prisoners in cars or buses. A reasonable amount would be advanced for a ticket too. Sufficient advance notice, preferably 90 days, should be given to the Bureau of Prisons when such transfer of a prisoner is desired.)

OUT OF STATE INCARCERATION

Mr. Falls of Idaho made a brief statement regarding the Out of State Incarceration Amendment. He emphasized the fact that more ratification of the amendment would be a great asset even if its provisions were not used since parolees would be deterred from violating by the knowledge that they could be incarcerated in the receiving state. He said that four states (Connecticut, Idaho, New Jersey and Utah) had adopted the amendment, but that none of those states had been able to use it since the cases they might have wished to incarcerate were being supervised in non-signatory states. He expressed the hope that other states would ratify the amendment during the 1955 sessions so that there would be an opportunity to put the provisions of the amendment into action.
Mr. Griffield reviewed some of the more important aspects of the amendment. He stressed the fact that the use of the provisions of the amendment would be discretionary, and that an Administrator would have a choice as to whether he wanted to incarcerate the violator in the receiving state, leave him in the receiving state under supervision, or bring him home. In connection with his discussion of the amendment, Mr. Griffield reported that the New York State Joint Legislative Committee on Interstate Cooperation would be sponsoring a meeting on the juvenile compact, return of violators and out-of-state incarceration early in 1955, and he said that New York would probably extend invitations to the Compact Administrators.

Incarceration of Adult Women Prisoners. Mr. Wiltsee of the Council of State Governments reported on the South Central States Conference on the Incarceration of Adult Women Prisoners from which he had just returned. He said that this was merely an exploratory meeting, but that the Conference had agreed that "formal interstate cooperation in the field of incarceration of adult women prisoners may best be achieved through the use of one or more interstate compacts." Mr. Wiltsee said that no definite decisions were made at this exploratory meeting, but that the delegates seemed to feel that two major compact groups might prove feasible, one East and one West of the Mississippi. There will be additional committee meetings on this subject and a large conference will probably be held in mid-January.

Mr. Wiltsee complimented the Association on the high reputation of its compact. He reported that it has been mentioned many times at the South Central Conference as an example of the results which could be achieved by interstate cooperation despite difficult technical and legal problems.

UNIFORM AND MODEL LAWS

Uniform Reciprocal Enforcement of Support Act. Mr. Griffield explained that the Uniform Reciprocal Enforcement of Support Act was an act permitting the transmission of written evidence from the courts of one state to the courts of another state so that a deserted dependent might obtain support without extraditing the obligor or appearing personally in the courts of the state to which the obligor had fled. Mr. Griffield said that such legislation had been passed by the Virgin Islands, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Alaska, Guam, and all states of the United States except Nevada, and that additional information about the act could be secured from the Secretariat.

Proposed Legislation on Narcotics and Related Subjects. Mr. Wiltsee of the Council of State Governments called the attention of the group to the Council of State Government's legislation on narcotics and related subjects. He gave a brief review of the Council's newest act on this subject. (an act relating to the control of sleep inducing drugs, such as barbiturates). Mr. Wiltsee said that the text of the new act was included in Suggested State Legislation Program for 1955, and that copies of this book would be sent to all administrators.

Standard Probation and Parole Act. Mr. Milton Rector of the National Probation and Parole Association reviewed the provisions of a new Standard Probation and Parole Act which his organization has drafted. He emphasized the fact that this act, when finally promulgated would be used only as a guide for state legislation on the subject. The act is not intended as a uniform act, and it is expected that state legislation based on the act will vary considerably.
NAME OF ASSOCIATION. The official name of the Association was changed to "Parole and Probation Compact Administrators' Association." It was agreed that supplies of stationary bearing the old name could be used up before administrators ordered new stock bearing the new name.

Handbook on Interstate Crime Control. The Association appropriated $500 for the purchase of the balance of the Council of State Governments' supply of the 1949 edition of the "Handbook on Interstate Crime Control," and the Secretariat was directed to divide the supply among the Administrators after ascertaining the maximum number wanted by each state. The appropriation was made contingent upon the agreement of the Council of State Governments to prepare a new edition of the Handbook.

The Association agreed to appropriate another $500 as its share of the cost of printing the new Handbook. This sum will be payable after the Handbook is printed and will entitle each administrator to ten free copies and a 50% discount on future copies purchased by his office.

Next Annual Meeting. The Association recommended unanimously that the Executive Committee schedule the next annual meeting as a two-day meeting in Des Moines, Iowa in conjunction with the Congress of Corrections.

Report of the Auditing Committee. The report of the Auditing Committee was heard and unanimously approved. This report is attached (See Exhibit D).

Report of the Resolutions Committee. The group heard and approved unanimously the report of the Resolutions Committee. This report is attached (See Exhibit E).

Report of the Nominating Committee. The report of the nominating committee was accepted as the official ballot of the Association. The Secretariat was directed to cast one ballot for the entire slate. The report of the Nominating Committee is attached (See Exhibit F).

Mr. Randall then turned the gavel over to Mr. Chow of Virginia, the Association's new president.

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 P.M. on Sunday, October 24.

* Under the constitution this change in name becomes effective 30 days after notification to the members unless fifteen active members dissent.
This Compact for Interstate Supervision of Parolees and Probationers came into being in the mid-1930's. More and more States became signatory to the Compact as years rolled by, and the Compact Administrators met annually under the sponsorship of the Interstate Commission on Crime, but not as a formal and separate group. When the Interstate Commission on Crime went out of operating existence in 1942, the Compact Administrators had no "home of their own" for a time. They met informally in conjunction with the annual meetings of other associations, and occasionally in special regional groups; however, on October 11, 1944, recognizing the need of a strong organization to administer the Interstate Compact, the Council of State Governments called an important nation-wide conference of Administrators, to be held in New York City.

The whole question of working out a central organization was discussed and debated. An Interim Committee was established to develop specific plans for such an organization. This Committee did yeoman work, and at a meeting held on November 12, 1945, the Compact Administrators met again in New York City, and formally approved a Constitution establishing the Association.

Two days later, a resolution was passed requesting the Council of State Governments to become Secretariat. By this act alone the Administrators, in my opinion, took one of the most important steps of our whole existence. The Council of State Governments, in acting as Secretariat of this Association, has been the spark plug which has not only kept the organization moving forward, but has given real life and direction to the Association throughout the years, since our beginning.

The slate of officers elected to serve until our first annual meeting could be held in 1946 consisted of Joe Hagan of Rhode Island, President; Reuben Ervinson of Minnesota, Vice-President; W. S. Terry of Louisiana, Hollis Elsdott of Vermont, A. B. Rivers of Oklahoma, Richard Heissner of Nebraska and Mrs. Edwin Mitchell of Alabama, members of the Executive Committee; and Francis Bridges of Florida, Garrett Haynes of Michigan, Walter Gordon of California, Frederick Moran of New York and William Hanahan of Virginia, members of the Council. Of this group, only four are members of the Association today.

While our Association is rather young in the matter of years, still, we have been able to build up quite a history. In this history are many honored names—including Judge Richard Hartshorne of New Jersey, Chairman of the Interstate Commission on Crime, and "father" of the Compact which was developed by that body; Francis Bridges of Florida, a member of the subcommittee which drafted the Constitution of the Association, an officer of the Association every year since its founding and most jealous guardian of our funds; Joe Hagan of Rhode Island, first President of the Association and an active member ever since; Sanford Bates of New Jersey, internationally known in his field, who offered the motion in 1944 to set up a committee which would recommend some type of continuing organization of Administrators. Sanford was President of this Association in 1949-1950. Then, we have Walter Gordon of California, still an active member, as he has been from the beginning. He was a member of the first Council of the Association, and President for 1950-1951. Reuben Ervinson of Minnesota, the Association's first Vice-President; Judge Henry Hunt of Connecticut, President of the Association in 1951-1952; and Glenn Klopstein of Ohio, immediate past President of the Association in 1952-1953.
At the time of our first annual meeting, our President, Joe Hagan, pointed out that only eight States then remained who were not yet signatory to the Compact, and one of the first projects of the new Association was to urge legislation in these States to bring them all within the fold. In this we were successful. Our sights have now been set to include the Federal Government, and possessions, and have taken as a first step the development of an informal working arrangement with the Federal parole system, which has been in effect for about two years; and, which, to the best of my knowledge, is proving to be most successful.

Other projects undertaken and successfully completed are:

The establishment of the regular statistical reporting on the movement of parolees and probationers under the Compact. The first difficulty we encountered in this project was that some States either did not keep proper statistical information to complete the report requested by the Association, or lacked sufficient clerical help to prepare such a report. We still have this problem. Our latest report prepared by our Secretariat, covering the year July 1, 1952, to June 30, 1953, reflects that there are nine States that did not submit a report covering the movement of parolees and probationers under their supervision. I urge these States to make greater effort in completing the necessary reports, so that our Secretariat, and through the Secretariat, each one of the Administrators will have a full and complete picture of the annual number of parolees and probationers being supervised under the Compact. Our incomplete report, however, shows that more than 10,000 parolees and probationers are being supervised by receiving States under the terms of the Compact. If it were possible to have full and complete reports from every State, I am sure this number would be in the neighborhood of 15,000.

The Association has developed a "Digest of Interpretations" to assist Administrators in interpreting the Compact uniformly.

We have made provisions for the regular exchange of information and views among the Administrators.

We have prepared an "Administrators' Manual" with comprehensive information on the detailed operations of the Compact and related activities. This Manual, as you know, is kept up-to-date by our Secretariat, and has proven its worth to every Administrator.

We have sponsored the "Joint Committee on Detainers", the most complete review yet done on this difficult problem. Though we have not yet reached our objective in the handling of detainers, I feel that much progress has been made, and that everyone involved in this problem is fully aware that such a problem does exist, and is most interested in seeking ways and means whereby it might be solved.

We have sponsored the "Handbook on Interstate Crime Control", which was originally developed by the Interstate Commission on Crime.

We have developed the "Out of State Incarceration Amendment" to further expand the use of the Compact, and to reduce, so far as we are able, the terrific expenditure of money necessary to return parole and probation violators. Along this same line, we have developed studies, proposed legislation and have drafted forms and contracts to be used for a more economical joint return of violators. Both of these methods have been used, and are being used, by more and more States, and will in turn eventually substantially reduce the cost necessary to perform this important and necessary function of parole and probation.
Most important perhaps of all our accomplishments is the continued development of our annual meetings, where we Administrators may sit down together, get better acquainted with each other and share our experiences and problems. Speaking for myself, I feel that these annual meetings are most important for us and are primarily responsible for the development of the splendid spirit of cooperation which now exists between States. Of course, we have our problems and our gripes; but, so long as we can meet annually and bring these problems and gripes out into the open and discuss them in a spirit of cooperation and friendship, I am sure we will have no reason to doubt either the continued existence of this Association, or its continued development throughout the years ahead.

It has been a real pleasure, and a great honor, to have served as your President during the past year; and, I particularly want to thank the Council of State Governments, which in this case means E. E. Crinhfield—or Crinh—for the help and support he has given me, and for his friendly advice which has always been most acceptable.

We have a most interesting agenda ahead of us today and tomorrow, and while many of the matters to be discussed are basic problems and are with us from year to year, still they represent "fundamentals" and are always of interest to us whether we be an old-timer or a new-comer to this Association; and, I hope that each of us may gain inspiration from this meeting and return home with a determination to further the objectives of this most important Compact which we administer.
Once again, your Secretariat, the Council of State Governments, takes pleasure in presenting its report to the Association. We are happy to renew friendships with the long-time loyal members and to have the opportunity to meet with those of you who are attending for the first time. These annual meetings provide an excellent forum for the exchange of information, and yes -- the interchange of gripes too. The interstate problems that seem major from time to time throughout the year sometimes have a way of working out more smoothly when the administrators sit around the table and talk them out in a spirit of mutual comity.

At this time we would hope that you will bear with us through a brief report on the major activities and developments under the compact since the last annual meeting as well as a few side comments on things to come:

(1) First of all, and I am sure that each of you has heard of this, we regret to have to take cognizance of the retirement of Sanford Bates, a real "old pro" who always has been one of the Association's most active and loyal members. I am certain that all of you join us in wishing the Commissioner well in the years to come.

(2) During the past year we have been gathering a master file of the basic state acts which approved or authorized entry into the compact. We now have these from all states except the following, and we hope to have the file complete as soon as possible: Ariz., Colo., Del., Idaho, Ill., Ky., La., Mich., Miss., Neb., N.D., S.D., Vt., Wash., West Va. and Wisconsin.

(3) The compact has continued to withstand what few legal attacks still are made upon it. There have been no appellate or supreme court cases during the past year on the validity of the compact. The only cases reported to us were Burns v. Starr, in the Circuit Court of Florida and In Re Windell in the Ninth Judicial District Court of Idaho. We shall see that a summary of the facts in these cases is sent to all administrators for inclusion in the legal section of the manual. Since the last annual meeting we have sent you the North Carolina decision in the case of In Re Severson, referred to in our report last year.

(4) The Association last year directed us to attempt to secure official designation by the Attorney General of the United States of "two representatives, one from the field of parole and one from the field of probation" who would be cooperating members of the Association and attend our meetings. We are glad to report that we received the most cordial cooperation from the United States Department of Justice in this regard, and that the two representatives have been appointed. Mr. Louis Sharp, the Probation Representative, could not be with us, but Mr. Scevold Richardson is here as the Federal Representative for Parole, and he will address the group later.

(5) We have been most fortunate during the past year to establish a cooperative working agreement with the Columbia University Law School. One of the first jobs that they have done is to complete a very comprehensive revision of several chapters of the Handbook on Interstate Crime Control. This leads to the question of whether there should be a new publication of the Handbook. The agenda for today's meeting contains a discussion of this matter.

(6) Last year we discussed at some length the desirability of Congressional action to permit joinder by Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia in the compact. We are sorry to report that the bill for this purpose, H.R. 5699, died at the current session of Congress. We will seek a re-introduction when the new Congress convenes and we hope that all administrators will take a special effort to write to Congress urging enactment of the bill.
(7) At last year's meeting there was discussion of cooperation with federal authorities in picking up prisoners at convenient locations, and also of whether there was any federal law which required that a man be returned to the state or area from which he was taken into custody. We have received pertinent information on these matters and they will be reported to you during the course of the meeting.

(8) We have tried to give you brief information on the progress of the states in operating under the Uniform Reciprocal Enforcement of Support Act. We are glad to report that more states have acted in this field, and there are now 47 states (all except Nevada) plus five other jurisdictions with such legislation on the books. A nation-wide conference on the operation of the reciprocal support laws will be held under the auspices of the Council of State Governments in Pittsburgh on November 4-5 and any and all of you would be most welcome.

(9) In the field of new uniform crime control legislation there are some recent developments. The Standard Probation and Parole Act of the National Probation and Parole Association is almost ready for promulgation. We have developed a revision of the act for joint return of violators. We are hard at work on a new compact for juveniles and on one for joint institutionalization of women prisoners. We have prepared an act for the regulation of hypnotic and semisynthetic drugs. All of these matters will be brought to your attention during the course of this meeting.

(10) In accordance with your directive, we have printed and distributed the revised forms for use under the compact and they form Chapter 3 of the Manual For Administrators. The changes in Chapter 2 (Digest of Interpretations) ordered at last year's meeting have been incorporated, and we have revised the pages of the Manual which deal with Canadian cooperation.

(11) In connection with the statistics on the interstate movement of parolees and probationers, we would like to draw to your attention the fact that only 36 of the 48 states have sent in their data. The summarization will be delayed until the remaining replies are received. We request that all who have not done so, please send in the statistics as soon as possible.

(12) An up to date roster of official administrators of the compact has been bound into the agenda for this meeting. Be sure to let us know if you would like to have a fairly large number to distribute in your state. A note to the secretary any time during the meeting will suffice. Also, we have a last minute agenda suggestion which we would like to talk over with you now, namely that we prepare the next such roster with additional information showing the telephone number of the compact administrator. If this is viewed with favor, we may as well get your telephone numbers from you today and tomorrow.

(13) We would like to draw to your attention the special manual on the compact which has been prepared by New York. Only a few of the states have undertaken such brochures in the past, and we commend it to your attention as a method of getting compact operations better known within your states. It is an excellent educational medium.

(14) At the last two annual meetings we have found it to be helpful if the group will express an informal opinion as to the best time and place for the next year's meeting. A discussion of this point is scheduled for your final business session, and we feel sure that the new Executive Committee will appreciate the group's comments on this matter.

In conclusion, we would again like to repeat our oft-repeated statement that the Council of State Governments greatly enjoys its association with all of you. As the service agency of all the states, solely supported by the states, it is our major task to do those things that our affiliated groups need to have done.
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
United States Board of Parole
Washington

September 9, 1954

Mr. B. E. Cribbfield
The Council of State Governments
Eastern Regional Office
522 Fifth Avenue
New York 36, New York

Dear Mr. Cribbfield:

This is to inform you that, as a result of my returning to New York University and work with the American Law Institute, I shall no longer be associated with the United States Board of Parole after the 10th of this month. This decision was dictated by necessity and I have regretted leaving the work here, and I regret also that it means I shall not have an opportunity to continue to represent the Board with the Association on the Interstate Compact. Presumably a successor will be appointed from the membership of the Board to carry on with the compact.

I am much in sympathy with the purposes of the Association and pleased with the results that you have been able to attain. While I have not had an opportunity for direct association myself with the group, I am sure that you will be interested to know that during the period of my chairmanship of the Board we have worked out a new set of Rules and Regulations that should be published in the not-too-distant future. Among other matters this includes a statement of revised policy on the handling of detainers that is as closely in line with the policy statements of the Association as we have been able to bring it. The statement is attached. I am sure you will understand that the handling of detainers on a federal level has some special problems. At the penitentiary level it is not unusual to find as much as twenty-five percent of the population with detainers and in one institution these number from one up to seventeen detainers on individuals. The new Board has not considered the presence of one or more detainers a bar to parole and has already paroled a considerable number of state detainers. It may be worth pointing out that one difficulty we face in making such decisions lies in the fact that different jurisdictions have quite different policies in handling cases that have been so paroled; whether they will bring cases to trial, will reinprison, will go along with joint parole, etc. It is frequently difficult or impossible to determine that a given jurisdiction will do. However, I do think we are moving in the right direction.

Sincerely yours,

Sgd.

Paul W. Tappan, Chairman
POLICIES REGARDING DETAINERS *

United States Board of Parole

"Policy and practice of the Board is in general accord with the principles recommended by the Association of Administrators of the Interstate Compact for the Supervision of Parolees and Probationers:"

1. The status of detainers held against prisoners in Federal institutions will be investigated, so far as is reasonably possible, prior to parole hearings.

2. In appropriate cases summary information regarding institutional adjustment of such prisoners will be provided to state or local authorities.

3. Where a detainer is not lifted, the Board may grant to such detainer if a prisoner is considered in other respects to be a good parole risk. Ordinarily, however, the Board will grant to such detainer only if the status of that detainer has been investigated.

4. The Board will cooperate in working out arrangements for concurrent supervision with other jurisdictions where this is feasible and where release on parole appears to be justified.

5. Where Federal parole violator detainers have been imposed upon prisoners in state and local institutions, information will be welcomed from the authorities to determine appropriate disposition of such detainers.

"The Board holds that the presence of a detainer may not be of itself a valid reason for the denial of parole. It is weighed with other factors in arriving at Board decisions. It is recognized that where the prisoner appears to be a good parole risk, there may be distinct advantage in granting parole despite a detainer. One such advantage is that even where the prisoner may then be held on such detainer and perhaps re-imprisoned, he is thereby enabled to start service on the subsequent sentence at an earlier date."

Parole to Immigration Detainers

"Immigration detainers differ from others in some important respects. They differ procedurally in that such detainers are not lifted generally unless there is a subsequent determination that the prisoner is not deportable. Also under the Administrative rules of the Immigration and Naturalization Service (established in its Directive 56204 of February 15, 1950), it is the policy of the Service not to accept custody where parole has been granted "for deportation only" until arrangements have been completed for deportation of the individual involved. In accordance with this Directive the Service will accept custody of prisoners released on "general parole" or under conditional release and may, at its discretion, enlange such individuals on bond.

"It is the view of the Board that there are three types of cases involving immigration detainers. They shall be handled in the following ways:

1. Prisoners who should be retained in prison so long as is permissible under their sentences. Such cases will be conditionally released after parole denial to the custody of the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

2. Prisoners who merit parole but should be retained in the custody of the Prison Bureau until arrangements have been completed for their deportation. Such cases will be paroled for deportation only.

3. Prisoners who are deemed appropriate for release into community supervision, though they may eventually be deported under the detainers filed against them. Such cases will be paroled generally. Immigration authorities will be notified of such general paroles, as in other forms of release, and the effective dates of release as established by the Orders of the Board."

* From Policies, Regulations and Procedures of the U.S. Board of Parole.
REPORT OF THE AUDITING COMMITTEE

We, the undersigned auditors, have examined the accounts of the Honorable Francis R. Bridges, Jr., Treasurer of the Association, and find that receipts and disbursements are in accordance with his annual report as submitted at the annual meeting.

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 $1,455.70 as of June 30, 1954.

Signed: G. I. Giardini
Walter Hofmann
Auditors R. W. Hobzin
Chicago, Illinois, October 24, 1954

CAPITAL CITY NATIONAL BANK
of Tallahassee
Tallahassee, Florida
July 1, 1954

Mr. Francis R. Bridges
P. O. 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 June 30, 1954 is $1,455.70.

Sincerely yours,

Fred N. Lowry
RESOLUTIONS
NINTH ANNUAL MEETING

I.

WHEREAS, it continues to be the sincere conviction of the Compact Administrators that regular attendance at the Annual Meetings of this Association has furthered closer cooperation and strengthened the relationships between states, which in turn has much more effectively implemented the provisions of the Compact and has improved the supervision of parolees and probationers with all its attendant benefits;

BE IT RESOLVED, that this Association respectfully request the Governor of each State to assure representation of his State at the 1955 Annual Meeting of this organization; and,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a copy of this resolution be sent to each Governor.

II.

WHEREAS, in certain cases families of inmates have been informed directly or indirectly by investigating officers that the inmate was likely to come home under out-of-state parole supervision despite the fact that the receiving state had not yet agreed to supervise the case; and

WHEREAS, in certain cases inmates have been advised of the contents of investigating reports, and many obvious problems have resulted;

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Compact Administrators strongly oppose the violation of the confidential nature of records which are interchanged between states by the disclosure of their contents to the inmate or his family in any manner except through official channels.

III.

WHEREAS, the Parole and Probation Compact Administrators’ Association has been continuously concerned with the policy of the Federal Parole Board with regard to detainers and other matters of mutual concern; and,

WHEREAS, the Association had previously requested the Attorney General of the United States to authorize the regular attendance of a representative of the Federal Parole Board at the Annual Meeting of the Association;

BE IT RESOLVED, That the Compact Administrators’ Association is highly appreciative of the response of the Attorney General to the request mentioned; and,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Association is deeply grateful for the attendance of Sevovel Richardson, Chairman of the United States Parole Board, and for his statement of the change in policy relative to detainers and regular attendance at our meetings, which will prove exceedingly helpful in resolving mutual problems.
IV.

WHEREAS, the Parole and Probation Compact Administrators' Association has heretofore endorsed the formation of a compact on juveniles; and,

WHEREAS, the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges has manifested an interest in such a compact by honoring our meeting with two representatives;

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Compact Administrators' Association reaffirms its previous action supporting such a juvenile compact; and,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Association expresses its deep gratitude to the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges for their interest, and to the Honorable Frank H. Bieck and the Honorable Thomas E. Kluczynski for meeting with our Association and so ably participating in the discussion of the many phases of the problem.

V.

WHEREAS, The Council of State Governments and the Association's legal consultant have rendered diligent efficient and valuable service to this Association continuously throughout the year;

BE IT RESOLVED, that our Association extends its sincere appreciation to Ervand Cribbfield, Jane Parks and Mitchell Wendell.

VI.

WHEREAS, the Administrators of the Interstate Compact have profited immensely from the report regarding the Standard Probation and Parole Act by Mr. Milton Rector, Parole Director for the National Probation and Parole Association; and

WHEREAS, they have also profited immensely from the reports by Mr. Herbert Wiltsie of the Council of State Governments regarding suggested legislation on barbiturates, and the discussion at the South Central Conference on Women Prisoners of a proposed compact on incarceration of women prisoners;

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Parole and Probation Compact Administrators' Association record its sincere appreciation for the enlightening presentations of these programs.
REPORT OF THE NOMINATION COMMITTEE

PAROLE AND PROBATION COMPACT ADMINISTRATORS' ASSOCIATION

OFFICERS—1954—1955

PRESIDENT: Charles P. Chow, Virginia
VICE PRESIDENT: J. C. Copeland, Indiana
TREASURER: Francis R. Bridges, Jr., Florida
SECRETARIAT: Council of State Governments

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (In addition to the officers)

Irma Walsh, Kansas
Norman S. Haynor, Washington
H. M. Randall, Oregon
R. W. Bobzin, Iowa
James K. Hepbron, Maryland
John V. Woodhull, Vermont

MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL: L. E. Stephens, Alabama, CHAIRMAN
Donald W. Fankar, Missouri
Joseph H. Hagan, Rhode Island
Richard C. Neissner, Nebraska
Gordon S. Jacob, Minnesota

Respectfully submitted,

L. E. Stephens
Richard Neissner
Keith Wilson
Charles Crow
John Woodhull