

The Future of Federal Probation¹

Henry P. Chandler

(Former) Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts

IT DOES NOT seem likely that there will be any substantial change in the present functions of federal probation officers in the next 25 years. These functions are principally presentence investigation and the supervision of persons on probation and parole.

Presentence Investigation and Supervision

In the beginning of federal probation officers were concerned almost exclusively with the supervision of persons on probation and parole. The courts soon found, however, that it was helpful to them in deciding what sentence to impose, to have full information from the probation officers concerning the personality and associations of the offenders and an estimate of their capacity for rehabilitation. So the courts came to require presentence investigations and reports in a large proportion of the cases of conviction of crime. Rule 32c of the Rules of Criminal Procedure requires this unless the court otherwise directs. In the fiscal year 1949 a total of 23,704 investigations were made, of which 14,921 were presentence investigations, 7,261 were investigations of civilian prisoners preliminary to their parole from prison, and 1,522 were similar investigations for the Army for which the probation officers serve as parole agents. The number of persons under supervision in the same year was 29,726, of whom 21,557 were probationers, 4,555 were parolees, 2,550 were persons on conditional release, and 1,064 were parolees from the Army.

Relation of Probation Officers to the Courts in Presentence Investigations

There is a substantial difference between the position of probation officers in presentence investigations and in supervision. In making presentence investigations they assemble and present the facts pertinent to the offender for the consideration of the court. Some courts desire a recommendation of action from the probation officers and some do not. In either case the task calls for a high degree of intelligence on the part of the probation officers in appraising the facts and presenting them in clear, logical, and balanced form. But the responsibility is in the court.

Comparative Independence of Probation Officers in Supervision

In supervision on the other hand, the responsibility for planning and action is in the probation officers, with only an occasional reference to the court or board of parole. The probation officers are really the treatment agents for the persons committed to them, just as the prisons, civil or military, are the agencies for treatment of the offenders in their custody. Generally after a court puts a person on probation he expects the probation officer to take charge of the case and conduct it. The probation officer is largely independent and thrown pretty much on his resources. It is only when there is a substantial violation of the probation and the question arises whether it should be revoked, that the case again comes before the court. Likewise cases of persons on parole, whether civil or military,

are in the hands of the probation officers to be handled according to their judgment, up to the point of substantial breach of the terms of parole. It does not seem likely that this condition will change.

Dual Duty of Probation Officers to Supervise Probationers and Parolees

Another feature of federal probation that seems almost certain to continue is the dual duty of the officers to supervise for the courts persons on probation, and for the board of parole and the Army, paroled prisoners. A generation ago correctional authorities were not inclined to put the supervision of probationers and parolees in the same persons. They were apprehensive that if this was done the stigma of prison would attach to the probationers and the work with them would be less effective. There may still be some opinion of this nature which is not without reason. But in the Federal Government in any event economy makes it necessary to provide in many districts for the supervision of probationers and parolees by the same officers. This is particularly true in districts of large area and sparse population. It would involve unnecessary expense to have two sets of officers ranging over the same territory to supervise probationers and parolees when one could do the work. While it would be possible to make a separation in populous districts if the statute so provided, the present plan for the supervision of probationers and parolees by the same officers has become so firmly imbedded in the law that it does not seem likely that it will change.

¹ This article was first published in the June 1950 issue of *Federal Probation*, which marked the 25th anniversary of the federal probation system.

After all there may not be any intrinsic difference between a man who is sentenced to prison for an offense and another man who for the same offense is put on probation. By and large persons committed to prison are doubtless more confirmed offenders than those who are put on probation, and therefore the task of rehabilitation is more difficult and success in it less likely. This is shown by the generally higher proportion of violations of parole than of probation. But the difference is one of degree and not of kind.

It does not appear from experience that probation officers are handicapped in supervising probationers because they are also supervising parolees unless their work load is too great. And that would be true if their load consisted entirely of probationers. The federal probation officers are asked to give their efforts to probationers and parolees without distinction except upon the basis of their individual needs as persons. There seems every reason to think that this policy will continue.

Now we reach the question raised by the title. What will the next quarter century bring in federal probation, or perhaps rather (because it is difficult to be a prophet) what should we like it to bring? I will put down some of the things that occur to me.

Qualifications of Probation Officers

High among the developments for which I hope, I place more general observance in the appointment of federal probation officers of the standard of qualifications recommended by the Judicial Conference of the United States. This has been the burden of my pleas in annual reports for the last 10 years and consequently I need not spend much time on it. But in my judgment the importance of it can hardly be overestimated.

In 1942 the Judicial Conference, in accordance with the report of a committee of judges which had studied the matter, recommended to the district courts minimum qualifications for probation officers. Among them were:

A liberal education of not less than collegiate grade, evidenced by a bachelor's degree (B.A. or B.S.) from a college of recognized standing, or its equivalent; and

Experience in personnel work for the welfare of others of not less than two years, or two years of specific training for the welfare work (a) in a school of social service of recognized standing, or (b) in a

professional course of a college or university of recognized standing.

In recommending the standards quote, the Judicial Conference only recognized what is obvious, that the work of a probation officer is a professional task; that it requires unusual understanding of the factors of personality, environment, and association that influence human conduct; and that while a faculty for working with people is requisite, this faculty like an aptitude for law or medicine has to be sharpened by training and developed by experience. There are many difficult occupations, but I know of none in the field of the social sciences that seems to me harder or more baffling than that of a probation officer. The personal factors with which he deals are so intangible and elusive that unless he has the knowledge that a wide, general education, study of psychology and sociology, and the aptitude that some experience in working with people to help them can give, he can hardly hope to succeed. There are exceptions to all rules and occasionally an apparently unpromising person may develop into a good probation officer. But for every instance of that kind there are more instances of officers appointed without qualifications for the work, who are a drag upon the system. It is well known that when a court appoints a probation officer, whatever his training or lack of it for probation, the Administrative Office gives to him every help possible and does its best to build him up. That will continue to be the policy. Furthermore, I am proud of the caliber and the devotion of the federal probation officers as a class. I like to quote the observation of Dr. Sheldon Glueck of the Harvard Law School concerning the federal probation officers whom he met at a regional conference at Harvard in June 1942:

But one could not help being greatly encouraged in observing the federal probation officers at the Conference. They gave the impression of dignified, mature, clear-headed and socially minded men; and at the lectures, especially the vital discussions guided by Dr. Arthur E. Fink, they proved emphatically that they were on their intellectual toes.

Nevertheless the fact is that of 108 officers who were appointed in the federal system during the period from January 1, 1943 following the recommendation of qualifications by the Judicial Conference, through December 15, 1949, only 63, or 58.3 percent, met the qualifications of both education and experience,

and 15, or 13 percent, met neither type of qualifications. Nothing else I believe could do so much to lift the federal probation service in effectiveness and public esteem as for the courts to follow uniformly the very reasonable standards for appointment recommended by the Judicial Conference.

Increase in the Number of Probation Officers and Decrease in the Case Load

Through the consideration of the Congress in the annual appropriations, the number of probation officers has been increased in the period of a little more than 10 years since 1939 from 206 to 297, making possible, along with some reduction in the number of convicted offenders in the federal courts in recent years, a decrease in the average case load per officer from 160 at the end of 1939 to 103 at the end of 1949, or approximately 37½ percent. This has been very beneficial. Nevertheless an average case load for supervision, exclusive of presentence and preparole investigations, of 100 persons is recognized by all authorities in the field of corrections to be too much for the best work. Also the load varies widely in different districts and in some districts the load per officer is much above 100 persons.

I am not disposed to be dogmatic in the matter of case load or to set any rigid limit. A great deal naturally depends upon such factors as the nature of the offenders and the seriousness of their criminal tendencies, also the distances which have to be traveled by the officer to see them. But probation is a method of treatment which depends upon individual attention to the persons under supervision. Even in federal prisons where offenders are in custody, more and more effort is being made to study each individual inmate to find out what he needs physically, psychologically, vocationally, and socially to fit him to resume a place in society. Personal service is the sole stock in trade of the probation officer who has neither walls, bars, schools, shops, nor any like facilities. Therefore it would seem unnecessary to labor the point that the number of probation officers should be sufficient to enable them to give a reasonable amount of individual attention to the persons in their charge.

In the discussion of actual probation cases which occurs at the regional probation conferences, again and again it appears that in some crucial situation the probation officer was not in touch with the probationer and could not give the word or help, which might have saved

him from backsliding. On the other hand, probationers who succeeded after many falls were repeatedly and at short intervals helped in times of strain by the probation officer. The probation system with a sufficient staff costs so much less than imprisonment and can save so much in future crime avoided that the economy in the long run of providing for it adequately seems obvious.

Increase of In-Service Training

Regional conferences are held for probation officers in different parts of the country at intervals of 2 or sometimes 3 years. The main feature of the programs is discussions of cases of probation and parole led by most capable teachers of social work in different universities. These are highly beneficial; they give fresh understanding and insight and stimulate the officers in attendance. They are particularly helpful to officers who come from districts in which they work alone. The conferences are limited, however, to 5 days or less. It has long been recognized that something more in the way of in-service training is desirable, especially for new officers but not limited to them.

An experiment in this direction is being inaugurated in the probation office for the Northern District of Illinois. There the court, with the assistance and collaboration of the School of Social Service Administration of the University of Chicago, is setting up a training course in connection with the regular work of the office, for probation officers in the Midwest, who may wish to take it and whose courts may approve. It will be under the charge of the recently appointed chief probation officer, Mr. Ben S. Meeker who, following a period of service in the probation office of the district, has had a number of years of experience as a teacher in the field of social work at the University of Indiana.

Newly appointed officers in the district and officers coming to the district from other districts with the approval of their courts, will receive instruction in probation administration in which members of the faculty of the University of Chicago will co-operate. They will also do actual casework under special supervision. Chicago, because of its central location, is especially well adapted for a training center for a wide area. If the results after a period of experience bear out the promise of the plan, it may be that later similar centers can be provided for in a very few other strategic locations.

Separation of Probation from Imprisonment

A practice has been followed in some districts which is declining, of sentencing offenders to probation for an offense following a term of imprisonment on another count. This practice is inconsistent with the nature of probation as a method of treating offenders without custody. Practically it has a number of disadvantages and tends to weaken probation for the persons without prison experience for whom it is most efficacious.

Persons put on probation following a term in prison almost always resent it. They feel that they have paid the penalty for their crime in their imprisonment and that the added imposition is unjust. Also probation in these cases is frequently used by the court as a means of policing the offenders after their release from prison. They take the time and energy of the probation officers from those who receive simple probation and give more prospect of rehabilitation. Parole is a more appropriate means of providing for the transition of an offender from prison to the world outside for persons who have served terms in prison.

Some judges who make excellent use of probation consider that occasionally it is salutary even for a person who is put on probation to impose also a short jail sentence. This, as they express it, is to give the man a "jolt" and bring home to him that crime does not pay. They say that after he realizes this, he accepts probation cheerfully and co-operates with it. With all deference the advisability of such a policy seems very dubious. The contaminating effects of confinement and association with other offenders in even the best jails are likely to be so serious that if a man is a fit subject for probation, it would seem to be better to give him probation alone and not run the risk of even a short term in jail or prison. Certainly the practice of imposing probation after a substantial prison sentence in order to provide for checking up on the conduct of the offender is far removed from the primary concept of probation which is, through personal, friendly guidance, to help the offender change his attitude and adapt himself to the society in which he lives. It is therefore to be hoped that the practice of so-called "mixed" sentences, which have been and to some extent still are an appendage of probation in some districts, may go into disuse.

Jurisdiction Over Probation in Case of Removal from One District to Another

It is fairly common for a probationer to move with the approval of the court from the district in which he was tried to another district. Thus of 13,048 probationers received for supervision in the fiscal year 1949, 2,791 or something over 21% came by transfer from another district. Until 1948 when this happened the probation officer of the second district supervised the probationer while he was there, but as the agent of the court which placed the offender on probation. The court of the second district had nothing to do with the case. If the probationer misbehaved and the question came up whether probation should be revoked, all that the probation officer could do was to report to the officer of the district from which the probationer came and await instructions from that district. If it was decided to hold a hearing on the question of revocation of probation, the probationer with any witnesses to his misconduct while on probation had to be transported back to the district of trial.

This lessened the influence of the probation officer in the second district on the probationer because his control was indirect and action took some time even when the court of the first district was willing to act. Sometimes it appeared that after the probationer left the district in which he was tried, the court for that district was not greatly concerned with what he did somewhere else. The probationer was almost free as a practical matter from control by any court. Supervision of the probation officer in the district where he was could not be very effective.

A few years ago District Judge Thomas C. Trimble, of the Eastern District of Arkansas, suggested that when a probationer goes from one district to another, jurisdiction over him, if the courts of both districts approve, be transferred to the court of the second district. A law of this nature was enacted in 1948 and incorporated in substance in the revised Criminal Code (18 U.S.C. 3653) by a statute (approved May 24, 1949) correcting various inadvertent omissions and errors in the original revision.

It cannot fail to make for greater effectiveness in the administration of probation to give direct control of any probationer to the probation officer and the court of the district where the probationer is. After an offender is placed on probation, any question of revocation is

to be determined on the basis of his conduct while in that status. Consequently it is desirable that a probationer in any given district should be amenable to the court of that district, whether he was placed on probation by that court or by another. The probation officer should be able to deal with persons under his charge in the district in the same way irrespective of the district of origin of the probationer.

The law properly makes the transfer of jurisdiction dependent upon the consent of the courts of both districts, because after all the matter is one for the discretion of the courts. It is to be hoped, however, that courts will generally exercise their discretion to give jurisdiction to the court of the district where the probationer is, and do so promptly whenever it appears that he is permanently moving from one district to another. This is necessary in order to give to the probation officer of the second district the support which he needs for good results.

Oversight by the Courts of Probation Supervision

I have said earlier that in the supervision of probationers and also parolees, a probation officer acts pretty much independently and is his own master. In large probation offices with a number of officers, if they are well organized, office policies are developed through conferences and general direction by the chief probation officer. Even there the supervision is conducted generally independently of the courts served except in the case of misconduct of probationers giving rise to the question of revocation and a hearing on that question.

I am convinced that it would be helpful to the probation administration if the courts would give somewhat more attention to the conduct of the probation offices and from time to time hold conferences with the staffs at which general policies could be discussed. Frequently questions arise long before conditions develop to the point of revocation of probation, in which it might be helpful to the probation officers to have the benefit of the views and advice of the judges on the policies involved. Such conferences would also give to the judges more understanding of the practical problems that come up, and be helpful to them in deciding the question of giving or withholding probation in other cases. Judge Henry N. Graven of the Northern District of Iowa, who makes it a practice to follow the progress of probationers in his district, lays emphasis on the latter aspect. He writes in the December 1949 issue of *Federal Probation* that, "Such a study has been helpful to me in

deciding whether to grant probation and what to do in the matter of revoking, continuing, or extending probation."

I realize that most federal judges are hard pressed with their judicial work. It is only natural that they should think that when the court has a probation officer, he should take care of probation and they should not have to be bothered with it. But in probation, unlike imprisonment, the responsibility for the treatment is in the court. Over the country something like a third of the persons convicted of crime in the federal courts are being placed on probation. The wise or unwise handling of these persons during probation may have a great deal to do with their conduct during the rest of their lives and with the prevention of new crimes on their part. It also affects the respect for the court on the part of the public. In view of this it would seem that time given by the judges to occasional conferences with their probation officers or staffs, at which the officers would have an opportunity to report what was happening in the probation administration and to obtain the advice of the judges upon difficulties encountered, would be well spent.

Such conferences need not be held often and probably would not take more than a few hours in the course of the year. I see possibilities in them of aiding the judgment of probation officers and giving to them a sense of support by the courts which would greatly strengthen them in the discharge of their duties, arduous enough at the best. I hope that collaboration between the probation staffs and the judges along this line may develop in the coming years.

More Objective Studies of the Subsequent Records of Probationers

Until recently the only evidence of the success of federal probation in terms of conduct of probationers related to the period prior to their discharge from probation. At the present time about seven out of every eight persons, who are placed on probation by the federal courts, make good during that period. They are then, however, under supervision and there are safeguards against reversion into crime which are lifted on their discharge. It is a fair question which has been raised sometimes in hearings on appropriations for the probation service before appropriations committees of the House of Representatives, what kind of a record do probationers make after they are through with probation? Particularly

do they continue to behave themselves as law-abiding citizens, or do they relapse into crime?

It has always seemed reasonable to suppose that persons who succeeded in probation extended over a substantial period and kept free of crime while in that status would continue to do so. But there is no inductive evidence of this, nothing beyond the probability in the abstract. A study is now in progress of the records of probationers discharged by the District Court for the Northern District of Alabama, which furnishes knowledge on the point for that area. The study is being made by Dr. Morris G. Caldwell, professor of sociology in the University of Alabama, with the collaboration of the probation staff for that district. While it is not yet completed, it has gone far enough to show that of the 403 persons completely studied, the number who committed felonies in periods ranging from 5½ years to 11½ years following the completion of probation was only 8, or 2%, and the number who were free from subsequent convictions of any kind, either felonies or misdemeanors, was 337, or 83.6 percent. If offenses not involving moral turpitude, such as breach of traffic regulations, were subtracted, the proportion with clean records in the years following their discharge from probation would be higher.

The facts disclosed by this study are gratifying. It would not be safe, however, to generalize too broadly from the results in one district. It is desirable that a number of similar studies be made in different parts of the country. Two others are now under way: one under the direction of the University of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia, and one under the direction of the University of Maryland in Baltimore. The more objective evidence we can get whether probation succeeds or not, the better it will be. If, as we think, such evidence will show a considerable success for this method of treatment, it will powerfully support the case for adequate appropriations. If it does not, we equally want to know that in order that we may re-examine the procedure to find out what is wrong with it, and try to correct it.

Assistance from Community Agencies

No probation officer and no group of officers in a large probation office can have within themselves the resources for dealing with the multifarious problems that arise in probation. The only way that a probation officer or staff can accomplish the maximum results is to draw on the help of whatever agencies are in the community. In many localities, not only

large cities but rural areas in which there is a good community organization, they may be many and effective.

A probation officer in supervising a probationer works not only with the person but with his family and becomes a kind of mentor not only for the individual but the group. He comes against physical disease, mental difficulty, addiction to liquor or drugs, lack of education, inability to work, marital tensions, all of which affect the conduct of the probationer. There may be difficulties in any one of these fields and many others that need to be resolved if the probation officer is to have the slightest chance of helping the probationer to take his part in the world. That means that he needs to resort to clinics and hospitals for medical aid, to obtain the advice or service of psychiatrists, to secure vocational counsel, to bring into play the assistance of pastors, and in general to find in any situation the person or agency with the special knowledge and experience, usually professional, to meet it. The ability of a probation officer thus to draw on the community is especially important because of the large case load which in general federal probation officers are carrying. Much is being done in this way in many districts, but I believe that in the country as a whole there is opportunity for a much larger use of community helps, and I hope that it will be developed.

Alert probation officers are doing what they can to make their work known to the people of their districts. They make speeches about it and have articles printed in their local newspapers when they have a chance. Particularly they try to make it known to employers and to show to employers that probationers whom they recommend can be good employees.

Employment for Probationers and Parolees

The mention of employment touches upon what we all recognize as one of the most difficult and at the same time one of the most essential requisites for rehabilitation; that is, work. Employers quite naturally are disinclined to employ men with criminal records. With many the mere fact that a man has such a record, without any consideration of the individual circumstances, is enough to bar him from employment. During the recent war and before it when manpower was scarce and production was at a premium, this prejudice was to a considerable extent overcome. The War Production Board issued a letter referring to the need to utilize the productive power of all persons who were fit, and urging that if

an applicant for employment seemed suitable at the time notwithstanding a past criminal record he be employed.

It was formerly a rule of the United States Civil Service Commission that nobody who had been convicted of a felony could be employed in government work until the expiration of 2 years after his release from prison or discharge from probation. During the war the Commission modified this to permit the employment of persons convicted of federal offenses upon a recommendation of the probation officer in the case of probationers, or of the warden of the institution in the case of inmates of institutions, except in positions offering temptations to dishonesty like those involving the handling of money. Not many months ago after an apparent recession from the liberal war policy, the Civil Service Commission re-adopted substantially that policy.

For a number of years employment has been high. During this time many employers, who formerly would not have a man with a criminal record in their shops, have found that such men who are properly vouched for can be reliable workers and have been employing them. Part of the credit for this is due to the care of probation officers in recommending for employment only probationers or parolees whom they believe to be good risks.

Now employment is becoming scarcer. It is not unlikely that in the months ahead it may become more difficult for men with criminal records, even when recommended by the probation officers, to secure work. But in instances in which the probation officers have won the confidence of employers in their recommendations, it seems not too much to hope for that something of the more liberal attitude which was built up during the war will continue. Certainly probation officers can do few things that will help them more in their work than to win and maintain understanding and friendly relations with the managers of industries and personnel and employment officers in their communities.

Judicial Finding of Rehabilitation of Probationers

In California and a few other states laws have been passed providing that when a probationer fulfills the terms of his probation and is discharged he may apply to the court and, if the court finds that by his conduct he has merited it, the court may make a finding that he has shown capacity for leading a law-abiding life and vacate the judgment of conviction. Such laws may help to meet the difficult situation in

which the probationer finds himself when he is asked whether he has ever been convicted of a crime. Of course there is only one answer that he can truthfully make, and that is yes. That is true even if there is a law of the nature mentioned. But if he has a certificate from the court that he properly served his probation, and that his character is restored, it should carry weight with a reasonable employer who is concerned with the present trustworthiness of the man before him rather than the question whether he committed a crime at some time in the past. There is objection on the part of some persons to such statutes on the ground that when once a court has entered a judgment of conviction it is there, and it is not appropriate for the court to vacate the judgment. Perhaps the purpose could be served almost if not quite as well by a certificate of the court at the time of the offender's discharge that he has conducted himself properly and has shown to the satisfaction of the court that he is a law-abiding citizen.

Voluntary Sponsors of Probationers and Parolees

For extension of the opportunity for employment of probationers and parolees, understanding of the processes of probation and parole and sympathy with them on the part of employers as citizens is important. Probation officers can hardly give too much thought and effort to the development of good public relations in their communities. These may be helpful in yet another way; namely, in procuring the aid of probationers and parolees of men of understanding and large hearts as sponsors in individual cases.

The enlistment of sponsors who can be relied upon is not easy, and it probably is not possible on any large scale. Certainly a probation officer cannot expect to unload his duties on a voluntary sponsor. Nevertheless if probation officers proceed carefully they are likely to find here and there men who are not only willing but desirous to be friends to persons whose greatest need may be just for friendship. The good probation officer in his own person meets this need to a large extent if his attention is not divided among too many persons. But his friendship to a probationer need not and should not stand in the way of the friendship of others who can give help and who the probation officer can see have the wisdom as well as the heart to do it. One of the large service clubs of the country has taken as a special project the helping with counsel and friendship of offenders who want to mend their ways and get back on the right track.

It seems possible and desirable, provided the policy is judiciously developed, to secure a considerable re-enforcement of the probation officers through voluntary sponsorship of particular persons along the lines suggested.

Public Opinion and Appropriations for Probation

Finally, good public relations will be the basis for adequate financial support through appropriations by the Congress for the probation service. A request to an appropriations committee to appropriate more money in order to employ more probation officers or clerks and reduce the case loads, leaves the committee cold unless they become aware of the importance of probation in the prevention of crime, and conscious of a public sentiment that favors adequate financial provision for the probation service.

Conclusion

Apparently the proportion of convicted offenders placed on probation by the federal courts has remained about constant in the last 10 years. It has ranged between 30 and 35

percent. Whether the proportion will increase in the coming years, whether it is desirable that it should increase, I cannot say. Certainly with the present number of probation officers the load is high enough as it is. The continued exercise by judges of care in placing persons on probation so that the probation officers may use their energies on those who give the greatest promise of rehabilitation would seem to be necessary.

Sometimes when we see the commission of fresh offenses by persons who are on probation or parole we tend to get discouraged. Then criticism of probation and parole ensues. But we always need to have in mind that the commission of a criminal offense is the end product of factors of personality and association that began far back, long before the offender came into the courts. We have all had the experience of attending discussions of delinquency, whether juvenile or adult, in which speakers attributed the prevalence of crime to the lack of parental control in youth, the general habit of drinking, or to other detrimental influences in the community. All this may be true, but it does not change the fact

that when an offender comes into court and is convicted, the court has to take him as he is, and do what it can do to convert him into a law-abiding citizen. It cannot change his parentage; it cannot obliterate the damage that may have been done to his character by the gangs of hoodlums with whom he has run. It can, if his offense is sufficiently serious, send him to prison or place him on probation.

There is strong ground for confidence from the experience which has been had, that for a substantial proportion of the offenders convicted in the federal courts population, probation, if properly administered, offers the best prospect of rehabilitating the offender and deterring him from future crime. The present is a time to take heart and go forward. Given probation officers possessing uniformly the requisite qualifications of mind and character, and given a sufficient number of such officers to do a thorough job, we have every reason to expect that federal probation will become stronger and more effective with the passing years. I hope that whoever reviews the record 25 years from now will find that this expectation has come true.