

caseworker's time and the costs of administration. An agency contracting for parole supervision may be pressured into minimizing direct contact with the parolee to avoid losing money on the program. If direct contact were to take up all the time paid by contract, there would be no time left for the other necessary work units such as writing reports, travelling to the parolee's home or place of work, making enquiries when problems arise, telephone calls with the parolee, his employer, his family and friends, etc.

After examining the evidence, we can only conclude that the National Parole Service devotes less than an average of three hours per month to direct contact with each parolee and that agencies and services which have contracted with the government for parole supervision, are providing no more. Thus an inmate leaves an institution where he was under guard 24 hours per day to be in direct contact with a parole officer for less than an average of 3 hours per month. It is clear that the system devotes too little time in direct contact supervision to meet the challenge it faces. Staff resources must therefore, either be increased or relieved of other functions in order to devote more time to the more important function of supervision.⁸

Private After-Care Agencies

The Fauteux and Ouimet Reports both described the role of private agencies in the field of corrections generally and in parole in particular.⁹ Over the years, the growth of the private after-care agencies has paralleled the increased demand for services through the greater use of probation and parole. The Outerbridge Report documented the involvement and contribution of private agencies in developing community residential centres for released offenders.¹⁰ The importance of the role of private agencies in these developments is recognized.

Nevertheless, representatives of private after-care agencies who appeared before this Committee shared a common uneasiness. The agencies observed the expansion of the public service sector of the parole system from two parole district offices in 1956 to more than thirty in 1974. Expansion of provincial parole services, where they exist, is less dramatic but still leaves private agencies wondering whether they will be pushed out of the parole supervision field by public agencies. Their portion of the work has been gradually dwindling over the years to the point where they are now supervising less than twenty-five per cent of the cases.¹¹ Their anxiety appears justified. The development of public agencies in recent years has left the private agencies behind and the gap between them is widening.

The Committee noted the important contribution of private after-care agencies in the parole system and considers that their involvement must be maintained. They are an effective channel for public participation that should not be weakened. At a time when parole and other correctional programs are being attacked, greater effort must be made to encourage citizens to participate in these programs. If our proposals are adopted, there will be more opportunities for people to become directly involved.

While we cannot arbitrarily decide what portion of parole supervision responsibilities should be assigned to private agencies, we are concerned about the small fraction of the