

While our evidence is not conclusive, it suggests that resources deployed for direct contacts with parolees are not sufficient. Many field parole officers in the National Parole Service who were interviewed by Committee staff estimated that they spend sixty to seventy per cent of their time closeted in their offices doing paperwork with no direct contact with clients. Two recent surveys, carried out by the Management Consulting Service, Ministry of the Solicitor General, examined the time National Parole Officers devoted to their various tasks.⁴ The purpose of the studies was to establish the size of the labour force needed for the workload. The finding was that National Parole Service officers, on the average, devoted three hours per month to each case. Parole Service officers must visit the parolees; see them in their office; meet employers, relatives, friends; prepare warrants and investigate breaches of parole conditions; and write progress reports. All these tasks were included in the monthly average of three hours devoted to the individual parolee. It follows that very little of the three hours is direct contact since only the first two tasks involved face-to-face meetings. A detailed analysis of supervision by these parole officers would probably reveal that direct contacts last only a few minutes.

National Parole Service officers often exercise an indirect form of supervision over some individuals while the direct contact is provided by a private agency caseworker or workers in other public agencies such as provincial probation services. The National Parole Service estimated in the 1971 survey that fifteen minutes per month per case was needed but discovered, in the 1973 survey, that each case required thirty minutes per month. There was no indication that officers had any direct contact with the parolee except in special circumstances. Insofar as concerns caseworkers in agencies and services other than the National Parole Service, it appears that here again the larger proportion of the time involves administration while face-to-face interviews absorb only a portion of direct contact supervision.⁵

Contracts between the Solicitor General and private after-care agencies stipulate that the "society shall, in providing parole supervision, provide the requisite degree of supervision according to the needs of the individual (in accordance with the rules in Appendix B)".⁶ With respect to "requisite degree of supervision" and "needs of the individual", the preamble to the Appendix makes the point that the rules are merely guidelines "not restricting flexibility in providing uniquely appropriate service to each individual". In defining contacts, the Appendix states:

The contacts with the parolee will be as frequent as considered necessary depending on the needs and circumstances of each case. They will be more frequent during the first months following the release from an institution; not less than once a month during the whole release period.

The contacts of the supervisor with the parolee will take place either in an office set-up or preferably they should happen also in the home or place of residence of the parolee. Employers should also be contacted unless they are not aware of the status of their employees as parolees. Contacts made through group counselling meetings and community organizations are also encouraged.⁷

There is nothing in the contracts to suggest that private agencies and other public services must provide more direct contact with the parolee than the National Parole Service. In fact, the contracts provide for payment of approximately \$40 per case per month of supervision. The sum will not pay for much more than two or three hours of a