

what we require in our community assessment. A copy of such a contract could be given to each of you, I am sure.

Senator Thompson: I am more interested in the qualifications of the person making the investigation. What are the standards you set for that?

Mr. Miller: No, I am sorry. I now understand you. We do not insist that they have any particular qualifications.

Senator Thompson: Why?

Mr. Miller: Because across the board, in the general view that we have, from anywhere in the community can arise a way of helping in this field. A particular kind of agency may not have what we would call a professional type of employee, but it can be very supportive and we would be giving them the cases in which they could be supportive.

Senator Thompson: Do you have qualifications for your parole officers before you hire them?

Mr. Miller: Indeed, we do.

Senator Thompson: Then, since 50 per cent of the people are going to be with the after-care agencies, why do you not require qualifications for their staff?

Mr. Miller: Our qualifications are set for us under the Public Service Commission Standards and in negotiation. The essence of this co-operation with the community is to be sufficiently flexible to allow for different kinds of things.

Senator Thompson: I am concerned about the qualifications of people who are handling the ex-offender. We all want to get community support, but I am talking about where public money is given to the personnel of these agencies, and you have no qualifications that you demand of the after-care agencies.

Mr. Miller: That is right. We do not have those qualifications.

Senator Quart: Mr. Chairman, I know very little about this aspect of the subject, but, since there are different standards in different agencies as regards case workers or after care and so on, would it not be better to have employees in the department who would be more qualified to deal with these cases and not deal with any agencies at all? Or is there some advantage in having outside agencies that for other reasons I know nothing about? Perhaps there are contacts or something of that kind.

Mr. Street: Well, that is a rather delicate question.

Senator Quart: Do not feel you have to answer it.

Mr. Street: We have been told to give 50 per cent to the agencies. The agencies vary from very good to not very good. For the reasons mentioned, it is not feasible to insist on as high standards as we would insist on in our own service. Most of our men have masters' degrees in social sciences. At any rate, we have been told to give 50 per cent, and we have to deal with it the best way we can. If it is a very difficult case we can supervise it ourselves, but we do have to give 50 per cent to people outside.

Senator Fergusson: Mr. Chairman, is this not a matter of policy? We can hardly require an answer from Mr. Street on questions of policy. If the minister were here we could put questions to him on this, but I do not see why we should ask Mr. Street these questions.

The Deputy Chairman: It was a rather detailed question which perhaps involved policy, but Mr. Street is giving us the reasons that they do this. Perhaps there are one or two questions which would make the matter clearer. For example, am I correct in assuming, Mr. Street, that the reason you use these private agencies and do not insist too much on high professional standards is that, particularly in smaller communities, you are better off with something than with nothing? Is it not also true that the astronomical cost of supplying staff in places that would not require staff could not be justified?

Mr. Street: Those are good points, senator. Certainly, there are small towns where there would be no use in having either a parole office or a parole officer. There would not be sufficient numbers of cases to justify that. In those places you need somebody else's help. Usually, however, the after-care agencies for the most part have their offices in the centres in which we have ours. They have them in the larger centres. They do not always cover the small towns either, presumably for the same reasons that we do not, although I should say that in some places they do have what they call a volunteer supervisor, who is a person with no particular qualifications but who is interested in the work and does it for them.

Even if we were allowed to, we could never put parole officers in all of the different places, but where we do not have offices we do try to get someone else, such as a provincial probation officer. That would answer that, because in a little town like Wetaskiwin, in Alberta, there are not enough paroles to justify an office, but we have to do the best we can.

Senator Thompson: Mr. Street, I think I speak for all here when I say that we have a high admiration for the way you have tackled this very tough job.

Mr. Street: Thank you.

Senator Thompson: What do you think has been the greatest asset for you in assuming this position so far as your background is concerned? Was it your experience as a magistrate, for example? What do you think has helped you the most?

Mr. Street: In my personal background?

Senator Thompson: Yes.

Mr. Street: I always had these views about imprisonment when I was a magistrate, and I used to use probation even before we had a probation officer. I always felt strongly about more control in the community and giving discipline that the individual did not get before, and things like that. What I have found useful in this particular job is the fact that I was a magistrate for 11 years and was stuck with the job of deciding and sentencing, and the more I knew of this business the more I realized how difficult that is. It makes it easier for me to go and talk particularly to the chief justices in Canada and the judges of the courts of