

Queen's University, Kingston; Dr. N. L. Freedman, Department of Psychology, Queen's University, Kingston; Mr. W. A. Brister, Governor, Morton Hall, Borstal Institution, Swinderby, Lincoln, England; Mr. Clarence B. Litchfield, Architect, New York City, N.Y.

The Committee also had the benefit of certain materials that were made available for its assistance, namely:—a Brief submitted by the Canadian Corrections Association (printed as an Appendix to the Proceedings); an "Evaluation of the Design for Maximum Security Prisons Developed by the Canadian Penitentiary Service" prepared by the Canadian Committee on Corrections, bearing date November 10, 1966, and containing a detailed sketch of an alternative design prepared by Mr. H. B. Kohl; a memorandum to the Solicitor General from the Commissioner of Penitentiaries, bearing date November 29, 1966, replying to criticisms of the Canadian Penitentiary Service design contained in the "Evaluation" prepared by the Canadian Committee on Corrections; a model and working plans of the proposed Canadian Penitentiary Service design; certain films prepared by the Canadian Penitentiary Service; and slides demonstrating the alternative design prepared by Mr. Kohl.

The Committee wishes to emphasize the peculiar difficulty with which it is presented by this reference. Architectural design, especially as it relates to prison architecture, is a highly specialized field. The Committee was informed that only a very few architects in North America are recognized as experts in the field of prison architecture. The design for a maximum security institution that is proposed by the Canadian Penitentiary Service is strenuously opposed by representatives of both the Canadian Corrections Association and the Canadian Committee on Corrections. It is similarly opposed by one prison architect, and apparently viewed with something less than enthusiasm by another. In the latter case, the architect is a recognized expert in the field. In the circumstances, therefore, the Committee finds itself placed in the role of adjudicator.

It is common ground that opinions among architects as to what is desirable may differ. Further, we are told that a proper assessment of any prison design can only be obtained from long and intimate association between an architect and the planning authority. To this extent any "outside" expert is at a disadvantage, and assessment or criticism offered by him must be viewed with some measure of caution. At the same time, a prison design of necessity reflects—implicitly if not explicitly—the correctional philosophy that it is intended to embody. There comes a point, therefore, at which it is a particular correctional philosophy itself that is in issue. This does not mean that the difficulties are removed, for here also the questions to be resolved are in the domain of experts—experts whose opinions once again differ.

In assessing the Canadian Penitentiary Service design, it is important to bear in mind that the maximum security institution is to be one of a complex of integrated and contiguous institutions. This complex, in addition to the maximum security institution, is to consist of a regional reception centre, a medium security institution, a minimum security institution, a special correctional unit and a medical psychiatric centre. There are immediate design implications to this plan. This explains why it is considered practicable to arrange for food preparation outside the institution. It explains the absence of a reception and classification unit in the design. It is also offered as some explanation as to why the separation of the hospital from the offices of the clinical staff is not considered inherently objectionable, for under the plan as it is conceived, services that would otherwise be provided to clinical personnel by the hospital will be provided by the medical psychiatric unit outside the institution. A further implication is that the special correctional unit will remove from the maximum