

- (4) It is more difficult to comment on the criticism that the proposed institution lacks flexibility. In some respects the institution is designed with a particular view to flexibility. The Committee notes that the three "activities buildings" can all be extended, that the workshops building is apparently designed so as to allow considerable freedom of internal alteration, and that the design and placing of the cell units is such that space for day rooms or interview rooms can be increased by the removal of cells. It is also claimed for the design that it provides for maximum flexibility in grouping for purposes of segregation, although we think it only fair to note that this claim has been challenged. The Committee has serious doubts whether the building is adaptable to evolving program needs in accordance with developments in correctional philosophy and questions whether it would readily allow for any program that presupposes relatively free and uninterrupted inmate movement.

If this is all that there were to consider, the Committee is inclined to the view that there should be a basic and detailed re-examination of the standard design for a maximum security institution proposed by the Canadian Penitentiary Service before any further construction is allowed to proceed. There are, however, other considerations.

It has been impressed upon the Committee that there is an urgent need for an early start on another maximum security institution to relieve overcrowding at the St. Vincent de Paul and Kingston Penitentiaries. The Committee did hear evidence that the inmate population at Kingston Penitentiary has been reduced, that medium security institutions are not operating to full capacity and that the opening of the Warkworth institution will further relieve the pressure of population. There is some evidence also, that the estimated percentage of inmates requiring maximum security custody as expressed in the ten-year program on which the Canadian Penitentiary Service building plans are based is too high. Nevertheless, the Committee thinks that the case for an early start on one additional maximum security institution has been made. The Committee is informed that the preparation of a new design would take a considerable time to complete. The Committee has heard estimates that vary between one to three years.

However, we have no hesitation in recommending a basic review before any consideration is given to constructing additional maximum security institutions in accordance with this design, as is apparently contemplated under the ten-year plan of institutional development. To begin with, the Committee has serious reservations about the design itself. Secondly, the Committee is concerned that the estimated percentage of inmates requiring maximum security custody may be too high. Under the ten-year plan, this segment of the inmate population is estimated at 32 percent. The Committee notes that the *Manual of Correctional Standards* of the American Correctional Association, which lists a number of leading Canadian authorities as contributors and consultants, express doubt "if real maximum security facilities are needed for more than 15 percent of an unselected prison population". The Committee appreciates that the inmate population in the penitentiary system is in some respects unique in that the system receives only offenders sentenced to imprisonment for periods of two years or more, so that it is not "an unselected prison population". However, the Committee thinks that more evidence is required to account for a difference between 15 percent and the Canadian Penitentiary Service estimate of 32 percent. Authoritative evidence has been received by the Committee that would indicate that developments in the correctional field are moving at such