

complaint that the proposed institution is too large for effective correctional procedure, we think it only fair to point out that the proposed inmate population of 432 compares favourably with other institutions of this kind.

The criticisms of the general conception of the proposed maximum security institution are more difficult to assess for the very reason that they are less specific. Nevertheless, the Committee is of the opinion that there is some merit in each of the four general criticisms that were outlined previously. The Committee makes the following observations:

- (1) The manner in which the control of inmate movement is conceived in the institution is likely to have a repressive effect. The opposite view expressed to the Committee was that the width and comparative shortness of the corridors will give a feeling of spaciousness that is less oppressive than results from the longer corridors that are customary in such institutions. The Committee believes that this view fails to take into account the multiplicity of glass enclosed control points that characterizes the design. The Committee thinks also that the complexity of the corridor design can only serve to accentuate inmate awareness of omnipresence of "control".
- (2) It seems evident to the Committee that the Canadian Penitentiary Service design provides for the maximum separation of staff from inmates. All of the evidence that we have heard is to the effect that the tendency in correctional development is to break down unnecessary barriers between inmates and staff as the most hopeful means of effecting personality change. This development is documented in the correctional literature and borne out in experience with maximum security institutions such as Marion, Illinois. The Committee recognizes the need to protect officers from attack. The question is whether protection is to be bought at too high a price in this design. It is relevant to note that the workshop building will apparently contain a "catwalk", presumably to permit an armed guard to preside over work activities. Our information is that no such protection has been built into a federal prison in the United States in over half a century and that "catwalks" in earlier prisons have in most cases been removed. The criticism, therefore, that the design is concerned primarily with "custodial emphasis" seems warranted.
- (3) Specific criticisms concerning program space have been considered above. The Committee has been able to obtain no satisfactory comparative assessment of the overall allocation of space for program purposes, in part because of the multi-purpose use that is apparently contemplated for the workshop building. The Committee is concerned about the approach that the Canadian Penitentiary Service appear to have brought to program planning in relation to architectural design. There seems to have been little attempt made to seek out professional advice concerning the kinds of programming that might serve most effectively to meet the needs of prisoners and what, architecturally, might be desirable to facilitate such programming. It is the Committee's understanding that leading modern prison architects have come to recognize this as their most important and creative function. Put in its simplest terms, more attention should be given to program planning prior to design and construction.