

- (4) Dining facilities are inadequate. As the institution is conceived, inmates will eat either in small groups in day rooms or individually in their cells. There is no provision for a large central dining hall, or for any dining room of intermediate size. This arrangement is criticized on several counts. The day rooms are small, so that as a practical matter most of the inmates will eat in their cells. The use of day rooms for dining purposes, with the consequent problems of waste and food odours, is inconsistent with the multi-purpose use that is contemplated for such rooms. There is, in any event, a need for a larger dining facility where inmates can be observed in more open surroundings in assessing whether they are ready for transfer to medium security institutions.

Comment: The Committee is convinced that dining in the day rooms is an improvement over the present cell dining arrangement in maximum security prisons, however, the Committee believes that some larger group dining facilities should be seriously considered. The Committee is further convinced, on the evidence that it has heard, that a larger dining facility does not present an unreasonable problem of control, even in a maximum security institution.

- (5) The arrangement whereby food will be prepared outside the walls, in preference to an interior kitchen, is undesirable, both because the quality of the meals will suffer and because this will be a vehicle for the entry of contraband into the institution.

Comment: This criticism has been answered to the Committee's satisfaction on the basis that the kitchen is for the common use of a complex of adjoining institutions.

- (6) The Canadian Penitentiary Service design provides for a small combined exercise room and auditorium, but no gymnasium. It is contended that this is inadequate.

Comment: The Committee is sympathetic to this criticism, and noted on one hand the larger space per inmate of indoor recreation facilities provided by the U.S. Federal Bureau of Prison but also noted greater use of outdoor facilities in the Canadian prison system. The Committee recommends that more consideration be given to the multipurpose use of indoor recreational facilities.

- (7) The location of areas in relation to one another is badly planned. For example, the hospital is separated by substantial distances from the offices of clinical personnel and from the disassociation unit. Similarly, the chapel is placed in a location such that access to it can be obtained only by passing through the maximum number of control points. Nor are separate offices provided for chaplains in immediate proximity to the chapel.

Comment: It appears to the Committee that there would be substantial advantages to Chapels being centrally located with chaplain's offices in close proximity.

It will be evident in reviewing these criticisms of particular features of the Canadian Penitentiary Service design that some have been answered, or answered to a degree. Still others, although not all, can be met by additions or modifications to the design. The Committee thinks it important to note also that a number of features of the design have elicited favourable comment. Reference might be made in particular to the arrangement of cells into small, segregated cell units, to the provision of outside cells throughout, and to the placing of interview rooms close to the cells. While there has been some