

security institution some of the more violent inmates classed as non-psychotic, and the medical psychiatric centre will remove psychotic inmates. This in turn is reflected in the more limited space allotted for the disassociation unit and for the hospital.

The criticisms of the proposed design may be divided into two categories:— those directed to the general concept of a maximum security institution as conceived by the Canadian Penitentiary Service; and those concerned with particular features of the design itself. These two categories are not, of course, entirely separate. Criticism in point of detail provides, understandably, much of the evidence that is advanced in support of the challenge to the design in its general conception. For convenience, however, we will consider the various criticisms that have been made under these two headings:

The criticisms that have been directed at the general conception of the Canadian Penitentiary Services' standard design for a maximum security institution are the following:

- (1) Control of inmate movement is unnecessarily rigid and centralized, and the consequent restrictive atmosphere will result in serious loss of time and disruption of program. It is further suggested that efforts at rehabilitation will be inhibited by the manner in which inmate control is conceived in the institution.
- (2) There is too great a division of staff from inmates in the proposed institution and this can give to prisoners the impression that the staff is afraid of them. Emphasis needs to be placed on increasing contact between inmates and staff, rather than on increasing separation.
- (3) The space allocated for program needs is inadequate. This point is made in reference to a number of detailed features of the program design: i.e. educational facilities; provision for recreation; dining facilities; the library; etc. However, the argument also proceeds at a more fundamental level. The contention is that the design reflects no conception of "program" that the institution is planned almost exclusively by reference to custodial considerations, without any clear assessment as to the kinds of prisoners who are to be placed in the institution or the kind of program that is required if there is to be any hope of effecting behavioural change. A correctional institution, it is said, should be built around an express conception of the program that is to be conducted in it, and such is not apparent from the present design.
- (4) The design is wanting in flexibility. It cannot be modified to meet changing conditions in later years, and especially change in the prevailing philosophy of corrections.

The Committee proposes later in this interim report to return to these criticisms of the general conception of the design. The Committee turns at this point to an assessment of criticisms of particular features of the design. The principal criticisms on matters of detail, with our comments, are as follows:

- (1) There are too many control points in the present design. This contributes to an oppressive atmosphere in the institution. It accentuates the separation between inmates and staff. It results in too large an allocation of manpower into unproductive tasks, with a consequent reduction of funds available for training and rehabilitation.

Comment: It seems to the Committee that this criticism has been answered in part, but only in part. An analysis provided by the Canadian Penitentiary Service indicates that the number of 24-hour control points is only five. It appears to the Committee, however,