

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF CORRECTIONAL IDEOLOGY
OF THE CORRECTIONAL SERVICE OF CANADA AND
NATIVE IDEOLOGY AT STONY MOUNTAIN PENITENTIARY

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF SOCIAL WORK

BY

© WILHELMIENA C.M. CARLETON

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK
UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA
WINNIPEG, MANITOBA

OCTOBER, 1985

Permission has been granted to the National Library of Canada to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author (copyright owner) has reserved other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her written permission.

L'autorisation a été accordée à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur (titulaire du droit d'auteur) se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation écrite.

ISBN 0-315-33872-5

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF CORRECTIONAL IDEOLOGY
OF THE CORRECTIONAL SERVICE OF CANADA AND
NATIVE IDEOLOGY AT STONY MOUNTAIN PENITENTIARY

BY

WILHELMIENA C.M. CARLETON

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of
the University of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements
of the degree of

MASTER OF SOCIAL WORK

© 1985

Permission has been granted to the LIBRARY OF THE UNIVER-
SITY OF MANITOBA to lend or sell copies of this thesis. to
the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this
thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film, and UNIVERSITY
MICROFILMS to publish an abstract of this thesis.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the
thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or other-
wise reproduced without the author's written permission.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer gratefully expresses her appreciation to her major advisor, Len Kaminski, of the School of Social Work, and to the other Committee members, Grant Reid of the School of Social Work and Stephen Brickey of the Department of Sociology, University of Manitoba. Each of these persons provided assistance in their own way.

I would also like to express gratitude to the students, staff and representatives of both native organizations and the federal corrections department for their assistance with this study.

Finally, I wish to thank my husband for his support and encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ii

ABSTRACT iv

CHAPTER:

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. STUDY DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY 29

III. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK: CONSENSUS THEORY

IV. INTERPRETATION OF IDEOLOGICAL ELEMENTS
BY THE DIFFERENT SCHOOLS OF CRIMINOLOGY 59

V. COMPARATIVE IDEOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF
INDIVIDUAL TRATMENT MODEL AND OPPORTUNITIES
MODEL 85

VI. THE POSITION OF NATIVE PEOPLE IN SOCIETY144

VII. NATIVE VIEW OF THE WORLD180

VIII. CONCLUSIONS 218

BIBLIOGRAPHY 227

ABSTRACT

The analysis of social policy and theories of deviancy has to take into account social values and, as well, the social and political ideas of the policy makers or the theorists. The analysis must explain how policy implementers perceive the world and why, in order to assess the objectives and implementation of the policy and its subsequent programs.

This study considers a "new" correctional model, the Opportunities Model, presently operating within Stony Mountain Penitentiary and analyzes and compares this model and its programs with the former Individual Treatment Model. This research employs normative theory and a modified form of John Horton's paradigm to interpret specific ideological elements and demonstrate that the two correctional models, although claiming to be different, are in fact similar and share a consensus perspective of society.

The culture of Central North American Natives is explored and the native world view is presented. The concepts of colonialism and native oppression are examined in this analysis, as one cannot divorce these concepts within the native interpretation of the ideological elements and the native view of the world. Using normative theory, this thesis will prove native ideology to be in conflict with that of Correctional Services of Canada. This raises a number of questions regarding the appropriateness, possible effects, and the latent objectives of this correctional model and its programs, for native inmates.

Areas of possible future research topics are presented and discussed.

ABBREVIATIONS

A.A.	Alcoholics Anonymous
A.F.M.	Alcohol Foundation of Manitoba
C.P.S.	Canadian Penitentiary Service
C.S.C.	Correctional Service of Canada
I.P.P.	Individualized Program Planning
I.T.M.	Individual Treatment Model
OPMOD	Opportunities Model
L.U.	Living Unit or Living Unit Officer
L.U.D.O.	Living Unit Development Officer
L.U.P.	Living Unit Program
N.P.B.	National Parole Board
N.P.S.	National Parole Service
S.M.I.	Stony Mountain Institution
T.A.	Temporary Absence

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Sociological responses to deviancy, as defined by our present Canadian legal and judicial system, have generally focussed upon the individual law-breaker and his behaviour rather than upon societal forces affecting these actions.¹ Given this interpretation of deviancy, most practitioners in criminology develop prison programs which basically consider methods directed at "changing" the individual.

In the fall of 1973, the then Solicitor-General of Canada appointed a Task Force ² to re-examine and analyze the role of federal corrections in order to develop an integrated correctional service for Canada which would encompass the Canadian Penitentiary Service and the National Parole Service. The Task Force rejected the concept of the "medical model" operating within Canadian penitentiaries during the 1950's and 1960's, because it implied that the correctional agency was somehow "directly responsible for the 'success' or 'failure' of the offender."³ The Task Force considered this unrealistic as corrections could not work "magic" and return the offender to the community as a "socially responsible individual." The medical model assumed only "experts" capable of "rehabilitating" offenders, and the Task Force perceived that this belief resulted in the tendency of the community to evade its responsibility. The Task Force considered continued emphasis on rehabilitation would mislead not only the public but the offender as well in terms of the actual capacity of corrections. The Task Force concluded that, as a result,

"We will continue to draw the accusation of failure arising from unrealistic expectations, and will hinder the development of effective relationships between corrections and the public."⁴

In other words, it proposed that if corrections was to maintain good public relations, it had to shift responsibility back onto the offender.

The Opportunities Model

Rather than continue to draw the "accusations of failure" upon the corrections system, the Task Force saw the "opportunities model" as an alternative:

"In order to meet the reality of today's correctional environment, Federal Corrections must provide correctional opportunities, opportunities designed to assist the offender in the development of daily living skills, confidence to cope with his personal problems and social environment and the capacity to adopt more acceptable conduct norms. The opportunities principle is based on the assumption that the offender is ultimately responsible for his behaviour. This approach further recognizes that the offender is convicted and sentenced on the basis of his criminal behaviour, not on the basis of some underlying personality disorder or deprived socio-economic condition."⁵

The opportunities model acknowledges the inmate to be responsible and accountable for his deviant behaviour and proposes that change can be accomplished only by the inmate himself by availing himself of the "opportunities" presented to him by the corrections system.

Relationship Between the Individual Treatment Model and the Opportunities Model

Talk of prison reform frequently includes a plethora of "pilot projects," "demonstration programs," and "new philosophical models." This thesis intends to demonstrate that, in reality, the so-called "new" approach to the problem of deviancy as proposed in the opportunities model is a reflection of previous criminological thought. As well, it will be demonstrated that both the Individual Treatment Model (I.T.M.) and the Opportunities Model (OPMOD) reflect a consensus perspective of society. They have both tended to focus upon the individual and methods to change him.

Classical School of Criminology

Classical theory of criminology flourished at the end of the 18th century and its principles were typified in the writings of Beccaria. Although not used in its pure form, classical theory is nevertheless one of the pillars of our contemporary system of corrections.⁶ Beccaria's principles of the classical school reflected the social contract theories of Hobbes, Locke, Montesquieu and Rousseau.⁷ Laws were perceived as the conditions under which individuals, naturally independent, voluntarily united themselves to evolve a "civil society" because they feared living in continual war. The individual, possessing free will, voluntarily consented to bind himself to society.

Individuals were perceived as being rationally oriented towards the pursuit of pleasure and the avoidance of pain.⁸ This

essentially Hobbesian principle saw a person as being individually oriented, each seeking his own ends, and therefore each being capable of committing crimes. Classical theorists assumed consensus in society as to the desirability of protecting private property and personal welfare.⁹ Man's social contract with the state implied that the state was to preserve the peace and terms of this consensus. The individual, perceived as a rational being, was thus responsible for his behaviour and subsequently amenable to a rational system of social control.¹⁰ Punishment was therefore a legitimate right to be exercised by the state by virtue of the above principles. It was determined that punishment should be utilized as a deterrent for not only the offender but, as well, should serve as a warning to others. Punishment was to be a tool in the hands of the legislator whereby "the greatest happiness for the community could be achieved." This utilitarian concept of "the greatest happiness for the greatest number" was the foundation for the role of the state and its application of punishment.¹¹

In addition, classical theory of criminology proposed punishments to be proportional to the interests violated by the offence.¹² Punishments should not be excessive nor should punishment be used as a method of reformation. According to classical criminology, this would suggest encroachment on the rights of the individual and, as well, would violate the social contract. Classical criminology perceived the rule of the law to be such that the law, rather than the judge, should determine the punishment. Thus, classical criminology advocated that equal punishment should be applied for the same crime regardless of other conditions or circumstances. In the eyes

of the law, all individuals were considered equal.

Classical theorists considered restricted use of the law to be the most satisfactory, and felt the implementation of the laws should be circumscribed by due process. Inherent in classical interpretation was consideration of proportionality of punishment, i.e. let the punishment fit the crime.

Implicit within classical theory were, however, two apparent contradictions. The image of man was such that the individual was perceived as a rational being who consented to the legitimacy of the beneficial social contract with society while at the same time he was perceived as unthinking and self-interest seeking. As well, punishment was to deter the individual but, when his reason failed, his passions tempted him to criminality.

However, the model of man within classical criminology considered the individual to be responsible for his actions and mitigating circumstances were not to be considered. Man's free will implied equality of responsibility.

Motivation and extenuating circumstances were not considered in the classical interpretation of deviancy. These contradictions with the classical model's interpretation of the nature of crime led to inherent confusion, as crime was perceived as either an irrational act, a product of passion, or the result of factors negatively influencing a person's freedom to exercise a rational choice.

Neo-Classical School

Reaction to these contradictions, as well as the concept of equal punishment, gave birth to the neo-classical school of criminology. Although the individual was still considered sane, accountable, and responsible for his actions, an allowance was made for mitigating circumstances. All individuals were still perceived as being capable of crime. Only children and the aged were seen to be less capable of making responsible and accountable decisions and a small group, such as the insane or feeble minded, were perceived as incapable of freedom of action.¹³

Within neo-classical criminology however, the person became a more "rounded" individual, having a past and a future. Man was still rational and had free will, but now the circumstances of the offender, his physical and social environment, his past offences and his "degree" of responsibility were to be considered. Other mitigating factors including incompetence, pathology, insanity and impulsive behaviour could be considered as affecting the ability of the individual to exercise his free will.

Judicial discretion became relevant, and it was recognized that a given sentence would have differing effects for individual offenders dependent upon their personal characteristics. As well, neo-classical criminology recognized that imprisonment itself could affect the offender's propensity for future criminal behaviour.

Neo-classical criminology attempted to phrase punishment in relation to rehabilitation.

"The criminal had to be punished in an environment conducive to his making the correct moral decisions. Choice was (and still is) seen to be a characteristic of the individual actor--but there is now a recognition that certain structures are more conducive to free choice than others."¹⁴

Correct moral decisions were those which reflected the moral standards of the given society. This was based upon the premise that the individual was a rational human being, with free will, who entered the social contract with society and thereby agreed to the "accepted" roles, norms and methods of society.

Positivist Criminology

Positivism rejected harsh legalism and substituted the doctrine of determinism for free will.¹⁵ Positivism saw man as being propelled by forces of which he himself was unaware and he could therefore not exercise free will nor be held accountable and responsible for his actions. The concept of determinism, therefore, foreshortened human choice.

Positivism assumed the existence of social and moral consensus in society. Liberal positivism interpreted the law to be the crystallization of this consensus and thus, by definition, crime was extreme deviance. It was believed that laws could be reformed to represent this moral consensus.¹⁶ Radical positivism also assumed that moral consensus was embodied in the criminal law, but believed that deviancy reflected ineffectiveness in the administration of social control. It was believed that the administrators of justice, police, social workers, the judiciary, etc., exercised non-scientific criteria

in their dispositions, and that reforms were necessary to ensure scientific effectiveness of the administration of social control to reflect the objective interests of the consensus view. The scientific method was a central concept in positivist criminology.

It is important to note that both liberal and radical positivism perceived a social and moral consensus in society. Values, norms and morality were perceived as neutral objects of the social system. They were a "given" within the system. This assumption, however, presented a contradiction as it implied that the legal system reflected "freely chosen contracts between rational men and liberal society."¹⁷

Positivism saw society consisting of predominantly "normal" people who represented the consensus. Deviants represented only a minority and existed at the margins of society. Social reaction against the deviant was only considered in terms of the scientific effectiveness of the criminal justice system in their role of representing the collectivity. Social reaction was of no consequence in the explanation of deviance since, by definition, deviants were individuals having no free will, were under-socialized or pathological, and therefore they could not take their place in healthy society.¹⁸

Consequently, deviance was, by definition, "that which is reacted against--by, and on behalf of, the majority of (right-minded) men."¹⁹ Positivism emphasize the "actor" rather than the "act," and focussed on the criminal, his physical being, psychological make-up and his environment. Most biological, psychological, sociological and economic studies of crime have tended to be conducted within the concepts of positivist criminology. Prevailing criminological studies

still tend to view criminal behaviour as "descriptive of a kind of person rather than a kind of state."²⁰

Lombroso was convinced that the criminal was a biological throwback (atavism) who had the body and mind of primitive man. This individual, acting in a "natural" way (for him), exhibited deviant behaviour and consequently broke the laws of present society. This individual had to be removed and needed restraints to prevent him from committing further crimes.

Other positivists argued that the primary concern of the penal system ought to be treatment rather than punishment. They contended that efforts should be concentrated in ameliorating conditions which produce crime and not upon punishing those convicted.

Positivists contended that it was the responsibility of the state to ensure that appropriate treatment was made available to cure the offenders. They argued that the administration of the criminal justice system should be dealt with on a scientific basis; jurists should be replaced by experts having knowledge of the science of human behaviour. They suggested that there should be a system of indeterminate sentences which would allow sufficient time for a "cure" to be effected. As well, positivists argued the abolition of punishment, as they believed it to be inappropriate.

Durkheimian Criminology

In addition to the three previously mentioned criminological schools of thought, the influence of Emile Durkheim is evident within our Canadian correctional system as well. Durkheim presented a

dualistic view of human nature: the body and its needs, and the soul.

"The instincts of men are organically given; and the control and constraint of men is the task of social sentiment acting through the 'soul.' It is evident that passions and egoistic tendencies derive from our individual constitutions, while our rational activity--whether theoretical or practical--is dependent on social causes."²¹

Durkheim's "homo duplex" needed repression of the biological predispositions as they could otherwise lead to anomic normlessness. The body and soul would be out of phase.

Durkheim interpreted society from a political-sociological perspective, taking into consideration the society's productive relations as well as social facts. He perceived society's productive relations and morality as external to the individual but, nevertheless, constraining him. He also saw society as having its own nature, different from the nature of individuals.

"It's (society's) requirements are different from those of our own nature as individuals: the interests of the whole are not necessarily those of the parts. therefore, society cannot be formed without our being required to make perpetual and costly sacrifices."²²

Durkheim perceived individuals capable of accepting moral authority "only to the extent that authority was relevant to men's real, material situation."²³

Traditional society, according to Durkheim, was characterized by relationships of mechanical solidarity consisting of homogenous, interdependent systems. The law in traditional society reflected the collective conscience. It consisted of general moral agreement on the nature of sanctionable behaviour and there was agreement on punishment.

Punishment did not need to stress rehabilitation since this was not necessary; everyone was aware of the obligations to society as they were specified in the strong collective conscience.²⁴

According to Durkheim, individuals had natural inequalities and these were reflected in social inequalities. Spontaneous division of labour occurred as a result of these natural inequalities. Roles were distributed in accordance with biological merit and the state judged all values at their true worth.

Durkheim's analysis of social problems was premised on the concept of anomie. He perceived three types of deviancy. The biological deviant resulted when individual consciences varied from the collective conscience as a result of genetic inheritance and situational factors. The functional rebel acted out the "true" collective conscience as it was in the process of emerging. The skewed deviant was an inappropriately socialized individual in a sick society. Durkheim saw two possible sources resulting in skewed deviant behaviour: anomie and egoism. Weakened social control, inadequate institutionalization of goals, inadequate means to achieve system goals, or inadequate socialization were all reflected in anomie and social problems.²⁵ Egoism represented the egoistic desires of the individual in a way that would be incompatible with the social order and inappropriate with their given biological abilities.

The state, according to Durkheim, had the responsibility to intercede in order that individuals could be re-socialized or provided with appropriate means and opportunities to meet the maintenance needs of the system. Solutions to deviancy should consider re-socialization of the individual to "accept and obey the customs of society"²⁶ to

be of primary importance. The means and opportunities provided by the state for the individual to achieve goals, and thereby meet the needs of the system, appeared in the form of skills, training and education.

"Education must inculcate a spirit of self-discipline and obedience to the social order..."²⁷

The expansion of opportunities for mobility within the society was of prime importance.

Mertonian Criminology

Another major influence upon Canadian corrections has been the theory presented by Robert Merton. He expanded Durkheim's theory of deviancy and attempted to explore social explanations of egoism and anomie.

Merton depicted individuals as capable of making meaningful choices, accepting or rejecting cultural goals, and the institutionalized means to achieve these goals. Merton perceived choices made by individuals to be dependent on the specific positions occupied by individuals within the social structure. He believed the ideal society to be one where there would be an accord between merit and its consequences.

"The means for achieving success would be respected, and the opportunities open to all those of sufficient merit. The motivation to compete and the opportunities to succeed would be in proportion to the degree of individual stratification necessary for the society to function."²⁸

He identified two central elements of the cultural structure; the

culturally defined goals and the institutionalized means to achieve these goals.²⁹ Thus competition was accepted and desirable by members of society. Merton interpreted that a consensus on values existed in society, that there was a "realization of values that men respect."³⁰

However, although Merton recognized that "people are not equally placed at birth in the competition for success,"³¹ he claimed that system needs had to be maintained. He attributed the meritocratic ideology to the progress of the division of labour and to the placement of individuals in positions appropriate to their aptitude.

Merton interpreted deviancy to be the result of

"strain generated when persons are encouraged to structure their aspirations around a set of cultural goals, yet are denied access to the legitimate institutionalized means or avenues for goal achievement."³²

In other words, the cultural goals which they have internalized cannot legitimately be realized, and the adaptations they make will likely constitute deviance.³³ His typology of deviant adaptations included innovation, ritualism, retreatism, and rebellion.

Merton maintained that any ameliorative action to deviancy would need to consider a number of factors. Among these would be inadequate socialization, the development of coping mechanisms to enable members to deal with personal tensions, and the provision of structures within the system to allow members to attain agreed upon system goals. As well, ameliorative action might need to consider the development of relations between members to maintain appropriate social cohesion in order to carry on consensually agreed upon activities.

It was the role of the state to provide the necessary opportunities for individuals to legitimately achieve system goals. Merton believed that, although success had to be based upon merit, in order to implement this, the state had to ensure the existence of ample opportunities.

The Ideological Roots of the I.T.M. and OPMOD

While the Task Force rejected the individual treatment model and considered the opportunities model as an alternative, the two models, although having some differences, are in fact ideologically similar. It will be demonstrated that the "Medical Model" or "Individual Treatment Model" had its roots in the positivist philosophy of criminology. It defined the individual as being ill and assumed only "treatment" could rehabilitate the individual to become a contributing member of society.

The Opportunities Model, presented as the alternative by the Task Force, reflected predominantly neo-classical criminology. However, as will be demonstrated in the analysis of the OPMOD, considerable confusion and inconsistency exists within the OPMOD as some policies and programs reflect classical thought, some positivist criminology, while others reflect Durkheimian and Mertonian criminological thought. However, neo-classical philosophy dominates the OPMOD criminological perspective.

Positivist Criminology and I.T.M.

Positivism perceived the person as not responsible for his behaviour. The individual was seen as being propelled by forces of which he was himself unaware. Positivism believed social life should be explained by more profound causes which were unperceived by consciousness. Individuals had no free will but rather their choices were influenced by other forces, i.e. they were coerced in their behaviour.

Deviancy, therefore, according to the positivist perspective, may be in part a product of society or genetics. Positivism considered basically three factors influencing deviancy. Environmental factors included such issues as ecology, culture, composition of population and economic determinism. Biological factors included areas such as morphological considerations, "born criminals," and feeble-mindedness. Psychological factors took into consideration psychopathy, psychoses, epilepsy and insanity.

Any ameliorative action for deviancy therefore had to consider biological make-up, environmental factors, and personality. It will be demonstrated that the I.T.M. attempted to address these areas. It will be shown that institutional programs attempted to consider these factors and emphasized specific "deficiencies"--both personal and societal. Programs within the I.T.M. included aversion therapy for sexual offenders, psychological assessments, psychiatric counselling, individual casework, group therapy and, as well, the various "learning programs"--upgrading, trades, shops, self-awareness, A.A.'s and drug treatment programs.

Neo-Classical Criminology and the OPMOD

Neo-classicists perceived individuals to be capable of making rational, responsible decisions and individuals were, therefore, to be held accountable for their actions. Certain mitigating circumstances could be taken into consideration however. Neo-classicism perceived most individuals to be fully responsible for their actions, with the exception of children and the aged. Motivational patterns (e.g. psychological types) or structural circumstances (e.g. poverty) were not recognized and were perceived as excuses for individuals to evade their responsibility. Individuals were perceived as having free will and being capable of free choice in determining behaviour. The OPMOD reflects this criminological philosophy.

Deviancy, therefore, was perceived as a rational act and the person was held responsible and accountable for the action. Utilitarianism could be seen to operate within the neo-classical philosophy. All beings were perceived to be capable of crime precisely because man was by nature self-seeking and imperfect. Deviancy was thus seen as an act against the good order and consensus of what was defined as "good" and "proper" by society as a whole. Basically this assumed that consensus existed among rational human beings on the morality and permanence of the present distribution of property.

These theoretical principles are taken into consideration by the correctional system, therefore, when developing the ameliorative responses to deviancy--correctional policies, and subsequent institutional programs. It will be demonstrated that our present Canadian correctional system and the OPMOD with its L.U.P. and I.P.P.

case management process, reflect the neo-classical perspective, but deterministic explanations of behaviour are employed when "appropriate."

How the Opportunities Model Works

Within the opportunities model, the institution provides the opportunities while "the inmate bears the responsibility for planning and carrying out a program designed to allow him to return to the community as a responsible citizen."³⁴ The opportunities provided by the institution include programs, resources and staff. The offender will have the "opportunity" to make decisions concerning the nature and manner in which his time of imprisonment will be served, and this will thereby allow him to demonstrate "responsible" conduct. Thus the inmate has free will to take advantage of institutional opportunities available.

The institutional "opportunities" an inmate may wish to consider could include any or all of the following:

- upgrading--from basic elementary to University level,
- life skills--learning how to look for work, attend interviews, use community resources, budget finances,
- trades training--welding, auto body, carpentry,
- alcohol treatment--courses presented by the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba, A.A. meetings,
- impulse control--through discussions with the institutional psychologist,
- marriage counselling--with the appropriate religious advisor within the institution.

It is the responsibility of the inmate to avail himself of resources and thereby facilitate his rehabilitation.

The Living Unit Concept

An integral component of the OPMOD is the living unit concept. The living unit program was designed to facilitate assisting the offender "in the development of daily living skills" which would allow him to return to the community as a contributing member of society. The living unit program traced its origins to Dr. Maxwell Jones and his concept of the "therapeutic community." This program attempted to create a community atmosphere with a treatment orientation.

Role of Living Unit Program Staff

The staff are perceived as "resocialization agents" in this program and their role includes helping inmates understand and accept restrictions. The theory is that this knowledge would then be transferable to the community and would ultimately help the inmate understand and accept his responsibility "in and to the community to which he returns."³⁵

Individual Program Plan

A very essential part of the living unit program and the opportunities model, is the "Individual Program Plan" (I.P.P.) case management process. One of the rationales for the introduction of I.P.P. was to

"operationalize the opportunities model through ensuring individual consideration of every inmate with respect to his needs and the resources available."³⁶

I.P.P. has been described as a "case management process" rather than a new "program". It was set up to provide effective utilization of all case management components of the federal correctional services. I.P.P. co-ordinated "the efforts of institutional and community (parole) resources from sentencing to warrant expiry date." As well, I.P.P. would allow the changes contained in the "Peace and Security" legislation to be integrated into the Correctional Service of Canada case management system. It was hoped that I.P.P. would provide the data base to plan new and/or recommend changes to existing institutional programs.

The Correctional Service of Canada (C.S.C.) determined that programs previously did not consider all aspects of the inmate's needs, with the result being that fragmentation of services often occurred. I.P.P. would involve institutional staff, parole staff, and the Parole Board, with the inmate's "program plan" to meet his needs from the time of entry into the institution. This would allow the development of a co-ordinated case management process.

I.P.P. is based upon a "team" approach which includes the inmate, the L.U. officer, the L.U.D.O. or living unit development officer, formerly referred to as the counsellor or classification officer, as well as the parole officer. Other "resource" people such as the psychologist, shop instructors or community organizations (John Howard Society, Alcoholics Anonymous member) could be included on the team as well.

I.P.P. is a case management process which takes the entire sentence into account. Black et al stated that if the correctional system demanded change on the part of the client, then such change should be continually promoted and reinforced from the moment the inmate enters the system. The goal of I.P.P. is to

"design, implement and monitor an individual program plan for every inmate possible in which he selects the program activities he and his case management team feel are appropriate to his needs, in conformity with the program opportunities that exist."³⁷

There is no option; all inmates are involved in I.P.P. because it is a "regionally applied case management process."³⁸ Methods of prison reform have generally been applied to everyone, without distinction, who has been defined as deviant and who has been incarcerated within Canadian penitentiaries. The opportunities model, living unit program and I.P.P. case management process presented as the "new" approach to corrections and presently operating in S.M.I. resemble previous prison reform approaches; they are applied to everyone in the institution, are directed at changing the individual, and, it will be demonstrated, reflect an order or consensus perspective of society.

S.M.I. Inmate Profile

The inmate population within the S.M.I. includes a distinct percentage of individuals of native origin.³⁹ For the purpose of this paper, the term native includes all individuals of North American Indian origin. These individuals of indigenous origin employ self-identification and espouse those values which incorporate an Indian view of the world. This definition could therefore encompass status Indians, non-status Indians, treaty Indians, non-treaty Indians as well as Metis.

This research acknowledges that natives have been subjected to continual efforts by the white dominant group to either change or eliminate their cultural lifestyle. Consequently, some natives have been adequately socialized within the majority society and have internalized and accepted the values of the Protestant Ethic. Traditionalists refer to these natives as "apples."⁴⁰ Wuttunee has been referred to as such a native. He does not agree with the existence of a native "culture" per se and advocates native assimilation to the white dominant culture. He feels that the

"cause of the problem is not so much what the white man has done to him, but what the Indian does to himself through his interpretation of what transpired in the past."⁴¹

The term "native" may be used by some researchers to include everyone from status or treaty Indian to someone who is second generation Metis and who considers himself "French-Canadian." Some past research has employed "appearance" as the sole criteria in the identification of "natives" for a particular study. Thus the term