

To Discipline and Train: Adult Rehabilitation Programmes in Ontario Prisons, 1874-1900

by Donald G. WETHERELL*

Incarceration in the Central Prison in Toronto was not, claimed the Warden, James Massie, simply a matter of punishment "as some seem to think". Rather it was to "bring about penitence for the past and purer motives for the future".¹ During the term of imprisonment, the inmates would be put "under the necessary discipline and training to help them enter upon and lead proper lives".² This ambition had been a major force behind the establishment of the Central Prison in 1874 and the Andrew Mercer Reformatory for Women in 1880.³ A further example of this contemporary concern was the organization in 1874 of the Prisoner's Aid Association of Toronto. The PAA was a government-subsidized voluntary body which lobbied for prison reform and, as well, worked directly with the inmates of the Toronto prisons to supplement and complement the institutions' rehabilitation programmes. Thus, in respect to prisons, 1874 marks the beginning of a new phase of state social policy in post-confederation Ontario.

This is not to suggest that rehabilitation was a novel ambition in 1874. The establishment of Kingston Penitentiary in 1835 had been in part justified on the grounds of rehabilitation.⁴ Many of the ambitions of prison reformers and administrators in pre-Confederation Canada were repeated and elaborated during the last quarter of the nineteenth century. Confederation had created new jurisdictions in criminal justice, and it is natural to see the Ontario developments after 1874 as in part being a response to the new constitutional arrangement.

In the last quarter of the nineteenth century Ontario penal institutions were one element in the struggle to preserve social order by deterring deviance and by changing the behaviour of those who had been imprisoned. The analogy in the latter instance between parents and their children and prisons and their inmates was frequently made and even more frequently implied. The techniques which were applied inside the institutions to change behaviour were the same ones which were believed to be effective in socializing children.⁵ In this context the penal institu-

* Department of History, University of Alberta.

¹ *Report of the Inspector of Prisons and Public Charities for the Year 1888*, Ontario, *Sessional Papers*, 1889, No. 2, p. 90. Hereafter cited as *Report*.

² *Report*, 1891, No. 7, p. 78.

³ See: *Report*, 1874, No. 2, pp. 1-2 and *Ibid.*, 1879, No. 8, pp. 81-2.

⁴ J.M. BEATTIE, *Attitudes Towards Crime and Punishment in Upper Canada, 1830-50*, (Toronto, 1977) pp. 15ff; and R. BAEHRE, "Origins of the Penitentiary System in Upper Canada", *Ontario History*, vol. LXIX, No. 3 (1977): 185-207.

⁵ Alison PRENTICE, *The School Promoters* (Toronto, 1977) pp. 25-41.

tions were obviously acting as agents of social control. The inmates had to be socialized to the norms which the state endorsed. The wider implications of social control as illustrated, for example, through the public deterrence function of prisons, falls outside the scope of this paper. Nevertheless, reference to a wider study is useful, the most notable being David Rothman's *The Discovery of the Asylum*. Rothman argues that early nineteenth century American penitentiaries sought not only to reform criminals, but through example the whole society.⁶ In the United States these notions soon broke down in the face of recidivism and the institutional needs for order and security. The end result was that American penitentiaries had become merely custodial institutions by the middle of the nineteenth century.⁷

This disillusionment with penal institutions was not characteristic of Ontario thinking, even though American penology provided the main model for Ontario theorists. Long after many Americans had become dissatisfied with their institutions as places of reform, many concerned Ontarians still placed substantial faith in penal institutions as the locale of rehabilitation. The reasons for this dissimilarity between the model and its imitator lay both in the relative newness of the Ontario system and the type of inmates with whom it dealt. Ontario provincial inmates all had sentences of less than two years, for any with longer sentences were confined in a federal penitentiary. Thus the majority of prisoners in the Ontario prisons had been convicted of relatively minor offences. Nevertheless, Ontario prison reformers and officials agreed that a number of abuses were present in their system, but they assumed that through certain reforms the system could be made more effective. More importantly, rehabilitation and institutional integrity were most often seen as compatible. Though between the actual and ideal of many prison activities there were a number of tensions, in general these activities were held to be consistent with both rehabilitation and institutional order. Thus prison labour reformed the inmates but at the same time made money for the state. Prison discipline was necessary for institutional order but it also reformed. The various rewards kept order but as well created character change. This melding of objectives was enhanced by the relatively strong strain of authoritarianism in Ontario legal and political thinking during this period.⁸ Consequently it was natural to see the various objectives of the penal institutions as being symbiotic.

After 1874 there were three categories of prisons to which adult offenders were sentenced in Ontario. At the lowest level was the County or Common Jails, where both men and women convicted of minor offences or awaiting trial were held. At the next level was the Central Prison for men and after 1880, the Mercer Reformatory for Women. The latter two institutions were known as intermediate prisons and held those persons

⁶ David ROTHMAN, *The Discovery of the Asylum*, (Boston, 1971) p. xix, and p. 84.

⁷ *Ibid.* pp. 235-46.

⁸ See for example: Bruce HODGINS, "Democracy and the Ontario Fathers of Confederation", in Edith FIRTH, (ed.) *Profiles of a Province*, (Toronto, 1967) pp. 83-90.

sentenced to between two months and two years. They were the most important prisons in the provincial system and carried out the most comprehensive rehabilitation schemes. Anyone who was sentenced for a term longer than two years was confined in one of the Federal penitentiaries and was thus removed from provincial jurisdiction. The funding of the provincial prisons was divided between the counties and the province. County jails were partially funded out of local rates,⁹ and the two intermediate prisons were wholly financed by the province.

Though the County Jails were in part funded by local government, the province theoretically had substantial control over them.¹⁰ Through the Office of the Inspector of Prisons and Public Charities, the provincial government exercised its authority to frame regulations, supervise the organization and inspect all prisons in the province. In cases where the provincial regulations were flouted by the county, the Inspectors could recommend action to the Department of the Provincial Secretary. However, this system of control was not easily enforced. The province's only effective recourse in the face of county intransigence was first to negotiate with the county for compliance, and failing that, to take the county to court. Since the two intermediate prisons came under a different administrative category in the provincial network, they were under more effective control by the provincial authorities.

The inmates of the provincial prisons were incarcerated for a wide variety of reasons. The most common causes were drunk and disorderly conduct, vagrancy, larceny, and in relatively fewer cases other offences against property, the person, the peace and public morals. In addition, those awaiting trial were held in the County Jails, which meant in effect that all convicted criminals initially passed through the local jails. Roughly 40-45 percent of those awaiting trial were subsequently acquitted. Thus the jails held both the innocent and the guilty. The total number of commitments to the various jails and prisons was relatively high, and the numbers tended to rise slowly for the Central Prison and the Mercer Reformatory, while they lessened for the Common Jails. For example, in 1874, 366 men were committed to the Central Prison. By 1886 the number had risen to 579 and to over 600 annually for most of the 1890s. The number of yearly commitments to the Mercer Reformatory was much less, and generally stood between 100 and 150, again tending to rise over the years. As for the County Jails, the total number of commitments was 7,589 in 1877 and 6,171 in the following year, but by the 1890s had declined to the mid-four thousand range.¹¹

The cause of crime was the subject of much contemporary discussion. It was of course necessary to arrive at a conclusion about the reasons for crime in order to implement successful rehabilitation schemes.

⁹ The Province paid for the maintenance of those prisoners in the County Jails who were "criminal prisoners"; the remainder of the inmates in local jails were supported by the county. *Report*, 1884, No. 8, p. 11.

¹⁰ Richard SPLANE, *Social Welfare in Ontario* (Toronto, 1965) p. 158.

¹¹ Compiled from figures cited in *Reports*, 1874-1901.

The majority opinion on this matter appears to have centered mainly around the institution of the family and its importance in the formation of good character in children. It was the lack or perversion of parental duties that produced the greatest number of criminals. The family was seen as the basic factor in socialization and subsequently in social control. Hence negligence in a child's upbringing could have disastrous results.

In the framework of the family the child should be taught thrift, self-control, industry, habits of regularity and be encouraged to acquire a trade or profession. It was essential that these values and attitudes be formed in youth so that they would develop into habits in later life.¹² As well, it was assumed that Christian precepts should be imparted through the example and encouragement of the parents. The results of a neglected upbringing could be manifest in many forms: in poor work habits and idleness; in poor self-control and drunkenness and violence; in avarice and a general weakness in controlling one's passions.¹³ It was also reasoned that other factors such as urbanization, drunkenness, poverty and uncontrolled immigration were sometimes responsible for crime. However, the latter also were generally grounded in an implicit belief that a good family was the first bulwark against the development of criminals. The foundations of social order lay in the family.¹⁴ When that system of control failed, and fears were expressed that it was failing in increasing numbers, it was the obligation and duty of the state to step in and try to correct the resulting evils.

Ontario prison officials often voiced these arguments about the link between the family and character formation. Mrs. O'Reilly, the Superintendent of the Mercer Reformatory claimed that "a large number of those now in the reformatory have drifted into criminal ways through not having been trained to habits of industry in their own homes."¹⁵ When in 1890 the number of juvenile commitments to the Central Prison increased over the previous year, Warden Massie stated that "it shews that the number of neglected and improperly trained youths is on the increase."

¹² For an example of one theory on 'habit' see: "Early Formation of Habits," *Journal of Education* (March, 1874), p. 45; where habit is described as follows: "after he has repeated them frequently [a given action], each single action suggests the following one so instantaneously that he cannot distinguish them in his knowledge, but is conscious of them only as a comprehensive whole. This is to be explained by several laws of suggestion, and... by the law of frequency of occurrence". The implications of such a theory of character development made the importance of environment and youth obvious.

¹³ Egerton RYERSON, *First Lessons in Christian Morals For Canadian Families and Schools* (Toronto, 1871). See especially pp. 20-43.

¹⁴ Some of the contemporary theories about the cause of crime can be found in various numbers of: Ontario, *Report of the Inspectors of Prisons and Public Charities*; Canada, *Report of the Minister of Justice as to Penitentiaries in Canada*, and the *Annual Reports* of the various Prisoner's Aid Associations. See also: *Report of the Commissioners Appointed to Enquire into the Prison and Reformatory System of Ontario*, (1891) pp. 34-47; and the various proceedings of the International Prison Congress and the National Conference of Charities and Correction. Reports from the latter two organizations were often quoted by Canadians concerned with the problems of crime and rehabilitation.

¹⁵ *Report*, 1887, No. 12, p. 102.

The parents of these prisoners often showed "great anxiety" about their sons, but Massie was unsympathetic. The prisoners "often" told him that they had "received no training from their parents, were not sent to school, nor taught anything good at home, but allowed to run the streets" and consequently, the parents' "assumed anxiety... is but mockery and comes too late." The Warden ominously concluded that it was "no uncommon thing to hear young lads curse their parents for their neglect and blame them for being here."¹⁶

These fruits of neglect were not considered in all cases to be permanent. After the individual had been imprisoned, the state began to attempt his rehabilitation. The methods used were closely related to those which were advocated for rearing children. Thus the prisons utilized work and the instruction in a trade, discipline, education, religion, a number of positive and negative reinforcements and a tightly controlled environment. These techniques would theoretically create new habits and behaviour in the prisoners.

The first stage of the rehabilitation programme was to ensure that the prison environment would not lead to further corruption of character. This was especially important for first offenders, youths and those awaiting trial for it was believed that the recidivists or 'hardened' criminals would inevitably corrupt them. Finlay Spencer of the PAA warned in his report in 1882 that:¹⁷

no one can have any conception of the amount of moral strength that is requisite to enable prisoners who desire to reform to withstand the incessant efforts to make foul and keep foul which the hardened criminals put forth. The one thing which these do with their might is the corruption of the young (and, in many cases, more sinned against than sinning) prisoners.

To prevent such occurrences, the prison had to be physically structured and organized so that the novices were separated from the 'hardened' criminals. These classification systems meant that the inmates were graded and separated from each other on the basis of sex, age, crime and as far as known, criminal record. Theoretically, each class would be confined to a corridor totally separate from the other classes.

Classification was in Inspector Chamberlain's opinion of such great significance that it was the "most important factor in the prevention of crime."¹⁸ Proof of this contention had been presented in the *Report of 1888* in which the Ottawa jail had been condemned as a school of crime. In Ottawa no proper system of classification was used. As a result, "young girls have started out on the most dissolute courses of life after associations formed while temporarily incarcerated for trifling offences and ultimately graduated as matured criminals."¹⁹ Such occurrences gave

¹⁶ *Report*, 1891, No. 7, p. 77.

¹⁷ *Report*, 1882/83, No. 8, p. 79.

¹⁸ *Report*, 1892, No. 8, p. 5. See also: *Report of Commissioners Appointed to Enquire into the Prison and Reformatory System of Ontario*, 1891, p. 222. Hereafter cited as *Commissioner's Report*, 1891.

¹⁹ *Report*, 1889, No. 2, p. 59.

impetus to the drive to classify the provincial jails, especially when it is recalled that the jails also held those awaiting trial.

In respect to the Common Jails, classification was, by the 1880s one of the most ardently pursued objectives of the Inspectors. It had been said in the 1870s that the County Jails were, because of "faulty arrangement and improper classification... nurseries of crime and bad morals."²⁰ It had been hoped that the newly created Central Prison would draw from the County Jails the most serious and therefore potentially the most corrupting inmates. However, it was becoming apparent by the 1880s that that ambition had failed and that the jails were still a source of corruption.

Accordingly, the government began seriously to promote a classification system for all County Jails in the province; especially those located in areas with high urban population. In 1887 the Provincial Secretary issued a memorandum informing the counties in which Toronto, Ottawa, Hamilton and London were located, that the Province expected them to implement proper systems of classification in their jails. If the counties refused this demand, the provincial government would "compel" them to "make proper provision for classification" even if it necessitated major renovations or the erection of additional buildings.²¹

The system which the government wanted the counties to implement was based on seven categories. Each jail should established adequate and separate facilities for the insane who were temporarily committed, for juveniles committed for the first time for "trivial offences", for prisoners committed for default of sufficient distress or non-payment of fines, for old and infirm inmates committed under the Vagrant Act, for those awaiting trial, for people convicted of serious offences, and for those committed for capital offences.²²

There were, however, a number of obstacles to the proper classification of the County Jails which were not surmounted during the period under consideration. In the first place, many of the County Jails were old buildings which had been constructed in the years before classification. Chamberlain noted in 1891 that many of the jails had been built when "little, if any, attention was given... to such arrangement of cells and corridors as would best facilitate a proper classification of prisoners. This faulty structural arrangement is now difficult to remedy..."²³ It was not, though, only the County Jails that suffered from poor design. The Mercer Reformatory, which had been designed to permit proper classification was criticized by a Grand Jury only eight years after its opening as being poorly arranged, for young girls were allowed to associate with "lunatics and hardened criminals." This was denied by the Superintendent,²⁴ and no

²⁰ *Asylums, Prisons and Public Charities — Ontario — 1876* (Toronto: Printed for the Government of Ontario for the Centennial Exhibition, Philadelphia, 1876) p. 18.

²¹ *Report*, 1889, No. 2, p. 12.

²² *Report*, 1889, No. 2, p. 46.

²³ *Report*, 1892, No. 8, p. 3.

²⁴ *Report*, 1888, No. 11, p. 101.

immediate action was taken on the Jury's findings. However, in 1899 it was found necessary to renovate completely the Reformatory to permit the proper arrangement of prisoners in classes.²⁵

The same situation developed in respect to the classification system at the Central Prison. The building had been designed with classification as a priority, but by 1894 the system was breaking down because of overcrowding.²⁶ The overcrowding subsequently became worse, and some prisoners were forced to sleep two in a cell. This was an occurrence, it was said, which would "engender vices the most odious, to neutralize all reformatory efforts, and to cause a pestilence destructive to all morals to overspread the prisoners."²⁷ By 1898, some prisoners sentenced by the Courts to the Central Prison were held for their full term in the County Jails instead of being sent to the overcrowded Central Prison.²⁸

A further factor which caused overcrowding and inhibited classification in the Common Jails was the unfortunate committal of aged, infirm and indigent persons as vagrants. It was the duty of the county to build and maintain refuges and poor houses, but rather than suffer the expense, many counties used their jails not only for the normal function but as poor houses as well. This was in part a continuation of practices of earlier years, but the Inspectors had no patience with old-fashioned approaches. It was a "disgrace" to use the jails for such purposes, thought Chamberlain, "for in most cases these people have lived honest and respectable lives," but due to events "over which they had no control have lost children, property and health." To commit such people to jail as vagrants was "unhuman, unchristian, and unpatriotic" and it "should be prevented by the most stringent legislation, if not immediately remedied by the authorities of the various counties."²⁹ To stop this abuse, the province offered the counties subsidies to build poor houses. That was not a sufficient incentive in all cases and consequently in 1891 the province went a step further and framed regulations requiring the local authorities to provide better food and clothing for the indigent inmates.³⁰ In the same year the Commission examining the Ontario penal system advised that all counties be compelled to build poor houses to relieve the prisons of their destitute inmates.³¹ Neither this recommendation nor the provincial regulations were very effective. In 1893 it was reported that the regulation was not receiving proper attention in some counties for indigents were still clothed in prisoner uniforms and were eating prisoner food. Chamberlain warned that he would be "compelled to make the counties build additions to the gaols for the special care and comfort of these indigent people" for they were taking up room that was required for the "criminal classes."³² By

²⁵ *Report*, 1899, No. 35, p. 77.

²⁶ *Report-Central Prison*, 1895, No. 11, p. 13.

²⁷ *Report-Central Prison*, 1898, No. 11, p. 13.

²⁸ *Report*, 1899, No. 12, p. 16.

²⁹ *Report*, 1892, No. 8, p. 5.

³⁰ *Report*, 1893, No. 9, p. 4.

³¹ *Commissioner's Report*, 1891, p. 220.

³² *Report*, 1893, No. 9, p. 5.

1896 these conditions were reported to be improving in the county jails, but the issue was an indication of the respect with which some of the counties approached their social welfare responsibilities. It is not an exaggeration to say that in many cases the counties' prime concern was expense.³³

Despite the impediments to classification that have been noted, it remained one of the pillars of late nineteenth century penology and was judged as the first and indispensable step towards rehabilitation. Classification was in part a reflection of the contemporary assumptions about the importance of environment in affecting behaviour. If for certain individuals the socialization process had not been effective or had broken down, and crime was considered to be proof of that, the individual was at the mercy of not only his passions but his environment. Thus it was imperative that an environment be created which would mitigate as far as possible this vulnerability, and such a created environment was only possible within an institution.³⁴

The creation of the uncorrupting environment was only the beginning of the rehabilitation programme. All the prisons, especially the intermediate ones, used work as a rehabilitative device, though in many County Jails this was more honoured in the breach. It was believed that work was an activity which would help the inmates to learn habits of industriousness, self-discipline and ultimately, a trade. Warden Massie explained several of these advantages when he noted that "as a factor in the preservation of good order, for the elevation and fitting of the prisoner for his place in the contest for an honourable living, labour in its several pursuits stands next to Christianity, first and indispensable; without it reformation of character may be said to be impossible."³⁵

The advantages of work were not only of a moral nature. It was a widespread belief that prisoners should help defray the cost of their imprisonment and thus be made, in theory at least, responsible for their past actions. The ultimate in this line of reasoning was the occasional demand that the prisons be made self-sustaining from the products of the inmates' labour. These notions fitted nicely with the contemporary emphasis upon inexpensive government. In accordance with this fiscal ambition, some prison labour at the Central Prison was done under the contract system. Contract labour was an arrangement whereby a capitalist would rent the inmates' labour for a fixed *per diem* rate and carry out a manufacturing operation on the prison property. This system was justly criticized as

³³ See: *Report*, 1894, No. 27, p. 4 and *Report*, 1897, No. 11, p. 2.

³⁴ Rothman, *op. cit.*, pp. 82-3.

³⁵ *Report*, 1889, No. 2, p. 90. A further disadvantage of idleness in poorly classified prisons was that it gave "the older and more hardened criminals full opportunity to teach the younger ones all the varied devices for committing crime". *Report*, 1893, No. 9, p. 4.

both an unwarrantable interference with the state's authority over the prisoners and as a hindrance to rehabilitation.³⁶

Not all the complaints about the contract system were based on a concern for the inmate's rehabilitation. It was sometimes contended, often by labour spokesmen, that contract labour as well as any prison labour was an interference with the rights of free labourers. It was argued that prison labour lessened the work available in the society as a whole, and also that prison manufactures were sold on the open market at low prices which undercut the efforts of honest and free workers. This issue was never resolved to the satisfaction of the concerned parties during these years. In reality a solution was impossible, for the prisons insisted upon utilizing work as an economic and rehabilitative device, and their critics refused to believe that prison labour was not a threat. The government was concerned nevertheless with the resulting public resentment. In 1882 Inspector Christie asserted that an "important consideration" when planning prison labour was the selection of work projects which would interfere "in the smallest degree" with that of free workers and yet still have some rehabilitative benefit for the prisoners.³⁷ An example of the depths to which debate over this question could go was given in the Legislature in 1895. During the debates of that year MPP George Ryerson asserted that any form of productive prison labour was an unjust interference with free labour. Therefore he thought it would be best to "keep the prisoners employed in carrying balls and chains and digging holes in the sand and filling them up again". He subsequently amended his proposals for unproductive labour by recommending that the prisoners be employed in doing the printing of the Legislature.³⁸

Such ideas about unproductive labour had been dismissed previously by Warden Massie as old-fashioned and "far behind in what this progressive age requires". He believed instead that the inmates should work on useful and productive projects.³⁹ This was not simply a justification for money-making work. It was also an assertion of the contemporary belief in usefulness as an indispensable factor in human activity and in the creation of self-confidence and self-respect. It was pointed out in 1891 that work which did not force the inmate to acquire manual and mental dexterity could not rehabilitate. Consequently, it was observed that "many may be said to begin life anew and on truer principles from the time they

³⁶ See: "The Prison Labour Question. History of the Contract System in the Toronto Central Prison. A Record of Continuous Failures. The Outlook for the Future". (A Speech of the Hon. W. J. Hanna delivered in the Ontario Legislature, 26 February 1907). The problem was not only interference with the prison's direct authority. In one short-lived case at the Central Prison, the Contractor employed free labourers to work alongside the inmates. Langmuir protested against this practice, and demanded that the outside workers be forbidden to give tobacco to the inmates, as well as stop "the practice of expressing sympathy with the prisoners". *Report*, 1874, No. 2, p. 208.

³⁷ *Report*, 1882/83, No. 8, p. 55.

³⁸ *The Globe*, April 10, 1895.

³⁹ *Report*, 1888, No. 11, p. 78.

enter the workshops.”⁴⁰ Inspector Noxon argued that there would be no “improvement” in the Mercer Reformatory inmates⁴¹

until habits of industry have been formed and skill in the use of hands acquired as foundation upon which to build a confidence in their ability to maintain themselves in the honest pursuits of life. This once given it is not difficult to arouse the moral sense to a hope that there may yet be for them the reward of a better life.

Accordingly, an important aspect of work was teaching trades. To this end the workshops at the Central Prison were gradually enlarged so that by 1892 the manufacture of bricks, shoes, brooms and wooden-wares was carried out. In addition the inmates were employed in the prison’s tailor shop, the machine shop, the small woolen mill and the farm. It was stated that these various activities offered the inmates seventeen occupational choices.⁴² This variety of work entailed high capitalization which reduced possible profits, but Warden Massie contended that the rehabilitative benefits were a “sufficient offset to any lessening of the revenue which might be averted by throwing the whole energies of the management into one of two lines of manufacture.”⁴³ Despite this variety of training though, the inmates’ occupational aspirations were firmly limited to trades. In the Mercer Reformatory the occupational choices were considerably less, and reflected the contemporary image of women’s work. The women were employed at sewing, knitting, mending clothes and doing laundry;⁴⁴ all of which would fit them to be either housewives, domestics or workers in the needle and thread trade.

All these work programmes were based on the ambition to reintegrate the prisoner into the wage economy. However, it was soon realized that the possession of a skill was not the only requirement for that integration to be successful. In addition, the inmates had to be given a reason to acquire proficiency in a trade, and the reason they were eventually given was money.

In 1881 it was discovered that the workers in the contract broom shop at the Central Prison were producing only 1½ dozen brooms per day, as compared to the three dozen which free labourers normally produced. Thus an incentive payment was instituted and the contractor paid \$0.10 per dozen brooms produced over three dozen per day.⁴⁵ The advantages soon became apparent, for payment not only increased productivity but also served as a device which had both immediate and long-term impact on the prisoners’ behaviour. The payments were held in trust by the Warden until the inmate was released from prison, and the collection of these earnings was made conditional upon his past good behaviour and

⁴⁰ *Report*, 1892, No. 8, p. 85.

⁴¹ *Report-Andrew Mercer Reformatory*, 1899, No. 12, p. 3.

⁴² *Report*, 1892, No. 8, p. 84.

⁴³ *Report*, 1894, No. 27, p. 139.

⁴⁴ *Report*, 1892, No. 8, p. 109.

⁴⁵ *Report*, 1882, No. 8, p. 160.

observation of the prison rules.⁴⁶ By 1890 the system of overwork payments had been extended to the other industrial pursuits of the prison. Warden Massie found the system invaluable for encouraging good behaviour, as well as for promoting rehabilitation. He observed in 1896 that "there are some prisoners who have never earned honest money, and these people have been made to feel that honest labour has its rewards."⁴⁷

The payments did not prove to be a sufficient incentive for all the Central Prison inmates. It was said that some of the men were so physically debilitated through "intemperance and unclean habits", that they were incapable of doing any work until they had been "physically built up". Others were so lazy and without self-discipline that they had shunned work "by every conceivable device when at liberty, and they bring the same arts into practice here, and if deceitful pretences, lying, shaming could avail, they would not do a stroke of work".⁴⁸ In any case, the payments which the inmates received were generally quite small. In 1896 the total amount paid to the men was \$2,478, and the average payment was \$4.00; though it was reported that some inmates earned as much as \$2.00 to \$4.00 per month. However, these latter amounts were only within the reach of those men who "possessed mechanical skill, great aptitude for work and who have borne themselves well in point of conduct."⁴⁹

Overwork payments were available only to inmates of the Central Prison. Neither the Mercer Reformatory nor the County Jails used such a system, though the Superintendent of the Reformatory urged that a "trifling sum be given to each woman who does her work well, thus giving her an interest in her own work."⁵⁰ This recommendation was not acted upon. As for the County Jails, such a system of payments would have been pointless, for work was scarce. This was the result of several factors. First, there was an extremely limited market for any prison manufactures in Canada, and many counties were in any case reluctant to make the necessary capital investment for machinery and material. Another factor was that since most inmates were being held on short sentences, the teaching of trades or any employment which required the development of skill was impossible. An added complication was local politics. In 1877 the Federal government had passed a permissive statute on public

⁴⁶ *Report*, 1891, No. 7, p. 75. In earlier years it had been the practice to give to discharged prisoners who had been well-behaved, a small gratuity to assist them in the first few days of freedom. *Report*, 1875, No. 4, p. 66.

⁴⁷ *Report-Central Prison*, 1897, No. 11, p. 14. Another system which was often advocated but never implemented was remission of sentence. Under that arrangement, the inmate would receive a given number of days per month off his sentence in return for good behaviour. As with payment of wages, he could forfeit the whole through bad conduct. *Commissioner's Report*, 1891, p. 221.

⁴⁸ *Report*, 1882/83, No. 8, p. 66.

⁴⁹ *Report-Central Prison*, 1897, No. 11, p. 14.

⁵⁰ *Report*, 1884, No. 8, p. 145.

works.⁵¹ This was, however, nullified by the issue of free versus prison labour. Inspector Langmuir noted that "the fact that the prisoner's labour would conflict with that of free men, has an influence upon the elections for the members of municipal councils..."⁵²

This lack of work in the jails constantly irritated the Inspectors, and they urged and threatened the county authorities to provide facilities for work in the jails. Generally, the work available for the jail inmates was splitting wood for the jail stoves, breaking stone for the county streets, whitewashing and cleaning the jail and sometimes picking oakum. In 1893 the Inspector observed that the jails had at last recognized the necessity of labour "on account of the beneficial effect that work produces... both physically, morally and mentally."⁵³ Recognition however, did not lead to a change in practice. In 1900 it was again reported that work in the jails was almost non-existent, and the inmates were being "allowed to spend their time idly and worse than uselessly..."⁵⁴ As with classification, so it was with work: the jails did not operate in a fashion that was consistent either with provincial government policy or with the opinions of contemporary penologists.

Work was only part of the rehabilitation programme. In addition the prisoners received regular religious and secular instruction. For Protestant inmates of the Mercer Reformatory, the Central Prison and the Toronto Jail, the religious efforts were handled by the Prisoner's Aid Association. Roman Catholic inmates were ministered to by a priest who was assisted by "young men of the Christian Doctrinal Society." As well as saying mass, the priest and his helpers visited with the inmates on Sunday evenings.⁵⁵ Secular instruction, however, was handled by the PAA for all inmates.

⁵¹ CANADA, HOUSE OF COMMONS, *Debates*, March 29, 1877, p. 1062. The Act was: *An Act to Provide for the Employment without the Walls of Common Goals, of Prisoners sentenced to Imprisonment therein*, Canada, *Statutes*, 40 Victoria, 1877, Chapter 36. Edward Blake was not certain of the benefit of this statute. He agreed with the need for hard labour in the country's jails and prisons, but feared that public labour, except for the most "Hardened" criminals would tend "to degrade any prisoner so employed in the presence of the free people of the country." He did not think such work would be "likely to be productive of improving results to the prisoner" as would be if the prisoner worked "on a farm or something of that kind more in the country". *Ibid.*, p. 1062.

⁵² *Report*, 1879, No. 8, p. 76.

⁵³ *Report*, 1894, No. 27, p. 3.

⁵⁴ *Report*, 1901, No. 36, p. 9.

⁵⁵ *Report*, 1878, No. 4, p. 364. There is little information provided in the Reports on religious efforts for Roman Catholic inmates. In 1885, however, a number of charges were laid against Warden Massie, some of which included allegations of anti-Roman Catholic bias. A Commission was held to examine these charges. Massie was charged with taking down Roman Catholic pictures from Catholic inmates' cells, refusing admittance to the prison to Catholic chaplains who had come to preach, and among other things, that those "in authority" had spoken disparagingly about Catholics and their institutions. None of these charges were authenticated due to a lack of evidence. *Report of Evidence of Wardens of Prisons etc. in the United States and Canada, Taken Before the Royal Commission Appointed to Enquire into Certain Charges Against the Warden of the Central Prison and into the Management of the Said Prison*; in Ontario, *Sessional Papers*, 1886, No. 26, pp. 4-6 and 61-63. Hereafter cited as *Central Prison Inquiry — 1885*.

When the Central Prison was opened in 1874, the Toronto Jail Mission was approached by the then Inspector John Langmuir to assume the responsibility for the religious work with the inmates. Later that year they reorganized themselves as the Prisoner's Aid Association.⁵⁶ When the Mercer Reformatory was opened, the PAA took on the additional charge of working with the inmates of that institution. In return for their efforts with the inmates, the Association received a yearly grant from the provincial government. This enabled the Association to conduct regular, long-term programmes in the Toronto prisons. Accordingly they employed an agent, a school teacher, several Bible Readers and recruited voluntary ministers to preach at the prisons. The recruitment of ministers did not prove to be easy. In 1873 the PAA sent a circular to the Toronto Ministerial Association asking for volunteers to lead the Sunday School and to conduct regular religious services.⁵⁷ The work was undenominational and the PAA gave assistance in the form of cab fares and hints on how best to approach the inmates. The PAA appeal was not as successful as they had expected it to be, and consequently they were able to have compulsory Sunday School and Service only on alternate Sundays. This lack of workers was eventually corrected, and by 1879 both Sunday activities were being held weekly.⁵⁸

There was never any doubt expressed about the efficacy of Christianity as an agent for the rehabilitation of prisoners. W. H. Howland, Superintendent of the Mercer Reformatory Sunday School, remarked that "we [the PAA] are satisfied that the Word of God is the best means for the reformation of the fallen. The steady persistent teaching of this Word bears more fruit than any other method".⁵⁹ Maude Keith, one of the PAA Bible Readers, testified that the Gospel had given new life to some of the inmates. One of the Mercer Reformatory inmates reputedly told her that "I praise the Lord that I was ever sent to the Mercer Reformatory." Keith found however, that some of the Central Prison inmates were tougher to convert, but nevertheless the religious readings often inspired hope and ambition for a changed life. She claimed that "often as we tell the simple story of the cross, I have seen tears course down the bruised and battered faces and have felt that there is still something good left in them."⁶⁰

The PAA believed that the Sunday School was one of the most important aspects of their work in the prisons, for it presented the pulpit preaching as "personally applied to the heart and conscience of the prisoners." The key to this effectiveness was that the Sunday School Teacher:⁶¹

⁵⁶ *Report*, 1874, pp. 217-18.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 218-19. Attendance at both Sunday School and Church Service was compulsory for all inmates.

⁵⁸ *Report*, 1879, No. 8, p. 391.

⁵⁹ *Report*, 1892, No. 8, p. 121.

⁶⁰ *Report*, 1894, No. 27, p. 104.

⁶¹ *Report*, 1874, No. 2, p. 219.

looks with a kindly interest into the eyes of the individual man in his class, and reasons with him "of the righteousness and a judgment to come", while he, at the same time, in various forms, puts these questions substantially and directly to him: "Do you desire to flee from the wrath to come?", "Will you accept the blessed Saviour as your Saviour?..." Few men, with even so hard a heart, can long resist the king, loving appeal of an earnest devoted Christian man who talks to him thus.

The timetable of the Sunday School shows that it primarily consisted of hymn singing, reading Bible verses and studying the Bible. In 1877, the PAA reported that the attendance at the Sunday School had averaged thirty-five, and throughout the year forty different individuals had conducted the school.⁶²

The Association employed a full-time Agent at the Central Prison to supplement the regular Sunday activities. He individually counselled the inmates in their cells each Sunday, and visited each Thursday afternoon at which time he conducted a service in the corridor. During these visits he distributed Bibles, New Testaments and Tracts, all of which the PAA obtained from the Bible and Tract Society.⁶³ A further responsibility of the Agent was to assist the men at the time of their release. More will be said about this activity later.

The inmates of the County Jails, with the exception of some of the large urban jails, did not receive religious instruction on a comprehensive basis. This was left in the hands of the local clergy, who ministered as often and when they saw fit.

In addition to the overtly religious work that it carried on at the Toronto institutions, in 1883 the PAA began to operate a night school four times a week at the Central Prison. The establishment of this school was one of the conditions of its annual government grant. The school aimed at giving an elementary education which would prepare the inmates to earn an "honest" living after their release.⁶⁴ The curriculum consisted of mathematics, writing, reading, "current events" and occasionally geography.⁶⁵ Current events was designed to give the inmates "something healthy to think about... thus diverting their thoughts into more healthy channels". As well, every third lesson included a lecture by the teacher on topics of concern such as temperance, masturbation, discipline and "self-control." The teacher, E.A. Stevens, noted that he was "more and more convinced that these subjects should be frequently brought before them. My motto is: "The poorest education that teaches self-control is better than the best that neglects it".⁶⁶ A further example of the school's role in rehabilitation was the teacher's boast in 1896 that "every opportunity is seized to inculcate moral lessons, and develop an ambition to rise to a useful, pure and noble life".⁶⁷

⁶² *Report*, 1878, No. 4, p. 365.

⁶³ *Report of the Toronto Prisoner's Aid Society for the Year 1875-76*, p. 6.

⁶⁴ *Report*, 1894, No. 27, p. 162.

⁶⁵ *Report*, 1889, No. 2, pp. 101-02.

⁶⁶ *Loq. cit.*

⁶⁷ *Report-Central Prison*, 1896, No. 12, p. 32.

The school was thus designed to teach the inmates those ideal attributes that had apparently been neglected during their youth. Since contemporary theory held that lack of education was often a cause of crime, it followed that education could also reverse that process. To increase the lessons of self-control which the inmates received in the school, and at the same time better organize the prison, attendance at the school was made a "privilege" which was "forfeitable for any misconduct in or out of school." The inmate had to obtain the Warden's approval before he could enroll in the school, and this was granted only if he was considered a "fit subject for the school" and there were "no bad reports recorded against him in the prison books". This ruling was often rescinded if the prisoner pleaded long and convincingly enough, and after a "couple of refusals the man is usually allowed to attend."⁶⁸ In 1889 both Warden Massie and the PAA recommended that schooling be made compulsory for all inmates.⁶⁹ This recommendation was doubtless due to the increasing emphasis which was being placed on literacy as a marketable skill and on the power of the written word to shape character. Nevertheless, that schooling was made a reward is suggestive of the manner in which institutional needs were identified with rehabilitation.

Literacy was difficult to encourage in the prisons because books were not available in sufficient quantities in either the jails, the Central Prison or the Mercer Reformatory. The Central Prison library consisted of 840 books which were insufficient for the number of users. These volumes consisted of "carefully selected books of the best authors in the various branches of literature."⁷⁰ The Mercer Reformatory library was small but was even more inadequate than that of the Central Prison. It was noted in 1898 that more books were needed at the Reformatory because the ones they had were falling to pieces since they had been of a "cheap" variety.⁷¹ The women who were able to read were allowed to take these books out and read them in their cells. The policy at the Central Prison was that the men were allowed to have, in addition to a Bible and a Prayer Book, one library book at a time in their cells. This was only allowed if the inmate's "conduct has been good."⁷²

Books for prisoners could be a mixed blessing. In keeping with the controlled environment which it was believed essential to establish in the prisons, it was necessary to keep undesirable books away from the inmates. In 1881 one of the prisoners in London Jail was discovered reading "flash novels," an occurrence which Langmuir found alarming.⁷³ It was believed to be of little use to attempt to wean men from their past habits if they were only reinforced through tales of murders, crimes and passion. This was a recurrent problem with books. Since it was accepted that the

⁶⁸ *Report*, 1885, No. 12, p. 103.

⁶⁹ *Report*, 1890, No. 11, p. 91.

⁷⁰ *Report-Central Prison*, 1896, No. 12, p. 14.

⁷¹ *Report-Andrew Mercer Reformatory*, 1899, No. 12, p. 8.

⁷² *Report*, 1874, No. 2, p. 46.

⁷³ *Report*, 1882, No. 8, p. 105.

written word could shape minds, conversely it was felt that it could corrupt if the content was of an inappropriate nature. The same issue was at stake when the Central Prison Warden had pictures, some of which had religious motifs, taken down from the cell walls, because "there were writings and drawings of an obscene character drawn by the prisoners on the backs of some of these pictures."⁷⁴

To help fill this gap in approved reading and at the same time impart knowledge to the inmates, the PAA School Teacher established in 1886 a small newspaper for the prisoners in the Central Prison. It was called the *Echo*, and as the teacher explained, "by this means I endeavour to stir up a taste for wholesome reading and bring before them things which it may be useful to know."⁷⁵ Unfortunately the *Echo* seems to have been a shortlived enterprise, for there was no subsequent mention of its publication. An additional means of imparting knowledge to the inmates was through lectures given by people from outside the prison. In 1886 for example, a "number of gentlemen" gave lectures to the prisoners of the Central Prison on "various topics." This too was a privilege, for attendance was conditional upon good behaviour.⁷⁶ Again, the needs of the institution were combined with the need for rehabilitation.

It would be misleading to suggest that the encouragement of discipline through a system of privileges in return for good conduct was a matter which only marginally concerned rehabilitation. Discipline was necessary to preserve order in the institution, but that order and discipline would, it was believed, also lead to personal habits of restraint, regularity and decorum. Through the tightly regulated prison life which was reinforced through various punishments and rewards, the inmates' former habits would be broken and replaced by more conventional and repressed ones. Massie believed that discipline was "highly beneficial in its effects towards reform" because many of the prisoners had never been "put under proper restraint... and were accustomed to follow only the dictates of their depraved and vicious natures... they have to be educated and comply with order, and be submissive to authority."⁷⁷

Many of the prison rules were designed to further this process of transformation of habit.⁷⁸ For example, in 1884 the use of tobacco by the inmates at the Central Prison was forbidden. In addition to teaching the men denial, though perhaps for many it only taught deviousness, the non-use of tobacco helped in the struggle against rum. In 1882 Hamilton Cassels of the PAA had urged the abolition of tobacco, for it "to a large extent, keeps alive and satisfies for the time being that desire and appetite for the excessive use of intoxicating liquor, indulgence in which it is

⁷⁴ *Central Prison Inquiry-1885*, p. 61. See Also: "What to Read" *The Journal of Education for Ontario*, Vol. 29, 1876, p. 63.

⁷⁵ *Report*, 1887, No. 12, p. 93.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 81.

⁷⁷ *Report*, 1889, No. 2, p. 91.

⁷⁸ For rules of the County Jails see: *Report*, 1882, No. 8, pp. 77-91. A timetable for the Mercer Reformatory is in: *Report*, 1889, No. 2, p. 103.

well known, is the cause, in the majority of cases, for which the men are committed..." Consequently, if they were denied tobacco their rehabilitation would be furthered and strengthened.⁷⁹

The abolition of tobacco was only a single example in the overall picture. In addition, the rigid timetables, silence and restraint which were part of the prison rules were intended to aid rehabilitation. Rules provided an external form of discipline which would in time affect the inmates' personal habits. In this manner the older habits would be replaced with more desirable ones. In that connection, Inspector Langmuir explained that "the regularity, order and decorum" that "should prevail" if the prisoners ate together instead of in their cells "cannot fail in having a good moral effect." In addition, "good discipline and complete subordination, two of the most important lessons that prisoners have to learn — are practically inculcated." He concluded that the act of "sitting down together — although in silence" would have a "humanizing and elevating effect" upon the inmates.⁸⁰

The creation of new personalities and habits by such means as have been outlined above obviously required a great deal of time. This was recognized at the time and consequently there was a continual and bitter stream of complaint directed by prison administrators and reformers against the existing system of sentencing. The maximum sentence of any inmate in an Ontario prison was two years, though the average sentence imposed upon inmates in the Central Prison was between six and nine months.⁸¹ The sentences in the jails were of course less. These sentences were considered to be much too short to achieve any lasting and effective transformation of character. Therefore, demands were made for longer fixed sentences or for the implementation of indeterminate sentencing. Under an indeterminate sentence the prisoner would be committed for a minimum but not a maximum term, and release would be conditional upon rehabilitation being achieved.⁸² Mrs. O'Reilly of the Mercer Reformatory wanted longer sentences, especially for recidivists and drunkards. She argued that "much greater good would likely result, owing to the more permanent influences which Reformatory discipline and training would have."⁸³ John Langmuir had made the same argument in 1873 when he wrote that society received no benefit from short sentences for recidivist, and suggested that "when a person, by repeated petty offences, evinces a proclivity to crime, his term of imprisonment should be made so long that his idle and vagrant habits may be broken up, and replaced by habits of industry and usefulness."⁸⁴ Later in the century Massie flatly stated that short sentences were in fact an encouragement for crime. He argued that

⁷⁹ *Report*, 1882/83, No. 8, p. 79.

⁸⁰ *Report*, 1874, No. 2, p. 47.

⁸¹ *Report-Central Prison*, 1898, No. 11, pp. 18-19.

⁸² James MASSIE, "Prison Reform in Ontario", *The Canadian Law Review*, vol. 2, (1902/03), pp. 394-96, *passim*.

⁸³ *Report*, 1889, No. 2, p. 105.

⁸⁴ *Report*, 1874, No. 2, p. 45.

the prisoners served only short sentences after which they were released to "resume their depredations on society, ...with invigorated health, acquired at the expense of the province...."⁸⁵ In 1890 Mrs. O'Reilly visited several female reformatories in the United States and she returned to Canada even more enthusiastic about long sentences. The American inmates, because of their long sentences of up to ten years, "look upon the Reformatory as their home" she reported, and consequently they found it in their "best interests" to behave in a "quiet orderly manner."⁸⁶ Similarly, the PAA in its various annual reports made demands for the implementation of either the indeterminate sentence or at least longer fixed sentences. Institutionalization had not yet become a concern for prison theorists.

The demands for longer fixed sentences were in large part the result of a feeling that the existing rehabilitation schemes were inadequate, especially for those inmates who were "incorrigible" or recidivist. However, criminal records were not kept until 1900, and prior to that date only occasional statistical counts were made. One such tabulation for the Common Jails in 1876 revealed that 30 percent of the inmates were recidivists.⁸⁷ The same percentage of inmates of the Central Prison were discovered to be recidivists in 1900 when regularly collected figures were published.⁸⁸ Despite these figures, which were considered to be alarmingly high, there were many references made to the examples of men and women who had been rehabilitated in the province's prisons. These were very subjective impressions, and were based upon word of mouth reports or letters from former inmates.

In order to counter recidivism, the PAA and the Salvation Army provided the inmates with assistance at the time of their release. It has already been noted that the PAA employed an agent who in addition to his other duties assisted the released inmates. The scope and amount of aid granted by the PAA is shown in the Table below. It was a remarkably comprehensive set of benefits, and was a credit to the efforts of the Association. Many of the necessities that were distributed were obtained from public donations. In 1875 the Association stressed in its Annual Report that it welcomed any "donation of cast off clothing for discharged prisoners many of whom are destitute and have no friends."⁸⁹ The PAA was not the only source of clothing, for the prisons distributed clothing to the inmates at the time of their release. At the Mercer Reformatory all the women received, at the time of their discharge, a suit of clothes. Those who had been confined for longer than twelve months and who had been well behaved were "provided with an outfit of better material."⁹⁰ The

⁸⁵ *Report*, 1890, No. 11, p. 88.

⁸⁶ *Report*, 1891, No. 7, p. 103.

⁸⁷ *Report*, 1876, No. 2, p. 67.

⁸⁸ *Report*, 1901, No. 36, p. 46.

⁸⁹ *Report of the Toronto Prisoner's Aid Society for the Year 1874/75*, p. 10.

⁹⁰ *Report-Andrew Mercer Reformatory*, 1899, No. 12, p. 7. In 1885 it was recommended that clothing for discharged prisoners at the Central Prison be used as a reward. If an inmate had behaved badly in prison then he could receive clothes only sufficient "to protect him from the severity of the season". Well behaved inmates would receive clothing of a better quality. *Central Prison Inquiry-1885*, p. 55.

Association also made loans to former prisoners, and as is reported in Table I a considerable portion of these loans were repaid.

Table I

AID GRANTED TO PRISONERS BY THE PAA: 1885-1894

YEAR:	1885	1886	1887	1888	1889	1890	1891	1892	1893	1894
Work found for:	384	311	291	301	319	181	174	128	71	120
Prisoner's families aided:	n/a	40	37	43	71	84	140	75	26	25
Articles of furniture given:	68 ^a	105	93	68	39	32	21	81 ^a	n/a	1
Rent paid for:	24	33	21	14	9	14	18	15	4	1
Articles of clothing given:	339	428	362	274	193	226	160	183	50	222 ^b
Number given tools and materials:	59	33	24	31	53	40	52	36	4	6
Fares paid: (Rail)	29	39	28	17	26	40	72	51	31	21
Number of meals given:	380 ^d	3066	2118	2835	4343	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	229 ^d
Lodgings given to:	250	500	547	625	1344 ^c	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
\$ Loaned:	\$522	\$593	\$615	\$304	\$313	\$350	\$338	\$167	\$42	\$26
\$ Repaid on loans:	\$417	\$507	\$518	\$222	\$219	\$240	\$204	\$115	\$37	n/a
Total number assisted by PAA:	726	841	673	715	723	761	796	506	271	457

Source: Compiled from *Reports*, 1886-95

a Number of families given to

b Clothing given to

c Nights of lodging given

d Includes lodgings

The PAA also helped the released prisoners to find jobs, and they reported in 1883 that "it is remarkable how willing the great majority of employers of labour are to give them [former prisoners] an opportunity to retrieve their character and position."⁹¹ However, in 1898 it was reported that it was more difficult to get employment for these people because the employers showed "preference to others than prisoners."⁹² The latter condition was in fact the normal state of affairs, and consequently the availability of jobs for former prisoners was closely tied to current economic conditions.⁹³ The inmates of the Mercer Reformatory were sometimes placed in positions by the Reformatory.⁹⁴ Through that system the women were more closely watched and controlled after their release, but there was no legal authority for the Reformatory to regulate

⁹¹ *Report*, 1884, No. 8, p. 111.

⁹² *Report-Central Prison*, 1898, No. 11, p. 35.

⁹³ *Report*, 1901, No. 36, p. 64.

⁹⁴ *Report*, 1894, No. 27, p. 88.

their behaviour. Further assistance was provided in the form of two PAA shelters, one for females and another for males, in which the released prisoners could stay for a short time. In 1900 the Salvation Army established a farm just outside of Toronto to which the men could go after their release.⁹⁵ The Army also operated a shelter in Toronto.

The Salvation Army had become involved in prison work towards the end of the century and operated under the name of the Prison Gate Movement. It was directed by W.P. Archibald, who later became the first Dominion Parole Officer. Archibald had a deep faith that the gospel could reform men, but at the same time he rejected the "twaddle of many people" who preached at the prisoners about the "Prodigal Son or some other wild character of the Bible". He believed that former prisoners needed not more tracts but realistic programmes of assistance. He argued that "if the criminal classes are to be transformed into new men... Divine life must be transfused into them through human agencies or channels." It was essential however that "this be done by practical methods adapted to meet the requirements as the individual case may need". These practical methods included visiting and giving necessities to inmates and their families both before and after release, assistance in finding a job and temporary shelter when needed.⁹⁶

Archibald's insistence upon practical help was not, as can be seen in the Table, confined only to the Salvation Army. The PAA assistance was largely predicated upon the same assumption. As extensions of the institutional programmes they gave tools and materials to encourage wage employment and self-employment, provided household goods to re-establish or create homes and gave loans for the same general purposes. The rail fares were provided either to return ex-prisoners to their homes or to send them to places where employment was available. The objects of the PAA and the Salvation Army were therefore the same: to normalize through various means, the former prisoners' relationship with society.

This policy of re-integration began to be more closely associated with the institution itself by the close of the century. Throughout the 1890s various demands had been made for a parole system, and a parole or ticket of leave Act was finally passed in 1899 for the inmates of Federal penitentiaries.⁹⁷ In the following year this Act was extended as well to

⁹⁵ *Report*, 1901, No. 36, p. 67. The use of farms for released inmates was a common theme. In 1877 the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Toronto urged Langmuir to establish an "industrial farm" for released men, or alternately put them to out-door public works in the free-grant districts. *Report*, 1878, No. 4, p. 364-65. Likewise the myth of agricultural pursuits, or at least rural ones, appealed to the PAA who discouraged newly released inmates from staying in Toronto, presumably to avoid urban-caused corruption. *Twelfth Annual Report of the Prisoner's Aid Association of Canada for the Year 1886*, p. 4. See also note 44 above.

⁹⁶ *Report*, 1901, No. 36, p. 66.

⁹⁷ The Act was: *An Act to provide for the Conditional Liberation of Penitentiary Convicts*, Canada, *Statutes*, 62-63 Victoria, Chapter 49. Under this Act the inmate was supervised only insofar as he had to regularly report to the local police.

the inmates of provincial prisons. J.T. Gilmour, the new Central Prison Warden, thought that the act was an "excellent one." However, he felt that the "mode of enforcing it was so very imperfect that we derive but little benefit from it."⁹⁸ He was probably referring to the lack of centralized supervision of the parolees.

The Parole Act can be seen as a first tentative step away from the previous reliance upon programmes carried on within institutions to effect rehabilitation. During the nineteenth century institutions had become integral and assumed factors in the treatment of many forms of deviance. Parole was not a rejection of those methods, nor was it intended to be. Rather it was envisaged as a consistent development of those programmes which gave rewards in return for good behaviour. Nevertheless, it was significant that the state had begun offering the ultimate reward. It signaled a slowly developing change in Canadian correctional thought, and a recognition that there were alternate programmes with which to attempt rehabilitation.

⁹⁸ *Report*, 1901, No. 36, p. 46.