

Land, Agriculture, and the Carceral: The Territorializing Function of Penitentiary Farms

Kelly Struthers Montford

Abstract: The Correctional Service of Canada is currently re-instituting animal-based agribusiness programs in two federal penitentiaries. To situate the contemporary function of such programs, I provide a historical overview of prison agriculture in relation to Canadian nation-making. I argue that penitentiary farms have functioned as a means of prison expansion and settler territorialisation. While support for agricultural programming is rooted in its perceived facilitation of rehabilitation and vocational training, I show that these justifications are untenable. Rather the prison farm ought to be viewed as an institution made possible by and that reproduces, settler colonial power relations to animals, labour, and territory. Prison agribusiness is then an expression of colonial, agricultural, and carceral powers.

I. Introduction

Prior to confederation in 1867, and until 2010, Canadian penitentiary farms were a component of federal male incarceration.¹ In 2009, under the direction of the Conservative government, the

-
1. Archambault “Report of the Royal Commission,” 136. The archival records that I have reviewed do not provide a rationale as to why penitentiary agriculture was unique to men’s institutions. Women under federal sentence were historically “rehabilitated” according to standards of middle-class whiteness so that they could become marriageable and find employment as domestic servants. See Hannah-Moffat, *Punishment in Disguise*. Prison labour in women’s

Correctional Service of Canada (CSC) announced the closure of its agribusiness programs.² Prior to their closure, the penitentiary farms employed approximately 716 federal prisoners (less than 1 percent of the prison population) in six institutions³ whose work included animal-based farming activities such as dairying, egg-production, and the rearing, slaughtering, and butchering of farmed animals. The government stated that less than one percent of prisoners working in agribusiness found work in this field upon release. Furthermore, at the time of closure, the farms were operating at a loss of \$4 million per year—costing \$11 million to operate, the farms generated \$7 million in revenue.⁴ The government positioned the farms as both financially unviable and as having little return on “investment” in that prisoners were not trained in marketable skills. The government had announced that this program would be replaced by updated and relevant employment training initiatives.⁵

In 2010, amidst public resistance and protest, the farms closed. In the summer of 2016, as a result of ongoing public pressure from food activists, farming groups, public officials, and citizens, CSC ran a public consultation exploring the possibility of reopening prison farms.⁶ In February 2018, the liberal government committed \$4.3 million dollars to re-open two penitentiary farms in the Kingston, Ontario area over the next five years. In the presentation of their federal budget, the current liberal government stated that reopening two of the previously closed farms would “provide federal inmates with training opportunities to acquire new skills, while

penitentiaries also continues to be gendered and in service of the larger men’s institutions. This includes laundry services, textiles, and the sewing of prison-issued men’s clothing, towels, bed linens, and drapery. See Office of the Correctional Investigator Canada, “Annual Report.” The *Penitentiary Act* of 1868 also provided for the imposition of “hard labour” for a period not exceeding three months, see Canada, “An Act respecting Penitentiaries.” For these reasons, I suspect that agriculture was not seen as an appropriate rehabilitative program for women as it is rooted in beliefs about strenuous physical labour and masculine dominance over nature. See MacDonald, “(Confidential Memorandum)”; Anderson, *Creatures of Empire*; Fischer, *Cattle Colonialism*; Kim, *Dangerous Crossings*.

2. Goodman and Dawe, “Prisoners, Cows and Abattoirs.”
3. Mehta, “Trudeau Government Considers Reopening Prison Farms”; Fitzgerald, “Doing Time in a Slaughterhouse.”
4. Neufield, “The Herd at the Pen.”
5. Francis, “Ottawa Failing on Prison Farm Replacement.”
6. CSC “Penitentiary Farm Online Public Consultation.”

preparing for employment and successful reintegration and rehabilitation into the community.”⁷

As a first step, the re-opened farms will operate a goat dairy, in which milk from approximately 500 goats will be sold to a Chinese-based infant formula producer, Feihe International. Penitentiary goat-dairies have been positioned as responsive to an increased demand for goat dairy products in the region in which the two farms will re-open. This increased demand, however, is the result of Feihe International investing \$225 million to build an infant formula plant in the Kingston, Ontario area. The plant will purchase Canadian dairy to make 60,000 tonnes of dry infant food per year; 85 percent of which will be transported to China to support the baby boom expected with the repeal of their one-child policy.⁸ With the opening of the plant, the government plans to double penitentiary herds from 500 goats to 1000 goats to support production demands.⁹ Subsequent announcements reveal that thirty cows will also be part of the re-opened farms.¹⁰ CSC also plans to have penal agricultural labourers slaughtering and butchering goats not used in the dairy, as well as animals for 350 farms in the surrounding area. In total, the farms will occupy 1,500 acres of land.¹¹ The Government has directed that the farms would again be managed by CORCAN¹² using a for-profit model.¹³

Despite the historical importance of agriculture in Canada’s colonial project and the place of the penitentiary farm in Canada’s penological history, it has received little academic attention. Of the attention paid, much of it addresses contemporary penal agriculture, and fails to consider farmed animals as subjects who are targeted by overlapping forms

7. Canada, “Federal Budget 2018.”

8. McGregor, “New Chinese Baby Formula Plant to Buy Canadian Milk.”

9. Vincent, “The Return of Prison Farms and Tattoos.”

10. MacAlpine, “Cows, Goats Headed Back to Jail,”; Snowdon, “More than 30 Dairy Cows.”

11. MacAlpine, “Cows Not in Initial Prison Farm Plan.”

12. CORCAN is a Special Operating Agency that manages federal prison industries in Canada. As per the CSC, “CORCAN is a key rehabilitation program of the Correctional Service of Canada (CSC). It contributes to safe communities by providing offenders with employment and employability skills training while incarcerated in federal penitentiaries, and for brief periods of time, after they are released into the community.” They currently produce four “business lines” spanning textiles, manufacturing, construction, and services. See CSC, “CORCAN.”

13. Canada, “Federal Budget 2018”; MacAlpine, “Cows, Goats Headed Back to Jail.”

of carceral power.¹⁴ Of the criminological literature that takes the question of animal subjectivity seriously, attention is not paid to the role of colonialism and animal subjugation.¹⁵ Recent scholarship has considered the spatial similarities shaping separate locations and institutions of human and animal confinement such as prisons, solitary confinement cells, factory farms, zoos, and research laboratories,¹⁶ but the prison farm remains unaddressed. This paper responds to these omissions by situating the federal prison farm as an instrument of settler colonialism that has served to expand the geographical footprint of the prison itself, while at the same time instituting settler-colonial ways of relating to animals, labour, land, and punishment. In so doing, this paper seeks to nuance and contextualize current debates surrounding the reinstatement of the penitentiary farms.

I show that in the context of Canada, prison farms are distinctly rooted in a settler colonial project of territorialisation whereby land and animals are transformed into property.¹⁷ I approach prison-based agriculture as historically contingent penal practice that requires an account of its conditions of possibility.¹⁸ By analyzing archival and historical documents related to prison-based agriculture, labour, and nation-making, I show that the penitentiary farm was not an inevitable result of historical process, but was articulable because it tracked onto dominant tenets of Canadian nation-making in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Based on my analysis, I argue that the penitentiary farm is rooted in a settler colonial project of nation-making in four overlapping manners: (1) the prison farm has enabled the prison to expand its geographical footprint; (2) it relies on colonial relations of private property to animals and to land; (3) it reproduces settler colonial norms of labour and life as natural and superior; and (4) as an income generating program that provides labour and food to the prison, and for sale outside of the prison, it contributes to the overall viability of the prison and reproduces a specific vision of civilized punishment. Rather than offering a uniquely rehabilitative programme, the penitentiary farm is a settler location of punishment, pedagogy, and labour extraction. Settler colonialism—a racialized project of territorial

14. See, further, Goodman and Dawe, "Prisoners, Cows and Abattoirs"; Dawe and Goodman, "Conservative Politics, Sacred Cows."

15. See, e.g., Fitzgerald, "Doing Time in a Slaughterhouse."

16. Gruen, "Dignity, Captivity,"; Guenther, *Solitary Confinement*; Morin, *Carceral Space*; Morin, "Wildspace"; Struthers Montford, "Dehumanized Denizens."

17. See, further, Anderson, *Creatures of Empire*; Kim, *Dangerous Crossings*; Struthers Montford, "Agricultural Power."

18. See, further, Carlen, *A Criminological Imagination*; Foucault, "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History"; Foucault, "Two Lectures"; Haque, *Multiculturalism*.

acquisition, cultural genocide, and nation-building—cannot then be divorced from regimes of punishment. The re-opening of the penitentiary agriculture must then be placed in historical context, namely the explicitly colonial purpose in which these farms were instituted and operated during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

II. Settler Colonialism, Territory, and the Prison

In the “Colonialism of Incarceration,” Robert Nichols¹⁹ argues that a land critique should inform critical prison scholarship examining incarceration in settler colonial contexts. For Nichols, it is not the case that the prison is an inherently colonial institution, but that in Canada, its deployment and contemporary function supports settler colonial projects that must constantly reproduce and secure the settler state’s singularity of rule, deny indigenous modes of self-governance, as well as ensure the state’s ongoing access to land. For Patrick Wolfe, “territoriality is settler colonialism’s specific, irreducible element.”²⁰ Land must therefore be constantly re-secured and accessed as it is “the foundation of colonial state-formation, settlement and capitalist development.”²¹ In this perspective, the specificity of settler colonialism centres upon “the disappearance of indigeneity and the sedimentation of settler life-ways as normative.”²² The historical imposition of animal agriculture was one method in which colonists asserted Western modes of life as inherent and inevitable. Despite this supposed inevitability, in Canada and the United States, animal agriculture was not the natural result of historical progress, but was a tactical, focused, and targeted strategy of colonial governance.²³

Settlers understood the practice of animal agriculture to be an important marker of civility, as it entailed “proper” relationships to animals and to land, as well as to labour (as diligent and contributing to the wealth of the nation).²⁴ Due to its inextricable link to civilized norms, agriculture became a means for colonists to assert difference and superiority between white settlers and Indigenous persons. It also allowed colonists to invoke claims of “terra nullius.” They did so on the basis that Indigenous nations did not have private property relationships to land, nor used animals—with whom colonists also claimed private property relationships over—to

19. Nichols, “The Colonialism of Incarceration.”

20. Wolfe, “Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native,” 388.

21. Coulthard, *Red Skin, White Masks*, 6.

22. Belcourt, “Animal Bodies, Colonial Subjects,” 2.

23. See Anderson, *Creatures of Empire*; Kim, *Dangerous Crossings*; Struthers Montford, “Agricultural Power.”

24. Anderson, *Creatures of Empire*.

improve the land via agriculture. Their use of the land was therefore not perceived as productive, and hence did not constitute a legal claim to territory. By enclosing land, marking property lines, and having farmed animals graze on and transform land, colonists met their own legal requirements that allowed them to make a claim to the territory in question.²⁵ Animal agriculture in the Canadian settler context is then an institution that is shaped by an anthropocentric politics of life and of space “whereby land is commodified and privatized for animal agriculture”²⁶ and animals become “subjects of empire.”²⁷

The position of animals as property and resources to serve colonial ends is not an ontological certainty, but in the context of Canada, a colonial import. Indigenous scholars such as Kim TallBear (Sisseton-Wahpeton Oyate, South Dakota), Billy-Ray Belcourt (Driftpile Cree First Nation, Alberta), and Margaret Robinson (Mi'kmaq scholar and member of Lennox Island First Nation), have argued that the dualism of human/animal and the violent hierarchies mobilized on this basis are distinctly colonial, politically beneficial to settler nation-making projects, and in conflict with Indigenous understandings of life and responsibility.²⁸ Indigenous understandings of animals as subjects in their own right were indexed as uncivilized, naïve, and a-cultural and taken to be another indicator that Indigenous persons required colonization.²⁹ While settler governments used animal agriculture to acquire land, the practice was also imposed upon Indigenous persons as a way to have them attain a modicum of civility.³⁰ In 1891, for example, Edgar Dewdney, Superintendent General of the Department of Indian Affairs, included in his annual report that the Indigenous peoples of Manitoba and Keewatin had made “satisfactory progress” in adopting private property relationships that served to “transform an Indian into a white-man in sentiment”:

The personal property of these Indians, in cattle especially, is increasing; and the more general substitution of substantially built homes for the

25. *Ibid.*; Anderson, *Creatures of Empire*; Kim, *Dangerous Crossings*; Struthers Montford, “Agricultural Power.”

26. Belcourt, “Animal Bodies, Colonial Subjects,” 5.

27. *Ibid.*, 5

28. *Ibid.*; Robinson, “Animal Personhood”; Robinson, “Veganism”; TallBear, “An Indigenous Approach”; TallBear, “Beyond the Life/Not-Life Binary.”

29. Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, *What We Have Learned*; Anderson, *Creatures of Empire*; Kim, *Dangerous Crossings*.

30. Anderson, *Creatures of Empire*; Kim, *Dangerous Crossings*; Woolford, *This Benevolent Experiment*.

temporary wigwam, evinces the growth among them of an inclination for domestic life of permanent character, with its attendant comforts.³¹

Belcourt argues that the transformation of animals from subjects to property continues to advance settler colonial projects: “Settler colonialism is invested in animality and therefore re-makes animal bodies into colonial subjects to normalize settler modes of political life (i.e., territorial acquisition, anthropocentrism, capitalism, white supremacy, and neoliberal pluralism) that further displace and disappear indigenous bodies and epistemologies.”³² Philosophers such as Lisa Guenther and James Stanescu have argued that farmed animals exist as de-animalized³³ and deadened life³⁴—subject positions made possible by and mediated by their property status. Farmed animals are not considered relational, feeling beings, but are instead reduced to input-out machines whose entire lives are structured and directed based on the products they will produce and/or become. Animal agriculture is itself carceral in its techniques of enclosure, objectification, corporeal domination, and profit extraction.

As institutions the prison and the animal farm have competing goals. While the prison is meant to keep those in its charge alive (though this must be distinguished from quality of life), the expressed purpose of animal agriculture is the production of corpses.³⁵ Guenther, for example, writes that, “prisoners have become risks to be managed, resistances to be eliminated, and organisms to be fed, maintained, and even prevented from taking their own lives.”³⁶ Writing about the location of the factory farm, Stanescu argues that, “animals are conceived here as machines that convert certain inputs (like feedstuffs) into certain outputs (like eggs, milk, flesh).”³⁷ In order to minimize inputs while maximizing outputs, every element of the animal-machine is controlled.³⁸ Despite these differences, the prison and the farm are shaped by similar logics and exist on a carceral continuum.³⁹

In Karen Morin’s development of a concept of “carceral space” across sites of punishment and animal exploitation, she argues that these

31. Dewdney quoted in Canada, “Annual Report of the Department of Indian Affairs,” xxvi.

32. Belcourt, “Animal Bodies, Colonial Subjects,” 9.

33. Guenther, *Solitary Confinement*.

34. Stanescu, “Beyond Biopolitics.”

35. *Ibid.*

36. Guenther, *Solitary Confinement*, xvi

37. Stanescu, “Beyond Biopolitics.”

38. *Ibid.*, 155.

39. See *ibid.*; Gruen, “Dignity, Captivity;”; Morin, *Carceral Space*.

locations are “connected and entangled spatial, structural, operational, and embodied carceral practices and processes” that effect a kind of “epistemic violence” against those targeted.⁴⁰ This epistemic violence is related to being caged. They experience limited movement, lack autonomy to direct their movement through these limited spaces, and are confined in spaces largely devoid of adherence to law and meaningful legal oversight. The prison and the farm also prevent dignity in the sense that their architecture is meant to render subjects hyper-visible, with little access to privacy or the ability to be out of sight/surveillance even when performing intimate bodily functions and activities usually done in privacy such as urination, defecation, and having sex.⁴¹ As such, it is appropriate to consider prisoners and farmed animals as carceral subjects.

Guenther argues that the vocabulary of de-humanization cannot capture the ontological violence occurring in these spaces of intensive confinement, such as solitary confinement and factory-farms. Instead, she urges us to think about intensive confinement by way of de-animalization. De-animalization is “the reduction of a living, relational animal to a non-relational thing to be stored, exchanged, or even destroyed without regard for its particular ways of being in the world.”⁴² Intensive confinement, for Guenther, is then not a violation of our humanity, but of our shared animality as relational beings who develop understandings of ourselves through our relations with others, and for whom meaningful inter-corporeal relationships act as a hinge between us and our surroundings. The outright denial of animality for both human and nonhuman animals held in prolonged isolation, results in different but pathological and harmful effects for members of various species. Humans kept in solitary confinement, and animals in zoos, laboratories, and factory farming have been observed time and time again to demonstrate symptoms grouped as “SHU syndrome,”⁴³ including anxiety, fatigue, confusion, paranoia, depression, hallucinations, headaches, uncontrollable trembling, and pacing. Specific to animals, additional behaviors include: excessive grooming, scratching, derangement, and violence in that they peck, tail-bite, and otherwise attack those whose body parts they can reach through their cages.

40. Morin, *Carceral Space*.

41. Gruen, “Dignity, Captivity.”

42. Guenther, *Solitary Confinement*, 157.

43. “SHU syndrome” refers to common symptoms and effects experienced and reported by those held in Special Handling Units or Secure Housing Units. The conditions of confinement shaping these units is that of extreme isolation and the deprivation of meaningful interpersonal contact with others.

It is then the experience of broken social bonds, denial of dignity, the prevention of meaningful relationships of one's choosing, and being unable to make sense of oneself in relation to others that aptly links multiple locations of intensive confinement, regardless of species membership. It is then not that the prison reduces humans to animals, but that by relying on a Western colonial idea of the human—as an independent and autonomous actor who does not thrive or require meaningful embodied relationships—that we fail to comprehend the ethical and ontological violations occurring in sites of captivity.⁴⁴ The prison farm then is a site through which agricultural and carceral power merges to expand the geographical reach of the prison and to solidify colonial ontologies of life.

III. The Territorializing Function of Penitentiary Farms

In a step to create separate justice systems for youth and adults, the Government enacted the 1857 *Act for establishing Prisons for Young Offenders, for the better government of Public Asylums, Hospitals and Prisons, and for the better construction of Common Gaols*. This Act allowed farms to be attached to prisons for youth:

It shall be lawful for the Governor to cause to be procured and provided, surrounding or adjacent to each of the Reformatory Prisons, a tract of land fit for agricultural purposes not exceeding two hundred acres for each Prison, and to cause the same to be securely inclosed, and each Prison shall be held to include all the land contained within such inclosure.⁴⁵

This legal provision provides an example of the position of agriculture relative to punishment: prisons may territorially expand pending its new land is used in a productive manner, in this instance, for agriculture.

In the 1880 *Annual Report of the Inspector of Penitentiaries*, Minister of Justice, James MacDonald requested that additional land be acquired for the Manitoba Penitentiary so that the prison could produce its own food. MacDonald's request for additional land would be echoed the following year by the Inspector of Penitentiaries, J. G. Moylan:

Allow me, in this report, as in the last, to represent the advisability and ultimate economy of adding about two hundred acres more to the Penitentiary Reserve. Were this done, the meat, vegetables, including potatoes, and forage necessary for the use of the Penitentiary, could be annually produced on the farm. The sooner land could be procured the more

44. Guenther, *Solitary Confinement*.

45. MacDonald, *An Act*, S. XII at 30, 3.

reasonable the terms of purchase would be, as its value becomes more and more enhanced every year.⁴⁶

The prison farm, reliant on using prison labour and animal bodies, provides the conditions in which the prison could expand in an economically viable manner.

Nation-making and settlement initiatives co-articulated with prison-based agriculture. In his 1899 annual report, A. G. Irvine, Warden of Manitoba Penitentiary, recommends to the Inspector of Penitentiaries that Manitoba Penitentiary be expanded and that prisoners be sent from Kingston Penitentiary to cultivate “every foot of our soil that is fit for cultivation. . . . [P]risoners could not be put to more profitable work for the country at large.”⁴⁷ To this end he states, “I would go so far as to say that another wing should be built to this prison” to house the suggested prisoners from Kingston. To provide work for additional prisoners, Irvine suggests that the penitentiary farm be supplied with livestock and that the prison acquire more land to feed farmed animals:

We have at present a splendid farm. Every part of it is in full view of the main building which enables the convicts to be thoroughly under supervision. What we now require is the farm to be stocked. I would strongly recommend the purchase of thoroughbred cattle (short horned) and sufficient teams to carry out the work of the farm. There are certain sections of hay land in view of the prison, the purchase of which I would recommend.⁴⁸

This passage succinctly illustrates the expansionist logic of prison agriculture: land is transformed into a productive resource by prisoners and animals. Because farmed animals consume large quantities of food, additional land that is required to provide sustenance to the farmed animals can also become prison property. Understood as perpetual resources, farmed animals and their offspring would continue to be bred, raised, and slaughtered to become food products for the prison.

Irvine’s views are consistent with dominant approaches to imprisonment at the time, specifically that having prisoners work on farms was necessary for their reformation while also benefitting the institution. Irvine also links the prosperity of the nation to prison-based agriculture:

I am strongly of the opinion that the best thing for *the country*, and the convicts themselves, is to keep them employed cultivating the soil, and improving the roads. The end in view is to make this a model farm, an

46. Irvine, “Wardens’ Reports,” 65-19.

47. *Ibid.*, 25.

48. *Ibid.*

object lesson to the surrounding farmers, and an attraction to prospective settlers.⁴⁹

In this report, Irvine justifies prison expansion on the basis that it will benefit the nation; prospective settlers could view the prison farm as a standard from which they could themselves transform “uncultivated” land into a “productive” resource, and thereby lay private property rights to it under the Government’s settlement scheme.⁵⁰

In his annual report from 1899, the Warden of St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, J. A. Duchesneau, asked the Inspectorate of Penitentiaries for his support in the expansion of the institution’s farm:

Everybody agrees in the utility and advantages of farm work for convicts, who derive from it, both physically and morally, a welfare of inestimable value. I take a particular interest in that department, which I recommend to your protection in favouring the enlargement of the penitentiary farm.⁵¹

Duchesneau’s passage is demonstrative of the notion that agriculture is universal and its benefits undeniable. Despite the fact that agriculture was being purposely instituted by the settler state as a widespread and integral method of settlement for the overall country,⁵² it appears that state and prison officials did not question its place inside the prison, nor whether it was reformatory in the manner they claimed. By 1938, every Canadian penitentiary, apart from the Prison for Women, had its own farm. At this time, federal farms totalled 6,049 acres. Provincial jails and reformatories typically had their own farms as well. By the end of the nineteenth century, and well into the twentieth century, penal farms often consisted of a greenhouse, a root house, a piggery, and could also have cattle and dairy herds, sheep, and chickens. Farmed animals were killed and processed into commodities in abattoirs located on prison grounds.⁵³

IV. De-Animalized Subjects of Empire

Despite the central place of the penitentiary farm in Canadian penology in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, farmed animals themselves remain scarcely mentioned. When they are referred to, it is in reference to their labour or products they will or have become. Put another way, their property status is taken to be an ontological certainty instead

49. *Ibid.*; emphasis added.

50. Struthers Montford, “Agricultural Power”

51. Duchesneau, “Wardens’ Report,” 14.

52. Struthers Montford, “Agricultural Power.”

53. Archambault, “Report of the Royal Commission.”

of a contingent legal relationship instituted by the colonial state.⁵⁴ In the annual penitentiary reports submitted to the House of Commons in 1881, farmed animals and working animals, such as horses, are listed as either “stock, pigs, etc.” or “horses” along with other tallied items.⁵⁵ In the account records for the farm at the same institution, the tallies for pigs and ewes sold, as well as for the pounds of pork, and gallons of milk sold to the hospital are listed alongside various vegetables, pulses, and grains. Carceral labour is also accounted for: 1,010 days of labour from horses are counted as an expenditure at the same rate as convict labour, which amounted to 7,748 days in this fiscal year. Both of these line items are charged at a rate of 5 cents per day.⁵⁶ As such, animals, whether considered labourers or food, feature as commodified life (and death) to be managed by prison labourers.

The Archambault Commission provides another example in which the de-animalization of farmed animals is explicit. In their recounting of an event that occurred in 1935 at the Dorchester Penitentiary Farm, they explain that the farm instructor had built additional pens for the pigs using materials not purchased for that reason. Prior to this, there was one pen that contained more pigs than could be accommodated in that space. Due to overcrowding, the pigs had become “lame” and would likely die. The Archambault commissioners reported that the Superintendent reacted to this measure harshly despite the fact that “the farm instructor had saved a considerable loss of *penitentiary property* by utilizing the wire.”⁵⁷ If the farm instructor had not acted, and instead followed institutional procedures, “\$700 worth of pigs would have sickened, and a great majority of them would have died.”⁵⁸ The fact that these pigs would be killed in the slaughterhouse and then served as prison food is not considered in this instance. Instead, it is that if the pigs had died in a manner *other than* this, their usefulness as property would be negated.

The colonial notion that animals are objects of property rights worked to reinforce the penal structure being instituted during the end of the nineteenth century and the early twentieth century. Animals existed at the nexus of labour, prison industry, and prison expansion. In the prison farm, animals are then non-subjects *through which* punishment is administered, the prison territorially expands as well as augments its economic viability. As I next show, the link between penal agriculture, rehabilitation,

54. Canada, “Annual Report of the Department of Indian Affairs,” xxvi.

55. Dominion of Canada, *Sessional Papers*, 62.

56. *Ibid.*, 69.

57. Archambault, “Report of the Royal Commission,” 31.

58. *Ibid.*

and proper citizenship was taken as certainty despite the relatively recent and ongoing institution of animal agriculture.⁵⁹

V. Agricultural Labour and Rehabilitation

Inherent in the productive value of the prison farm was not only the production of agricultural products, but also the reformation offenders who would become necessary to the settler workforce. The form of penal labour instilled in the penitentiary farm tracked along both carceral and nation-making goals in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Individual industriousness was to be valued and inculcated in prisoners and settler immigrants—industriousness that could take the form of agricultural work to the benefit of the nation. For example, in his 1881 annual review of penitentiaries to the House of Commons, J. G. Moylan, Inspector of Penitentiaries for Canada, states that “the convicts appear to have been constantly and usefully employed all year on the farm, and at work connected with the Penitentiary.”⁶⁰ It is in the same report that the Inspector asks the House of Commons to purchase 200 more acres at this penitentiary for agriculture.

Following the abolition of prison contract labour programs in 1895,⁶¹ state officials and prison administrators had to grapple with the problem of “labour difficulty in the penitentiaries.”⁶² While the Commissioners of the 1914 Royal Commission supported the termination of contract labour regimes, they did not support unproductive labour tasks:

To abolish the system of contract labour in prisons was justifiable; to leave unfortunate prisoners to hammer out their term on a stone pile, or become mental and physical wrecks in the solitary idleness of their cells, was a crime against humanity.⁶³

The Commission presented two solutions to the labour problem: outside work and inside work. Outside work entailed “general farming operations, clearing land, quarrying stone, making brick, building roads, etc.,” with

59. Anderson, *Creatures of Empire*; Kim, *Dangerous Crossings*; Struthers Montford “Agricultural Power.”

60. Dominion of Canada, *Sessional Papers*, 19.

61. Contract labour programs, whereby private companies were able to lease prisoner labour to manufacture goods on prison grounds, were abolished in 1895. The abolition of this labour scheme was not based on concern for the exploitation of prisoners, but from the private sector who claimed that contract prison labour caused undue interference with the free labour market; Ekstedt and Griffiths, *Corrections in Canada*.

62. Macdonnell, “Royal Commission on Penitentiaries,” 32.

63. *Ibid.*

inside work including “employment in the various departments for the proper upkeep and management of *the prison*. Employment in the making of goods *for the state*.”⁶⁴ The problem presented by having prisoners perform physical labour to no end, such as “hammer[ing] out their terms on a stone pile . . . [represented] a crime against humanity”⁶⁵ whereas similar activities of quarrying stone and/or making brick suggested as a component of outside work, represented proper relations to labour in that such activities would be profitable to the institution. Sentiments about labour, land, and natural resources aligned with wider discourses and practices regarding nation-making during this time.

Following confederation, Canada was repeatedly depicted by government officials as a “fertile and salubrious” territory whose cultivation and settlement would ensure state success.⁶⁶ Yet this successful cultivation depended on the institution of colonial labour norms of self-sufficiency and productive labour directed to the prosperity of the nation. For example, John A. MacDonald devised a scheme for attracting Irish immigrants that would provide them with land, a house, a cow, and agricultural implements so that they could cultivate land. His plan relied on “the assumption that the emigrants [*sic*] sent out are fit for agricultural work, and have the energy and ability to take care of themselves, after getting the fair start thus provided for them.”⁶⁷ This proposed immigration and settlement policy demonstrates the values that the settler government sought to facilitate and expected of its citizens: property, individual responsibility, and industriousness.

In a Speech from the Throne made in 1901, the Speaker opined that Government initiatives had been successful in attracting the proper sort of immigrant settlers:

During my journey [through Canada], I was, from personal observation, much impressed with the great activity displayed in the development of the mining and agricultural industries of the country, and with the substantial increase in its population. The thrift, energy, and *law-abiding character* of the immigrants are a subject of much congratulation and afford ample proof of the *usefulness as citizens of the Dominion*.⁶⁸

Here, state representatives positioned labour as productive in that it positively shaped the character of the labourer and furthered the State’s goal

64. *Ibid.*; emphasis added.

65. *Ibid.*

66. Canada, “Speech from the Throne,” 1883, 27; Canada, “Speech from the Throne,” 1878.

67. MacDonald, “(Confidential Memorandum),” 83.

68. Canada, “Speech from the Throne,” 1901, 23; emphasis added.

of settlement. Such an approach to labour is also evident in the penitentiary and tracks along colonial norms of humanity, labour, and land— notions that coalesce in discourses about the rehabilitative potential of penal agriculture.

Politicians and prison officials lauded prison farms as uniquely rehabilitative. Agricultural labour was positioned as a means and an end of proper citizenship. In the 1914 Royal Commission on Penitentiaries, the Commission stated that “old mother nature is a kind nurse to the fellow who is at all disposed to get back to his better self. Hence, farming operations of any kind make ideal work for improvable prisoners.”⁶⁹ On their review of provincial institutions,⁷⁰ the Archambault Commission described that most included large farms where a large number of prisoners worked for the duration of their sentence. According to the Commission, this meant that prisoners could:

Become acquainted with agricultural methods. Prisoners incarcerated in such institutions have thus some opportunity to better themselves, both mentally and physically, and when their sentences have been completed, they are better equipped to obtain *employment and find a place for themselves in the social system*.⁷¹

Penal agricultural labour was positioned as a benevolent means to make proper Canadian citizens. Proponents assumed that when released, former prisoners could continue to participate in agricultural work. The supposed certainty of agriculture as *the proper* manner to produce food and relate to land and animals likely resulted in the unquestioned institution of prison farming and the acceptance of its rehabilitative potential (and outcomes). Prison-based agriculture is then a form of ‘rehabilitation’ that tracks along settler ontologies whereby land and animals exist as commodified resources to be directed to human ends.⁷²

VI. Civilized Punishment/Profitable Incarceration

As the farms became more established, concerns over efficiency tied into broader questions about its role in sustaining the prison. State officials and commissioners believed that penitentiary farms could be better

69. Macdonnell, “Royal Commission on Penitentiaries,” 3.

70. Provincial prison farms were also not inevitable. In Ontario, for example, farms were positioned as a solution to surplus labour following the termination of prison labour/manufacturing contracts in the early 1900s, see Hanna, “The Prison Labour Question.”

71. Archambault, “Report of the Royal Commission,” 17.

72. Belcourt, “Animal Bodies, Colonial Subjects”; Robinson, “Veganism”; Struthers Montford, “Agricultural Power.”

managed. In their 1938 report, the Archambault Commission compared federal prison farms to those on provincial jail and reformatory grounds. The Commission concluded that the federal farms were inefficient: “[W]e do not consider that the operation of the penitentiary farms compares favourably with the farms operated in connection with the provincial jails and reformatories.”⁷³ In terms of production, the penitentiary farms incurred annual losses due to a “lack of proper management.”⁷⁴ The Commission attributed this to a lack of leadership and restrictive release conditions that prevented a large number of prisoners from working on the farms located outside the prison walls. The Commission recommended the following:

In view of the fact that there are seven large farms operated by the Penitentiary Branch throughout Canada, a highly qualified official should be required to devote *his entire time to the management of this important part of the penitentiary service.*⁷⁵

This recommendation highlights the integral position prison farms held in the administration of federal sentences. The Commission reasoned that if such an official was appointed “the expense incurred will be more than justified by greater efficiency in production.”⁷⁶ Other recommendations included the implementation of canning and vegetable storage facilities so that crop yields could supply the prisons.

The Archambault Commission also explicitly recommended that “dairy herds should be established at all penitentiaries for the purpose of supplying their dairy requirements.”⁷⁷ This is not a recommendation made during the initial implementation of penitentiary farms, but is explicitly suggested with a view to improving the fiscal viability of farm operations by decreasing overall operating costs. Penitentiary-specific recommendations were made in a context in which provincial and reformatory farms were manufacturing products that not only sustained their institution, but supplied other state facilities. In their assessment of provincial institutions, the Archambault Commission lauded agricultural programming as a marker of proper prison administration: “In other provinces, where reformatories and prison farms have been established, the prisoners serve their sentences under much more satisfactory conditions.”⁷⁸ The

73. Archambault, “Report of the Royal Commission,” 136.

74. *Ibid.*, 137.

75. *Ibid.*, 138; emphasis added.

76. *Ibid.*

77. *Ibid.*

78. *Ibid.*, 17.

Commission further noted that well-run prison farms used most of their acres for farming; the Ontario Reformatory used most of their 945 acres in this way: “[T]here is a fine herd of dairy cattle, and the institution supplies beef to other reformatories, hospitals, etc.”⁷⁹ The Toronto Municipal Farm for men serving short term sentences was reported to have “a farm of 940 acres . . . attached to this institution, on which there is a dairy herd that supplies milk to different institutions in the city of Toronto.”⁸⁰ The Commission therefore recommended that excess amounts of penitentiary-produced agricultural products be used to supply other prisons or be sold.⁸¹ Unpaid or low-paying prison labour coupled with the commodification of animals in agriculture was a means by which the prison service avoided paying market-value for its food supply. Penal agriculture was also supported for its potential to generate profit for the prison. As such, animal agriculture was not only consistent with settler nation-making endeavours, but—couched in a rhetoric of prisoner therapy and fiscal efficiency—supplied other state institutions using a captive and underpaid and/or unpaid labour force.

The logic of the prison farm then, is tethered to the sustainability of the prison itself as an economically viable institution. Considered in its historical context, the prison farm is a location in which offenders can become proper Canadian subjects through agricultural training. Materially and symbolically, it was also a method of settler territorialisation that expanded the prison via the transformation of “uncultivated” land into a productive resource. Similar sentiments structured the protests against the 2010 closure of the penitentiary farms, and recent community feedback about how prison farms ought to be re-instituted. Contemporary penal agriculture continues to be an issue marrying national identity, Canadian penology, labour, economy, and property.

VII. Public Support for Farming: ‘Heartfelt Beliefs,’ Unquestioned ‘Truths’

During the 2015 federal election, Liberal candidates in the Kingston, Ontario, area campaigned on promises of re-establishing the penitentiary farms. Following the election of the liberal government, local residents pressured their elected representatives to re-open the farms.⁸² From June to August of 2016, CSC ran a two-month online consultation on “institutional agribusiness.” CSC also held a town hall in Kingston to garner

79. *Ibid.*, 20.

80. *Ibid.*

81. *Ibid.*, 139.

82. CSC, “Report on the Town Hall Meeting.”

feedback and advice on the feasibility of re-opening farms at both the Joyville and Collins Bay federal men's penitentiaries. Close to 6,000 people participated in the online consultation and about 300 people attended the town hall meeting. Reports based on the results of these two events reveal that themes historically supporting penal agriculture continue to shape support for its return. Dominant themes include "the need to help the rehabilitation of inmates, and the positive impact it could have in communities and in the use of land."⁸³ Other supporters suggested that food produced using penal agriculture could supply penitentiaries and local foodbanks.⁸⁴ Both reports stress the fact that the statements made by participants "were opinions, based on personal observation and heartfelt beliefs and not upon any rigorous analysis of the actual impact of penitentiary farm programs on either rehabilitation or employability post release."⁸⁵ In fact, empirical evidence showing the rehabilitative potential of penal agriculture is lacking.⁸⁶ Instead, it seems that because of the purportedly universal and natural place that animal agriculture holds in Canada, it is taken as normatively beneficial despite an absence of evidence to support this position.

VII.a. Carceral Land

Most respondents (82 percent) in the online consultation believed that land formerly used for penal agriculture "*must*" again be used for agricultural purposes. This approach to land use dovetails with ideals of rehabilitation, with supporters stating that "this land is meant for helping people through CSC programs."⁸⁷ Tellingly, others married national identity to farming, and "other views shared by many respondents were that Canada needs to keep its farmlands or should have more."⁸⁸ Participants

83. CSC, "Online Consultation," 2.

84. Ibid. and CSC, "Report on the Town Hall Meeting."

85. CSC, "Report on the Town Hall Meeting," 3.

86. Project SOIL has claimed that penal agriculture programs can serve a rehabilitative purpose. They do so by relying on a 2006 article by Gennifer Furst, "Prison-Based Animal Programs." This article, however, evaluates the rehabilitative potential of prison-based *therapeutic* animal programs such as dog training. Furst is adamant that given the differences between the training of a service dog versus the raising and slaughtering animals in agriculture, her results are *not applicable* to penal animal agriculture programs.

87. CSC, "Online Consultation" 9.

88. Ibid. Other suggestions for the use of this land included real estate development, urban protected greenspaces, reforestation, and sports fields. However, these suggestions were not put forward on the basis of their relation to Canadian identity, as was agriculture.

in the town hall meeting linked land and animal agriculture in such a way that presumed its naturalness. In other words, animal agriculture was positioned as a priori *the way* in which land is to be used: “You have the land. You have the barns. All you are missing is the cows. And we have just what you need.”⁸⁹ Others claimed that re-instated prison farms would serve a pedagogical function. A supporter of prison-based dairy operations, for example, stated that such a program would “educate the community about dairy products.”⁹⁰ This sentiment is consistent with that expressed by Warden Irvine in 1900 about the potential of the penitentiary farm to serve as a model for prospective settlers. In both instances the farms and the animals within them are meant to impart and instill norms related to land, animals, and food. Support for penal agriculture continues to pivot on state ownership of land, the farming of animals upon said land, and a belief in the rehabilitative potential of agricultural labour unmatched by other initiatives.

VII.b. Empathetic Rehabilitation

Participants in both consultation events stressed that they believed penal agriculture to impart skills that cannot be learned in other institutional employment programs. Skills attributed to penal agriculture include that it:

Encourages general life skills such as patience, empathy and responsibility; helps inmates to develop a work ethic, punctuality, setting goals; rebuilds skills related to work relationships (i.e., employee/employer not inmate to guard); creates team building opportunities and develops interpersonal communication skills.⁹¹

Respondents also positioned penal agriculture as preparing prisoners for life upon release, regardless of where they might become employed. A participant at the town hall stated, “what one learns working on a farm one learns for life, the skills are immeasurably transferable.”⁹² Respondents expressed that working outside and in a physical manner is a beneficial aspect of penal agribusiness, much in the same way described by Macdonnell in 1914. Unlike early debates about penal agriculture, however, animals now figure as those *through* which empathy can be cultivated.

Current participants believed that interacting with animals can uniquely cultivate empathy and can thus lead prisoners to redemption.

89. CSC “Report on the Town Hall Meeting” 7.

90. CSC “Online Consultation” 6.

91. CSC “Report on the Town Hall Meeting” 7.

92. Ibid.

While demographic information pertaining to those who attended the Town Hall meeting is not available, former prisoners were grouped as “other” in the online town hall. At 15 percent, “other” participants also included prisoners’ relatives, professionals working in agriculture, rehabilitation, or fields related to the criminal justice system. A former prisoner explained that “the cows taught me so many skills and they taught me patience, compassion. The skills I learned while milking the cows and making them well. . . . Lots of people could be damaged now because they don’t have a chance to work with animals.”⁹³ In this sense, animals become the means by which prisoners can heal, yet animals are not necessarily subjects themselves whose interests are addressed in ways that are politically meaningful—they remain killable property pending they serve as means to human end.⁹⁴ Furthermore, it is the scenarios and imagery of prisoners interacting with animals in pastures and barns in which the animal-empathy connection is made.

The scenarios of factory-farming conditions and/or of prisoners working in animal slaughtering and butchering, both in onsite and offsite abattoirs, is not presented as that which is healing and empathetic. In fact, these aspects of animal agriculture rarely feature in the discourse of those seeking to reinstate penal agribusiness. Instead, it is those opposed to the reinstatement of penal agriculture who feature the opposing perspectives of former prisoners—many of whom detail dangerous and denigrating working conditions, as well as trauma related to inflicting or witnessing violence against animals.⁹⁵ In fact, of the 143 prisoners in federal penitentiaries who participated in a survey, 72 percent indicated that they would prefer to care for farmed animals in a sanctuary setting and/or participate in plant-based agriculture; 28 percent indicated a preference for animal dairying.⁹⁶ Many wrote “no slaughter” on their survey response forms.⁹⁷

Prior to the termination of CORCAN agribusiness programs, prisoners were tasked with managing other carceral subjects, including tens of thousands of hens confined in battery cages, running “dairy operations,” and working in slaughterhouses to kill and dismember the animals.⁹⁸ At its worst, slaughterhouse work is dangerous, workers often lose their

93. Ibid.

94. Derrida, *The Animal That Therefore I Am*.

95. *Evolve Our Prison Farms*.

96. Ibid.

97. <https://www.plantbasednews.org/post/controversy-as-canada-invests-4-3-million-in-prisoner-staffed-animal-agriculture>.

98. Fitzgerald, “Doing Time in a Slaughterhouse,”; Goodman and Dawe, “Prisoners, Cows and Abattoirs”; “Project SOIL”; Neufield, “The Herd at the Pen.”

limbs in meat grinders, or are crushed by falling animal carcasses.⁹⁹ At its minimum, slaughterhouse work “has injury and illness rates three times the average of the rates of other manufacturing industries.”¹⁰⁰ For example, workers sustain repetitive strain injuries exacerbated by performing repetitive tasks coupled with ever-increasing kill floor speeds. In stark opposition to CORCAN’s stated objectives regarding the development of marketable skills for prisoners once released, slaughterhouse work is low-paying, commonly non-unionized, and has a turnover rate of 200 per cent a year.¹⁰¹

In comparison to other “manufacturing industries,” slaughterhouse work has also been shown to increase crime rates among the communities where they operate, including sexual assaults, domestic abuse, and family violence.¹⁰² This form of work is not only precarious and physically dangerous, but psychologically damaging as it *requires* employees to “inflict harm upon living beings while rationalizing their behaviour and suppressing their compassion.”¹⁰³ Slaughterhouse work requires workers to engage in behaviour that would be criminalized if done to humans or to some animals, such as ‘pets,’ not legally categorized as food. As such, the notion that agricultural labour cultivates empathy might be in stark opposition to the realities of this form of work. It instead might be the case that penal agribusiness has provided a cost-effective supply of labour for local farmers. For example, proponents of the penitentiary farms continue to claim that prior to their closure, the farms were economic drivers for the communities in which they were housed; for example, prisoners from Kingston institutions “processed” animals for over 300 farms in the surrounding area.¹⁰⁴

Participants in the recent feasibility forums also claimed that this approach to prison employment was feasible because of a shortage of agricultural labour in Canada—positions typically filled by migrant and temporary foreign workers who are paid a low wage and receive few to no occupational health and safety protections.¹⁰⁵ Given the realities of agricultural work both in terms of working conditions and job security, it is surprising that this form of employment is used to justify the re-opening

99. Taylor, *Beasts of Burden*.

100. Fitzgerald, “Doing Time in a Slaughterhouse” 22.

101. *Ibid.*

102. Fitzgerald, Kalof, and Dietz, “Slaughterhouses and Increased Crime Rates.”

103. Fitzgerald, “Doing Time in a Slaughterhouse,” 14.

104. “Project SOIL.”

105. Fitzgerald, “Doing Time in a Slaughterhouse”; Otero and Preibisch, *Citizenship and Precarious Labour*.

of penitentiary farms. Furthermore, the constitution of empathic relationships *with* nonhuman others is better cultivated in scenarios where they are not desubjectified nor commodified, and where carceral labourers are not required to slaughter the animals they are simultaneously expected to bond with as a component of their rehabilitation.

VIII. Conclusion: Contemporary Farm Politics and Speculative Futures

Labour has been central to an ‘enlightened’ and modern approach to penal regimes premised on the moral reformation of prisoners.¹⁰⁶ Despite the centrality of labour in the administration of *punishment*, the prevailing rationality of the prison continues to position ‘work’ as benevolent and redemptive. Such a perspective is contrary to recent research on the political economy of penal labour that positions it as exploitative and racially discriminatory.¹⁰⁷ In the U.S. context, prison-based agriculture has been criticized for incorporating and reproducing the logic of slavery.¹⁰⁸ In the Canadian context, I have shown that this form of ‘benevolent’ rehabilitation functioned as a means through which the prison expanded its geography and trained prisoners to be proper settler citizens. Penal agriculture is thereby a site where colonialism, race, labour, species, and punishment intersect. Like other practices and locations of punishment, prison farms are “landscapes generated by and for convict labour” to the benefit of the prison and state.¹⁰⁹

Some scholars of U.S. penal labour have noted a shift from a penal welfarist approach centered on the rehabilitation of prisoners through labour, to that administered for commercial purposes under a penal state.¹¹⁰ The example of Canadian penal agriculture, however shows that such approaches do not replace each other but come together in a broader context of racial capitalism with multi-national production flows. This is especially evident in that the re-opened farms will operate goat and cow dairies

106. Archambault, “Report of the Royal Commission”; Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*; Garland, *Punishment and Modern Society*; Garland, *Punishment and Welfare*; Hanna, “The Prison Labour Question”; Hannah-Moffat, *Punishment in Disguise*; Hatton, “When Work Is Punishment”; Hawkins, “Prison Labor and Prison Industries”; McCoy, *Hard Time*; Oshinsky, *Worse than Slavery*; Rusche and Kirchheimer, *Punishment and Social Structure*; Tuffin et al., “Landscapes of Production and Punishment.”

107. Scherrer and Shah, “The Political Economy of Prison Labour.”

108. Oshinsky, *Worse than Slavery*.

109. Tuffin et al., “Landscapes of Production and Punishment” 56.

110. Scherrer and Shah, “The Political Economy of Prison Labour.”

that will supply China-based infant formula manufacturers. Discourses of moral reform and the economic role of penal agribusiness continue to shape support for the re-opening of penitentiary farms. Agribusiness programs will also resume ‘vocational training’ in the form of slaughterhouse and butchering labour. Consistent with the historical logics structuring the original implementation of penitentiary farms during the last half of the nineteenth century, prisoners and animals remain targeted by agricultural and carceral power whose biological capacities are manipulated in support of the prison. For pro-penitentiary farm advocates, prisoners and animals appear as flattened and de-animalized subjects whose labour (and lives), via prison farms, will be again used to benefit CORCAN’s profit margins, local businesses, and now international corporations. Despite the enduring claim that agribusiness is an effective method of rehabilitation, evidence supporting this claim remains absent.¹¹¹

Those in favour of the prison farms have argued that the farms were “national community icons” and represented a uniquely Canadian approach to penalty (an approach premised on rehabilitative ideals, whereas other jurisdictions had taken a more punitive turn).¹¹² While it is accurate that these farms are symbolic and material representations of Canadiana, it is not because they are rehabilitative. Rather, prison farms represent a specific apparatus of settler colonial territorialisation that expands the footprint of the prison, naturalizes private property relationships to land and to animals, and teaches prisoners “civilized” relationships to labour. If we consider the colonial and racialized implications of penal agribusiness, its colonial function becomes apparent as do the socio-economic structures shaping who will be streamed into such programs—programs that have historically endeavoured to ‘civilize’ workers through the installation of labour norms bound-up in whiteness. Because agricultural work is often precarious, exploitative, and performed by vulnerable and racialized workers, it is likely that inside, the most hyper-criminalized and vulnerable segments of the prison population—those with lower educational levels and unstable employment histories, including Indigenous and Black prisoners—will be assigned to agribusiness programming, and that such assignments will be positioned as benevolent. As such it is likely that racialized persons will be streamed into agricultural labour fields which are amongst the most unstable, exploitative, dangerous, and psychologically damaging.¹¹³ Rather, initiatives suggested by *Evolve our Prison Farms* such

111. Fitzgerald, “Doing Time in a Slaughterhouse”; Goodman and Dawe, “Prisoners, Cows and Abattoirs.”

112. Goodman and Dawe, “Prisoners, Cows and Abattoirs,” 801.

113. Office of the Correctional Investigator, “Annual Report.”

as plant-based agriculture and/or animal sanctuary would resist colonial relationships of property and de-animalization inherent in agriculture, and exploitative labour practices. Sanctuary initiatives are also premised on the notion that animals are subjects in their own right and could afford them meaningful intercorporeal relationships. By providing opportunities for the cultivation of multi-species relationships of empathy and healing, sanctuary programs are also consistent with requests made by those incarcerated to have access to programs that are meaningful and that lessen, rather than augment, the trauma of incarceration.

Acknowledgements

This research was supported by funding from the Killam Trusts. Earlier versions of this paper were presented at the annual meetings of the Law & Society Association and the Association of Women's and Gender Studies et Recherches Féministes, as well as at the Jackman Humanities Animals and the Law working group. I am grateful to those who provided feedback during these meetings, as well as to Chloë Taylor, Kelly Hannah-Moffat, Jenna-Lynn Simpson, and Darren Chang, whose insight strengthened the article. I am also grateful to the anonymous reviewers for their diligent reading and helpful advice.

References

- Anderson, Virginia. *Creatures of Empire: How Domestic Animals Transformed Early America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Archambault, Hon. Mr. Justice Joseph. "Report of the Royal Commission to Investigate the Penal System of Canada." Ottawa, 1938. CP32-100-1938-1-eng.pdf.
- Belcourt, Billy-Ray. "Animal Bodies, Colonial Subjects: (Re)Locating Animality in Decolonial Thought." *Societies* 5.1 (December 24, 2014): 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.3390/soc5010001>
- Canada. "An Act respecting Penitentiaries, and the Directors thereof, and for Other Purposes" (1868). Available at <http://eco.canadiana.ca/>.
- Canada. "Annual Report of the Department of Indian Affairs." *Sessional Papers of the Dominion of Canada*, 1891. Available at http://eco.canadiana.ca/view/oocihm.9_08050_1_2/295?r=0&s=1.
- Canada. "Federal Budget 2018: Equality and Growth, a Strong Middle Class." Ottawa, February 27, 2018. <https://www.budget.gc.ca/2018/docs/plan/toc-tdm-en.html>.
- Canada. "Speech from the Throne," 1878. Available at https://lop.parl.ca/sites/ParlInfo/default/en_CA/Parliament/procedure/throneSpeech.
- Canada. "Speech from the Throne," 1883. Available at https://lop.parl.ca/sites/ParlInfo/default/en_CA/Parliament/procedure/throneSpeech.

- Canada. "Speech from the Throne," 1901. Available at https://lop.parl.ca/sites/ParlInfo/default/en_CA/Parliament/procedure/throneSpeech.
- Carlen, Pat. *A Criminological Imagination: Essays on Justice, Punishment, Discourse*. Oxford: Ashgate, 2010.
- Correctional Service of Canada. "CORCAN." <http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/corcan/index-eng.shtml>.
- Correctional Service of Canada. "Online Consultation on Institutional Agri-business Report," November 9, 2016. <http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/publications/005007-5802-eng.shtml>.
- Correctional Service of Canada. "Penitentiary Farm Online Public Consultation," August 2, 2016. <http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/consult/index-en.shtml>.
- Correctional Service of Canada. "Report on the Town Hall Meeting on the Feasibility of Re-Establishing Penitentiary Farms at the Joyceville and Collins Bay Institutions," November 9, 2016. <http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/publications/005007-5801-eng.shtml>.
- Coulthard, Glen Sean. *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014. <https://doi.org/10.5749/minnesota/9780816679645.001.0001>
- Dawe, Meghan, and Philip Goodman. "Conservative Politics, Sacred Cows, and Sacrificial Lambs: The (Mis)Use of Evidence in Canada's Political and Penal Fields." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue Canadienne de Sociologie* 54.2 (May 1, 2017): 129–46.
- Derrida, Jacques. *The Animal That Therefore I Am*, 3rd edition. New York: Fordham University Press, 2008.
- Dominion of Canada. *Sessional Papers of the Dominion of Canada: Volume 9, Third Session of the Fourth Parliament Session 1880–81*. Vol. Sessional Paper 65: Penitentiaries. Ottawa: MacLean, 1881.
- Dominion of Canada. "Sessional Papers of the Parliament of Canada: Fifth Session, Eighth Parliament of the Dominion of Canada." Volume 13, 1900: <https://archive.org/details/documents18174s1900cana/page/n5>.
- Duchesneau, J. A. "Wardens' Report: St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary." In *Sessional Papers of the Dominion of Canada, Fifth Session of the Eighth Parliament*, 63 Victoria., 13:12–15. Ottawa: MacLean, 1900.
- Ekstedt, John W., and Curt T. Griffiths. *Corrections in Canada: Policy and Practice*. Toronto: Elsevier, 2013.
- Evolve Our Prison Farms. <http://evolveourprisonfarms.ca/prisoner/>. 2018–2019.
- Fischer, John Ryan. *Cattle Colonialism: An Environmental History of the Conquest of California and Hawai'i*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2015. <https://doi.org/10.5149/northcarolina/9781469625126.001.0001>
- Fitzgerald, Amy J. "Doing Time in a Slaughterhouse: A Critical Review of the Use of Animals and Inmates in Prison Labor Programmes." *Journal of Critical Animal Studies* 10 (2011): 12–46.

- Fitzgerald, Amy J., L. Kalof, and T. Dietz. "Slaughterhouses and Increased Crime Rates: An Empirical Analysis of the Spillover From 'The Jungle' Into the Surrounding Community." *Organization & Environment* 22.2 (June 1, 2009): 158–84. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1086026609338164>
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Vintage Books, 1977.
- Foucault, Michel. "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History." In *The Essential Foucault: Selections from Essential Works of Foucault, 1954–1984*, ed. Paul Rabinow and Nikolas Rose, 351–70. New York: The New Press, 2003.
- Foucault, Michel. "Two Lectures." In *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972–1977*, ed. Colin Gordon, 78–108. Brighton: Harvester, 1980.
- Francis, Annette. "Ottawa Failing on Prison Farm Replacement." *APTN National News*. September 10, 2010. <https://aptnnews.ca/2010/09/10/ottawa-breaking-promise-on-prison-farm-shut-down/>.
- Furst, Gennifer. "Prison-Based Animal Programs: A National Survey." *The Prison Journal* 86.4 (December 1, 2006): 407–30. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0032885506293242>
- Garland, David. *Punishment and Modern Society*. Chicago: University Of Chicago Press, 1990.
- Garland, David. *Punishment and Welfare: A History of Penal Strategies*. Aldershot: Gower Publishing Company, 1985.
- Goodman, Philip, and Meghan Dawe. "Prisoners, Cows and Abattoirs: The Closing of Canada's Prison Farms as a Political Penal Drama." *The British Journal of Criminology* 56.4 (July 1, 2016): 793–812. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azv078>
- Gruen, Lori. "Dignity, Captivity, and an Ethics of Sight." In *The Ethics of Captivity*, ed. Lori Gruen, 231–47. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 2014. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199977994.003.0015>
- Guenther, Lisa. *Solitary Confinement*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2013. <https://doi.org/10.5749/minnesota/9780816679584.001.0001>
- Hanna, The Honourable W. J. "The Prison Labour Question: History of the Contract System in the Toronto Central Prison: A Record of Continuous Failures; The Outlook for the Future." Speech, Ontario Legislature, February 26, 1907.
- Hannah-Moffat, Kelly. *Punishment in Disguise: Penal Governance and Federal Imprisonment of Women in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001. <https://doi.org/10.3138/9781442678903>
- Haque, Eve. *Multiculturalism within a Bilingual Framework: Language, Race, and Belonging in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012. <https://doi.org/10.3138/9781442686083>
- Hatton, Erin. "When Work Is Punishment: Penal Subjectivities in Punitive Labor Regimes." *Punishment & Society* 20.2 (April 1, 2018): 174–91. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1462474517690001>

- Hawkins, Gordon. "Prison Labor and Prison Industries." *Crime and Justice* 5 (January 1, 1983): 85–127. <https://doi.org/10.1086/449094>
- Irvine, A. G. "Wardens' Reports: Manitoba Penitentiary." In *Sessional Papers of the Dominion of Canada, Fifth Session of the Eighth Parliament*, 63 Victoria, 13:24–25. Ottawa: MacLean, 1900.
- Kim, Claire Jean. *Dangerous Crossings: Race, Species, and Nature in a Multicultural Age*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107045392>
- MacAlpine, Ian. "Cows, Goats Headed Back to Jail at Joyceville, Collins Bay." *Ottawa Citizen*, June 22, 2018. <http://ottawacitizen.com/news/local-news/cows-goats-headed-back-to-jail-at-joyceville-collins-bay>.
- MacAlpine, Ian. "Cows Not in Initial Prison Farm Plan." *The Kingston Whig-Standard*, March 8, 2018. <http://www.thewhig.com/2018/03/08/cows-not-in-initial-prison-farm-plan>.
- MacDonald. "(Confidential Memorandum)," n.d.
- MacDonald, Hon. Atty. Genl. "An Act for Establishing Prisons for Young Offenders: For the Better Government of Public Asylums, Hospitals and Prisons, and for the Better Construction of Common Gaols, Pub. L. No. 222 (1857).
- Macdonnell, George Milnes. "Royal Commission on Penitentiaries," 1914. <http://www.torontopubliclibrary.ca/detail.jsp?Entt=RDM1499213&R=1499213>.
- McCoy, Ted. *Hard Time: Reforming the Penitentiary in Nineteenth-Century Canada*. Edmonton: Athabasca University Press, 2012.
- McGregor, Janyce. "New Chinese Baby Formula Plant to Buy Canadian Milk — but at What Price?" *CBC News*, August 3, 2017. <https://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/feihe-plant-trade-1.4228502>.
- Mehta, Diana. "Trudeau Government Considers Reopening Prison Farms Shut Down in 2010." *Toronto Star*, July 10, 2016. <https://www.thestar.com/news/canada/2016/07/10/trudeau-government-considers-reopening-prison-farms-shut-down-in-2010.html>.
- Morin, Karen. "Carceral Space: Prisoners and Animals." *Antipode* 48.5 (November 1, 2016): 1317–36. <https://doi.org/10.1111/anti.12239>
- Morin, Karen. *Carceral Space, Prisoners and Animals*. New York: Routledge, 2018. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315636986>
- Morin, Karen. "Wildspace: The Cage, the Supermax, and the Zoo." In *Critical Animal Geographies: Politics, Intersections and Hierarchies in a Multispecies World*, 73–91. London: Routledge, 2015. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315762760-5>
- Neufield, Calvin. "The Herd at the Pen: The Promise of Animal Sanctuary on Prison Farms." *Briarpatch Magazine*, May 1, 2017. <https://briarpatchmagazine.com/articles/view/herd-at-the-pen>.
- Nichols, Robert. "The Colonialism of Incarceration." *Radical Philosophy Review* 17.2 (2014): 435–55. <https://doi.org/10.5840/radphilrev201491622>

- Office of the Correctional Investigator Canada. "Annual Report, Office of the Correctional Investigator, 2016–2017." <http://www.oci-bec.gc.ca/cnt/rpt/pdf/annrpt/annrpt20162017-eng.pdf>.
- Oshinsky, David M. *Worse than Slavery*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1996.
- Otero, Gerardo, and Kerry Preibisch. *Citizenship and Precarious Labour in Canadian Agriculture*. Vancouver: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, 2015. <http://www.deslibris.ca/ID/248389>.
- Project SOIL. Accessed May 14, 2017. <http://projectsoil.ca/project-overview/case-studies/frontenac-and-pittsburgh-prison-farms/>.
- Robinson, Margaret. "Animal Personhood in Mi'kmaq Perspective." *Societies* 4.4 (December 3, 2014): 672–88. <https://doi.org/10.3390/soc4040672>
- Robinson, Margaret. "Veganism and Mi'kmaq Legends." *The Canadian Journal of Native Studies* 33.1 (2013): 189–96.
- Rusche, Georg, and Otto Kirchheimer. *Punishment and Social Structure*. Piscataway, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2003.
- Scherrer, Christoph, and Anil Shah. "The Political Economy of Prison Labour: From Penal Welfarism to the Penal State." *Global Labour Journal* 8.1 (January 2017): 32–48. <https://doi.org/10.15173/glj.v8i1.2774>
- Snowdon, Frazer. "More than 30 Dairy Cows Now Part of the Prison Farm Program in Kingston." *Global News*, June 21, 2018. <https://globalnews.ca/news/4289722/more-than-30-dairy-cows-now-part-of-the-prison-farm-program-in-kingston/>.
- Stanescu, James. "Beyond Biopolitics: Animal Studies, Factory Farms, and the Advent of Deading Life." *PhaenEx* 8.2 (2013): 135–60. <https://doi.org/10.22329/p.v8i2.4090>
- Struthers Montford, Kelly. "Agricultural Power: Politicized Ontologies of Food, Life, and Law in Settler Colonial Spaces." PhD dissertation, University of Alberta, 2017.
- Struthers Montford, Kelly. "Dehumanized Denizens, Displayed Animals: Prison Tourism and the Discourse of the Zoo." *PhiloSOPHIA* 6.1 (2016): 73–91. <https://doi.org/10.1353/phi.2016.0017>
- TallBear, Kim. "Beyond the Life/Not-Life Binary: A Feminist-Indigenous Reading of Cryopreservation, Interspecies Thinking, and the New Materialisms." In *Cryopolitics*, ed. Joanna Radin and Emma Kowal. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2017. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/10456.003.0015>
- TallBear, Kim. "An Indigenous Approach to Critical Animal Studies, Interspecies Thinking, and the New Materialisms." Borders of Kinship: Species/Race/Indigeneity, Latin American & Caribbean Studies program, the Jackson School of International Studies, the Simpson Center for the Humanities, and the Institute for the Study of Ethnicity, Race, & Sexuality (WISER), University of Washington, May 23, 2013.
- Taylor, Sunaura. *Beasts of Burden: Animal and Disability Liberation*. New York: The New Press, 2017.

- Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. *What We Have Learned: Principles of Truth and Reconciliation*, 2015.
- Tuffin, Richard, Martin Gibbs, David Roberts, Hamish Maxwell-Stewart, David Roe, Jody Steele, Susan Hood, and Barry Godfrey. "Landscapes of Production and Punishment: Convict Labour in the Australian Context." *Journal of Social Archaeology* 18.1 (February 2018): 50–76.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1469605317748387>
- Vincent, Donovan. "The Return of Prison Farms and Tattoos: Why This New Watchdog Won't Slam the Door on Canada's Inmates." *The Toronto Star*, February 4, 2018. <https://www.thestar.com/news/insight/2018/02/04/the-return-of-prison-farms-and-tattoos-why-this-new-watchdog-wont-slam-the-door-on-canadas-inmates.html>.
- Wolfe, Patrick. "Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native." *Journal of Genocide Research* 8.4 (2006): 387–409.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14623520601056240>
- Woolford, Andrew. *This Benevolent Experiment: Indigenous Boarding Schools, Genocide, and Redress in Canada and the United States*. Winnipeg, MB: University of Manitoba Press, 2015.