

THE METAMORPHOSIS FROM THE NIGERIA PRISON SERVICE TO NIGERIA CORRECTIONAL SERVICE: ITS IMPLICATIONS AND WAY FORWARD

ULO, EDAFE

Department of Sociology and Psychology

Faculty of Social Science,

Delta State University, Abraka

Delta State

Email address: Uloedafe@gmail.com

Abstract

The Nigeria prison service and by extension the prisons system, represent traditional criminal justice system of punishment philosophy which places emphasis on merely to punish the offender rather than correction of the offender. The Nigeria prisons has been attributed with a lot of problems ranging from administrative problems, poor financing, poor health care, infrastructural/recreational facilities, prison overcrowding, focus on punishment, lack of rehabilitation, poor training and retraining of prison staff, problem of human resource wastage, too regimental on the inmates and lack of non-custodial services. These highlighted problems mar the aims and objectives of the prison in deterring and rehabilitating the offenders, thus negating the major excesses of imprisonment which are to reform, rehabilitate, and reintegrate the offender into the mainstream of society, thereby making them useful to themselves and the society in general upon release. The prisons lack of rehabilitation of inmates leads to high recidivism of inmates on release. These aforementioned problems triggered the federal government, the national house of assembly, stake holders of the criminal justice system, the United Nations and civil society organisations (international and national) to champion a course on prison reforms through a bill presented by Victor Ndoma-Egba, the former senator and current chairman of the Niger Delta Development Commission (NDDC) to the National House of Assembly in January 2008. For the past 11 years this bill has been there, awaiting the presidential accent, not until 28th Aug, 2019 when the president signed the bill into law; thereby changing the name from "Nigeria Prison Service" to "Nigeria Correctional Service", this invariably led to a change in structure and functions of the new service, as it included the non-custodial faculty, giving credence to rehabilitations of inmate. The non-custodial faculty includes in it, parole, probation and community services capturing international best practises. Against this background, this work seeks to discuss and examine the metamorphosis from the "Nigeria Prison Service" to "Nigeria Correctional Service": its implications and way forward, and by extension seek to look at the origin of the Nigeria prison service, the problems of the Nigeria prison system, weave theoretical framework, Further looking at the metamorphosis of the prison with regards to its implications, distinguishing features of the Nigeria Correctional Service Act of 2019, relevance of the Act, presenting a polemical criticism, concluding with recommendations on the way forward.

Keywords: Metamorphosis, Nigeria Prison Service, Correctional Service, Implications, Prison.

Introduction

The penological underpinnings of imprisonment as an aspect of punishment is enshrined in the retributivist and deterrent philosophy which prescribe that deviant should be punished in order to pay back for his actions and to deter him and others from committing crime. Imprisonment is most appropriately conceived as a formal perspective of inflicting pain on the individuals, which has been an aspect of the traditional criminal justice system in various societies of the world and Nigeria in particular (Obioha, 2002). While imprisonment is a prescription, prisonization is the process of living within a confinement known as a prison. According to Siegel and Bartollas (2011) contemporary prisons are seen as offering many functions. First, they get dangerous people off the streets and give them "just

deserts" for their crimes. With this approach, prison success is measured by such factors as physical security, length of incapacitation, a lower crime rate, and inmates who fear criminal sanctions. Second, they punish criminals, reform criminals and to prevent them from recidivating after re-enter society. Third, Prison provides good jobs for local communities and act as economic life blood of a community. Finally, work in a prison can serve as an important career in corrections.

The Nigerian prison system was established in accordance with three forms of penal legislation which operate alongside each other in the country; the Penal Code and the accompanying Criminal Procedure Code Cap 81 Laws of the Federation 1990 (CPC); the Criminal Code and the accompanying Criminal Procedure Act Cap 80 Laws of the Federation 1990 (CPA) and the Sharia penal legislation in 12 northern states (which applies to only Muslim members of these states) (Emeka, 2011). By its establishment philosophy, the Nigerian prison service is an institution meant to administer penal treatment to adult offenders. Its importance is in the bid to reduce crime in the society. On the basis of imprisonment policy, the prison service was established to manage criminals in prison yards. This constitutional function empowers the Nigerian prison operatives to:

- keep convicted offenders (prisoners) for safe custody,
- keep awaiting trial inmates in custody, until law courts ask for their production
- punish offenders as instructed by the law courts
- reform the convicted prisoners
- rehabilitate and to re-integrate prisoners who have completed the sentences in the prison (extract from prison training manual) (cited in Adetula, Adetula, Fatusin, 2010).

Inferring from the above, the main philosophical underpinnings for establishing the prison institution in all parts of the world including Nigeria is to provide rehabilitation and correctional facility for those who have violated the rules and regulations of society. However, the extent to which this maxim is true in practice has been a subject of controversy. Instances abound where the prisons have become a training ground for criminals instead of rehabilitation home in Nigeria (Obioha, 2002). As Emeka (2011) maintained that a casual observation of the population that goes in and out of the prisons in Nigeria presupposes that there are problems in the prison system, hence the prisons system has not been able to live up to its expectations in terms of impacting positively on lives of inmates which raises some questions yet to be completely addressed on the system functions and existence.

Origin of the Nigeria Prison Service

The prison system has been around long before the amalgamation of 1914 from mere detention centres to native Authority prison and to the current federal prison system we have today. The Nigeria prison have come a long way, the origin of modern prisons service in Nigeria began in the year 1861, the year that conceptually, western type was established in Nigeria. The declaration of Lagos as a colony in 1861 marked the beginning of the institution of formal machinery of governance. At this stage the preoccupation of the colonial government was to protect legitimate trade guarantee the protectorate of the British merchant in Lagos formed a police force of about 25 constables. This was followed in 1862 by the establishment in Lagos, a police court to resolve party disputes among merchants and traders. The functioning of the courts and the police in the colonial settings necessarily means that prisons was needed to complete the system. And it was not long in coming, for in 1872, the broad street prison was established with an initial capacity of 300 inmates (Iginovia, Okonofua, Omoyibo and Osunde, 2002).

Administratively, Jarma (1996) observed that Nigerian Prison is sandwiched between the Ministry of Internal Affairs (MIA), the Immigration Service and Prisons Service Board (IPB). Whereas the Ministry of Internal Affairs has the absolute financial control over the Prisons Service, the immigration and Prisons Service Board, formulates general policy guidelines and also appoints, promotes and disciplines all senior officers of the Service (Iginovia, Okonofua, Omoyibo and Osunde, 2002). The implications of this on the overall organization, control and development of Nigerian Prisons are crucial to understanding why many people including Seun Adeoye of the Guardian Newspapers describe Nigerian Prisons as "seriously battered Nigerian Prisons" and why from the mud walls of remote gaols in Nsukka, Bimin Kebbi, and Gembu to the iron gates of Gashua and Kirikiri, the overriding picture seems to be

that of grim images of neglect, overcrowding, absence of basic sanitation, lack of well trained manpower and lack of medi-care (Iginovia *et al.*, 2002).

The Problems of Nigerian Prison

Obioha (2002) maintained that the Nigerian prisons have been enormously characterized with problems, which several studies have indicated to be the reasons for the inadequacies of the system to correct inmates thus making them to relapse on release.

In various respects, life in Nigerian prisons in general is obviously regimented to the extent that there is strict control in virtually all activities of the inmates. This often leaves the prisoners in a mentally brutalized manner with broken body and spirit, which destroys the individuals. In this regard, it is apparent that the prisons system in Nigeria is faced with the problem of destroying the individual members of the community, which negates the essence.

The Nigerian prisons have been identified also as a veritable avenue for human resources wastage in the society. There is idleness and wastage among the inmates, while old time trade ideas and occupations vanish (Obioha, 1995). Where there are existing trade and skills acquisition centres within the prison yards, they are either not functioning or unsuitable for some of the inmates who may prefer other trades and educational learning processes that are non existence in the prisons rehabilitation curriculum. For instance, some inmates have demonstrated ability and the desire to acquire higher academic qualifications while in the prison in order to improve on both their social status and meet up with their life educational ambition which may not necessarily be related to the vocational trades in the prison yard.

Relating to social infrastructure, there are no good recreational facilities and other amenities in most prisons in Nigeria, as reported by Soyinka (1972), Kangiwa (1986), and Obioha (1995) in Sokoto and Ibadan prison yards respectively. The Nigerian prison environment with regard to amenities have been characterized as “uncheerful” (Awolowo, 1985), “dehumanising” (Soyinka, 1972), and “a hell” by Abubakar Rimi, after his life experience as a political prisoner in Nigeria at the termination of the second republic. This lack of social amenities accounts for the culture of fragility and explosive social violence that is recurrent and descriptive of Nigerian prison community over the years. Physical infrastructure and housing facility could better be described as uncivilized. The rooms and cells are not good for human habitation, while the beddings are in most cases absent as many prison inmates in Nigeria sleep on bare floor.

Another reflective problem that is associated with Nigeria prison is overcrowded beyond the designed population (Obioha, 2002). This manifests in most of the prisons holding more population of inmates than they were originally planned to accommodate, which in turn overstretches available infrastructure beyond their limits of function due to human pressure. It is a recurring administrative problem that had been identified in notable Nigerian prisons prior to colonial rule. This problem of congestion in the Nigerian prisons is discovered to be the major cause of some killer diseases, such as air born infections.

Furthermore, the deplorable health condition in the prison have propelled infectious diseases to thrive within the prison, to worsen the situation, there are no standard hospitals, drugs and qualified medical personnel to take care of the sick inmates. Even when there is a need to take a sick inmate out of the prison yard for treatment in a hospital, there are no motor vehicles to do that. The apparent out- come of this situation without standard health facilities in the prisons can be imagined from the point of view of what happens to a sick inmate in coma or critical emergency condition that requires urgent medical attention which is neither readily available nor accessible.

Lastly, is the of problem of training and retraining prison officials across the Nigeria prisons, this actually mars the prisons ability to effectively achieve its goal of reformation and rehabilitation which is a direct function of its training content (Iginovia, Okonofua, Omoyibo and Osunde, 2002).

Judging the above enumerated problems existing in the Nigeria prisons, it's difficult for Nigerian prisoners to be rehabilitated from such dungeons. The government has to make it clear, through financial and other necessary supports, knowing well that the prison system has a responsibility to rehabilitate

the inmates, making them useful to themselves and the society in general upon release. Except the right tools and working atmosphere are provided, mere sloganeering reform will serve no meaningful purpose as all the aims and goals for prison reforms will continue to end up as a mirage.

Theoretical Frame Work

The Rehabilitationist Theory of Penology

The rehabilitation theory of penology derived its strength from the Lombroso's biological school of criminology, which emphasises that crime is a disease and the criminals are infected with the diseases making them sick individuals. Therefore, if criminals are sick individuals, what's required is for them to be treated or cured, by reforming them, so they can operate as a better person in the society on release from treatment (imprisonment). The rehabilitationist perspective emerged as a result of the recognition that the retribution and deterrent theory of punishment, places more emphases on punishment. It became apparent at a certain point, that punishment was not achieving its stated objectives (to prevent and control crime). As a result, specific reformative techniques such as probation and parole were developed to help change the people attitude toward the criminal. Also influential at this time was the increased belief in the philosophy of humanism with its overriding concern for human welfare. All these factors helped encourage the development of the reformative viewpoint.

Earliest proponents of Rehabilitaionist School, such John Howard (1726-1790) and Samuel Romilly (1757-1818) both English. Alexander Maconochie an Australian and John Augustus an American, all, in their writings, made a penological history by developing parole and probation as a reformative treatment devices which emphasised reform and correction of the inmates rather than punishment (Iginovia et al., 2002). They believed that rehabilitation is a noble goal of punishment by the state that seeks to help the offender become a productive, noncriminal member of society. Throughout history, there have been several different notions as to how this help should be administered. When our modern correctional system was forming, this was the dominate model. We can see by the very name corrections that the idea was to help the offender become a non-offender. Utilising educational programs, faith-based programs, drug treatment programs, anger management programs, and many others are aimed at helping the offender "get better."

The rehabilitation aspect of sentencing is based on being able to predict future needs of the offender, not on the gravity of the current offense. For example, if a judge sentences a person convicted of a felony to a community-based program, the judge's actions reflect his or her belief that the offender can be successfully treated and presents no future threat to society (Siegel & Bartollas, 2011).

The most widely accepted tenets of rehabilitation of criminal sentences are listed as follows:

- i. To prevent the commission of offenses
- ii. To promote the correction and rehabilitation of offenders
- iii. To effect individualized treatment, and
- iv. To advance the use of generally accepted scientific methods and knowledge in the sentencing and treatment of offenders (Model penal Code, 1981).

Support for rehabilitation-based sentencing practices began to erode when reformers raised questions about the ethics of the rehabilitation model. The erosion accelerated in the early 1970s when criminal justice researcher Robert Martinson and his associates failed to find any systematic evidence that indeterminate sentencing actually worked and prison programs rehabilitated inmates (Martinson, 1974). It was also charged at the time that parole boards were unable to determine when inmates eligible for release had been cured of their criminal propensities. The combined evidence made a mockery of the term "correctional institution".

The declined support of the rehabilitation ideal in the early 1970s as the principal justification for imprisonment left a void. It was a void that the goal of incapacitation was soon to fill. Yet rehabilitation has made something of a comeback. Many private, community, and even institutional corrections are rehabilitative focused, and many are readopting the principles of rehabilitation. Also, a number of comprehensive reviews of research on the effectiveness of correctional treatment have found that some treatment programs do have positive outcomes in improving the attitudes of offenders and in reducing

recidivism (James & Glaze, 2006; Voorhis, Braswell & Lester, 2007). The challenge is to identify which program will work with what offenders in what setting. (Robison, 2008; Ward 2007; Lipsey & Cullen, 2007).

Drawing from the above premises one could explain why the Nigeria State had adopted the rehabilitationist principle of punishment which emphasizes more on reformatting the offender rather than punishment solely. The Nigeria prison system as the name implies, placed more emphases on punishment of offenders, coupled with the numerous prison problems, which has led to a greater number of inmate's recidivism. Thus, the government deem it fit that the name prison which emphasizes more on punishment should be changed to correctional service, incorporating non-custodial faculty into the former prison featuring parole, probation and community service. This will give the prison a new lease of hope for the reform and treatment of offenders, rather than punishment solely, if properly implemented.

The Metamorphosis from Nigeria Prison Service to Nigeria Correctional Service

The Nigeria State, on August 14, 2019 witnessed a metamorphosis leading to a new phrase of prison reform as the president; Mr. Muhammadu Buhari signed the Nigerian Correctional Service Act into law, which repealed the Prisons Act. The Correctional Act addresses new issues by providing for non-custodial measures. Signing of the bill into law the Nigeria Correctional Service as represented in the new Act has two faculties:

- The Custodial Service; and
- The Non-custodial Service

The Custodial Service, among other roles, will offer custody and take control of persons legally interned in safe, secure and humane conditions, conveying remand persons to and from courts in motorized formations; Identifying the existence and causes of anti-social behaviours of inmates; Conducting risk and needs assessment aimed at developing appropriate correctional treatment methods for reformation, rehabilitation and reintegration; and implementing reformation and rehabilitation programmes to enhance the reintegration of inmates back into the society, among others.

The Non-custodial Service will be responsible for the administration of non-custodial measures like community service, probation, parole, restorative justice and other measures such as carrying out court orders of competent jurisdiction.

Adopting international best practises of prison reforms, the new Service (The Nigerian Correctional Service) like any other correctional institution across the globe, is now saddled with the sole responsibility of accommodating awaiting trial inmates as well as convicted inmates for the purpose of treatment and reform which are the whole mark of rehabilitation theory (Agbola, 2019).

Distinguishing Features of the Nigeria Correctional Service Act of 2019

A closer look at the opening vignette of the Nigeria Prison Service Act and the Nigeria Correctional service Act, one can deduce that the Nigerian Correctional Service Act of 2019 thus has some distinguishing promising qualities priding itself from that of the 1972 Nigeria Prison Services Act;

Some of the distinguishing features are stated bellow as follows:

1. The law empowers the State Comptroller of Prisons to reject additional prisoners where the prison in question is already filled to capacity.
2. The law divides the Correctional Service into two sections, The Custodial Service and Non-custodial Service.
3. The Custodial Service will, among other things, take control of persons legally interned in safe, secure and humane conditions and provide support to facilitate the speedy disposal of cases of persons awaiting trial.
4. The Non-custodial Service will be responsible for the administration of non-custodial measures like community service, probation, parole, restorative justice measures and such other measures as a court of competent jurisdiction may order.

5. The objective of the law is to focus on correction and promote reformation, rehabilitation and reintegration of offenders.
6. The law stipulates that the Correctional Service will be headed by the Controller-General and a minimum of eight Deputy Controller-Generals.
7. The law states the Correctional Service must initiate behaviour modification in inmates through the provision of medical, psychological, spiritual and counselling services for all offenders including violent extremists.
8. The law also states that where an inmate sentenced to death has exhausted all legal procedures for appeal and a period of 10 years has elapsed without the execution of the sentence, the Chief Judge may revert the death sentence to life imprisonment.
9. The law also prohibits torture, inhumane and abusive treatment of inmates (Agbola, 2019).

The Implication of the Metamorphosis to Correctional Service

Some of the likely challenges that might bedevil the new Correctional Service Act of 2019 are stated as follows:

Funding Challenges

The adequate implementation of the new Act will definitely involve huge funding. In the 2019 fiscal year, South Africa budgets R23, 848bn that is over N500bn for its correctional service, although some of the reformation projects are funded by grants and partnerships.

According to the Nigerian Prisons Service website, there are 73,995 inmates across the various prisons in the 36 states and the Federal Capital Territory. Deducting from the above figures, 23,568 are convicted inmates while 50,427, which are about 69 percent of the inmates, are on awaiting trial. Many of the projects for correction and rehabilitation would require more funding because of the use of technology and manpower that would be needed, also of important is the need to recruit and retraining of professionals into the correctional service (Azu, 2019).

The Financial Involvement of States and NGOs in Funding

Another major issue in the 2019 Act is the role of the States in supporting and funding, especially in the area of non-custodial outfit. Section 44 and 45 of the Administration of Criminal Justice Act (ACJA) prescribed that states can assist in non-custodial measures. The irony here is that many States, including the States that have adopted the ACJA are yet to contribute their quota fully.

Azu (2019) citing the Executive Director of Citizens United in the Rehabilitation of Errants (CURE) Sylvester Uhaa, quoted as follows:

“The states would not just fold their arms and watch the Federal Government struggle to fix the prisons and the criminal justice system. Prisons maybe a federal institution, most of the inmates in prisons are indigenes of those states. So, Also, NGOs, development partners and religious organisations should contribute.”

The question here is that, if some state finds it difficult to pay their staff before. Culminating with the present advent of the new minimum wage of #30,000, how can they fulfil their quota with respect to funding the non-custodial outfit?

Reformative Facilities

The present of the correctional service Act, therefore imply that the prison should be upgraded structural and functionally. Introducing new facilities which will aid technical and skilfully training of inmates, equipping the facility with technological facilities, such as ‘Electronic Monitoring Systems’ and other hi-tech devices in surveillance specifically for the non-custodial faculty. AdJudging that the present prisons structure in the country lags in the area of infrastructure and technology manpower and to keep up with international standard, it’s important to put in place reformatory facilities that will enable us achieve our goal of reforming offenders.

Need to Recruit More Trained Manpower

The advent of the non-custodial system means that there would be a new directorate as the Comptroller General of the Prisons will remain in charge of custodial faculty. Trained supervisors would have to be recruited for the programme to run efficiently specifically for the non-custodial outfit. For example, if inmates are sent on parole, probation and community service, it would require trained officials to monitor, supervise, evaluate and measure their attitudes and behaviours. These issues raised above are some of the likely areas that might mar the cogent implementations of the Act. If not put in place, the Act would just end with the change of name from NPS to NCS, which I consider putting the cart before the horse, as the Federal Government should have before now implemented the tenets of the Act by putting in place the required structure both human and infrastructural before proceeding with the change of name.

Relevance of the Correctional Service Act

The Act will produce positive outcome if properly implemented to logical conclusion, especially in areas of funding, during from the Act itself one can make projections on the relevance of Correctional Service Act; some of the relevance are as follows:

Address Problem of Petty/Minor Offenders Detained in Prison Custody

The Correctional Act will help address the problem of having petty/minor offenders detained in prison custody as these can benefit from the non-custodial service. This will save funds for the government, avoid these low risk offenders being socialised into more criminal culture by high risks offenders and hardened criminals.

A boost for Non-Custodial Sentences

The Act will help fast track the implementation of the non-custodial provisions of the Administration of Criminal Justice Act (ACJA) 2015 and the Administration of Criminal Justice Laws of various states, by providing the needed support in terms of manpower for the supervision of non-custodial sentences across the states of the Federation and the Federal Capital Territory (FCT) just as we currently have prisons (custodial centres) across these location. With this, it will encourage the courts to issue non-custodial sentences in deserving cases, specifically when the offences aren't deserving imprisonment.

Management of Prison Overcrowding

"Correctional Service Act: cure or placebo?" (2019) cited Agomoh (2019) observed that; Sections 12(4), 12(5), 12(6), 12(7), 12(8), 12(9), 12(10), 12(11) and 12(12) of the Correctional Service Act is targeted at solving overcrowding in prisons. It also empowers the correctional centre superintendent to reject more intakes of inmates where it is apparent that the centre in question is filled to capacity. The Act will make the correctional service to take a more active role in helping manage prison overcrowding by having them trigger an early warning system to alerting the judiciary, ministry of justice and other key stakeholders of the inmates population status viz-a-viz the prison capacity to undertake measures to help control the inflow and outflow of inmates in the facility in question.

Inmates' Mental Health Provided For

Section 24 of the Act provides for the establishment of the mental health review board to help review cases of inmates with mental disorder. This will hopefully help address the problem of the so called 'civil lunatics' and 'criminal lunatics', who are often detained in prison without adequate review and mental health treatment. This will hopefully help reduce the burden and capacity gap on the service with respect to the management of these persons.

Young Offender Facility

The provision of young offenders' facility in each state is intended to help address the problem of having underage persons in adult prisons. This is provided under Section 35 of the Correctional Act.

Self-Development

The Act also provides incentives to encourage inmate's participation in training and vocational workshops and reintegration of inmates into the society (example through issuance of good behaviour to deserving inmates) which will go a long way to encourage good behaviour in the custodial facilities.

Relief to Prison Staff

The enactment of the Act if implemented will bring a huge relief to the entire prison community, particularly first offenders that have minor infractions, instead of keeping them in prison; they are sent to community service. The non-custodial system which features the incorporation of probation and parole into the correctional service, will guide the offender on proper ways of behaving.

The existence of this mode of reforms, involving paroles and probations officers will definitely reduce prison congestions and by extension relief prison staff of work overload. This will definitely guarantee a win-win situation, the society that the offender has offended will win because they will do services free of charge, the offender himself will win because he will no longer be in prison, rather he will be doing community service and still be relevant to himself and his family.

Criticism

Though, the Act possesses the qualities that might transform imprisonment and prisonization process with its aims of correcting, rehabilitating and to reintegrating the inmates into society if properly implemented; the provisions of the Act will not only improve the correction and reintegration of convicted persons, but also breathe life into the provisions of the Administration of Criminal Justice Act and the various dealing with Non-Custodial alternatives, there exist some likely criticism with the correctional service Act; first, since the enactment of the bill into law, the prison structure and operations had only witnessed change in principles but no meaningful changes in practise, especially in the area of personnel who will man the non-custodial outfit. The correctional service is still mar with the problems of poor prison infrastructure and inadequate training of correctional officers. Second, the non-custodial measures such as community service, probation, parole etc may not work effectively if we do not have reliable data of every person in the prison and the country at large. If there are no reliable information of inmates, as it will be difficult to effectively trace them when they abscond. Third, there exists a potential problem with Section 12 (8) of the Act. This section provides that: "Without prejudice to sub-section (4), the state Controller of Correctional Service, in conjunction with the Correctional Centre Superintendent, shall have the power to reject more intakes of inmates where it is apparent that the correctional centre in question is filled to capacity". The questions here are, where will the inmate be taken to? Will such inmates be released, particularly where he/she has been alleged to have committed heinous crime? Fourth, Technology wise, the country is not yet ready for the administration of non-custodial measures, reason been that the whole prisons in the county lags in the areas of surveillance, ICT and other hi-tech devices. Fifth, is the issue of funding which lack meaningful strategy or clarity, as funding involves the federal, state and NGO's. The reforms require huge resources which will fiscally transform the prisons from punitive facilities to rehabilitation/correctional centres. Otherwise, it would just end with the change, which I consider putting the cart before the horse, as the Federal Government should have before now implemented the Act by putting in place the required infrastructure before the change of name.

Conclusion

It is considered a welcome development that the correctional service billing of 2008 was finally signed into law by the President on 29 Aug, 2019. This changed the Nigeria criminal justice and by extension the penological understanding of imprisonment from the orientation of punishment of offenders to the treatment or reform of the offenders with the sole aim of rehabilitation. This will be more commendable only if translated into reality at the level of implementation, but if not then it will definitely end as a placebo. The implementation of the tenets of the Correctional Act should be held sacrosanct by all the organs of government, if they are to succeed. Though, it's been considered by many as putting cart

before the horse, as they believed that the structure of the prison should have being well equipped and upgraded in areas of manpower, infrastructural and technology wise before the changed name. The government at all levels should place their hands on deck to support the federal government in making sure that the correctional Act succeed as it give priority to the reform of the inmates and by extension curtails recidivism on one hand and the other hand, maintaining international standard.

Recommendations

The Federal Government should declare a state of emergency to addressing the age-long problems that have bedevilled the institution, because the changed name will not make a difference, if the cardinal problems aren't addressed. Government should, as a matter of urgency, revamp the rehabilitation centre and replicate same across the country.

The Federal and State Governments and by extensions NGO'S as prescribed in the Act should adequately provide resources needed for the massive changes in terms of budgetary allocation.

There should be total administrative reform, separating the correctional service from the Ministry of Internal Affairs and Immigration Service, wherein financial autonomy is guarantee, and the prison service board oversee their affairs by playing supervising role and reporting directly to the federal government.

For the non-custodial outfit to operate effectively, trained personnel especially in areas of paroles, probations, rehabilitation and community service must be employed. Technology is also a vital prerequisite, the non-custodial faculty can only effectively operate if technological facilities, use in tracking criminals such as data mapping crime, Smartphone tracking, Wi-Fi capabilities and biometrics is present, which will be use especially to track offenders on parole.

Here it is also proper to adopt the recommendation of Agbede and Agiobu-Kemmer (2019) that there should be a total reorientation to suit the new name for it to create maximum impact and achieve its cardinal aims and objectives of correcting, rehabilitating and reintegrating inmates upon release. As 'prison' is associated with punishment, while 'correctional', is to reformation and rehabilitation. This means that the vision, objectives and structure of the institution needs to realign in compliance to the new name.

The inmate's cognitive, psychomotor and behavioural aspects must be taken into consideration, for the prison reform to be effective.

There should be need for the creation of more directorates in the Service and also ensure the decongestion of the prisons.

There is need for infrastructural upgrade and training and retraining of correctional officers for the new act to have any effect. In order for the act to fulfil its aim of reforming, rehabilitating and reintegrating offenders, there needs to be fewer people in our overcrowded prisons and adequate and state-of-the-art training facility. This will ensure that most inmates can benefit from the beneficial training be it educational and vocational that will be of immense benefit to them after release.

Lastly, more prisons should be built, considering our population as a country, and more particularly in urban areas of the country in other to avoid prison overcrowding.

REFERENCES

- Adetula G. A., Adetula A., & Fatusin A. F. (2010). The prison subsystem culture: Its attitudinal effects on operatives, convicts and the free society. *Ife Psychologia*. 18(1):232-251.
- Agbede, O. & Agiobu-Kemmer, S. (2019, September 7). Reforming Nigeria prisons beyond name change. The Guardian. Retrieved from <https://guardian.ng/saturday-magazine/cover/reforming-nigeria-prisons-beyond-name-change/>
- Agbola, B. (2019, August 16). 10 things to know about Nigeria's new law on prisons. Premium Time. Retrieved from <https://www.premiumtimesng.com/news/top-news/346864-10-things-to-know-about-nigerias-new-law-on-prisons.html>

- Awolowo, O. (1985). *Adventure in Power: My March Through Prison*. Ibadan: Macmillian Publishers.
- Azu, J. C. (2019, August 20). Major implications of Nigeria's new Correctional Act. Daily Trust. Retrieved from <https://www.dailytrust.com.ng/major-implications-of-nigerias-new-correctional-act.html>
- Correctional Service Act: cure or placebo? (2019, August 27). The Nations. Retrieved from <https://thenationonline.net/correctional-service-act-cure-or-placebo/>
- Emeka, E. E. (2011). Challenges and Reforms in the Nigerian Prisons System. *J Soc Sci*, 27(2): 95-109.
- Iginovia, P. E., Okonofua, B. A. Omoyibo, K. U. & Osunde, O. O. (2002). *Crime and Delinquency in Nigeria: Theories, Patterns and Trends*. Nigeria: Kryne Monitor Books.
- Jarma, J. H. (1996). Prisons and the Reformation of the Offenders in Issues in Crime Prevention and Control in Nigeria, *J Soc Sci*, Vol. 1.p. 196-197.
- Kangiwa, G. A. (1986). *The Political Economy of Crime in Sokoto Town*. B.Sc Project, Unpublished. Sokoto: University of Sokoto.
- Obioha E. E. (1995). *Prison Culture in Nigeria; A Study of Life Within Agodi Prison Community*, Ibadan. M.Sc Dissertation, Unpublished. Ibadan: Department of Sociology, University of Ibadan.
- Obioha, E. E. (2002). Punishment in Society. In: UC Isiugo-Abanihe, AN Isamah, O Adesina 'Jimi (Eds.): *Currents and Perspectives in Sociology*. Lagos: Malthouse Press Limited, pp. 367-379.
- Siegel, L. & Bartollas C. (2011). *Corrections Today*. USA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Soyinka, W. (1972). *The Man Died: Prison Notes*. London: Penguin Books.
- James, D. I. & Glaze, L. E. (2006). *Mental Health Problems of Prisons and Jails Inmates. Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report*.
- Voorhis, P. V., Braswell, M. & Lester, D. (2007). *Correctional Counselling and Rehabilitation*. (6th ed), Cincinnati: Anderson.
- Robinson, G. (2008). "Late-Modern Rehabilitation: The Evolution of a Penal Strategy," *Punishment and Society*, 10: 429-445.
- Ward, T. & Maruna, S. (2007). *Rehabilitation: Beyond the Risk Principle*. London: Routledge.
- Lipsey, M. W. & Cullen, F. T. (2007). "The Effectiveness of Correctional Rehabilitation: A Review of Systematic Reviews," *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, 3: 297-320.
- 'Annual Meeting of the American Law Institute', (1962). *Model Penal Code*, adopted in 1962 and last updated in 1981.
- Martinson, R. (1974). "What Works? Questions and Answers about Prison Reform," *Public Interest*, 35: 22-54.
- The Nigeria Prison Service Act (1972). Retrieved from: <https://lawsofnigeria.placng.org/laws/P29.pdf>
- The Nigeria Correctional Service Act (2019). Retrieved from: https://placng.org/wp/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/Nigerian-Correctional-Service-Act-2019.pdf_z