

Those whose relatives cannot or will not support them. (3) Those who have got beyond the discipline of their relatives. The first class certainly should be looked after by the State. For children left helpless must surely deserve from the State, what they cannot give themselves, a training that will enable them to live honestly. It makes little difference whether they are vicious or not; they must be taken in hand, and given a chance. Those of the second class also should receive attention, for whether a boy's parents are alive or not makes little difference to him if he is thrown upon his own resources. The third class should be dealt with by the State, though, perhaps, in a different way, and for a different reason. Not to speak of justice, there is that chief function and duty of a commonwealth, namely, to protect the weak against the strong, that demands first, that children should be removed from surroundings that in any way encourage a life of crime, and second, that when they have unfortunately been involved in such a career, and have become incorrigible—and therefore an influence for bad—they should be removed to a safe spot where they cannot contaminate others.

With this as with other classes already criminal, or placed in circumstances that will lead them to become criminal, there are only two proper courses: First, if possible, to secure the unfortunate before bad habits have been formed, and evil associations have tied him to a life of vice, remove him, and place him in the midst of good influences, to educate him to hate crime, at the same time teaching him some useful trade that will give him the opportunity of winning an honest livelihood. Second, if he is a hardened criminal, to remove him to a place where he will have no influence over either the innocent or those whose habits are not such as to for-

bid all hope of reform. The first of these processes is educational in the best sense of the word; the second is chiefly penal, but might be made, to some extent, reformatory or educational.

Were such a course of treatment followed what would result? First, the stream of evil tendency would be cut off at its source, and useful citizens would be made of those who otherwise would have been criminals all their life, and would have been the occasion of loss and expense to the State. Second, the criminal—especially if he were sentenced for no definite period—would endeavour to show himself tractable in order to procure his dismissal on the ground of good conduct, and when once he was set at liberty he would hesitate to commit the smallest crime, knowing that it might result in perpetual imprisonment. Such a plan would probably not be more difficult in its working than that now in vogue, which has these two faults, that it does not educate—at least not in the right way—and that its only object is to punish in order to deter. In other words, instead of stepping in and anticipating crime, we allow neglected children to commit it and then place them in contact with hardened criminals, who serve as schoolmasters in crime. Thus we send the culprit out after his thirty days or three months in a far worse state than that in which he entered, only to have him back in a very short time for a longer term and for a more serious offence.

Of these plans who can hesitate to make choice? And yet things will go on much the same way unless public attention is directed to this question. For years and years the matter has been agitated by Prison Reform Associations and by philanthropic men, and something has been accomplished, but not much. When teachers discuss the question at their gatherings,