

of the wretched prisoner in the throes of the most cruel torture. And yet to this very day, in certain cases, this method is employed in a more elaborate but scarcely less barbarous form, generally known as the Third Degree.

It is hardly worth while to cite instances of this anachronism, for its methods are too widely known, but perhaps one case mentioned will serve to call up to mind a number of others. It is a newspaper account that I am citing from memory, and although the details may not be altogether correct, the scheme that is devised in the interests of justice is quite typical.

The prisoner in the account was accused of murder, but pleaded innocent. There was really no direct evidence against him, and the desideratum of the prosecution was of course to draw out a confession from the prisoner. To this end, a detective was introduced into his cell in the guise of a fellow prisoner who did not find it difficult to ingratiate himself with and win the confidence of the suspect. While the latter was sound asleep, worn out with care and worry, the detective would address him in gruesome tones accusing him of the murder and describing the scene in a general way. The prisoner, horror-stricken and in utter bewilderment, would awake only to find his mate fast asleep. With some difficulty he roused him and asked where these weird cries were coming from. His cell-mate naturally denied that he had heard any sounds, and claimed that it was only an illusion on the part of the hearer. This procedure the detective went through several times at different intervals, always making sure that the real prisoner was not awake. The effects of this trickery were cumulative, till finally the suspect broke down and confessed to the crime with which he was charged. The district attorney triumphed; and the detectives congratulated themselves upon their art when this suspect was brought to the gallows. Now, whether the man hanged was actually the author of the crime or not is a matter that will probably never be settled. The question, however, which is of extreme importance is that of the principle. Can such means and methods be justifiable when they violate the very foundation of justice?