

Nay, every year you keep him under that all-embracing supervision, you take the spring out of him more utterly, weaken his will, render him incapable of originating anything or shifting for himself. If a man was unfit to regulate his own affairs and showed himself unequal to the task of earning an honest livelihood before that treatment, how much less will he be able to do so after a few years, when you have accustomed him to have everything arranged for him, and to live eternally at the orders of others. You kill all feelings of responsibility, strangle all ideas of arrangement, method, and initiative on the part of the man himself by lack of use, and then, when he leaves prison you imagine he will be capable of managing his own affairs, and getting a living. It is true that to be able to rule, one must have learnt to obey, but this absolute subjection, without appeal, to an established order of things which never alters from year's end to year's end, and does not admit of the slightest variation on the part of the prisoner will certainly never send forth at the end of five or ten years a man capable of performing the duties of a citizen. What is to be done then?

One of two courses alone remains as either rational or humane. The first is a careful curative treatment of the criminal, some very elastic system which would allow every possible variation according to the particular idiosyncrasy of the patient. Such a treatment must be both mental and physical—moral is implied in both. It must tend to inculcate responsibility not to crush it, to elevate the Ego not to degrade it. Beginning by restoring the health (and therefore the vigor) of the criminal, it must carry out a thorough treatment of each individual case, and the patient must not be dismissed till, in the opinion of his medical advisers, he is cured. He must not be sent to prison for a fixed time

as a punishment. He must be sent for treatment for a specific infirmity. Only when that infirmity is overcome can he be set at liberty once more. He must be compulsorily treated for a dangerous malady. If it be said such a treatment is impossible, that the expense would be enormous, the appliances, staff, establishment needed too great for any country to afford, we should be inclined to reply that the expense after the initial outlay would be no greater than that of the present system. There would be fewer men in prison, for there would not be the constant crop of prisoners, who return again and again. And, as we saw above, many kinds of crime which are now punished with imprisonment would be disposed of in other less expensive ways. The results would be more satisfactory, and therefore indirectly would save an enormous amount of money at present wasted. For it must be remembered that our vast criminal class is absolutely unproductive. It is so much dead weight, a part of the body politic which performs no function and only preys upon the other members. Of course the treatment of the criminal—criminal therapeutics if you prefer the term—is still more or less in its infancy as a science, and, despite the elaborate investigations at Elmira, in America, remains largely experimental in character; but still a good deal is fairly well established, and much is being learnt every year. But if the objection of expense outweighs all other considerations there yet remains an alternative plan, inexpensive, humane, and rational, three characteristics which our present methods certainly cannot boast of. The *recidiviste* must be put out of the way. He is the lost dog of the human species. He must be taken to a judicial Battersea, put in the lethal chamber, and painlessly extinguished. It is no question of punishment. It is