

drunkenness, the proper treatment for the habitual inebriate is plain enough. He must be sent to a home of inebriates, to a State Hospital, not a prison, and he must be kept there till the guardians consider that there is a fair probability that he is cured. Seven days in jail never yet cured alcoholism. You might as well prescribe it for small-pox. This may sound an expensive method of treatment, but it is not really so. The present system brings the same people back week after week to prison and makes the drunkard practically the guest of the State year in, year out. It adds a heavy burden to the duties of the police, and encourages, or at least does not diminish, a most extravagant and corrupting tendency from the force of example. Anything that will cure drunkenness will be a saving of money from every point of view.

The criminal-by-accident, as we have called him, is a less important factor in the social problem. He is not really a criminal, except in name. He is not anti-social. The man who resents an insult with a blow, and so puts himself within the reach of the law, or the laborer who steals a turnip because he is starving, must not be put in the same category with the professional burglar or thief. The duty of the State with regard to him is plain. He ought not to be sent to prison at all. Some penalty there must be for such acts as these, but sending to prison is not the one to be chosen. It would be better in the long run to let such a man go scot free than send him to herd with the scum of the earth in jail. That cannot raise him morally. It will probably debase him. Some sort of a fine, either in money or labor, would meet the case; or, in less important offences, the man might be dismissed with a reprimand, or ordered to come up for judgment when called for.

The same applies to first offences.

The difficulty of dealing with first offenders has been realized for some time now in England, but not always very fruitfully. One thing may safely be said. First offenders should *never* be sent to prison to herd with more hardened ruffians. Probably they should never be sent to prison at all. The system of entering into recognizances, giving securities, and deferred judgments is the best for dealing with these cases, together with fines when these can be enforced. Some system should be devised by which a man who has no money could be fined in labor or in his weekly wages for a time. This would have a considerable deterrent effect, would cost far less than imprisoning the man, and would save him from all danger of the moral contagion of prison life. There remains then the case of the habitual, instinctive, professional criminal to be considered, and he presents the most difficult problem. At present he is a source of enormous expense. Every kind of elaborate machinery is required to protect society against him—costly prisons, detectives, police, warders, chaplains, and all the other extravagant paraphernalia which are considered requisite for dealing with this pest. He spends two-thirds of a lifetime in prison, and during that time plans the robberies of the remaining third. When he is at large he is even more expensive to the community than when he is in durance. What is to be done with him?

We hear a good deal about kleptomania at different times, and no one has quite made up his mind when theft ceases to be mere larceny, and has to be dignified by the longer name. The truth is *all theft is kleptomania* with the exception of occasional isolated acts, like that of the starving man who steals a loaf. At present, if a rich man steals something he cannot possibly want, and could pay for easily if he did, we call it