

not to imperil the mental and physical health of the prisoners, work in common with enforced silence insisted on during the day. These two systems were generally adopted for a time, the Philadelphia system for the beginning of the punishment, and the Auburn for the succeeding period, each being warmly advocated by special reformers and philanthropists divided in opinions as to their relative completeness to gain the reform of the prisoner. The introduction of these two methods was attempted in Millbank Prison in England at the beginning of the present century, and later at Peltonville, which, however, gave way to cellular isolation, with some alleviation, it being deemed more or less impossible to enforce silence during the daily labors of the convicts. France, Belgium, the different States of Germany, Holland, Sweden Norway, Switzerland, Russia, Italy, Spain and Greece, have all followed this reform movement as its gradual developments manifested themselves.

It is worthy of note that these two systems, having been generally accepted as a step in the right direction, were eagerly taken up by reformers in England, which had previously transported her convicts to distant colonies, as a basis for further improvements, and a more generous view of the cause of, and the most effectual humanitarian methods of suppressing, crime. Just as the penitentiary system began to manifest itself when 'the rights of man' was becoming a powerful cry all over the civilised world, so was it left to those countries more free from statecraft and court intrigue, and more advanced in habits of philosophical thought, to carry on the reform movement, though the American ideas were not adopted further by England to any great extent. In the British prisons the convicts to increase the severity of their punishment are for some months employed in work almost or entirely unproductive, such as that of the treadmill or the moving of heavy shot. The managers of all the penal institutions of the United States agree that while labor is absolutely necessary as a means of reformation, unproductive labor has a most injurious moral effect on prisoners, and it is never resorted to un-

less for purposes of instruction. Productive labor, however, would only appear to be justifiable to the extent of making a penitentiary as far as possible self-sustaining and in so far as it does not materially affect free labor and cause displacement of industrial wage-earners outside; while labor of some kind, as severe as it can possibly be made with due regard to the physical capacity of the prisoner is absolutely indispensable to his reformation and as a deterrent on others inclined to wrong-doing. Considering the difficulties of the older and more densely populated country on the one hand, and the infinite possibilities of the other, the divergence of opinion on this point is not without some reason. The American penal establishments are also more liberal than the British in the matter of dietary in which penologists seem everywhere to differ, it being contended by some that a bare sufficiency of coarse food is all that the interests of society and of the prisoner demand, while others aver that by being careful as to quality of the diet and as to the manner in which it is served, whatever self-respect and human feeling the prisoner retains are thereby strengthened, and his ability to work made alone possible. Some of the penitentiaries in the United States even allow the friends of prisoners to give them delicacies, and furniture and ornaments for their cells, while in most cases they receive a liberal supply of tobacco—privileges which, perhaps, in the future, as population increases, new discoveries cause fresh displacements, and the competition becomes as keen and exciting as in England to-day, will have a terrible effect on society and enormously increase the volume of crime among those driven to try dangerous experiments in order to preserve their social status.

Many powerful writers in America and England condemned the cellular system as being calculated to brood despondency rather than hope in the minds of criminals; others foresaw no certain prospect of the guilty regaining their lost reputation when the term of their imprisonment had expired; while the governments of the two countries, especially England, agreed that neither the Philadelphia nor the