

1914

Ideal Prison System

Eugene N. Foss

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/jclc>

 Part of the [Criminal Law Commons](#), [Criminology Commons](#), and the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Eugene N. Foss, Ideal Prison System, 4 J. Am. Inst. Crim. L. & Criminology 674 (May 1913 to March 1914)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology by an authorized editor of Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons.

THE IDEAL PRISON SYSTEM.¹

EUGENE N. FOSS.²

Politics and the Prisons.—After three years of practical contact as governor with the administration of our prison system I am convinced that it is still the weakest spot in our form of government. Nor do I hope to see this condition permanently changed through any political organization. The change must come, as it is coming in Massachusetts, through an awakened public conscience.

I wish to say at the outset that I regard Massachusetts today as a leader in the work of improving our prison system. Whatever criticisms I may make will be directed against those reactionary interests which, in every section of the country, including Massachusetts, oppose and belittle every attempt at improvement.

I have forced certain prison reforms upon the political machinery of Massachusetts, but at every step these reforms have been opposed by partisan leaders.

The penal administration of a state, with its hundreds of henchmen, forms in itself a powerful political machine. Then there is the still greater political power of the local and county institutions, with their thousands of retainers and favorites. Political control of all this machinery is, in some cases, enough to insure political control of the state. Therefore the practical politician often fights to maintain the old order and keep out those reforms which would surely destroy his grip. *The people must take the prisons, reformatories, jails and houses of correction out of politics and keep them out.* There is no more excuse for political administration of a prison than for the political administration of a hospital, a school or a bank.

Poverty and the Prisons.—In my study of our court and prison methods I found, as I shall presently demonstrate, a great wastage of human lives—a failure to reclaim and utilize them.

I recall my amazement at learning, a year ago, that more than one-third of all our commitments in Massachusetts were for debt. Of 27,454 commitments, in that one year, more than 78 per cent, were for petty offenses. These were divided into two groups: 11,156 had definite sentences of less than six months. An almost equal number

¹Address before the American Prison Association at Indianapolis, Oct. 13, 1913.

²Governor of Massachusetts.

THE IDEAL PRISON SYSTEM

(10,371) were not sentenced to prison, but were incarcerated with the others, and *subjected to precisely the same treatment*, because, at the moment of conviction, they could not pay the small fines imposed.

Imprisonment was inflicted upon the first group as a penalty for their law-breaking. The second group were sentenced *only* to small money penalties, and suffered imprisonment *only* for being temporarily poor. The courts did not consider that they deserved imprisonment. Otherwise they would have been committed in the first instance.

I discovered, also, that the fate of any small offender at the bar of justice depends far too much upon the temperament and theories (notions) of his particular judge, and that more attention is given to his particular act than to his character and the causes of the offense.

Let me add in all seriousness that the managers of my own shops and factories make a more efficient and intelligent sorting and reclamation of scrap metal than the laws have generally made of the living men and women that have been thrown upon the scrap heap of our jails and prisons.

Luck and the Prisons.—The 10,000 who were locked up for debt were, in many instances, the victims, not of justice but of the inequality of our justice. In each case, if the penniless prisoner came before a certain judge he was most likely to receive human sympathy and understanding, and to be allowed a few days of grace to pay his fine, just as every signer of an overdue note receives his legal days of grace to pay it. If he chanced to come before another judge he was practically certain to receive no grace whatever. I realize that these are harsh-sounding statements. Let us proceed to prove that they are true.

The matter was made the subject of searching legislative investigation two years ago, following a demand in my first inaugural address for a more equal and efficient administration of justice. A commission of five experts, headed by the chief justice of the Municipal Court of Suffolk County (*i. e.*, Boston), analyzed our court and prison records and declared that in our lower courts

“there exists a radical and multiform variation and antagonism in matters essential to the enforcement of law. In our opinion this is a matter of grave moment, for no body of law can serve its full purpose, no penal law can command the full measure of that public respect (failing which the law itself fails) when the execution of such laws needlessly and unreasonably varies within a given community.”

This legislative investigation showed, for example, that one police judge gave probation in 80 per cent of his cases; another in 40 per cent of his cases; another in only 16 per cent; another in 10 per cent. One fined four and one-half times as many cases as he committed; another fined and committed equally. Even in the higher courts there has

been the same lack of uniformity. In one of these, 75 sentences were imposed for every hundred cases begun; in another, 60; in another, 52; in another, 39; in another, 33; in another, 29; and in another, none.

In all, some 54,000 sentences for minor offenses (fines or under six months) were given in Massachusetts in 1912. Thirty-three thousand paid their fines and went free. Ten thousand more couldn't pay, and for that reason alone were enrolled among our prison population. Eleven thousand more were sentenced to brief terms and not given the opportunity to make a money payment at all. Judge for yourselves, in view of this official report, whether or not the element of simple chance entered into the disposition of these 54,000 cases.

Probation: the Basis of Reform.—This year we have taken a very radical and progressive step toward the further reform of our prison system. We have enacted a law compelling the judges of the lower courts, when they impose small fines, to suspend commitments for failure to pay, and to allow time for such payments to be made. They are required to investigate thoroughly the prisoner's character and circumstances, and must put him on probation and give him time to pay his fine, unless it is found (affirmatively) that he is likely to default, or that the public interest requires his commitment. This law only re-enforces the great principles of probation, which we now recognize as a more effective moral force than punishment for the vast majority of incipient criminals. It is *probation* that must form the corner stone of our ideal prison system.

I have already shown you that 38 per cent of our jail commitments in Massachusetts have in the past resulted from the refusal of the minor courts to grant periods of grace or probation in cases of fines that are not paid when so ordered. Governor Oswald West of Oregon, whose work for the rational treatment of prisoners is widely known, says,

"My belief [is] that three-fourths of the men who are sent to the penitentiary are not criminals at heart, are really not any worse offenders than thousands who, through some turn of fortune's wheel, escape the stigma of a penitentiary term."

Governor West is right. Let me prove it.

Out of 27,000 prison commitments per annum in Massachusetts there are only 1,300 for offenses against the person; only 300 for offenses serious enough to receive sentences for a year or longer. The fact is that many offenses against the law have no serious moral quality. They do not indicate defects of character in the offender. They are only acts which the legislature has prohibited arbitrarily, in the general interest of the public, and most of them are punishable with

THE IDEAL PRISON SYSTEM

money penalties. Any one of these acts may, however, send a man to jail if he is poor.

And yet our prisons and even reformatories are built and armored in the belief that this population is all of a type dangerous to the community and requiring to be kept in steel or masonry cells.

I believe that a more scientific administration of our judicial and penal systems will result in cutting down our prison population by at least 50 per cent, and at the same time accomplish more than is now accomplished for the community.

Industries for the Prisons.—In committing to jail in default of fine, it is presumed that the fine will be paid off by work. That is the ancient theory. But even in this our present system is a failure.

In Massachusetts, out of the 10,371 jail commitments of men and women last year for non-payment of fines, only 2,260 of these (or less than 22 per cent) succeeded in securing their release by the payment of the fine; and even in these cases the money was not earned by the prisoners. They had no chance to earn it, and were not expected or even allowed to do so. In most cases they paid up only by taking, from wives, children or friends, the money needed to "satisfy justice."

Again, you have the right to demand my proofs as to our prison industries. Here they are:

In Massachusetts we have 21 jails and houses of correction, 13 of which have a limited industrial equipment. But, with a total average population of 3,200 inmates, the aggregate income from the industries represented less than \$11 per capita for a year's residence, and less than \$2 for each individual committed. The earnings of all the industries of all our jails and houses of correction last year were \$34,370.62; but the maintenance costs of these institutions for the year was \$737,608. The industries earned, in fact, only one-sixth of the cost of the food used in the institutions. They earned only about the same amount that was spent on the prisoners' clothing.

Our existing jail practice not only fails to collect the amount of the debtor's fine, but actually increases the prisoner's cost to the taxpayer for every day he is detained.

In our state prison and the two state reformatories we get somewhat better industrial results. Even here, with an average aggregate population of 1,692 prisoners, the average income from the industries was only about \$24 per capita per year, or less than 50 cents per capita for a week's residence. The cost of maintaining the state prison for the year was \$178,704, of which the industries earned a little over 11 per cent.

I mention these pitifully poor showings of our prison industries to indicate the wonderful opportunity we have for intelligent improvement in this important part of the penal system. It should also be said that our experience with all sorts of prisoners has proved, first of all, that merely being locked up behind iron bars is as futile for the cure of crime as it would be for the cure of any physical disease.

But we also know that vigorous and wholesome productive labor is a universal medicine for *moral weakness*, as it is for physical ills. We are even recognizing that many insane persons, if kept cheerfully and actively at work, stand an infinitely better chance of recovery than if kept in idleness. Productive employment for the inmates of all penal institutions must be provided if we are to solve the business problems of our prisons, and are also to make imprisonment realize its highest purpose—the reformation of the prisoner.

The Markets and the Prisons.—In building up our prison industries we shall face the necessity of finding markets for their products. In discussing any reasonable system of prison industries it is obvious that we shall not have to take into consideration the present unduly populous condition of our prisons.

With the reduction of our prison population which will result from a more scientific penal system we shall have no difficulty in securing a market for the products of the prison industries without placing these products upon the open market. They will be sold at their full values for use in the various public institutions. By this means the prison industries, if diversified and organized along modern business lines, can be maintained at a normal rate of activity, each man's full working capacity can be utilized, and men whose criminality has been due to industrial incapacity may be fitted for self-support.

The Prisoners and their Families—Social Service.—We need business-like penal institutions for the direct good they will do the prisoners, and we need them no less in order to protect the families from destitution and pauperism.

Remember that in our Massachusetts state prison and reformatories, with an average population of nearly 1,700, the industries produce less than 50 cents per capita per week. And then take note that many of these inmates are men and women with families. Last year, for example, there were 9,888 married prisoners in our Massachusetts penal institutions. Many others had parents and other relatives dependent upon them. Many of them, though law-breakers, had at least supported their families and would be glad to continue to do so. Others, who would shirk this duty, should be forced to meet it squarely. But, as it is, even the paltry 50 cents a week does not, as a

THE IDEAL PRISON SYSTEM

rule, go to the dependent wives and children of the prisoners. *In fact, our total jail, reformatory and prison commitments, in this one state, numbering some 27,000 a year, probably involve in financial disaster (often permanent disaster) at least 50,000 persons a year, many of these being innocent children.*

No systematic general study of the normal earning power of arrested persons has been made, but "nine prisoners interviewed at random in the Michigan state prison all admitted that they were married and had been earning at the time of conviction amounts varying from \$1 a day to \$2,000 a year, while in prison the highest sum earned was \$34 per year. All had children under fourteen years of age. In seven cases the wives were endeavoring to provide for their children, their earnings never exceeding \$8 per week, and in three cases amounting to only \$2. One wife was a cripple, and in another case it was stated that the family was dependent on help provided by the Poor Commission."¹

I have said in opening this paper that I consider our prison system as the weakest spot in our form of government. It is the worst possible sort of political economy, and the worst possible sort of moral economy, to seek the reformation of any law-breaker by throwing his family into the poorhouse, or making it dependent upon public or private charity. We now have a law in Massachusetts that in cases of non-support the judge may order the payment of 50 cents a day to the prisoner's destitute family. But these cases form less than 2 per cent of all commitments. Other dependent families get nothing.

The main hope for the reformation of the offender must be found in his relations to those he loves. It cannot be found in punishment. When we beggar a prisoner's family, destroying the self-respect of his wife and children, we not only make them charges upon the public, but are in great danger of turning the man himself into an anarchist, a hater of God and of human society.

Notwithstanding these facts, short-term convicts in 12 states are still subject to the notorious prison-contract system, under which their forced labor is leased for a few cents a day to some private concern. Neither they nor their families receive even this beggarly pittance, and the products which their labor renders cheap are used in the open market to cut down the established price levels in our industrial world.

It is also a shock to learn that in 31 states the houses of correction are still under the direct political control of county officials, as they are today in Massachusetts. Crime is against the state, which should control all institutions for its treatment.

¹From paper by Miss H. V. Boswell, in "Annals of American Academy of Political and Social Science," March, 1913.

As a characteristic example of the way American prison industries employing family men are being misdirected, I refer to the report which the National Committee on Prison Labor made in 1911 upon the house of correction at Jessup, Maryland. The committee found at this institution that 190 prisoners were producing 200 dozen shirts a day for one contractor, who paid 35 cents per day per man for the labor. And the men did not get even this small pittance. It was paid to the state. Men with families were making a little cash for themselves, amounting in some instances to \$2 or \$3 a month, by working overtime. But overtime work in a prison sweat shop is a deadly way of earning money, as any one who is familiar with the conditions of these shops can testify.

I regret to add that in Massachusetts we are still furnishing several lines of prison products to the public markets under conditions which give no return whatever to the prisoner or his destitute family and no return worth mentioning to the state.

Here and there over the United States the principle of social service is becoming recognized, and financial help is being set aside to prevent pauperizing the otherwise helpless families of the incarcerated law-breakers. But social service must go further than this; and its agents must act as the mutual friends and helpers of the prisoner inside the prison walls and his family outside. His family must be held together, encouraged and advised; shown how to keep the home together, and how to provide conditions toward which the prisoner himself can look hopefully forward. In all this work we must remember that the first principle of the penal code is not to punish but to reform. So an important element of the social service must be the direct assistance of the discharged prisoner.

We are now sending this man out on the streets with a decent outfit of clothing and possibly a dollar or two in his pocket, but without friends, with very little hope of employment, and with the face of the community set hard against him. He may have worked ten years in the prison shops and some one has profited by his labor, but neither he nor the state has profited. He has been producing merchandise, but the fruits of his labor have not represented more than one-fifth or even one-tenth of the cost of maintaining him in prison.

Last year Massachusetts helped, from the state treasury, 2,937 long-term prisoners discharged from its institutions, including men and women, and it devoted to this purpose only \$12,098—an average of approximately \$4 per capita, and these sums included clothing, transportation and medicines, besides office expenses. In the county jails and houses of correction, which have an aggregate population throughout

THE IDEAL PRISON SYSTEM

the year of 3,200 persons, only \$3,211 was given for the help of discharged prisoners.

In sharp distinction from our experiences in Massachusetts, I quote from the testimony of Sheriff Frank H. Tracy, of Washington County, Vt. This progressive and humanitarian officer began to employ his men under a prison labor law of 1906, which provided that the prisoners should be worked under guard. Results were very poor. The men did as little work as possible and with little care as to quality. Finally, Sheriff Tracy commenced on a plan of his own, of giving the men themselves a part of their earnings. He promised them all they earned above \$1 a day, and under this system the results have been remarkable. Mr. Tracy says, "We have had many a man support his family from his earnings while serving time." The men are said to work cheerfully, to save their wages, and to be contented with the terms of their employment.

I know, from personal testimony, that this official has won the respect of his men, made friends with them, and reformed a large proportion of them through cheerful work and through fostering a spirit of manhood.

Social Service and the Drunkard.—Any rational attempt to conserve the economic status of the prisoner, or to provide for their destitute families, must take cognizance first of all of the inebriate class.

Last year two-thirds of all our commitments to jails, houses of correction and state penal institutions *were for drunkenness* and for default of fines imposed for drunkenness. These numbered 18,564. While we all recognize the necessity of still further protecting the community from the inebriate, we must first admit that merely sending a man to jail does not cure his drinking. This fact stands out first among all the data of scientific penology. Let us prove it.

Of these 18,000 commitments there were 3,665 in which the offender had been previously committed from 6 to 15 times; there were 1,100 cases in which the prisoner had been previously committed from 16 to 30 times; there were 44 cases in which the prisoner had been re-committed more than 50 times. In all, 66 per cent of the cases were of persons previously committed. *There were only 6,000 first commitments.*

No argument is needed to prove the folly of a system of treating drunkenness out of which a very large per cent of the cases treated come back from 5 to 50 times each. Nor is this the whole story as to inebriety. While only two-thirds of the commitments were directly for drunkenness, nevertheless, out of our entire number of commitments, in 95 per cent of the cases the prisoner is reported to be of intemperate

habits. Last year the number of prisoners marked down as being intemperate was 26,369. We must change radically the system of treating drunkenness.

We have solved the problem, in a measure, by extending probation to occasional offenders and imposing fines upon those who need a slight reminder of the danger of continuing their habits; but at this point our penal system breaks down, and we simply throw the habitual drunkard onto the scrap heap for a few days or weeks and then allow him to crawl away again to repeat the performance indefinitely. With each successive commitment, the man's standing in the community is still further lowered. His self-respect and will power are both undermined in proportion as he receives merely punitive and not curative treatment for his trouble.

I believe that it is necessary for us to take practically the entire field of drunkenness out of the prison system, exactly as we have already separated from the prison administration the care of all the insane and some of the feeble-minded. We are looking into this problem in Massachusetts under an expert commission, especially created by the last legislature and appointed by the governor, to report its recommendations to the next General Court.

I am therefore reluctant to speak in detail of the plans suggested. Let it suffice to say that we expect to catch practically every habitual drunkard early in his career of drunkenness; and, instead of locking him up for ten days in jail, to put him into a farm or hospital colony where he will be kept at work under hygienic and cheerful conditions, until there is reason to think that he is fit to be returned to the community.

The young drunkard in Massachusetts will learn from this system, when it is established, that for his third or fourth public offense the law may take him into permanent custody, exactly as if he were an insane person. For, like the insane, he has obviously lost his will power and is unfit for liberty. In the custody of the state he will first be set to work and compelled to work for his own physical regeneration as well as the practical support of his family, if he has one. If possible, he will be employed in some farm or agricultural colony where he will be expected to work his way as soon as he is in fit physical condition. When he is finally discharged with satisfactory bodily health, and presumably with will power restored, he must learn that if he still persists in becoming intoxicated he will be sent, at the discretion of a duly qualified board of examiners, to a colony where his detention by the state may become permanent unless he can give better evidence of his fitness to be at liberty.

THE IDEAL PRISON SYSTEM

You may say that this contemplated system in Massachusetts, which we have already initiated to a certain extent through our new hospitals for dipsomaniacs, will cost too much. If so, I must disagree with you. Remember that the greater part of our entire judicial and criminal system is maintained, at enormous public expense, because of inebriety. Remember, also, that these recurrent cases of drunkenness are more expensive to handle than that relatively insignificant part of our criminal population that is locked up for sentences of a year or more; for in each arrest for drunkenness the machinery of the courts and the jails must be set in motion just as if the case involved a graver offense and a longer sentence.

Take the 12,000 commitments for drunkenness in Massachusetts last year which represented from 1 to 50 previous commitments each, and you can realize something of the direct expense involved in the present method. Then remember, also, that these men and women were detained without any effective medical supervision, without efficient employment and with practically no expectation of reformation either on the part of the state or the prisoner himself. Remember that in most of these cases the men had at least been earning something, and that with their detention in prison their earning power absolutely ceased. Remember that at least one-half of them are men with families and that these families, becoming known for the repeated arrests of the husband and father, sink to one or another of the lowest social strata of modern life.

Figure, if you can, the enormous loss to the community represented by this vast amount of degradation, deprivation of earning power and destitution. Then you will see the urgent need of some system which will not only be more effective in its working out, but more justifiable on economic grounds as well.

Classification.—I have spoken of these tens of thousands of men and women committed to our penal institutions as the scrap heap of humanity. Now in reclaiming any scrap heap, whether of the machine shop or of human society, the first essential is to *sort it out*, and do the best you can with each assortment at its own value. But our human scrap heap—the most costly and complicated scrap heap in the world—*has never yet been adequately sorted.*

Our local jails, which house two-thirds of our average penal population, and to which some nine-tenths of all actual commitments are made, have practically no classification whatever. Our state institutions, which take care of the rest of the penal population, have extremely little classification. The difficulty is that a very large percentage of our so-called criminal class is not really criminal at all, but merely defective.

We know that the intermarriage of diseased families results in offspring who do not have the right moral temper to withstand temptations of various kinds, and these so-called defectives fall a victim to laws which they do not know enough, and have not strength enough to obey. Our first duty is to get all of these defectives out of our penal institutions, and to put those unfit for liberty into schools, colonies and institutions suited to their needs. Even these defectives can be usefully employed if given work fitted to their limitations. But their presence in the prison shops cuts down the general efficiency of the shop and debauches the moral tone of the working force.

Again, you must remember that those 10,000 jail commitments of last year, in default of fines, resulted in throwing thousands of young men and women, of legal age or over, into close contact with the most degenerate and depraved jail characters.

In order to get an effective classification we must have prison buildings and prison colonies in the country adapted for the productive employment of every inmate. We must have reformatories with a similar industrial equipment. We must have industrial schools more adequately equipped to train and employ the unruly boys and girls who come under the ban of the law; colonies with educational equipment for the mentally defective; hospital schools for the delinquent children who are not able-bodied enough for the industrial schools; and, finally, homes for the feeble-minded who have grown old beyond any possibility of productive employment.

The Indeterminate Sentence.—But no matter what improvements are made in prisons and reformatories, they can never accomplish the results desired until the definite sentence is supplanted by one which deals scientifically with the discharge of prisoners.

Ordering the commitment of a man to prison is a judicial function. But no judge can determine, in advance, when a prisoner is fit to return to the community. Probably we are not ready to give to any board the authority to hold a human being permanently in prison, though we do not hesitate to give absolute power to keep persons in insane hospitals until they are believed to be recovered.

As a concession to popular distrust of officials, we may authorize the courts to limit the maximum term for which a criminal may be held. But no court should be allowed to say, in advance, when a prisoner shall be discharged. That is an administrative function. He should remain until it is believed that he has ceased to be a criminal. The determination of this question should be left to a board constituted for that purpose, composed of men appointed solely on the ground of special fitness. Political considerations should be absolutely excluded in their se-

THE IDEAL PRISON SYSTEM

lection. Their qualifications should be equal to those of the judges, though different. Their compensation should be sufficient to command the service of high grade men. The judges who send men to prison are paid for their work. No one would be satisfied with volunteers. It is as unreasonable to expect unpaid men to perform the equally important duty of releasing men from prison.

Mere passive obedience to ordinary prison rules cannot be accepted as proof that a prisoner is fit for liberty. There should be a system of marking covering every detail of his life, requiring his actual co-operation with the administration, and constantly testing his character. He should be released gradually, from grade to grade, with increasing liberty until at last he is allowed to go at large. Even then he should not be free. He should understand that his sentence is still in force. He should be under constant helpful supervision, and subject to recall for any shortcoming or misdemeanor.

Conclusion.—This brief outline of work toward the goal of a better prison system has all been demonstrated in part in different sections of the country. It only remains to combine the separately valuable elements into a coherent system. This result is demanded not only from economic considerations, but as a moral duty which the public owes to itself.

The waste of lives resulting from the present system is appalling. Each year an army of at least 300,000 men and women is marched into the prisons of the United States for the single reason that they could not pay fines imposed by the lower courts for some minor infringement of the law.

At least 300,000 human beings each year (and probably the total is nearer half a million), with all their family connections and dependents, are thus needlessly infected with the moral poison of prison life and their opportunities of honest industrial employment and self-respecting independence needlessly diminished.

At least an equal number of human beings are sent to prison each year in the theoretical expectation that their prison punishment will reform them, but with the inevitable result that they sink down to a lower moral stratum and come out worse off than they went in.

As an employer of labor, I know something of the value of self-respecting human beings to themselves and to the community. But no man can fix a limit to this value. We cannot afford on either economic or moral grounds to waste and debauch needlessly any of the potential values of human beings to their families, to their community and to their country.

Even the "jail-bird" is worth something to himself and his friends, and even he is worth helping, training, educating and reforming. It will cost something to establish these better methods of treatment, but

EUGENE N. FOSS

it will not cost one-tenth of what the present human wastage amounts to.

For example, in Massachusetts last year we spent nearly \$7,000,000 for our police system, our courts and our prisons, but we spent less than \$25,000 for restoration. That is to say, for every \$28 that we spent in pursuing and punishing a violator of the law, we spend \$1 in helping him to re-enter the community as a self-supporting and self-respecting citizen.

I maintain that a large part of this \$7,000,000 expended in one state alone is not only thrown away, but worse than that. It is used to establish criminal records for thousands upon thousands of persons who could be both punished and helped more effectively by a proper development of our parole and probation systems.

Throughout the United States last year 400,000 sentenced prisoners were discharged from penal institutions. The greater number of these had been simply thrown upon the prison scrap heap for a certain period, allowed to deteriorate in the terribly unfavorable conditions of these institutions, and then thrown back again upon the community in a helpless or semi-helpless condition.

Our civilization has learned how to apply to human problems the science of prophylaxis, hygiene, medicine and surgery, and in the criminal world there are sciences, tested here and there throughout the country, which, if co-ordinated and universally applied, will lessen the evils of crime and its resultant poverty, just as surely as the science of sanitation eliminates an infectious disease.

The suggestions that I have made in this address are all based on practical experience reported from different quarters of the country, but it is impossible to put them into practice unless we can take the entire penal system of the country out of politics and put it on a sound, non-partisan, business basis.

For our schools we hunt all over the world for professional skill and training to administer these institutions. We spare absolutely no expense to make our public schools the bulwark of democracy. Gradually we are solving that problem and fitting our schools to fulfill their duty to society.

But our judicial and criminal fields are still under the thrall of politics. In many sections of the country judges are elected on political grounds, and criminal administrators appointed in return for political services.

We must establish the entire field of penal administration on a humanitarian basis and entrust it to highly qualified managers, especially fitted by training and temperament to this exacting field. We must pay them in the same spirit that we pay the managers of our great industries, and hold them to the same sort of accounting for the efficiency and the moral and economic success of their stewardship.