

1916

Jails Lockups and Police Stations

William T. Cross

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

William T. Cross, Jails Lockups and Police Stations, 7 J. Am. Inst. Crim. L. & Criminology 379 (May 1916 to March 1917)

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.

JAILS, LOCKUPS AND POLICE STATIONS.

(REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE AMERICAN PRISON ASSOCIATION.)¹

WILLIAM T. CROSS, Chairman.²

This report relates to the problems of penology represented in the maintenance and administration of local prisons. As a designation of this general subject, the title *jails, lockups and police stations* was adopted at the creation of this committee in 1911. It has been the practice of previous reporters for the committee not to limit the discussion strictly to technical problems of jail administration, and this will not be done in the present paper. The unorganized state of public opinion regarding a complete modern system of treatment of the misdemeanant class calls for a liberal interpretation of the scope of discussion in this section.

The following table is derived from statistics given in *Bulletin 121* of the United States census:

	In Institutions January 1, 1910.		Committed During 1910.	
	Number.	Per Ct.	Number.	Per Ct.
State prisons, penitentiaries and reformatories.	67,871	49.7	27,732	5.6
County jails, workhouses and chain gangs....	35,008	25.7	275,658	55.8
Municipal jails and workhouses.....	8,619	6.3	176,397	35.7
Institutions for juvenile delinquents.....	24,974	18.3	14,147	2.9
Total	136,472	100.0	493,934	100.0

Many more important relationships are shown by these statistics which need not be reviewed. It is of special interest to observe that, of the total population of all penal institutions at a given time, January 1, 1910, 32 per cent were in county and municipal institutions—the class covered by this study. But the “volume of business” of these local institutions is much better shown by the number received during the year than by those found incarcerated on any given date. Thus we find that 91.5 per cent of all prisoners committed during 1910 were sent to these local institutions. While this ratio would be reduced by correction according to the number of “repeaters”, it may fairly be used as an indication of the importance of local prisons. The emphasis does not appear to be misplaced when one considers the number who are committed temporarily to jail and subse-

¹Committee Report presented at the meeting of the American Prison Association at Oakland, Cal., Oct. 15, 1915.

²General Secretary of the National Conference of Charities and Correction, Chicago, Ill.

quently released unconvicted, who are not taken into account by the census. Further, it will be observed that, while less than one-half as many were committed to the state institutions during the year as were present at the beginning of the year, correspondingly more than ten times as many were committed to local institutions. Finally, by way of comparison with the last previous study of the sort, that of July 30, 1904, in the intervening period of a little less than six years, the total number enumerated in local prisons more than doubled, and the total committed during twelve months more than quadrupled. During the ten years 1890-1900 the population of the United States increased 21 per cent. More thorough analysis is needed to comprehend the interesting statistics gathered by the federal census, and especially to guard against hasty misinterpretation of fluctuations; but even brief reference is sufficient to establish the great and growing importance of the problem of treatment of the misdemeanor class.

Statistics such as the federal census has been able to gather, including the general classification of offenses, show fairly well the magnitude of crime, but only in a limited way can they be expected to portray the quality of such problems as those under the consideration of the committee. For the latter purpose a much safer guide is the experience of any State in which the subject has had considerable attention. This is natural, for the treatment of crime is chiefly a state function.

But the essential character of the problem appears only with a knowledge of the individual cases involved. A man, woman or child may, almost accidentally, have committed some contravention of the law, or a prisoner may be a professional criminal apparently incapable of reformation. A prisoner may grade anywhere from zero to "400" in the social scale, though statistics show that, for the most part, those committed for misdemeanors are artisans and day laborers. One may find in the jail prisoners convicted of any of the scores of offenses in the criminal code, and others who may have been committed on only slight suspicion, or who are incarcerated temporarily for non-criminal causes. Court sentences are of wide variety under the varied codes and customs of different States and communities. The prisoner is "doing time" in an institution that may represent the ideals or neglect of any period from colonial days to the present. Usually he is treated without respect to the physical bases of crime, with comparatively little effort on the part of the State to conserve his domestic interests—if he have a home—or to reset him in society after his abnormal experience. So it appears that the essential factors in the establishment of a com-

mon-sense system of reformatory treatment of petty criminals are the actual condition of the individual offender and the effectiveness in each specific case of the process of corrective rehabilitation. Our chief regret in the preparation of this report is that there is not sufficient space for copious illustration with case descriptions, as it is our conviction that all reforms in this field must be based on a more systematic and intelligent effort to understand the peculiar condition and needs of the individual delinquent.

The local jail has long represented the entire process of treatment of the misdemeanant. Incidental to the main thesis of this paper, however, it is intended to demonstrate that (1) the old-fashioned jail is unsuccessful as a means of reformation of the petty criminal, and (2) the making over of this institution is only part of a larger scheme of treatment whereby we may hope to reduce the burden of crime. It would be manifestly illogical at this stage, when the more comprehensive plan has not been brought home with sufficient emphasis to the consciousness of those who are dealing with the problem, to devote our attention exclusively to the administration of jails, narrowly conceived as a problem of prison science. The functions and duties of jailers should, to be sure, be limited sufficiently for purposes of practical administration. The natural limitations of official action in any department of government must not be lost sight of. But if the historic jail is in a state of evolution, we can neither give much encouragement to the well-intentioned jailer who has long wanted to see better results from his efforts, nor hope to halt the process of training criminals for the future, until there is a better understanding of the entire new system toward which we are tending. To devote attention now exclusively to the jail itself would be no less shortsighted than the naive and frantic efforts of the English a century and a half ago to stop the spread of contagion from their overcrowded jails by erecting exhaust fans on the roofs.

To demonstrate and to record the important change that is believed to be taking place in the aspect of the local jail question is the main object of this report. From the literature of the subject, from conversation and correspondence with representative officials concerned with jail administration, and from personal experience and observation, we are convinced that the principles and practical issues involved in handling this subject twenty-five years ago and now are widely different. Under two such different régimes an identical procedure should not be expected. Many authorities dealing with the jail question today are confessedly discouraged. Yet why should they

be if there is a sign of hope on the horizon? It would be a matter of chagrin to us to discover that we are postponing the ideal day by too long consorting with outworn principles, that we are lingering in sight of the "promised land".

The literature of this local jail question holds in store for the student of social reform a disappointing experience. The matter has not been under discussion so long without our learning many facts and principles. Nevertheless, President Byers truly summed up the situation in his address before this Association in 1898 when he said: "If we are to judge from what has been said or written in the past ten or twenty years regarding the county jails of our country, we are today little, if any, in advance of our model of more than a century ago." Mr. Byers came to the conclusion that what progress had been made was along material lines. The late Dr. Fred H. Wines, in his masterful address, at the Boston meeting of the National Conference of Charities and Correction, on "The Abolition of the County Jail", said: "Of all the reforms included under the general title of prison reform in the United States, none is so urgent as the overthrow of our existing system of dealing with misdemeanants. Three-fourths of those in custody are in fact held in institutions, the practical effect of which is to train an unascertained percentage of their inmates for the penitentiary." But, notwithstanding such scathing arraignments, this subject has not had the continuing intelligent attention which it deserves. Perhaps a partial explanation can be found in the fact, for example, that in Dr. Wines' splendid review in 1890 of "Twenty Years' Growth of the American Prison System", the jail question is scarcely more than mentioned. Only recently have authorities in a few States begun to demonstrate that the work of jails is part of a complete system by which the State undertakes to combat crime. A committee on this subject in this Association has been continuous only since 1911, and it is still called "special". The appeal of Dr. Hastings H. Hart at the 1907 meeting may well be recalled: "I candidly believe that we have reached a point in the development of prison reform when the National Prison Association ought to address itself systematically and faithfully, for a series of years, to the reformation of the county jail system."

In contrast with the standstill we have reached with the jail question, recall the progress we have made in the solution of other social problems. The sister institution of the jail, the county almshouse, has been, in many States, fairly well reclaimed from its early deplorable catch-all character. Children have been removed by legal

prohibition, the insane have been taken for specialized care to state institutions, the number of feeble-minded in almshouses, as shown by the last two census reports, was reduced in six years by almost fifty per cent. Within a very few years we have made great headway in the solution of the problem of community recreation. Remarkable improvements have been made in the last two decades in the administration of voluntary charity. Organized effort has, within ten years, been amazingly effective in the reduction of the child labor evil. While in some instances needed reforms have come about too slowly, perhaps no other problem can be named for which methods of partial solution have been so long and so well known, with which we have made so little progress as in the treatment of minor offenders.

It would be an unfair representation of developments in this field to make a clear distinction between ideals of the present and of the past. Nevertheless, a somewhat arbitrary division is necessary in order properly to portray the trend of present-day thought and action. Thus, in a general way it may be said that, for the most part, the following principles and ideals have been developed and emphasized in respect to local jails up to the last five or ten years:

1. *Security.* This was the primary principle in the development of jails in the early days. It explains the massive, mediæval structures everywhere to be seen, so impossible to administer according to modern standards, and so difficult to modify.

2. *Cleanliness.* This has been an important consideration since the days of the jail fever. It is to be secured chiefly through the adoption of sanitary devices and through persevering administration.

3. *Food.* While the opportunity of improvements of the criminal through the adoption of better dietary standards has received scarcely any attention, a comparatively negative aspect of the food question—the method of furnishing meals to prisoners—has made it one of the chief issues in jail reform. A member of this committee writes: "The per diem system of dieting is the curse of the jail". In a few States, after hard struggles, laws have been passed requiring that food be furnished prisoners on the basis of competitive bids.

4. *Moral Supervision.* From the earliest days this has consisted mainly of the conduct of religious exercises by persons who have little contact with or conception of the jail problem, frequently under the eyes of an indulgent but skeptical jailer. An effective scheme of practical moral supervision has yet to be invented.

5. *Classification of Prisoners.* This principle, first emphasized for the sake of the most elementary requirements of decency, has

had great attention in the last twenty years. It is possibly the most fruitful one of the entire list, for logically carried out it will mean the complete individualization of treatment on the basis of the offender's mental make-up and social condition. But classification is shamefully neglected in a great majority of jails. An indication of the possibilities of the principle is to be seen in the effects of establishing the star-class system (for first offenders) in the English local prisons. It is reported that during the first twelve years of its operation only 9.1 per cent males and 14.2 per cent females, first offenders, were re-committed.

6. *Abolition of the Fee System.* It has been known for many years that the political connections of sheriffs are a constant obstacle to reform measures, and that the evil is intensified by the fact that the sheriff's office is generally supported on the basis of fees. The movement, fast gaining strength, for putting the sheriff's office on a salary basis is an important part of the program of jail reform. With this ideal is usually combined that of better selection of and more permanent tenure for jailers.

7. *State Inspection.* The period under review includes the establishment of the principle of inspection of local jails under state authority, with power to enforce the abandonment of jails below a certain standard. New York, Indiana and Alabama afford good examples in this respect. State inspection is general in the United States, though legislatures seem loath to give to administrative authorities summary power of condemnation.

8. *Standardized Jail Rules.* In some States it has been attempted to supersede prisoners' moot-court rules and the personal inclinations of sheriffs in the management of jails with standardized rules promulgated by state authority. The tendency has been to stop short with mere recommendation on the part of state boards, on account of interference with local authority.

9. *Standardized Specifications for Construction and Repairs.* Such standard specifications have been adopted in a few States where supervision is furthest advanced, in connection with the approval of plans made by local authorities.

The foregoing are principles that have been evolved in handling the jail question, rather than *ideals*. Until quite recently we have had no conscious policy in the treatment of the misdemeanant, just as formerly we had no policy in the administration of the catch-all almshouse. The American jail has not been an ideal institution. Scarcely any of those services which the State ought to render in

the effort to turn the novice in crime into paths of righteousness does the old-time jail system perform, and many conditions directly subversive of character it perpetuates. To quote Dr. Wines again: ". . . . the best jail that was ever built, although the physical treatment accorded to its unfortunate inmates may be perfectly humane and just, fails to subserve any of the ends of a prison except that of confinement". But these principles, based on experience, are not negligible. They are all live issues in the modern program of jail improvement, and a recurrence to them is a good antidote for visionary reform.

But a larger conception of the problem of the petty offender is necessary as a basis for comprehensive, flexible and hopeful handling of the local jail question. In the last decade there have come into prominence, under widely varied leadership, a series of measures and principles which are completely changing the nature of this issue. Sufficient experience has been accumulated to warrant positive conclusions. While proposals to supersede or modify established institutions should be critically scrutinized, it behooves us to give all possible credence to efforts that point a way out of the present discouraging situation. These measures are, of course, involved in any statement of the earlier development of ideas concerning the jail. But for the most part they represent ideals of a new period. The newer system includes:

I. Methods involving a change in the plan of incarceration.

(a) *State penal farms.* Perhaps the most revolutionary and practical proposal for the cure of the jail evil is that prisoners sentenced for any but the briefest terms should be sent to state farms. The plan has developed out of successful experiments in outdoor work for convicts, and of the removal of municipal houses of correction to the country, beginning with Cleveland, Kansas City and the District of Columbia. In New York farms are conducted in connection with the jails of three counties, two of the county penitentiaries are likely soon to be moved to the country, and a state farm for male misdemeanants 16 to 21 years of age is in process of establishment. In Indiana 1,605 acres have been purchased near the center of the State for a state institution for misdemeanants, and the construction of buildings begun. Inmates are to be received on sentences of sixty days or more who otherwise would serve their terms in county jails. It is intended later to establish similar institutions in other parts of the State. Indiana had made a beginning on this principle previously in the establishment of a state institution for female misdemeanants. In other

States movements are growing for the establishment of state farms for minor offenders. On special inquiry we find the creation of institutions of this character to be the practically unanimous desire of reformers in this field in the leading States.

(b) *Payments to prisoners in the nature of wages.* This principle has been approved by the International Prison Congress as of interest to the State, the object being the support of the prisoner's dependents and their rehabilitation.³ Payments to convicts are optional with prison authorities in a number of States, and the way seems clear for the adoption of the principles with respect to the misdemeanor class. In the administration of the Kansas City Municipal Farm up to \$1.00 a day may be allowed the family of any prisoner, dependent upon their needs as revealed by direct investigation.⁴

(c) *Revision of sentences.* The principle of systematic revision of sentences on the basis of more complete knowledge of the criminal and his action subsequent to conviction has been established through the success of the indeterminate sentence acts. A very considerable proportion of prisoners now in penal institutions are serving indeterminate sentences.⁵ The indeterminate sentence now applies to persons committed to the New York City workhouse, penitentiary and reformatory, and a general extension of this important principle to the misdemeanor class may be expected.

(d) *Habitual offender acts.* A recent study at Springfield, Illinois,⁶ shows that 45 per cent of those convicted in the city courts are repeaters. The desirability of a plan of sentence and treatment which takes into consideration the repetition of offenses is generally conceded. The British Parliament in 1908, after protracted attention had been given the subject, passed the Prevention of Crime Act, under which it is possible to add from five to ten years to the sentences of recidivists, and a special Preventive Detention Camp has been established on the Isle of Wight. In New York State women misdemeanants thirty years of age or more who have been convicted as many as five times in two years may be sent to the State Farm for Women at Valatie, which was opened last year.

(e) *Educational work and mental examination.* The brevity of sentences of misdemeanants and the distracting circumstances under

³V Int. Pris. Congress, Sec. ii, Quest. 4; VIII Congress, Sec. iii, Quest. 3.

⁴*The Payment of Wages to Workhouse Prisoners.* K. L. Schreiber, Nat. Conf. Char. and Cor., Proc. 1915.

⁵U. S. Census Bul. 121, Table 9.

⁶*The Correctional System of Springfield, Illinois.* Zenas L. Potter, p. 47.

which school work would have to be conducted, are obstacles in the way of formal educational work. But such examples as that of the Baltimore City Jail, where a school has been operated successfully for several years can not be ignored in the modern plan of treatment of the petty offender. Both school work and classification within the institution should be based on thorough mental examination of every prisoner. The work of the Juvenile Psychopathic Institute of Chicago and the establishment of the Research Department of the Chicago House of Correction point the way to the establishment generally of such bureaus as part of the public equipment for the treatment of misdemeanants.

II. Methods involving supervision under conditional liberation.

(a) *Adult probation.* Adult probation laws have been adopted in twenty-three States. The experience of these probation authorities has furnished some of our most illuminating information on the character and problems of prisoners in local jails, and their activities have brought about some of our best remedial legislation. In Cook County, Illinois (which includes Chicago), during the first three years' operation of the adult probation law the earnings of probationers amounted to over \$1,000,000.⁷ It has been calculated that adult probation in Massachusetts pays a profit of 94 per cent.⁸

(b) *Parole.* Supervision on the basis of conditional release from penal institutions, a method that has met with undeniable success in case of felons in many States,⁹ has lately begun to be adopted in respect to misdemeanants. In six years nearly 12,000 prisoners have been paroled with good success from the Kansas City workhouse and municipal farm, and this plan has recently been adopted at the St. Louis workhouse. A successful instance appears in Onondaga County, New York.¹⁰ This method, therefore, appears to be an important part of the modern system of treatment of petty criminals.

(c) *Out-work for local prisoners.* It is quite common for local prisoners to be used on road work. The Wisconsin legislature of 1913 passed a law requiring that the sheriff should hire out the prisoners in the county jail and that he should supervise their employment, turning over their earnings, to the extent of \$1.00 a day, to their dependents, in case there are any. Though the law has not met with

⁷Third Ann. Rep. Adult Probation Office of Cook Co., Ill., p. 3.

⁸*The Cost of Crime.* Warren F. Spaulding, Am. Jour. Criminal Law and Criminology, v. 1, p. 94.

⁹See B. W. Brown in Am. Jour. Cr. Law and Cr., v. 6, p. 65.

¹⁰Sixth Ann. Rep. N. Y. State Probation Comm., p. 35.

universal success, it is in operation in twenty-one counties and the results seem to be commendable. One county reports turning over more than \$6,000 to the dependents of prisoners.¹¹ There is an earlier instance of the adoption of this same principle, without special legal authorization, at Montpelier, Vermont.¹²

(d) *Employment of prisoners without guards, an aspect of the so-called honor system.* Although there has not been the opportunity to build upon the trustworthiness of prisoners in case of misdemeanants that there has been in case of felons, occasions for it seem to increase with the employment of prisoners in larger numbers, as on municipal or state farms.

(e) *Restitution.* An outstanding evil of the present system of criminal procedure is the fact that the punishment of the offender does not include reparation to the injured party for the wrong done him. The possibility of reform in this respect seems reasonable.¹³ But the same end is being attained informally through the operation of the adult probation laws. In Massachusetts the collection of restitution money aggregating \$10,000 annually is reported,¹⁴ and in Cook County, Illinois, alone, more than \$8,000.¹⁵

(f) *Change in system for commitment for fines.* One of the most abhorrent features persisting in our system of treatment of petty criminals is that of imprisonment in lieu of payment of fines. In the study at Springfield, Illinois, it was found that 29 per cent. of those fined actually paid the penalty with prison service.¹⁶ Unless graded according to the ability of the offender to pay, fining is a poor means of attaining justice; and in case of certain classes, like prostitutes, it serves merely as a licensing system. The International Prison Congress has advocated that fines be made payable in instalments or on public work.¹⁷ An encouraging sign is the collection of \$28,000 annually on fines through the operation of the adult probation law in Massachusetts.¹⁸

¹¹*The Paroling of Prisoners Sentenced to County Jails.* J. L. Gillin, Mss.

¹²N. Y. Pris. Assn., 1911 Rep., p. 152.

¹³See address by Hon. S. E. Baldwin, Rep. U. S. Comr. Int. Pris. Comm., 1899.

¹⁴Mass. Pris. Assn. pamphlet 44, p. 9.

¹⁵Third Ann. Rep. Adult Probation Office of Cook Co., Ill., p. 3.

¹⁶Potter, *op. cit.*, p. 22; see *The County Prisons of Pennsylvania*, A. H. Votaw, for study of fining in Pa.

¹⁷Int. Pris. Congress, 1905, Sec. vi.

¹⁸Mass. Pris. Assn., pamphlet 44, p. 16.

III. Rehabilitation of the offender.

(a) *Special treatment for special classes.* With such abundant evidence that the jail is in no way a curative of the evils with which it deals we should not continue to use it as a cure-all for a great variety of ills, for which, for the most part, other institutions and modes of treatment have already been established. In most communities it is still common to find the jail the chief means of handling inebriates, vagrants, cases of wife desertion and non-support, prostitutes, and even the feeble-minded.

(b) *Co-operation with community agencies.* It is only an imaginary line that separates the social problems of dependence, defectiveness and delinquency. The agencies which deal with these three evils should, therefore, be closely interwoven in matters of practical administration. Juvenile courts, playgrounds, homes for discharged prisoners, associated charities, societies for the reformation of drunkards, boards of health, and a great number of other agencies are likely to be as definitely focused on the problem of crime as any penal institution the State may establish. It is stimulating to find this testimony on the part of the English Prison Commission:¹⁹ “. . . we have of recent years striven to establish the principle of close co-operation between the prison authority and voluntary workers—lay and religious—in all parts of the country.”

(c) *Case work.* One of the greatest contributions made to the science of social betterment is the method of case work developed in the charity organization societies. Whatever be the nature of the maladjustment through which the offender is finally committed to prison the prime need is for some agency to undertake to see through to the end the process of his rehabilitation. Whether as leader or as co-operator, the penal institution ought definitely to take part in this process.

IV. Improvement in the process preliminary to conviction.

(a) *Psychopathic study.* Recent studies of the feeble-minded delinquent, the establishment of bureaus of psychopathic research in connection with courts and penal institutions, with such results as the production of Dr. William Healy's epoch-making work, *The Individual Delinquent*, may be regarded as heralds of the ultimate establishment of the principle of psychopathic study as a basis of judgment and treatment of criminals.

(b) *Reforms in legal procedure and police administration.* The report of the so-called Merriam Crime Commission in Chicago this

¹⁹Eng. Pris. Comm., *op. cit.*, 1913-14, Pt. I, p. 11.

year depicts in a convincing way the almost hopeless tangle of out-grown legal forms and bad police practices at the basis of the crime that heads up in the local jails. The Springfield Survey revealed the fact that only 34 per cent. of those arrested finally paid penalties.²⁰ The whole program of reform of legal procedure, the reorganization of court systems on the basis of modern principles of administrative efficiency,²¹ as exemplified partially in the Chicago Municipal Court, such sensible arrangement as is common in England for the appearance of a large percentage of petty offenders on summons without the inconvenience and disgrace of incarceration, the matter of police reform which nowadays is so commonly discussed, the maintenance of comprehensive schemes of registration and identification of criminals and other classes, these and similar practical measures are definitely involved in the modern system of treatment of misdemeanants.

V. Supervision.

(a) *State supervision and control.* The principle of state control of the treatment of misdemeanants is clear, for crimes committed against the State. Our acceptance of this principle is demonstrated by the fact that offenders against our federal government have always been United States prisoners. As was impressed on us so forcefully at the Washington meeting of the International Prison Congress, our best prospect lies in the direction of improvement of state supervision and extension of direct State control of local jails. A permanent policy of this kind would facilitate in many ways the adoption and operation of principles enumerated in this report, would establish confidence and respect on the part of the people in the effectiveness of penal administration and increase the respect of would-be criminals for the law, and probably would result in huge financial saving. Since the taking-over of the local prisons by the State in Great Britain in 1878 both crime and criminality have steadily decreased. For example, the ratio of convictions and commitments to all classes of prisons was in 1913, 369.5 per 100,000 population, in 1899-1900, 483.4.²² They have gone on the principle laid down by the Gladstone committee, that the supply of criminals could be cut off only at its source.²³

(b) *Statistics.* The meagerness and useless quality of statis-

²⁰Potter, *op. cit.*, p. 20.

²¹See article by Herbert Harley in Bull. Amer. Judicature Society, No. 4, and address before La. State Bar Assn. 1915.

²²Eng. Pris. Comm., *op. cit.*, 1913-14, Pt. I, p. 6.

²³*Crime and Criminals*, R. F. Quinton, p. 216.

tics of misdemeanants in America is notorious. In contrast, one reviews with admiration the comprehensive and telling figures of the English Prison Commission and of authorities in other countries.

In considering its effects on the local jail problem, the system which has been suggested should be taken as a whole, for there is not time to describe adequately all the ways in which our treatment of the petty offender is being made over. The principle of punishment is not eliminated from the new system, but rather is it made more effective. The tendency is, on the one hand, toward continual supervision of the criminally-inclined under the circumstances of ordinary life, and treatment of certain types by specialized institutions and agencies, and on the other hand, toward a reorganization of the plan of penal treatment for those who must be incarcerated. The local jail is left virtually a place of detention only, and that elusive ideal of our penology, separate confinement for the unconvicted prisoner, is brought a step nearer.

It can scarcely be argued that this outline is over-theoretical, for copious reference has been made to facts and actual practices. But it may be said that the program is too general and differentiated, that only one or two simple reforms should be advocated. It may be answered that the accepted modern programs for the improvement of the work of the church, of the school, and of many other institutions are exceedingly complex, and concerned largely with what goes on outside of the institution itself. The essential evils of the old-time jail have been its crude composite character and its lack of correlation with other agencies of social betterment.

Or, it may be asked, is not the new system more attractive to the petty criminal? To this the reply may be given that effective measures—relentless follow-up work—is the most objectionable to him. The present haphazard arrangement comes much nearer being his ideal. The history of prison reform in England is an illuminating answer to this argument.

More tenable grounds of opposition are set forth in the following quotation:²⁴ "The greatest obstacles in the way of substitution of the new system for the old are public indifference and the enormous investments which have been made in the old style prisons." The cost of one of the leading features of the new scheme, the state farm, may be calculated on the following basis: the District of Columbia farm cost \$19,000 and maintains a prison population of 1,500 per

²⁴Mass. Pris. Assn., pamphlet 44, p. 15.

day—about five-sixths of the local jail population of one of the larger States.²⁵ The initial appropriation for the Indiana State Farm is \$90,000, plus \$200 per annum for each prisoner. The secretary of the Pennsylvania Prison Society calculates that the present net cost of about \$1,000,000 yearly for the maintenance of county jails in that State could be reduced one-half through the establishment of state farms.²⁶ It must be remembered that the old-style jails are rapidly being replaced by new ones, and that consequently the adoption of the state farm system cannot be regarded as a cancellation of the value of all existing jails. As to the cost of other features mentioned, in this report, most of them have already been put in operation, and it may be relied upon that none of them has been adopted without conviction of the soundness of the innovation from the financial standpoint.

The deepest-seated opposition arises from the fact that our fortress-like old jails merely signify a persistence in the minds of the people of ideals of generations long dead. Some of these structures are inscribed with such dates as 1836—the days of Andrew Jackson, of the invention of the steamboat, and of the pioneer struggle. The vicious fee system, and all that goes with it, is based on a structure of popular ideals dating back a generation or more. It is this which our advisers in the construction of this report have in mind when they have emphasized public indifference and the need of wide-spread popular education.

Many questions of policy relating to local jails are yet to be worked out; differences in the requirements of the various types of institutions included in the title of this committee, the establishment of standards of administration for lockups and police stations, perhaps an adjustment of the state farm idea to the requirements of large urban populations, etc.

A striking counterpart for the program advocated in this report is to be found in the history of the so-called socialization of the public schools. Vocational education, organized recreation, the general relating of the school to the life of the community—the philosophy of Dewey and the practical inventions of Wirt—these correspond to the work of probation, psychopathic study, concentration in state institutions, and co-operation with community agencies. Jails have been called “schools of crime”. The new régime in the treatment of the misdemeanant means the socialization of the “school of crime”.

Signed by the full Committee.

²⁵*The Jail*, repr., from Rep. Va. State Board of Char. and Cor., for 1913, p. 6.

²⁶Votaw, *op. cit.*, p. 22.