

But if the system is incomplete, it can and should be perfected as speedily as possible; the welfare and good name of the institution demand it. If co-operation is lacking, there is a remedy, assuming that the warden controls prison affairs and his hands are not shackled by political interference. In him alone should be vested the right, the power, and the privilege to weed out the drones, to perfect his organization, to systematize the various departments of his institution, and to place in them loyal, industrious and fearless men, who will stand with him shoulder to shoulder in his battle for co-operation and system, ready, men who know their duty and dare to do it, who stand ever tall, men who know their duty and dare to do it, who stand ever ready to answer the roll call in fair weather or in storm.

With such an army at his command the warden can not lose, the fight is won, the realization of his hopes and ambitions near at hand, the model prison a reality and prison management a success.

Mr. Morgan then announced the next paper, which, in the absence of its author, was read by Amos W. Butler, of Indianapolis.

THE INDIANA PLAN.

H. C. SHARP, M. D., EX-SUBGON INDIANA REFORMATORY,
INDIANAPOLIS.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen—There is but little more for me to say than what I have said heretofore upon what has become known as the Indiana Idea.

As most of you know, by the Indiana Idea is meant that we are establishing a method through a surgical procedure, by which we prevent persons of mental defect and transmissible physical disease from procreating, without in any way endangering life, mutilating or incapacitating them in their enjoyment of life, health and pursuit of happiness otherwise.

This is done upon the male by what is known as severing of the *vas deferens*. This operation requires but a short space of

time, with very little pain, not sufficient to require an anesthetic, either local or general, and does not endanger, in any way, the life of the patient, nor prevent him from engaging in his daily work, for a longer period of time than it requires to do the operation.

In the female the operation is slightly more serious, as you have to reach the ovivivum through an abdominal wound, this requiring a general anesthetic, with from a week or ten days in a ward of the hospital. The operation is no more dangerous to life than is the one performed upon the male, if the performance is in the hands of a skillful operator.

In the case of the male, the end of the *vas* nearest to the testicle is left patent in order that the normal secretion of that gland may be poured out around the blood vessels and lymphatics of the spermatic cord. When it is reabsorbed (just as any fluid injected hypodermatically is absorbed) and appropriated by the system, it acts as a wonderful nerve and muscular tonic, and it has been conclusively proven that this secretion, when thus reabsorbed, has a remarkable influence upon the nervous system, mental and physical vigor. The activity of the spinal centers are greatly improved, not only in the case of general prostration and neurasthenia, but also in the case of the aged.

Brown-Sequard demonstrated this fact a number of years ago in the hypodermatic injection of the above referred to secretion from a goat and a sheep. The case was so impressive in a wonderful dynamogenic effect that he heralded to the world that he had discovered the Elixir of Life.

Poehl asserts that he has observed very beneficial effects upon the metabolism of the body by the injection of this secretion, and he claims that it exercises extraordinary action as a physiological tonic.

Zoth and Pregal claim that they have obtained very objective proof of the stimulating action of the sexual secretion upon the neuromuscular apparatus in man. They find that the injection of this substance causes not only a demulcent in the muscular and nerve fatigue resulting from overwork, but also lessens the subjective fatigue sensation.

What has been said of this secretion applies equally to the secretion in the ovary in the female, and it undoubtedly plays a very important part in the general nutrition. In addition here to in gynecological practice, it has been observed that when there is a premature menopause accompanied by distressing symptoms, mental and physical, such symptoms have been materially alleviated by a hypodermic injection of the ovarian secretion.

One argument that was presented against each of these operations was that if they were performed upon persons before reaching the age of puberty, that it would arrest sexual development. The fallacy of this I have demonstrated to my own satisfaction, both upon the human being and the bovine.

I selected a four-week old male calf, did a double vasectomy and observed development. There was no impairment of the development of the genitalia. He assumed the normal characteristics such as the thick neck, curly face and deep basso voice and from all outward appearances was a normal specimen of his sex. Likewise, I took a female of the same species and after I severed the oviduct, I observed that she developed sexually to the point of pubescence as any other of her variety do. She menstruated regularly and had all the outward appearance of a normal female which had not borne offspring.

I have also severed the oviduct in an epileptic female child of 11 years of age. At 14 she menstruated and has continued to menstruate every 28 days and has full chest development, is feminine in her ways and has no outward appearance of being unsexed.

It has been my misfortune that I have not had an opportunity to operate upon a male child prior to the age of puberty, but there is no doubt in my mind but that he would go through to complete sexual development.

I present these facts to you solely for the purpose of reproducing the prevalent idea that this operation is a mutilation or a punishment to the individual.

We have received no antagonism from the medical profession, or from the sociologist, and are encouraged by the ministry

itself, but have been confronted with a protest from the great and mighty legal profession, whose business it is to try to find in any law that is written any conflict with some instrument which has been previously written and then rise up with great pomp and say, "Why, it is unconstitutional." Not being one so profoundly learned, I am not prepared to state whether the law of Indiana as written is one that is not constitutional. That which I wish to bring before the people is that it was enacted for the sole purpose of benefiting mankind, not alone the present, but infinitely more the future generation. Through this method, we not only relieve society of the burden of caring for the great army of public dependents, but we will equally relieve the great mass of weaklings from striving to care for their issue, who, in fact, are not competent to care for themselves. So, in reality, it is a beneficence and not a punishment, and if our great and learned legal brothers would take a broader view of benefiting humanity, instead of using a microscope to ferret out some technical contradiction between law and constitutionality, they would be by far a greater benefit to our race. I would, then, like to urge upon you that it is not to detract from the Indiana law but to add to and extend its scope.

We have, for many years, realized the wisdom of restricting marriage in the unfit, but how much better it would be if we would add to our restriction that no one of this class should marry without first submitting to this operation. If this were the case, it would be possible for many of these people that are now deprived of the happiness of domestic life, to enjoy the same without jeopardizing the public from the additional issue from such relation. I believe that it would very materially lessen the number of illegitimate children as well as decrease the population of our county poor asylums, almshouses and old ladies' homes.

It is a well-known fact among the medical profession that many women have incompetent surgeons to perform the very grave operation of ovariectomy for the purpose of preventing them from bearing children, thus you may readily see how popular an operation so simple as the one described above may be.

come with people who wish to avoid the responsibility of caring for their offspring.

I, therefore, seriously advocate a restrictive method, making it a criminal offense for any one to submit to or to perform this operation unless it be legally authorized.

I humbly submit these few ideas for your serious consideration, hoping that you will fully realize the importance of the same and joining hands in the immediate work of the restricting procreation in the unfit.

DISCUSSION.

F. H. Mills, New York: Before the discussion of this paper takes place I rise to protest and move against its acceptance. I think it highly improper that such a paper should be read before an audience of this kind. I do not think we have any right to discuss it, and it is not a question concerning which we have any right to speak. It is getting into the province of some other association altogether.

Dr. J. T. Gilmore: Concerning this paper I wish to say that we may just as well recognize the fact that unless we want to fill this continent with epileptic hospitals and homes for feeble-minded we must face that issue. We are not here to indulge in sentimentality. It is a delicate subject. The most delicate things in the world are the most vital to us, and this is one. Are you aware that today in England one in every one hundred and ninety-two of the population is a charge upon the public, just through inattention to this great issue? If you will go over the length and breadth of this continent, into our agricultural institutions, among the best farmers, what is one of their very great cares? The breeding of their stock. It is humanity that should receive such attention. Then let us face it.

F. H. Mills, New York: I object to any discussion of this paper and for these reasons. In the first place this association never intended to assume the functions of the Almighty God. You haven't any right to cut a man's arm off and you haven't

any right to interfere with his physical makeup. That is not in your province. If the physicians care to do it, let them do it in their own assembly. The laws of this country will not allow you to take a man's liberty or cut him up physically, and as far as sentiment is concerned, if you haven't any sentiment you haven't any soul, and if you haven't any soul you can not accomplish anything in good works.

Mrs. Deborah C. Leeds, Member Prison Association, West Chester, Pa.: I want to say to you that the time has come when this subject must be brought before the people. It is hard for me to stand here and feel that there is such a strong opposition, but I knew that all good things have to bear with opposition, and for the sake of the epileptics and other unfortunates the time has come when, as the Bible says, "We must have cuncths for the kingdom of heaven's sake," therefore I insist that this subject shall be handled as it should be, for the help of our nation.

Albert Garvin, Wethersfield, Conn.: I indorse the paper and make this statement: The procreation law was passed without a dissenting vote in Connecticut.

Mrs. C. B. Hoffman, Enterprise, Kansas: Until we take up the source of life and contend for the purity of our children as we contend for that of the animals we raise, our civilization is more or less doomed. The blessed law of evolution will ever rise on and on, but slowly. I am not a warden, I have no official position, and I do not know why our Governor sent me here except that he knew I would make a little noise. I move you that we take up this paper and discuss it as humanitarians, as mothers and fathers, brothers and sisters, in a sensible and sane way, and I am here to say that not one woman in this audience, who has come perhaps hundreds of miles, as I have, to learn before this learned body, will blush at anything that may be said.

F. O. Hellstrom, Warden State Penitentiary, Grove, N. D.: I believe that the gentlemen who made the motion to suppress this paper was acting along proper lines. What is the object of

bringing this paper before this association? Is it with the idea of showing a connection between the methods pursued in prison management and the suppression of crime? I want to say to you who advocate the adoption of the principle back of that paper that you have not studied the real cause of crime, and you do not know where the real fountainhead of crime is. In 99 cases out of 100 the man who has committed an overt act and become a criminal has become a criminal largely from force of circumstances and through environment. If you want to suppress crime you should educate, and not only educate, but see that justice is done man to man. It is absurd to think of putting into effect any such law or doctrine, and I should like to ask you who are advocates of this doctrine, will you submit yourselves to the operation? Are you prepared that your offspring shall be treated in like manner? Who, may I ask, shall presume to say that they are the judges of humanity, that they are the judges of posterity? Who may you be, ladies and gentlemen, that set yourselves up to be greater in your judgment than the Almighty powers that brought us all into existence? When you say that I, or you, or this man or that man shall be deprived of the right of offspring I say you are flying in the face of the Almighty. I want to say that there are many and many ways of preventing crime that will prevent more crime than this one law will prevent. Our social organizations, our churches, our schools and our whole social existence will stand a whole lot of reforming, but is it necessary to perform operations on men and women to prevent posterity from coming into existence? What is the French government doing today? They are paying a bounty for children. Why do you want to come here with a doctrine that will deprive the people of this nation of propagating their own? I say the doctrine is damnable. It is dangerous. It is inhuman and it is unconstitutional.

W. A. Gates, Secretary California State Board of Charities and Corrections, San Francisco: The argument has been advanced that there is no divine authority for doing anything of this kind. I know of no divine authority for depriving a man of his liberty and putting him in prison, and yet we are here rep-

resenting that idea, and I think we will find as much authority for adopting the Indiana plan as of depriving a man of his liberty. The majority of crime originates from some other source, but there is a certain amount of crime that originates from this source, and this law is to meet this particular element of crime; but I rise more particularly to say that California has passed a law similar to the Indiana law, and I am glad of it, and I hope to see the law enforced.

U. E. Harmon, Chehalis, Washington: I suppose there are some attorneys in this audience. We have had a little bit of constitutional law given to us this morning. I want to tell you there will be a constitutional way found for society to protect itself, I do not care what the exigencies will be. You have found a constitutional way to punish a man who takes another man's life. There is no constitutional barrier in the way of hanging a man when he has taken the life of a fellow being. If you can take a man's life can you not protect society against the things that he may do in the future? There will be a constitutional way found to reach this question, and you cannot suppress the things that ought to be discussed by voting that they shall be suppressed. If they are questions that are vital to the welfare of society, it is your business to discuss them. It is your business as men and women to come here and meet them as men and women ought to meet them, and face the responsibilities of life that are before you. I feel deeply on this subject, because for a short time I was prosecuting attorney of the county of Lewis, which I represent here. You may know something of the Tom Brown case that went to the United States Supreme Court. That young man was tried for the murder of his father in Lewis county. He was found not guilty by a verdict of the jury because of his mental irresponsibility. There was no law upon the statute books at that time by which he could be sent to the penitentiary and confined in a ward for the insane. He was kept in the Lewis county jail during pendency of his appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States. In the meantime this young man, through a decision of the judge, secured his liberty. Out in the woods a ronder was a girl, also of feeble-mind. Today there is a child

been and has been given to us to support and the mother and the child are both dependent upon us and the public. Tom Brown is back in the jail being held, but a habeas corpus pending for his release. If that carries, as it seems now it will carry, that man is back again upon our society. That girl over there is back upon our hands, and the public will have to take care of the child as long as the child lives. Is this not a question for us to discuss? Is it not a question that we should meet and should it not be met with the highest intelligence that American citizenship affords? And now is the time. How can we know these facts unless the men who know the results bring them to our attention for our consideration?

W. H. Fiehhorn, Member Indiana Board of State Charities, Bluffton: The opposition that has come from the lawyers, as spoken of, is that which comes in the handling of cases they are called to defend. I do not speak of this in reproach upon my profession. A lawyer who is employed in a case has a right to accomplish results by such methods as he may wish to use, because he is going to be antagonized by somebody else on the other side who will be just as zealous. There seems to be some little misapprehension about the scope of the law. The law is not meant to apply generally and to affect every person who is convicted of a criminal offense. It is intended to apply only to that class of criminals who may be rightly known as confirmed, habitual criminals. Make your laws, if you please, so it will not apply to an individual until it is shown there are three or four or five generations of criminals behind him, or make it apply to the defective, for whom there can be no recovery whatever. In our vegetable life we cut out the weeds, the things that interfere with the wholesome growth of that which is helpful to mankind. Why should society not protect itself by preventing, not the associating together, but preventing the perpetuation of the strains of criminal blood and strains of different kinds which result in a charge upon society. The gentleman who preceded me I think failed to mention one of the most serious things in the situation he described. That is: that not only there is a charge upon society, but that there is a child which will in turn

have the same feeble-mindedness of its progenitor, and so far as that is permitted to go on, as is desired by some, we will have that perpetuity of strain of blood which causes the difficulty with which we are contending.

John M. Semple, M. D., Superintendent Eastern Washington State Insane Hospital, Medical Lake: I feel that much good has been had from this discussion. The one thing that impressed me particularly was the fact that while it is a good thing to emascuate those who are likely to reproduce their kind when that is evil, there is a tendency to go too far. It has been suggested that those who are idiots in the schools for feeble-minded should be emasculated. To me that is unchristian. They are no danger. The ones to emascuate are those who are at liberty and have an opportunity to reproduce their kind. The chronic insane, with which class I have to deal, should be cared for just as we are beginning to care for the imbecile and the confirmed criminal, confined in places of safety. But it is those going out, the semi-insane, those partial criminals who have a bad family history back of them that we have to fear. These are the ones that must be looked after. I agree with the remarks made that the larger proportion of criminals result from environment, at the same time we cannot get away from the fact that heredity is a powerful factor. I might illustrate a case we have in our care at the present time. Some years ago I was visited by an old gentleman who sought the release of his daughter from the asylum. I found that the man was a senile dement at that time. I refused to turn the girl over to his care. He took the matter to the court, and the judge ordered her discharge because this old gentleman paid a \$2,000 bond. The history of that girl was this: She was an imbecile. She was profane and vulgar, one of the lowest types. She had had four illegitimate children, all of whom she had murdered, yet the court took her out without asking me one question.

Do not go so far as to attack the institutions for those poor feeble-minded and weak people who have a right to live and be cared for.

vocated in no other manner, it should apply first, last and always to the depraved defiler of little children.

I hold that it is unjust, dishonorable and a blot on our boasted twentieth century civilization and progress that the perpetrators of such crimes against children should ever be allowed to go free and repeat such crimes at the first favorable opportunity. Life incarceration at hard labor should be the universal penalty, and if the State does not desire to maintain them and incur this expense, then if not legally, make it physically impossible for a repetition of this unspeakable condition. Our sympathy and plea for justice should not be for the criminal in crimes of this character, but for the helpless, unfortunate children of the degenerate and criminally depraved who are brought into the world handicapped at their birth, cursed before they see the light of day, stunted mentally, morally and physically. They are the ones that are punished—they are the ones that pay the price, yea, even unto the third and fourth generation.

Mr. Morgan: I see in the audience several gentlemen who are working prisoners on the outside, and in the absence of those who were to have presented the subject I will ask the views of some of those present on

"AGRICULTURAL WORK FOR CONVICTS."

DISCUSSION.

J. J. Laughinghouse, Superintendent State Prison, Raleigh, N. C.: This is a new work to me, because I have been in the employ of the State in the management of the convict force for only about three months. We are utilizing about 250 convicts out of 700 in our State in the pursuit of agriculture. We have about 3,500 acres of land in cultivation. I find that the health of the prisoners on the farm is better than those in railroad work or any other work that we can give them. It is remunerative. An objection has been raised because it is in competition with other agricultural work, still the State feels it is the best that can be

done. Most of the convict force is among the negro race. We are very much pleased with the result, and it is very satisfactory.

Mr. F. G. Pettigrove, Chairman Massachusetts Prison Commission, Boston, Mass.: I am not a warden, but I have had some experience in planning for the employment of prisoners out of doors on a very small scale, to be sure, so far, but there is in the meeting the superintendent of one of our largest institutions where for more than twenty-five years prisoners have been employed in reclaiming, improving and cultivating a tract of land, and I think it would be interesting to hear from Captain Blackstone, Superintendent of the Massachusetts State Farm. A few years ago I secured from the legislature an appropriation to put into operation an experiment in reclaiming a small tract of land in one of the hill towns of Massachusetts, where there was nothing but trees and stone when we began and where we succeeded, to a certain extent, in getting some crops.

H. M. Blackstone, Superintendent State Farm, State Farm, Mass.: I almost want to suggest that we adjourn this subject to another year. The subject is a very great one, and one that must be developed in the future care of our prison population. We are working nearly 300 men out in the open under an ordinary restraint. When an officer takes twenty or twenty-five sentenced men out into the open fields to work you can figure that the degree of restraint is minimum. He may have a revolver in his hip pocket, but I would guarantee that he could not shoot a barn door 100 feet away if he tried, and I do not recall that it has ever been drawn from his pocket in our fields. I cite that to show you the restraint feature is an easy matter. The great question is the selection of the men. Then comes in the question of man to man work and the warden and his associates reading the men, not trying very many experiments, but being pretty sure of your ground.

W. E. Collett, General Secretary Prison Association, Denver, Colo.: We have in Colorado in the State Prison a population of about 735 to 740. For a year and a half we have had any where