

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY TUESDAY & SATURDAY MORNING...

THE TERMS Are THREE DOLLARS PER ANNUM, payable half yearly in advance.

No subscription discontinued until arrears are settled, without the approbation of the publisher.

ADVERTISEMENTS not exceeding a square, inserted THREE TIMES FOR ONE DOLLAR, and twenty five cents for each subsequent insertion—larger advertisements in proportion.

From the American Sentinel. The Penitentiary System of the United States appears to occupy an enviable notice and prominent position among the desiderata of the European governments.

There are at present two grand systems of punishment by imprisonment—which is now considered by the best jurists as the most efficacious mode of punishing and preventing crime.

If then our system was enforced in the houses of correction, houses of refuge, and similar institutions, the moral improvement and efficacy would be efficiently promoted; and the superiority of the Pennsylvania discipline be too palpably evident to be denied.

But the system of solitary seclusion day and night, and with labor, as in the principle and practice of the Pennsylvania trial, was not considered so attractive or economical as the system of solitary confinement at night with labor in common by day—which is the basis of the Auburn practice.

The only rational objection now to our system is its expense—the expense of constructing so many separate cells, and the expense of keeping the criminals separate.

In their comparison of the merits of the two systems, the French commissioners do not prefer either;—though they favor the Auburn, from the energy with which it is prosecuted, and the extent to which it is adopted.

Colonel Elam Lynds—who is the grand champion for the Auburn system, and its most strenuous and efficacious friend and improver—prefers his plan to ours because the convict at Auburn considers his labor as a hardship and a task, which is therefore beneficial to him as inuring him to submitting to the necessity of performing a task in obedience to law: whereas (says he) to the convict in solitary confinement, labor is but a solace and relief from ennui: so that the motive ceasing to exist, he will cease from working.

ter, the convict is convinced of the necessity of labor to his existence and health, while no corporal punishment is required or administered in any instance.

ter, the convict is convinced of the necessity of labor to his existence and health, while no corporal punishment is required or administered in any instance.

The habits engendered are alike in consequences: if compulsion is removed, the habit may not cease, but if the habit ceases in any instance, it is more likely to be in that practice resulting from physical force than that from moral conviction of necessity.

But the Pennsylvania plan rests not on speculative advantages, or negative superiority. The non-communication of convicts at any period is a positive advantage of paramount importance.

Not so where there is no intercommunication. No convict knows his fellow. Being alone, the mind of the wicked is compelled to recoil into itself, and self-sectinize; and the heart becomes softened to counsel and reformation.

There are at present two grand systems of punishment by imprisonment—which is now considered by the best jurists as the most efficacious mode of punishing and preventing crime.

If then our system was enforced in the houses of correction, houses of refuge, and similar institutions, the moral improvement and efficacy would be efficiently promoted; and the superiority of the Pennsylvania discipline be too palpably evident to be denied.

But the system of solitary seclusion day and night, and with labor, as in the principle and practice of the Pennsylvania trial, was not considered so attractive or economical as the system of solitary confinement at night with labor in common by day—which is the basis of the Auburn practice.

The only rational objection now to our system is its expense—the expense of constructing so many separate cells, and the expense of keeping the criminals separate.

In their comparison of the merits of the two systems, the French commissioners do not prefer either;—though they favor the Auburn, from the energy with which it is prosecuted, and the extent to which it is adopted.

Colonel Elam Lynds—who is the grand champion for the Auburn system, and its most strenuous and efficacious friend and improver—prefers his plan to ours because the convict at Auburn considers his labor as a hardship and a task, which is therefore beneficial to him as inuring him to submitting to the necessity of performing a task in obedience to law: whereas (says he) to the convict in solitary confinement, labor is but a solace and relief from ennui: so that the motive ceasing to exist, he will cease from working.

ter, the convict is convinced of the necessity of labor to his existence and health, while no corporal punishment is required or administered in any instance.

The habits engendered are alike in consequences: if compulsion is removed, the habit may not cease, but if the habit ceases in any instance, it is more likely to be in that practice resulting from physical force than that from moral conviction of necessity.

But the Pennsylvania plan rests not on speculative advantages, or negative superiority. The non-communication of convicts at any period is a positive advantage of paramount importance.

ter, the convict is convinced of the necessity of labor to his existence and health, while no corporal punishment is required or administered in any instance.

The habits engendered are alike in consequences: if compulsion is removed, the habit may not cease, but if the habit ceases in any instance, it is more likely to be in that practice resulting from physical force than that from moral conviction of necessity.

But the Pennsylvania plan rests not on speculative advantages, or negative superiority. The non-communication of convicts at any period is a positive advantage of paramount importance.

Not so where there is no intercommunication. No convict knows his fellow. Being alone, the mind of the wicked is compelled to recoil into itself, and self-sectinize; and the heart becomes softened to counsel and reformation.

There are at present two grand systems of punishment by imprisonment—which is now considered by the best jurists as the most efficacious mode of punishing and preventing crime.

If then our system was enforced in the houses of correction, houses of refuge, and similar institutions, the moral improvement and efficacy would be efficiently promoted; and the superiority of the Pennsylvania discipline be too palpably evident to be denied.

But the system of solitary seclusion day and night, and with labor, as in the principle and practice of the Pennsylvania trial, was not considered so attractive or economical as the system of solitary confinement at night with labor in common by day—which is the basis of the Auburn practice.

The only rational objection now to our system is its expense—the expense of constructing so many separate cells, and the expense of keeping the criminals separate.

In their comparison of the merits of the two systems, the French commissioners do not prefer either;—though they favor the Auburn, from the energy with which it is prosecuted, and the extent to which it is adopted.

Colonel Elam Lynds—who is the grand champion for the Auburn system, and its most strenuous and efficacious friend and improver—prefers his plan to ours because the convict at Auburn considers his labor as a hardship and a task, which is therefore beneficial to him as inuring him to submitting to the necessity of performing a task in obedience to law: whereas (says he) to the convict in solitary confinement, labor is but a solace and relief from ennui: so that the motive ceasing to exist, he will cease from working.

ter, the convict is convinced of the necessity of labor to his existence and health, while no corporal punishment is required or administered in any instance.

The habits engendered are alike in consequences: if compulsion is removed, the habit may not cease, but if the habit ceases in any instance, it is more likely to be in that practice resulting from physical force than that from moral conviction of necessity.

ter, the convict is convinced of the necessity of labor to his existence and health, while no corporal punishment is required or administered in any instance.

The habits engendered are alike in consequences: if compulsion is removed, the habit may not cease, but if the habit ceases in any instance, it is more likely to be in that practice resulting from physical force than that from moral conviction of necessity.

But the Pennsylvania plan rests not on speculative advantages, or negative superiority. The non-communication of convicts at any period is a positive advantage of paramount importance.

Not so where there is no intercommunication. No convict knows his fellow. Being alone, the mind of the wicked is compelled to recoil into itself, and self-sectinize; and the heart becomes softened to counsel and reformation.

There are at present two grand systems of punishment by imprisonment—which is now considered by the best jurists as the most efficacious mode of punishing and preventing crime.

If then our system was enforced in the houses of correction, houses of refuge, and similar institutions, the moral improvement and efficacy would be efficiently promoted; and the superiority of the Pennsylvania discipline be too palpably evident to be denied.

But the system of solitary seclusion day and night, and with labor, as in the principle and practice of the Pennsylvania trial, was not considered so attractive or economical as the system of solitary confinement at night with labor in common by day—which is the basis of the Auburn practice.

The only rational objection now to our system is its expense—the expense of constructing so many separate cells, and the expense of keeping the criminals separate.

In their comparison of the merits of the two systems, the French commissioners do not prefer either;—though they favor the Auburn, from the energy with which it is prosecuted, and the extent to which it is adopted.

Colonel Elam Lynds—who is the grand champion for the Auburn system, and its most strenuous and efficacious friend and improver—prefers his plan to ours because the convict at Auburn considers his labor as a hardship and a task, which is therefore beneficial to him as inuring him to submitting to the necessity of performing a task in obedience to law: whereas (says he) to the convict in solitary confinement, labor is but a solace and relief from ennui: so that the motive ceasing to exist, he will cease from working.

ter, the convict is convinced of the necessity of labor to his existence and health, while no corporal punishment is required or administered in any instance.

The habits engendered are alike in consequences: if compulsion is removed, the habit may not cease, but if the habit ceases in any instance, it is more likely to be in that practice resulting from physical force than that from moral conviction of necessity.

ter, the convict is convinced of the necessity of labor to his existence and health, while no corporal punishment is required or administered in any instance.

The habits engendered are alike in consequences: if compulsion is removed, the habit may not cease, but if the habit ceases in any instance, it is more likely to be in that practice resulting from physical force than that from moral conviction of necessity.

But the Pennsylvania plan rests not on speculative advantages, or negative superiority. The non-communication of convicts at any period is a positive advantage of paramount importance.

Not so where there is no intercommunication. No convict knows his fellow. Being alone, the mind of the wicked is compelled to recoil into itself, and self-sectinize; and the heart becomes softened to counsel and reformation.

There are at present two grand systems of punishment by imprisonment—which is now considered by the best jurists as the most efficacious mode of punishing and preventing crime.

If then our system was enforced in the houses of correction, houses of refuge, and similar institutions, the moral improvement and efficacy would be efficiently promoted; and the superiority of the Pennsylvania discipline be too palpably evident to be denied.

But the system of solitary seclusion day and night, and with labor, as in the principle and practice of the Pennsylvania trial, was not considered so attractive or economical as the system of solitary confinement at night with labor in common by day—which is the basis of the Auburn practice.

The only rational objection now to our system is its expense—the expense of constructing so many separate cells, and the expense of keeping the criminals separate.

In their comparison of the merits of the two systems, the French commissioners do not prefer either;—though they favor the Auburn, from the energy with which it is prosecuted, and the extent to which it is adopted.

Colonel Elam Lynds—who is the grand champion for the Auburn system, and its most strenuous and efficacious friend and improver—prefers his plan to ours because the convict at Auburn considers his labor as a hardship and a task, which is therefore beneficial to him as inuring him to submitting to the necessity of performing a task in obedience to law: whereas (says he) to the convict in solitary confinement, labor is but a solace and relief from ennui: so that the motive ceasing to exist, he will cease from working.

ter, the convict is convinced of the necessity of labor to his existence and health, while no corporal punishment is required or administered in any instance.

The habits engendered are alike in consequences: if compulsion is removed, the habit may not cease, but if the habit ceases in any instance, it is more likely to be in that practice resulting from physical force than that from moral conviction of necessity.

ter, the convict is convinced of the necessity of labor to his existence and health, while no corporal punishment is required or administered in any instance.

The habits engendered are alike in consequences: if compulsion is removed, the habit may not cease, but if the habit ceases in any instance, it is more likely to be in that practice resulting from physical force than that from moral conviction of necessity.

But the Pennsylvania plan rests not on speculative advantages, or negative superiority. The non-communication of convicts at any period is a positive advantage of paramount importance.

Not so where there is no intercommunication. No convict knows his fellow. Being alone, the mind of the wicked is compelled to recoil into itself, and self-sectinize; and the heart becomes softened to counsel and reformation.

There are at present two grand systems of punishment by imprisonment—which is now considered by the best jurists as the most efficacious mode of punishing and preventing crime.

If then our system was enforced in the houses of correction, houses of refuge, and similar institutions, the moral improvement and efficacy would be efficiently promoted; and the superiority of the Pennsylvania discipline be too palpably evident to be denied.

But the system of solitary seclusion day and night, and with labor, as in the principle and practice of the Pennsylvania trial, was not considered so attractive or economical as the system of solitary confinement at night with labor in common by day—which is the basis of the Auburn practice.

The only rational objection now to our system is its expense—the expense of constructing so many separate cells, and the expense of keeping the criminals separate.

In their comparison of the merits of the two systems, the French commissioners do not prefer either;—though they favor the Auburn, from the energy with which it is prosecuted, and the extent to which it is adopted.

Colonel Elam Lynds—who is the grand champion for the Auburn system, and its most strenuous and efficacious friend and improver—prefers his plan to ours because the convict at Auburn considers his labor as a hardship and a task, which is therefore beneficial to him as inuring him to submitting to the necessity of performing a task in obedience to law: whereas (says he) to the convict in solitary confinement, labor is but a solace and relief from ennui: so that the motive ceasing to exist, he will cease from working.

ter, the convict is convinced of the necessity of labor to his existence and health, while no corporal punishment is required or administered in any instance.

The habits engendered are alike in consequences: if compulsion is removed, the habit may not cease, but if the habit ceases in any instance, it is more likely to be in that practice resulting from physical force than that from moral conviction of necessity.