

stition, and belongs to the "seeing the moon over your left shoulder" and "13 at the table" fancies. Still it would be unfair to say that the observance of Lent is not of some value. It is a means of stopping some of the social excesses of fashionable society. It gives these people a rest from their balls and parties, and is a good regulator of their physical system. So the observance of Lent cannot do earnest Christian people any harm as they will be "always abounding in the work of the Lord" and it may do some of these social people some good, to their health if not to their hearts. Let us not be prejudiced against Lent, for some souls cannot get along without it.

AN EIGHT HOUR EXPERIMENT.

An exchange gives details of an interesting experiment that is about to be tried in one of the largest iron establishments in England, the works at Salford, near Manchester. The hours of labor have heretofore been 53 per week, eight on Saturday and nine for each other working day. The proposition now is to reduce the weekly service to 48 hours, an average of eight per day. The understanding with the men is that the output of the works shall not be diminished by this shortening of the hours. The employees are to be punctual and energetic, and to save the owners from loss because of this shortening of hours, by greater industry. There is to be no reduction of wages, and if the end of a year finds the experiment successful the 48-hour week will be the permanent arrangement. Every friend of labor, and every believer in justice even to capital, will watch this experiment with lively interest. If the men employed are of the right kind, we think the plan will prove successful, and if it does, one of the strongest objections to the general introduction of the eight-hour day will be removed. There are hosts of people who, believing that eight hours for work, eight for recreation, improvement and food, and eight for rest, constitute the correct division of the day, are almost ready to have it so declared by law; yet many who are of this way of thinking cannot justly bring themselves to grant the correlative claim of labor that the same wages should be paid for the eight hours of work as are now paid for nine or ten. Upon these persons, and their logic, the result of the year's operations at Salford ought to have a conclusive effect.

A WOMAN JAILER.

Rhode Island is not big enough to have many things entitling it to distinction, but a woman jailer, hailing from Warwick, is certainly one of them. The New York Sun tells her story. Her name is Mrs. Evelyn G. Smith, and her grandfather, her father and her husband were all jailers before her. When Mr. Smith died, that was thirteen years ago, Mrs. Smith, who has literally grown up in jail, knows its etiquette, the tastes and habits of its inmates, was appointed to her husband's place. This she has held with credit, asking nothing of anybody in keeping up its discipline since she came into authority. She is a woman of courage and physical strength, and at times has had as many as 250 prisoners

under her. Twice only prisoners have escaped, and once felt so badly about it that he wrote back and apologized for leaving. These men had dug a hole in the wall and got through it. The authorities were so long in getting it fixed that the prisoners told Mrs. Smith that it wasn't seemly for a jail to have such a hole in it. Mrs. Smith said that she had presented the matter to the state authorities, but there was so much red tape to untie. At length one of the prisoners borrowed pen, ink and paper and wrote to Gov. Van Randt, who was then in authority: "Unless you send some one down here and patch up the jail pretty quick for Mrs. Smith, as she wants it, I'll leave." This letter is now preserved in the archives of the state. This jail is historic, as it was a calaboose when King George ruled the land. Mrs. Smith's cooking is so good that bread and water is her most effective punishment.

PRISONERS AND PAUPERS.

The question of the nativity and percentage of prisoners and paupers is one to which the census department of the government has devoted some attention; it is, in fact, the subject of a recent bulletin from that bureau, but it refers only to the year 1890. In that year, as shown, there were 82,329 prisoners in the United States, of whom 75,924 were men and 6,405 were women. The whites numbered 57,310, of whom 52,894 were men and 4,416 were women. Of the whites 40,471 were natives, including 38,156 men and 2,315 women, and 15,932 were foreign born, including 13,869 men and 2,063 women. The colored prison population numbered 25,019, of whom 23,030 were men and 1,989 were women. The bulk of the colored population consisted of Negroes, the percentage of Chinese, Japanese and Indians in prison being comparatively small. The percentage of native whites was 71.75 and of foreign whites 28.25. The Chinese and Japanese are, of course, to be counted as foreigners, while the Negroes and Indians are counted as natives.

As regards parentage, it appears that of the 40,471 whites born in the United States 21,037 (20,101 men and 936 women) had a native father and a native mother, 12,601 (11,766 men and 835 women) had both parents foreign born, 2881 (2729 men and 152 women) had one native and one foreign parent, and the parentage of 3952 (3560 men and 392 women) was unknown as to one or both parents. Omitting the latter, the percentage of whites of purely native origin was 57.61, of purely foreign origin 34.50, and of mixed origin 7.89.

JUDGE ZANE ON EXEMPTIONS.

The system of exempting the employees of public corporations from attachment or execution for the collection of just demands upon them is not in all respects the conservator of public policy which those who advocate it claim. It is true that the authorities mainly uphold it for the reason that the public service might otherwise be

interfered with if not seriously impeded, but they go no further than this, the intention being of course, to not allow private claims to militate against the general welfare even temporarily. There is no expression amounting or looking to anybody's right to shelter from the just claim of a creditor, for this itself would be against public policy in that it would be an incentive to dishonesty and prodigality while creating in the community a distinctly though disagreeably favored class.

It seems to us that when, for instance, a single man works for a municipal corporation and receives a large salary therefor, the rule ought not to be extended so far as to enable him to evade payment for the clothes he has on, or any others for that matter, nor for the meals or lodgings with which he is provided. These are all necessities without which he could not attend to his public duties at all, and surely no court ought to say that a portion of his earnings cannot be applied in the payment therefor; but some courts do say so nevertheless, because they are disposed to construe the rule strictly and thus make of the law a most unelastic and unwieldy contrivance at such times.

It affords us pleasure to be able to note that Judge Zane looks at things differently. We believe he is as strict a constructionist as any jurist we have yet had, while it is also certain that he ranks with the ablest. And yet he can see wherein the blind and unreasoning adherence to a rule may in certain emergencies be improper if not disastrous. He departs from the pattern of Judge Jeffries of unsavory memory, who, although a thorough lawyer and scholar, was yet so hide-bound that he would scatter merit to the wind in order to uphold a purely technical point or sustain all the conventionalities of practice. This kind of thing was bad enough for those days, but it would be infinitely worse now.

The case decided by Judge Zane is of course different from those in which the claim is of a purely personal nature; but we hope that with our advancing intellectual attainments and our increased ability to shape measures to needed ends there will be some relaxation of the rule spoken of even when the matter is altogether personal, not to the extent of actual deprivation or inflicting harm upon the debtor or his dependences, but to the extent of securing and maintaining ordinary uprightness in the community. Why should the law permit half of a poor laborer's wages to be taken in satisfaction of a debt, when perhaps they are small and his family is large, and the rule let the one who has a small or no family and a large salary escape altogether? We admit that the law is a bad one and we hope to see it modified; but it is not much if any worse than the rule.

WHAT CLEVELAND WILL NOT DO.

The fiat goes forth from President Cleveland that there will be no extra session of Congress; it is also semi-officially stated that officeholders against whom there are no charges will be permitted to serve out their full terms. These are both wise and timely conclusions. The next session