

were Holland and Belgium separated in 1830? Is the present Constitution of Austria-Hungary a success? and (a question some omit to ask) what is the Constitution of Austria-Hungary? Does federal government work well in the United States? This last question receives various answers, according to the taste and fancy of the individual debater. Politicians of the Chamberlain school assure us that it works admirably, combining the maximum of national dignity with the maximum of local independence. Anti-federalists assure us that the system produces confusion and over-legislation; that no country can provide fit men for two sets of representative bodies. We are also told that the federal system gives too much importance to lawyers and to the legal element in politics. Our own experiments in constitution-building do not seem to help us much in the present difficulty. We know how to establish a self-governing colony; but then no British statesman will admit that Ireland can ever become as independent as New Zealand. We have tried our hands at confederation in Canada; but then it is just a little doubtful how far the experiment has succeeded. There certainly has been a good deal of litigation between the Dominion and the provinces; Quebec has more than once pursued what Scotch theologians call "divisive courses." Nova Scotia, which has welcomed Mr. Gladstone's bill with effusion, is itself in the act of proposing to secede from the Confederation. All these cases are now more or less in point, and they are cited freely on all sides. If this controversy has no other practical result, it will at least have made considerable additions to the legal and historical knowledge of our people. R.

THE HOME-RULE MOVEMENT.—I. ITS STRENGTH.

OXFORD, May 13, 1886.

THE revolution in England moves apace. But a month has passed since my last letter, and the movement for home rule has already entered on a new stage. My present object is to analyze, as dispassionately as may be possible to an opponent, the causes to which that movement owes its strength. In my next communication I shall say something of its weakness.

1. The primary condition on which depends the success of Mr. Gladstone's new policy is a peculiar state of English opinion.

For the first time in the course of our history our national policy is under the influence, not so much of democratic convictions, as of a much more formidable thing—democratic sentiment. Every idea which can rightly or wrongly be called popular, commands, even among persons who think themselves Conservatives, a ready assent. Hence (be it at once admitted) flow some of the best characteristics of our age. Hence the detestation of inhumanity; hence the growth of the conviction that property has at least as many duties as rights; hence the faith that by some means or other the toiling multitudes ought to share in the prosperity which is due, in part at least, to their ceaseless labor. Hence, too, arise a host of dubious, not to say ignoble, ideas, as that the voice of the majority is the voice of God; that it is useless to struggle with any prevalent phase of opinion; that any body of persons who claim to be united by a sentiment of nationality have an inherent right to be treated as an independent nation. It were needless to explain how the currency of democratic sentiment tells in favor of home rule. It is, however, worth pointing out that democratic ideas at the present day exert far less influence from any enthusiasm they excite, than from their singular capacity for dissolving the convictions by which the claims of every kind of revolutionists are opposed. The argument that if Irish house-

holders had votes, the majority of the United Kingdom must concede anything which the majority of Irish householders desire, is logically absurd; but, combined with other causes, it convinced a Conservative Government that in Ireland the executive was under no obligation to enforce the law of the land. The most curious, however, and the most alarming feature of the situation is the way in which democratic sentiment blends in the minds of modern Englishmen with feelings of a much less respectable order. Dislike of trouble, hatred to the performance of arduous political duties, indifference (one is constrained to add) to ordinary commonplace ideas of law and justice, are at the present moment influencing both members of Parliament and, it may be feared, the electors on whose wishes the conduct of members of Parliament depends. It is hardly too much to say that half the arguments used by politicians in favor of home rule amount simply to this: that five hundred and odd English gentlemen cannot be expected to resist the continuous pressure of the eighty-six Parnellites. Respectable members of Parliament yield, to the terror of being bored, what their fathers would not concede to armed rebellion.

2. No foreign observer can fully appreciate the immense influence exerted by Mr. Gladstone's personality. He represents in his person in a very singular way the best and the worst features of the sentiment of the day. He is also one of the few modern politicians who possess the energy which characterized the statesmen of the last generation. When you add to this that he is, to use his own language, an "old Parliamentary hand"—that is to say, a thoroughly trained and very skilful party manager—you understand part, at least, of the sources of his influence; but there is a good deal more in this influence than it is easy to sum up in a few words. High personal character has at all times told very strongly on the imagination of Englishmen. It was admittedly quite as much the superior morality as the genius of Chatham and his son which made the two Pitts the heroes of England. George the Third, with all his dulness and his cunning, was a popular idol because he was the "Good old King"; and Mr. Gladstone is to the electors the "good man" of English politics. In part by his merits and great powers, in part also, in my judgment, by his genuine sympathy with some of the weaker sides of English sentiment, Mr. Gladstone has obtained a hold on popular feeling which he can hardly lose. Fickleness, as Macaulay pointed out long ago, is not really the vice of the people. The masses cling to their idols; it is more doubtful whether they choose the objects of their admiration with perfect discretion. But the influence of the Premier is, it is fair to remember, due to a great extent to a circumstance independent of either the merits or the defects of his character. Modern democracies, in Europe at least, show a marked tendency, which is not in all respects a bad one, to place more store by persons than by principles. The people (they feel) can judge of a man's character; they cannot judge of his policy. The result is, that the one predominant idea which sways the conduct of thousands of electors is that Mr. Gladstone's policy must be supported simply because it is Mr. Gladstone's. No sensible person doubts that his present policy would not have had a hearing if proposed by any other politician. Few cool observers can, I suspect, doubt that if Mr. Gladstone were to vanish from the political arena, two-thirds of his followers would hasten to explain that they had never meant to favor home rule. I can easily believe that the Prime Minister himself would admit the difficulties besetting his policy far more readily than would his followers. It is quite possible that Mr. Gladstone is not a Gladstonian.

3. Many persons who are neither swayed by sentiment nor victims to the disease of Gladstonianism, are so impressed, and naturally enough, with the failure of all past attempts to govern Ireland; they are so disgusted with the weary round of concession following on coercion, and coercion again succeeding to concession, that they are willing to try almost any experiment which may give a chance of closing the secular feud between Great Britain and Ireland. This feeling harmonizes well with the kind of political hopelessness which prevails among many of the educated classes. Mr. Gladstone is the most sanguine of optimists; it is quite natural that he should exert exaggerated power over men who feel their own lack of hope. A moralist or statesman may condemn all forms of despair; but it is the merest justice to persons who are not likely to receive just treatment from partisans of any class, to recognize the fact that Mr. Gladstone's proposals are supported by men, who appreciate its dangers, because they see in it at least a chance of making a new departure in our Irish policy. Nothing is so idle as to suppose that statesmen such, for example, as Lord Spencer, are influenced by the spirit of vanity or affection. They may be taking a leap in the dark, but they are taking it to escape from what they deem to be an untenable and intolerable position.

4. English parties, and especially the Liberal party, have of recent years been organized on a plan which approaches the American model. We have our caucuses, our managers, our wire-pullers—in short, our "machine." At the present moment the Machine, as far as the Liberal party is concerned, is worked wholly in Mr. Gladstone's interest. There is no need of explaining to the citizens of New York all that this means, but they will easily perceive that the fact of Mr. Gladstone's supporters being in command of the party mechanism greatly favors the movement for home-rule, or indeed any movement which may be identified with the name of the Prime Minister. One curious result, however, of our new party organization may escape the attention of American observers. A new element of uncertainty is added to the numerous difficulties of ascertaining the true set of opinion among the electors. No one knows how far the resolutions of so-called public meetings do or do not express the feeling of the public. It is impossible to tell how far machine-made opinion may not pass current for the genuine article. In any case, members of Parliament are rendered extremely nervous about their seats should they oppose the party, and the party is at this moment identified with Mr. Gladstone. Here, however, I am nearly touching upon the weakness as well as the strength of the home-rule movement, and that topic I purposely reserve for my next letter.

A. V. DICKEY.

THE DUC DE BROGLIE'S RECOLLECTIONS.

PARIS, May 6, 1886.

THE publication of the 'Souvenirs' of the late Duc de Broglie, the father of the present Duke, has begun. One volume has appeared, and I hear that it will be followed by the publication of two others. Among the men who have played some part in the affairs of their time, few have resisted the temptation to write such memoirs: "Ecce enim breves anni transeunt, et semitemper quam non revertar ambulo." The biographical notes which are now published were written when the Duc de Broglie was already advanced in years; they have not the form of a journal, you do not feel in them the spur of the occasion. They are wanderings over the past, but what a past!—the French Revolution, the Empire, the return of the old dynasty. The preface is written in a grave, solemn style:

"I have lived more than seventy years, I have gone through an epoch of disorders, of misfortunes, of crimes. God has spared me neither misfortunes nor defeats; he has given me the grace never to ignore the wisdom of his ways, nor the excellency of his works. I love life. 'Je l'aime et la cultive,' says Montaigne, 'telle qu'il a plu à Dieu nous l'octroyer.' I enjoyed it in my infancy, in my youth, in my middle age; I enjoy it still in my old age, mildly and gratefully. I regret nothing of what the progress of years has successively taken from me. I feel that, if we live long, we gain definitively more than we lose; and if we can belong to our age and to our time, as fast as the exterior man gets destroyed, the inner man gets renewed."

The Duc de Broglie was not a pessimist of the modern school, a misanthrope. He had a certain sort of serenity which came partly from good health, partly from self-contentment, partly from philosophy. I saw him in the latter part of his life, under the Second Empire. He was out of active politics, but he kept his interest in all the events of the time. He was much occupied with philosophical speculations, and saw the affairs of the world from those *templa serena* of which Lucretius speaks. He liked to speak in aphorisms; and when he had hit on a good one, he rehearsed it frequently. I heard him once, speaking of the policy of Napoleon III., at the time of the *Coup d'état*, when the future Emperor was coquetting at the same moment with the Socialists and with the Conservatives, say pointedly: "He says to the wicked, 'I am with you,' and to the good, 'I protect you.'" He was so pleased with this formula that he repeated it, as it were to himself, three or four times.

The Duc de Broglie was born in Paris, November 28, 1785. His grandfather was Marshal of France and Governor of Metz. His father was only thirty years old, and was Colonel of the regiment of Bourbonnais; he had, three years before, in 1782, joined the army commanded by Rochambeau in the United States. His regiment had reembarked for an expedition against Jamaica, and had returned to France after the signing of the peace. A manuscript of the journal of Colonel de Broglie exists among the papers of the family. The Colonel married a lady of Swedish extraction, who had large estates in Alsace, where her family had been established since the Thirty Years' War. Judging from the picture of her which is at Broglie, she was a person of great beauty.

The Marshal emigrated at the beginning of the Revolution. His son, who had adopted liberal ideas, remained in France, and was a member of the Constituent Assembly. He afterwards joined the army of the Rhine, under Luckner; he had himself Desaix, then a mere lieutenant, as his aide-de camp. His brothers, who had joined the Marshal, disavowed him, and would have no further communication with him. He was, nevertheless, ill looked upon by the Jacobins; he lost his command, and was finally arrested. He died on the Revolutionary scaffold June 27, 1794; his wife, who was reserved for the same fate, succeeded in making her escape from prison and fled to Switzerland, through the mountains of the Jura. She returned to France after the ninth Thermidor. Young Broglie had found a second father in M. d'Argenson, and received, during those terrible years, such an education as could then be received in France. He was capable of learning from events and things as well as from books; his mind was very receptive, and his character acquired in infancy a strength which it always preserved. When he was in Paris, he saw the remains of the old society mixed with the lights of the new society; all social distinctions seemed to have been lost in blood. As a very young man he made the acquaintance of Mme. de Chevreuse (who was afterwards exiled by Bonaparte), of Talleyrand, of M. de Narbonne, of the Suard, who received in their salon the

Abbé Morellet, Garat, Daunou, Ginguené, the latest philosophers.

The first time he saw Bonaparte was in the garden of the Tuileries "giving his right arm to Bourrienne, keeping under his left arm a little Turkish sword: thin, slender, with a yellow complexion and a wild look." He saw him again at the château of the D'Argensons, when the Emperor was on his way to Spain. "All was changed: the bust was short and fat, the little legs fleshy; the complexion sallow, the forehead bare, the face cut like a Roman medal." Nobody, at the time, understood Spanish affairs, and the Duc de Broglie seemed to think that Napoleon himself had no idea what he was going to do at Bayonne. "He had surely prepared the trap, but he did not know exactly how much prepotency, wickedness, and perfidy would be necessary to attain the end." He describes very vividly the unexpected arrival, some time afterwards, of the King of Spain, of the Queen, and of the Prince de la Paix, who were sent, as prisoners, to Fontainebleau. The house of M. d'Argenson marked one of the halts of the royal party. The prisoners arrived in the same carriages which had taken Philip V. to Spain, enormous gilded carriages, with glasses on all sides, more fit for gala ceremonies than for a long journey; "and this was Spain, was the house of Bourbon!" The King was tall, bald, strong-looking, but merely strong in body. The Queen looked a very clean, nice little old body, dignified and reserved:

"Then came out of the carriage the Prince de la Paix, whom we have seen so long in Paris, a sort of cross between the butler and the *chasseur*. The King did not stay a minute in the apartment which had been prepared for him; he walked incessantly in the château and in the gardens, shouting, 'Godoy, Godoy!' He would not lose sight of his favorite, and he finally established himself with him in the billiard room. The Queen remained in her apartment. She received my mother with dignity, gravity, kindness, and put all sorts of royal questions: 'How many children have you? How many boys? How old are they? How long has this *château* been built?' The name of Napoleon was never pronounced."

Three months afterward came the news of the catastrophe of Baylen.

In 1809 the Duc de Broglie was named *auditor* of the Council of State, and as such was attached to the Ministry of War. He performed various missions to the armies in Austria; he was afterward sent to Spain and again to Warsaw, on a diplomatic mission, of which the Abbé de Pradt was the head. He was attached to M. de Narbonne at the time of the Conference of Prague, and was initiated into all the negotiations which followed the disastrous war of Napoleon in Russia. One day the Emperor was talking with M. de Narbonne of this Russian campaign: "After all," said he to M. de Narbonne, who repeated it to me the same evening, 'what does all this cost me? Three hundred thousand men, and in this number there were a good many Germans.'" The Congress of Prague lasted twenty days, but it ended in nothing, and the Duc de Broglie returned to France full of sad apprehensions. He goes rapidly, with a feverish step, over the last days of the Empire, and begins his third book in these words:

"In the night of December 31, 1813-January 1, 1814, the Allies, after having long hesitated, crossed the Rhine between Spire and Bâle.

"January 24, the Emperor left for the army.

"March 31, Paris capitulated.

"April 2, the Senate pronounced the *déchéance*.

"The Emperor abdicated on the 11th.

"Louis XVIII., recalled to the throne, entered France on the 29th.

"May 2, he conceded the general principles of the *Charte* in the declaration of Saint-Ouen.

"The 30th, he opened the two Chambers."

The Duc de Broglie saw these great events as a mere witness: he took no part in the conclaves of the Legitimists. He witnessed the astonishment of the Parisians when they saw the allied armies from the hills of Montmartre and heard the first guns. "Nobody believed in anything, everybody expected everything." The Duc d'Artois arrived, and all the royalists went to see him in the Tuileries; then came Louis XVIII., escorted by the generals and marshals of the empire. "I saw, as a mere *curieux*, the great procession. I followed it from street to street, from boulevard to boulevard, as far as the Tuileries. I think that I am not mistaken if I say that there was a double current—one composed of people like myself, and it was by far the largest, curious, sad, resigned; the other, composed of ardent royalists, limited in number, but noisy and demonstrative." The King looked serious and unmoved; the Duchess of Angoulême was grave. The generals on horseback were visibly agitated and uneasy.

We come now to a curious passage in the memoirs. The Duc de Broglie received an invitation to take a place in the new House of Peers. He had desired to offer himself as a candidate for the House of Deputies, but he was only twenty-nine years old, and by the new law the candidates were to be at least forty years old. "I was not personally prepared for the compensation which was offered to me. It may seem extraordinary, but it is nevertheless true—I had completely forgotten that I was the head of the oldest branch of my family, the heir to the Dukedom of Broglie, and that, as such, since a House of Peers was created, I must necessarily be called to it." The fact is certainly a curious one. During the Empire the Duc de Broglie was merely called the Prince de Broglie; but that he should not have been conscious of his rights, shows how profoundly the French Revolution had mixed all the social elements in France. The Emperor had continued what the Terror had begun. We are living now in 1886, under a third Republic, and the passion for titles has never been so great as I see it. We have now society papers which give the lists of guests at a great party classified as the names are classified in the list of a *levée* at the Court of St. James—dukes and duchesses first, marquises, counts, viscounts; etc. This is quite an innovation in a country where the ancient rule was "un gentilhomme vaut un gentilhomme," and where mere titles were almost unimportant, except the title of *duc et pair*, which conferred a privilege. It must be supposed that the powers of imagination are very strong. At any rate, the young Prince de Broglie had forgotten in 1814 that he was a duke; his uncle, Prince Amédée, who was a friend of the Prince de Condé, remembered it, and so the unconscious Duke received a letter which summoned him to the Tuileries. "I found myself," says he, "transported suddenly, by the mere flow of events, to the first rank in society and in the state. I had not deserved it by my services; I had not made myself unworthy of it by my feelings, my language, and my conduct. There remained nothing for me to do but to use well this unexpected good-fortune."

At this very moment the Duc de Broglie was preparing to marry the daughter of Mme. de Staël. He tells us, at the end of his first volume, the history of Mme. de Staël during the Empire; of her return to France, with her son, her daughter, with M. Rocca, her second husband, and with Wilhelm Schlegel. He draws a portrait of this celebrated person, which is full of life, and of a warm and enthusiastic admiration. Her salon was the rendezvous of all the illustrious strangers whom the Restoration had drawn to Paris. The Duc de Broglie became acquainted there with the Duke of Wellington, with Canning, Sir

James Mackintosh, Humboldt; with Chateaubriand, M. de La Fayette, Benjamin Constant. During the "Hundred Days" she left Paris. The Duc de Broglie remained, and he describes all the incidents of this dramatic period which came under his eyes.

Correspondence.

CABINET OFFICERS ON THE FLOOR OF THE HOUSE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I wish to call your attention to a bill now before Congress which, though of considerable importance, has not attracted the attention and discussion which it deserves. I refer to the bill giving Cabinet officers seats in the House of Representatives. It was introduced many months ago by Mr. Long, of Massachusetts, and was referred to the Select Committee on Reform in the Civil Service, where it now lies, and where it will continue to lie unless there is some popular agitation for or against it. The subject is an interesting one, and has been much talked of for many years by the public-spirited; and as it is now before the country in proper form, we should at least have a discussion of it, and find out what the wise and learned have to say.

The bill is in the following words:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Interior, the Attorney-General, and the Postmaster-General shall be entitled to occupy seats on the floor of the House of Representatives, with the right to participate in debate on matters relating to the business of their respective departments, under such rules as may be prescribed by the House."

It will be observed that the bill gives members of the Cabinet seats in the House of Representatives, and the right to debate and answer questions, but not the right to vote. It might be said that the privilege should not be confined to the House, and that the Cabinet officers should be given seats in the Senate also. But this is matter for amendment and may be passed by here, as I am at present concerned only with the main issue of the question. The bill is clearly constitutional. The Constitution says that "each house may determine the rules of its proceedings"; and it has always been the custom for Congress to give the privilege of its floor to whomsoever it pleased. Nor is the bill a violation of the clause in the Constitution which says that "No person holding any office under the United States shall be a member of either house during his continuance in office." A Cabinet officer with only the privilege of the floor cannot be called a member. He has neither the right to vote, nor freedom from arrest, nor any of the essentials of membership.

It is to be further observed that the bill does not make the members of the Cabinet hold their offices at the pleasure of Congress. In other words, there is no resemblance to the English system of a responsible ministry. In England, the Cabinet resign as soon as a majority of Parliament is opposed to their plans and policy. But our Cabinet officers will, under the change proposed, hold their positions whether Congress is with them or against them. In England the legislative and executive departments are merged, and the executive is simply a committee of the legislature. But it is a fundamental principle of our form of government to keep the legislature distinct from the executive. To have our Cabinet officers go in and out at the pleasure of a majority of Congress would require an amendment

to the Constitution. The object of the present bill is simply to make the means of communication between Congress and the departments more convenient. Communication is now carried on between them by resolutions calling for information, and the information is furnished in writing; when mismanagement is suspected, an investigating committee is appointed, which takes testimony in secret and reports to the House. Congress cannot obtain easily from the departments the information which is necessary to intelligent legislation, and the heads of departments have no say, except by lobbying, in legislation which concerns their work. But if the Cabinet officers have seats in Congress, information will be obtained more readily and accurately, and, what is of still greater importance, openly, before the whole country. By the questions put to members of the Cabinet on the floor of Congress and their answers thereto, the people will be kept constantly informed of the doings of the Administration. There will also be an additional check on the Government, and frauds when suspected will be more easily traced and punished. The Administration, in its turn, will have the opportunity of defending itself openly before the people, and of exercising a salutary influence on legislation. Neither legislature nor executive will gain power at the expense of the other, but the power of each to check the other will be increased; and this is in exact accord with the theory of the Constitution.

There recently appeared in the *Atlantic Monthly* a very able article entitled "Ministerial Responsibility and the Constitution," in which the writer took for granted that there was a movement on foot to introduce a responsible ministry in this country, and then he proceeded to prove that it was in violation of the Constitution, and would, by merging the executive and legislature into one and making Congress all-powerful, destroy our principle of balanced powers of government. He succeeded in this most admirably, and showed himself a good constitutional lawyer and a valuable citizen. But he wasted his excellent ammunition and soiled his gun all for nothing. He fired at a phantom of his own creation. No one has any intention of setting up a responsible ministry in the United States, and there is no bill for that purpose before Congress. Such a thing could only be accomplished by an amendment, and an amendment of that sort could not be carried.

F. G. S.

May 18, 1886.

TEXT-BOOKS IN CHEMISTRY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In an article on text-books of chemistry, which appeared in your last issue, there occurs a passage which calls for an explanation from me. It is this: "Mr. Shepard makes Dr. Remsen appear as a quasi-godfather to his book. Our surprise at this, and belief that in some way Dr. Remsen's apparent endorsement must be due to a misapprehension on the part of Mr. Shepard, are strengthened by the publication, after a short interval, of an elementary text-book by Dr. Remsen himself."

I beg to say that Mr. Shepard has said nothing which he was not fully justified in saying. At the request of Messrs. Ginn & Heath, I some time ago consented to examine Mr. Shepard's book in manuscript, and afterwards I agreed to make such changes and additions as I thought were called for. It seemed to me that the book was likely to prove useful in showing teachers how they could keep their pupils profitably at work in the laboratory from the beginning of their study. The lesson taught by the book is that chemistry can only be learned in the laboratory, and that the book is only a guide to experi-

mental work; and this is a lesson which certainly needs to be taught above all others in chemistry.

As to the fact that "after a short interval" an elementary book by myself appeared, I have to say only this, that I did not begin my book until I had had a free correspondence with Mr. Heath and Mr. Shepard, and they had expressed themselves in the most friendly way in regard to the proposed work.—Yours very truly,

IRA REMSEN.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY, May 24, 1886.

A BAD LOT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Mr. Bear's statement (*Nation*, No. 1089, p. 393) about the character of the Irish majority—"a crowd of Fenians, priests, rogues, and paupers"—puts me in mind of the late Jones McCarty in the 'Dodd Letters': "He loved his country, and it was a treat to hear him praise it. 'Oh,' he would say, 'there's but one blot on her. The Judges is rogues, the Government's rogues, the Grand Jury's rogues, and the people is villains.'"

Bear-ing the Irish stock, isn't it?

Respectfully,

F. H. S.

SPRINGFIELD, MO., May 19, 1886.

A HAPPY THOUGHT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Permit me through the *Nation* to make a suggestion for the settlement of the labor question and the solution of the silver problem, believing it will commend itself to all who are logical in thought and Christian-like in desire. The suggestion is this: Pay the eight-hours workmen with the eighty-cents dollar.

Y.

Notes.

'Cut,' a West Point novel, by G. I. Cervus, author of 'White Feathers,' is in the press of J. B. Lippincott Co.

'Aspirations,' a story by Helen Hays, will be issued this week by Thomas Whittaker.

Harriet Martineau's 'The Peasant and the Prince,' edited with notes for schools, and a new edition of James M. Whiton's 'Six Weeks' Preparation for Reading Caesar,' are announced for next month by Ginn & Co.

T. Y. Crowell & Co. will publish directly 'The Labor Question in America,' by Prof. Richard T. Ely; and 'A Vital Question; or, What is to be Done?' from the Russian of N. G. Tchernishevsky, by Nathan Haskell Dole.

The title of Miss Macfarlane's forthcoming novel, 'Children of the Earth,' is said to be derived from Rosencrantz's reply to Hamlet's inquiry of him and Guildenstern, "How do ye both?" The scenes are laid on the shores of Nova Scotia and in New York society.

Mr. William Archer, the author of 'English Dramatists of the Present Day,' and one of the most careful and acute of English dramatic critics, is collecting certain of his magazine papers into a volume, 'About the Theatre,' to be published by T. Fisher Unwin.

As a private souvenir of a long-shore cruise from Boston to Mt. Desert in a steam yacht, the 'Log of the Ariel in the Gulf of Maine' (Boston: Cupples, Upham & Co.) would be safe from criticism. Much taste has entered into the embellishment of it, and an expenditure of money probably sufficient to have made it at once more valuable and less costly to a circle of readers not specially interested in the small party and their insignificant adventures. If, for example, instead of drawings from photographs, we had had photogravures like the frontispiece showing the