

which was used very effectively in the House of Commons before an important division on the Coercion Bill by Mr. Balfour, was got up and headed by a man of the lowest character, who had been five years in the pay of the police, and who turned informer as soon as the job was done. The evictions, too, at Bodyke and elsewhere, carried out with the assistance of a large military and police force, sometimes under circumstances of great cruelty, and reported in thoroughly sensational style, have deeply moved the British public, or at all events the democratic portion of it.

These things, combined with the feeble leadership of the Conservative party in the House of Commons last session, with the uncertainty and weakening of the support given to the Ministry by the Liberal Unionists, with the open desertion of such prominent ones as Sir George Trevelyan, Mr. T. W. Russell, and even the Secretary of the Liberal Unionist Association, Mr. Maude, and with the approaching disappearance of Mr. Chamberlain across the Atlantic just when matters are at their worst, have spread a sort of panic through the Conservative ranks. Their writers are, in fact, in this last month's magazines almost throwing up the sponge. Mr. Matthew Arnold, who sang a song of triumph over them last May, confessed sorrowfully in the September *Nineteenth Century* that they have proved a failure. In the October number of the same periodical Mr. Edward Dicey, one of their most ardent eulogists, who also promised great things for them, confesses that although all is not lost, the outlook is very dark indeed. But he has no remedy to offer except the adoption of the name of Conservatives by the Liberal Unionists, and the formation of a coalition Ministry by the entrance of others of their number into the Cabinet. How this will mend matters does not clearly appear. It will not make the Irish more submissive, nor will it do anything to make the Irish policy of the Government more acceptable to the English constituencies, whose growing disgust with coercion is now no longer denied.

But some kind of Cabinet reconstruction appears to be resolved on, and the approaching conference of the Liberal Unionists, at which Lord Hartington is to preside, will probably determine what part they are to play in it. Most of them think if he would enter the Cabinet, it would have a wonderful effect on the country, while the despondent Conservatives are equally assured that if Lord Randolph Churchill were put back into his old position of leader of the House, it would restore the fortunes of the Cabinet in Parliament. If nothing satisfactory can be accomplished in this way, it is admitted that the game will be up, and that the Ministry will be unable to face another session of this Parliament, and will have to dissolve.

Mr. Dicey's article in the *Nineteenth Century* is very interesting reading as a revelation of the exact nature of the Liberal Unionists' disappointments and deceptions. They were all thoroughly persuaded that home rule threatened the very existence of the Empire, and felt sure that the whole Liberal party would, if not at first, very soon share their fears and abandon Gladstone. Mr. Dicey admits that this was a delusion, that the hold of Gladstone on the

bulk of the Liberal party has not been shaken by anything that has occurred, and that those Liberal Unionists who still call themselves Liberals are threatened with total exclusion from public life at the next election. For this reason he advises them to become Tories at once, in name as well as in reality, and thus give themselves a chance of Conservative seats at least. He says very truly that the reasons they give for not going plumply into the Conservative camp are too metaphysical and fine-drawn to be understood or appreciated by the bulk of the voters.

THE CIVIL SERVICE IN FRANCE.

ONE of the complaints against the present republican form of government in France is, that it is a great deal more expensive than its imperial and royal predecessors. This finds expression in a recent number of the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, a very Orleanist journal, from the pen of M. Cucheval-Clarigny, an old literary workman under the Empire. He starts out with a reference to the good old times of the restoration of the Bourbons in 1814, when the whole force of the Law Department counted only thirty-five officials. To-day, with no more courts or lawyers or notaries, although there are a great many more criminals, the clerical force has increased enormously. The expenses of administering the Government of France have risen in fifty years from two hundred to over seven hundred millions of dollars. The Government of July in eighteen years only added sixty millions to the old outlay, and the Imperial Government in nearly twenty-two years as much more, although it provided railroads and telegraphs and other such important public services. The Republican Legislature has multiplied the number of public employees and has increased their pay. Thus, in the Post-office, where letter-carriers used to receive six dollars a month, of which the first month's pay was retained for the pension fund and three dollars was deducted for the expenses of their oath of office, by 1880 the outlay was just double that of 1869, and in the last six years it has been increased again by fourteen millions of dollars. An annual disbursement for salaries in 1869 of fifty millions of dollars, and in 1876 of fifty-six millions, had grown in 1886 to eighty millions of dollars. Two Commissions have investigated the subject, but, beyond a recommendation to reduce the expenses, nothing has been done.

France still has twenty-six courts of appeal, although before 1789 she got along very well with her fifteen parliaments. Three-fourths of the litigation is now settled in assize courts, in commercial tribunals, and by the prefects, while railroad facilities would make it easy to dispense with a large proportion of the subordinate local courts. The War Department of France holds more than forty million dollars' worth of buildings and building sites, utterly useless for any military purpose, but only serving for an army of officials to take care of; and two-thirds of its small forts, etc., which have been ordered by the Legislature to be abandoned, are still used to furnish luxurious quarters for officers of high rank. Every prefect in France has a sub-prefect to enhance his dignity, without regard to the amount of work to be done, and a council, which only helps to perpetuate that interference of the Government in many strictly local matters which had better be left to the ordinary tribunals. At least two hundred engineers are employed in the prefectures for work that could easily be done by experts engaged in business for others, on better terms

and in a better way than by the present force. Naval and army officers on leave could take the place of the large body of civilians employed at navy-yards and forts and arsenals.

France, in claiming for its Government a monopoly of the business of education, according to M. Cucheval-Clarigny, is doing that which does not belong to the task of administering the laws, and is entirely on the wrong tack. Before 1789, in some of the provinces of France there were fewer illiterates than there are to-day. The country was full of schools of all kinds, from the modest parish school to colleges and special scientific schools of a high order of excellence. Education was almost gratuitous, and without expense to the royal treasury or to taxpayers, for all these establishments were supported by old endowments. There was a lively emulation between the universities and the great teaching bodies, the Oratorians, the Jesuits, and the masters from Port Royal, to whose methods modern pedagogy has made little real addition. The Revolution made a clean sweep of all; the buildings were sold, the libraries burned, the masters sent to the scaffold and into exile. Napoleon undertook to restore them, and for this purpose used the resources of the Government. The Republic has put an end to the liberty of instruction which made France famous, and the cities are following the example of the national Government by extravagant outlays; and no sooner are these made than they appeal to the Treasury for enormous sums to complete their college and school buildings and maintain them. The high schools for boys cost \$200 and those for girls \$300 for each pupil, a sum far beyond the fair average that ought to be thus distributed. Thirty of these schools ought to be suppressed, leaving fifty vigorous establishments, and from these the costly outlay for board and lodging ought to be taken, so that more money could be spent on the proper business of a school—education—and not, as at present, on an army of employees, and in providing for girls and boys luxurious homes, far better than those of their own families. The teachers in the primary schools are condemned to misery by reason of their wretched pay, over 30,000 getting less than \$160 a year, over 23,000 less than \$200 a year; and the Legislature, so lavish in other directions, refuses the \$50,000,000 asked as far back as 1883 for an increase of their salaries.

The Post-office and Telegraph Department exhibits the curious anomaly of an increase of receipts and a diminution of service. In 1886 it cost \$30,000,000, and showed a profit of \$3,000,000; yet in 1869, with expenses amounting to \$12,000,000, it earned a surplus of \$4,000,000, a profit of over 25 per cent., and it had established a daily postal service in every commune, paid over \$4,000,000 in subsidies for mail service at sea, and had to pay for a great many postal routes by wagon which are now all served without expense by rail. The railroads do for nothing work that saves the Government more than \$4,000,000 annually. The post-office and the telegraph services are badly managed in France and fail to meet the public necessities, while the outlay is steadily increasing. To meet the demands, not of the people, but of their representatives in the French Legislature, with a view to increasing their political influence, the number of post-offices and post-office employees steadily increases, and even in Paris the cost of delivering letters in the suburbs is six times the amount of the postage collected for the service. The tax department has been injured by the forced retirement of a large army of old employees, to make room for a vast body of men whose only recommendation was the political influence of members of the Legislature. Instead of securing honesty by rewarding long service, the tendency of late

years has been to employ new men at low salaries, with increased duties, larger facilities and temptations to dishonesty and inefficiency, and hence an almost universal complaint from taxpayers of annoyances, and from the Treasury of frequent peculations.

Paris is the centre of all the favoritism that has grown out of the necessity of consulting the wishes of members of the Legislature in a matter with which, in England and other well-governed countries, they have nothing to do—the purely administrative business. Thus it is that what used to be merely divisions of this or that department have grown into independent departments, with new officials of all grades, new quarters, and new expenses. The Department of Fine Arts now has its own minister, with a large corps of inspectors, clerks, etc., at a large annual outlay, doing work that was just as well done by a small body of experts in old times. Three new departments have been formed out of the old Department of Finance and Public Works; and, under a Minister of Agriculture, the expenses of the old Division of Forests have increased 40 per cent. and the receipts diminished 20 per cent. In 1869 it produced a revenue of \$8,000,000 at an expense of \$2,000,000, but in 1883, under a Minister of Agriculture, it yielded less than \$6,000,000. In Algiers the expense was doubled, and to-day it is fourfold the receipts. The expenses for the Post-office have increased, from 1875 to 1886, 45 per cent., and its surplus is steadily decreasing, so that the balance in favor is likely soon to disappear altogether. The expense of the Department of Agriculture has increased 8 per cent., and that of the Department of Commerce has doubled in the same period—1875 to 1886—the former costing \$144,000 and the latter \$110,000, just for bureau expenses, while those of the departments from which these were taken have also increased—30 per cent. for the Treasury and 40 per cent. for the Public Works. In 1886 the Post-office Department in Paris consisted of 5 directors, 15 chiefs of bureau, 35 sub-chiefs, 306 clerks, 40 assistants, 146 second assistants, 72 porters and messengers, and 25 special officers, costing \$350,000 in salaries and \$75,000 for material used. Besides this item there were special allowances in addition for inspectors, telegraphic instruction, post-offices and telegraph offices in Paris. The Department of Agriculture gives its minister an assistant, three chiefs of division, 10 chiefs of bureau, 5 assistants, and 62 other employees, costing nearly \$200,000—\$125,000 for salaries, \$25,000 for material, and nearly as much for printing. The care of the woods and forests costs about half of the six millions produced by the revenues of the forests still owned by the Government—967,000 hectares (about two and a half million acres). The Department of Commerce paid \$2,500,000 in subsidies to the merchant marine, and \$500,000 bounties to fisheries, and about \$1,000,000 for its other expenses—15 per cent. of it for its office at Paris, \$100,000 in salaries, \$30,000 for material, and \$50,000 for printing. In 1886 it consisted of the Minister (our secretary), three directors, three sub-directors, fourteen chiefs of bureau, thirteen sub-chiefs, thirty-two clerks, and forty other employees. By making this, as it used to be, a simple bureau of the Department of Public Works, there would be a saving of at least \$150,000 a year, and a like saving might be effected by restoring the Post-office and the Forests to the Treasury, Commerce and Agriculture to the Public Works, and thus cutting off three expensive and useless staffs, without detriment to the public service and with a substantial gain to the taxpayer. The Minister of Public Works in 1876 had one chief and one assistant; but, although the Department had lost some important bureaus, which became independent ministries, by 1886 it consisted of 1 chief, 1 assistant, 1 sub-chief, 4 reporters, 4 special

clerks, 1 secretary, and 2 assistant secretaries—14 instead of 3 employees. In the same period of ten years there were added 1 director, 3 heads of division, 11 chiefs of bureau, 34 sub-chiefs, and 200 clerks and employees. The Department of Public Instruction in 1869 consisted of 136 employees, in 1876 of 133, and in 1881 of 273, and the expenses had doubled, too, from \$100,000 to \$200,000. The Department of the Interior and that of Public Works have both found means to increase the number of their employees and the amount of their outlays, without waiting for parliamentary action and in despite of the adverse decree of the Cour des Comptes, the auditing department, which is supposed to hold French officials to a very strict obedience to law. The War Department consists of 24 superior officers, 186 officers or others holding assimilated rank, 204 officers detached for this special duty, 557 civilians, 147 messengers, and an indeterminate number of temporary employees, besides a large force in other bureaus throughout the various branches of the service. The expenses of the central office exceed a million dollars, for salaries, materials, printing, and other outlays. The Navy Department spends \$200,000 on its own bureaus and \$100,000 on the colonies—which are soon to be assigned to a new department, with a minister and a bureau of its own.

The steady increase of high officials is exhibited in a curious table showing that there are of this class in the Bureau of Manufactures, 15 chiefs for 22 clerks; Bureau of Registration, 36 chiefs for 42 clerks; Bureau of Taxes, 11 chiefs for 19 clerks; Bureau of Agriculture, 31 chiefs for 62 clerks; Bureau of Commerce, 37 chiefs for 72 clerks; Bureau of Fine Arts, 25 chiefs for 65 clerks; Bureau of Religion, 15 chiefs for 31 clerks. Another elaborate series of tables for each department show that all ten have increased in cost from 1876 to 1885 about 55 per cent., from \$4,000,000 to \$6,500,000.

The question of how far these great offices do their work and that of the Government really well, is also a matter of discussion. The War Department, it is true, sells every now and then its waste paper; 30,000 kilos (about 75,000 pounds) at a time, but this hardly makes any visible diminution of the vast amount of writing crowded in its walls, now by order of Gen. Boulanger closed to the public, no one being allowed to enter the office except by a special permit from the Minister himself. The Navy Department has plenty of work to do in its official correspondence with the fleets and the colonies, although much of its business is disposed of by the maritime prefects, the officers in charge of navy-yards, etc. The Treasury has vastly increased its work in order to keep pace with the growth of the national debt and its wide distribution, the increase of civil and military pensions, and the methods of insuring annuities and other matters of supervision of saving funds, etc., special to French governmental ways. The heads of bureaus and those who have to help the ministers answer questions put to them in the Legislature have plenty to do, but in the Department of the Interior and in that of Justice the clerks are said to have a real El Dorado—plenty of leisure and an abundance of time in which to do the little work that is expected of them. A recent novel by M. Theuriet throws a great deal of light on the occupations of the clerks and high employees of the French Civil Service: playwrights, novel writers, poets, newspaper correspondents, all find time for their literary compositions in office hours, and M. Cucheval-Clarigny gravely adds instances of whist playing, grocery-store keeping, music copying, all carried on by clerks quite openly. Some reform was made by requiring the clerks to work in large apartments, instead of in the small rooms that used to be the paradise

of the favored ones, each with its fireplace and its special attendant, and the privacy that enabled every clerk to work for the public in his own way. The excuse that Government work requires solitary and separate quarters will hardly avail when banks and railroads and other great employers of clerical forces require them to work in common, under constant supervision. A porter for every three clerks, separate fires and lights are items that invite expense and risks which may well be avoided in the interest of economy and security.

A serious fault in the French civil service is the absence of any permanent regulation prescribing the conditions of admission, promotion, and retirement upon pension. In all other European countries the number, rank, salary, and other conditions of civil service are regulated by law, creating the *cadre* or skeleton organization; but in France nothing of the sort has yet been successfully adopted, although it was attempted in 1843 and again in 1871. A minister at the head of any department can by simple decree change the organization, create or suppress bureaus, increase the number and alter the amount of the pay of the employees. In 1882 a law was passed to regulate these matters, but in 1884 it was reported to the Legislature that there was no attention paid to it. There is no security in France for the permanency of any of its civil-service employees. In 1848 more than thirty Inspectors General of Public Works were put on the retired list by a new Minister, and in 1853 a law was passed to regulate this, so as to avoid the abuse of the pension which is provided by law for every French employee after a certain term of service; but that is not much of a safeguard at present. The civil pensions have increased over \$8,000,000 in the ten years from 1876 to 1886, and the Budget for 1888 adds nearly half a million to meet this heavy outlay. In England there is an annual increase of pay averaging 10 per cent. for the lower and 5 per cent. for the higher class of employees, and this wholesome rule is adopted generally in Europe, thus securing the pecuniary advancement of faithful services without that personal solicitation which is one of the worst features in the French civil service. The uncertainty of the tenure of office is one of the characteristics of the modern republican government of France. Napoleon gave the greatest permanency to all civil offices, and thus secured the efficiency and fidelity of the civil as well as the military army; he established and maintained the irremovable quality of the judiciary, of the clergy, of every branch in turn; but all these barriers against tyranny and hardship have been thrown down by the present Government of France. The civil service has lost much, and the Government has gained nothing. The subordinates lose their courage, the debtor of the Government abuses his claim upon the protection of some member of the Legislature, and votes are gained or lost by favoring the neglect or worse of a poor clerk, who sees his profit in blinking at dishonesty and perhaps in being a party to it.

The important task of gathering the taxes is left largely to old soldiers, and to raw recruits gathered from those families in which the service of the State is a tradition. Heads of departments, instead of being chosen from the best employees, are largely appointed out of those in the Paris central offices, on the score of political influence with the members of the Legislature whose votes are thus secured. As far back as 1850, Berryer spoke of the ruinous effect of the public service upon the young men who chose it, instead of risking competition in life in other employment. Energy and capacity are used up in waiting for advancement, and when it does come, it is too often the reward for services other than those done in office. To throw open the

civil service to the test of public examination is recommended as the solution of the present stagnant condition of the French civil service. It is in use in the choice of residents in hospitals and teachers in high schools, and might well be applied to other departments. To make the period of entering the public service thirty years of age, and of retiring on a pension sixty, with an increase if it is asked for only at sixty-five or seventy, would secure the flower of the nation for its offices. With such a body, a very great reduction in number would prove an inducement to increased efficiency; and an actual exclusion of all political influence in making appointments and promotions would add to the security of the civil service and to the credit of the Legislature. Reform would thus be twofold—below among the workmen of the Government, and above among those who are intrusted with the high and solemn duty of legislating for the country.

EMPRESS MARIE-LOUISE.

PARIS, September 20, 1887.

THE correspondence of the Empress Marie-Louise, between 1799 and 1847, has just been published in Vienna. The anonymous editor begins his short introduction with the words, "Sic transit gloria mundi." In the memoirs of Prince Metternich are found all the details of the negotiation which ended in the marriage of Napoleon I. with the young Archduchess Marie-Louise, who was only eighteen years old. The Austrian Emperor sacrificed her in order to obtain better conditions from his conqueror; and he does not seem to have suffered too much in making the sacrifice. Archduchesses are not born to gratify the instincts and the wishes of their hearts; they are taught from childhood to obey, to accept without a murmur the husbands that are given them. Marriage is one of their duties, and often a painful duty. When Marie-Louise knew what her fate was to be, she did not protest, and—shall we say, like a heroine, or shall we say, like a good child?—she merely answered: "I am ready to sacrifice myself for my father and for my country." Her feelings must, however, have been very mixed. It was something to be the Empress of France, to be the wife of a man whom friends and enemies represented as a military genius equal to Cæsar or to Alexander. On the other hand, this Cæsar, this Bonaparte, was a usurper; he had always been represented to the young Archduchess as a monster who was not much better than a Robespierre; as a "Robespierre à cheval." He was known to be violent, arbitrary, cruel—the blood of the young Duc d'Enghien was on his hands.

In the volume which has just appeared are found the letters which the Archduchess wrote as a child, and which are addressed to her governess, the Countess of Colloredo. The correspondence begins as early as 1799. The letters are almost all in French, and are full of faults of grammar and of orthography. They are the letters of a very ordinary child—a dry account of her walks, her drives, her amusements, her lessons. She sometimes speaks of Napoleon, and calls him "the Corsican." She makes extracts from Rollin's History, learns nine languages, works at a portfolio for "dear papa," and at a petticoat for "dear mamma"; every country she sees is a pretty country, and every town a pretty town. In 1809 she begins to speak oftener of Napoleon: "Since the divorce of Napoleon I open every number of the Frankfort *Gazette* with the hope of finding the announcement of the new spouse, and I confess this delay gives me involuntary inquietude. I put my fate in the hands of divine Providence, who alone knows what can make us happy. But if my misfortune will have

it so, I am ready to sacrifice my individual happiness to the welfare of the State,—persuaded as I am that true happiness is only found in the accomplishment of duty, to the prejudice of inclination." This was written while the French Army was in Austria. Marie-Louise gives news of the war to the Countess Colloredo, of the battles around Vienna. She is herself at Buda, and writes May 29, 1809: "Sundays we go to a garden where there are many people, but we have there a horrible spectacle; we see floating in the river half-decomposed and naked Frenchmen." On the 8th of July she writes: "I hope that your prophecy will be realized, and that the House of Austria may rise from its present state; but a secret instinct makes me doubt it, and I have often thought that we are approaching the end of the world, and that the man who oppresses us is the Antichrist." She describes the life of Napoleon at Schönbrunn surrounded by his guards, while Vienna is full of wounded—there are 60,000 of them; all the convents and the hospitals, and even the Imperial Burg, are full of them.

She is still at Buda on October 24, 1809, and I find in a long letter a curious commission to buy for her a "duo pour le piano-forte, dédié à Madame Bonaparte." She is afraid this last name will not please the commissioner, "but, nevertheless, I find this piece charming." On January 10, 1810: "I believe people are naming me as the person who will replace the wife of Napoleon, but they are mistaken, as Napoleon is too much afraid of being refused, and needs still to do us much more harm before he can make such a proposition, and papa is too good to force me on a point of so much importance." The same day she writes to another: "Everybody talks of the divorce of Napoleon. I let it go on and don't care about it. I only pity the poor Princess he may choose, and I am sure that I shall not be the victim of his politics." A few days after (January 23, 1810) she writes again: "I know that at Vienna they are marrying me already with the great Napoleon. I hope this will remain mere talk. I thank you for the wishes you form on this subject; I form counter wishes in the hope that it will not take place. If it do, I think that I shall be the only person who will not rejoice at it." Three months afterwards, she writes no longer from Buda, but from Compiègne, and I doubt whether there is anything in the 'Metamorphoses' of Ovid which can compare with this transformation. She thanks her dear Victoire for "the wishes formed on the occasion of her marriage. Heaven has blessed these wishes. May you soon enjoy a happiness equal to the happiness I enjoy" (April 24, 1810). On the 10th of May, 1810, she is at Middleburg. She has seen the ocean for the first time, and picked up shells with the Queen of Westphalia. "Perhaps you are already married," she says to Victoire, "and you enjoy a happiness as unalterable as mine."

In all likelihood, all her letters to her family and friends passed under the eyes of the Imperial police and of the Emperor. This may explain the total absence of any political news in her correspondence, as well as its optimistic character. All the memoirs of the time concur in saying that Napoleon was invariably kind to her. He was proud of his young Archduchess, and when she became a mother he delighted in the young "Roi de Rome" at Prague. She writes June 11, 1812: "You cannot imagine how happy I am in finding myself in the midst of my family, for you know how much I love it; but my happiness is spoiled by my separation from the Emperor. I can only be happy near him." I could cite several such passages, which read at first like the effusions of a tender and loving heart, but which have a certain monotony that raises doubt in the mind. The terrible police of Fouché were probably looking

over her shoulder when she wrote, and she was conscious of it. She also wrote such phrases very much in the spirit of a school-girl who writes a *devoir*. Everything was artificial in her, and we must perhaps not blame her too severely when, on the day of trial, this dream of conjugal and motherly love vanished in a moment. As soon as a new duty or the appearance of a new duty was shown her, as soon as her father called for her, she ceased to be the French Empress, she became at once and without a struggle the Austrian Archduchess. She hardly tried to save appearances. She was on her way to join her husband when she was arrested and conducted to Vienna. Napoleon wrote to her and called her back; it was all over—she was an obedient daughter, she was an Austrian. It is said that when Queen Caroline asked her why she had abandoned Napoleon so easily, she defended herself by saying that she had been prevented from joining him. Queen Caroline replied: "My dear, in such a case you must jump through the window"; and Queen Caroline was the most bitter enemy of Napoleon.

It must be said that Marie-Louise had been shamefully abandoned by all the courtiers. She had arrived almost alone with her son at Blois, and afterwards at Rambouillet. There she saw her father, the Emperor Francis, who had no difficulty in convincing her that she would find a suitable asylum in Vienna. She started immediately with her son. Baron de Vitrolles says that at the first moment nobody was surprised—that Bonaparte himself felt that the protection of the Emperor Francis had many advantages for his wife and for his son. He claimed them both in 1815, but they were refused him.

"People," says Vitrolles, "have reproached this Princess for not having sacrificed everything, but they ought not to view in the same way the daughters of kings and the wives of common men. Those who are born near the throne do not find in their education the ordinary sentiments of our families. They learn from infancy that they are condemned to separate themselves from their friends, and to be given away to princes whom they never choose. The sister of Marie-Louise, the Archduchess Léopoldine, died Empress of Brazil, six thousand miles away from her family. Marie-Louise had been a victim offered as a holocaust for the salvation of her house. It would be unfair, in such conditions, to exact from princesses the duties of those who have chosen their destiny, and to exact them to the verge of heroism."

It is, perhaps, not very surprising that Marie-Louise could easily bear to be separated from Napoleon; it is more difficult to understand how she accepted so easily her separation from her son, the King of Rome, who had become the Duke of Reichstadt, remaining in Vienna while Marie-Louise was sent to Parma. The little duchy became her retreat. She was still a sovereign, but her sovereignty was proportioned to her own individuality. She was not long in choosing a favorite, a gentleman belonging to a Würtemberg family, Gen. Count Neipperg. He was over forty, and wore a black patch over one of his eyes, which he had lost in battle. He was handsome, and he became the real administrator of the duchy. She had three children by him, and married himmorganatically as soon as the death of Napoleon allowed her to do so.

On July 19, 1831, she writes to the Countess Crenneville:

"I am in a state of great uncertainty. The Piedmont *Gazette* announces so positively the death of the Emperor Napoleon that it is almost impossible for me to doubt it. I confess that I have been greatly shocked by the news. Though I never had for him any strong feeling of any kind, I cannot forget that he is the father of my son, and, instead of ill-treating me, as everybody thinks he did, always showed me great consideration, the only thing one has a right to expect in a political marriage. I am consequently much grieved, and though we ought to congratulate