

In his speech at Milwaukee at the beginning of the campaign, Senator Spooner said: "That the Bennett Law is a perfect law I believe none of its friends instig; that it is not susceptible of constructions which, if enforced, would lead to harm and injustice, I do not find it necessary to-night to controvert, and I do not know that the friends, so called, of that law are disposed to controvert it."

At the opening of the late session of the Legislature, which had a Democratic majority in both branches, a bill was introduced for the unconditional repeal of the Bennett Law. Upon the passage of this bill, only 14 out of the 83 Republicans in the Assembly voted against it, one other being paired. Of the 14 Republicans in the Senate, 10 voted against it. In other words, the Bennett Law was repealed by a vote of 83 to 14 in the lower house, and of 20 to 10 in the upper house. A few days later, a new compulsory law was presented by the Democratic majority to take the place of all previous legislation upon this subject. The Republican members of the two houses held a joint caucus and voted unanimously to support the Democratic bill, although several of their number had already introduced compulsory-attendance bills.

In the conduct of the campaign the Democratic State Central Committee waged a vigorous warfare against the ultra-protectionism of the Republican party. They secured the help of Roger Q. Mills, Wm. MacAdoo, Wm. M. Springer, and John M. Black, and did their utmost to secure the services of Senator Carlisle, Frank Hurd, David A. Wells, and many other distinguished tariff-reform advocates. Reckless extravagance of the Republicans in State expenditures and the private appropriation of interest upon public funds by their State Treasurers also had great weight in determining the result. It is not denied that recent school legislation was an important factor, but the political revolution in Wisconsin was but little, if any, greater than in many other States. The assertion that the issue turned upon the question of teaching English in the schools seems, therefore, a gross misstatement of the facts. The only question affecting the schools was that of the right of the State to control instruction in private schools. I deem it but justice to your readers that this false impression should be corrected.

I enclose copies of the Bennett Law and the new compulsory law. O. E. WELLS.

MADISON, May 14, 1891.

THE ATTEMPT ON THE TZESAREVITCH.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The dailies of this date contain news of the attempt made near Kioto to assassinate the Tzesarevitch. The news is probably startling to the people of this country, but is not at all surprising to those cognizant of recent affairs in Japan. Ever since it was known that the Tzesarevitch contemplated visiting Japan, the matter has been a topic of discussion in the vernacular press. Most of the Japanese journals hailed the visit with delight, and were inclined to think that it would be productive of greater amity and closer relations between the two countries, and of much benefit to Japan in various ways. But in a few of the newspapers respectable attempts were made to arouse ill-feeling and suspicion; in fact, it was actually charged that the Tzesarevitch was to visit Japan as a spy.

It must also be borne in mind that the Japanese have always been jealous, even afraid, of Russia. The latter, ever since her

ships, about 100 years ago, began to encroach on the northern island, Yezo, of the Japanese Empire, has been an object of considerable suspicion. By dint of more or less finesse in negotiation, Russia obtained from Japan the island of Saghalien in exchange for the bleak Kurile Islands. This fear of Russian encroachments, by the way, has been one obstacle in the path of treaty revision. I was informed by a well-educated Japanese that one reason why Japan hesitated about giving foreigners the right to own property in the Empire, was because she feared that Russians would buy up the island of Yezo and large tracts in other portions of the land!

The Japanese have also looked with an eye of suspicion on the progress of the Greek Church in Japan. Inasmuch as that body is a state institution, controlled and patronized by the Russian Government, it has been considered a dangerous element in Japan. The magnificent Greek cathedral, towering on Suruga Dai above the city of Tokio, and thus higher even than the imperial palace, is an eye-sore to the Japanese. The deep and widespread influence of Bishop Nicolai and the Greek Church is dreaded as the source of a future political influence.

Whether these opinions are well founded or not, they have been used by demagogues and fanatics to stir up a feeling of distrust of Russia, and were employed recently to arouse suspicion concerning the object of the visit of the Tzesarevitch. These suspicions were not, of course, shared by the Japanese Government, or by intelligent citizens. When the writer left Japan, less than a month ago, elaborate preparations were then making to receive the Tzesarevitch with the respect due to him and the courtesy due from so polite a nation as Japan.

Although the despatches dub the assassin "a Buddhist fanatic, as seems most probable, or a Nihilist disguised as a Japanese," it is quite probable that he was a Shinto fanatic. Very likely he was one of the *Soshi*, a class of young ruffians who, conceited beyond their education, deem themselves called upon to avenge every "insult" to the dignity of the nation. They have a false idea of the *Yamato-damashii* (Japanese spirit) and of true patriotism, and are a disgrace to Japan. It was such an one who killed Viscount Mori for an alleged "insult" to the Shinto shrines of Ise. It was such an one who attempted, but unsuccessfully, to assassinate Count Okume for presuming to negotiate treaties beneath the "dignity" of the Japanese people. It is not surprising, then, that similar fanaticism attempted the life of the Tzesarevitch; but it is unfortunate that it still exists in so progressive a country as Japan. ERNEST W. CLEMENT.

MAY 13, 1891.

THE FRÉMONT LEGEND.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The recent discussions of the seizure of California in 1846, carried on in the *Century Magazine*, in the *Atlantic*, in the *Overland Monthly*, and elsewhere, would naturally seem to have exhausted the possible sources of information, or at all events the patience of the public; and I should not add another word to the lengthy controversy were it not that, quite unexpectedly, I have just found in a document, whose full text was never before in my hands, an additional piece of original evidence bearing upon the assertion made in the final statement of the late Gen. Frémont, as published in the *Century* for April, 1891. By the courtesy of the editor of the *Century*, who procured this document at Washington, I am enabled to use

the same here, since he has made me a gift of it.

In the mentioned paper, entitled the "Conquest of California," Gen. Frémont, just before his death, put upon record his final version of the events of the "Bear Flag Affair." This version, as it stands, differs materially from earlier accounts given by Gen. Frémont, but such comparisons are beside the present purpose. Most noteworthy, however, in the paper of Gen. Frémont, as posthumously edited, is the addition of an expression of opinion, by the late Mr. George Bancroft, to the effect that the actions of Frémont in California, in the spring of 1846, were, although of course not precisely contemplated by the distant Cabinet at Washington, still authorized by the tenor of the famous instructions conveyed to the young engineer by Lieut. Gillespie when the two met at Klamath Lake, May 9, 1846. "If," says George Bancroft, in a letter to Frémont—"if I had been in your place, I should have considered myself bound to do what I saw I could to promote the purpose of the President." This purpose, as the secret agent of the Government, Lieut. Gillespie undoubtedly told Frémont, was "to obtain possession of California." Now such an expression of Bancroft's opinion as the foregoing is, carrying as it does both the great authority of his name as historian and the added weight of the fact that he was then the Secretary of the Navy, must seem, of course, to a reader who does not understand the facts of the case, highly conclusive in Gen. Frémont's favor. And therefore it is that my new document, with a few words of introduction, may still be serviceable to the cause of historic truth.

The historical facts, as I have several times before this had occasion to show, are that every agent of the United States who had anything to do with California received, in advance of the declaration of war against Mexico, orders to do everything to conciliate the Californians; that these orders were communicated to Frémont by Gillespie; that the United States Government, by the personal order of the President, was engaged in April and May, 1846, in an intrigue, carried on by Consul Larkin, with the Californians for a peaceful surrender of their territory in disregard of the central Mexican authority; that the orders of Bancroft to Commodore Sloat, in command of our squadron on the Pacific Coast, were in strict accord with this design, which Secretary Bancroft himself unquestionably shared and cooperated in; and that this design was thwarted by Frémont, who, after he had heard Gillespie's instructions, proceeded almost forthwith to arouse the American settlers in the Sacramento Valley by false reports of dangers from Californian hostility; thereupon attacked the Californians in an irregular warfare before knowing of the outbreak of hostilities in the East; wrought considerable mischief; and thenceforth laid claim to the glory of the "conquest of California." The Cabinet at home, Bancroft included, were, however, deceived by an artful tale, sent home in letters to Senator Benton by his son-in-law, and not rendered any more historical by the Senator in the retelling. All this is a matter of substantial proof. What the reader will, however, here desire to know is, how George Bancroft, forty years later, could still so misinterpret the facts as to express so cordial an approval of Frémont's actually disobedient and mischievous conduct as is contained in Bancroft's letters to the latter in 1886.

The answer, of course, is that Bancroft never

had occasion to scrutinize as historian what occurred in distant California, and undoubtedly took his facts in large part from Gen. Frémont's own statement. How true this is, becomes evident at once when one considers two of the statements made by Bancroft in the private letters to Frémont which are quoted in the article referred to. One of these statements runs thus, speaking of what Gillespie communicated to Frémont at the meeting at Klamath Lake: "It was officially made known to you that your country was at war; and it was so made known expressly to guide your conduct." This statement cannot have been made by Bancroft after any careful review of the record, for it is one that a mere comparison of dates shows to be absurd. Gillespie received his instructions at the end of October, 1845, and left soon after for California. War broke out at about the very moment of his interview with Frémont at Klamath Lake, and this fact was unknown in California, even at Monterey, until the arrival there of Capt. Mervine, late in June, 1846, in the ship *Cyana*. North of San Francisco Bay the news of war came to hand much later. The despatches brought by Gillespie to Larkin and Sloat show that in the autumn of 1845 nobody at Washington knew or could know when the contemplated war with Mexico would break out. Fortune might have prevented it altogether, and both Commodore Sloat's and Consul Larkin's instructions were worded accordingly. It is, therefore, impossible that Bancroft can have used the words above quoted with any historical deliberation, or after any careful review of the past.

The other just-mentioned passage of Bancroft's private letter of approval, written to Frémont in 1886, runs: "The truth is, no officer of the Government had anything to do with California but the Secretary of the Navy so long as I was in the Cabinet." Alas, strange fate that should thus beset our greatest historian on one of the very few occasions when he ever wrote about his own public career! Nothing could better illustrate the danger of trusting to memory after many years. The same number of the *Century* that contains the article from which this passage is quoted, also contains the full text of the despatch from Secretary Buchanan to Consul Larkin which Gillespie brought, and which, speaking in the President's name, and with frequent mention of the President's express and official desires, embodies the actual plan of the Administration for the acquisition of California!

Two absolutely demonstrable errors in so short a space as that of the brief passages quoted from Bancroft's private letters to Frémont, show very clearly that the late historian was not speaking *ex cathedra* when he wrote these words of friendly approval. The well-known legend of the Frémont "conquest" he had heard; he certainly never had examined its sources. For the rest, all the other statements that he makes, in the same place, as to his own and the Cabinet's views in those days concerning California, the importance of getting it, the need of promptness and discretion, and the rest, are indeed, accurate enough. They have long been well-known matters. Properly understood, they form part of the case against Frémont.

This case then reduces itself to the following: Gillespie, as we now know, brought orders which he delivered to Sloat at Mazatlan. These orders related to the action of the Commodore to be taken in case he heard of the outbreak of war between the two countries. Gillespie also brought a despatch from Buchanan to Consul Larkin. This despatch is now

printed in full in the *Century* for April. Gillespie brought no other official orders addressed to any one in California. He acquainted Frémont at Klamath Lake with the contents of these instructions, but brought no official order directed to Frémont personally. Frémont, who formerly denied to me absolutely that he was ever acquainted with Larkin's orders, and who insisted upon this denial in a statement deliberately made to me, as historical student, for publication in my own book on California history, has for the first time admitted, in his final paper in the *Century*, that he *did* know of the Larkin despatch, and received it from Gillespie. But he adds that this despatch "was in conflict with our own instructions," so that he and Gillespie, not being under Buchanan's official authority, "dropped this idea [i. e., the plan of "conciliating the Californians]" from our minds," although, as the Larkin despatch itself shows, this "idea" was the President's own. Now these, "our own instructions," can only be the instructions of Secretary Bancroft, to whose official department Frémont himself belonged as little as he did to Buchanan's, but whose instructions to Sloat and Gillespie he shall have regarded as more warlike than were Buchanan's to Larkin.

Is this final version of the Frémont romance more authentic than any earlier version? Let the answer be the text of Bancroft's actual letter to Sloat, dated October 17, 1845, a letter never before printed. The date, as will be seen by comparison, is the same as that of Buchanan's despatch to Larkin. The plan embodied is also the same. The copy here given is officially certified as correct by the Department at Washington, and contains all of the despatch that relates to California—the omitted orders relating to matters connected with the exploration of the Columbia River, and to other matters wholly immaterial for the present inquiry. The original copy was sent, it will be seen, by Commodore Stockton, around the Horn. Gillespie, as secret agent, crossed Mexico with the despatches not written, but carried in his memory, so that they might be safe in case of his detention, and so that he might be able in case of successful passage through Mexico to get the official undertakings in California sooner under way:

U. S. NAVY DEPARTMENT.

WASHINGTON, Oct. 14, 1845. }

Com. John D. Sloat, Comm'g U. S. Squadron Pacific.

COMMODORE: This communication will be delivered to you by Commodore Stockton, who takes the *Congress* to the Pacific to reinforce your squadron.

In the judgment of this Department it is expedient that, as soon as practicable after the receipt of it, you should transfer your broad pennant to the *Congress*. Commodore Stockton you will then transfer to the command of the *Savannah*, subject to your orders. You may retain Commander DuPont in duties appropriate to his rank on board the *Congress*, or you may confer the command of the *Congress* under you on Captain Mervine and transfer Commander DuPont to the *Cyana*.

In the event of actual hostilities between the Mexican Government and our own, you will so dispose of your whole force as to carry out most effectually the objects specified in the instructions forwarded to you from the Department in view of such a contingency. Should peace continue, you will still retain your squadron off the coast of Mexico and Oregon.

You will communicate frequently with our Consul at Monterey, and will ascertain as exactly as you can the nature of the designs of the English and French in that region, the temper of the inhabitants, their disposition towards the United States, and their relations towards the central governments of Mexico. You will do everything that is proper to conciliate towards our country the most friendly regard of the people of California.

The length of time requisite to transmit to you despatches from this Department renders it necessary that you should judge for yourself, on the best information that you can obtain, whether it will be safe to detach an exploring party from your squadron.

Should hostilities be not likely to occur, you will detach a part of your squadron to display the flag of the United States in the County. To that end you may select a sloop and a smaller vessel if convenient, and attach to them, for the time being, such professors and other officers as will give the best results to the enterprise. You will, in your instructions to them, warn them of the dangers that attend the entrance to the Columbia River, that they may be on their guard against the swell of the ocean and the bar at the mouth of the harbor, and may run no risk with a vessel of the United States. When the ships are within the Columbia River, some of the officers should seize the occasion to visit the valley of the Willamet. They should make particular inquiries as to the disposition of the people who reside in those regions, the extent, character, and tendency of emigration from the United States and from other quarters, and generally they should collect such information as will aid in the Department fully with the condition and prospects of that territory. After this has been done a party may proceed by land to Puget's Sound, or some safe harbor you may designate in the Straits Juan de Fuca, and the vessel detached for the exploring party may meet them there.

The object of this order is to perfect the knowledge of the country of Oregon and to cheer our citizens in that region by the presence of the American flag; and, if peace continues, you will consider this the most important duty assigned to your squadron. If, contrary to present expectation, a state of war should exist, you will endeavor to persuade the crews of the *Savannah*, the *Warren*, and the *Levant* to prolong the terms of their enlistment in order that they may remain in co-operation with the rest of your force. But if affairs remain in their present attitude, you may direct Commodore Stockton to take charge of those three vessels and to bring them to the United States in season for the discharge of their crews within the period of their enlistment. Commodore Stockton, on taking the command of the returning squadron, may hoist his broad pennant. You may direct him on their return, if he can do so without material delay, to visit on his way places on the Mexican Coast where there may be opportunity of gathering useful information or conciliating kindly dispositions.

You will take care that the laws of the United States for the government of the navy and general orders in pursuance of them are strictly and sincerely respected and obeyed.

Very respectfully, GEORGE BANCROFT.

These, then, the orders of Bancroft to Sloat, sent in October, 1845, by the secret messenger, were "our instructions" which, according to Frémont's final statement, were in conflict with the letter of Buchanan to Larkin, and which authorized the means that Frémont thereupon took "to carry out the intentions of the President." These means consisted in that irregular attack upon the peaceful Californians whose mischievous consequences are now well known, an attack which was itself a distinct hindrance to the acquisition of California, endangering all our interests in that Territory. The attack was, indeed, opposed to Consul Larkin's plans. It was "authorized" by a despatch which told Sloat to "communicate frequently" with Consul Larkin and to "conciliate" the Californians.

It is also to be noticed that these same instructions seem to have authorized Capt. Frémont to write to Commander Montgomery of the *Portsmouth*, then in San Francisco Bay, at the moment when the young explorer was about to engage in the irregular hostilities of the "Bear Flag affair." There was, of course, good reason why Frémont had still to conceal his hand, in order that he might later have a chance to attribute his action to the necessities of self-defence. What he wrote to Montgomery, therefore, ran at one point thus (see *Century* for March, 1891): "The nature of my instructions, and the peaceful nature of our operations, do not contemplate any active hostility on my part, even in the event of war between the two countries." If one compares these words with the final account of Gen. Frémont concerning the "conquest," one sees afresh with what manner of romance one has to deal.

I regret, then, very much that our great historian's name has been made use of, so soon after his death, for so unhistorical a purpose

as that of the posthumously published Frémont narrative. Nobody respects Bancroft's memory more than does the present writer. His actual part in the seizure of California has long been known through other of his despatches, all of a similar tenor. He repeatedly instructed Sloat to seize the defenseless California ports at the outbreak of war, but to keep the inhabitants neutral if he could, to conciliate, and not to assail them, to show irresistible force, but to show every kindness as well. This policy Frémont, who was, indeed, not under Bancroft's immediate orders, lawlessly thwarted for his own glory, whereof he got a good deal. I should myself never think of attacking the Frémont legend so often, were it not so unsubstantially immortal. I shall rejoice, indeed, if ever the pale ghost ceases to walk in broad daylight. The twilight regions of our historical consciousness in this country will probably never be rid of it.

JOSIAH ROYCE.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., May 10, 1891.

Notes.

D. C. HEATH & Co., Boston, are about to issue a 'Comparative View of the Executive and Legislative Departments of the Governments of the United States, France, England, and Germany,' by John Wenzel, Assistant Librarian of the College of Liberal Arts, Boston University. The arrangement is by parallel columns.

Lee & Shepard announce a second series of the 'Speeches and Lectures of Wendell Phillips,' uniform with the first series; a reissue of 'The Life and Works of Horace Mann,' in five volumes; and 'Gestures and Attitudes, based on the Delsarte Philosophy of Expression,' by Edward B. Warman, with illustrations.

T. Y. Crowell & Co. announce 'Famous English Statesmen,' by Mrs. Sarah K. Bolton; 'A Score of Famous Composers,' by Nathan Haskell Dole; 'Elements of Socialism,' by Prof. R. T. Ely; and vols. iv. and v. of Sybel's 'Founding of the German Empire by William I.'

Houghton, Mifflin & Co. will shortly publish the authorized Life of Robert Browning by Mrs. Sutherland Orr, in two volumes; 'Lewis Cass,' by Prof. A. C. McLaughlin, in the "American Statesmen" series; and 'Ryle's Open Gate,' a story by Mrs. Susan T. Moore.

A translation of Dr. Richard Falckenberg's 'History of Philosophy,' from Nikolaus von Kues to the Present Day,' is about to appear with the imprint of Henry Holt & Co.

Macmillan & Co. have in press 'Renaissance,' a volume of verse with illustrations by Walter Crane.

Worthington Co. will publish directly 'The Rector of St. Luke's,' from the German of Marie Barnard, by Elsie L. Lathrop.

'My Official Wife' is the title of a novel by Col. Richard Henry Savage, to be brought out by the Howe Publishing Company.

A study of Proudhon, 'Ein Beitrag zur sozialen Reform,' by Dr. A. Mühlberger, is in the press of G. J. Göschen, Stuttgart, together with a work in which Dr. Cauer of Tübingen maintains that Aristotle cannot have been the author of the 'Constitution of Athens.'

Just four years ago we were reviewing, in the original French, Boutmy's 'Développement de la Constitution et de la Société Politique en Angleterre,' a work remarkable for its freshness not less than for its evidence of knowledge, grasp, and research. Under the

simpler title, 'The English Constitution,' this has now been translated by Isabel M. Eaden, and published, with a commendatory note of introduction by Sir Frederick Pollock, by Macmillan & Co. It makes a compact, handsome volume of 212 pages.

Little, Brown & Co., Boston, have issued, from the original plates, a second edition of the 'Life and Letters of Wilder Dwight, Lieutenant-Colonel Second Massachusetts Infantry Volunteers,' which first appeared in 1867. Ever since the first impression was exhausted, we are told, and we can well believe, there has been a yearly demand for the work, which could not be met. This demand was largely personal, we suppose, but the perennial interest in our civil war might also account for it, and this tribute of affection is as good an exhibition of the highest type of Northern soldier, associated with the highest type of Northern regiment, as could anywhere be found. Col. Dwight was a member of the class of 1853 of Harvard College—a class not a little distinguished for its varied and conspicuous talents, but having also a marked connection with the College subsequent to graduation. Many of his fellow-officers were Harvard men, and, as they figure in his letters, help to make this emphatically a "Harvard Memorial Biography." Dwight left the law to enter the army and lay down his life finally at Antietam. One is made acquainted with a singularly lovable and high-minded personality, and in his letters gets many graphic glimpses of the progress and conduct of the war. The story cannot be read without emotion.

A revival of equal age with the foregoing is the new edition of the 'Journal of Maurice de Guérin' (Dodd, Mead & Co.), but in this case we have also a new translation, by Jessie P. Frothingham. We have compared it with Mr. Fisher's version (1897), now out of print, and find it more literal and on the whole more felicitous. Sainte-Beuve's memoir is prefixed, and the French edition followed is the twentieth. The book would be a pretty one but for the untasteful binding.

A slight examination of the articles in 'Appleton's Dictionary of New York and its Vicinity,' of which the current issue is the thirteenth, makes good the claim to annual revision upon the title-page. But a reader test is the comparison of folios, which shows that the work is not printed from patched plates, but is kept in type for perfect fluidity in modifying and remaking. This is the only practicable course in the case of a work which has to undergo so many even if slight changes. The Dictionary needs no fresh praise. One of the new entries, "Labor Organizations," is a valuable summary account of the fortunes of the Central Labor Union.

'A Lady's Letters from Central Africa,' by Jane F. Moir (Macmillan & Co.), is a very entertaining account of a recent journey from the Shiré Highlands to Ujiji on Lake Tanganyika, by the manager of the African Lakes Company and his wife. At this latter place the travellers were the guests of the leading Arab slave-trader, and an animated description is given of the merry, but curious and impertinent, women of his household. Some distance to the south of this is Karema, a station of Cardinal Lavigerie's "White Fathers." Here, under the care of five men, are several hundred boys and girls who have been bought from the natives or the Arabs when from three to five years old. Each child is taught to work, rarely to read, and "each hoes its little bit of garden, and they are brought up strictly as Roman Catholics," knowing no other religion or superstition.

When old enough, the boys and girls live in separate villages near the convent, while the married couples live in still another village a little farther off. This system seems to be far better suited to the natives than that of the Protestant missionaries, "who, so far, have little hold on the people, though they work bravely." Two of these latter "said to us, 'Don't be surprised if some time you find the whole shores of Tanganyika Roman Catholic.'" An attractive picture is drawn of the beautiful country at the northern end of Lake Nyassa, where lovely villages nestle amid endless banana groves. "It is like walking through one vast palm-house or winter-garden, and the beautifully made cow-houses and huts are like ornamental summer houses." "The people, of whom there are thousands, are, almost without exception, very handsome. Especially at Makuya's the men are magnificent, the larger proportion of them being over six feet high and splendidly made." From these letters, which were not written for publication, it is very evident that the Scotch Lakes Company is doing an admirable work in developing the resources of the country through which it trades, as well as in checking the slave-trade. The work may usefully be read in connection with Prof. Drummond's 'Tropical Africa.'

A shower of new medical books, popular as well as technical, is a constant consequence of an epidemic. One of these, dropping from the gripe of last year, is 'Influenza and Common Colds,' by W. T. Fernie, M.D. (London: Percival & Co.). The therapeutics of the author, "bound by the tenets of no particular school," are those of regular medicine very highly flavored, or diluted, by homeopathy. In view of the recurrence of the pandemic, there is a natural tendency to such reading; but, except in minor disabilities and in the most arbitrary way, it seems that the cure of disease is a questionable branch of secular knowledge, whereas avoidance may always suitably be taught. The experienced practitioner might take one or two hints from this little work, but it is doubtful whether the average layman would profit much by it, except as to the early control of colds in the head.

J. W. Bouton sends us the Illustrated Catalogue of the Salon of the Champs-Élysées, which opened on May Day. Secession has done nothing to diminish the bulk of the exhibition, but its quality cannot of course be safely inferred from these pictorial memoranda. We remark a pen-sketch by V. Parlaghy, after his portrait of Dr. Windthorst, which looks to be carefully enough done to have value as a likeness in itself. E. Renouf has made the Brooklyn Bridge his theme. The inevitable Jeanne d'Arc of this exhibition is found in the statuary department, and shows the Maid vowing herself to the salvation of France.

In the *Scottish Geographical Magazine* for May is the first of an important series of papers on "Britannic Confederation." This is by Sir John Colomb, M. P., and is devoted to a general survey of existing conditions. His main point is, that, under the present system, the colonies, which are practically independent except in their foreign relations, contribute absolutely nothing to the defence of the Empire. Formerly this was of little consequence, but, with the recent extraordinary growth of their commerce, it has become a question of the first importance as to whether this burden should not be divided. The present sea-trade of the United Kingdom is estimated at \$744,000,000, that of the colonies at \$460,000,000. But more than half of this, \$273,000,000, is carried on with foreign countries, and in it the United Kingdom has no in-