embark for foreign parts: in 1894, 13,231 set sail for new and happy lands; of this total 4,613 were Germans; 4,316 Italians; and 2,008 Swiss. Their destinations were: The United States of America, Argentina, Montevideo and the West Indies. And were there no French? Yes! 1,711, nearly all of whom went elsewhere than to a French colony or possession. Clearly, Timbuctoo, the Congo, Dahomey, and Senegambia, do not draw patriots from Motherland. France is occupied with the curious problem of working colonies without colonists.

Co-related with this subject of the non-emigration of Frenchmen—only 1,711, from a population equal to that of the United Kingdom—is the meeting just held at the Sorbonne, under the presidency of M. Leon Say, who is always worth listening to, as, with much common sense, he spices his lecture with a gaiety that sometimes amounts to humour, a quality the French are strangers to. M. Say was the mouthpiece of the society for propagating the French language and keeping the well pure and undefiled. Every nation ranks its own system of palaver to be the best. One hundred and sixty-five millions of Anglo-Saxons, to-day, speak English, and in every part of the world; it is as expansive as the race itself. M. Say looks back with regret to the time when the debates in the British House of Commons were conducted in the French tongue. If the Chamber of Deputies would only try and conduct a few seances "in English as she is spoke," the budget, say, would be speedily voted. "English is the language of business; French of ideas, art and literature." As the language of making money will ever be the most popular, English is likely to rule; as to "ideas and literature," English and Germans may be excused smiling at M. Say's linguistic chauvinism; even Scandanavia claims a voice now to be heard. English and Germans, too, are, in matters of art, treading on the Kibes.

"To avoid being divorced, never get married," observes a French philosopher of the period. The new divorce law, carried by Deputy Naquet eleven years ago, reveals some curious figures; they are reliable only down to 1891, when 7,445 divorces were granted during that year. A singular fact: M. Naquet and his wife are neither separated nor divorced, have the greatest affection for each other, but do not live together; they merely exchange visits and cards. In comparing the divorce statistics of France with other countries, the common and vigorous analogy is borne out—that divorces and suicides march together. So different effects have not yet been traced to the same cause or groups of causes. The enigma is for the soul doctors to solve. And note that the same regions, the same religions, the same professions, participate in a like proportion to suicides and divorces. We are all equal.

In France it is easier to be divorced than to obtain a deed of separation—the latter is generally the overture to the former. The French Judges only accord separations when they conclude time and reflection may, perhaps, lead the parties to reconciliation. Since 1885, the annual number of divorces has doubled in France. The most trying period for the married is between the fifth and tenth year after the honeymoon. Only 3 per cent. of the wedded apply for divorce after one year; five persons have applied to break their chains after half a century of wedlock. Servants and farmers divorce least; artizans, labourers and traders the most; and the poorest in each class are the most numerous to claim divorce. It is the wife who demands the divorce most frequently; twice greater than the husband, but she is the greater sinner under the head of adultery, by one-half, and the proof of adultery is the same for both. The existence of children does not weigh in the demands for a divorce.

M. Michelin, a deputy, does not want to encourage the increase of the population, by the naturalization of foreigners. His bill is to debar such naturalized being treated as a Frenchman and a brother, till after their fourth generation; then only their children could be trusted. That will be bad for the Chinese who were naturalized in 1894; in 120 years their children's children can become president. Z.

* * *

Washington Letter.

EARLY last December, it was predicted in this correspondence that disaster to his party would result from President Cleveland's failure to spur and rally the party by a "ringing" message to Congress on the financial situation. The message came two months afterwards, but it was two months too late. Disintegration had done its work in the meantime, and there is no Democratic Senator or Representative so insignificant that does not feel himself at liberty to use the privileges of the floor to flout the nominal leader of his party. Some of them are honest victims of the cheap money delusion, others fear to separate themselves from the cheap money sentiments of rural politicians and editors, and others, not a few, are savage at having lost their jobs by the political turnover last November, and the conviction that the Administration is not going to take care of them when their terms expire a fortnight hence.

Politics is so much a trade in our public life, that the biennial rush of superseded Congressmen for administrative places is one of the blots upon the national character; but the spectacle is not unfamiliar in Canada, nor in countries across the ocean of more pretention.

In his annual message, last December, President Cleveland proposed no financial measure of his own, but announced that Mr. Secretary Carlisle had one in hand that he meant to approve, and further intimated that if the Carlisle panacea should not be found acceptable, the Democratic majorities in the two houses might provide one themselves. This was virtually giving the case away, for Mr. Carlisle, though Finance Minister, by the grace of Mr. Cleveland, had no such reputation or qualification for dealing with so recondite a question as that of finance, as to pass for an oracle with Congress. So the sequel showed, for his draft bill proved so objectionable that it was abandoned with his own consent. It may be noted here that the shiftiness of the Secretary of the Treasury, which comes from timidity and not from lack of principle, has been a great thorn in the side of the President all through the life of the present administration, and Mr. Cleveland has, on two notable occasions, shown that he felt the rankling of it, though he has refrained from going to extremes about it.

Since the swift collapse of the Carlisle scheme for restoring soundness to the monetary system of perhaps the richest and most resourceful of countries, every attempt at remedial legislation has resulted in bringing out more plainly the incapacity and anarchy that paralyses the Democratic Party. When the danger to national prosperity from an apparent inevitable drift towards the silver standard became flagrant, the President seems to have hoped that the sound-money Republicans would come to his assistance against the silverites of his and their party, as they did in 1893, in the repeal of the Silver Purchase Act. Senator Sherman, the greatest authority on finance in public life, was called into the administration councils, and for a few days the business circles of the country hoped that something might be enacted that would lift the drag from the wheels of enterprise and industry. But a successful Sherman Act would make the veteran, but still hale statesman, the popular candidate for the Republican nomination to the Presidency a year hence, a contingency that the respective supporters of Messrs. McKinley, Reed, and Harrison were ready enough to unite to spoil. Hence Mr. Sherman, who could, if he might point the way back to sound finances, has been left to flock by himself, and the McKinleyites, Reedites, and Harrisonites in Congress are trying to hark away the public on a false scent, by the cry that the currency system is all right, but that the whole trouble springs from a deficient revenue under the new Democratic tariff.

Happily, under some old statutes running back to the time of the civil war, the President has been enabled to preserve the gold standard by going into debt for the purchase of gold with which to redeem treasury notes on demand. In a purchase of a little over sixty millions of dollars he has been obliged to grant the Rothschild-Morgan syndicate a concession of sixteen millions more in the ultimate interest account than was demanded if the obligations issued could be made specifically redeemable in gold. This required Congressional action, and ten days were allowed for it in the contract. The President's recommendation to Congress to save the sixteen millions of interest money has met with a storm of objurgation, in which "the Jew bankers" and "the Judas at the White House" are coupled in no complimentary terms. The demagogues of both parties, including such gentlemanly and scholarly ones as Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge, Senator from Massachusetts, are scrambling over each other