of that of all Central America. The incursion, moreover, has shown no tendency to concentration, but has been distributed in the eastern half. The province of Havana, as a matter of fact, shows the smallest ratio of growth, 13 per cent. It is still the leading province, with a population of 1,217,254, but it is closely pressed by Santa Clara with 471,387, and an increase of 29 per cent. Oriente (formerly Santiago de Cuba), with 432,332, and an increase of 38 per cent. The highest rate of growth was in Matanzas, which now has 296,088, an increase of 42 per cent. Filadelfia del Rio's growth to 248,781 has been at the rate of 29 per cent, and Camagüey to 172,632 at the rate of 55 per cent. To these results immigration has, of course, largely contributed.

Of the new cardinal created in the recent consistory, two are Frenchmen—the Archbishops of Rheims and Marseille—and a third, to judge from his name, De Lati, is probably of the same nationality. A sudden increase in the number of French cardinals from five to eight is without significant meaning at a time when the question of the final disposition of church property resulting from the Separation Law is being taken up by the French Chamber. Of a report of the Separation Law there can be, in short, little hope. The problem that confronts the Church in France is one of organization for carrying on work under new conditions. That the heart of the Catholic Church is in close sympathy with the faithful in face of their oppressions and the great task before them, the increase in the number of French cardinals is probably one method of satisfying the devotion of church property is comparatively an unimportant matter in the view of the militant Catholic leaders; as it is, it would be a question of sacrificing little more or less of a generalship.

Organisation for the future is the watchword—organization not only for the church but for the state as well. We find such a concerted effort north, far north, for instance, by the Bishop of Rouen, some time ago. According to his statement, Catholics must organize, in the first place, to procure for the clergy the active means of subsistence, as well as for the “ensoulement” of religious liberty, for the advancement of society against dissipation through the deterioration of moral principles, and for the protection of the young. And the best mode of defence is to attack, as to foresee still further, Napoleon was decapitated only when he had ceased to act.

The Revue de Paris publishes a translation of one of Mrs. Ethel Wharton’s novellas, under the title, “Close by her heart: a memoir,” which, an inspired reader might guess, is French for “The House of Mirth.” Translations from the English are enjoying increasing popularity in Continental periodicals, especially as the “pétulante” literature of Great Britain, and, to a less extent, America, is naturally adaptable. That the Paris Figaro should announce their translation of one of Robert Hichens’ stories, may be explained by the choice of the exact which characterizes the Englishman’s taste of North Africa—a field, by the way, in which French romancers have themselves done excellent work. It is noted that the favorites for feuilleton consumption are not the Maupassants and the Mocteux, but Rupell and Conan Doyle.

Boycott as a term of approach has entered into the thought and speech of at least two generations. In India, Pulinthe as a convenient euphemist for what we do not like. In literature, in art, in all of us in society, to be a boycotter is to be something infinitely but unaccountably awful. Careful parents and anxious teachers warn the young against importing this habit. The maladies come in as from France, and there are those who maintain that we give it a more malign significance than it has in its country of origin. Prof. Barrett Wendell has recently pointed out that, the great body of students at the French universities are boycotting. So are the leading professional men; they derive from middle-class families in the provinces. Such is notoriety the case with public men in France. When the French student under Jaures from the tarantula of the Left, Charles Combes casts a glance upon them, as a habitualist in the form of a weekly, he sees the subject of analysis by a Frenchman, M. Armand, Deputy from Lyon, as a speech before a continental club, he took up the question of the “war of science.” It is, of course, “guerre a une boisson,” that the Socialists demand, but M. Armand dealt them on exactly what they mean. With as much truth as we, he contended that “the eneys of science is the essential cause and not a means to its end.” There is no outward sign, nor in fractions of a or town, by which one may detect the boycotte. To be more, there are great circles of people who may be so groupable. But even in the class there is no folly. M. Armand had a little investigation of a thousand of the most distingushed commercial houses of Lyon. Ninety-nine of them had been founded by men who were actual workers or employees shortly before, and who with their families could not even be called boycotte to-day, so rapid has been their rise, owing to their own initiative and to the free opportunity offered by the town. There is, admitted, in France as in this country, a kingdom of the bourgeoisie, but its boundaries are vague and shifting. Within it are the classes which represent actual, rather than formal, status, which do not respect, and the spirit of progress. Hence, on average, one superior being cannot get his letters patent superintendently leveled at the boycotter, but he anxiously depth his way up to when they stand, and join them. And presently to in his turn, becomes very conventional of all that is boycotting.

The career of Lord Kelvin illustrates the great opportunity and appeal which underlie science makes to capable and aspiring natures. There is the element of intense mental satisfaction. To be grappling with the problems that underlie all human problems must yield its daily thrill. But this higher type of science never loses itself in egotism. His sense of the actual is too strong for that. He is always eager to show the bearing of his most refined speculations upon the thoughts and lives of men and the march of progress. And if, as in all men of science of a liberal habits of the intellect, he is always desirous of perfect some process or to lead to the triumphs of science to the bearers of men, he has the conscientious which come from seeing his his feet upon the earth and doing service to its demands. His example shows what is really meant when we speak of the science of the science. In.Meisters, in fact, it is strikingly passed on the correctness the scientific spirit of the present and the consequence of science in principle. Then there was something almost supernatural in the idea of science. It brought up a mystical figure, looking only at the sky, and with a feet disturbingly touching the earth only to quit it. To-day, on the contrary, science is pictured as forced down with books and instruments, "pale with and labor, and pressing forward, passing on the path towards the of science, with eyes fixed ever on the earth. To-day two conceptions are not wholly irreconcilable. In Lord Kel- vin they were hostile, and our point of view that something of the old was felt for the last reservous itself in the case of such a brainiac as he. He was seen to be one "commending with the skin." Yet he would emerge from this closely and display a kind of magic control of the forces of nature. Thus both reverence and gratitude attend him. The peculiar impress he made upon his time, such subduedness of Stanton as were his, could scarcely be paralleled in any other calling.