from the French of Paris than the Bostonian's English differs from the Baltimorean's. It is a mistake to think that outside of Paris, a patois is generally spoken. This common error comes from the American traveller's usual avoidance of the provinces in his journeys. It is true that every French province, almost every French commune, even, has its patois; but this is consinued to the uneducated classes. If a patois is spoken in the kitchen, good French is the language of the drawing-room in every part of France.

Half an hour beyond La Bourboule the diligence sets us down in the bustling square of Mont-Dore, and upon the Dordogne River near its mountain sources. We are at an elevation of 3,445 feet above sea-level; excepting only Barèges, Mont-Dore is the most elevated mineral spring in France. I may add that it has another distinction: its name is misspelled with a more curious persistence than that of any other spring. Since the name of Gustave Doré became familiar it has not been given to any English or American compositor to abstain from adding the acute accent to the last vowel of Mont-Dore; even in the Index of the usually accurate Poole this error occurs. At first sight the mountain village of Mont-Dore has a somewhat severe aspect; the roofs of it are covered with hewn stone instead of tiles to resist the winter storms. Its two hundred houses are huddled together on the right bank of the upper valley of the Dordogne, still an infant stream, not far from its point of origin in the cascades of the Dore and the Dogne. Some thirteen hundred people live here all the year round; the number of the summer guests is several times as large. On either hand rise fantastically shaped mountains. The top of the Pic de Sancy, a few miles away, 6,181 feet high, is the most elevated point of the mountains of Central France. The springs have been known from great antiquity; here the Arverni had their piscinx before history began, and here the Romans disported themselves after the fatigues of oppressing the Gauls. Then, during the dark ages, Mont Dore, the Mons Duranius of the Romans, was forgotten; for a thousand years you will find but one mention of the place in all literature. This occurs in a letter written by the good Bishop of Clermont, Sidonius Apollinarius (agnomen of prandial suggestiveness), in the fifth century to his friend Oppert; in this epistle he refers to the springs of Mont-Dore at the Calentes

Early in the present century these waters began to resume their ancient importance. The inflow of patients led to the construction of new establishments. The new establishments in turn attracted new patients, convincing many doubting invalids that they could really afford the luxury of being ill. Hotels sprang up rapidly; and now, in place of the mountain rudeness, one finds at this station every convenience, and nearly every luxury, that the most determined and self-regarding invalid can desire, besides every means for the administration of the thermal waters. Baths, douches, "pulverizations," piscinæ, and all the modern therapeutic bathing appliances are here developed to their fullest perfection, and I need not attempt their description.

The climate of Mont-Dore is a true mountain climate, not dissimilar to that of Davos or of Saint-Moritz in Switzerland—that is to say, it is cool in the morning and evening, and generally warm during the day, with variations of the thermometer almost but not quite as sudden and trying as those of New York, Philadelphia, or Boston. But it is the tonic coolness and the agreeable warmth of the mountain air, without the seaside humidity. The season lasts from mid-June to mid-September; July and August are perhaps the pleasanter months to choose, though the crowd is

then greater. There are charming days in early September; but after the 15th, winter is apt to leap down any night from the heights of the Pic de Sancy. At the elevation of Mont-Dore the mean barometer is but 26.58 inches, and this lessened pressure is well recognized as a beneficial influence in certain diseases which are specially treated at this station. In pulmonary phthisis the effect of elevation is still a controverted question among physicians. I am of those who believe that lessened atmospheric pressure is almost always beneficial in the earlier stages of phthisis and before there is any danger of homorrhage. In the later stages lessened pressure is mechanically dangerous, bringing too great a strain upon the pulmonary tissue, and inducing arterial ruptures. But it is only the earlier stages of phthisis. that ever should be treated at Mont-Dore.

The springs are nine in number, with a daily yield of 100,000 gallons. Eight of these are thermal, ranging from 38° to 45° C. (100° to 113° Fah.); the other, the Sainte-Marguerite spring, flows at 101/2° C. (51° Fah.). This spring contains little but carbonic-acid gas, and is used mainly in diluting wine. All these springs have their source in the rock at the foot of a mountain of granitic lava, the Angle. Their mineralization is not strong; they contain the bicarbonates of lime and soda, besides arsenic and many other less important constituents. The waters are taken intus vel extra. Internally a glass every half hour until the noon breakfast is the ordinary form of exhibition. As baths, inhalations, sprayings, the application is a very elaborate affair, and choice is made among the appliances according to the indication of the special case. Taken internally the waters quicken the pulse, awake the functions of the skin, and increase the bronchial secretions. At first they cause a freer expectoration in sufferers from pulmonary disease; then, in favorable cases, they check or stop it. After drinking the waters for a fortnight the moment of what is called "saturation" arrives; the appetite is for the first time checked, aversion for the mineral waters is felt; it is the moment to discontinue their use. A longer sojourn among the hills will help to complete the cure, unless the patient is possessed with the restlessness which leads him to fatiguing changes of habitat during the summer.

And for what complaints is the cure at Mont-Dore to be prescribed?

(1.) Affections of the respiratory organs are the main diseases treated at Mont-Dore. The reader need not be reminded that of all diseases of maturity these form the most extensive and the most fatal class. They include bronchitis, laryngitis, asthma, pharyngitis, catarrh, both bronchial and post-nasal; and last, but most important of all, phithisis, here treated in its early stages.

Chronic bronchitis is one of the affections most commonly and most satisfactorily treated at Mont-Dore. There are usually complications, as with asthma, pulmonary emphysema, dilatation of the bronchial tubes. Such cases are often sent as a last resort to Mont-Dore; but it rarely happens that a material improvement is not effected by the thermal treatment. The inhalations act directly upon the bronchial mucus, and check its secretion; and as a drink, the waters have a tonic and alterant effect.

With "dry" or "nervous" asthma, that obdurate form, namely, of this persistent disease, which is caused by muscular spasm of the smaller bronchial tubes, a three-weeks' course at Mont-Dore gives relief, sometimes cure; but in a certain number of cases repeated yearly visits are necessary. My friend Dr. Emond of Mont-Dore reports a considerable number of such cases, in which a perfect cure was brought about. In moist asthma the results are still more encouraging. In a case known to me—that of a lady who was sont from New York to Mont-Dore a

few years ago by one of our best-known city surgeons—the most persistent symptoms were entirely cured; in this instance there was much dyspacea. Chronic bronchitis and laryngitis, or "clergyman's sore throat," finds here, as at Royat, an excellent sanitarium; the difference being in the cooler climate of Mont-Dore, which for certain constitutions is more powerfully tonic than that of the other station.

Post-nasal catarrh, the most distinctively American of diseases in its frequency, and one of the most stubborn to treat, will seldom succumb to anything but energetic local measures. The tissues that are affected must be attacked; and these local applications require to be supplemented, in cases where there is a scrofulous, arthritic, or other constitutional tendency, by tonics and by general treatment. At Mont-Dore, at Aix-les-Bains, and at some other smaller places, both local and constitutional treatment are combined successfully; it is for the physician to choose among these places, according to his patient's special need. They are the appointed sanatoria for this distressing disease.

It remains to speak of phthisis, the master-malady of northern countries—the cachexia with which physicians and pathologists have struggled with but partial success. The bacillus theory of the origin of the disease remains to be proved by the pathologists; the cure of the disease, when once it is fully established, remains to be sought. It is a rare, though an occasional, triumph of the physician; and in some constitutions nature triumphs over even well-advanced cases, and leaves the sufferer of early years to a healthy old age. But the experience of nine cases out of ten is that the malady, if checked at all, must be checked before it has made much headway.

There is no doubt that in many cases this can be done. My own observation leads me to believe that pulmonary consumption could be arrested in four or five cases out of ten if it were taken early in hand, and if the proper conditions could be commanded for the patient. But the lot in life of the majority of sufferers makes this command of favoring conditions impossible. A cure that requires the entire change of the patient's way of living is not one that can be generally available; sometimes it is impossible on account of the expense required, sometimes impracticable on account of the invalid's natural unwillingness to suffer transplantation. One of my patients once said to me, "I would rather die in the North than live in the South." But, after all, these cases are exceptional; and summer transplantation to spots like Mont-Dore, Eaux-Bonnes in the Pyrenees, or Aix-les-Bains, is one of many beneficial influences that will sometimes arrest the early stages of consumption. In the later, the invalid is generally the better for staying at home. Exile, under sentence of death, is the most cruel of prescriptions. It is of little use to leave home unless the invalid can command the conditions of contentment, as well as of comfort abroad.

(2.) It remains to add that rheumatism in its milder forms, nervous paralysis, and uterine derangements not depending upon grave lesions, are all treated at Mont-Dore, and sometimes cured. Drs. Emond, Cohadon, and Alvin may be consulted with full confidence.

TITUS MUNSON COAN.

AFTER THE BATTLE.

LONDON, June 8, 1886.

"Tellers for the noes, Mr. Brand and Mr. Caine." The House of Commons never refuses a mild joke, and the odd juxtaposition of names sent honorable members smiling and chuckling into their respective lobbies. Up to the last moment, everything was possible; and when the

clerk handed to Mr. Brand the slip of paper which is the symbol of victory, there arose a storm of excitement which carried everything before it. No such scene has been witnessed since 1866, when a combination of Whigs and Tories threw out Mr. Gladstone's Reform Bill. "These violent delights have violent ends"; the Whig victory of 1866 was followed by the Conservative surrender of 1867, when Tories and Radicals combined to set up household suffrage. Some of the older Liberal members sat silent last night while the two parties opposite were trying to shout one another down. Perhaps they were trying to discover which of the jubilant ex-Ministers on the front Opposition bench would rise in 1887 to introduce an Irish Government bill conceived in the spirit of Tory democracy. The Government accepted defeat without any sign of emotion; they must have known what was coming, and their plans must be already almost matured. Will they dissolve or resign? It is generally believed at present that Mr. Gladstone will resign, and that Lord Hartington may be induced to form a government; but dissolution cannot be long delayed. Setting aside the enthusiasts on both sides, there is but little expectation that a general election will produce a decisive change in the balance of parties. Even if Mr. Gladstone were to come back with a compact majority of British home-rulers, it is almost certain that the House of Lords will reject, once at least, any measure of home rule sent up from the Commons. We have before us the far from pleasant prospect of a series of short and barren Parliaments; the strife of parties and sections may continue until at last, in sheer weariness, we accept some unsatisfactory compromise of the Irish question. For the Liberal party the outlook is very gloomy. We are most seriously divided, and instead of discussing quietly the principles now at issue, we are wrangling furiously over the question who is to blame for what has happened. The Associations are all for making an example of Mr. Chamberlain; but Mr. Chamberlain is not in the least frightened. He goes about with the air of a good man basking in the sunshine of prosperity. He told us what would happen if his advice should be neglected, and now his prophecy has been fulfilled.

To speak seriously, Mr. Chamberlain has not greatly distinguished himself in the course of this great controversy. He has shown himself a consummate debater, but he has been very inconsistent and very superficial. In his speech on the second reading, he declared for a Constitution on the Canadian model, but he seemed to be unaware of the scope of his own argument. He has fallen back on federalism in order to save the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament. Yet who can doubt that the federalization of the United Kingdom would alter the position of Parliament much more radically than Mr. Gladstone proposes to alter it? Even in making his citations from the British North America Act, Mr. Chamberlain managed to show that he has not made a thorough study of his subject. He quoted the general words of the section which defines the legislative authority of the Dominion; he took no note of the general words which define the legislative authority of the Provinces. Nor does he seem to have heard of the decisions of our courts by which the Canadian Provinces have been upheld in the exercise of independent powers such as he would probably deny to Ireland. Mr. Chamberlain stands on dangerous ground as a party man. He has given up his hold on the Associations; he has inflicted a conspicuous humiliation on his own friends. He might therefore have been expected to make his constitutional platform as safe as possible, instead of which he has done his best to convince us that his platform is not one on which any practical politician can stand beside him. He has succeeded in his immediate purpose, and now, where is he to go? If he takes office under Lord Hartington, he will finally alienate his Radical friends. If, on the other hand, he means to remain unattached till this Irish difficulty is settled, he may find himself classed as a sort of Radical Goschen—one of the small band of distinguished impracticables who are always with the Liberal party.

But if Mr. Chamberlain deserves 'censure as a party man and as a statesman, there can be no doubt that the chief responsibility for our present confusion must rest on Mr. Gladstone. We are sometimes told that our failure to respond to his proposals is another proof of our national inaccessibility to ideas. That is hardly a fair statement of the case. Mr. Gladstone had certain ideas about home rule which he continued to expound with great vigor for four teen or fifteen years. He told us on many occasions that the Imperial Parliament was both competent and willing to make good laws for Ireland. He pointed out the difficulty of separating between British and Irish affairs. He said he would never give Ireland any home rule except such as might be given to Scotland. He "would never condescend to the prejudices of the Home-Rulers"; he would never consent to "disintegrate the capital institutions of the country"; and if Irishmen made unreasonable demands he would remind them that "there is a higher law than the law of conciliation." So late as May, 1884, Mr. Gladstone argued that the franchise might safely be extended in Ireland because" there is a security for the loyal minority in the composition of the House of Commons. These were the ideas which found access to the mind of the Liberal party down to the end of 1885. About that time Mr. Gladstone parted with his old ideas, and laid in an entirely fresh stock. He became convinced that Parliament could not legislate for Ireland, and that if there was a higher law than that of conciliation, it was not for us to apply it. We must meet the prejudices of the Home-Rulers against "foreign "law, by disintegrating Parliament, and by giving them a legislature of their own. These new ideas may have been perfectly sound, but they could not be expected to penetrate all at once into minds already occupied by the Gladstonian ideas of 1871-85. This, however, is a kind of difficulty for which the Prime Minister had no consideration. He had himself not only discarded, but honestly forgotten his old opinions, and he felt sure that he had the heart of the people with him in his new venture. He allowed no delay; he scouted the notion of prolonged inquiry; he paid no attention to differences of opinion in his own party. His new principle occupied his mind to the exclusion of everything else; trusting in that and in his own powers of management and persuasion, he went right forward and broke up his partv.

What the effects of the split may be, we cannot yet foresee. Some of the Whigs desire to organize themselves strongly as a party of Liberals opposed to home rule, state socialism, and disestablishment of the Church. Radicals of the Labouchere type profess to look with satisfaction on the Whig movement. They hope to recapture Mr. Chamberlain, but they would like to force Lord Hartington and his friends into the Conservative camp. It is not at all likely that they will succeed, but if they do, they will probably be disappointed by the result. I do not believe that Radicalism in this country is strong enough to stand by itself without the help of the moderate Liberals. All the recent triumphs of the Liberal party have been due to the fact that Mr. Gladstone commanded the confidence of Whigs and Radicals alike. There is hardly any one among his possible successors who can command the support of both sections. Perhaps Lord Rose-

bery might manage it, but then he has the great misfortune to sit in the House of Lords. A single leader is not absolutely necessary for the maintenance of unity; but after enjoying the services of a leader who makes perhaps the best party hero on record, Liberals will hardly know how to do without a chief of one sort or another. In the meantime they make light of their difficulties, and they fight out their domestic quarrels with perfect indifference to the presence of the Conservatives. And the Conservatives have not done much to shake the confidence of their opponents. Lord Salisbury has had a splendid opportunity, and he has missed it, not for want of ability, but for want of a little elementary politics. His recent speeches have been very able, but they might have been expressly composed in order to confirm the popular impression that the Tories are a party of coercion, totally destitute of sympathy with the Irish people. His phrase about not giving self-government to Hottentots was of course only a figure of speech, but Irishmen believe that he has compared them to Hottentots, and that is enough. Again, Lord Salisbury's recommendation of twenty years of "firm" government was perfectly well meant; but nothing he can say will persuade British Radicals that he meant anything but twenty years of repressive legislation. Lord Salisbury also has the misfortune to sit in a House whose members are not brought directly into contact with the people: and that is one reason why he is so extremely weak as an electioneering agent. The difference between the Lord Beaconsfield of 1880 and the Mr. Disraeli of 1874 was not merely a difference of age.

THE DEFEAT OF MR. GLADSTONE'S BILL.

DUBLIN, June 12, 1886.

Mr. GLADSTONE'S Home-Rule Bill has been defeated, and defeated by a larger majority than either supporters or opponents anticipated. This is only what we might have expected. It was not reasonable to suppose that a measure could be rushed through at once which has been advanced by British statesmen only within the past few months, and advanced almost without British party and press support-rather in the face of party and press opposition-and without the animating influence of a vigorous British public agitation. In this respect and as regards a measure of first importance, it appears to me that Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Morley stand out in (as Mr. Healy put it) their "almost divine courage." The defeat is only what we might have expected, and it need not be deplored. It is better that the English people should have time to consider the question and appreciate the wisdom of the change. They will be more likely to give home rule their moral support, and less likely to consider it as still an evil-if only the least of two evils. As to Irish Home-Rulers, the delay is altogether an advantage. It is not good for the country generally that the present disorganization should be continued, and continue it will until matters are taken in hand by an Irisb Administration; but it is well that the thinking portion of the country should appreciate and be made to accept the position to which the Irish party has now brought the question.

Reviewing the past eight years, since Mr. Parnell fully undertook the unravelment of the Irish skein, we must acknowledge that in a certain sense parties in Ireland have been manœuvred rather than persuaded into accord. Mr. Parnell has "drawn all men unto him," not so much by the force of argument as by making each man think that he, Parnell, agreed with him—or at least was not opposed to him. Hostility and outspoken denunciation are generally the attitude of an earnest political or moral leader towards