

which he has already attained some well-earned reputation. We are glad to find, in the *N. Y. Independent* of the 6th inst., now before us, a poem of eighteen stanzas (quatrains) on "The Night Express," which is not only in a large measure free from the fault of obscurity which has seemed to us to mar "Marjory Darrow" and other of Mr. Carman's poems, but which strikes us as one of the most graphic bits of objective verse we have seen for some time. We shall, therefore, take the liberty of publishing a part of a letter which we have received from an admirer and personal friend of Mr. Carman, which will explain itself. As the letter was not designed for publication, we do not feel at liberty to give the name or address of the writer, who will, we hope, pardon us for making this use of his communication. We refrain from comment beyond the single remark that to our thinking the explanation that the refrain is intended to be suggestive of ideas as well as phonetic, and that some parts of it have a semblance of meaning, but makes the matter worse by giving the poem more of the character of a puzzle:—

You think there exists no relation between the refrain and stanzas that suggest the story, and deem it imprudent that the author should have chosen words with a futile semblance of meaning, thereby to beguile and delude the reader. But I doubt if the author will admit your premise. The writer fancies he can trace the meaning of the whole, and connect the refrain in each case with the idea of the stanza preceding it. In all courtesy and friendliness let him read it to you as he understands it.

Of course it is obvious that the refrain is an imitation by syllables of the thrush's song, but, though they are chosen with great felicity, they are not used alone for their phonetic value, but also for the ideas, suggestively.

Stanza first: Marjory Darrow is in the bloom of maidenhood, and wakens at an early summer dawn—her twentieth birthday. The poet paints her finely, and with no hackneyed phrases. Suddenly she hears the thrushes starting their song. The refrain suggests the early hour, the clearness of the song, the flushing of the east before the sun.

Stanza second: The morning is advanced. The blue martins are playing about their doorways. The sun rises. The refrain is distinctly connected with that fact. Both express the pure joy of creation, which the musing mind of Marjory imbibes. She is yet heart-free, and her love of all around her is distraught by no alien passion. Her "brows are cool."

Stanza third: An interval occurs. Marjory's mental condition has changed, with the situation of her affairs. She is in love, and apparently the course does not run smooth. There is either opposition from without, or her maiden spirit is striving against the warm conclusion. It is the old story of love and warfare "that braced the battle gear of war when the young world was glad." (Vide Helen of Troy.) The imitative refrain hints the same fact. A new star has arisen in her life—"new in the old of the dawn." "Peeps" out through the hindering clouds, a "new star," as aware that the dawn of her real life has arisen.

Fourth stanza: Develops the idea of love. She stands in the garden in the midst of pale roses, with the hot heart in conflict with itself and its foes. "She must not be deprived of him whom her soul desires." In the refrain the thrushes reassure her. The words are suggestively heartening—"here," "old," "keep," etc. Be faithful. Constancy has its assurance. She will be true.

The fifth stanza balances the strength of youth against the more sedate power of love. "Love is a seraph *dour* (gravely obstinate) and blind, leading his mortal kin." Refrain suggests the union of two souls. They are to move on together "through the drear of the dawn, year on year."

Stanza sixth: This time the change is sorrow. "Marjory Darrow's eyes are wet." "She loved, but whom she loved the grave has lost in its unconscious womb." The hills seem to "ache" like her heart, and the song of the thrushes, in the refrain, is interpreted in harmony with her sorrow. This idea, however, is not all contained in this stanza and refrain, but is developed through the other two. It may be that in the sixth the lover is hopelessly ill; that in the seventh death is certain; and in the eighth that he has gone, the last part of the last refrain reading:—

Gone, thou art gone,
Dear . . .

To me this is a beautiful poem, and one of Carman's best. I can enjoy its exquisite delicacy of sentiment and expression, its music, and the expressive harmony of the imitative portions, having listened in delight to the bird itself. Burroughs uses the phrase "O spherul, sphere" to express the liquid bell of the hermit thrush. It may be true that multitudes cannot, or will not take the pains to, understand such a poem as this; but it is a marvel to me how to you it should have brought such absolute difficulty as you complain of.

A CLOSER examination of Mr. Lawder's strictures in our last number upon certain paragraphs in a preceding number of *THE WEEK*, commenting upon his pamphlet and previous article, does not enable us to discover anything

which requires a very lengthy reply in addition to what we said last week. In regard to the value of Mr. Lawder's statistics as an argument likely to influence our United States neighbours in favour of reciprocity, we have already asked permission to substitute the word "conclusions" for the word "figures" in the sentence to which Mr. Lawder took exception. We have no desire to press this point, or to say a word to detract from the weight of those really valuable figures, and so will add but a word by way of explanation. In another part of his pamphlet Mr. Lawder shows that during the two years covered by his statistics, the proportion of imports admitted into Canada, free of duty, from the United States, was forty per cent. larger than the proportion admitted into the United States from Canada on the same terms. He also shows that during those years the average rate of duty on all imports into Canada from the United States was 16.22 per cent., while the average rate of duty on all imports into the United States from Canada was 20.15 per cent. Putting these two facts together, is it not open to the United States politician to say that they at once explain the cause of the balance of trade in their favour and therefore furnish an argument for continuing rather than discontinuing the tariff which brings them this advantage? We do not, of course, admit the validity of this kind of argument, but it shows one of the grounds on which a shrewd American would be very likely to challenge the conclusions which Mr. Lawder desires to establish. We commented as we did upon Mr. Lawder's pamphlet mainly for two reasons. First because we are utterly sceptical as to the possibility of ever again obtaining reciprocity with our neighbours on the lines indicated, or those which we *guess* were laid down by the Canadian Government in its proposals at the late conferences, if any proposals were really made. Our reasons for such scepticism are drawn partly from the repeated declarations of those who may be supposed to represent American opinion and feeling in the matter, that the United States would never again consent to what they are pleased to term a "jug-handled" reciprocity—and here let it be noted that by this term our neighbours usually designate, not reciprocity between five millions and sixty-five millions of people, as Mr. Lawder seems to suppose, but reciprocity in natural products only or chiefly, instead of reciprocity in both natural products and manufactured goods—and partly from the repeated assurances of our own Government and its supporters on the platform and in the press that they have again and again striven in vain to secure such reciprocity. In view of this settled resolve of the American Government and Congress, what is it but waste of time and effort to seek to attain the unattainable?

OUR second reason for want of faith in the efficacy of Mr. Lawder's methods was that we do not think a "jug-handled" reciprocity of the kind indicated a thing to be desired by Canada any more than by the United States. Of course we should regard such an arrangement, if it were possible, as preferable to the present tariff war, on the principle that "half a loaf is better than no bread." But what we hold to be the really desirable thing for Canada as well as for the United States is reciprocity all around, in manufactures as well as in natural products. We are very far from admitting, what protectionists like Mr. Lawder take for granted, viz., that under full reciprocity the manufactured goods would all go in one direction. If Canada's resources and capabilities are anything like what we all believe them to be, there surely must be many lines of manufacturing and other industries besides simple farming, mining, lumbering and fishing, for which we have better facilities than our neighbours. If so, it follows that under complete reciprocity capital, enterprise and labour, following as they are sure to do along the lines of least resistance, would seek the most favourable locations, irrespective of international boundaries. Of course, again, we should much rather see this grand consummation reached as the result of mutual free trade, or tariff for revenue only, than by special treaty, and for this we confidently look, as we have said, in the good time coming. Meanwhile such an extension of the area of free trade as would be meant by full reciprocity, or a large and liberal measure of reciprocity, between these two great countries would be a long step in the right direction. In one part of his pamphlet Mr. Lawder turns aside to draw an inference in favour of protection from the fact that the United States produce certain classes of highly-protected goods more cheaply than free trade England. The iteration becomes tiresome, but it is

perhaps necessary to call attention once more to the fact that the manufacturers of the United States enjoy free trade over a wider extent of rich and cultivated territory and under more favourable conditions in respect to variety of climate and productions than any other people in the world. "Does *THE WEEK*," Mr. Lawder asks, "contend that in producing the sixty million dollars' worth of merchandise sold to Canada less labour or capital find employment in the United States than are employed in Canada in producing the forty millions' worth of merchandise sold to the United States?" No; *THE WEEK* makes no such contention, as every one who has read carefully our comments must know. What *THE WEEK* did and does contend is that, one hundred and eighteen million dollars' worth of exports is a matter of far less importance to sixty-five millions of comparatively rich people, than seventy-eight million dollars' worth to five millions of comparatively poor people. Has Mr. Lawder shown the contrary?

THE letter of Mr. J. Castell Hopkins is singularly wide of the mark. In the first place, we were not "referring to British preferential duties" but to what we understood to be specific discrimination *against* a particular nation. The principle involved was pretty fully discussed by authorities a few years ago, and, if we mistake not, the conclusion reached by general consent was that a nation may, without violation of courtesy, or "the most favoured nation" obligation, give preferential treatment to another nation, in return for similar favours, by arrangement. But to impose specific taxes *against* the products of any nation would be a very different thing and one which the nation thus discriminated against would have a right to resent as hostile and offensive. The cases of Brazil, Cuba, etc., are not in point, as there is really no discrimination and no "compulsion" in the matter save what is involved in a general tariff law, applicable to all nations to whom the conditions may apply. Our readers know well how much we admire such a policy, but that is not the question here. As to the taunt touching our regard for American susceptibilities, we shall probably survive it so long as we are conscious of pleading only for what is fair, courteous and right, on our part, irrespective of anything which we may think to be the opposite on the part of our neighbours. We strongly suspect that the spirit revealed in Mr. Hopkins' sarcasm is the same spirit which, as displayed on platform and in the press, has probably had more than anything else to do with making the Washington politicians disinclined to listen to any advances made by our Government in the direction of better trade relations. But, be that as it may, we stand for an even, straightforward, friendly course, free from marks of irritation or dislike, on the part of Canada, first because that is the right course, and, second, because it is the wise and statesmanlike course. In view of the fact that these two Anglo-Saxon peoples are anchored side by side for all the future, we hold that whatever tends to make or perpetuate bad blood between them, on the part of either, is a crime against both and against humanity. Nor could any provocation on either side justify the other in failing to preserve its dignity and equanimity, and holding firmly to the right.

THE recent filling of two of the vacancies in the Dominion Senate has turned public attention for a moment to one of the estates of the realm whose existence the people might be in danger of forgetting but for an occasional appointment of this kind. The two gentlemen who have just now been selected for the doubtful distinction, are, so far as we are aware, personally unobjectionable. It is when we come to enquire into the principle which governs in this and other appointments that we confront serious difficulties and objections. Like all or very nearly all the Senators who have been appointed within the last ten or twelve years both are partisans of the present Administration. One, at least, is a candidate for the Commons who was defeated at the polls. To one taking an outside view of the question, it is not easy to understand how a man who believes in the principle of popular government can bring himself to accept appointment to the Upper House after having been rejected by the people of his own constituency for the Lower. Aside from that, it is hard to conceive of any course which could be adopted by a Government better calculated to destroy both the usefulness and the prestige which the Senate might have had—if that is not an Hibernicism—than that of filling its seats with members chosen almost exclusively from one political party. This reproach falls, as it happens, specially upon