

by the free admission of the products of other nations as well as her own to the British markets. What reasonable hope can there be that such inducements can ever prevail with our fellow-countrymen in Great Britain? But we are told that the protectionist idea is making progress there. No doubt it is finding favour with certain classes, the only classes who could hope to be profited by the taxation of food—those, namely, who are interested in its production and sale. No doubt the land-owners and land-tillers of the Mother Country find themselves hard-pressed by the competition of the vast and fertile territories beyond the sea. Their case is a hard one, but it is in the last degree unlikely that the fiscal policy of England will ever again be shaped to suit the wishes of the thousands of producers at the expense of the hundreds of thousands of consumers. It is, moreover, to be noted that the proposed change could benefit these interested producers only on the condition of a rise in the price of food, the very thing that the Canadian advocate of the change feels it necessary to argue will not take place. We yield to none in the sincerity of our desire to see a great enlargement of trade between Canada and Great Britain. May we not hope that the sojourn of so many of the Ministers and Members of our Parliament in England this season may have the effect of opening their eyes to see that the one simple and sure method of effecting this most desirable end is within our power; that Canada has only to reduce the barrier which she has herself erected against such trade-expansion, not only with England but with all the world, in order to give such an impulse to Canadian foreign trade as can be imparted no other way.

ONE of the noteworthy signs of the time in the United States is the frankness with which the Republican leaders, many of them at least, acknowledge that their cherished policy was the cause of their defeat, and accept the situation. President Harrison himself admits that the McKinley tariff brought around his party's downfall. Mr. Chauncey Depew said at the Chamber of Commerce banquet in New York, that the voice of the American people has pronounced in stentorian tones its condemnation of the trade policy followed for the last thirty years in the Republic, and that it now demanded and would not be denied a fair trial of the substitute offered by the Democratic party. He went even further and declared that if that substitute should prove successful in producing the favourable effects predicted for it, he would be one of the first to confess his former errors and crown President Cleveland as the benefactor of his country. Such incidents as these are important as showing that the triumph of the Democrats is recognized on all hands as the victory of freer trade, or revenue-tariff principles, and that the victorious party leaders will not only be able but will be compelled to put the policy which has carried them into office into practice as rapidly as circumstances will permit. More significant than all is Mr. Cleveland's own declaration that the struggle has only just begun. The outside world may therefore safely hail the entrance of the new President into the White House as the beginning of a new era in the history of the great Republic. We in Canada may do so, not only for the sake of whatever advantage we may hope to derive from a gradual reduction of the American tariff, but by reason of the moral effect which the adoption of a more liberal trade policy is likely to have upon the general tone and temper of our neighbour. We have strong faith in the moral power of right ideas. There is a kind of contagiousness in them. The tendency of the short-sighted selfishness which prompts a nation to put up the bars against other nations is to produce a crabbedness which is sure to show itself in other international matters. On the other hand, when two peoples trade freely and largely with each other the very closeness of their business intercourse makes it the more difficult for them to quarrel about other things. Neighbourliness in trade promotes friendliness and courtesy in national as in individual life.

BEFORE these words are printed the German Reichstag will have assembled in what will almost surely be an exciting, and may prove to be a memorable, session. The opening speech of the Emperor is awaited with a good deal of interest, as it will probably have an important bearing upon subsequent developments. Some time has elapsed, however, since Emperor William has made one of his strongly self-assertive speeches, and it seems not unlikely that years and experience are bringing him a

wisdom which was wanting in some of his earlier utterances. In the present uncertain state of parties it is not easy to determine the probabilities in regard to the fate of the Army Bill. As that fate depends largely upon the attitude of the Centrists, and as this party is supposed to have ends of its own to promote, it need create no surprise should it not persist in the opposition with which for a time it has threatened the measure. There is some reason to doubt whether Bismarck's attacks upon the Bill and the Government may not tend to defeat their own object by reason of their excessive violence. In view of the evident utter inability of the ex-Chancellor to control himself, it becomes increasingly a mystery how he could have for so long a time been virtual ruler of the Empire and arbiter of the destinies of Europe. His ferocity of disposition and tenacity of purpose may have had not a little to do with securing and maintaining that wonderful pre-eminence which he maintained so long and so boldly. These qualities were reinforced by the unscrupulousness in the use of means which he is even now at no pains to conceal or deny. Possibly, too, advancing years and a native irritability stimulated by disappointment and the sense of injury over which he seems to be continually brooding, have had their effect in producing his present unhappy state of mind. Be all that as it may, it seems tolerably clear that the man whose hostility would at one time have been more to be dreaded by the Government than that of a host of minor opponents, has brought his influence down to such a level that some even insinuate that his fiery opposition may be a help rather than an obstacle to the Government leaders. Under any form of Government, and especially under the German form, the chances are usually on the side of those in power, and it is very likely that the present instance may prove no exception.

PROFESSOR CLARK'S LECTURES ON TENNYSON—VI.

THE DRAMAS.

SO far, in reviewing the works of our great poet we have, for the most part, followed the order of their production. In the case of the "Idylls," however, it was necessary, in studying the collection as finally arranged by the author, to depart from this order. So in regard to the dramas, although a good many shorter poems were put forth between the publication of the various plays, it will be better to postpone the consideration of these and take the dramas altogether in order.

It cannot, in this generation, be otherwise than difficult to form a judgment on the dramatic work of Tennyson. For those to whom Tennyson had been the most illuminating of teachers it was not easy to come dispassionately to the consideration of any new work of his. On the other hand, there are always critics ready to challenge an author's right to break new ground. Unfortunately, genius never arises without having its footsteps dogged by envy and jealousy, and Tennyson was never without a certain number of detractors who were ready to point out any seeming failures of his.

It is certainly not to be wondered at that the great poet who had written lyrics equal to the best which had ever appeared in any language, and had produced an epic fit to be placed in the same class with the "Iliad," the "Æneid," the "Divine Comedy," and "Paradise Lost," should attempt the drama. He had stood beside Homer and Virgil, and Dante and Milton. Might he not stand beside Shakespeare, Æschylus, and Sophocles? His admiration for Shakespeare breaks out in his writings. Could he range himself with him?

The attempt was a work of immense difficulty in many ways. In the first place, the state of the modern stage was to be considered. Was there a chance of a great dramatist succeeding upon it? For example, how many of Shakespeare's plays are still presented? And what changes are they subjected to before they are thought fit for presentation? and how much of their popularity is owing to the accessories of scenery and the like? Tennyson seems to have come to see this. He wrote "Queen Mary," a five-act play, with no fewer than forty-four characters. It had to be cut down and was then only a moderate success. "Harold" was much shorter. In "Becket" he returned to the size of "Queen Mary," but, in his dedication to Lord Selborne, he admitted that it was "not intended in its present form to meet the exigencies of our present theatre."

It has been thought by some that the genius of Tennyson was not essentially dramatic, or that, at any rate, it was too late in life for him to take to the drama with any hope of success; and it does seem as though there was a lack of action in some of his plays. Yet this is not quite the case with all of them. Perhaps we must allow posterity to decide this question. It cannot, however, be forgotten that, in one respect, Tennyson had not the advantages of Shakespeare as a writer for the stage. Shakespeare was the manager of a theatre, whilst Tennyson had been almost a recluse.

In the general design of his plays Tennyson selected the type presented in the "Histories" of Shakespeare, rather than that of the Tragedies. This may account for the complaint that the plays do not work up to a climax, although this could hardly be said of "Becket." To a certain extent, we may say, Tennyson intended to complete the Shakespearean cycle of histories. This had begun with Richard II. and had ended with Henry VIII., taking up the great period of the conflict of the Houses of York and Lancaster and the beginning of the Reformation. Tennyson completed the series at both ends. In "Harold" he showed the laying of the foundations for the building up of our modern composite England—composite in race and in language. In "Becket" he showed the struggle between the State and the Church which never terminated until the papal power was disowned—even if it be now terminated; and in "Queen Mary" he carried on the conflict until the accomplishment of the Reformation by the accession of Queen Elizabeth.

In one respect we may perhaps say that Tennyson worked under more difficult conditions than those which his circumstances imposed upon Shakespeare. The latter drew his stories from the chronicles, and addressed an audience which had more regard for literature and art than for the absolute accuracy of the narrative. Tennyson, on the contrary, lived and wrote in an age when history had become a science, and bound himself to historical accuracy.

The plays of Tennyson, like those of Shakespeare, may be studied in one or two ways. We make take them in the historical order, or in the order of publication. Some day, perhaps, the former way will be preferred. For us who have read them as they were written, it will be more natural to take them in that order. We shall therefore notice them, as follows: "Queen Mary," "Harold," "The Falcon," "The Cup," "The Promise of May," "Becket," and "The Foresters"—although to some of these only a very few words can be given.

"Queen Mary" appeared in 1875, and in the following year was presented, in a reduced form, at the Lyceum Theatre in London, Miss Kate Bateman playing Queen Mary, and Mr. Irving playing Philip II. Mr. Irving is said still to be of opinion that, if curtailed, it would make a "magnificent domestic drama." It cannot be denied that the characters are drawn with truth and power and are sustained with a remarkable consistency. If it is true that the play is pervaded by a certain monotony, this is partially attributable to the character of the principal person of the drama, and it must be acknowledged that some of the situations are very striking. The characters, too, are real and living characters. Philip, the narrow bigot, the cold-blooded sensualist, Mary, sharing her devotion between Philip and the Church, Gardiner, the fierce, cruel fanatic, yet trimmer withal; Cranmer, the same as he appeared in "Henry VIII."—gentle, weak, heroic. We cannot wonder if George Eliot should say that Tennyson ran Shakespeare very close.

Mary is represented as a woman whose sympathies are essentially Spanish. The memory of the injuries inflicted upon Queen Catharine still rankle in her heart. She can hardly think with patience of her father or her brother. Her sister, as the daughter of her mother's supplanter, Queen Anne Boleyn, is peculiarly offensive to her.

My good mother came (God rest her soul)
Of Spain, and I am Spanish in myself,
And in my likings. (Act I., Scene 5.)

Her passion for Philip was overpowering. Yet she is afraid that he may remember her eleven years in advance of him.

But will he care for that?
No, by the holy virgin, being noble,
But love me only.

There are few scenes in the play more touching than those in which the Queen's devotion and idolatry are put in contrast with the coldness of her husband, who, after finding that there was little chance of her giving him a son, was in haste to leave her. Moreover, Philip's one thought was to strengthen Spain, and in order to this, to get the English people to proclaim war on France, which they were not at all inclined to do. The Spanish ambassador, Simon Renard, suggested that the King might gratify the Queen by remaining another day with her.

Philip:
Madam, a day may sink or save a realm.

Mary:
A day may save a heart from breaking, too.

Philip:
Well, Simon Renard, shall we stop a day?

Renard:
Your Grace's business will not suffer, sire,
For one day more, so far as I can tell.

Philip:
Then one day more to please her majesty.

Mary:
The sunshine sweeps across my life again.
O! if I knew you felt this parting, Philip,
As I do!

Philip:
By St. James I do protest,
Upon the faith and honour of a Spaniard,
I am vastly grieved to leave your majesty.
Simon, is supper ready? (Act III., Scene 6.)

One of the most touching scenes is that between Mary and her cousin, Reginald Pole, whom she had made Archbishop of Canterbury.