

no milk-and-water policy. He did not try to run with the Free Trade hare and hunt with the N.P. hounds. He believed it was wrong to increase the burdens of the people in a time of depression. He went to the polls on this issue, and was defeated by the people he was bravely trying to help. Burke told the electors of Bristol that he had advanced their interests contrary to their opinions. Mr. Mackenzie tried to do the same thing for the people of Canada and failed. A few years will show, if the revelation has not already been made, whether the electors of Canada did a wise thing when they dismissed a faithful public servant for not taxing five millions of people to enrich a few. Never did British or Colonial Statesman display more moral heroism than was displayed by Alexander Mackenzie in '78 when he stood by his principles while the pistol was pointed at his head—held at times, with shame be it said, by some who pose as moral reformers. If there is no room in the public life of Canada for a man who bravely faces defeat rather than do what he believes to be wrong, then Canada is morally rotten and should be buried out of sight.

Soon after his defeat in '78 Mr. Mackenzie became a resident of Toronto. Owing to declining health he found it inconvenient to represent a large constituency like West Lambton and in 1882 stood for East York. For this constituency he has been twice elected. East York derives as much honour from its representative as Mr. Mackenzie derives from representing an historic constituency of which he is justly proud.

For the same unfortunate reason Mr. Mackenzie found it necessary some years ago to resign the leadership of the Liberal party. His strength was not equal to the task, and Alexander Mackenzie never was the man to undertake anything unless he could do it thoroughly. The arduous and irksome nature of the work of an Opposition leader in Canada may be learned from the fact that the distinguished gentleman who succeeded Mr. Mackenzie—a gentleman who once could work eighteen hours out of the twenty-four with impunity—has since broken down in health and has been compelled, temporarily at least, to leave public life. The one great mistake of Mr. Mackenzie's life was his brave attempt to attend to the details of his department while Premier and Minister of Public Works. It is easy to be wise when events are over, but one cannot help thinking that had he worked less then he might be the able and trusted leader of his party to-day, and the party needs a leader badly enough.

Mr. Mackenzie's Parliamentary services have not been confined to the Dominion Parliament, and the Parliament of Old Canada. In 1871 he ran for West Middlesex, was elected, and on the downfall of Sandfield Macdonald's Government soon after, took office under Mr. Blake, first as Provincial Secretary, and afterwards as Provincial Treasurer. Dual representation being abolished, both he and Mr. Blake left the Local Legislature at the same time.

Besides his parliamentary work, Mr. Mackenzie has rendered Canada good service by his well-written biography of his friend and leader, George Brown. The tone of the book is moderate throughout, and though written by a strong party man, the facts, so far as we know, have never been seriously questioned.

It has occasionally been charged against Mr. Mackenzie that his manner is cold, and his language curt. It is quite true that he calls a spade a spade, and a scoundrel a scoundrel. It may be true that when scaly politicians have asked him to help them to carry out dirty jobs he gave them a reply not always couched in diplomatic language. Quite likely he met the pious proposal of some moral reformers to tax the people for their benefit with language that may have seemed to them unnecessarily vigorous. All this may be so; but those who know Alexander Mackenzie know him to be a warm-hearted man, as kindly as he is firm and true—a man ready at any moment to help the needy, or make sacrifices for his friend. He hates humbug, and scorns shams, and can unmask a hypocrite with rare skill; but no more kindly man stands in the Dominion to-day. May a kind heaven send Canada more Mackenzies.

KNOXIAN.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE FISHERIES QUESTION.

To the Editor of THE WEEK:

SIR,—Canada's single interest in the fisheries negotiations is to retain her fish. It is safe to assume that they are worth more to her than it would pay the United States and Britain together to give for them. The actual value of this country's Atlantic fisheries can only be inferred, for it is over thirty years since her people enjoyed the sole right of fishing in their own waters. Under the Reciprocity and Washington Treaties their rivals of the United States were permitted to conduct a process of extermination upon their fishing grounds, and in the interval between the treaties and during the time that has elapsed since the expiration of the latter one they have made a fairly successful business of fish piracy. The past season was the first since the beginning of the Reciprocity Treaty in which Canadian fishermen enjoyed even a partial monopoly within their own limits. According to reliable reports the financial result has been most satisfactory. The Maritime Provinces have valuable resources of field, forest, and mine, but their waters contain their greatest, their most accessible, and most lasting source of wealth. If United States fishermen are kept off Canadian fishing grounds more fish will be caught by our own people, and the general wealth of the country will be increased by so much. Every dollar's worth of fish taken from Canadian waters by United States fishermen is a loss to the country as though it was a dollar's worth of wheat, of lumber, or of stock that was stolen. The interest that Canadians outside the Maritime Provinces have in this matter is not merely sentimental. An increased catch

of fish in those provinces means increased trade with the rest of the country and increased contributions by their people to the Federal treasury.

The ground is taken by some that it is more in the interest of the Maritime people to find an outside market—which it is alleged can only be found in the United States—for what fish they catch than to secure them in the monopoly of catching in their own waters, and that, therefore, it would be well to give United States fishermen equal rights with Canadians in Canadian waters if thereby a free market for Canadian-caught fish could be secured in the United States. Whether this would or would not be an advantageous arrangement for Canada, there appears to be no present prospect of securing it, and if there were, there is another view that may be taken of the case. Canada—with Newfoundland—has practically a monopoly of the fisheries on the Atlantic coast of America. The bulk of the population of the United States is along, or easily accessible from, that coast. The fish required by that population can best be supplied from Canadian waters. If Canada retains a firm grip on her fishery rights it is a matter of indifference to her whether the people of the United States choose to pay duty on their fish or not; they must get them from Canada in any case. As soon as that is demonstrated to them the duty will be taken off. The surest way for Canadians to get a free market for their fish in the United States is, not to pay for the privilege, but to stick to their fish.

The United States has valuable fisheries on the Pacific coast of Alaska, but not so valuable as Canada's Atlantic fisheries, owing to the population to be supplied from them being comparatively small. That country will of course assert its sovereignty over these fisheries, and therein lies the strength of Canada's case. What the United States demands on the Pacific she must concede on the Atlantic. If Canada chooses to retain her fisheries she can do so. The danger is that in grasping after fancy prospects she may lose what is of greater solid value.

To Canada this is more than a question of fish, it is a question of men. If her fisheries are handed over to a foreign power to be pillaged at will, and exhausted at no distant day, the fishing industry and the trade resulting from it will disappear, and the men, the vessels, and the capital now employed in it will have to engage in other occupations or perhaps abandon the country altogether; but if they are retained she is, in spite of herself, a maritime power of no mean consequence, and has of herself the means to market the produce of field, of forest, of mine, and of mill, wherever in the wide world a market can be found. For this reason, if there were no others, the fisheries should be retained at any cost.

FRANK OLIVER.

READINGS FROM CURRENT LITERATURE.

MUSICAL EXPRESSION.

THERE is no danger of mankind ever exhausting the gamut of musical expression, for we stand only at the threshold of musical combinations. Nevertheless, it may be very desirable to draw new modes of musical thought from unused quarters. The German, the French, the Italian flavour is no longer a new one in music. What is the chief charm of Greig? He speaks to us with a fresh flavour brought from Scandinavia. Tchaikowsky charms us by frequently using the Russian style of musical expression. The Russian Government is now collecting the weird, strange melodies of Siberia and of the Cossacks of the Don. Dvorak is presenting us with musical wonders from Bohemia. Liszt has made known to us the musical frenzy of Hungary. Let none of these be despised. They will all yet unite to broaden our musical stream, and music will assimilate these new contributions in a manner that will make the compositions of the twentieth century yet more cosmopolitan than those of the nineteenth.—*Musical Herald.*

SCIENCE AND VERACITY.

So far as my experience goes, men of science are neither better nor worse than the rest of the world. Occupation with the endlessly great parts of the universe does not necessarily involve greatness of character, nor does microscopic study of the infinitely little always produce humility. We have our full share of original sin; need, greed, and vain glory beset us as they do other mortals; and our progress is, for the most part, like that of a tacking ship, the resultant of opposite divergencies from the straight path. But, for all that, there is one moral benefit which the pursuit of science unquestionably bestows. It keeps the estimate of the value of evidence up to the proper mark; and we are constantly receiving lessons, and sometimes very sharp ones, on the nature of proof. Men of science will always act up to their standard of veracity, when mankind in general leave off sinning; but that standard appears to me to be higher among them than in any other class of the community. I do not know any body of scientific men who could be got to listen without the strongest expressions of disgusted repudiation to the exposition of a pretended scientific discovery, which had no better evidence to show for itself than the story of the devils entering a herd of swine, or of the fig-tree that was blasted for bearing no figs when "it was not the season of figs." Whether such events are possible or impossible, no man can say; but scientific ethics can and does declare that the profession of belief in them, on the evidence of documents of unknown date and of unknown authorship, is immoral. Theological apologists who insist that morality will vanish if their dogmas are exploded, would do well to consider the fact that, in the matter of intellectual veracity, science is already a long way ahead of the churches; and that, in this particular, it is exerting an educational influence on mankind of which the churches have shown themselves utterly incapable.—*Prof. T. H. Huxley.*