

by a *modus vivendi* between Downing Street and Washington. Writing in a Chicago newspaper, Mr. McGrath, the ablest journalist in the island, echoes Sir Robert's complaints. There was, even in London, no pretence that the letter of the Treaty of 1818 has not been violated with the object of promoting "good-feeling" between Great Britain and the United States—a good-feeling which we Canadians venture to consider a will-o'-the-wisp fruitlessly pursued by British ministry after British ministry.

The Newfoundlanders are quite well aware of this fact. They know that their rights have been filched away from them by the intriguing diplomacy of the United States. Yet they refuse to call to their aid a willing ally whose influence at Downing Street would strengthen immeasurably their case. Had Newfoundland been a Canadian province, the British Government would have walked very delicately in last winter's negotiations, for the memory of Canadian resentment over the Alaskan boundary dispute has not yet died out. The London-Washington agreement ignored the provisions of the Treaty of 1818, and, to make bad worse, Newfoundland's undoubted rights were turned into pledges of good-will—at the cost solely of the Islanders. But hostages and Danegelds do not fit in well with the modern British scheme of things. Certainly, Ethelred promoted "good feeling" with the Danes by paying tribute, but the amity did not last any longer than the gentlemen from Jutland thought desirable. Will the historical parallel be fulfilled in the case of the pledged Terranovans and the altruistic statesmen who are the exponents of the Uncle Sam brand of diplomacy, based upon the rules of draw-poker? Canada might have a useful word to say were she in a position warrantably to utter it, but the Newfoundlanders seem to prefer splendid isolation and impracticable wrath.

THERE has been considerable historical and other literary work produced in Canada, some of it good but much of it slovenly and carelessly done. In fact, "slovenly" is a term which might easily be acknowledged as national. Even the papers read before the Royal Society of Canada have been wordy, badly constructed, not well thought out, and carelessly edited. These volumes should be valuable, but are seldom consulted. They are a splendid monument to our national literary inefficiency. Hopkins' "Canada: an Encyclopedia" is another monument of like character, redolent of inaccuracies, contradictions and incongruities. Mr. Beckles Willson's history of the Hudson's Bay Company is another. The pseudo history of the Canada Company is a glaring example of illogical and unclassified treatment. Of all the more pretentious works issued since the nation began to take some pride in itself, Kingsford's ten volume history comes the nearest to being accurate and reliable.

These remarks have been suggested by a glance over an "Index" to the first twenty-five volumes of the Canadian Magazine recently issued by the publishers of that excellent periodical. As a piece of slovenly work, it easily surpasses any other literary production of modern times. From "A" to "F" the articles are neatly indexed in proper alphabetical order. When he got to "G" the editor seems to have grown weary and we find the word "Game" in five different places in the list instead of finding the five references to this word grouped together. Similarly the six references to "Great Britain" are well scattered through the list. This wonderful lack of harmony prevails through the rest of the index to "Articles." For example under "M" are two references to moose, and they are several inches apart and on different pages, and nine references to Manitoba scattered through four pages. In the index to "Authors" there is the same slovenly arrangement. Under "C" the second

name is Clark, the fifteenth is Clarke, the twenty-first is Clarke, the fifty-eighth is Clarke, the sixty-second is Clarke, and the eighty-fourth is Clark. Under "F" the first author is Fox and the last Freed. Under "T" the first name is Tipton and the last Tarbell.

With all its imperfections, however, this fifty-five page "Index" should be supremely useful to students of Canadian affairs, since these twenty-five volumes of the magazine contain the best essays and other literary compositions published in this country between March, 1893 and October, 1905. The wealth of information scattered through these 15,000 pages is made more accessible. If the editor had not forgotten the order of the letters in the alphabet, the Index might have been one of the most valuable of Canadian reference books.

IT is rapidly becoming the custom for Canadian-Americans upon returning for a visit to their native land to decry the lack of flag veneration in our Dominion, by which they expressly mean the marked scarcity of Union Jacks floating in public places. For example, one writer indignantly declares that in a certain well-known city of the Maritime Provinces only one National Ensign waves from a mast-head and that is the National Ensign of the United States occupying its official position over the American Consulate.

That there is a small particle of justification in these loudly-voiced laments of our expatriated citizens is undoubtedly true, yet we question very much the wisdom of their enthusiastic remarks, respecting our Southern neighbours' spectacular flaunting of bunting upon every possible, though ridiculously inappropriate occasion, at every street corner and over every notion store. Flag exhibition is certainly not synonymous with flag reverence. Familiarity here breeds a frivolous indifference, if not contempt. That which is symbolic of a nation's birth and struggle in the ever-acting play of history, finally degenerates into a convenient trademark for a much-advertised piece of merchandise. That this unrestrained show of Old Gloryism has already been overtaken by the Nemesis of an apathetic regard for the true purpose of the flag's existence, the special legislation of Congress a few years ago amply shows. In many States of the Union the National Ensign has lost its true significance, being used as a mere fetic for ultrajingoism.

In Canada, we may have erred somewhat on the other side, but of the two evils it may unreservedly be stated that we possess the lesser one. Even though our standard may sometimes savour of militarism in its display, it is better to be accompanied by this fault in a young and virile nation than to lose all dignity by its continuous flaunting in the hands of an over-excited, half intoxicated crowd. Intrinsically, a flag is, at best, but a few yards of coloured silk; hence, an every-day exhibition and noisy adulation, must sooner or later bring its loud-voiced worshippers to so complete a realisation of this fact that in their eyes it will eventually lose all or the greater part of its intense national significance. A judicious use of the Union Jack in our public schools is advisable, as is also its hoisting upon great national holidays. Extravagance in patriotism, however, wears itself out. Then comes indifference.

However, there is no doubt that the foolish flaunting of the Stars and Stripes upon Canadian soil has been regarded too tolerantly. Uncle Sam needs to learn that when he is on British territory he must respect the emblem of the constitution. No flag in the world has a more significant history than that in which the crosses of St. George, St. Andrew and St. Patrick are united. While we have no wish to join the crowd designated "flag-flappers" by the disdainful Mr. Kipling, we should see that our ensign is respected.