

## Letters to the Editor.

## THE COPYRIGHT ACT.

SIR,—A writer on the Canadian Copyright Act in the *Contemporary Review* alludes to my former connection with your journal and seems to infer that I am in favour of the Act. I thought I had made it clear that in my judgment, whatever the interest of Canadian printers may be, that of Canadian writers is, as Senator Boulton has forcibly shown, on the side of honest law. It can hardly be doubted that competition with unpaid or under-paid works must have a depressing effect on the literature of any country, as it certainly had, before International Copyright, on the literature of the United States. That the royalty could be collected from any printer, say an American interloper, who chose to withhold it, nobody seems very confidently to maintain.

Yours faithfully,

GOLDWIN SMITH.

Toronto, June 10th, 1895.

## WOMEN'S SOCIETIES.

SIR,—The recent meeting of the Council of Women in Toronto brings before us the multiplicity of women's societies on this continent, and while we cannot help admiring the bravery with which the delegates to this latest organization "tackled" any and every subject, we must question the advisability of establishing more associations, in a country already overrun with societies, which tend to take woman's attention from her own immediate duties in connection with the home.

I am well aware that my friend the "advanced" woman will cry out against this, declaring that the less woman binds herself to her own legitimate duties, and the more she tries to seize upon man's, and air herself on the public platform, the better for herself and the human race generally; and, in accordance with this theory, associations flourish and grow apace till now almost the only society unestablished is a Home Society. In a country like this, where domestic help is so difficult to obtain, the time of every housekeeper is fully occupied with her own duties, reading sufficient to keep her abreast of the times, and a little necessary recreation. When, therefore, we see the numbers of mothers who swell the membership of the average society, generally established in the name of religion, culture, or "advancement," we cannot wonder at the numbers of children, who, when school is over, run neglected through the streets, nor can we wonder at the religious ignorance of these children. Can we reasonably expect the Sunday School to take the mother's place as religious instructor? I think not, and yet this is what is often expected of it.

It is so unfashionable now to bother oneself with one's own children, so much nobler and broader to try and reform the world instead of our own small corner; to cry for the ballot that woman may take away from adults, by force of law, those temptations to sin which would, in all probability, have been no temptations had they been taught an abhorrence of vice in their youth.

Amongst a certain class of women—a class which is unfortunately growing larger, and who, I believe, consider themselves especially enlightened and intelligent—there seems to be an idea that every duty which is truly woman's is degrading to her, and that the most ennobling thing for her to do is to turn herself into a "female man," if I may use the expression. Not long ago a writer of this extreme type, writing in a daily paper, wildly defends women who go to murder trials on the ground that by thus pandering to all that is basest in human nature they are "broadening their minds." The writer goes on to say that as women may one day sit on juries it befits her to attend the court room as much as possible, instead of "cramping her mind with the petty cares of home." The *petty* cares of home! Petty! What is nobler than the cares of home? The mission to implant the good seed in the virgin soil, to store the expanding mind, God has given to women, and to the human race He has given a nobler heritage; what most of us are our mothers made us.

I think that when woman gives up her sphere to tread, so to speak, on the edge of man's, she will find, all too late, that she has sold her birthright for a mess of pottage.

Our mothers, among the better classes, were as well

educated as the average woman of to-day, and what they learned they learned with just half the fuss and turmoil of the present day, and what they learned they knew, which is more than can be said of many of the women of to-day, when many young girls will coolly discuss all the "ologies," Herbert Spencer, Carlyle, etc., quite unaware of the mistakes they make. When will we be content to settle down to learn calmly what we can, to do away with all this sham culture, this cant of education, and to be truly and genuinely what we are? In this respect I must admit women are not the only offenders.

OSSERVATORE.

## THE CANADIAN FLAG.

SIR,—As to what the Canadian flag should be, can we get to common ground?

It seems to be admitted that we should have a badge of simple design; that the Dominion arms will not do; and that we must retain the Cross, which represents not only England, Scotland, and Ireland, but also France. What should be added?

Mr. Sandford Fleming's arguments against the maple leaf are very strong. In addition, I might point out that the maple leaf, or even the maple tree, is not the symbol of the Maritime Provinces, of Manitoba, of the North-West, or of British Columbia. It would certainly not do for Newfoundland. The May-flower is the emblem of Nova Scotia. The poplar or aspen is the characteristic tree of Manitoba, and the cedar or Douglas pine of British Columbia.

Will a star, with seven points at present, do? Let me call Mr. Chadwick's attention to the fact that it is no more republican than the English language is republican and un-British, because it is spoken in the States. The sun rising is the ancient emblem of the British race, and is preserved to-day in Ireland's "Sunburst." What is the sun but a star near at hand? A star is a sun farther off.

The chief difference between us and the States is that we are a Dominion or one country, whereas they are many States. Hence it is that they have no common name and they have to call themselves American, the name legitimately claimed by Canadians, by Mexicans, and by a good many other nationalities. They could properly be called Statia, but as they do not give themselves that name, we cannot. We, on the contrary, have a common name, which no one else can claim, but we are also a Confederation. The star with as many points as there are Provinces, surely symbolizes our unity and manifoldness, while forty or fifty stars cannot be said to represent unity. All that can be said is that they are better than forty or fifty maple leaves would be.

G. M. GRANT.

Queen's University, Kingston, 8th June, 1895.

SIR,—In the letter which I addressed to you last week, I stated that a star as a suggested badge for Canada was a novelty. Since the publication of that letter my attention has been directed to a circumstance in view of which that statement appears to be slightly inaccurate; it seems that a star was at one time adopted as an emblem of Canada, but I think under such circumstances as to make its readoption quite out of the question: it was adopted as the badge of the Republic formed by William Lyon MacKenzie on Navy Island in 1838, and which existed—after its own fashion—for several days.

Mr. Howell suggests a maple wreath enclosing a white space. At telescopic distance this would present almost exactly the same appearance as the badge now used, and be almost, if not quite, as difficult to distinguish from the badge of many Colonies of the Empire.

Both Mr. Fleming and Mr. Caldecott refer to the supposed action of some enterprising flag-maker of Glasgow. It is not easy to understand how such a misapprehension can have arisen. There is no flag-maker of any repute in the British Dominions who would attempt to do what is evidently, but quite erroneously, supposed to have been done. The incorrect flags which have been put out may have been made in Glasgow, but the errors are certainly not those of the maker, but of those who furnished him (quite unintentionally, I am sure) with incorrect information.

June 10th, 1895.

E. M. CHADWICK.