

West Australia, the Black Swan, the emblem of their colony, and Canada a shield bearing the Coats of Arms of the Provinces of the Dominion. This forms the distinguishing flag of Canada. At the time of the Exhibition at Chicago it was first displayed as the ensign of Canada among the national flags of the world. Over the British Head Quarters floated the Union Jack plain and simple, the ensign of Great and Greater Britain, and close alongside, over the Canadian Head Quarters, floated the ensign of Canada, the "red ensign" with the arms of the Provinces on the field, the mother and the eldest daughter thus supporting one another. It was inspiring, too, to see the Canadian ensign elevated to its proper position and taking equal rank with the flags of Great Britain, United States, France, Belgium, Switzerland, Brazil, etc., as they lined the cornices of the principal buildings. We have, therefore, already a Canadian ensign, not by haphazard, but by constitutional enactment. The sole question to be considered is whether the present distinguishing badge should be altered. It is proposed that instead of an oval shield bearing the Canadian Coat of Arms there should be displayed a seven pointed star, one point for each Province. There is nothing Canadian in the star, and it is possible that with the subsequent addition of additional points for additional Provinces the badge would become only too like a cart wheel without a rim. If any change is to be made it should be to a *Maple Leaf*. This is already the flag emblem of Canada. In the form of a wreath of Maple Leaves it encircles the arms of Canada upon the flag of the Governor-General and in every one of the Provinces the flag of each Lieut.-Governor bears the arms of his Province, surrounded by a wreath of Maple Leaves. As a tree, according to Bell's "Geological Survey of Canada" and Sargent's "Forests of North America," it is universal in Canada. From the Island of Newfoundland across Quebec, where it displays its greatest glory, through Ontario to the central mountains and the remotest shores of British Columbia, the Maple Tree flourishes in our northern clime. A wreath of Manitoba Maple Leaves was laid at the foot of the Statue of Sir John Macdonald as the tribute of Manitoba to the founder of the Dominion. Beyond all question it is the emblem of our land, and displayed upon the red field of the ensign of Great Britain would tell the story, as a *flag should tell it*, of the glad allegiance of the land of the Maple Leaf.

BARLOW CUMBERLAND.

Toronto, June 19th, 1895.

SIR,—I beg to object to the design for the Canadian flag published by you. This is simply the lone star of Texas, which was the flag of that State during its short lived independence, before it was absorbed by the American Union. The lone star was the precursor of that absorption, and on its being accomplished, the star took its natural place on the American flag. Does any Canadian wish to be reminded of those things on looking at his flag? Are the annexationists to be given a hope of their unpracticable dreams being realized by the adoption of such a design? It should be repudiated by all Canadians at once and forever, and left to the Salvation Army whose flag it is now.

What we want is something that will animate patriotism, and destroy everything that prevents the growth of that sentiment. It is notorious that the people of Quebec will not use, and do not care for the present national symbol. To them it is the old symbol of the conqueror. The placing of a grotesque coat of arms on the flag has no attraction for them. Neither would a star or a simple maple leaf. These would make no perceptible difference to them; and owing to the want of a distinctive Canadian flag, the French flag is universally in use among them. One of the chief uses of a new Canadian flag would be to displace the French flag in Quebec.

The French Canadian people are also entitled to representation on the flag, and to have their sentiment respected and acknowledged; and this can be done while giving to the English-speaking people the full representation to which they are entitled.

What we want, in fact, is a combination of the British and French flags. This can be had by adding the tricolour to the British crosses. The fly of the flag might as well be red, white, and blue as entirely red, much better as these colours are as much British as French. They have been British colours since 1707; they have been French only since

1794. Then if the green maple leaf was put in the central white colour we should have a Canadian flag which would satisfy the vast majority of the Canadian people.

If this flag were adopted it would displace the French flag in Quebec in six months. The tricolour has only lately become the flag of the French Canadians. The white flag of old France and the *fluer de lis* were his, and had there been a Canadian flag there would be no more chance of his adopting the tricolour than there was of Henry de Chambord's accepting it. Moreover, if my suggested design were accepted there would be some meaning in our most popular after-dinner song, "The Red, White, and Blue."

These reasons may be thought trivial by some; but, still, there would be immense meaning in this design. It would symbolize the dream of the true Canadian, the fusion of the two races which now inhabit the country and whose differences do so much to weaken and enfeeble us; it would form the centre of attraction for the hearts and eyes of all Canadians, stimulating patriotism, and high endeavour, while at the same time continually reminding us of the honour, power, and glories of the two great nations from which we have sprung, and so prevent us, as a people, from ever stooping to any low or unworthy action.

Woodstock, June 17th, 1895.

WILLIAM NORRIS.

SIR,—The question of a national flag for my native country is one so full of interest to me that I cannot, while the present discussion is proceeding in *THE WEEK*, forego giving expression to my opinion respecting the suggestion made by Mr. Sandford Fleming. No one, probably, can have greater aversion than myself to adopting anything which might appear to be copying from the United States; but the idea contained in Mr. Fleming's proposition is so distinctly original and so widely different from the purpose of the stars in the United States flag that surely imitation is out of the question. I rather like the recommendation of Mr. Baylis, that the Maple Leaf be placed in the centre of the star. At any rate I am in favour of Mr. Fleming's suggestion.

Lake Joseph.

WM. CANNIFF.

CORONER'S INQUESTS.

SIR,—In your editorial headed "The Coroner's Inquest," published in *THE WEEK* of the 14th inst., you seem to have misconstrued the statute relating to the holding of inquests. According to your interpretation of the law no inquest can be held unless (1) "a medical man declares on oath that it is necessary," (2) "a medical man shall take an oath that an inquest is necessary."

The Statute, R.S.O., 1887, chap. 80, s. 2, reads as follows:—"No inquest shall be held on the body of any deceased person by a coroner until it has been made to appear to the coroner that there is reason to believe that the deceased died from violence or unfair means or by culpable or negligent conduct either of himself or of others under such circumstances as require investigation and not through mere accident or mischance."

There is nothing here about a medical man's oath as to the necessity or non-necessity for an inquest. If it has been made to appear to the coroner that there is reason to believe, etc., he is authorized to hold the inquest. Under the wording of the Act a very great deal of latitude may be taken by the coroner if he is inclined to hold the enquiry. On a certain statement of facts opinions will differ as to the necessity or otherwise for enquiry, but the coroner alone is made the judge in cases committed to him, and he alone must conclude whether or not the representations made to him will justify the holding of an enquiry in accordance with the section I have quoted. This section would seem to be on the lines suggested in your editorial as to what in your opinion the law should be.

You would seem to have confounded this section with section 4 of the same Act, which provides that "no fees shall be claimable by a coroner in respect of an inquest unless prior to the issuing of his warrant for summoning the jury he shall have made a declaration in writing under oath stating that from information received by the coroner he is of opinion that there is reason for believing that the deceased did not come to his death from natural causes or from mere accident or mischance but came to his death from violence or unfair means or culpable or negligent conduct of others under circumstances requiring investigation by a coroner's inquest."