SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD
AND
THE CANADIAN FLAG

"The flag which has come to be considered as the recognized flag of the Dominion both afloat and ashore."

The Governor-General, Lord Stanley
12th December, 1891

1907

Sir John A. Macdonald and the Canadian Flag

BY

JOHN S. EWART

TO THE EDITOR

WITH MR. EWART'S COMPLIMENTS

Sir John A. Macdonald and the Canadian Flag

BY

JOHN S. EWART

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD

AND

THE CANADIAN FLAG.

Mr. Joseph Pope has issued a pamphlet concerning my article ("The Canadian Flag") in the January number of The Canadian Magazine and my recent address to The Canadian Club of Ottawa. I say "concerning," for although the pamphlet is, no doubt, supposed to be a reply to what I wrote and said, it has really very little to do with anything that can be ascribed to my authorship. Its irrelevance is due, upon one of its points, to Mr. Pope's failure to appreciate what I did say, and upon the other, to his resolute refusal to associate with, or even recognize the existence of facts which are not quite in harmony with his conceptions of fittest propriety. For the first of these misfortunes I may be blameworthy; the second we must excuse.

The history of British colonial relationship—its evolution in Canada from military governorship to responsible government—Mr. Pope either forgets or declines to acknowledge. He appears to imagine that "connection with the mother country" is something with clear, historic meaning; something indicative of a relationship of fixed and certain character; something without variety of circumstances or diversity of detail; something which everybody can agree to,or dissent from, without definition of terms or qualification of meaning.

Speaking accurately, the phrase "British connection" means of course, some sort of connection with the United Kingdom. It does not imply any particular set of arrangements. It does not mean even supremacy in Downing Street (*a*), and obedience in Ottawa.

Speaking popularly and loosely, "British connection" means, I suppose, that sort of connection which exists at the present moment, and as the words have always had that signification, they have never in Canadian history, for ten years in succession, meant the same thing.

(a) I use the phrases "Downing Street" and Colonial Office" instead of the "British government," because only upon the rarest occasions does the Colonial Secretary submit colonial matters to cabinet meetings; and when he does, his recommendations are seldom disputed. Mr. Chamberlain referred to himself as "Downing Street "; See Col. Off. Journal 1, p. 286.

At one time, "British connection" was thought, by many excellent men, to prohibit criticism of gubernatorial action; at another, to inhibit all encroachment upon royal prerogative; at another, to debar all tendency to responsible government; at another, to forbid protective duties as against British manufactures. And now if anyone be asked whether or not he favors British connection, he must, if he would avoid misunderstanding, demand the meaning of the phrase.

For example, Lord Grenville, when he was defending his stamp statute in 1766, said:—

> "Protection and obedience are reciprocal. Great Britain protects America; America is bound to yield obedience" (*a*).

Prove to Canada that British connection means colonial obedience, and Canada will renounce it to-morrow. Prove that it means what it meant in 1837, or what Lord Russell or Lord Glenelg said it meant, and almost every man in Canada (including Mr. Pope, I hope) would abjure it. Prove, indeed, that it is inconsistent with Canadian exercise of the very highest functions of self-government, and there are very few who would not forego it and disavow it, rather than interrupt Canadian attainment of nationhood. If, on the other hand, British connection means that which Sir John A. Macdonald would have had it to mean, only the most rigid of irreconcilables would dissent from it.

About twenty-five years ago, the nature of the discussion as to "British connection" underwent a most significant change. While the phrase has probably always been popularly accepted as meaning "British connection as we now have it," thinking imperialists, in the eighteen-eighties, ceased to argue for indefinite prolongation of colonialism, and joined with Dr. Parkin and all nationalists in declaring that

> "If the greater British colonies are content with their political status, they are unworthy of the source from which they sprang."

Everybody agrees, too, with Dr. Parkin's successor in imperialistic missionary endeavor—Professor Leacock:—

> "This colonial status is a worn-out, by-gone thing. The sense and feeling of it has become harmful to us. It limits the ideas and circumscribes the patriotism of our people. It impairs the mental vigor and narrows the outlook of those that are reared and educated in our midst."

Very well: now what does an imperialist of the present day mean, precisely, when he says that he favors "British connection?" Not connection as we now have it, or ever heretofore have had it; not colonialism with its humiliating subordination to the Colonial Office. But what then? With some sort of precision, please: What then?

(*a*) Quoted in a recent very good book, "British Colonial Policy 1754–1765," by G. L. Beer.

While the Imperial Federation League lived, we had some sort of an answer. It was vague and unsatisfying, no doubt; but there were, at all events, some men (and some very able men) who were trying to make it more definite. The League, however, gave up the struggle some fifteen years ago, and no one now attempts anything more than does Mr. Pope:—

> "I cannot doubt that, little by little, the present difficulties in the way of closer union between its component parts will be overcome."

In view of all this uncertainty, and in view of the fact that the popular notion of "British connection" has changed with probably every decade in our history, I should have thought that little argumentative advancement could be made by citing passages—even eloquent passages—from speeches in favor of "British connection." Yet that is what Mr. Pope (discussing one of his points) entirely relies upon, and appears to be perfectly satisfied with.

In my Canadian Club address, I pointed out that "British connection" might mean a Canadian monarchy, with the British King as our Sovereign; I said that Sir John A. Macdonald, in 1867, had desired that the new federation should be styled "The Kingdom of Canada;" and I quoted his declaration that he had in view

> "the noble object of founding a great British monarchy, in connection with the British Empire and under the British Queen . . . recognizing the Sovereign of Great Britain as its sole and only head."

Sir John in these words accurately, and in precise and technical language, defined the kind of "British connection" which he desired. Theretofore, we had been "colonies" with the rank of "provinces," and the Colonial Office had kept us to some extent in leading-strings and under tutelage. Sir John's ambition was to end our colonialism —our provincialism—and to make Canada a "Kingdom" equal in rank with the United Kingdom itself, and like it,

> "recognizing the Sovereign of Great Britain 'as our sole and only head' " (*a*).

Sir John wished to be

> "a subject of a great British American nation, under the government of Her Majesty and in connection with the British Empire."

He said that the new constitution

> "was intended to be, as far as circumstances would permit, similar to that of the imperial government, and recognizing the Sovereign of Great Britain as its sole and only head."

What Sir John A. Macdonald wanted forty years ago, I ventured

(*a*) Mr. Pope, in his excellent Life of Sir John A. Macdonald, tells us that "Mr. Macdonald made every effort to retain the phrase" (Kingdom of Canada) but it was changed "at the instance of Lord Derby, the Foreign Minister, who feared the word 'Kingdom' would wound the susceptibilities of the Yankees."(Vol. 1, p. 313).

to bring, in his own language, before the Canadian Club; and this is Mr. Pope's comment:—

> "Such visionary and impracticable ideas are not likely to do much harm in themselves, but I cannot refrain from expressing my surprise and regret that the lecturer should associate the name of Sir John Macdonald with his fantastic scheme—Sir John Macdonald! the guiding principle of whose long and eventful life was British connection, and for whom the visible symbol of that intimate union stood as a pillar of cloud by day and a pillar of fire by night."

That sentence shows Mr. Pope's confusion. No one doubts for a moment that Sir John stood for "British connection." He so declared in the extract from him which I gave in my address. But to Sir John's clear mind, Canada could have "British connection" and yet have "the Sovereign of Great Britain," and not the Colonial Office, "as its sole and only head." That proposition does not appear to me to be one specially difficult of comprehension.

Not understanding it, Mr. Pope proceeds with one quotation after another in order to demonstrate that Sir John was in favor of "British connection." Of course he was; but *what sort of connection?*—a connection of dominant with subordinate?—a connection of superior with inferior?—an everlasting colonialism? That is the point to which attention should have been directed.

Sir John's personal history illustrates, with remarkable clearness, the different meanings which have attached to the phrase "British connection;" for although Sir John always favored "connection with the mother-country," yet his view as to the character of the connection underwent all the changes involved in advancement from colonialism to nationalism. This fact is interesting and instructive; let us notice Sir John's action at three different periods of our history:

1. Down to the eighteen-forties, Canada was without responsible government. Governors came and went—nineteen of them in Upper and Lower Canada between 1792 and 1840. None of these Governors knew anything about Canada when they arrived. Every one of them took such advice as he pleased in Canada, and such orders as came to him from the Colonial Office. At the Colonial Office, presided Colonial Secretaries, who also came and went (fifteen of them during the same period—an average of one every three years). None of these had ever been in Canada; or, when he commenced issuing orders, knew anything about it. Meanwhile, Canadians had been electing Assemblies; and the Assemblies had been meeting, debating, protesting, refusing supplies—doing precisely what the British House of Commons had done in order to obtain political power. After years of fighting, the Assembly's control of the purse was fairly well acknowledged, but as Lord Durham said in his famous report, the Assembly

> "still found itself deprived of all voice in the choice or even designation of the persons in whose administration of affairs it could feel confidence."

"Thus every successive year consolidated and enlarged the strength of the ruling party. Fortified by family connexion, and the common interest felt by all who held and all who desired subordinate offices, that party was thus erected into a solid and permanent power, controlled by no responsibility, subject to no serious change, exercising over the whole government of the Province an authority utterly independent of the people and its representatives, and possessing the only means of influencing either the government at home, or the colonial representative of the Crown".

In Lord Durham's opinion, that state of affairs was absurd:—

"The powers for which the Assembly contended appear in both instances to be such as it was perfectly justified in demanding. It is difficult to conceive what could have been their theory of government who imagined that, in any colony of England, a body, invested with the name and character of a representative Assembly, could be deprived of any of these powers which, in the opinion of Englishmen, are inherent in a popular legislature. It was a vain delusion to imagine that by mere limitations in the constitutional act, or an exclusive system of government, a body, strong in the consciousness of wielding the public opinion of the majority, could regard certain portions of the provincial revenues as sacred from its control; could confine itself to the mere business of making laws; and look on as a passive and indifferent spectator while those laws were carried into effect or evaded, and the whole business of the country was conducted by men in whose intentions or capacity it had not the slightest confidence. Yet such was the limitation placed on the authority of the Assembly of Lower Canada (*a*); it might refuse or pass laws, vote or withhold supplies, but it could exercise no influence on the nomination of a single servant of the Crown. The Executive Council, the law officers, and whatever heads of departments as are known to the administrative system of the province, were placed in power, without any regard to the wishes of the people or their representatives; nor indeed are there wanting instances in which a mere hostility to the majority of the Assembly, elevated the most incompetent persons to posts of honor and trust. However decidedly the Assembly might condemn the policy of the government, the persons who had advised that policy retained their offices and their power of giving bad advice. If a law was passed after repeated conflicts, it had to be carried into effect by those who had most strenuously opposed it. The wisdom of adopting the true principle of representative government, and facilitating the management of public affairs by entrusting it to the persons who have the confidence of the representative body, has never been recognized in the government of the North American colonies. All the officers of government were independent of the Assembly; and that body which had nothing to say to their appointment, was left to get on as it best might with a set of public functionaries whose paramount feeling may not unfairly be said to have been one of hostility to itself."

"From the commencement, therefore, to the end of the disputes which mark the whole parliamentary history of Lower Canada (*b*), I look on the conduct of the Assembly as a constant warfare with the Executive for the purpose of obtaining the powers inherent in a representative body by the very nature of representative government."

Everybody now recognizes the truth of Lord Durham's diagnosis, and all colonials now acclaim his great report as the charter of their liberties. But it was not to be supposed that the imperialists of the day would agree with it. To such men, the report was the veriest rubbish, the purest abomination, the most transparent republicanism, the wickedest incitement to rebellion; and they continued their struggle for Canadian colonialism.

It was during the last battle of this great civil war that Sir John commenced his political career. In November 1843, the Baldwin-Lafontaine government (except Mr. Daly, "the perpetual Secretary") resigned because the Governor (Lord Metcalfe) insisted upon making appointments to office without his ministers advice or knowledge,

(*a*) Upper Canada was in precisely the same situation.
(*b*) The same language was applied to Upper Canada.

and for some months the Governor and Mr. Daly did as they pleased. With difficulty the Governor secured a new executive, but as Mr. Pope tells us:—

> "That his new Council did not possess the confidence of the Assembly, Sir Charles Metcalfe knew too well" (*a*).

Nevertheless, as Mr. Pope approvingly says:—

> "the Conservative party stood manfully by the Governor-General in this emergency" (*b*).

The Governor dissolved the Assembly; elections ensued; Sir John issued his address in Kingston (5th October, 1844); and in it he declared his firm belief that the

> "prosperity of Canada depends upon its permanent *connection with the mother-country*, and that I shall resist, to the utmost, any attempt (from whatever quarter it may come) which may tend to weaken that union." (*c*).

He made no other reference to the great question of the day, except inferentially when he deprecated

> "fruitless discussions on abstract and theoretical questions of government" (*d*).

Fully to appreciate the language of Sir John, one has to be reminded not only, or principally, of the fierceness of the struggle for responsible government, but of the strongly asserted belief that the displacement of gubernatorial authority meant termination of British connection. In the present little essay, there is not room for more than two illustrative quotations, but they shall be from the very highest authority. The Colonial Secretary (Lord Glenelg) declared that responsible government

> "is inconsistent with a due adherence to the essential distinction between a metropolitan and a colonial government, and is therefore inadmissable."

And the Prime Minister (Lord John Russell) said that the agitation for responsible government is

> "not a demand for the removal of a grievance, but is a demand to have a constitution which must be, to all intents and purposes, an independent constitution; because it is impossible that the ministers of the government in Canada should be removeable at the pleasure of the Assembly, and yet be able to act at the same time UPON ORDERS WHICH THEY RECEIVE FROM THE QUEEN'S GOVERNMENT AT HOME."

There was the great question—Shall Canada have responsible government? or shall not Canadian statesmen continue to act "upon orders which they receive from the Queen's Government at home?"

(*a*) Life of Sir John A. Macdonald, p. 31.
(*b*) Ib. p. 30.
(*c*) Ibid. 32.
(*d*) Ibid. 33.

According to Sir John A. Macdonald, that was one of those "abstract and theoretical questions of government" which ought not to be discussed. For himself, it sufficed that he believed in "permanent connection with the mother-country," and he pledged himself to resist "any attempt which may tend to weaken the union."

In those days, "British connection," to many people, meant government by British Governors, and Sir John was in favor of "British connection." The phrase lost *that* signification within the next three years.

2. Let us now note what, at the same period of our history and for fifteen years afterwards, "British connection" meant in the realm of trade and commerce. When Sir John issued that first election address, neither he nor anyone else would have imagined that "British connection" could possibly outlive the imposition by Canada of protective duties upon British manufactures. The whole theory of British colonialism was based upon the commercial subordination of the colonies—that was their purpose, their sole *raison d'être*. Colonies brought no fighting strength to the United Kingdom; on the contrary, they were a source of weakness and enormous expense. But they were, at the same time, most valuable commercial assets, and European nations fought fiercely for possession of them. Sir George Cornewall Lewis produced his classic work on "The Government of Dependencies" in 1841, and as his recent editor (*a*) tells us, that Sir George

> "never contemplated that colonies, whose commercial relations with the mother-country were precisely the same as those of foreign nations, could still remain part of the Empire."

To Sir John A. Macdonald, therefore in 1844, resistance to "any attempt which may tend to weaken the union" would certainly have meant opposition to any proposal of taxation of British manufactures, with a view to their exclusion from the Canadian markets—to any proposal which would disturb the very basis of British connection. That was his view in 1844. From 1859 to the day of his death he acted upon contrary principle.

In 1846, the Canadian parliament passed a bill increasing duties upon leather and leather manufactures. Mr. Gladstone took fright, and declared that—

> "Her Majesty's Government are not prepared to assent to the imposition on such British goods as are ordinarily sent to Canada from the United Kingdom or from a British possession, of rates of duty substantially higher than those which were levied under the previous provincial customs act, although they take no objection to the substitution, for duties ad valorem, of such fixed amounts as may be considered on the average equivalent to them. Your Lordship will consider this as *their fixed decision*, and will make it known accordingly. An amendment of the Act, to bring it *into conformity with this decision is indispensable*."

(*a*). Mr. Lucas, now chief of the "Dominions" department of the Colonial Office.

There must be no protective duties as against British manufactures. From the beginning of colonialism to its termination, according to Sir George Cornewall Lewis, that must be the rule—there can be no "British connection" without that rule.

Now let us go on to 1859. Sir John Macdonald and Sir George Cartier are at the head of the Canadian government and their finance minister has introduced a tariff bill, with clauses said to be for the purpose of raising revenue, but which will have the effect of protecting Canadian manufactures as against the rest of the world—the mother-country included. The Sir John A.Macdonald of 1844 would have resisted "any attempt which may tend to weaken that union"—would have voted against that bill. Now, in 1859, he is a member of the government that is asserting Canadian commercial independence; is asserting the right to treat the mother-country as though it were a foreign country—if Canada so wishes.

But if Sir John's view had thus undergone very substantial modification, no one could expect that British manufacturers would complacently assent to these colonial pretensions. And so we find Sheffield petitioning the Colonial Secretary:—

> "that the policy of protection to native manufactures in Canada should be distinctly discountenanced by Her Majesty's Government, as a system condemned by reason and experience, directly contrary to the policy solemnly adopted by the mother-country, and calculated to breed dissension and distrust between Great Britain and her colonies" (*a*).

The Colonial Secretary hesitated as to disallowing the Canadian statute; confined himself to severe remonstrance; and received in reply one of the most important state-documents in the history of Canada (25th October, 1859)—sent by Sir John A. Macdonald's government:—

> "From expressions used by His Grace in reference to the sanction of the provincial customs act, it would appear that he had even entertained the suggestion of its disallowance; and though happily Her Majesty has not been so advised, yet the question having been raised, and the consequence of such a step, if ever adopted, being of the most serious character, it becomes the duty of the provincial government distinctly to state what they consider to be *the position and rights of the Canadian Legislature.*
>
> Respect to the Imperial Government must always dictate the desire to satisfy them that the policy of this country is neither hastily nor unwisely formed, and that due regard is had to the interests of the mother-country as well as of the province. But the government of Canada acting for its legislature and people, cannot, through those feelings of deference which they owe to the imperial authorities, *in any manner waive or diminish the right of the people of Canada to decide for themselves* both as to the mode and extent to which taxation shall be imposed. The provincial ministry are at all times ready to afford explanations in regard to the acts of the legislature to which they are a party—but subject to *their duty and allegiance to Her Majesty, their responsibility, in all general questions of policy, must be to the provincial parliament,* by whose confidence they administer the affairs of the country . . . . . Self-government would be utterly annihilated *IF THE VIEWS OF THE IMPERIAL GOVERNMENT WERE TO BE PREFERRED TO THOSE OF THE PEOPLE OF CANADA.* It is therefore the duty of the present government distinctly to affirm the right of the Canadian legislature to adjust the taxation of the people in the way they deem best—*even if it should*

(*a*) Can. Sess. Pap. 1860, No. 38.

unfortunately happen to meet the disapproval of the imperial ministry. Her Majesty cannot be advised to disallow such acts, unless Her advisers are *PREPARED TO ASSUME THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE AFFAIRS OF THE COLONY, IRRESPECTIVE OF THE VIEWS OF ITS INHABITANTS*" (*a*).

Mr. Pope makes light of the distinction between allegiance to the British Crown and subordination to the British government (*b*); but Sir John never confused those two fundamentally different things; and the most striking point of the document just quoted is missed, unless the distinction be observed. In the United Kingdom the people owe duty and allegiance to the King, but nevertheless they govern themselves. For the future, said Sir John and his government, it is to be the same in Canada. No feelings of—

> "deference to the imperial authorities" shall "in any manner waive or diminish the right of the people of Canada to decide for themselves."

"Duty and allegiance to Her Majesty" are acknowledged, but ministerial responsibility "must be to the provincial parliament" and not to the imperial government. If the imperial government thinks otherwise, it must be

> "prepared to assume the administration of the affairs of the colony, irrespective of the views of its inhabitants."

Well done, Sir John! (*c*) Twenty years from now, when you introduce your most unmistakeably protective tariff, your present courageous assertion of Canadian legislative independence will relieve you from all apprehension as to *its* disallowance.

3. Now let us come to federation times in 1867. Sir John is the chief man in that great movement. What does he wish? "British connection" as at the time of his election address in 1844? "British connection" even as in 1859? Or does he look forward to still ampler powers for Canada? To the graduation of Canada from colonialism? To parliamentary recognition of the great fact of Canada's legislative and commercial independence? The answer is clear and I cannot think that by quotations to prove that Sir John favored "British connection", Mr. Pope has succeeded in throwing the slightest doubt upon Sir John's attitude as disclosed in the excerpts which I have given from his federation speeches:—

Canada had been a "colony"; Sir John wanted her to be a "great British monarchy."

Canada's rank had been that of a "Province"; Sir John wanted her to be a "Kingdom".

(*a*) Ibid.

(*b*) Mr. Pope calls the British government "His Majesty's Government." In England "the church" is the Episcopal church; in Scotland it is the Presbyterian. In the United Kingdom, "His Majesty's Government" is the British Government; in Canada, it may mean the Government of Canada, or any one of the nine provinces.

(*c*) And well done! to Sir A. T. Galt also, the finance minister of the administration.

Canada had been subject to Colonial-Office supervision; Sir John desired to recognize "the Sovereign of Great Britain as Canada's sole and only head".

Canada had been connected with the United Kingdom—had been connected as a colony, and as subordinate to the Colonial Office; Sir John wanted British connection upon a basis of equality.

If this be a "visionary and impracticable" idea, I was not wrong, at all events, in associating with it the name of Sir John A. Macdonald.

> "Sir John Macdonald!" (exclaims Mr. Pope) "the guiding principle of whose long and eventful life was British connection, and for whom the visible symbol of that intimate union stood as a pillar of cloud by day and a pillar of fire by night."

A pretty phrase, Mr. Pope, but inconclusive, and better, as I think, and more true, in its original form—the form given to it by Sir John Thompson in his eulogy of his former chief:—

> Sir John's *love of Canada* and his desire to serve her must be put far *in the front of all his characteristics*. His daily thought might be expressed in Webster's words, 'Let our object be our country, our whole country, and nothing but our country.' Nothing but our country', in the sense that Canada was to be the first of all in every consideration of public policy or personal action. His true and deep *CANADIANISM* was the 'pillar of cloud by day and the pillar of fire by night' to the hundreds of thousands whom he led as no man could have led by a mere party banner" (*a*).

The steady, secular advance toward Canadian independence is a story that some day I hope to tell. In it, as in the history of British parliamentary government (Magna Charta, Bill of Rights, etc.) there are some striking episodes of capital importance, for example (1) the attainment of responsible government or legislative independence; (2) the adoption of a protective tariff, implying commercial independence; and (3) the federation of Canada, by which separated "Provinces" became a united "Dominion"—on the way to a "Kingdom", although the "susceptibilities of the Yankees" (or rather Lord Derby's absurd deference to some supposed susceptibilities) forbade us the name.

To the first of these great assertions of Canada's growing nationality, Sir John Macdonald was nominally but inactively opposed. He was the great leader in the other two movements; and in the last would have made Canadian independence apparent to everybody. Mr. Pope, in his book, tells us that Sir John "made every effort" to get for us the title "Kingdom of Canada" (*b*). He says that Sir John "was intent upon founding a kingdom" while the imperial authorities wished to effect

> "an arrangement which would result in the simpler administration of the then Colonial Office" (*c*).

(*a*) Quoted in Mr. Pope's Life of Sir John A. Macdonald, II, p. 344. The italics are mine.

(*b*) Ibid. I, p. 312.

(*c*) Ibid. I, p 313.

Why does Mr. Pope blink those facts now? Is it not perfectly clear that Sir John wished to be well rid of "the simple administration" of the Colonial Office? Is it not perfectly clear that, with the King as our "sole and only head" we should be independent?

Among the minor episodes of Canadian constitutional history, there are two which many persons might well have denounced (and probably did denounce) as "attempts to weaken the union"—namely (1) Canadian leadership in the negotiation of her own treaties; and (2) the adoption of a distinctive Canadian flag.

In the days of our colonialism, the British government made such treaties for us as it pleased. We were not consulted. We had no voice. Does anybody want that sort of "British connection" now? It was under Sir John Macdonald's leadership that Sir Charles Tupper succeeded in putting an end to that foolishness—in taking the first long step towards diplomatic independence.

In my previous article I pointed out that the Union Jack was the jack (or flag) indicative of the union of the three kingdoms; and that it was properly flown in the United Kingdom and wherever the sovereignty of the United Kingdom extended (*a*). It should fly, therefore, in every colony or possession of the United Kingdom. And if Canada be still a colony, it should fly there. Canada is, however, very nearly free of its swaddling-clothes, and most naturally it has commenced to provide itself with a flag, other than the one which signifies subordination—which signifies over-lordship by some other nation. And the flag that has been adopted is extremely appropriate to our equivocal situation, namely, the red ensign with the Union Jack in the corner—indicative of colonialism, and the Canadian coat-of-arms in the fly—indicative of ind vidual existence.

It was Sir John Macdonald's government that instituted the new flag—as my preivous article proved—and did it in the face of opposition from the Admiralty, and indeed from the British Parliament. Fortunately the then Governor-General of Canada, convinced that Sir John was right, helped him by sending to the Colonial Secretary the following despatch (12th December, 1891):—

> "It has been one of the objects of the Dominion, as of imperial policy to emphasize the fact that by Confederation, Canada became not a mere assemblage of Provinces, but one United Dominion, and, though no actual order has ever been issued, the Dominion Government *has encouraged by precept and example the use on all public buildings throughout the Provinces of the red ensign with the Canadian badge in the fly.*

(*a*) Mr. Pope characterizes as "pedantry" my reference to the origin, and therefore the meaning, of the Union Jack. A charge of plagiarism would have been much more reasonable, for the official description is "the imperial colour of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in which the cross of St. George is conjoint with the crosses of St. Andrew and St. Patrick on a blue field".

Of course it may be replied that no restriction exists with respect to flags which may be hoisted on shore, but I submit that *THE FLAG IS ONE WHICH HAS COME TO BE CONSIDERED AS THE RECOGNIZED FLAG OF THE DOMINION, BOTH ASHORE AND AFLOAT*, and on sentimental grounds I think there is much to be said for its retention, as it expresses at once the unity of the several provinces of the Dominion and the identity of their flag with the colors hoisted by the ships of the mother-country."

These being, for Mr. Pope, extremely unpleasant facts, he must be excused for declining to recognize them or even allude to them. And probably, if he must write upon the subject at all, he takes the proper and only available course in repeating, in excellent phraseology, the somewhat etiolated warnings against tendencies "to cut loose from old-established moorings; against "this iconclastic spirit"; against the abolition of "ancient and venerable" institutions; against the "brand new"—upon the ground that we have "foolish hearts and fastidious intellects."

No fault must be found with such appeals. They indicate a temperament and a caste of mind, which would, indeed, have kept Canada and the world in the twin-thraldoms of ignorance and autocracies; but every age has had many men of that sort—every age has had to struggle against them, and to overcome them.

For the Union Jack, and for what has been accomplished by the great nation whose symbol it is, I have the greatest respect and the highest admiration. If I do not burst into exaggerated panygerics and religious perorations over it, it is not because I do not appreciate all that it has done in the world, but because I dislike spread-lionism nearly as much as both Mr. Pope and I dislike spread-eagleism.

But the Union Jack, in its simple form, cannot be the flag of Canada. If we should ever arrange a political union with the United Kingdom, the jack which with its one original cross said England, with its subsequent two crosses said England and Scotland, and with its present three crosses says England, Scotland and Ireland, would require still another adaptation.

As Mr. Pope says, "a flag is the symbol of sovereignty"; and so long, therefore, as Canada recognizes complete subordination, the flag of the nation to which she is subordinate is her proper flag.

But Canada has asserted and has attained to almost complete self-government—that is to almost complete independence. And when subordination ceases, the symbol of it becomes inappropriate. That is why Sir John A. Macdonald's government, fifteen years ago

"encouraged by precept and example the use on all public buildings throughout the provinces of the red ensign with the Canadian badge in the fly."

That is why Governor-General Lord Stanley said,

"THE FLAG IS ONE THAT HAS COME TO BE CONSIDERED AS THE RECOGNIZED FLAG OF THE DOMINION, BOTH AFLOAT AND ASHORE."

That is why it is called the Canadian flag.

Australia has a flag for shore display. Why should not Canada?

JOHN S. EWART.