



# CROWNS & MACES

## ROYAL AND LOYAL


 CROWN to the Royal Canadian Mint, which issued a sterling silver nickle in commemoration of the brave Canadian soldiers who landed in Normandy on D-Day. Accompanying the coin is a bronze medallion, a replica of the tombac coin issued during the War, which includes the coded cypher in dots and dashes around its rim – “We win when we work willingly.” The Mint included the following tribute in its information circular about the effigy on the obverse of this fine commemorative piece: “It is the portrait of His Majesty King George VI, Canada’s celebrated monarch who took a symbolic stand with Winston during “our finest hour” by refusing to leave Buckingham Palace.”



## JUVENILE ‘JOURNALISM’

 MACE to *National Post* and its Copy Editors for printing “Scene” columnist’s Shinan Govani’s tasteless mockery of the English accent of HRH The Princess Royal. Govani attended the Monarchist League Patrons’ Reception for Anne at the invitation of the Dominion Chairman. Thrice he quoted the Princess as asking fellow guests if they were a “membraah” of the League. We wonder if this supposedly amusing but actually frightfully clichéd stereotyping on the part of the *Post* stands as an accurate reflection of the newspaper’s policy vis a vis the racial, ethnic and linguistic differences which make up Canada and the Commonwealth today. Does the *Post* normally print reporters’ English transliterations of interviewees and news subjects’ speech? How might it report the words of an individual with a speech impediment? Does it find equally risible the particular English pronunciations of Her Majesty’s Black, Indo-Pakistani and Oriental subjects?

## ARMORIAL ANIMADVERSION, REFORM REMEMBERED

 CROWN to *The Toronto Star* for apologizing for an error, and to the Conservative Party of Canada for pointing it out in the first place, with reference to the motto on the Arms of Canada. The *Star*, largest newspaper in Canada, had on May 20 editorially criticized (in fact awarded a “dart” the journal’s equivalent of *CMN*’s mace!) to Opposition Leader Stephen Harper for “mistakenly” referring to Canada’s Arms as including the words “*They desire a better country.*” “Wrong, folks,” said the paper, “It says, “*From sea to sea.*” The Party quickly responded by drawing attention to the fact of the 1994 augmentation of Arms by The Queen, to incorporate into the Arms a riband bearing the motto of the Order of Canada: *Desiderantes Meliorem Patriam*,” Latin for “*They desire a better country.*”


“What started as a dart now looks more like a boomerang,” editorialized the *Star*’s rival, *National Post*.

However the *Star* quickly acknowledged its mistake in a witty editorial entitled “*Mea Culpa, Mr Harper*,” which read: “Holy sweet Cicero! Our gruff old Latin master back in high school would have rapped our knuckles for lobbing an unfair dart at Conservative Leader Stephen Harper, and on the eve of an election, no less! We wrongly faulted the Conservative party policy book for say-

ing Canada’s emblem says: “They desire a better country.” In fact, it does... To which, in all heraldic fairness, we can only say: *Mea culpa, Stephanus. Errare humanum est; ignoscere divinum.* (Sorry about that, Stephen. To err is human; to forgive divine). *Et absit invidia.* (No real offence intended).”

*CMN* finds the foregoing rather amusing, as it was the Reform Party, one of the predecessors to today’s Tories, which when the augmentation was announced a decade ago raised a wholly unjustified hue and cry about the “millions” that supposedly would be spent to change the display of the Arms throughout the country. *CMN* says “*tempus fugit.*”

## ADDLED ACADEME

 MACE to The Department of Political Science, University of Lethbridge, Alberta. It hosts an attractive website which, it claims is designed to “provide educators, students and the attentive public with a credible source for political education and information.” However, a brief review of the site reveals such biased and inaccurate statements as • “*Constitutional monarchy means that a monarchy (a King or Queen) reigns according to the limits imposed by a country’s Constitution. Thus, in Canada’s case, the monarchy of Britain (presently Queen Elizabeth II) rules Canada.*” • “*In Canada, “Crown” lands are property owned by the Queen of England.*”

With such nonsense emanating out of what is supposed to be an institution of higher education, small wonder that many Canadians are unaware of how they are governed.

## INQUIRY UNDERWAY

? We are tempted to award a MACE – but in hopes of a happy resolution we hold back at this time – to the Editor of the Oxford Canadian English Dictionary, Katherine Barber, for not having the elementary courtesy to respond to Monarchist League member Christopher Mahon’s letter suggesting ways in which the publication could become more “Canadian.”

The Dominion Chairman has twice approached Ms Barber to ask for a substantive reply; his latest attempt was rebuffed with the advice that the League produce its own dictionary “*which it thinks does the job better.*” Such an inelegant refusal to comment suggests a lofty *de haut en bas* attitude in respect of suggestions directed to the *appendix* of the work, having more a dictionary aspect, and certainly never intending – God forbid – to challenge those “*sound lexicographical principles, practicality and years of experience*” which Ms Barber asserts and doubtless even possesses.

Mahon wrote: “I bought a copy of the 2001 edition of the Oxford Canadian English Dictionary and noticed a number of things I’d like to bring to your attention. It’s primarily the second appendix, the lists of Prime Ministers and Governors General, that I’m concerned with. You may have heard this comment before, but I found it somewhat obvious that most of the page, which is currently blank, could appropriately be used to list our Heads of State, the Kings & Queens of Canada.

“While pondering this I also checked a number of entries in the dictionary proper and came up with a few other comments and suggestions as well:

“1) A list of Kings and Queens of Canada ought to be included in Appendix 2, perhaps beginning with Henry VII of England (who commissioned John Cabot) and including the French kings from Francis I (who hired Jacques Cartier) to Louis XV (who lost French North America). Otherwise the list could comprise the Kings and Queens of the Dominion of Canada, as the current lists do for the PMs & Governors General, and begin with Victoria at Confederation. “2) The entry on Elizabeth II mentions the UK twice where Canada would suffice and be more appropriate for a Canadian dictionary. A similar situation exists for many of the other monarchs, however, the Queen’s entry is more pronounced because she was given the specific title of Queen of Canada in 1953. Hence, the problem is quite blatant when the entry simply mentions that she has been “queen of the United Kingdom since 1952” instead of “Queen of Canada since 1952” or both.

“3) A number of other entries could be ‘Canadianized’ in this way, such as Windsor, Henry VII, Francis I, Louis XV and Victoria. Some already have been domesticated thusly, such as royal, royal assent, House of Commons, &c.

“4) The Duke of Connaught, mentioned in both the list of Governors General and in his own entry, was a Prince and subsequently ought to have HRH listed before his title as a part of it.

“Since Appendix 2 has to be updated anyway to include Paul Martin and Adrienne Clarkson, I figured now would be an appropriate time to also append a list of Canadian Sovereigns as well.

“I hope that these suggestions are of help to you and wish you all the best in your work.”

Seems to *CMN* that Mahon raises a lot of points worthy of even the august Mr Oxford’s consideration! Ms Barber is being approached afresh to see if a civil and substantive response may yet be obtained. As the Dominion Chairman wrote on July 20, “if the editor of “the” OED could correspond with – apparently profitably – all manner of folk, including the famed lunatic – you might possibly think that you yourself could engage in substantive discussion, or argument, with us!”