Newfoundland Studies

Fitting Newfoundland In

Stuart Pierson

Volume 4, numéro 2, fall 1988

URI : https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/nflds4_2re01

Aller au sommaire du numéro

Éditeur(s)

Faculty of Arts, Memorial University

ISSN

1198-8614 (imprimé)
1715-1430 (numérique)

Découvrir la revue

Citer ce compte rendu

Pierson, S. (1988). Compte rendu de [Fitting Newfoundland In]. *Newfoundland Studies*, *4*(2), 186–197.

REVIEW ARTICLE

Fitting Newfoundland In

The Canadian Encyclopedia. 3 vols. Edmonton: Hurtig Publishers, 1985. 2089 p. $225.

STUART PIERSON

I KNEW I WAS in trouble when I tipped the large (12 x 9 1/4 inches) carton and the three heavy volumes fell into my hand. The texture of the true, i.e., navy blue, covers is so harsh as to set one's teeth on edge, and each volume is so weighty (4 1/2 pounds) as to make it impossible to read comfortably in a chair or on a couch or in bed, using (as God intended) only hands as support.

I knew I was in deeper trouble when I opened the front cover of the first volume to the endpapers. These are crowded and colourful panoramas of typically Canadian persons, animals, artifacts and cultural symbols, done in water colour. The draughtsmanship, by Tom McNeely, is slack and sentimental, like that found in slick-paper "Know-Your-Heritage" textbooks for high school social studies courses. The page is organized according to medieval pre-perspective principles; that is, the more important the item or figure, the larger the drawing. The Parliamentary mace is larger than a totem pole, the Stanley Cup bigger than a propeller-driven monoplane (ca. 1930), Sir Isaac Brock bigger than Gaetan Boucher. I am happy to report, however, that the largest figures, Sir John A. MacDonald (front endpapers in all three volumes) and Sir Wilfred Laurier (back) are the same size. Canada is balance.

It is clear from the outset that we are in for an official, bleached, best-foot-forward promotional effort in which all eyes twinkle like Mme. Jeanne Sauvé's. This is not so much an examination of this country (and this age) as a celebration of it.

NEWFOUNDLAND STUDIES 4, 2 (1988)
0823-1737

It is the view from Alberta Board Rooms (nationalist wing) or, rather, the view that the Board Rooms of Alberta would like to see your average intelligent high school student adopt. The culture from which this work comes is revealed in the front matter. There is a "special acknowledgement" of Alberta's gift of $4 million to the project. This whopping sum, given for "research and development of the first comprehensive reference work" on Canada, made possible the five years' "intensive research, writing, editing, and verification" which resulted in "this vivid new portrait" of the country. The Government of Alberta also gave free sets of the encyclopedia to schools and diplomatic posts, and arranged to have the rights given free to a Quebec company to produce a French-language edition. The publisher offers "special thanks" to Alberta officials whose "enthusiastic support has made possible this worthy and enduring gift to all Canadians from the people of Alberta."

Pay careful attention to the language here. There are no acknowledgements or thanks not "special," no support not "enthusiastic." Not merely research went into the work; there was "development" as well. The research was, moreover, "intensive research." The resulting portrait, "vivid" and "new," is a "worthy and enduring" gift. Pay attention also overleaf, where another acknowledgement (given "gratefully") thanks NOVA, an Alberta Corporation. NOVA's monetary — sorry, "major" gift — paid for the pictures, or, rather, its "financial support made possible the acquisition of the cartography, artwork and illustrations." This "timely and generous assistance" made possible the "inclusion of colour [sic] illustration and maps." If you are curious about NOVA, turn to page 1282 where, in an unsigned article headed by a distinctive typeface not found elsewhere in the work, you will learn that it is a "Canadian energy company . . . with over 90% Canadian ownership." The article is one line shorter than that for General Motors of Canada.

The puffery continues in another grateful acknowledgement, this time to the University of Alberta, which also helped the project or, rather, "whose enthusiastic assistance and encouragement played an indispensable support role in the preparation of the *Canadian Encyclopedia*." It is the sort of prose many of us slash at with red pens come term paper time. "The cooperation provided by the university community exceeded anything the publisher could reasonably have expected and is a reflection of the University of Alberta's commitment to research, scholarship and education." When language inflates, it gets vague. What did the university give them? My guess is office space and a library card. For the rest, what is the University of Alberta *for* if not to teach and learn ("research, scholarship and education")?

The publisher, Mel Hurtig, and the chief editor, James Marsh, wrote introductions. We learn something of the difficulty and complexity of putting together a work like this. Five years in the making. Editorial work done centrally at Edmonton, but also at Calgary, Ottawa, Toronto, and London, Ont.

Colour separation done in Vancouver; printing in Montreal; cloth made in Cornwall; binding done in Toronto; packaging in Oshawa. Twenty-five hundred "authorities" wrote some ten million words; these had to be read, checked and edited down to 3.2 million words.

The purpose? "To bring to Canadians a deeper knowledge about themselves and their diverse country." It was Hurtig's hope that "all Canadians would be drawn together in this national project." The editors don't start with a very high estimation of the level of literacy among their readers. They have provided, says Marsh, "entries on a representative sample of Canadian literary works, such as *The Apprenticeship of Duddy Kravitz* and *Kamouraska* . . . in hope they will introduce readers to good Canadian books." One wonders about the kind of "deeper knowledge" being purveyed here.

The general outlook in the CE is whiggish, upbeat and tub-thumping. It is devoted to the idea of progress and addicted to superlatives. Here is the last paragraph of I.F. Legget's article "Canals and Inland Waterways":

> Today, the St. Lawrence Seaway incorporating the fourth Welland Canal, is one of the few great ship canals of the world, carrying freight from and to the rest of the world and to and from the heart of the N. American continent. The great passenger ship services of earlier years have almost all disappeared, their place now taken (especially on the smaller canals) by ubiquitous private pleasure craft. Once away from these main routes, the lakes and streams remain as one of the delights of Canada. Still used today as they have been for centuries, they illustrate how appropriate the designation "Dominion" is for Canada — "from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth."

No decline of the Maritime shipping industry, no acid rain, no problematic southern neighbour. Private pleasure boats an unalloyed boon.

Under "Advertising" (by Jerry Goodis) we are told that "advertising in Canada is highly regulated." The intelligent high school student asks, "why is that?" Because market discipline has not proved to be effective for preventing lies, deceit, fraud? No answer. Next sentence: "The practice of advertising law has become a profitable legal speciality." I can already feel my understanding deepening, and I'm only on page 12.

One of the manifestations of the boardroom ethos is muddleheadedness about "culture." Culture is not what one does and one's ways of doing it, not a way of life absorbing whole persons, their habits and manners and stories and songs; it is a "sector," something for "spare time," that is, time left over from life's main business, which is economic and which is not defined as being "cultural" at all. Consider this passage from Robert M. Stamp's article, "Alberta":

> Cultural life in Alberta has had to combat two major negative forces: the persistence of a 'frontier ethos' that emphasizes economic materialism and rugged individualism; and a cultural dependency on . . . New York, London, Toronto and Los Angeles. Yet it has had advantages: a rich physical landscape that has influenced both painters and

> writers; a diverse population that perpetuates various ethnic cultures; plus recent governmental corporate and private affluence, which has benefited the cultural sector.

What is this "frontier ethos," if not agribusiness and the kind of wildcat development associated with petroleum, both of them rooted in the international capitalism whose centres are precisely New York, Toronto, etc., and whose profits spell "governmental, corporate and private affluence"? The "cultural sector" is supposed to "combat" all of this? Is "muddled" too strong a word for a mentality that believes the market to be the one sacrosanct institution in society and considers culture (or the cultural sector) to be hiring a Japanese conductor and a Soviet pianist to play the music of the Austro-Hungarian Empire? Texaco brings you *Parsifal.*

But I am not supposed to be reviewing the work as a whole, rather only Newfoundland's place in it. W.F. Summers, formerly of Memorial University's Geography Department (retired now), wrote the main entry for the province. Like the articles for the other provinces, it runs about 10,000 words and is accompanied by a map and an inset in bright orange showing the province's flag, its crest and location in the country. The inset also carries the provincial vital statistics: capital, motto, flower, largest cities, population, etc. Summers's article follows a plan nearly identical for all the provinces: introductory paragraph, "Land and Resources," "Resources and Conservation," "People," "Economy," "Government and Politics," "Education," "Cultural Life" and "History." It is very much the reference-work article, abounding in facts and figures; in spongy phrases like "colourful political history," "vibrant, distinctive culture" and "rich, colourful history;" and in received wisdom such as the myth of retarded settlement ("The West Country Merchants . . . succeeded in persuading British monarchs and parliaments to enact laws that would discourage and even forbid permanent settlement in Newfoundland").

The other major article solely on a Newfoundland subject is Melvin Baker's "St. John's." Each capital city in the country (except Whitehorse) and some sixteen other large cities have a special layout in the encyclopedia, with one inset (not coloured) for vital statistics, and another for showing "Distribution of Industrial Activity." (In the case of St. John's, this is completely misleading since, as Baker points out in the text, the city is not primarily an industrial one.) There are photographs also and a multi-coloured map of each of these special cities, not so much to show its rich history or its vibrant culture as to show its *zoning* (yellow for residential, brown for industrial, and so on). The maps show as well the main roads (warning to tourists: do not try to use the St. John's map to get around. You cannot turn north off Water Street and be on Rennies Mill Road) and the cities' "points of interest," of which in St. John's there are fifteen, including the Alcock and Brown Historical Plaque. Dr. Baker, whose Ph.D. dissertation was on the history of St. John's, does as well as one can within the format,

as stylized for cities as it is for provinces. His repeated forecast, however, of "economic activity to be generated by offshore oil development" begins to sound a little hollow. Also I am not sure whether he likes the city in all of its higgledy-piggledyness:

> Before Confederation the streets were narrow and winding, reflecting the city's system of land tenure. With much of the land in the main commercial-residential area owned by British absentee landlords, the government was financially unable, following the 1846 and 1892 fires, to acquire land to create straight wide streets in a gridiron pattern.

Thank God for British absentee landlords. Some kind of great political chasm exists between those who preferred old Brazil Square to the cold, alien, corporate structure now on the site, and those who think that Brazil Square was a slum to be razed and replaced by a progressive, modern symbol and example of "development" like the Quatre Saisons or whatever it is called now south of City Hall.

Now like all good Canadians I am worried about our province's getting its share. How did we do in the CE's distribution of space and attention? Here are some figures. Any encyclopedia must rely on the judgement of people who know things about various subjects; it draws on "consultants," of which in the present case there are nearly 250. Only four (1.6%) — Melvin Baker, Angus Bruneau, G.S. Kealey and John Parsons — are from here. (I don't for the purposes of this review distinguish between Newfoundlanders and those who merely live here.) Newfoundland's population being 2.3% of Canada's, so far not so good. When we turn to the authors, or "contributors," we find that out of about 2,400, 51 are in Newfoundland, or 2.2%, which is pretty evenhanded. (The list of contributors, let me note in passing, has omitted F.W. Rowe, author of the articles "London and Bristol Company," "Newfoundland Acts" and "Newfoundland Bill.") The bulk of the writing throughout the encyclopedia was done, understandably I guess, in Ontario, which, with only a little over a third of Canada's population, accounted for almost half of the consultants and contributors. This imbalance, which is also, and equally understandably, echoed in the figures for Alberta, occurred at the expense of Quebec, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. Note the relatively large number of contributors from the States. Considering Hurtig's outlook on life, this surprised me a little at first, though there are people there who, like Robin Winks and Robert Babcock, know a thing or two. Apparently no one in the Territories knows anything. What is true for consultants is also true for contributors. Authors living here wrote articles regional in bearing; as soon as a subject has a national ring to it, someone from upalong takes care of it. Thus "Johnny Burke" by James G.G. Moore, but "Gordon Pinsent" by James DeFelice, "Frank Moores" by Melvin Baker, but "Joseph Roberts Smallwood" by Richard Gwyn; the articles on David Blackwood, Christopher Pratt and Mary Pratt by Joan Murray of Ottawa. There are very few "national" articles writ-

ten here — about 0.3% — whereas about a quarter of the Newfoundland articles were written elsewhere.

Compilers of encyclopedias, I have no doubt, read reviews of their work with even more jaundice in their eyes than the average author, because every reviewer has a list of omitted subjects and every compiler remembers the fights to see the work come in within reasonable limits, under budget and on time. "You cannot include everything, goddamn it, and no one ever praises us for our imaginative inclusion of such-and-such," they might say. Well, that is true, and I am pleased to see Johnny Burke here, and the "Masterless Men" and Ted Russell. Still, I am a reviewer, and therefore am entitled to ask why no separate article, or why the skimpy treatment of, William Carson, Patrick Morris, Ambrose Shea, John Clinch (not in "Medicine, History of," but see "Trinity"), Bishop Aubrey Spencer (Edward Feild's there), Archbishop M.F. Howley, Richard Cashin, Ray Guy (not in "Humourous Writing in English"), Helen Parsons Shepherd, Reginald Shepherd, Don Wright, Scott Goudie, Heidi Oberheide, the St. Michael's printshop, Hibbs Hole, David French (but see "Drama in English" and "Theatre, English Language"), Percy Janes, Rufus Guinchard, Emile Benoit, Kelly Russell (Ti-Jean Carignon has a separate article), Guglielmo Marconi, Rockwell Kent, Varick Frissell or his film *The Viking*, CODCO, the LSPU Hall, White Bay, Fortune Bay, Beaumont Hamel, the *Ocean Ranger*, the Old Hag, blueberry, partridgeberry, bakeapple, and brewis?

In mitigation let it be said that the editors faced a paradox. The great, and even the not-so-great encyclopedias date from times when it could be assumed with some plausibility that the circle of knowledge was complete in its main outlines; that is, encyclopedias appear at the *end* of creative periods. Pliny's *Natural History*, in the first century of the Common Era, came along when the classical world had nearly exhausted its possibilities. Diderot's and d'Alembert's *Encyclopedie* speaks for a world in which young scientists complained that they lived in a universe which Newton had already explained, so what was there to do? Similarly in this century the eleventh edition of the *Britannica* (1910-11) coincided with the planning of the *Cambridge Modern History*, which was supposed to wrap up the subject, and with such declarations as that of the English physicist Osburne Reynolds that science would in the future consist mainly of adding numbers to the right of the decimal point in measurements already made and understood. The assumed stability and completedness of their worlds gave these authors, and I suppose their readers, a confidence denied the bunch down at the CE.

The paradox is that the CE appears in a period when we accept history and time as fundamental categories rather than as phenomena, as fleeting, apparent only, and therefore superficial. We've all read our Kuhn and (though the idea was not original with him) take it for granted that no scientific revolution is final. There is another consideration, however, that is more peculiar

to us. This is a young country, and as "Mt. Logan-to-Cape Spear" a very young country. One can feel the editors' struggle with this difficulty. An encyclopedia, a tracing of the circle of knowledge, of so fledgling an enterprise as Canada seems like writing a biography of a stripling. "Canada" has existed only since 1867 and in its present form since 1949. Events which occurred before those dates have no legitimate place here, as they belong to someone else's history. But that won't do, so one is left with the awkward demarcation: everything that happened within the confines of what is now called Canada is fair game. But again that takes in Newfoundland. So do we ingest the whole long history of the tenth province? Do we incorporate what is irrelevant to the history of Canada? There being no general solution in principle to this dilemma, one finds inconsistency and compromise. The Lieutenant-Governors and Premiers are listed, within the article "Newfoundland," only since 1949. On the other hand, early leaders in local politics — Bond, Squires and company—get separate articles (mostly by J.K. Hiller). George Rawlyk finds ("Atlantic Provinces") that until 1949 Newfoundlanders had "few emotional and economic ties" with the Maritimes or with Canada; rather, Newfoundland "was the western vantage point of a British way of life, providing a powerful under current for [its] unique brand of local patriotism." In the article "Battle of the Atlantic," however, W.A.B. Douglas gives no hint that Newfoundland was not at that time part of Canada. Similarly R.H. Roy ("Battle of the Somme") who, although he distinguishes Newfoundland outfits from Canadian ones, lumps the casualties: 24,713, Canadian and Newfoundland.

The province simply cannot be easily assimilated to the history of the country. The result is that when Newfoundland is not left out of general articles altogether, it is stuck in for a few token lines. There is no mention of Newfoundland in the article "Catholicism." We get one line in "Coinage" ("NF's coinage began in 1865"), seven lines out of a column in "Economic History, Atlantic Canada" (Ian Drummond). The coat of arms, which dates from 1637, is included in "Emblems, Provincial and Territorial" (Auguste Vachon). No mention in "Sailing Ships" or in "Historiography in English," despite Judge Prowse's diligence. The article "Snakes" does not notice that there are none here. "History [i.e., of Canada] since 1945" (John English) does not mention Newfoundland at all.

Perhaps in the same category are those articles or parts thereof which betray ignorance, condescension or what I will call the thin-ice treatment. By ignorance I do not mean the total kind, where the author knows nothing, but the more subtle kind shown by the askew remark which somehow misses the point. Thus W.B. Scott ("Cod") notes that "most of the catch is now frozen, but salted cod [not saltfish], once the most popular form, was esteemed in many countries." Yes, "esteemed" by West Indian slaves who got from it the energy to harvest the sugar which in turn provided the energy

for English labourers to sustain the Industrial Revolution. Or "esteemed" by Portuguese peasants who grew the grapes to provide the masters of the Industrial Revolution with port. As though historical relations and historical change were a product of the shifting tides of "esteem." Condescension: "in the late 1960s CNR replaced the subsidized passenger service of the Bullet with a bus service." Equally subsidized, one might add, but the note is already struck: the CNR bailed us out. Again, consider the length of articles: Frank Moores and Brian Peckford weigh in with articles as long as those devoted to Bernard and Sylvia Ostry. As for thin ice, I mean the unexceptionable general statement followed by an example which reveals how far the author's knowledge runs. Thus "Newfoundlanders have contributed a rich treasure of sea chanties and ballads of shipwrecks and have also produced well-known dance songs such as 'I'se the B'y that Builds the Boat' " (Barbara Godard, "Oral Literature in English").

The treatment of certain subjects reveals how hard it is to get things right from a distance. Suppose you were an intelligent high school student in Saskatchewan and wanted to know why, in connection with the politics of offshore petroleum, the *Ocean Ranger* kept being referred to. Turn to volume two and check "Ocean" . . . "Ocean Industry" . . . "Ocean Mining" . . . "Oceanography" . . . whoops! "October Crisis." No help either in any of the "ocean" articles above, not even in the subsection "Drilling Platforms" of the article "Ocean Industry." Well, try the index at the end of volume three. Three references: "Royal Commissions," "Climate and Man" and "Grand Banks." In the first of these you learn that the "probe into the loss of the . . . Ocean Ranger was changed from a commission to a royal commission," a point not about the rig but about commissions. What does D.W. Phillips have to say in "Climate and Man"? That the design of ships "*must* incorporate information about storms, e.g. that which sank the Ocean Ranger . . . off Newfoundland, drowning 84 men (15 February 1982), in order to defend against such hazards." Must, indeed. My emphasis. Again, the point is not the rig but something else. Locking barn doors comes to mind. In the article "Grand Banks," Ken Drinkwater and Allyn Clarke write that "oil drilling, which began on the banks in the late 1970s, gained public attention with the disastrous loss of the Ocean Ranger rig. Test wells have been promising and expectations are high that oil production will begin in the near future." Here the fate of the rig and its crew are mentioned only as being instrumental in alerting the public to offshore drilling. From these *asides* you have learned when and where the *Ocean Ranger* went down, how many drowned or froze, and that it was a disaster. Did you learn that the men on it did not own it? Did you learn that it was unsafe?

Or consider "resettlement." There is no entry and, this time, no help from the index. W.F. Summers in "Newfoundland" tells us that "since ww II many people have moved from small communities to large towns and

growth centres." Richard Gwyn's "Smallwood" states that after the loggers' strike in 1959 Smallwood, "no longer a socialist, except in his rhetoric . . . consorted with corporate tycoons such as John C. Doyle and John Shaheen and devoted himself to large industrial endeavours like . . . Churchill Falls . . . at the same time encouraging NFers to leave isolated outports for new 'resettlement' communities." Jim Albert, Professor of Social Work, Carleton Univeristy, in "Social and Welfare Services," asserts that resettlement "disrupted family and community life by forcing the closure of small industries in an attempt to centralize economic activity. This resulted in a shift of population to the larger centres and a concentration of social and welfare services." So what was "resettlement"? Motion, according to Summers; encouragement, according to Gwyn; and, in Albert's account, the result of closing small industries. So far, not very clear. Further digging does not help very much. We learn that resettlement was abandoned in Fogo (J.E.M. Pitt, "Fogo") because of a "movement towards rural development." How did this movement manage to thwart motion, discourage encouragement and stop the closing of small industries? Well, it had something to do with the National Film Board, "whose short documentaries helped to unite residents, crossing traditional social, cultural and religious lines." It all came about from "the interactive use of film and videotape to foster community awareness and identity." Clearer?

Maybe the small ironies are more instructive. R.D. Pitt reveals why there is an article on "Brunette Island" (in Fortune Bay; much smaller than Merasheen, for which there is no entry).

> From the early 1800s the island supported a fishing community at Mercer's Cove in the SE until the islanders were resettled, with government assistance, in the late 1950s. Brunette I. then became a provincial wildlife reserve and the site of experimental colonies of caribou, moose, Arctic hare and bison, the latter brought from Alberta in 1964 in a unique but unsuccessful attempt to introduce the animal to Newfoundland.

Perhaps the airplanes carried workers for Fort McMurray as ballast on the return trip.

It strikes me, and it may strike you, that this is a thoroughly bad-tempered review. I don't know whether to apologize or not. There is so much to complain about. One might mention the maps, which omit many places mentioned in the text, e.g., Bonne Bay. One might mention the utterly conventional photographs, picture-postcard, tourist-bureau, pretty-pretty as they are, in the Newfoundland sections, many of them by John de Visser, about whom I was equally bad-tempered in these pages a while back. Then there is the curious overlapping and repetitious treatment of many subjects: why do we have "Drama in English" and "in French," and later "Theatre, English-Language" (and "French-Language")? The editing and fact-checking are not what one would expect from a project at this level of seriousness: Geoff Budden was, no doubt, pleased to learn that the editors have promot-

ed him to "Professor of History, MUN" (see list of contributors). Is the highest point in this province Mt. Caubvick at 1,738 metres (1830) or Mt. Carbrick at 1,652 metres (1244)? Is the St. John's Regatta the "oldest continuous sporting event in North America" (Melvin Baker, "St. John's") or is it only "*believed* to be the oldest" (James Marsh, "St. John's Regatta")? Does it date from the 1820s (Baker) or "may" the first race have taken place on September 22, 1818 (Marsh)? The editors let this one, claiming some tricky moves on Red Bay's part, go by them: "After research into Spanish documents and archaeological finds on Saddle Island and underwater, Red Bay was designated a historical site 1978-79" (J.E.M. Pitt and R.D. Pitt, "Red Bay").

Does one have the right to lament the almost complete absence of humour from these pages? Even so small a sally as P.B. Waite's remark concerning the idea of a Canadian confederation ca. 1860, that it was "the subject of occasional dinner speeches when wine raised a man's sights, softened political asperities, and broadened his horizons" (399) — mild as it is — comes as a big surprise and a welcome scintilla in the midst of the surrounding grey flat prose. There is a tiny joke concealed in the article "Sarah Binks," whose author, Neil Besner, deliberately leaves Binks's historicity ambiguous and concludes: "Long, loud may she sing." I don't know who is responsible for the slightly larger joke at page 1504. The article is "Public Archives of Canada" and it begins with the ringing and undeniable, yet modest claim that the PAC is "one of Canada's oldest and most impossible archival institutions." The claims for age and venerability are then vindicated for half a column or so, and the article is signed PUBLIC ARCHIVES OF CANADA. I was reminded of the dog Beauregard in the old Pogo comic strip, singing lugubriously about the bravery and selflessness of Old Dog Tray and crying his eyes out.

Some readers might be upset to learn that a lot of the CE is pillaged from other reference works (compare the article "Argentia" by J.E.M. Pitt and R.D. Pitt with the articles "Argentia" and "Argentia Base" by C.F. Horan in the *Encyclopedia of Newfoundland and Labrador*). This does not worry me so much, since it seems to be an inevitable and universal allegation about encyclopedia-making. What does worry me is the positivistic fact worship combined with celebratory purpose, which makes it impossible for anyone to tell or learn the truth about anything. One is caught between numbers — sizes, lengths, heights, amounts, measures of all sorts — and puffery. Too few write candidly, as for example Philip Chesney Yorke did in the *Encyclopedia Britannica* (11th edition) of Queen Anne (1665-1714):

> Anne was a woman of small ability, of dull mind, and of that kind of obstinacy which accompanies weakness of character . . . . She dined alone after her husband's death, but it was reported by no means abstemiously . . . . She took no interest in the art, the drama, or the literature of her day . . . . According to her small ability she served the state well . . . (etc., etc.).

Although there are welcome exceptions, such as J.K. Hiller's "Morris, Ed-

ward Patrick, 1st Baron Morris," who had "no clear policy other than to keep himself in power," or M. MacLeod's "Morine, Sir Alfred Bishop," who "exemplified the toleration that the public showed to corrupt politicians," most of the time the rule seems to be that of your mother: "If you can't find anything nice to say . . . ." Further to illustrate the point, here is P.C. Smith on Lewisporte: ". . . a busy commercial port on the Bay of Exploits, [it] is also the headquarters of the successful bluefin-tuna sports-fishing on Notre Dame Bay." Evangelical pseudo-religions are not mentioned, nor is the allegation that Lewisporte is the druggie capital of northeastern Newfoundland. Also J.E.M. Pitt and R.D. Pitt on Deer Lake, "one of the main pulpwood, service and transportation centers of Newfoundland." (The Pitts, who wrote over a third of the articles on Newfoundland subjects, call every town large enough to be included here a "regional service centre.") The fact that Deer Lake is about as goodlooking a town as Anne was intelligent a queen is something that these pages do not tell us.

Nothing is ugly, vulgar, banal here. There are no conflicts. No villages opposed the creation of Gros Morne National Park; no Innu-White tensions plague Happy Valley-Goose Bay, nor pro- and anti-NATO ones; "culture" does not include Reveen, wrestling, soap opera or bingo; cuisine in Newfoundland, "home of the cod," consists of lobster, seal, squid, salt pork, salt beef, dandelion greens, turnips, turnip tops, cabbage, potatoes, carrots, partridge berries, marshberries, squashberries, the "bakeapple berry"; "traditional dishes are baked cod cheeks and tongues, seal-flipper pie, cod roe, fish stew and the boiled dinner featuring salt beef or salt pork" (454). Cuisine is not Coke or Pepsi and chips, Mr. Freeze, fried Maple Leaf Bologna, or chicken takeout; and don't let Mel Hurtig know that that boiled dinner is called "Jiggs'."

The intelligent high school student, listening one morning to the CBC, hears the phrase "branch-plant economy" and wonders what this is. He turns to the CE but alas draws a blank. No entry in the text and no reference in the index. Browsing, however, leads him to various articles beginning with the word "business" and he finds this, under "Business Elites" by Peter C. Newman:

> Canada's business elite . . . may be the only national elite in history that has cheerfully participated in its own demise . . . . This let's-surrender-with-profit syndrome has prevented Canada's capitalist class from attaining any clear perspective of itself and its long-term role. Northrop Frye has interpreted this colonial attitude as frostbite on the roots of the Canadian imagination. 'Colonialism', he has written, 'produces a disease for which I think the best name is prudery. By this I do not mean reticence in sexual matters. I mean the instinct to seek a conventional or commonplace expression of an idea.' Frye's description of the prudery of spirit, the snobbish modesty and the reluctance to take risks characterizes Canada's elite.

Prudery of spirit, I am afraid, also haunts *The Canadian Encyclopedia.*

MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY