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ABSTRACT

When the Great War erupted in 1914, Canadian society was more religious than it is today, which endowed clergymen with prestige and considerable influence. Their influence went into the service of Canada’s war effort, including the recruitment of men for the Canadian Expeditionary Force. This thesis examines the role of the Anglican Church as a leading voice during the years of voluntary enlistment, 1914 to 1917. Using sermons, speeches and letters printed in the secular press, it follows how the province’s Anglican Church leaders revealed the war’s meaning and grafted this onto patriotism to rally enlistment. While a definitive connection between these activities and enlistments is difficult to establish, the religious composition of several provincial battalions suggests that the efforts of the Anglican clergy were largely successful. Indeed, the evidence reveals that Anglican New Brunswickers enlisted in numbers twice their relative share of the provincial population, significantly more than other denominations.
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INTRODUCTION

The war that began on 28 July 1914, predicted by Kaiser Wilhelm II to be over “before the leaves have fallen from the trees,”¹ lasted fifty-one months. In that time, over six hundred thousand Canadian men donned the khaki to fight for King and country. The Church of England in Canada accounted for about 41% of these enlistments. This remarkable figure is all the more significant considering just 14% of Canadians in 1914 identified themselves as Church of England adherents.

This thesis examines how the Church of England in Canada (the Anglican Church of Canada’s name until 1955),² responded to the global crisis and, specifically, the active and public role it assumed during the years of voluntary recruitment from 1914 until the introduction of conscription in late 1917. It uses the Province of New Brunswick (ecclesiastically, the Diocese of Fredericton) as a case study, focusing especially the Anglican clerics who rose to prominence in those years. Their sermons, speeches and letters published in the secular press reveal how these religious leaders interpreted their Church’s mission and purpose during the war, and how these interpretations were then put into the service of recruitment. In fact, the record shows that recruitment was their principle concern throughout the period studied: the Church’s wartime leadership was constantly preoccupied with New Brunswick men doing ‘their bit’ for the Empire.³ Their public statements often suggest they didn’t believe this was happening, at least not in sufficient numbers. This study attempts to determine what those numbers were, by examining the religious composition of several battalions raised in New Brunswick prior to conscription.

² The rest of this thesis will use the modern version, the ‘Anglican Church’ (or simply, ‘the Church’), and its members, ‘Anglicans.’ This admittedly ahistorical concession to brevity will make for a less cumbersome narrative.
³ The colloquialism common throughout the empire for military service.
Historians have demonstrated the extent to which members of the Anglican Church in Canada volunteered for military service in the Great War on a nationwide scale. Although the Anglican Church represented just over 14% of the Canadian population in 1914, fully 62% (i.e. 20,250 out of 32,665 men) of the First Contingent of the Canadian Expeditionary Force (CEF) attested as Anglicans. Even by war’s end, the proportion of the CEF that claimed Anglican affiliation never fell below 41% (i.e. 254,000 out of 619,636). A Canadian scholar of history summed it up this way: “[It] was the pace-setter, and to some extent other denominations appear to have been pulled in its wake as it steered full speed, gun decks manned, into the Holy War. Disproportionate [Church of England] engagement was inevitable.”\(^4\) This phenomenon is explained by centuries of Church history, much of which had been imported to Canada as early as the eighteenth century.

A hundred years ago, Canadians of European heritage made sense of the world through a Judeo-Christian lens, even among those who were infrequent church-goers.\(^5\) In Canada, adherents of the Church of England combined this interpretive worldview with the unique position they occupied as members of a church which, by virtue of its very name, \textit{The Church of England in Canada}, was the institutionalized embodiment of British nationalism and imperialism. This affiliation conferred upon them a sense of what Paul Friesen calls an “Anglican citizenship,” a unique identity that transcended national and political boundaries.\(^6\) While all Canadian nationals were British subjects (separate citizenship would not exist until 1

\(^4\) Brock Millman, \textit{Polarity, Patriotism, and Dissent in Great War Canada, 1914-1919} (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2016), 86.

\(^5\) S.C. Williams, in \textit{Religious Belief in Popular Culture in Southwark, c.1880-1939}, (Oxford, 1999), using a central London borough for a case study, cautions against assessing the vitality of popular (viz. ‘pervasive and informal’) religion with quantifiable metrics such as church attendance. Rather, she argues that religion should be understood as a cultural system in its own right. See Adrian Gregory, \textit{The Last Great War: British Society and the First World War} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 153.

January 1947), the Anglican Church in Canada generally felt a closer affinity with the Mother Country than other denominations. It has been the Established (i.e. State) Church of Great Britain since Henry VIII’s break with Rome in 1534, with the monarch as the Church’s Governor and “Defender of the Faith.” This connection to the Crown bestowed upon the Church of England an institutional authority and influence without peer in British and, later, Canadian societies. In Britain, temporal and ecclesiastical power were wedded, quite literally, through marriages within upper class society and the nobility, which also dominated the officer class of the armed services. Thus, historical precedents brought the Church of England into an association with Imperial expansion from which it cannot be separated. But this identity was about much more than power projection. Imperialism cultivated within the Anglican psyche a special sense of civilizing mission, whose purpose was to propagate unique British Enlightenment virtues of individual liberty, justice and morality through the power of the Gospel.

In Canada, despite the Church’s official disestablishment at Confederation in 1867, the traditional power structures that had been imported remained largely undisturbed into the mid-20th century. Not only did the British Monarch remain the Dominion’s head of State, he or she also remained the titular head of the Anglican Church in Canada, a dynamic which placed Canadian members in a cognitive grey zone between the church and state. Perhaps nowhere was this more evident than within the Canadian army and navy, institutions which embodied British tradition until Paul Hellyer’s reforms of the 1960s all but swept it away. Protestant soldiers, regardless of denomination, were served by Anglican chaplains. Regimental church

---

7 Wendy Fletcher, “Canadian Anglicanism and Ethnicity,” in Christianity and Ethnicity in Canada, eds. Bramadat, P. and D. Seljak (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008), 139.
8 Ibid, 145.
parades and services were divided along Protestant and Roman Catholic lines. Cities and towns where the militia and armies were garrisoned were assigned to an Anglican parish church, known as a garrison church, which provided the regimental chaplain. Within the garrison church hung the regimental colours, alongside the Union Jack, the flag of St. George, and the Canadian Red Ensign. Many examples of this tradition can still be seen across Canada to this day, especially in the older churches that witnessed the imperial wars of the 19th century, and the World Wars of the 20th. Scores of British-born and educated clerics also presided over parishes across the breadth of the Dominion, their presence no doubt reinforcing pre-existing sensibilities and inclinations. Thus history, ethnicity, and temperament, combined with a Victorian sense of Anglo-Protestant superiority and civilizing mission, strongly inclined the Anglican Church in Canada to enthusiastically support Britain during the Great War, and in remarkable disproportion to other Canadian denominations.

The reasons for choosing New Brunswick as a case study for the role of Anglican war sermons in voluntary enlistment are various: ethnically, it was one of the most ‘British’ provinces in the country in 1914 (based on the 1911 census); its heritage as the ‘Loyalist Province’ (at least for much of its English population); and the fact that New Brunswick is often seen as a microcosm of Canada, at least in terms of its French-English demographics.

There is also an historiographical reason for studying this subject. The religious aspects of the Great War suffered from a kind of benign neglect within academia through most of the 20th century. Even Archbishop Philip Carrington’s The Anglican Church in Canada, A History, covering three hundred years, dedicates just one small paragraph to the Great War in all of its

---

10 For an example of the interior of a garrison church, see Plate 4, page 27.
three hundred and two pages, *without actually naming the war.*\(^\text{13}\) This blind spot for the religious dimensions of the war has had unfortunate consequences. One of these consequences is an underappreciation for how much religion still permeated Edwardian consciousness, how it motivated people to go to war, and then how it sustained them through years of terrible suffering. It has been said that the Great War was the last major European conflict with overt and widespread religious dimensions, to the point that it could even be described as a religious event.\(^\text{14}\) While that assertion may be debatable, the fact remains that religion is an aspect of war and conflict that deserves historical consideration. Filling this gap in the historiography of the Great War will lead to a better understanding of why Canadians supported and endured a conflict that, for much of its duration, looked interminable.

Aside from rare examples, such as Alan Wilkinson’s *The Church of England and the First World War,*\(^\text{15}\) little has been written on the war from the perspective of the Anglican Church (or for that matter, any faith community). But Wilkinson is British and wrote British history for a British audience. There is no comparable volume for the Anglican Church in Canada. This is starting to change. The historiography of the Great War in Canada has benefited over the last twenty years from rising scholarly interest on the influences of religion, both at home and on the front lines (focused predominantly on Western Christianity in Europe and North America, but now broadening to include Judaism and Islam).\(^\text{16}\) Gordon Heath’s 2011 work, “Canadian Churches and War: An Introductory Essay and Annotated Bibliography,” remains an essential

---

\(^{13}\) Phillip Carrington, *The Anglican Church in Canada – A History* (Toronto: Collins, 1963), 252. Carrington’s treatment is perhaps not surprising, given the First World War’s reputation in popular consciousness at the time. Efforts by revisionist military historians, such as Britain’s John Terraine, to rebalance and contextualize the war’s purpose in history were still nascent.


\(^{16}\) See Jenkins, *The Great and Holy War,* as an example.
starting point for identifying secondary sources, even if it would benefit from updating. It is useful not just for the Great War but all conflicts in which Canadians have participated, from the War of 1812 through the UN mission in Rwanda.17 Another excellent source of secondary material may be found in the bibliography to Melissa Davidson’s 2012 MA thesis, “Preaching the Great War: Canadian Anglicans and the War Sermon.”18 Yet, even these sources reveal that the Anglican Church in Canada has received little attention. For instance, Heath reports that of the one hundred and forty-seven publications on Canada’s Protestant churches and war, only eight are about Anglicans, compared to thirty-seven for the Mennonites, seventeen for Presbyterians, and thirty-three for Protestantism in general.19 Unfortunately, the historiography is devoid of any work dedicated to Anglicans in New Brunswick during the Great War.

The primary sources upon which this thesis relies are sermons, speeches, and letters printed in the contemporary secular press and a few ecclesiastical periodicals, the Synod Journals of the Diocese of Fredericton, the 1911 Dominion Census, and the records of battalions raised in New Brunswick. The geographic distribution of newspaper sources reflects the demographic reality of the time. In 1914, over 82% of New Brunswick’s Anglicans lived in the eight predominantly ‘Anglophone’ counties in the province’s southern half. Two of these counties, St. John and Kings, accounted for over 43% of the provincial total. The ‘Loyalist City’ of Saint John alone was home to 23% of all New Brunswick’s Anglicans. There were two consequences for the primary sources arising from this demographic distribution. First, of the

19 Heath, “Canadian Churches,” 64. Heath’s definition of ‘publications’ includes combined articles, in which more than one denomination is examined in equivalent measure; each denomination is counted as a separate ‘publication.’
one hundred and thirty-three published sermons, letters, announcements and similar clerical utterances found for the period studied, one hundred and sixteen were in just three newspapers. Two papers were based in Saint John, including the provincial daily; the third was in Moncton. Secondly, of the seventy priests in the province (including the Bishop), only seven emerged as ‘spokesmen’ in the press during the war. Of these, just five (Bishop Richardson, Reverends Hooper, Kuhring and Cody, and Canon Sisam) accounted for nearly 88% of all the press sources found. All five lived in urban centres in the province’s south: three in Saint John, and one each in Fredericton and Moncton. Thus, the ‘voice’ of the Anglican Church in New Brunswick was very southern. It was also urban and Saint John-centric. Only one rural priest, C. G. Lawrence of Trinity Church, Kingston, is cited in the press. Reverend W. J. Bate of St. Andrew’s Church, Newcastle, is the only notable voice north of Moncton, and an infrequent one at that.

The nature of this thesis lends itself broadly to two thematic sections. Chapters I and II examine in depth the Anglican effort to rally men to military service. These chapters are essentially a survey of newspaper coverage, from the war’s outbreak to the Canadian general election on conscription in December 1917. The sayings and activities of the province’s wartime Anglican spokesmen (referenced above) are contextualized within the progress of the war, national enlistments, political developments, some theology, and the historiography. The goals of Chapters I and II are twofold: to understand what motivated the clergy to place so much emphasis on recruitment, and to gain insight on whether recruitment, insofar as they perceived it, was meeting expectations. Chapter III attempts to answer this question ex post facto. The denominational composition of several infantry battalions raised in New Brunswick up to mid-1917 are examined and considered, within the context of demographic factors that were known at the time (and confirmed in numerous post-war analyses) to influence enlistment
patterns. The goal of Chapter IV is to reach a preliminary conclusion on whether the clergy’s perceptions of voluntary enlistments among Anglican men in New Brunswick were indeed accurate. More to the point, the final chapter seeks to determine the extent to which the province’s Anglican men answered the recruitment call, and how this correlated with recruitment sermons. This is accomplished through an in-depth analysis of the nominal rolls for eight military units mobilized in New Brunswick between 1914 and 1916. No effort is made, however, to investigate a causal relationship between recruitment sermons and enlistments, as cause would be very difficult, if not impossible, to establish.

Some further context is warranted with respect to those church leaders who figure prominently in this study. These religious men were products of late Victorian and Edwardian religiosity in an Anglo-Imperial world. Their perspectives were spiritual and cannot be completely explained by, or interpreted through, a purely secular lens. Religion needs to be understood on its own terms, because it follows an internal logic unique to its worldview and hermeneutical epistemology. This statement is not meant to imply that with the benefit of hindsight, the Anglican Church wouldn’t have approached and interpreted the war differently. Disillusionment in later years about the war’s purpose, and its apparent futility, led to many a pastoral mea culpa. This thesis is not an apologia for real or perceived religious excesses. Rather, by looking beyond first impressions, it can be shown that even when religion was conflated with Imperial patriotism (the latter of which was substantially matched by Canadian nationalism at war’s end), the primary motivation of the clergy studied here was deeply spiritual and moral, as they and society generally understood such concepts. For these men, Canada and the Empire of which they were proudly part were engaged in a war for the soul of humanity. The war being waged was not just against an external enemy whose Christianity was corrupt, it was also against perceived internal enemies on the home front: secularism,
materialism, and selfish individualism. The war to these men was an opportunity offered by God to the British Empire. Their divine mission was to arrest and roll back these corrosive influences on the soul of British civilization which, through self-sacrifice and suffering, would emerge from war purified, enlightened by grace, and spiritually reinvigorated for service to God, King, country and kin.
CHAPTER I

The Call to Arms

“Only the enlistment of might and manhood can give us security. The call has come. More men, more men, still more men.”

J. A. Richardson, Bishop of Fredericton, May 1915

In August 1914, Europe blundered into war. The series of malleable alliances and ententes that had preserved the peace between the Great Powers for ninety-nine years, the longest since the days of Pax Romana, finally failed. Years of arms races on land and sea had militarized diplomacy. The concept of ‘pre-emptive war’ came to be seen in Vienna and Berlin as a legitimate foreign policy option. For the first time in a century, vital national interests were at stake. A pretense was all that was needed, and it came suddenly and unexpectedly from an assassin’s pistol in Sarajevo in June 1914. No national government desired war over peace, but the fateful decisions were taken. On 4 August 1914, Great Britain declared war on Germany in response to the latter’s invasion of Belgium, bringing her empire, including Canada, into the struggle.

Notions of a short war were dispelled by mid-fall. By November, the British and French faced the Germans along a line of defensive trenches that reached from the Swiss Alps to the English Channel, ushering in three and a half years of static warfare. By year’s end, over a million and a half soldiers were already dead, wounded and missing. The call for volunteers went out across the British Empire, and the call was answered. Every facet of society mobilized to support the war effort, including the churches of every denomination. In Britain and Canada,

---

the Anglican Church played a central role in mobilizing their nations’ manpower. In Canada, 71% of the 30,600 men of the First Contingent of the Canadian Expeditionary Force (CEF), which went overseas in late September and early October 1914, attested as Anglican. New Brunswick’s contribution to this force was part of the 12th Battalion (mobilized at Valcartier, Quebec). Of its 1,191 volunteers, less than a quarter, or 266 men, listed a next-of-kin in New Brunswick. Seventy-three of these, or 27%, were Anglican – more than double their share of the provincial population.23

The origins of the Anglican Church in New Brunswick can be traced back to the arrival of thousands of American Loyalists in 1783, but how many of these were Anglican is unknown. The Loyalists were never counted after their arrival, let alone enumerated by religious affiliation.24 In fact, it was not until the 1861 census when people were asked about religious identification. Sir Guy Carleton’s assertion that the Loyalists were nominally Anglican was, it seemed, a hollow one, for as W. S. MacNutt wrote, “this implied no fixed allegiance to points of view upon doctrine or church government.”25 R. N. Hebb asserts that among the Loyalists, Anglicans were probably less than 20% of the population.26 This minority status, combined with other colonial demographic factors, precluded any practical possibility of formal Establishment comparable to that of the Mother Church in England.27 The New Brunswick Assembly, in early 1786, passed into law a statute which, on the surface, suggested Establishment as fact. Ponderously named an “Act for preserving the Church of England, as by law established in this

26 Hebb, Church of England in Loyalist New Brunswick, 19.
27 Establishment in this context connotes the official state religion of England and its possessions. The Monarch served then, like today, as both Head of State and the head of the Church of England. Establishment bestowed upon the Church numerous privileges in ecclesiastical, education, legal and military spheres, to name the major ones.
Province, and for securing liberty of conscience in matters of religion,” the legislation, in word and in practice, concerned itself only with the regulation of Church clergy and their strict adherence to liturgical doctrine.²⁸

The late 18th and early 19th centuries were a period of slow but steady growth for the Church. Most notable among its achievements in this period was the founding in 1785 of a liberal arts and sciences academy in Fredericton that would eventually become the University of New Brunswick. The clergy of the province petitioned for their own bishop in 1791 and 1819, but the Church in New Brunswick remained a part of the Diocese of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island until 1845, when it became the independent Diocese of Fredericton and received John Medley (originally from London, England) as its first bishop. Medley was personally responsible for the design and construction of the ecclesiastical seat, Christ Church Cathedral, which was consecrated in 1853.²⁹ In 1914, when the Great War came, the Diocese of Fredericton was organized into seven geographical subdivisions called Rural Deaneries, each represented by an Archdeacon, a Canon or other senior clergyman. The Deaneries, in turn, were divided into parishes, each served by a priest (also called a rector). Seventy priests (the Bishop included) served 118 out of the 150 parishes in the province, with over a quarter of them responsible for multiple parishes.³⁰ This equated to one priest for every 612 parishioners, based on the 1911 Dominion Census, in which 42,864 out of 351,889 New Brunswickers, just over 12%, identified as Anglican. The thirty-two parishes not served by a priest contained too few Anglicans to support one. The majority of these were in the predominantly Francophone and Roman Catholic regions, but there were also vacancies where other Protestant churches, such as the Baptists and Presbyterians, were dominant.

²⁹ Lyman Harding, Citizens with the Saints: A Brief History of Anglicanism in New Brunswick (Fredericton: The Diocesan Synod of Fredericton, 1994), 14-34.
The Emergence of the Church’s Wartime Leadership

The initial response to the Great War from the pulpits of New Brunswick’s Anglican clergy was mixed, and in two general ways. First, what was being said differed in the various church parishes, based on extant published sermons, as shall been seen later. Sermons took two basic forms, which for purposes of this study are called recruitment and pastoral. The latter were principally concerned with spiritual guidance and comfort, and attempted to frame the war in terms of personal sacrifice at home and the prospect of rewards commensurate with sacrifice. References to a better, spiritually renewed post-war world were often present, with little to no direct appeals for enlistment. Recruitment sermons, on the other hand, emphasized the duty to volunteer for military service. They exhorted duty to community, province, country and Empire. The language, depending on the speaker, could be nuanced and persuasive, or unabashedly patriotic, jingoistic and coercive.

In the early weeks of the war, when most could still believe it would be short, sermons focused on the justifications for Britain’s declaration of war on Germany (and by extension, Canada’s involvement). On Sunday morning, 6 September, for example, fifty-four-year-old Reverend Gustav A. Kuhring, a native of Quebec City, graduate of Wycliffe College, and former chaplain to the 8th Royal Rifles, stepped into his pulpit at the historic St. John’s (Stone) Church in Saint John. His was the first Anglican war sermon covered in detail in the New Brunswick press.\footnote{Attestation papers for G.A. Kuhring, Library and Archives Canada. Accessed 2 August 2017, \url{http://www.bac-lac.gc.ca/eng/discover/military-heritage/first-world-war/personnel-records/Pages/item.aspx?IdNumber=504977}} Drawing inspiration from a recent sermon by the Bishop of London, the Right Reverend Arthur Winnington-Ingram, Kuhring spoke of the coming days as a time of great personal service and sacrifice. Britain did not want war, he said. Referring to Germany’s invasion of
Belgium, he explained that Britain had no choice but to honour her treaty obligations. Using Matthew 20:20-21 as his allegory, he compared Britain to the Saviour:

Then came to him the mother of Zebedee’s children with her sons, worshiping him, and desiring a certain thing of him. / And he said unto her, What wilt thou? She saith unto him, Grant that these my two sons shall sit, one on thy right hand, and the other on the left, in thy kingdom. / But Jesus answered and said, Ye know not what ye ask. Are ye able to drink of the cup that I shall drink of....?

This passage from scripture was deliberately chosen for the reference to the cup, a metaphor for Christ’s atonement sacrifice. Righteous Britain, in imitation of this sacrifice, was impelled by duty and honour to shed her blood and treasure on behalf of Belgium for Germany’s sins. This cup would be a bitter one, Kuhring explained, for many reasons: the economic cost, the human cost in dead and maimed, the suffering and anxiety of those at home, and the hatred of fellow man that war inevitably breeds. Canada, as a daughter of the Mother Country, would drink from the cup, too. However, the bitterness of the cup would be commensurate with the rewards. Turning to the future, Kuhring offered hope for his flock in the coming trial. The war would end with “a new and peace-loving Germany... A France, reading well the lesson of Britain’s greatness, shedding her present infidelity and putting her trust in Britain’s God (an oblique reference to France’s official secularism)...Belgium, entering once more upon the enjoyment of her heritage [and a] Christian Britain, chief among the nations and mother of nations upon whose flag the sun never sets, trusted, loved by all as the nation whose promises are kept at all cost and whose devotion to principle and righteousness still keeps her as the chosen of God...”

Here it is necessary to pause and comment on a theme introduced by Kuhring. The reasons for the Empire’s war with Germany were, on the surface, obvious. Kuhring identified

32 “Much Good Must Come from War,” St. John Standard, 7 September 1914, 10.
33 “Much Good...,” St. John Standard, 7 September 1914.
them. Belgian sovereignty, guaranteed under treaty by Britain, had been violated. The alliance with France was formed years earlier in anticipation of this aggression. But church leaders, whose responsibility was to provide spiritual comfort and guidance for people who occupied a world where deeper meanings so often proved elusive (if not illusory), had to offer more than political justifications. For Christians to rally in support of the Empire, in heart and mind as much as in numbers, it was necessary to create a sense of divine purpose and Christian mission. They found it in the language of *righteousness*. This language formed a theme that featured regularly throughout the pre-conscription phase of the war, as it was an important justification for going overseas to fight.

‘Righteousness’ is an often misunderstood and occasionally maligned term. In Anglicanism, and Christianity in general, the concept is a theological one typically understood to attribute justice to actions morally correct with God, as interpreted through scripture. The word is etymologically Greek, while ethically and legally it is rooted respectively in 1 Thessalonians 2:10, and 1 Corinthians 4:4. ‘Righteousness’ and ‘just’ (e.g. a just man, a just cause, or a just war) are often used interchangeably, but there are subtle distinctions. In the modern secular consciousness, ‘just’ often retains its moral meaning while being stripped of theological context.\(^{34}\) One hundred years ago, however, this distinction did not seem to exist as clerics and laity alike used the terms synonymously.

The same Sunday that Kuhring was holding forth at the Stone church, a very different sermon was heard at St. Paul’s (Valley) Church, in Saint John’s north end. The rector, Reverend E. Bertram Hooper, was a 51-year old native of Belfast, Ireland, with a history of family service to both the Church and the military. His mother was the daughter of Archbishop Coster of

---

Fredericton, and his father and brother had served in the British army (the latter in the Boer War). A graduate of the University of New Brunswick, Hooper had carried on both traditions as an Anglican priest and pre-war chaplain to the 62nd Regiment, St. John Fusiliers. He would be the first chaplain to the 26th (New Brunswick) Battalion following its formation in November 1914. Any telling of New Brunswick’s Great War experience would be incomplete without some reference to Hooper. His emotive pronouncements from the pulpit, and later his frequent overseas letters printed in the province’s dailies, found broad appeal with New Brunswickers. His charitable work supporting wounded Canadian soldiers in England was famous and widely supported.35 Hooper’s patriotic sermon that Sunday in September 1914 signalled a pattern from which he would never deviate over four and a half years of war, and contrasted in both tone and content with Kuhring’s for its impassioned, even bellicose, call to military service. Referring to the “wicked action of Germany” in Belgium,36 Hooper said it was Canada’s duty to stand with the Empire by sending her sons to fight. “It is England’s duty to crush Germany,” he declared, “and to this end use every resource of the Empire. We do well to take our share in this war…and with willing hearts realize the proud privilege of being of the Empire whose flag is an emblem of freedom and security.”37

Meanwhile, Reverend Hiram A. Cody of St. James, another Saint John rector and a second-generation New Brunswicker from the Washadamoak, took an even more benign, if not

35 Curtis Mainville, Till the Boys Come Home: Life on the Home Front, Queens County, NB, 1914-1918 (Fredericton: Goose Lane Editions and The New Brunswick Military Heritage Project, 2015), 36.
36 Hooper’s passion was explained by recent events. Over five days at the end of the preceding August, the German army systematically destroyed by fire and looting much of the Belgian city of Louvain, including the university and its library filled with medieval manuscripts. Hundreds of civilians, irrespective of age and gender, were summarily executed and thousands more brutalized as the Germans exacted a deliberate military policy for what they regarded as partisan action against their forces. The events at Louvain, combined with an unapologetic Berlin, shocked the world and gave rise to the expression, “The Rape of Belgium.” Arguably, nothing did more to galvanize voluntary enlistment in the Empire up to that time than Louvain. cf. Adrian Gregory, The Last Great War: British Society and the First World War (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 51-55; also, A. J. Hoover, God, Germany, and Britain in the Great War: A Study in Clerical Nationalism (New York: Praeger, 1989), 22, 25.
37 “Germany Must Be Defeated,” St. John Standard, 7 September 1914, 10.
novel, approach. After intercessory prayers for servicemen and women, and the bereaved families of the fallen in Britain, Cody turned to the subject of labour. He reproached the declining respect in society for the honest work of labour, noting that Jesus himself was a labourer. After listing the many contributions of labour to the progress of society, Cody lamented "how it was an amazing thing that Germany, which had made such progress in the arts of peace, should draw the sword and plunge all Europe into the horrors of war."38 A month later, his theme was on the dual effects of the war on the church, for ill and for good. First among the negative consequences was the disheartening realization that after centuries of progress through Christian teaching, such an awful war could erupt between nations of the same faith. Money and resources that would normally be directed to charitable and missionary work would henceforth be diverted to war-related needs. Christianity’s message was at risk of devaluation in the eyes of potential converts. The last ill-effect would be “the stirring up of the baser passions, the hatred, recklessness, and brutality, which always marked war.” Turning to the prospect of positive consequences, Cody offered three reasons to be hopeful, the last of which echoed Kuhring’s September sermon. First would be the church’s moderating effect in the politics of the nation. Next, the war would unite the churches in common purpose, so that they would turn away from their theological divisions towards the practical work of solving the social ills that mattered to people. Finally, “the war would show the people that the strength of a nation is not in its armaments, but in the justice of its cause…”Righteousness exalteth a
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nation.’”39 Cody closed his pastoral sermon with an exhortation to self-sacrifice, and the placing of the nation’s interest above self-interest. He never mentioned recruitment.

It is noteworthy that Hooper, Kuhring, and Cody did not speculate on how long the war would last. If any of them still thought the war could be over by Christmas, they kept these notions to themselves. If anything, the tone of Kuhring’s sermon suggested he was bracing his flock for a long war. By comparison, Reverend William J. Bate, rector of St. Andrew’s Church at Newcastle, was feeling optimistic. The forty-eight-year-old Bate was a native of Plymouth, England, who had emigrated to Canada when he was twenty-five. He held rectorships in three New Brunswick parishes prior to his move to Newcastle in 1910.40 The First Contingent of the CEF had only been on the sea two days, when on Sunday, October 5th, Bate faced his assembly (which on this occasion included the Protestant soldiers of the local garrison) and spoke of the German retreat from Paris, and the Austro-Hungarian army’s defeat at Russia’s hands. The Empire had rallied to the Union Jack, Bate exulted; even the Boers and the Irish Nationalists answered the call. He spoke of the need for “grim determination” in the days ahead, and for everyone to do his or her part and remain, above all, faithful. “If we cease to be faithful, then good-bye to England,” he warned, adding, “The path to duty was the path to glory.” Bate concluded, in the words of the reporter, “with an appeal to the faithful for the country’s sake, for their forefathers’ sake, and for the sake of those coming after.”41

By this time, the Canadian government had extended to the British Secretary of State for the Colonies an offer of a second contingent of 20,000 men. These troops would
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41 “Sermon to Soldiers of Garrison at Newcastle,” Daily Times, 7 October 1914.
supplement the First Division *en route*, and bring the Canadian representation to a full army corps. The offer was gratefully accepted at the end of October, even though recruiting had already commenced. This development marked an important inflection point for the type of message New Brunswick’s Anglicans would hear from their Church. On 7 November, the 55\textsuperscript{th} (New Brunswick & Prince Edward Island) Battalion, based in Sussex, and the 26\textsuperscript{th} (New Brunswick) Battalion, based in Saint John, were mobilized for the new Canadian Second Division. Both units needed eleven hundred men, and quickly. Patriotic quarters in New Brunswick were still galled by their province being passed over for contributing its own eponymous battalion to the First Contingent, and seized on the new 26\textsuperscript{th} Battalion as a second chance to prove that love of Empire beat as strongly in the hearts of New Brunswickers as anywhere else in the Dominion. Perhaps nowhere was this spirit as much on display as in Saint John, where the 26\textsuperscript{th} Battalion was based, and where Reverend Hooper of St. Paul’s was to become as much the public image of the 26\textsuperscript{th} as its first commanding officer and principle recruiter, Lt.-Col. James L. McAvity. On Friday, 6 November, the day before the official announcement of the 26\textsuperscript{th} Battalion’s creation, Hooper was the keynote speaker for a recruitment social at the Royal Kennebecassis Yacht Club. Having just volunteered for overseas service in the 26\textsuperscript{th}, Hooper appealed to the assembly of young men to uphold their Loyalist heritage by rallying to the colours. The creation of their own battalion was

---

proof, he said, of the confidence placed in them by Canada and the Mother Country. Therefore, he added, those who had no serious obligations at home should do their duty and volunteer. Quoting the event’s coverage in the *St. John Standard*, Hooper lamented that “He could not understand how young men of intelligence, who realized the relation of Canada to the Empire, and knew that but for the British fleet Canada would be invaded by a German navy could, if they were without dependents, hold back when the call to arms came so clearly.”

This rather incredible statement was followed by Hooper’s account of a conversation that same evening with a married man of four, his advise to whom was to enlist as he would be better able to provide for his family as a soldier. While we have only one side of this conversation, it bears mentioning that until the summer of 1915, married men were required to furnish proof of their wives’ permission to enlist.

Two days later, on Sunday, 7 November, Hooper was back at St. Paul’s delivering a sermon he called “The Duty of the Hour.” Present that day were the Protestant officers and men who had already enlisted with the 26th, many of whom were, until recently, members of the 62nd (St. John Fusiliers), Hooper’s militia regiment. This seminal sermon deserves quoting at length, not only because the charismatic Anglican cleric was gaining a reputation with the press as an ardent recruitment advocate, but for language which signalled an escalation of urgency.

First came the familiar intonements of honour and justice:

> England, Mother England, is engaged in war...a war without parallel in human history...[one] into which England has been forced by a due regard for national honor and the sacredness of treaties. The absolute justice of England’s cause is beyond dispute.  

With reference made to Britain’s obligation to Belgium, Hooper then drew an image of an Empire engaged in an existential struggle with a formidable enemy bent on its annihilation:
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Germany, supported by Austria and within the past few days by perfidious Turkey...is the very embodiment of aggressive and organized militarism...her fear of England, her bitterness, hatred and jealousy are intense, and the one great hope, objective, and obsession of Germany in this war is to crush forever the power of England and completely to extinguish British supremacy and British rule. This is the true inwardness of this terrible struggle, and it is for us to realize, as England realizes, that it is a life and death struggle for Imperial and national existence.

The surge of volunteerism that followed the outbreak of war, and which resulted in over eleven hundred men quickly filling New Brunswick’s contribution to the First Contingent, was less vigorous with the creation of the Second. The rate at which men across the Dominion enlisted dropped markedly (for reasons discussed later). New Brunswick was not immune to this disconcerting development. It was, however, a matter of acute concern in a province that prided itself on its Loyalist roots. In the three weeks following the official creation of the 26th Battalion, only 367 men had answered the call, representing barely a third of the number needed.45 Faced with the humiliating prospect of the 26th losing its provincial designation and being rolled into another mixed unit of Maritimers, recruitment efforts rapidly expanded beyond the limits of Saint John into the city’s hinterlands. If the recruits wouldn’t come to the 26th, the 26th would go to them. Recruiting stations were established in St. John, Kings and Queens Counties. Anglican churchmen took up the challenge alongside the military and secular authorities. Recruitment took on the aspect of missionary work. On 12 November, the Diocesan Bishop, John Richardson, was in Sussex to speak at a

45 Mainville, Till the Boys, 31.
“monster patriotic meeting,” the subject of which was “Canada’s Part in the Conflict.”46 The Bishop’s two most ardent spokesmen in Saint John also rose to the challenge.

Duty was the central theme in Reverend Kuhring’s sermon at St. John’s (Stone) Church on Sunday, 15 November. His appeal found inspiration in scripture and was deeply religious in nature. On this occasion, Kuhring took a subtler line than Hooper to rally the Anglican flock, by assuaging what he perceived to be lingering doubts of the rightness of Christians fighting and killing other Christians. The Empire’s cause, Kuhring acknowledged, seemed to confront Christians with a paradox. How could war, something so inherently destructive and which demanded violation of the sixth commandment, be righteous?47 Kuhring explained, “[War] is Satanic when it is unjustifiable. When undertaken for pride and gain and unholy ambition.

When it tramples on the God-given rights of others and would rob them of liberty and home and all that man counts sacred.” Clarifying the paradox’s other aspect by drawing on Psalm 2:5-9, Kuhring added, “[War] is God-like when it is an effort to defend the right; assist the defenceless; punish the evil doer; retain God-given dominion (references to Belgium and France), and disarm the un-Godly.” Then, from Revelation 19:11-16: “And I saw heaven opened, and beheld a white horse: and He that sat upon it was called faithful and true, and in righteousness doth He make war.” The highly emotive language, crafted for maximum impact, characterized a war that was assuming apocalyptic proportions beyond human experience and memory, and the subtle references to Britain, Belgium, France and Germany were obvious to an audience familiar with Biblical allegory. The paradox thus unravelled, Kuhring had, in effect, revealed divine sanction for lethal force against a prideful Germany that had unleashed a war of “unholy ambition.” He moved quickly to the sermon’s central purpose, the duty to enlist.

46 “Bishop Richardson in Sussex,” Daily Gleaner, 12 November 1914, 12.
Kuhring chose the moment to remind those who did not already know that he himself, with the full support of his wife, had offered for overseas service with the CEF. Moreover, he and his wife were filled with pride that their own two sons, the eldest a student at UNB, had decided to volunteer. Having demonstrated that he was asking no more of his flock than that which he was prepared to do himself, Kuhring made his direct appeal for action:

By example and word this morning I bid you heed the call of duty. It is the voice of God to us Who uses men to overthrow ungodliness. It is the call of our peace-loving statesmen who have striven with all their power to avert destruction of life and yet preserve honor. It is the call from women and children to save them from violence and cruelty. It is the call from the starving throngs, whose daily bread is being seized by the ruthless invader. It is the call of our brothers who have well-nigh exhausted themselves in the trenches and battle fields against overwhelming numbers for us while we have dreamed of helping. It is the call from the dead who have invested their lives, bidding us let it not be in vain. It is the call from posterity, bidding us not to stain the banner under which they shall live, asking us to leave them the inspiring heritage of the example of fathers and mothers who choose the stern and noble path of duty...The aim of every suitable man should be the “overseas contingent,” not the “home guard,” for the security of our homes will be secured or lost in the battles on foreign soil.”

Across town, Reverend Hooper was also dipping into scripture to win over not just the doubters, but those men he characterized as lacking individual initiative. Drawing on the prophetess Deborah’s lesson to Barak in Judges 4:8-9, Hooper’s sermon carried a warning to recalcitrant young men to not let the chance for honour and victory in battle slip by. He exhorted able men of military age to show initiative, to act for themselves and not defer to, or seek approval from, others. Highlighting what was at stake, Hooper raised the ante with the prospect of looming shame:

Several hundred more men are needed. I cannot understand this slowness in enlistment. For I cannot understand how any young man who knows that the most awful struggle in history is going on, a struggle in which the existence of the empire is jeopardized; I cannot understand how any young man of eighteen and

49 Barak said to her, “If you go with me, I will go, but if you don’t go with me, I won’t go.” “Certainly I will go with you,” said Deborah. “But because of the course you are taking, the honor will not be yours, for the Lord will deliver Sisera into the hands of a woman.” (Holy Bible, New International Version)
over, reading the daily papers and knowing the honor of New Brunswick is at stake, inasmuch as we have been challenged to raise a regiment of infantry from within our own borders to fight for England and the empire in this time of need...  

The disappointment was also personal:

I have always loved Canada and especially our province where I have lived and worked for over a quarter century – the province, too, where my mother was born. But oh! when England calls and Canada calls as well: to arms, to arms, ye sons of New Brunswick; how proud I should feel if the young men had been as hounds straining on the leash – and the very week the lists for regiments were opened all over the province they had rushed to the recruiting stations. This has not been the case hitherto...Young men! What is holding you back?

This personalizing by Hooper is not altogether uncharacteristic of his war sermons, but on this particular occasion it may in part be inspired by the recent example of his own son, Douglas, who announced his intention to apply for leave from his employer so he could enlist with the 26th Battalion. In fact, it is quite unusual that Hooper neglected to highlight this given his family’s military tradition, something of which he was clearly proud, not to mention Reverend Kuhring’s recent announcement of his own two sons’ pending enlistment. Within the next few weeks Kuhring, followed by Hooper, would receive the welcome news that their applications for chaplaincies had been accepted by the army, subject to Bishop Richardson’s approval, which the latter formally gave the following February. Newspapers in Saint John and Moncton wrote in glowing terms of both men, and in a tone of patriotic pride.

Hooper’s sermons have been quoted at length because of their emphasis on recruitment, and the language used to deliver this message. Melissa Davidson’s analysis of Anglican ‘national sermons’ from across Canada in the Great War, observed a discernable
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evolution in of sermon patterns through the war with inflection points occurring right after major events or developments (called ‘national events’). The first inflection point, Davidson observed, occurred during the Second Battle of Ypres in late April 1915. This battle marked Germany’s first use of poison gas and Canada’s first experience with mass casualties. Sermons from Anglican clergymen prior to that battle, in Davidson’s study, were primarily concerned with the spiritual justifications for the war, examples of which were evident in New Brunswick, in the sermons of Kuhring and Bate. Justifications were consistently and universally framed in the theology of righteousness and thus, as Davidson writes, clergymen called upon their listeners “to recognize how their established religious responsibilities might inform their patriotism.” The examples of sermons she cites for the eight months prior to Second Ypres reveal no direct recruitment appeals. New Brunswick newspapers, however, were printing Anglican recruitment sermons well before Second Ypres. The following unattributed pronouncement (Figure 1) which appeared in Saint John’s Daily Telegraph, is another example of this divergence. Remarkable for its bellicosity, it reads as if penned by Hooper himself. It is interesting in another respect, in that the language of shame in this appeal is not shame before God, but before other people.

Nothing in Davidson’s survey of Anglican sermons for the early period of the war compares in rhetorical tone and content to this anonymous reproach. Though not necessarily written by a clergyman – an authorized lay reader, or a regular member of the laity may have provided it – it nevertheless would, in all likelihood, have required the prior approval of a clergyman before it was sent to the paper. Davidson correctly observes that the trend in modern historiography eschews top-down histories, at the
cost of “obscur[ing] the importance of messages [from] those in authority.”

Primates, Archbishops and Bishops preached on “national events,” such as national civic holidays, religious festivals, and after major battles, such as Second Ypres. However, an exclusive reliance on so-called “national sermons” can equally obscure what was happening at the parish level, where charismatic priests like Hooper could wield as much, if not more, influence on their parishioners and followers than the Church ‘executive.’ Davidson’s work on Great War Anglican sermons improves our understanding of the Church’s role in wartime society, but the national arc of sermon themes she observed does not fit as neatly in New Brunswick.

Changes in the 26th Battalion’s recruiting strategies meant it was able to fill its entire complement with volunteers by early December 1914. Such was not the case for the 55th Battalion. As the slow pace of enlistment in New Brunswick, real or perceived,
continued into 1915 and 1916, the language of duty and the rhetorical embellishments from the pulpits intensified and hardened.\footnote{At the time of writing, it remains unknown how many New Brunswick-born men enlisted outside of their home province.}

In early February 1915, the Diocese of Fredericton met at the province’s capital for Synod, its first since the war broke out. Meetings of Synod had previously been held in November, the last being in 1913. The unexpected duration of the war well into the fall resulted in the 1914 Synod being postponed into the following winter. It was then that the province’s senior Anglican cleric, the Bishop of the Diocese of Fredericton, John Richardson, delivered his first widely broadcast message on the war.

Richardson was a relatively young man of 46. A native of Warwick, England and himself the son of an Anglican priest, he emigrated to western Canada as a youth. After trying his hand at farming and teaching, he enrolled at St. John’s College, Winnipeg, where he was ordained in 1895 and received all his formal education, including a Doctorate in Divinity. After serving in two Manitoba parishes from 1895 to 1899, he accepted a transfer to New Brunswick where he took up his charge as Rector of Trinity Church, Saint John. Within three years he was made a canon\footnote{An honourary title, granted to a member of the clergy by the diocesan bishop in recognition of valuable service to the church.} and, in 1907, he was elected as the Third Bishop of the Diocese of Fredericton, an office he held until his death in 1938. His address to Synod in 1915 distinguished him as an unapologetic and strident believer in all that was righteous about Britain and Canada’s part in the war. His reputation as a gifted orator was well-established and known far and wide, and so when he spoke his words took on a special quality that led one admiring colleague to grant him the appellation, “the golden voice of the House of Bishops.”\footnote{Harding, \textit{Citizens}, 59.} The Venurable A.H. Crowfoot, Archdeacon of Saint John, once described an encounter with Richardson’s persuasive oratorical
power at a meeting of the General Synod, the Church’s governing body in Canada: “Whenever [he] rose to speak there was a hush of expectation. We heard once again the ringing tones of that clarion voice. We listened intently to what he had to say. Frequently he would sway the whole assembly to his way of thinking. An unpopular cause, with him as its advocate, was sure of a fair hearing.”

Given the exigencies of war that weighed so heavily on New Brunswick’s Synod delegation that February day in 1915, one might imagine the “hush of expectation” in Fredericton’s City Hall when the Bishop turned to the subject of the war. Expounding eloquently on the same themes of duty and honour espoused by Kuhring, Cody and Hooper, and Germany’s guilt for bringing war upon the world, Richardson invoked self-defence as another justification for the Empire’s war against Germany. “[T]he safety of the Empire was at stake,” he declared. “[T]hat was the third clear conviction, under whose pressure Great Britain drew the sword... she buckled on her armour in the sober consciousness that she was fighting for her life... ‘The Day’ had dawned at last...of onslaught on an Empire whose success [the Germans] envied, and whose people they despised.” Richardson then closed with his challenge and the call for enlistment. As a member of the Imperial family of nations and, indeed, as the senior daughter, Canada’s honour was also at stake, and she was duty-bound to uphold it by coming to the Empire’s defence.

What is the Duty of the Church in this great crisis of our national history – in this great peril epoch (sic) of our country’s life? The first duty of the Church...is to send her sons to fight for our heritage of liberty. There might be wars in which the Church would hesitate to take her part. There might be wars upon which the Church could not set her seal of approval. There might be wars to which the Church would refuse to send her sons. But this is no such war...here is a war, whose manifest issues are those of truth and righteousness...I give this solemn charge – The Empire calls for men; let not
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the Empire call in vain. It is the call of duty. It is the voice of honour that we hear. It is the cry of a mother to her children. What shall be the answer?²⁶¹

With this exhortation, the head of Anglicanism in New Brunswick very publicly aligned himself with the province’s most strident advocate of enlistment, Reverend Bertram Hooper. This could be in part the product of common temperament or inclination, but just as likely was another concern preoccupying Richardson: enlistments in the province were at a level far below where he felt they needed to be for New Brunswick to fulfil the role he imagined for it. Even though the 26th Battalion had recruited to full strength in early December despite the initial tepid response, the anxiety of the experience was not forgotten. Enlistment had returned to its previous lacklustre rate, and with the departure of Canada’s Second Contingent scheduled for the spring, time was now at a premium. Richardson knew that his influence went well beyond the message he was enjoining his fellow clergymen to take back to their parishes.

He was a public figure who in 1915 occupied an office that still retained considerable moral authority and influence. His war speech to the Synod was, therefore, written with the general public in mind, knowing as he did that it would be widely carried by an enthusiastic press.

The duty of the Church was not going to be fully discharged simply by sending her sons to fight, however, and here Richardson introduced another theme: redemption. The war held deeper spiritual significance, a purpose and divine opportunity

²⁶¹ Ibid, 52.
rooted in the righteousness of the Empire’s fight against worldly evil. Before elaborating, Richardson first wanted to make it clear that he was not to be counted among those who saw the war as God’s punishment for England’s sins. “This is not God’s war,” he admonished, but “a war whose seeds were sown in hell. It is the devil’s war.”\textsuperscript{62} Rather, Richardson spoke of the war as a divinely-ordained opportunity for the Empire to redeem and purify itself spiritually through self-sacrifice. Its people, ennobled by the virtue of selflessness, would come to reject the materialism that had so corrupted German Christianity and led to a war of conquest. The duty of the Church, therefore, was to use the war to bring the Empire into a closer relationship with God. This interpretation was not Richardson’s alone. A similar message was used in the sermons of Anglican priests across Canada and in Britain since the previous fall.\textsuperscript{63} Richardson reiterated this message of spiritual redemption throughout the war, but it met its first true test in the early months of 1915.

On 15 February 1915, less than two weeks after Bishop Richardson spoke in Synod, the 1\textsuperscript{st} Division of the CEF crossed the English Channel from Avonmouth to St. Nazaire, France, from where it was quickly brought to Hazebrouck, fifteen miles southwest of the front at Ypres. Here the Canadians saw their first real action during the Battle of Neuve-Chapelle, where casualties were light. They were then transferred back to Ypres and the Second Army. By 17 April, the 1\textsuperscript{st} Division had taken its place on the front along a forty-five hundred-yard line, facing west across No Man’s Land to the German 51\textsuperscript{st} Reserve Division and the 38\textsuperscript{th} Landwehr Brigade.\textsuperscript{64}
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A Turning Point: Second Ypres

On Thursday, 22 April 1915, the German Army launched a new weapon in the form of chlorine gas against the Allied forces at Ypres. Colonial units of the French Army in the sector north of the Canadians took the full brunt of the attack. The ensuing casualties, panic and retreat opened a four-mile gap into which the German soldiers advanced. The Canadians stood their ground and poured fire into the German flank. For three desperate days they held the line and managed to prevent a breakthrough. By the time the First Division came out of the line on 3 May, it had suffered over 6,500 casualties, a third of its strength, including about 2,000 dead. It was Canada’s first experience with such losses. It also marked the beginning of a new Canadian identity in the war, which found expression in the famous words of “In Flanders Fields,” written by a Canadian officer and witness to the battle, John McCrae.

What came to be known as the Second Battle of Ypres affected Canadians in other ways. It awakened in them a new perception of the war, their role in it, and the kind of enemy they were fighting. Reverend William Bate, speaking at a special memorial at St. Andrew’s in Newcastle, delivered an eloquent and emotional sermon that spoke of the democratizing nature of war, uniting men of all backgrounds in facing death together, and their examples of duty, honour, and self-sacrifice. Also reminiscent of earlier themes are the familiar patriotic references to Empire and Anglo-Saxon exceptionalism. However, what is truly notable in Reverend Bate’s sermon is something new: a heightened sense of Canada’s standing vis-à-vis Britain, presaging the new Canadian identity so often observed by contemporaries and future commentators. Bate imagined Canada as a bereaved mother whose grief is assuaged by solemn pride at the words of praise from all corners of the Empire for the heroism of her dead sons.
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before moving to quote from an unnamed source: “‘[in] one crowded hour of glorious life’ they have done more for the world than years could give.”66

The shock of Second Ypres was followed by another on Friday, 7 May, when the Lusitania was torpedoed and sunk off Ireland by the German U-20, resulting in nearly twelve hundred deaths, including hundreds of women and children. The international outrage elicited by this action exacerbated the revulsion still felt for the Germans’ use of gas just weeks earlier. Passions were running at peak. Not since the anxious days of November, when the fate of the 26th Battalion hung in the balance, had New Brunswick Anglicans been faced with such an urgent call for men. The 55th Battalion was still 600 men short of its required strength. Bishop Richardson, preaching at his old church of Trinity in Saint John, on 23 May (“Patriotic” Sunday) spoke of the Empire’s tenuous security situation and vulnerability to “monsters working against the very principles of Christ’s teaching...One disaster to the British fleet, one break in the line of our army” would be enough to jeopardize morale and the spirit of freedom. Appealing again to national honour and duty, the Bishop declared, “Only the enlistment of might and manhood can give us security. The call has come. More men, more men, still more men.”67 Some sermons mixed negative tactics, not heretofore published, with the tried and true positive ones.

66 “Memorial Sermon for Soldiers,” North Shore Leader, 7 May 1915, 1, 8.
Across town on the same day, Reverend Hooper was in an expansive mood when he delivered at St. Paul’s what would be one of his most fiery orations before his departure with the 26th Battalion in June. A detachment of the 26th was present that day, and Hooper’s first words paid respect to the men in khaki. After noting the “happy coincidence” of Patriotic Sunday falling on Whit Sunday\(^68\), Hooper likened the patriotism-filled hearts of the soldiers to the transformation that came over the disciples, an event that made them into “lion-hearted soldiers of Christ,” to the transformation experienced by those filled with divinely-inspired patriotism. Then he turned his oratorical sights on the assembled civilians.

What we need is an out-pouring of the Spirit of God, a Pentecostal wind and fire that shall transform every British subject into ready to do, to bear, to die for England, for Canada, for the Empire. I tell you to your face that...if you are able to go and yet shut your ears to the call of the Empire, you are unworthy of the name and the privileges of being a British citizen.\(^69\)

Hooper then directly challenged the manhood of those able and eligible men who were not in uniform, reproaching their women in the same breath.

You hear of a mother or wife who weeps at the very thought of you becoming a British soldier...She will not let her son or husband go. Oh, shame upon such wives or mothers! If you are young enough and strong enough and yet hide behind some woman’s skirt, I say, shame upon you! What about those noble women who are giving their all for King and country? Thank God for such women!

This sermon breaks new ground for its direct (if not insensitive) challenge to women and their responsibilities to the Empire and, more to the point, what Hooper saw as their failures. He was essentially calling such women shirkers, with the same connotations the label carried for able men who hadn’t enlisted, the men whose masculinity he just challenged. This was a risky tactic. It risked polarizing the church community into potentially antagonistic groups – those who had honourably enlisted or whose loved ones had, and those who let others

---
\(^{68}\) The name in the Anglican and Methodist churches for the festival of Pentecost, celebrated on the eighth Sunday after Easter; traditionally the day commemorating the disciples’ transformation by the Holy Spirit following Jesus’ resurrection. (Acts 2:1-4)

shoulder the burden of war. Nor was it endearing Hooper to many, and he readily admitted the personal cost of his convictions. “I have lost some friends by my plain speaking...” he said, “I may lose more today. I cannot help that.”70 His claimed that inspiration by a “higher power” had prepared him to “sacrifice all he held most dear.”71 Hooper had his detractors, but also a following. His sermons were a regular feature in the press, the Saint John papers especially, and journalists gave him favourable and preferred coverage treatment which may have contributed to his general appeal with the public.72

Such journalistic favouritism was ultimately in service of the war effort. Much has been written about the role of the press during the Great War. Jeff Keshen has written extensively on the complicity and “loval disposition” of the press in fanning nationalism and enthusiasm for military service.73 In an era “unencumbered by professional standards promoting dispassionate report,” newsmen willingly self-censored and generally were successful in not printing content that could hurt morale and cause alarm. In this, they were united across partisan lines.74

Chaplain Hooper and the 1,148 men of the 26th Battalion embarked for England from Saint John aboard the S.S. Caledonia on Sunday, 13 June 1915. They crossed the Atlantic in eleven days and passed safely through the German U-boat blockade of Britain, arriving at Davenport on 24 June. Two months of intensive training followed at East Sandling, near Shorncliffe. On 13 September, an advance detachment departed for France, one year to the day since the First Contingent made the same crossing. The rest of the battalion followed on 15 September, landing at Boulogne with the 2nd Canadian Division en route to join the 1st Division at Ypres, the combined forces creating the new Canadian Corps. On 25 September, New

70 Ibid.
72 Mainville, Till the Boys, 36.
74 Keshen, Propaganda, xi-xii, 69.
Brunswickers of the 26th Battalion were in the front line at Ypres opposite the 3rd Bavarians. Within a month they'd be taking heavy casualties in daylight trench raids, the first on the Western Front, which earned one of their non-commissioned officers a Distinguished Conduct Medal (DCM), the first decoration of any grade awarded to the 2nd Division. Here they would hold the line until transferring to St. Eloi in the Ypres Salient's southeastern sector, in March 1916.

Reverend Kuhring, meanwhile, was also successful in being attached to a regiment destined for overseas service. He had remained on the General List until 7 June, having volunteered for service in November the previous year, when he attested with the 6th Canadian Mounted Rifles (CMR) at Amherst. The 6th CMR, which was authorized on 7 November 1914, was a Maritime unit consisting mostly of former mounted infantrymen and cavalry from the 8th Hussars (Princess Louise’s), the 14th Hussars, and the 28th (New Brunswick) Dragoons.75 The 594-man strong 6th CMR departed for England from Quebec City aboard the S.S. Herschel, on 17 July 1915. It reached France on 24 October and joined the new 3rd Canadian Division. In January 1916, the regiment was reorganized as dismounted infantry and dissolved into the 4th and 5th CMRs before going into the line at Ypres. Kuhring, however, was in England less than thirty-six hours when, on 29 July, he was detached from the 6th CMR and transferred to a military hospital on the island of Lemnos in the Dardanelles. He served there as chaplain in support of the Gallipoli campaign, until January 1916.76

---

75 The 8th Canadian Hussars was formed in April 1848 in New Brunswick where it has remained since. It is now the oldest armoured regiment in the Canadian Army. It is based in Sussex. The 28th Dragoons was formed 2 March 1911, in Saint John, and following a series of mergers with other units in the 20th century, it became part of what is now the Royal New Brunswick Regiment.

76 Service file for G.A. Kuhring (# B5262-S042), Library and Archives Canada.
On the home front, recruitment for the 55th Battalion continued to experience difficulties, due in part to poor organization. The lessons that had reversed the fortunes of the 26th Battalion in such short order were not implemented as successfully with the 55th. Complicating matters for recruitment was the increasing need for drafts to reinforce the battalions already overseas. Once again, anxiety spread in patriotic quarters that the Loyalist Province was not pulling its weight. With two of the Church’s leading recruiters now deployed overseas with their regiments, the task of preaching the Empire’s righteous cause fell increasingly to the Bishop and other leading priests. One of those to assume the mantle was the Very Reverend Scovil Neales, Dean of Christ Church Cathedral in Fredericton. When war came, the Gagetown-born, UNB-educated Neales (B.A. 1884, M.A. 1886) was a 54 year-old Canon and Rector in Sussex, where he had served since 1897 following prior postings in Andover and Southampton. The office of Dean, to which Neales was elevated in 1915, made him the most senior priest in the Diocese under the Bishop, and a man of public profile and
influence. On the same “Patriotic” Sunday that Hooper was holding forth at St. Paul’s with his Pentecostal allegories, Neales made a direct appeal on behalf of the 55th Battalion by invoking the legendary figure of Nelson. After this and various appeals to the higher natures of men’s hearts, Neales also revealed he was not averse to the methods of reproach, for like Hooper he was personally invested. “My only son is there. And now your country needs your service. Will you respond to the call of duty, or will you play the coward’s part?”

The vacancies left by Kuhring and Hooper also resulted in the ascendancy of another rector who would assume much of the responsibility for recruiting efforts in the province. Reverend William B. Sisam of St. George’s Church, Moncton, was a native of Gloucestershire, England. Born in 1856, Sisam was ordained in 1880 and served the church in various capacities, including two years as an Army chaplain in Burma (modern Myanmar). In 1902 he came to Canada, ministering in Manitoba and Nova Scotia before being transferred in 1907 to the Parish of Moncton as Rector of St. George’s Church (Hooper’s church before he was moved to St. Paul’s in Saint John).

On Sunday, 13 June, as the 26th Battalion was departing, Sisam delivered a powerful recruitment sermon entitled “Patriotism: A Sacred Duty.”

---

78 “‘No Nobler or More Heroic Act Than That of the Young Man Who Responds to the Call of His King and Country,’ Declares the Dean,” Daily Gleaner, 25 May 1915, 3.
Quoting from recent sermons by Britain’s Bishops of Truro and Exeter, he drew attention to the mounting lists of casualties that was putting the fate of the Empire in the balance. He reproachfully declared that Monctonians could do better, by enlisting as well as sacrificing at the home front. Anything less was a failure of sacred patriotic duty, warning that “apathy is little short of a crime.”

Sisam became a regular feature in Moncton’s Daily Times, preaching the need for frugality and stigmatizing extravagant living as unpatriotic behaviour, prevailing upon all to help with recruitment and imploring women to do their bit for King and country by not impeding their men from signing up, even though the legal requirement for the consent of wives had been repealed in August 1915. The 55th Battalion still hadn’t reached its full complement. This state of affairs, plus the revelation by the Daily Telegraph that less than three quarters of the 26th Battalion’s complement was New Brunswick-born, raised serious questions about the patriotic spirit and commitment of young men of Canadian birth.

Even Reverend Hooper returned to service as the unofficial chief recruiter for New Brunswick’s Anglicans. Despite his removal by thousands of miles, Hooper’s letters from Belgium went directly to the offices of the Daily Telegraph, where they were printed and sent into circulation by editors glad to have the force of his words. His presence at the front powerfully augmented the recruitment drive, lending much-needed firepower to local entreaties aimed at the province’s military-aged men. Gone were the days of justifying Britain’s cause; the events of recent memory rendered redundant the need for such explanations. What was at risk now was the very existence of the Empire, Canada, and Christianity. Men back home not reporting for national service were taking the “cowardly course,” declared Hooper. Instead,

81 Mainville, Till the Boys, 38.
“the man who can come will not come as a man to be shunned and despised forever. Afraid of hardships? Afraid of death? When the cause of civilization is at stake? When British honour, justice and liberty are at stake...Are Canadians less patriotic [than Germans]?”

There can be no doubt about why the drive for volunteers was so acute in the patriotic minds of men like Hooper. On 8 July, Prime Minister Robert Borden increased the authorized strength of the CEF to 150,000. Following a visit in the ensuing weeks to England and France, however, Borden became acquainted for the first time with the true nature of the war and its ability to rapidly consume men. The war was not going well. British Empire casualties mounted and though casualty totals were never published during the war (by Britain or any of the belligerents), daily printed lists of the missing and dead, and the visible presence of scores of wounded returned from the front, left little doubt in the public consciousness that the war was taking a high toll in men. Immediately on his return to Canada, Borden sought and secured a new commitment to increase the authorized strength of the CEF to 250,000. The outlook for the Allies was grim.

Recruitment remained the overarching national priority for Canada through the closing months of 1915, a period marked by more disappointment, setback and suffering. A joint push in late September by the French and British in the Champagne region and at Loos failed to achieve a breakthrough, resulting in the now typical appalling losses of men for nominal gains in territory. Following the close of this failed offensive, King George V was moved to admit publicly that victory against the Central powers was nowhere in sight, and that more men would be needed to take the fight into 1916.

The New Brunswick boys who enlisted and were taken on strength between October 1914 and the spring of 1915 were, by year’s end, at the front. The 26th Battalion was holding the line near Ypres, but Reverend Hooper was not among them. He had been transferred to the 6th Field Ambulance not long after the 26th Battalion’s arrival on the continent. Conditions behind the front lines at Ypres took a quick toll on Hooper’s health. After three months he contracted bronchitis and returned to England for treatment and convalescence. Upon recovering, he was advised, to his admitted disappointment, that he was not going back to Belgium, but was instead attached on 15 February to the 30th Reserve Battalion, CEF, at Hythe, a small coastal town in Kent, to fulfil the duties of hospital chaplain. Setting his personal feelings aside, Hooper threw himself into the service of the wounded, and in this he found a new calling that softened, then dispelled, the blow of not returning to the front. Hooper’s assignment as a hospital chaplain was, as it turned out, propitious. The role more than likely afforded him a degree of personal freedom, if not convenience, that service at the front was unlikely to offer. In Hythe, and later at Ramsgate, Hooper remained a voice to rally enlistment in New Brunswick. He would also leverage his reputation and profile back home to raise monetary subscriptions in support of his new charity, the Wounded Soldiers Fund. Through this initiative, Hooper would remain a constant presence in the New Brunswick press for the rest of the war.

84 The 30th had been mobilized in western Canada. After its arrival in England, it supplied reinforcement drafts to CEF units in the field.
Energetic and persistent recruitment initiatives finally succeeded in filling the ranks of the 55th Battalion by the fall of 1915. This unit, with its mix of New Brunswickers and Prince Edward Islanders, shipped out of Montreal on the S.S. Corsican for Britain on 30 October, with a strength of 1,122 officers and men, but it would not see glory in the field. Instead, the 55th served as a reinforcement battalion to CEF units at the front, until it was disbanded in July 1916 and its remnant absorbed into the 40th (Nova Scotia) Battalion.

In late 1915, word went out that New Brunswick was to receive another dedicated infantry unit, and on 22 December, the 104th Battalion was authorized. Commanded by Lt-Col. George W. Fowler, previously of the Canadian Militia, the 104th mobilized at Sussex. One of its first officers, and its first chaplain, was Reverend C. Gordon Lawrence, rector of the historic Trinity Church, Kingston. The married Lawrence, a 29-year old native of Dumfries, New Brunswick, and graduate of Bishop’s University, had been a priest for only four years, all of them in Kingston, when he answered the call of King and country. Lawrence’s leave for active service was granted by Bishop Richardson on 23 October, making him the third Anglican minister from New Brunswick to join the CEF as a chaplain, after Hooper and Kuhring.

As the war dragged on and casualties mounted, pressure from the army for replacements started to increase too. The target in the minds of most was the commitment made to Britain by the federal government, which in mid-1915 was 250,000 men. For some,

---

85 The designation of ‘104’ for this unit was a deliberate appeal based in the War of 1812 legacy of the 104th Regiment of Foot (New Brunswick Fencibles).
however, the seeming arbitrariness of a cap on Canada’s commitment to Britain was dangerous in that, once met, complacency would set in. Bishop Richardson came as close as any to articulating this fear in the closing days of 1915. At a packed rally at Saint John’s Imperial Theatre, Richardson and Major Charles G. Pincombe, of the 104th Battalion, were drumming up enlistment for the 104th, 115th and 140th Battalions. The Bishop’s impassioned plea for men ended with what he believed Canada’s contribution to the Imperial Army should be. If Canada were to match Britain’s uniformed commitment proportional to her population, he said, the Dominion must raise 750,000 men. Pincombe elaborated: “Three million men must be raised by April [1916]. After a census was taken it was found that the United Kingdom could furnish at the very best only 1.9 million of this number. The Overseas Dominions must furnish the rest.”

Voluntary enlistments in Canada reached their apex in the first quarter of 1916. A steady, downward trajectory then began that would only be reversed with the implementation of conscription in January 1918. New Brunswick’s 104th Battalion reached its full strength in the spring of 1916, aided in great measure by the vigorous and unflagging efforts of Major Pincombe, and the transfer of approximately four hundred men from another battalion, the 64th (also based in Sussex), which had raised only about a quarter of its strength. The pressures already confronting the province’s overstretched recruitment resources were further aggravated by Prime Minister Borden when, in his New Year’s address of 1 January 1916, he

---

87 Prior to the war, Pincombe was a Baptist minister from Lower Jemseg, Queens County, and a 29-year veteran of the British Army (see Mainville, Till the Boys, 22).
88 Italics are the author’s. Of course, Richardson could not have known that in just two weeks, on 1 January, the federal government would raise Canada’s commitment to 500,000 men in uniform.
90 The core of this battalion was transferred to Nova Scotia, where it retained its designation. See Mainville, Till the Boys, 37.
announced that the Dominion’s commitment to the CEF was increased from July’s quarter of a million men to half a million, with immediate effect.

The Canadian *Official History* of the Great War takes pains to clarify what exactly the government intended with this commitment. At the time of its announcement, 500,000 men was understood by many, incorrectly, to mean total *enlistments*. Were that so, the country in all likelihood would never have seen the MSA and conscription. In fact, the government’s objective was to *maintain* the CEF overseas at a *strength* of 500,000. This decision, a political one taken arbitrarily, without expert consultation and absent a clear understanding of how such a goal was to be achieved, immediately presented a challenge that the voluntary recruitment system was simply unable to meet. The Army soon acquainted the Prime Minister with the scale of the challenge. The strength of the CEF at the end of November 1915, probably the latest date for which figures were available, was 162,674 officers and men, representing a shortfall of 88,000 men, and below the last commitment in July of a quarter of a million men.\(^91\)

Now, the system was confronted with a deficit of 338,000, and this had yet to consider the reducing effects of attrition. Once the half million-man strength had been achieved, a further 25,000 men *per month* would still have to be raised, for the duration of the war, just to replace the estimated monthly casualty rate of 5%. Therefore, maintaining the CEF at a strength of half a million would require a minimum of 300,000 new recruits annually.\(^92\) Borden’s decision was to have profound consequences for voluntary recruitment in Canada. In short, the new demands placed upon a system already straining to meet its current goal *and* maintain the previous force commitment ensured the target strength of half a million could not be reached in the absence of conscription. In January 1916, however, all this still lay in the undetermined

\(^91\) Nicholson, *Canadian Expeditionary Force*, Appendix “C,” Table 2, 547.

future. There was a war to be won, and with the need for men greater than ever, time was at a premium.

On 1 February 1916, three weeks before the German Army launched its massive offensive at Verdun in France, Bishop Richardson delivered his second wartime charge to the Diocesan Synod, which had assembled that year at Fredericton’s City Hall. For the first time in the extant source material, the Bishop clearly articulated the role of the Anglican church in the nation’s recruitment effort. It was to “throw [its] whole weight into the battle-line” by bringing the power of its influence to bear upon the men of its confession, to fire their sense of Christian and British duty – concepts which were synonymous – and mobilize them to enlist in support of Borden’s commitment of half a million men in uniform. The mechanics of how this was to be done was the responsibility of the secular authorities. The moral and spiritual means of recruitment were the responsibility of the Church. This theme lay at the heart of Richardson’s address, and he brought all his oratorical powers to bear upon its development by commencing with a powerful and forceful declaration: “It is a holy war which we are waging. It is a war in which God is calling us...We have a right to be sure that God is on our side.” The Bishop’s declaration of a holy war resembled, on its surface, similar declarations by other Anglican church leaders in Canada and Britain. A.F. Winnington-Ingram, the controversial wartime Bishop of London and a man who could have been one of Richardson’s spiritual, if not oratorical, inspirations, declared the previous October that “the Church can best help [Britain]

---

first of all by making it realize that it is engaged in a Holy War (sic), and not be afraid of saying so.”

It should not be presumed or understood that all Anglican clerics were as comfortable as Bishops Richardson and Winnington-Ingram with the crusading language of “holy war.” A great many priests were not and avoided it in their sermonizing. They chose less bellicose interpretations for their flocks, usually in the patriotic language of duty and sacrifice, and pastoral comfort. But as this study and Davidson’s show, there was a widespread consensus in New Brunswick, Canada, and Britain on the righteousness of the war, as evident in the consistent language that permeates most extant sermons of the period. Chaplains serving at or near the front were even less likely to indulge in the rhetoric of holy war. The New Brunswick Anglican chaplains covered in this study appear to have conformed to this norm, the Bishop and Chaplain Hooper notwithstanding.

---

97 Madigan, “Great Crusade,” 2.
CHAPTER II

Sacrifice, Suffering and the Coming of Conscription

The ever-lengthening war, with its escalating casualties and pressure of the resources of the nation had two effects, broadly speaking, on Anglican sermonizing after 1915. First, the already-urgent matter of recruiting assumed a new dimension which was deployed to further justify the war as a righteous one and buttress the appeal to national duty and sacrifice. This theme dealt with the external threat to the safety and security of the Empire. The second effect was the growth of the theme that addressed moral and spiritual decay. The lengthening war would be increasingly interpreted by the Anglican clergy as a divinely sent opportunity for spiritual renewal and purification through the sacrifice, self-denial and suffering demanded by the conflict, not just for Anglicans but for all of Canada. These two themes, with local variations, were to become common in the Anglican confession throughout the Empire, until conscription made the first redundant, leaving the emphasis almost solely on the second theme until the Armistice.

And so it was that in the second month of 1916 – the year that would witness the Battles of Verdun, Jutland and the Somme, the German declaration of unlimited submarine warfare, and the advent of conscription in Britain – an unsuspecting Bishop Richardson admonished his fellow clergymen and laity not to lose sight of the larger forces at work in the world:

...the great pressing need of the nation at this time, is not only the need of more men...but the need of a new relationship to God – the need of a new religious life. If we are to win this war – and we can only lose it, I believe, by defeating God’s will for us – we must not be content with mobilizing merely our material resources. We must mobilize also, and first of all, our spiritual resources...Is there anything to indicate that there has been in our midst a real revival of religion? I dare not say that there is. I fear
that by our lethargy, we are doing what I have said – defeating God’s will for us and for the world.  

The war in 1916 would sorely test the resolve behind these words. Yet, early in that fateful year, many remained optimistic that the war would soon be over.

It is interesting to observe that around this time, late March of 1916, Hooper as well as Reverend Kuhring offered nearly identical opinions on the subject of the war, to the effect that by December it would all be over, and in favour of the Entente. In March 1916, Saint John’s Daily Telegraph printed correspondence recently received from local overseas chaplains. Hooper was quoted as saying, “for the first time since the outbreak of this fearful war in 1914, I feel optimistic with regard to its ending…I fancy I see the light of coming peace through the present clouds and darkness...” Kuhring, writing from Alexandria (he had been transferred there from Lemnos in February), thought, “I may be wrong but I cannot help but believe that the war will suddenly collapse for Germany.”

Even Reverend Captain Gordon Lawrence, preaching at a drum head service for the 104th Battalion at the Armouries in Sussex, was inspired with enough of the spirit of optimism to be concerned about the men of his unit spending their wages as fast as they made them. Thus, he chose as the subject for his sermon, “Be prepared,” not just for going to war, but also for peace, advising them to open savings accounts and set aside

---

enough money so that when peace came, they wouldn’t be a financial burden on the state.\textsuperscript{100} The basis for this positivity is unclear, especially given that the titanic battle then raging in and around Verdun was beginning to achieve exactly what the Germans intended, to bleed the French Army dry. Moreover, given Borden’s monumental recruiting challenge, the optimistic prognostications of some of New Brunswick’s Anglican clergy, Hooper especially, seem counterproductive to say the least. St. George’s Reverend Sisam was more circumspect when he declared, “...any lack of men and munitions, any weakness or half-heartedness...would be criminal as prolonging the sufferings, the miseries and the slaughter...let us then fill up our battalions...The recruits of Canada can still proudly say that their service is still a purely voluntary one since to this land of liberty there is still no compulsion.”\textsuperscript{101} This last statement was an obvious reference to Britain, which had been compelled to dispense with voluntary enlistment in favour of conscription in January 1916,\textsuperscript{102} and perhaps a warning that the same fate could befall Canada if enthusiasm was insufficient. In fact, such warnings would become more frequent as enlistment dropped off in 1916 and 1917.

In May 1916, the pages of New Brunswick’s dailies filled with news of the war and reports on casualties. Letters from Kuhring and Hooper brought welcome news to loved ones back home of encounters with their men. Meanwhile, the Germans prepared a fresh assault to seize the last high ground still in British possession in the Ypres Salient. This ran along 2,200 metres of front that arced southwestward from Hooge through a series of hills, spurs and copses, before terminating at a low rise dubbed “Mount Sorrel” in the south. Four battalions of the Canadian 3\textsuperscript{rd} Division defended this ground in June 1916. One of them was the 4\textsuperscript{th} CMR, which contained many New Brunswick men formerly of the 6\textsuperscript{th} CMR (the remainder were with

\textsuperscript{100} “Sunday Message of Chaplain Lawrence,” Kings County Record, 24 March 1916, 1.
\textsuperscript{101} “Recruiting Sermons in City Churches,” Daily Times, 17 April 1916, 5.
\textsuperscript{102} The Military Service Bill. It received Royal Assent in March 1916 and went into immediate effect.
the 5th CMR, in reserve). On the morning of 2 June, the Germans opened their most intense bombardment of the war in the Salient up to that time. The shelling lasted for five hours and virtually obliterated the 4th CMR’s defences, killing, wounding and burying scores of men. This was immediately followed by massive explosions from four mines the Germans blew just short of the Canadian lines. Hundreds of men of the 4th CMR literally disappeared, vaporized or buried beneath tons of earth and debris. Over the next two weeks, the Battle of Mount Sorrel (as it came to be called) raged back and forth. The fourteen-day battle inflicted over 8,000 casualties, including 536 taken prisoner, on the battalions of the 3rd Division, but none suffered more than the 4th CMR. On 2 June alone, it suffered 89% dead, wounded, missing and taken prisoner.103 Of the 702 officers and men in the line that day, only 76 emerged unscathed.104

Among the dead and presumed dead were at least nineteen New Brunswick men of the original 6th CMR, five of whom were Anglicans (Appendix, Exhibit 5). The scores of wounded were invalided to Canadian Military Hospitals in England or France. By the time it was over, all three Canadian Divisions had fought at Mount Sorrel, sustaining 8,000 dead, wounded and missing, and 536 taken prisoner.105

104 Nicholson, Canadian Expeditionary Force, 149, 154.
105 Christie, Canadians at Mount Sorrel, 27.
On 28 June, the men of New Brunswick’s 104th Battalion departed Halifax for Britain on the RMS Olympic, with a full strength of 1,173 officers and men, including its chaplain, Reverend C. Gordon Lawrence. They were two days at sea when Field Marshal Douglas Haig launched one of the largest offensives of the war. The experience of the British Army on the opening day of the Battle of the Somme, on 1 July, proved that the Germans remained a formidable military force, as well-resourced and determined as ever. The worst day in the history of British arms witnessed the loss of nearly 57,000 men dead, wounded, missing and taken prisoner. The decision to launch what Haig called the “Big Push” was based on a threefold objective: to relieve the pressure on the French armies at Verdun by drawing German forces north to Picardy; to inflict the heaviest possible losses on the German army; and to aid other allies by preventing further transfers of German troops to their fronts.106 All three objectives succeeded, to varying degrees, but at a staggering cost in men and materiel, for about nine kilometres of territorial gain. Exact casualties were not known at the time and

estimates only appeared well after the war. The butcher’s bill for the Entente Powers was 432,000 dead, wounded, missing and taken prisoner. German casualties were later estimated between 400,000 and 500,000.107 Notions of an Entente victory in 1916 were forgotten.

The Canadian Corps was spared the slaughter of the Somme’s debut. They joined the great battle in late August after transferring south from Ypres. The 104th Battalion, however, was not among them. Upon its arrival in England in mid-July, the 104th was absorbed into the Canadian 17th and 32nd Reserve Battalions to supply reinforcements to units in the field, where it became part of the 5th Canadian Division formed in Britain in anticipation of service at the front.108 Reverend Captain Lawrence would remain with the 104th at Shoreham as Director of Chaplain Services until March 1917, when he was attached to the Canadian 1st General Hospital in France.109 The 26th Battalion, on the other hand, went into action at the Somme on 15 September with the 2nd Division’s attack on Courcelette, part of a larger British assault that lasted until 22 September. The gains won were tactically significant, resulting in a victory for

---

107 Cook, Sharp End, 521.
108 Council of Archives New Brunswick (CANB), Fonds 12.48 – 104th Battalion. Accessed 23 August 2017, https://search.canbarchives.ca/104th-battalion. The battalion was scheduled for reconstitution and inclusion in the 5th Canadian Division CEF, which formed in Britain in February 1917 but was dissolved one year later. Its elements were used to reinforce the first four divisions in the field.
which the Canadians were largely responsible. As a testament to the ferocity of the fighting in which they had been engaged, the 26th Battalion’s losses during its six-week tour at the Somme were 677 out of 929 men, 381 of which were inflicted on the first day. All told, Canadian casualties at the Somme were 24,029, out of a strength of 85,000.

The Battle of the Somme was in its final weeks when Chaplain Hooper issued an appeal, via the Daily Telegraph, for New Brunswick men to step up once again in the moment of crisis. It had become his practice to make his appeals in the form of reprinted letters, usually to a Saint John friend. As before, these were clearly written with the intent of wide circulation.

“Regarding Canada’s contribution in men to the Empire’s need,” Hooper wrote from Ramsgate, “I read the other day that the total of 350,000 had been reached. It is a grand contribution indeed, but in my opinion, not grand enough.” The text then switched to bold, upper case print for full effect:

SURELY CANADA WILL NOT BE CONTENT UNTIL 600,000 MEN WEARING THE “MAPLE LEAF” ARE FOUND SERVING BENEATH THE GLORIOUS BATTLE FLAG OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE. I AM PERSUADED THAT OUR DEAR PROVINCE OF NEW BRUNSWICK WILL RISE TO HER FULL DUTY IN THIS RESPECT. TO BE FIT TO GO, ABLE TO GO, YET REMAIN AT HOME IS NOT TO BE THOUGHT OF BY ANYONE WHO VALUES HIS SELF-RESPECT OR HIS PRIVILEGES AS A CITIZEN OF THE EMPIRE. THE NEED FOR MORE MEN IS SO IMPERATIVE THAT IT CANNOT BE EXAGGERATED."

Words like these were now falling on deaf ears. Voluntary enlistment in New Brunswick and the rest of Canada was in the doldrums despite the best exertions of civil and military recruitment organizations. The summer months of 1916, June through September, saw a mere 31,837 men across Canada added to the rolls, versus 29,187 for the single month of January 1916. October would record the lowest enlistments in two years, with just 5,517 men


111 Cook, Sharp End, 525.

112 A figure probably gleaned from the press. The actual number at the end of October 1916, when published many months later, was 383,874. (Nicholson, Canadian Expeditionary Force, 547).

113 “Need for More Men So Imperative That It Cannot Be Exaggerated,” Daily Telegraph, 8 November 1916, 4.
volunteering nationally for military service.\textsuperscript{114} The last full-strength battalion raised in New Brunswick during the Great War, the 104\textsuperscript{th} out of Sussex, had sailed on 28 June 1916 with a nominal roll of 1,173 officers and men. It was followed on 23 July by the under-strength 115\textsuperscript{th} Battalion, with 901 officers and men. The 140\textsuperscript{th} (St. John’s Tigers) and 145\textsuperscript{th} (New Brunswick) Battalions sailed on 25 September with respective strengths of only 851 and 549. The 132\textsuperscript{nd} (North Shore) Battalion sailed on 26 October, also with a poor showing of 851 officers and men. The remaining sister battalion that had also been authorized the previous December, the 165\textsuperscript{th} (Acadiens), struggled to rise even to these levels. It finally departed for Europe in March 1917, with 556 officers and men too urgently needed as reinforcements to tarry longer in New Brunswick. The last battalion authorized in the province, the highland 236\textsuperscript{th} (New Brunswick Kilties), was mobilized at Fredericton on 15 July 1916. It struggled too, so much in fact that it had to obtain approval from the Minister of Militia to expand its recruiting territory to the rest of the Dominion. Complaints from equally challenged recruiting agencies in other provinces, however, soon forced Ottawa to revoke this exception. By mid-April 1917, the Kilties had taken only 591 men on strength.\textsuperscript{115} The entry of the United States into the war that month, however, proved the salvation of the Kilties. It opened the door to the direct recruitment of ex-patriate New Brunswickers in New England. A flood of enlistments quickly brought the unit up to its full strength of 1,087 officers and men, and in October and November 1917 the Kilties finally reached Britain. Voluntary enlistment in New Brunswick by the end of 1916 had all but evaporated. Recruiting offices in Madawaska and Queens County could no longer be justified and were closed to save on costs.\textsuperscript{116}

\textsuperscript{114} Nicholson, \textit{Canadian Expeditionary Force}, Appendix “C”, “Table 1: Appointments and Enlistments by Months,” 546.


\textsuperscript{116} Mainville, \textit{Till the Boys}, 43.
In 1916 the Great War penetrated the Canadian consciousness in full. No province, and few communities, were spared anxiety or, worse, bereavement on a scale previously unimaginable. Operations at Ypres and the Somme far and away accounted for the majority of casualties experienced to this point. By the end of the year, twenty-nine months into the war, the Canadian Corps had sustained 61,000 casualties, of which 15,000 were deaths.\footnote{Cook, \textit{Sharp End}, 529.} The need for reinforcements just to keep the Corps at fighting strength coincided with the collapse of voluntary enlistment. In December 1916, the number of new recruits taken on strength was just 5,139 for the entire country, the lowest monthly intake so far.\footnote{Nicholson, \textit{Canadian Expeditionary Force}, 549.} The reasons for this have been debated by historians for nearly a century, but it is generally agreed that a confluence of factors depressed the voluntary system. The largest of these, one that a prolonged war virtually assured, was near-full employment as the country transition to a war economy. The urban centres that had contributed the majority of men for military service now needed them in factories and support industries to turn out materiel for the war effort. Employers in what were deemed war-essential industries were even starting to resent the incursions of recruiters on their pool of labour. This led to complaints that workers of military age in non-essential industries were shirking by failing to volunteer. Concurrently, in many parts of industrial Canada, growing labour shortages were inflating wages, creating a significant financial disincentive to enlist.

Rural Canada, meanwhile, with its labour-intensive agricultural economy, remained the challenge it had been for recruiters since the beginning of the war. Farmers and their families saw their role of feeding the nation and the Imperial armies as a duty no less patriotic than military service. Men from rural Canada with any inclination to volunteer had largely done so...
by the end of 1916, leaving this source of recruits all but exhausted. New Brunswick, as the second most rural province in the country, was no exception. The growing urban-rural imbalance in enlistments only added to the growing tensions and divisions. As early as April 1916, the New Brunswick legislature passed a resolution calling for Ottawa to adopt a national system that would “[call] to the colours all men of suitable age under an enrolment plan which would consider the requirements of agriculture and industry.”

![Plate 14: Headline from the Saint John Daily Telegraph, 6 July 1916. (Credit: PANB)](image)

The haphazard approach that characterized much of private recruiting efforts up to this time also came under criticism and scrutiny. Industry and editorialists alike called for a more organized, central approach to recruitment that would reduce antagonisms, and restore some balance between the needs of the country’s economic arm and its sword arm. In August 1916, the federal government attempted a solution with the creation of the National Service Board (NSB). Charged with building an inventory of the Dominion’s working-age males between the ages of 18 and 75, the NSB issued cards to households through the postal system. Response was voluntary. The process, undertaken in early 1917, was fraught with deficiencies and produced only 407,703 military prospects, of which a mere 286,976 were engaged in non-essential occupations. Lists were produced and sent to their corresponding local recruiting

---

120 After deducting serving soldiers, non-British subjects, those unfit for service, men with more than three dependents, and all others considered unsuitable. Ibid, 219-20.
offices which, in turn, contacted the men on their lists to ascertain if they would be willing to sign up for service in the CEF. The result was negligible. Bishop Richardson reserved his faith in the NSB scheme and would say so at his annual address to the Diocesan Synod the following February, just as the NSB’s work was getting underway.

Appeals to duty, patriotism, righteousness, and holy war might have driven some men to the recruitment centres in the past, but the war still seemed far from being won, and words would no longer be enough. The time had come for stronger, concrete measures.

**Conscription**

In February 1917, the Diocese of Fredericton held its third Synod of the war, this time in Saint John, next to the church where Bishop Richardson had presided as parish priest years earlier. In his annual address, the Bishop spoke at length on the war, first cataloguing the successes and disappointments of 1916, and chastising optimism as misplaced, uninformed and dangerous. It was misplaced, he argued, for being founded on the belief that because Germany had failed in her grand strategy to secure victory, she was no longer capable of winning the war. In short, went the reasoning, all the Allies had to do now was wait for the Kaiserkreich to come to its senses and see reason. Germany’s recent peace proposals were essentially proof of this reasoning. Richardson was unimpressed. He gave a lengthy and detailed account of Pan-Germanism, and the hegemonic worldview at its core. It was a vision where Germany enjoyed not only military dominion on the continent, but a greatly expanded political one, where parts or all of Europe’s sovereign nations were to be brought either under direct rule, or within a great confederation with power emanating from Berlin. These lands just happened to include most of the German-occupied territory. A peace with Germany now would amount to a victory for her. The Bishop closed the subject with a declaration of his unequivocal unity with the
Allied governments, who had declared peace with Germany impossible until she withdrew from the occupied territories and lay down her arms.\textsuperscript{121}

Having dispelled false optimism by painting a picture of the great threat they still faced, the Bishop moved on to his central theme: the Dominion’s obligation to protect the Empire. This duty boiled down to one thing, and that was men in uniform. Canada had promised the “Mother Country” 500,000 men. The most recent published enlistment rolls showed that Canada was still 120,000 deficient in this commitment. If anyone thought that Canada was fighting solely for Britain, that was a mistake; she was fighting as much for herself and her future freedom. Recruitment in Canada was deeply challenged, the voluntary system having reached its limits, just as it had in Britain in 1915. As for the much-touted NSB mission to stimulate enlistment, the Bishop was circumspect:

[W]e shall all be ready...to support it to the upmost of our power, but, whatever other good it may effect, it is difficult to understand in what real way it will stimulate recruiting...there has been very little to reassure me...there is little likelihood that it will materially increase our contribution of fighting men to the Empire...I am almost afraid that the contrary is true...not at least [because]...the stress that is being laid upon the economic contribution should serve to salve the conscience of multitudes of men...and so make it all too easy for them to stay at home...I can see nothing in the scheme that [will] stimulate recruiting, and that is to my mind the most urgent duty of the hour.\textsuperscript{122}

Richardson acknowledged the needs of the Dominion’s farmers and essential industries, but in his estimation their needs were secondary to the Army’s until victory was won. “To fail in that respect,” he emphasized, “is to fail in the first thing of all.”\textsuperscript{123} Here, Richardson was elaborating on statements he delivered just days before at a packed rally in the city’s opera house, where he directed his views on duty and enlistment at the so-called “stay-at-homes.” Drawing a sharp distinction between production and patriotism, the Bishop

\textsuperscript{122} Ibid, 40.
\textsuperscript{123} Ibid
declared, “There must not be too much to encourage the slacker. The best man was (sic) the man with the rifle.” He also enjoined New Brunswick’s farmers, represented that evening by members of the Farmers and Dairymen’s Association, to eschew partisanship in their dealings with the provincial government.\(^{124}\)

Richardson clarified exactly what, in his view, Canada’s obligation was, and how it was to be met. It was a view shared by all leading Anglican churchmen, as well as in other spheres of Canadian society, and it boiled down to some hard choices.\(^{125}\) Five hundred thousand men should not be the limit if circumstances demanded otherwise, he argued; this was about more than a commitment to Britain. It was Canada’s war too, and therefore the first commitment was to herself and to give all that was necessary. In Richardson’s estimation, the voluntary system had run its course. The only solution now, he added, was to accept reality and implement the policy option that had been the subject of controversy and debate for months. “[W]e are compelled in self-respect, I think,” said Richardson solemnly, “to consider the question of conscription, or at least, of some form of compulsory military service.”\(^{126}\)

The remainder of Bishop Richardson’s 1917 charge to the Synod, a third of the entire speech, was a full-throated, unequivocal argument for conscription inspired by Britain’s introduction of the same in December 1916. In summary: it was time for a frank national debate on the matter; partisanship had to be subordinated to national interest; precious time had been lost to political calculus, dissembling and indecision, blaming both the Government and the Official Opposition; systematic efforts designed to brace the population for the probability of compulsory service, a direct reference to the NSB, should have commenced at least eighteen months previous (“We are sowing the seed, when the harvest should have been

\(^{124}\) “‘Best Man Is One With Rifle,’ Asserts Bishop” (sic), *Daily Telegraph*, 1 February 1917, 1.

\(^{125}\) cf. Davidson, “Peaching the Great War,” 84. Also, Millman, 97.

\(^{126}\) *Synod* (1917), 41
ready for the reaping”); notions as to the undemocratic nature of compulsory service was “arrant nonsense;” and finally, “voluntary economy, like voluntary military service, is something that appeals only to the high-minded and unselfish, and unless the challenge is reinforced by some legislative sanction, the response is hardly likely to be very general. That has been the experience of England...it was urged in vain, and it is now being enforced by law.”

Following this harangue, the Bishop concluded on a positive note. The Church retained its pre-eminence among enlistments in the CEF. Using figures provided to the House of Bishops by the Department of Militia and Defence, the rolls of the CEF numbered about 370,000 as of the previous October, of which 165,000, or 44.5%, claimed Church of England affiliation. This represented 15.81% of the 1.043 million Canadians who declared themselves members of the Church in the 1911 census. The full text of Bishop Richardson’s charge to Synod was reprinted and widely circulated in the province’s broadsheets, as was typical in those days. A reader informed on current events would not have been surprised by Richardson’s views on conscription. The Bishop’s position was a matter of public record for several months.

127 Ibid, 42-3.
128 Ibid, 39.
The previous month, Canon Sisam struck a more moderate tone with respect to the NSB and conscription in his last sermon of 1916. Speaking from his pulpit at St. George’s in Moncton, part of his “War Day” service homily encouraged cooperation with NSB officials when they came calling. On recruitment, he recounted why Britain was ultimately compelled to implement conscription, and he reflected on whether the voluntary system in Canada would yet prove sufficient to meet the nation’s needs.129

The winter months of 1916-1917 were, by Western Front standards, relatively quiet for the Canadian Corps. Since the close of operations at the Somme, the Corps had been holding the line in the right sector of the British First Army at Artois, and it used this time to reinforce, recuperate, and train for the coming spring offensives. The French Third Army, under the command of General Robert Nivelle, had planned and prepared since December for a massive assault to be launched against the German lines at the Aisne River, north of Reims, with a subsidiary attack in the Champagne region, on the left. The Nivelle Offensive, as history came to call it, also included a preliminary British diversionary east of Arras towards Cambrai. The Canadian assault on Vimy Ridge was part of this strategic diversion. On 7 April, after months of meticulous preparation, the four divisions of the Canadian Corps, ranked shoulder-to-shoulder and assaulting as one for the first and only time in the war, attacked. New Brunswick’s 26th Battalion counted itself among the first units to go in.

Dailies across the Dominion, and even in Britain, heralded the martial prowess of the Canadian Corps, proclaiming it the finest assault force in the Imperial armies. Success came at a high cost, however, and within days the same newspapers swelled with the lists of dead, wounded and missing. When the full price was finally tallied years later, it showed Vimy Ridge had cost the Canadian Corps 10,602 men of all ranks, including 3,598 killed or dead of

wounds.\textsuperscript{130} The 26\textsuperscript{th} Battalion suffered its heaviest casualties since Courcelette, with 51 dead, over 127 wounded and two missing.\textsuperscript{131} For units whose field strength was typically less than a thousand men, losses like these represented an attrition rate of 20%. The Canadian Military Hospital at Ramsgate received many of the more-seriously wounded from Vimy, and in the weeks following the battle Reverend Hooper’s letters show that his thoughts were as much on the families of soldiers back home as on the men in Europe. In recognition of his tireless devotion to the wounded, Reverend Captain Hooper was promoted to the rank of Major on Dominion Day, 1917.\textsuperscript{132}

The spring of 1917 also witnessed important changes for New Brunswick’s other Anglican chaplains overseas. Reverend Captain Gustav Kuhring resigned his commission in the CEF the previous winter and was back in his pulpit at St. John’s (Stone) Church in time for Easter services. Priests who served overseas during the war did so at the pleasure of their churches and Bishop, and could be asked to return at any time, as appears to have been the case with Kuhring. Not every priest agreed to return, however, and if he declined such a request he might also have to resign his parish charge, and in so doing accepted the risk of having nowhere to serve when he did finally return. Hooper himself was one such example. The previous winter he declined a request by the vestry of St. Paul’s (Valley) Church to return and take up his pastoral duties, arguing strenuously that his ministering to Canada’s wounded in England outweighed the needs of his parishioners. Reverend Captain C. Gordon Lawrence, meanwhile, was posted to the No. 1 Canadian General Hospital in France, after two months leave in England following the sad death of his first-born child, a son.\textsuperscript{133} The following October,

\textsuperscript{130} Nicholson, \textit{Canadian Expeditionary Force}, 265.
\textsuperscript{133} “Captain Lawrence Goes to France,” \textit{Daily Telegraph}, 15 April 1917, 8.
Lawrence would also decline a request to return to New Brunswick and the offer of a rectorship at Hampton.\textsuperscript{134}

Meanwhile, the recruiting situation in Canada continued to deteriorate. Faced with a depressing situation where the attritional ‘wastage’ of front-line troops exceeded the replacement capacity of the moribund voluntary system, the Department of Militia in March and April 1917 tried a novel solution. Calling up 50,000 members of the Militia to form a Canadian Defence Force (CDF) of forty-seven battalions for home defence would, in theory, free up an equivalent number of CEF servicemen in Canada for overseas deployment. If successful this plan would, even if temporarily, counterbalance dwindling recruitment as well as buy the Dominion government time to consider its limited options. Creative as the plan may have been, it unfortunately hinged on members of the Dominion Militia volunteering for the CDF. It all ended, in the words of the Canada’s \textit{Official History} of the Great War, as “a melancholy failure.”\textsuperscript{135} Enlistments in the CDF were abysmal, and on July 31\textsuperscript{st}, orders were issued for its demobilization. Meanwhile, the regular military and civilian voluntary system raised just 38,063 recruits for the first seven months of 1917, nearly 32,000 below the level required to maintain the targeted force strength of 500,000, and barely enough to maintain the CEF at its present strength of 305,633. On the surface, this latter figure was an impressive accomplishment considering that the Dominion Army’s pre-war professional strength was about 7,000. Yet, when one considers that 305,633 factored in a paltry \textit{net increase of just 710 men year-over-year}, the accomplishment fades. Of the 67,701 enlistments since 31 July 1916, the great majority had been lost to casualties, most of these at the Somme and Arras. The crisis had arrived.

\textsuperscript{134} Notice in the \textit{Daily Telegraph}, 20 October 1917, 20.
\textsuperscript{135} Nicholson, \textit{Canadian Expeditionary Force}, 222.
Prime Minister Borden had ruled out the need for compulsory military service since Canada went to war in August 1914, believing it unnecessary but also in the knowledge that it would sorely test national unity and his party’s hold on power. However, as the seemingly interminable war entered 1917, the Dominion’s “surplus” of military-aged men was virtually depleted, and the half-million-man commitment to the Empire in jeopardy, Borden faced increasing pressure from powerful patriotic quarters, including his own party, to reverse the government’s position on conscription. It is impossible to see how any other option was available to him, and yet, he continued to demure and evade through late 1916 and early 1917, deferring for as long as possible the political poisoned chalice.

Matters came to a head between February and May 1917. Borden was overseas for meetings of the Imperial War Cabinet and a visit to the Canadian front in France. British military exhaustion and the terrible attrition rate in the CEF galvanized him into the realization that delay on conscription was no longer an option. When Borden returned to Canada he did so in the full knowledge that it would take considerably more time and men to defeat Germany in the field. Russia, having succumbed to the Socialist revolution in February, was now a questionable ally. America’s declaration of war on 6 April 1917 offered hope, but its million-man American Expeditionary Force would take many months to mobilize and was not expected to join the European land war until 1918.136 Meanwhile, the catastrophic failure of the Nivelle Offensive sent the French army into mutiny by May. It seemed, in the spring of 1917, that only Britain and her Empire stood in the way of a German victory.

In a speech to the House on 18 May, the Prime Minister declared his government’s intention to introduce legislation for compulsory military service, which it did on 11 June with the Military Service Bill. British subjects of the Dominion between the ages of 18 and 45 would

henceforth be liable for military service. Framing the debate as a national emergency, Borden emphasized that Canada’s 23,939 casualties in the months of April and May dwarfed enlistments in the same period by 12,149 men and, moreover, at least 70,000 reinforcements would be required by year’s end just to maintain the four divisions already at the front. Thus, the number of men to be raised under the proposed legislation was set at a limit of 100,000, the first drafts of which were to report on 3 January 1918.\footnote{Nicholson, \textit{Canadian Expeditionary Force}, 344} Seven days prior to the ignominious end of the CDF scheme, on 24 July, the Dominion Parliament voted in favour of the bill.\footnote{The following day, the ‘temporary’ Income Tax went into effect.} It then passed through the Senate and received Royal Assent, and on August 29th the Military Service Act (MSA), at it was now called, became law.

The MSA and its precursor, the Military Service Bill (MSB), was passed in part with considerable support from members of the opposition Liberals, whose leader was Sir Wilfred Laurier. Following his return from England in May, Borden had invited Laurier to form with the governing Conservatives a national Unity Government. Opposition to conscription by his large Quebec caucus, combined with other political risks in his home province, compelled Laurier to decline. Despite this setback, Borden still believed in the need for a formal and official expression of bi-partisan unity as a necessary show of strength against the various factions now galvanized by looming conscription, especially when it became clear in July that a scheduled general election could not be deferred into 1918. The impending vote would be what amounted to a referendum on compulsory military service.

All the major churches in English-speaking Canada, as well as in the Acadian Maritimes, took to their pulpits and vigorously threw their support behind Borden and his goal of a Unity Government. Archbishop Samuel Matheson, the Primate of the Church of England in Canada,
declared in June his own support for both a unity government and conscription. He no doubt spoke for most, if not all the Bishops. Bishop Richardson had been making his position on the matter clear for several months, as seen earlier. Others, such as the Metropolitan of British Columbia, Archbishop F. H. DuVernet, were perhaps better able to express what many believed but could not articulate. Writing on the choice of voluntary versus compulsory service, DuVernet stated that morally and spiritually, volunteerism was always superior for it was an expression of a man’s choice to subordinate himself in service of a great cause, whereas compulsion removed the element of virtue. On the other hand, he said “the number of those who will cheerfully respond to an appeal to the will is limited...[and so] the necessity of having every member...doing his share and not leaving the burden to the willing few becomes very evident.” The views expressed by Archbishop DuVernet, on the whole and in the main, reflected those of his co-religionists. The Anglican Church’s national newspaper, the Canadian Churchman, officially supported the government and conscription, and with increasing intensity through 1917 its pages carried sermons, columns and letters endorsing both.

Borden’s alternative to a coalition government with Laurier was the creation in October 1917 of the “big tent,” centre-right Unionist Party, which comprised the existing Conservative caucus plus Liberal MPs who backed conscription. Not leaving anything to chance, Borden augmented his new party’s winning conditions through several radical legislative measures created under the War-Times Elections Act of September 1917. The greatest gerrymandering in Canadian history was the result. Women were granted the democratic franchise, though not universally; only those women with close relations, living or dead, male or female, who were,

---
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or had, served outside Canada in the CEF or British forces qualified. Controversially, and to the condemnation of Laurier, the voting franchise was stripped from conscientious objectors, as well as from all citizens born in enemy nations and naturalized in Canada after 1902. A concurrent piece of new legislation, the Military Voters Act, was aimed at the nation’s strongly pro-conscription soldiers, granting them the right to choose the riding in which their vote would be counted, or to allow the party for which they voted to chose the riding in which their vote would count. Soldiers would be given a ballot with the simple choice: “Government,” or “Opposition.” The ground was set. Parliament was dissolved in October, and the election scheduled for 17 December.

Most of these events occurred against the backdrop of the latest British offensive in Flanders. The Battle of Third Ypres, commonly called Passchendaele, commenced on 31 July, one week after the Commons sent the MSA to the Senate for approval. While the British were slogging it out at Ypres, the Canadian Corps was heavily engaged forty-five kilometres to the south, near the French city of Lens. The Canadian action, in what became known as the Battle of Hill 70 (15-25 August), was an effort to draw German men and resources from the Ypres front and inflict further attritional damage on the German army. It was a tactical victory, with an estimated 20,000 German casualties, but at the cost of over 5,600 Canadian dead, wounded

---
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and missing.\textsuperscript{144} The Canadian Corps then transferred to the Ypres sector on 18 October to join the final phase of the British assault on Passchendaele. The offensive progressed steadily, but at the usual heavy cost. By 30 October, the relief of the exhausted 3\textsuperscript{rd} and 4\textsuperscript{th} Divisions began as the 1\textsuperscript{st} and 2\textsuperscript{nd} Divisions (the latter including the 26\textsuperscript{th} Battalion) moved up the line. The early morning hours of 6 November saw the attack renewed under clear skies and the cover of a massive and highly effective barrage. Passchendaele fell to the Canadians within hours, the 26\textsuperscript{th} Battalion being one of the first to arrive.\textsuperscript{145} On 10 November, Field Marshal Haig closed the Flanders offensive of 1917. The relief of the Canadian Corps commenced on 14 November, and by the 20\textsuperscript{th} it was back in the Lens-Vimy sector of northern France. They left behind another 15,654 dead, wounded and missing.\textsuperscript{146}

Back in Canada the election campaign was in full swing. In New Brunswick, Bishop Richardson hit the hustings, touring the churches in his diocese and exhorting his listeners at Sunday services to support the Union Government. There was an urgency to his actions, for he had been recently appointed by the House of Bishops to travel overseas to ascertain, on behalf of the Church, the social and moral conditions of the troops in England and at the front. He would depart at the end of November, and he was determined to use the time he had to rally his New Brunswick flock once again to their patriotic calling. Richardson was at St. Luke’s in Woodstock on Sunday, 11 November. Before the capacity crowd, the Bishop was unequivocal, exhorting his audience to support the Union Government, that doing so was “nothing less than a solemn duty at the present time.” He framed this duty not in terms of the supporting the troops, though that was the obvious context, but as “a God-given moral opportunity” to elevate and purify the politics of the land in pursuit of a noble cause, a “new and higher [ideal]


\textsuperscript{145} The 27\textsuperscript{th} (City of Winnipeg) Battalion had the honour of being the first unit to enter Passchendaele village.
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of what public service means.” The war had presented the opportunity, manifested in the Union Party, for the country to cleanse itself of the political scandals of the pre-war years. “Was there ever a nation in which the need of an awakened public conscience...was more clamorous, when one looks back upon the record of the past and reviews the amazing and appalling number of commissions appointed to investigate the corrupt expenditure of money in the public service?"147

The Bishop delivered a similar sermon the following week at St. John’s Stone Church, where he was a guest of Reverend Kuhring. “The history of Canada,” he divined, “is today being recorded on the unseen tablets of the future...will we fail to seize the opportunity of lifting up the moral level of public life by supporting at this time those political forces, whose return to power alone guarantees stability and strength?”148 The last Sunday of November found the Bishop in Halifax, en route to England and the front, and in the pulpit of All Saints’ Cathedral. Once again, the election was the focal point of his sermon and this time he spoke of it in terms of the nation’s moral duty to the men in the trenches. He “spoke scornfully” of those who couldn’t see beyond the selfish impulses of partisanship, and equated lack of support for the Union Party as betrayal “into the hands of the enemy the cause for which such sacrifice has been made; a cause which is truly Imperial and holy.” Richardson left his listeners with this final thought, and a quote from Kipling:

The hour is one when, in the name of God, all personal and partisan considerations should be flung aside as unworthy of men and women of British race, and when the whole manhood and womanhood of the nation should set itself to the winning of that goal to which, indeed, ‘not easy hopes nor lies, shall bring us, but iron sacrifice!’”149

---

Even Reverend Hiram Cody came out publicly in favour of conscription. For the three and a half years of voluntary enlistment, the popular and respected Cody had been neutral in the press, if not silent, on the issue of recruitment. This, of course, does not mean he lacked a position on recruitment, but whatever it was it never appeared in the newspapers surveyed for this study. Thus, it is surprising that Cody chose an issue as divisive as conscription to take a public stand, albeit enigmatically. Cody’s pronouncement appeared in the form of a poem in the *Carleton Sentinel* of Woodstock, a place far removed from his parish at Kingston, and the Washadamoak where he grew up and maintained a summer residence. The poem, barren of partisan rhetoric, makes it clear that Cody’s support is for the troops at the front. Uncharacteristically, it concludes with language usually the resort of Richardson and Hooper:

“Shame! Let the coward heads cover./ Shame! Let their base efforts fall./ Let us back up our boys in the trenches,/ Let us harken at once to their call,/ And send them the help they are needing,/ And stand firm at home—one and all.”

The election of 1917, sometimes called the “Khaki Election,” was the most acrimonious in Canada’s history. Outwardly, the nation divided firmly between French-speaking Quebecers and English Canadians, the latter of whom were overwhelmingly pro-Empire in sentiment, and who had provided the vast majority of enlisted men and, consequently, had suffered the heaviest casualties. The election returns, when tallied, starkly reflected this divide. The Union Party swept to victory, taking 153 of the 235 seats in the House of Commons, for a net gain of 21 seats. Laurier’s Liberals took 82 seats, 62 of which were in Quebec. Borden otherwise completely dominated the rest of the country, taking 52 of the 54 seats out West, and 74 of the 82 seats in Ontario. New Brunswick returned seven MPs out of eleven in favour of the Union Party, representing 59.4% of the popular vote, the highest in the Maritimes by ten percentage

---

points. Three of the four New Brunswick ridings that voted for the Opposition Liberals were the heavily ‘Francophone’ ridings of Gloucester (acclaimed), Kent (73% for the Liberals) and Restigouche-Madawaska (69% for the Liberals).151 The fourth, interestingly, was Westmorland, the only ‘Anglophone’ riding in the country to return a Liberal candidate.152 Nationally, Borden’s Unionists took 56.9% of the popular vote, the largest in Canada’s history.153 The Government had received a resounding mandate to enforce the MSA, which it proceeded to implement on 3 January 1918, as planned.

The period of voluntary recruitment in Canada was over, rendering redundant the need for clergymen of all denominations to call the men of the nation to the colours. Henceforth, and for the remainder of the war, the job of obtaining men for the trenches of Europe would be the domain of the federal government and the machinery of the MSA.154 Nothing more needed to be pronounced on the matter, a new state of affairs that no doubt provided much relief to the nation’s overextended clergy. Their liberated energy could now be directed more to deferred parish affairs and the pastoral needs of their congregations, until March 1918 when the German spring offensive would once again demand their utmost exertions and faith.

Yet the question remains: did New Brunswick Anglican men do their ‘bit’ for King and country, before compelled to do so by the MSA in January 1918? To what extent did they voluntarily heed the calls of the recruitment authorities, secular and ecclesiastical, not the least of the Anglican priests who emerged so prominently in this study? How did their enlistment

---

152 Ibid. Arthur Bliss Copp (1870-1949) took 57.1% of the popular vote.
154 Problems remained, however. Men still had to register, and the vast majority applied for – and received – deferrals under the various exceptions provided for in the MSA. Resistance to the MSA was strong, especially in more rural provinces like New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island.
levels compare with the national average? These were the questions on the minds of Richardson, Hooper, Kuhring, Sisam and many other authorities. For insights and clues on these questions, we turn to an examination of the battalions raised in New Brunswick between 1914 and 1918.

Plate 17: Some of the original officers of the 26th (New Brunswick) Battalion, Saint John, 1915. Rev. Capt. E. B. Hooper is fourth from the right. (Credit: Claudia Boorman)
CHAPTER III

Answering the Call: Observations on Enlistment

This study has shown that New Brunswick’s Anglican Church – at least those elements of it given a voice in the press – was greatly pre-occupied with, and actively engaged in, supporting the recruitment efforts of the province’s civilian and military leaders. Certainly, that was the case with the Diocesan Bishop, and in this he had the support of several priests located in areas with large concentrations of Anglicans. The content, tone and tenor of most of their recruitment sermons, however, more than suggest they were worried that their male congregants, if not New Brunswick men in general, were not doing their duty by enlisting in the army. These concerns culminated in 1917 with several speeches and sermons in favour of the Union Government and the need for conscription. Bishop Richardson made the point on various occasions, at least twice at Synod, of highlighting the large numbers of Anglicans across Canada who were enlisting without official compulsion. The frequent and subtle implication, or at least concern on his part, was that New Brunswick Anglican men were lagging.

The Anglican Church, by virtue of its network of priests, would have seemed to possess the resources needed to closely approximate the number of enlistments at the parish level, which could then have been aggregated at the diocesan level. Yet, no evidence exists in the historiography to suggest such an effort was even considered, let alone attempted. It may still be reasonably surmised that local priests knew approximately, or even exactly, how many of their charges were in uniform. If so, this information could have been communicated, officially or anecdotally, to other priests, or even up the hierarchy through the Deaneries to the Diocesan Bishop. If this were happening in New Brunswick, Richardson most certainly would have spoken of it, and yet there is no record that he ever did. If we assume the clergy in New
Brunswick had an anecdotal understanding of the degree to which their Diocese was providing men for the CEF, this was never consolidated into something tactile, such as a report in the form of a running tally. Unfortunately, the official records of the Diocese are silent on the subject. The war greatly taxed the resources of the clergy everywhere, and probably there was simply not enough time, or even a perceived need, to give the matter any priority. Perhaps Richardson and others, like Hooper, Sisam, and Kuhring relied instead on “gut feel,” sensing through simple observation that their Church, even New Brunswick in general, was just not pulling its weight. Assuming this was an accurate assessment on their parts, what does hindsight, with the benefit of enlistment data for the battalions raised in New Brunswick, tell us? Do these support the evidence that New Brunswick’s Anglican leadership believed its members were lagging the national Anglican CEF enlistment rate reported in October 1916 (a belief that might have added fuel to their support for a measure as controversial as conscription)? Before answering this question, it is first necessary to understand why there was speculation at all.

**Enlistment Data – The Residence Problem**

National enlistment numbers were available and regularly published, but these were never broken down by province. The explanation for this is complicated, beginning with a man’s place of residence. During the first year of the war, the “Attestation Paper” that an enlisted man was required to complete asked the following: “In what Town, Township or Parish, and in what Country were you born?” Note, this is not the same as asking for the man’s residence. It wasn’t until mid-1915 that a line requiring place of residence was added.155 Even with this addition, a complication remained. Canada was divided into Military Districts (MD) for
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administrative purposes. MD 7, based in Saint John, is where all enlistments in New Brunswick were registered (after forwarding from the many recruiting offices around the province). The emphasis on ‘in’ is important. Just because a man enlisted in New Brunswick didn’t mean he resided in the province. This cut both ways. Men who were residents of New Brunswick very often enlisted in battalions raised outside the province, such as with the Amherst-based 6th CMR, 38% of whom had next-of-kin in New Brunswick (Appendix, Exhibit 4). As Jonathan Vance observes, the Maritime provinces are especially problematic due to the short distances involved. Vance’s evidence suggests that the Maritimes displayed the highest incidence in Canada of men enlisting outside their province of residence.\textsuperscript{156} It is for these reasons, among others, Bishop Richardson and his contemporaries were in the dark on provincial enlistment figures. Even today, tabulating provincial enlistment statistics remains a Gordian knot.\textsuperscript{157}

This answers why uncertainty prevailed around the question of how many New Brunswick Anglicans were volunteering for military service. Before proceeding to the ultimate objective of answering this question, some detailed background on the demographic characteristics of the province’s Anglicans, and challenges these demographics presented, is required.

\textsuperscript{156} Ibid, 77-8.
\textsuperscript{157} Dr. Vance indefinitely deferred his 2008 research into provincial enlistments, citing data integrity issues that, at the time, appeared problematic for any useful conclusions. Full service files have since become available online, and this accessibility could facilitate access to other information justifying a resumption of Vance’s investigations. (From an email correspondence with the writer, dated 23 May 2017).
The Urban-Rural Divide

Where a man resided in a province mattered; in other words, was he an urban or rural dweller? Between 1871 and 1914, the Dominion Census defined ‘urban’ as any incorporated community, regardless of its population.\textsuperscript{158} Based on this definition, 71\% of New Brunswick’s population was rural, compared to the national figure of 54.5\%, when the war broke out. This made New Brunswick Canada’s second least urbanized province after Prince Edward Island.\textsuperscript{159} Since enlistment rates during the war correlated positively with urbanization, this historical fact mattered for New Brunswick. In short, healthy men of military age, single and married, were needed on farms, in the woods and in mines. New Brunswick’s 1914 male labour force (defined by the census as aged ten and over) was 94,261 individuals, heavily concentrated in what today are called ‘natural resource’ sectors. Over 51\% of males were employed in agriculture, forestry, hunting, fishing and mining, with agriculture alone accounting for 43.4\% of the entire male workforce (forestry was a distant second, at 4.3\%).\textsuperscript{160}

Nationally, about 44\% of males worked in natural resources and 15.7\% in the manufacturing sector. But these are categories that do not identify where the province’s Anglicans were concentrated, and so further demographic segmentation is necessary.

Exhibit 1 in the Appendix, which shows the distribution of Anglicans in New Brunswick by 1911 Census District (CD), reveals that 56.1\% of the Anglican population

\textsuperscript{158} Sharpe, “Recruitment,” 29.
\textsuperscript{159} Ibid, 54.
was concentrated in three southern CD s: Saint John City and County (29.0%); Kings and Albert (14.1%), and; York (13.0%). As mentioned earlier, 82% of the province’s Anglicans resided in the southern eight ‘Anglo’ counties, with Saint John City home to 23.2% of them. Exhibits 2A and 2B of the Appendix disaggregate the data further, separating the ‘urban’ Anglicans and where they resided from their ‘rural’ counterparts. In the years leading up to the war, 57.7% of New Brunswick’s Anglicans lived outside of the urban centres, again using the 1911 census definition for ‘urban’ (i.e. a community, regardless of population, only had to be incorporated). However, a cursory glance at the urban areas and their corresponding populations reveals how problematic, even misleading, the old census definition for ‘urban’ can be. Arguably, New Brunswick was more rural than officially portrayed. Exhibit 2B demonstrates this: six ‘urban’ centres have populations below one thousand. Gagetown, even with its tiny population of 233, was still classified as ‘urban’ for the simple fact it was an incorporated village. Thus, if the arbitrary but defensible step is taken to exclude all ‘urban’ centres except for the three cities, a sharper and perhaps more meaningful picture of the rural-urban divide emerges. The percentage of Anglicans living in the rural parts of New Brunswick is more like 70%, not 57.7%. Even if the ten largest urban centres are included, as shown in Exhibit 2A, the number of Anglicans residing in the rural districts was still 63.8% of the total of all Anglicans in the province. These data are given here to simply to highlight the reality that the 1911 census definition for ‘urban’ understates New Brunswick’s rural population in general, and its rural Anglican population in particular. Notwithstanding this qualification, it remains that any comparable analysis with national figures must adhere to the census definition, and any conclusions drawn will be based on that stipulation.

A word on settlement patterns is instructive. The Anglican community in New Brunswick started with the arrival of the United Empire Loyalists in 1783. The majority of
Loyalists either settled in Saint John or moved inland and settled on farming grants along the rich intervale and hinterlands of the St. John River system, where it passes through the counties of St. John, Kings, Queens, Sunbury and York. Reference again to Exhibit 1 suggests this legacy survived into the early 20th century, with the 1911 descendants of the Loyalists along the river system still accounting for 35% of New Brunswick’s total Anglican population, and 53% of its rural population, after subtracting the cities of Saint John and Fredericton, and the town of Sussex. Another important settlement pattern was that of the Ulster Irish, the great majority of whom were Protestant and came to New Brunswick in three distinct phases: 1815-29, 1830-45, and 1847. How many of these were Anglican (Church of Ireland) is difficult to say. Like their Scots-Irish countrymen who also emigrated to New Brunswick in great numbers, they were loyal to the Crown and honoured all things British and Protestant through their network of Orange Lodges. They were often attracted by the province’s burgeoning timber trade, resulting also in a pattern of rural settlement along the province’s rivers and streams.

Canadian, or British?

A man’s country of birth was also a significant predictor for enlistment, especially in the war’s early months. British-born men contributed proportionately more to the ranks of the CEF than any other group, especially in the First Contingent but also the Second, and New Brunswick was home to very few of these. When war came in 1914, approximately 300,000 men of military age in Canada claimed birth in Britain or one of her possessions, almost 18% of the eligible male population. Of these, 72% volunteered for service between 1914 and

---


162 ‘Military age’ defined as 18 to 45 years old.
1918 with about 63% posted overseas. The comparable figures for men of Canadian-birth were 28% and 18%, respectively. Where these men lived also determined the distribution of potential enlistments across the country. Nearly 35% of British Columbia’s total eligible male population were of British birth, followed by Manitoba with 32.4%, then Alberta, Saskatchewan and Ontario with 25.8%, 24.5% and 18.4%, respectively. In stark contrast, only 3.5% of New Brunswick’s population contained British-born men of military age (or just 0.8% of the national total), compared to 93% who claimed birth in Canada. This reveals a clear and positive correlation between British-born men of military age and enlistment. The inverse was true for their Canadian-born equivalents, even outside of Quebec where the pattern was especially pronounced. It would take conscription in 1918 to rebalance this distribution, so that by the time the CEF reached its maximum strength of 619,636, 51.4% were Canadian-born, versus 37.8% of British birth and 10.8% of other national origins. The apparent enthusiasm of British-born Canadians is partly explained as follows. Many of these men were discharged veterans who chose to return to the colours, even if they now had families. Others undoubtedly felt an acute sense of threat to ‘home,’ and an attendant sense of duty towards it and the loved ones who remained there. Another factor was the relative abundance of single men of military age who had travelled to the west seeking their fortunes but found themselves tenuously employed or unemployed by a pre-war depression. Many of these men saw the war as a chance to escape economic uncertainty or impoverishment through service in the army. Others may have seen enlistment simply as a chance to return home to Britain.

---

164 Ibid, “Table 1” and “2,” 2-3.
The case in New Brunswick is instructive. Recruiting for the Second Contingent (and reinforcement drafts for the First) ran from October 1914 to September 1915. During this period, known as the second phase of voluntary enlistment, recruitment challenges emerged almost immediately in New Brunswick, earlier than in Ontario and the West. Reverend Hooper’s anxious speeches and sermons were a reaction to the disappointing enlistments in the 26th Battalion in mid-fall 1914. This was only resolved, as seen earlier, with determined and focused initiative. Even so, when the 26th shipped overseas in June 1915, a full quarter of its men were British-born.168 A year later, though, evidence begins to emerge suggesting New Brunswick’s eligible pool of recruits from this segment of the population was nearing depletion. The 104th Battalion, which departed in June 1916, had a British-born complement of just 12%.169 The province’s experience in this regard mirrored the national pattern of British-born enlistments, except that it had been felt more acutely in New Brunswick all along due to its much smaller pool of British-born men. This resource was nearing depletion, leaving a heavily rural population of men to face the increasing demand for soldiers. To men like Bishop Richardson, Chaplain Hooper and many other, the future challenge must have appeared worrisome. In their eyes, New Brunswick-born men would now have to step up in much greater numbers.

...The country from which a man hailed may seem irrelevant to modern sensibilities.

Canada has always been a country of immigrants. Moreover, there was no legal concept of Canadian citizenship until 1949. Everyone born in Canada, as in the other Dominions and Overseas Territories, was a subject of the British Empire. In Anglo-Canada, this created a

---

unique sense of being a citizen of the Empire. In the final analysis, British-born men donned the same uniform as their Canadian-born counterparts. They fought, and often died, in Canadian battalions. This is why, looking back, it may seem strange that much ink was spilt over arguments of whether or not ‘real Canadians’ were contributing their proportionate share of men to the armies of the Empire, as compared to Australia, New Zealand and South Africa.\textsuperscript{170} The response to this challenge has to be, ‘because the distinction mattered to Canadians who lived through those years.’ It will be recalled how this distinction was on display following the revelation that over a quarter of the 26\textsuperscript{th} Battalion was British-born (see page 39). For this reason, the question of whether sufficient numbers of Canadian-born men enlisted is often considered one of the three general themes into which a critical analysis of Canada’s Great War recruitment story is grouped.\textsuperscript{171}

Some general observations may be drawn from the foregoing discussion. Some historians have suggested that enlistment rates among the Canadian-born was the lowest for those with the longest history in the country.\textsuperscript{172} The Anglican population of New Brunswick in 1914 was, in the vast majority, not only native born, but had deep roots in the province. Those of Loyalist stock, for example, were removed by several generations from Britain, as were the descendants of the Ulster Anglicans who arrived between 1815 and 1840. While these people in the majority very likely held strong pro-British sentiments and identity, they were probably as equally inclined to a strong native Canadian identity, something that could dampen their enthusiasm to fight for Britain in a European war. On the other hand, New Brunswick’s Anglican rural population, at 57.7%, was not much higher than the national average of 54% (for all denominations), making them relatively urban compared to their New Brunswick non-Anglican

\textsuperscript{170} Sharpe, “Enlistment,” 23. 
\textsuperscript{171} Sharpe, “Recruitment and Conscription,” 1; also, Sharpe, “Enlistment,” 47-50. 
\textsuperscript{172} Desmond Morton, A Military History of Canada from Champlain to the Gulf War, 3\textsuperscript{rd} ed. (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1992), 152, cited in Sharpe, “Enlistment,” 18.
neighbours. A more conservative view, however, argues that it was closer to seven out of ten Anglicans who lived in the countryside, or in small and dispersed villages, bringing them into line with the provincial rural figure of 71%. Thus, the picture that emerges is quite homogenous, the biggest internal divide being urban and rural. In comparison with the rest of English Canada, what emerges as the greatest difference is the relative dearth of British-born men residing in New Brunswick. This might have been the single most important factor affecting Anglican enlistment in New Brunswick, vis-à-vis other provinces in Canada.

**Insights from Some New Brunswick Battalions**

With the necessary background and context established, this study turns finally to addressing the question of whether or not New Brunswick Anglican men were enlisting in numbers stronger than the concerns expressed in the sermons and speeches surveyed earlier would suggest. First, some preliminary words on methodology are necessary.

The approach that follows is *ex post facto*. Information that was either not easily available at the time or, with the advantage of hindsight, understood as we do in the present, will be applied retroactively to the period 1914 through 1917. It is a corollary of this approach not to pass judgement on historical actors who lacked the benefit of knowledge that only the future would bring. Rather, the intent is solely to test the question posed above.

A second, and critical, aspect of the methodology is one of definition. It relates to an important subject raised earlier: a man’s place of residency. The problems associated with this have been covered in detail, but for our purposes they must now be temporarily resolved. A workable definition of *residence* is required. In fact, it was already used once earlier, in the discussion on residency, Military Districts and provinces of enlistment, where the 6th CMR was used as an example. In that case, and in the analysis which follows, *a man’s residency will be assumed to be the same as that of his next-of-kin on his Attestation Paper*. This assumption is
defended on the argument that a next-of-kin in the province establishes a concrete attachment. In the vast majority of cases, this connection is a family member, usually a parent, but often a wife or sibling. The flaws inherent in the assumption include some regrettable exclusions: men who were born and/or resided in New Brunswick, but whose next-of-kin had moved outside the province, and; men with no connection to New Brunswick, but chose it as their home. There are also inherent inclusions: men who were born outside New Brunswick, including those from Britain whose entire families had come with them, or who had named a New Brunswicker as next-of-kin, whether it was a wife, friend, landlord, or employer. In the case of British-born men, their inclusion is, to some extent, offset by the corresponding exclusions of their countrymen.

Exhibit 4 in the Appendix is an example of the residency assumption in action, using the relatively small 6th CMR as a test case. Within this mounted unit, men with a New Brunswick next-of-kin (and thus deemed New Brunswick residents) accounted for 209 officers and men, or 35.2% of the regiment’s initial strength. Perhaps more interesting is that 85.2% of these deemed New Brunswick men also declared Canada as their country of birth, whereas only twenty-four ‘New Brunswick’ men, or 11.5%, declared British birth.

The third and last issue is also one of definition. What defines a man of British birth, or British nationality, for residency purposes? Since the following battalion analysis (and the discussion above) relies extensively on the research of Christopher Sharpe on Great War enlistment patterns, this analysis uses his definition, which conforms to that used by the census and the Department of Militia and Defence, viz. ‘British’ includes those born in England, Scotland, Ireland, and Wales, plus all other British possessions.173

173 Sharpe, “Recruitment and Conscription.”
Using Chris Sharpe’s research into enlistments, the recruitment figures quoted by Bishop Richardson in his February 1917 Synod address, and the nominal rolls for battalions mobilized in New Brunswick, three key questions emerge:

- Of the pool of New Brunswick Anglican men eligible for military service, approximately how many enlisted (the participation rate)? What was the comparable national participation rate?
- How did the participation rates of urban and rural Anglicans compare in relation to each other, and to the overall national urban/rural ratio?
- How did New Brunswick’s Anglicans compare to the other denominations?

The answers to these questions will form the basis of this thesis’ conclusions.

**Enlistments and Eligibility: The Participation Rate**

The analysis that follows is summarized in Table 1 on page 86. Our starting point is with the enlistment figures cited by Richardson at the 1917 Synod on page 60, where 165,000 men in the CEF (as of October 1916), had attested as Anglican. The Bishop added that this number represented 15.81% of the Church’s national Anglican population of 1.043 million people. This latter figure, however, includes not just men eligible for military service, but every Anglican – men, women and children of all ages. Considering 99.5% of total enlistments in the CEF were men, the female element of the national Anglican population (assumed to be 50%) can be deducted, leaving a total of some 522,000 males of all ages who were members of the Anglican Church in Canada. 174

The next step is to approximate how many of these 522,000 Anglican males were of military age, and then approximately how many of them were Canadian-born. Sharpe’s
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174 Nicholson, *Canadian Expeditionary Force*, Appendix “C”, Table 1, 546. This assumes that of the 619,636 members of the CEF, the only women were the 2,854 Nursing Sisters.
monographs on regional enlistment in the CEF estimate that 1,537,172 men of military age were in Canada in 1911. Applying the Anglican Church’s percentage share of the national population of 14% to 1,537,171 equals 215,000 Anglican men of military age.

Approximating how many of these men were Canadian-born requires two steps. Sharpe estimates that in 1911 there were 307,419 men of British birth (of all denominations) eligible for military service living in Canada. Of these, 221,649 enlisted before 1918.\textsuperscript{175} Determining how many of these men were Anglican requires an important assumption: that their religious composition mirrored that of contemporary Great Britain.\textsuperscript{176} This is not a straightforward task; except for the 1851 census, the United Kingdom, as a matter of convention, has never taken a religious survey of its general population. However, a noted religious scholar in England estimates that when the Great War ended in 1918, about 29% of Britons were adherents of the Church of England.\textsuperscript{177} Using this figure, then approximately 89,151 of the 307,419 military-aged men of British birth in Canada in 1911 were probably Anglican. Deducting 89,151 from the total number of Anglican men of military age – 215,000, as calculated above – leaves just those of Canadian birth eligible for military service: 125,849 men.

The next and final step is to estimate how many of the 165,000 Anglican men serving in the CEF by October 1916 were Canadian-born. Applying 29% to the 221,649 British-born men who actually volunteered for service (per above), and assuming the vast majority of these had already done so by the end of 1916, then 64,278 would have belonged to the Church of England. Deducting this from the 165,000 total Anglican enlistments cited by Bishop Richardson leaves us with our estimate of Canadian-born Anglican enlistments in the CEF by October 1916:

\textsuperscript{175} Sharpe, “Recruitment,” 9.
\textsuperscript{176} This is, admittedly, a big assumption, but one deemed defensible on the strength of the large sample of 307,419.
100,721 men. Dividing this by the 125,849 Canadian Anglican men eligible for military service results in a participation rate of 80%. In other words, it seems that roughly 80% of the 125,849 Canadian-born Anglican men of military age had enlisted in the CEF by October 1916. 178 (See additional comments on this in the Summary, below).

**Table 1**

*Comparative Participation Rates of Canadian-Born Anglican Men in the CEF, 1914-1917: Canada and New Brunswick*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anglican Men</th>
<th>Military Age</th>
<th>Military Age, Enlisted</th>
<th>Participation Rate (B ÷ (A))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>British-Born</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Military-Aged Men</td>
<td>Canadian-Born (A)</td>
<td>British-Born (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>1,537,172</td>
<td>215,000</td>
<td>125,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>89,151</td>
<td>165,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>125,849</td>
<td>64,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>125,849</td>
<td>100,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.B.</td>
<td>68,097</td>
<td>8,172</td>
<td>713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How does this remarkable figure compare to New Brunswick? Using the same approach as above, the first step is to estimate the number of New Brunswick Anglican men eligible for military service by deducting those of British birth. Sharpe estimates New Brunswick’s total eligible male population in 1911 at 68,097. 179 Multiplying this by 12% (the Anglican percentage share of the provincial population in 1911) results in a total eligible male Anglican population of 8,172. Netting off 713 British-born Anglicans results in 7,459 male New Brunswick Anglican residents eligible for military service. 180 How many of these volunteered? The nominal rolls of battalions mobilized in New Brunswick offer a preliminary answer.

By the end of 1916, nine of the eleven battalions already raised in New Brunswick had departed for Europe. Of these nine, the nominal rolls for seven, plus one Maritime unit for a
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178 To summarize the calculation: 
\[
\frac{[165,000 \text{ total enlisted} - 64,278 \text{ British}]}{215,000 \text{ total eligible} - 89,151 \text{ British}} \times 100\% = 80.0\%
\]

179 Sharpe, “Recruitment,” 4. Brown and Loveridge cite New Brunswick’s male population, aged 15 to 44, as 77,904, and total single males over 15 as 50,840, based on the 1911 census. Sharpe seems to have adjusted these figures to exclude males under 18, to arrive at a revised 68,097 eligible men of military age. Sharpe follows the 1911 census convention of “place of birth” to distinguish between Canadians and non-Canadians, whereas this analysis continues to use the next-of-kin address as the distinguishing marker. Hence, the comparisons with Sharpe are relative rather than exact.

180 Calculated in the same fashion as for the national figure. Of the 307,419 British nationals in Canada eligible for military service in 1911, only 0.8%, or 2,459, resided in New Brunswick. Assuming again that 29% of these were Anglican, we arrive at 713.
total of eight, were sifted for the number of New Brunswick Anglican men taken onto their respective strengths. These are listed in Table 2, below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Batt.</th>
<th>Authorized</th>
<th>Mobilized</th>
<th>Departed</th>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>N.B. Men</th>
<th>Anglicans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12th</td>
<td>10 Aug 1914</td>
<td>Valcartier, QC</td>
<td>30 Sept 1914</td>
<td>1,191</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26th</td>
<td>7 Nov 1914</td>
<td>Saint John, NB</td>
<td>15 June 1915</td>
<td>1,148</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th CMR</td>
<td>7 Nov 1914</td>
<td>Amherst, NS</td>
<td>17 July 1915</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55th</td>
<td>7 Nov 1914</td>
<td>Sussex, NB</td>
<td>30 Oct 1915</td>
<td>1,122</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104th</td>
<td>22 Dec 1915</td>
<td>Sussex, NB</td>
<td>28 June 1916</td>
<td>1,173</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115th</td>
<td>22 Dec 1915</td>
<td>Saint John, NB</td>
<td>23 July 1916</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140th</td>
<td>22 Dec 1915</td>
<td>Saint John, NB</td>
<td>25 Sept 1916</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145th</td>
<td>22 Dec 1915</td>
<td>Moncton, NB</td>
<td>25 Sept 1916</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total | 7,529 | 5,023 | 1,151 |

Each of these battalions concentrated on recruitment in the southern, overwhelmingly Anglophone, half of New Brunswick. The 6th CMR was, of course a mixed-Maritime unit. However, as we saw earlier, 178 of its men, or 38%, hailed from New Brunswick. This is materially higher, in percentage terms, than the number of New Brunswick men who were enrolled with the larger 12th Battalion, a unit which, though initially pitched as a provincial regiment, in fact ended up being predominantly a Central and Eastern Canadian battalion characterized by a large minority percentage of New Brunswickers. An additional consideration that warranted its inclusion is the fact that Reverend Kuhring was its first chaplain.

Using the total of 1,151 Anglican enlistments in these battalions, and the estimated 7,459 Anglican men who were of military age in the province (per above), then the voluntary enlistment rate for New Brunswick Anglican men to December 1916 was 15.4%. This is far removed from the estimated national equivalent of 80%. This variance, however, is subject to some significant qualifiers. The foregoing analysis for New Brunswick does not take into consideration those men who enlisted in units in other provinces. Much of the history of New Brunswick is the story of young men leaving for the United States and Central or Western
Canada for employment. Nor does this analysis include reinforcement drafts for units already overseas. Department of Militia and Defence enlistment figures would have factored in these qualifications. Another important consideration is the problem of comparisons between large data sets and small ones; orders of magnitude can vary dramatically and result in misleading outcomes. In other words, errors in small sample sizes can be multiplied as they are extrapolated against larger samples. In truth, the participation rate of 15.4% captures only part of the voluntary enlistment story of New Brunswick’s Anglicans.

The remaining four of the eleven New Brunswick units (*Table 3*) were excluded from this analysis for the following reasons. Recruitment for the 28th Field Battery, which also drew largely on southern enlistments, fell within the voluntary recruitment period under discussion, but the nominal roll for this unit was unavailable at the time of writing. Rolls were available for the 132nd (North Shore) and 165th (Acadiens), but these units were not segmented by religious denomination as their recruitment efforts concentrated on regions and populations where the Anglican presence was low or negligible. Lastly, the roll for the 236th (New Brunswick Kilties) Battalion was also unavailable, but regardless, by the time it hit full strength it was well-beyond the period under review.

*Table 3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Battalion</th>
<th>Authorized</th>
<th>Mobilized</th>
<th>Departed</th>
<th>Strength</th>
<th># of N.B. Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28th Field Battery</td>
<td>7 Nov 1914</td>
<td>Newcastle, NB</td>
<td>9 Aug 1915</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132nd</td>
<td>22 Dec 1915</td>
<td>Chatham, NB</td>
<td>26 Oct 1916</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165th</td>
<td>22 Dec 1915</td>
<td>Moncton, NB</td>
<td>28 Mar 1917</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236th</td>
<td>15 July 1916</td>
<td>Fredericton, NB</td>
<td>30 Oct &amp; 9 Nov 1917</td>
<td>1,087</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Urban and Rural Sources of Enlistments

For ease of exposition, the distribution of urban and rural enlistments among Anglican volunteers is summarized below and discussed with reference to Exhibit 7 in the Appendix.

Table 4
Anglican Percentage Urban-Rural Enlistments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1911 Census (%) (Appendix, Exhibit 2A)</th>
<th>Battalion Composition (%) (Appendix, Exhibit 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>63.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 4 shows, the ratio of urban to rural enlistments among Anglicans in New Brunswick reflected the national experience in that their contribution to the CEF was disproportionately urban. Over 63% of all Anglican volunteers had next-of-kin addresses in one of the province’s twenty-four incorporated municipal districts. The ‘Loyalist City’ of Saint John, where 23% of the province’s Anglicans resided, contributed over 57% of all urban enlistments, and 36.1% of total enlistments. Fredericton, the capital and cathedral city, was a distant second with 8.5% of urban enlistments and 5.4% of the total. Volunteers from New Brunswick’s rural districts and unincorporated villages accounted for 36.9% of enlistments. Every county of the province was represented among these men but, unsurprisingly, an overwhelming preponderance hailed from the southwestern region, especially from the counties of St. John, Kings, and the communities of lower Sunbury and Queens, where Anglophone populations were long established. Unfortunately for comparative purposes, no national study for either urban-rural or denominational segmentation has been undertaken to date.

Anglican Enlistments Compared to Other Denominations

Exhibit 6 in the Appendix disaggregates the New Brunswick men for the seven battalions in Table 2 into their constituent denominations, yielding the following observations. Anglicans in these units accounted for 1,151, or 22.9%, out of 5,023 voluntary enlistments of all
denominations, almost double their percentage share of the provincial population of 12%. In all but one battalion they were anywhere from 19% to 32% of all the New Brunswick men taken on strength, the highest being in the 26th Battalion at 31.7%. How does this compare to the provinces other denominations, in terms of overall ranking?

Table 5 summarizes and ranks each major religious denomination’s share of the New Brunswick population, using the 1911 census.¹⁸¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>Pop. ('000s) &amp; %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All New Brunswick</td>
<td>351.9 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>114.9 (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>82.1 (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican</td>
<td>42.6 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
<td>39.2 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>34.6 (10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taking enlistment rankings first, and using Exhibit 6 in the Appendix, Baptists as the province’s largest Protestant element ranked first overall with 29%. Anglicans were second with 22.9%. Third were Catholics at 20%. These three denominations together accounted for 72% of total enlistments in southern New Brunswick during the voluntary phase of recruitment, statistically close to their collective share of the provincial population of 68%. An inversion in the enlistment rankings vis-à-vis the aggregate provincial ranking is evident, with Catholics falling from first to third, Baptists rising from second to first, and Anglicans rising from third to second. Presbyterians and Methodists were a distant fourth and fifth, at 12.5% and 9.4%, respectively. This is not surprising, given that the majority of the province’s Roman Catholic population was concentrated in its northern and Francophone regions. It may be inferred from this simple methodology that the Anglicans in New Brunswick were not dominating enlistments.

in any magnitude comparable to the national success the Church enjoyed. In fact, it is possible, if not likely, that if the remaining battalions in Table 3 were included (especially the 132nd and 165th, each of which recruited in predominantly Catholic regions), Anglicans could conceivably drop to third in ranking (and for that matter, the Baptists from first to second).

Summary and Sundry Observations

The answer to the question of whether (or not) New Brunswick’s native-born Anglican men were “doing their bit” is clearly mixed. The statistic that stands out is the provincial versus national participation rates of Anglican volunteers (i.e. 15.4% and 80%, respectively). The wide variance strongly suggests that small, especially rural, provinces like New Brunswick, do not lend themselves to national statistical comparisons. The results can be misleading, if not meaningless. Provinces like Ontario, with its large urban centres (areas where enlistments were high), can greatly skew statistical distributions. This leads to the conclusion that two other statistical approaches may be more valid and relevant: comparisons across provinces of similar populations and demographics (e.g. Nova Scotia), and comparisons within a province, as was done here to a degree. While an inter-provincial analysis was not contemplated for this study, it recommends itself as an avenue of future investigation. In conclusion, this study places its emphasis on the comparable data internal to New Brunswick only.

The foregoing analysis is instructive insofar as with hindsight, an argument can be made that given New Brunswick’s overwhelmingly rural and agrarian Anglican population, one removed from the “Mother country” by generations, and with a negligible British-born constituency, the Diocese of Fredericton had to this point been rather successful in getting its men into uniform. Nevertheless, even if all this was known at the time to men like Bishop Richardson, it would have arguably made little difference. The simple fact was that by the close of 1916, Canada was no longer providing enough men to replenish the losses sustained by the
Canadian Corps’ at the front, a trend that would become acute in the months to follow.

Richardson had his eye on the bigger picture, beyond the borders of New Brunswick. Perhaps he was onto something, as this study suggests, but the question of the fairness of the occasionally harsh rebuke from the pulpit remains one which the historian must not rush to judge prematurely. Hindsight was a privilege not available to these men. All they knew was what they could measure at the time, and what they observed was men failing to sign up in sufficient numbers, in the limited time available to meet Prime Minister Borden’s commitment to Britain.
CONCLUSION

This thesis surveyed 133 print sources, almost entirely from the secular press, where Anglican clergymen were directly quoted or referenced. Out of this sample, 112, or 84%, were from just three papers: the Daily Telegraph (72) and St. John Standard (14), both of Saint John, and the Daily Times (26) of Moncton. Only six sources were found in the Daily Gleaner, a remarkably low count considering Fredericton’s status as the capital and cathedral city. Other papers, such as the Carleton Sentinel (Woodstock), the North Shore Leader (Newcastle), and Kings County Record (Sussex) rounded out the total. This distribution reflects where the province’s Anglophones in general, and Anglicans in particular, lived and exercised influence at the centres of media, political, and military power. Fully 82% of New Brunswick’s Anglicans at this time lived in nine counties in the southern half of the province. Saint John city alone was home to 23% of them (29% including St. John County). The remainder were scattered across the northern counties, with concentrations in small urban centres, such as Bathurst and Campbellton. Anglican numbers in Madawaska, Victoria, Kent and Gloucester were so small that many parishes in these counties were not serviced by an Anglican priest.

Saint John city rectors comprised eighty-two, or 62%, of the 133 newsprint sources. Reverend Hooper alone accounted for fifty-nine of these, over 44% of all sources, besting by a wide margin even the oratorically-gifted Bishop Richardson, who was cited twenty-four times, or 18% of the total. Kuhring and Cody, the other Saint John rectors, accounted for nineteen and four citations, respectively, or 17.3% between them. In a real sense, the history of the Anglican Church in New Brunswick during the war, and to some extent the 26th Battalion, is the story of Chaplain Hooper. He was a strident Imperial patriot and indefatigable recruiter. He remained a force majeure in the province, thanks to the media (and presumably with the full blessing, if not
encouragement, of Richardson), long after his departure with the 26th Battalion in June 1915. The voice of the Church during the war was thus also *urban*.

An important observation is the distribution of direct recruitment sermons over the forty months under review. The period of greatest intensity occurred during the first five months of the war, in 1914, at thirteen sermons and speeches, or 35% of the total. Sixteen recruitment sermons were distributed across 1915 with a discernable, if not unsurprising, spike following the Battle of Second Ypres in April. Through 1916, only seven sources appeared in the press which can be described as direct recruitment appeals by the Anglican Church. In 1917, recruitment sermons as such all but disappeared, being replaced with appeals for support of the Union Government of Prime Minister Borden, and the need for conscription in the face of moribund enlistments (a nationwide phenomenon after the spring of 1916).

Anglican sermon patterns and content in New Brunswick generally aligned with those exhibited in Canada and Great Britain. The war was initially justified in terms of honour, national security, and patriotic duty. Sacrifice was conflated with these and framed in the rhetorical language of righteousness. By early spring 1915, it was not just the safety of Britain at stake, but the Empire and therefore all of civilization. As the casualties mounted, and grief became widespread, the war came to be interpreted as a means by which civilization was being spiritually purified and prepared for a victorious and glorious post-war renaissance, and a new relationship with God. These were universal thematic patterns across the Anglican confession, at home and abroad. In New Brunswick, however, there were variations within these themes. The emphasis on recruitment was quite pronounced as early as November 1914 and was intensely sustained until conscription.

The sustained and periodically intense energy invested by the province’s leading Anglicans into the recruitment effort raises legitimate questions of motivation. Was the source
general, or was it more local? There were several instances where Reverend Hooper, for example, expressed his dissatisfaction with enlistments in the “Loyalist Province,” even chastising his fellow New Brunswickers for what he saw as their lack of patriotism. Bishop Richardson’s frame of reference, on the other hand, was in national statistics and trends. His chastisements were more nuanced, and less personal, but no less aimed at the peoples’ sense of patriotism than Hooper’s. The differences between the two men were attributable to rhetorical styles, plus the tact and gravitas demanded of Richardson by his high office.

Richardson, like Hooper, held military service to be the highest form of patriotism required of a righteous war and, in this respect, he was publicly unequivocal. Richardson’s advocacy for conscription, a position that aligned him with the official position of his Church and which was also faithful to his patriotism and religious convictions, was therefore unsurprising.

Analysis of the nominal rolls for the battalions raised in New Brunswick’s Anglophone south indicates that, among New Brunswick natives, those of the Anglican confession were well represented, in most cases by multiples approaching two and three times their relative share of the province’s constituent denominations. The extent to which this was so was not, however, apparent to Richardson and his fellow churchmen, or for that matter to anyone. Enlistment statistics released by the Department of Militia were national, or by Military Districts, the latter of which often overlapped provincial boundaries. Provincial data was not available. What was apparent and measurable to everyone, however, was the Dominion’s commitment of a half-million men, and the inability of the voluntary system to fulfil that commitment. It was this commitment, above all, that occupied the minds and energies of recruiting advocates.

Nearly two-thirds of the Anglican men who enlisted with the eight battalions surveyed were of urban origin, in a province that was 71% rural. This distribution is in concordance with nationally-observed patterns. The story of the Anglican Church in New Brunswick during the
Great War is intimately tied to one city in particular, Saint John. The city was the single largest source of Anglican volunteers, well above any other district. This reflected the coincidental fact that 23% of Saint John’s population was Anglican, while also being home to 23% of all the Anglicans in New Brunswick. The city also provided two Anglican rectors (Hooper and Kuhring) who went overseas as chaplains in the CEF – both of whom were regularly quoted in provincial papers – plus another rector (Cody), who didn’t enlist but featured in the press from time to time. The prevalence of Saint John Anglicans is apparent in seven of the eight New Brunswick battalions surveyed.

There is some cursory evidence that suggests the character of a clergyman’s nationalism was influenced by his country of birth. The national origins of the eight Anglican clergy who rose to varying prominence in New Brunswick during the Great War were evenly split: half were British-born (Richardson, Hooper, Sisam and Bate), and half were Canadian-born (Kuhring, Lawrence, Neales and Cody, the latter three being New Brunswick natives). The most vocal and passionate recruiters from among these men were Richardson and Hooper, followed by the Quebec City-born Kuhring. The three clergymen who were born in New Brunswick rarely (never, in Cody’s case) appeared in the press as advocates for recruitment, although one (Lawrence) set an example by joining up as a battalion chaplain and serving overseas. It may be surmised that clergymen who were silent on issues like recruitment and Imperialism, such as Reverend Cody, were either disinclined in this regard by personality, or chose to express their patriotism by other means in their parish work. That said, Cody did side with his Church in its support for conscription. There was also, of course, the matter of censorship in the press, most of it happily self-imposed in service of Canada’s war effort. Still, the sample of clergymen surveyed here is too small to warrant even a preliminary connection between nationalism and country of birth. A Canada-wide investigation would be required and
could provide the answer. *Crockford’s Clerical Directory* would be an obvious starting point for this research.

The New Brunswick clergymen who featured in this study, whether British or Canadian-born, made little to no distinction between ‘Canadian’ and ‘British’ in 1914 and early 1915. Identity was almost exclusively framed in Imperial, British, or racial terms (i.e. Anglo-Saxon). The Second Battle of Ypres in April 1915 marked Canada’s first experience with mass casualties, but also with wide acclaim for the heroism and bravery of Canadian soldiers in the field. The glory bestowed on the CEF after Second Ypres created something new: an incipient identity which, long before Vimy Ridge, steadily grew into a self-awareness where Canadians increasingly saw themselves as an independent force within the Imperial Army. This trend was buoyed up by two things: the growing reputation of the CEF’s fighting prowess, and the nation’s blood sacrifice.

In summary, the Anglican community of New Brunswick between 1914 and 1917 made a respectable contribution to voluntary enlistments, sometimes by multiples approaching two to three times their percentage share of the population, as the battalion statistics suggest. Though this level of participation appeared then, as it still does today, below the national rate, it may have been the best that could have been expected from an Anglican population that was overwhelmingly rural and agrarian, removed from Britain by generations, and with a negligible British-born constituency. New Brunswick’s Anglican leadership did not have the benefit of provincially disaggregated data, and what they did possess would have been insufficient to draw even informed inferences. Rather, they went on the basis of what they were told by the Department of the Militia and Defence, and probably with what they observed locally, or heard anecdotally. To all and sundry, it was clear by mid-1917 that the voluntary recruitment system was not going to enable Canada to meet her troop commitments to the Empire. This
knowledge alone was more than sufficient for clergymen like Bishop Richardson and Reverend Hooper to expect and demand more from their flocks, regardless of the obstacles, and then ultimately to lead the national call for conscription. The war against Germany was a righteous war being waged to save British Christian civilization, and therefore Canada. New Brunswick’s Anglicans, as members of a church tradition that embodied all that was great about Britain and the Empire, were expected by their religious leaders to be in the vanguard of the great crusade for civilization.
APPENDIX
### Exhibit 1: Concentration & Distribution of Anglicans in New Brunswick, by Census Districts (C.D.) - 1911

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census District</th>
<th>Census District Population</th>
<th>Number of Anglicans</th>
<th>Percentage of C.D. Population</th>
<th>Percentage of NB Anglican Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carleton</td>
<td>21,446</td>
<td>2,331</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>21,147</td>
<td>3,643</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester</td>
<td>32,662</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>24,376</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings &amp; Albert</td>
<td>30,285</td>
<td>6,059</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td>31,194</td>
<td>2,608</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restigouche</td>
<td>15,687</td>
<td>1,174</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint John City &amp; Co.</td>
<td>53,572</td>
<td>12,446</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunbury &amp; Queens</td>
<td>17,116</td>
<td>2,625</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria &amp; Madawaska</td>
<td>28,222</td>
<td>2,099</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmorland</td>
<td>44,621</td>
<td>2,545</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>31,561</td>
<td>5,588</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total NB</strong></td>
<td><strong>351,889</strong></td>
<td><strong>42,864</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Exhibit 2A: Anglicans in New Brunswick's ‘Urban’ Centres - 1911

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-District</th>
<th>Census District</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Anglicans</th>
<th>Percentage of Sub-District Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saint John (city)</td>
<td>St. John City &amp; Co.</td>
<td>42,511</td>
<td>9,880</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moncton (city)</td>
<td>Westmorland</td>
<td>11,345</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fredericton (city)</td>
<td>York</td>
<td>7,208</td>
<td>1,853</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathurst (town)</td>
<td>Gloucester</td>
<td>5,248</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatham (town)</td>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td>4,666</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodstock (town)</td>
<td>Carleton</td>
<td>3,856</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbellton (town)</td>
<td>Restigouche</td>
<td>3,817</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle (town)</td>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td>2,945</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Stephen (town)</td>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>2,836</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sackville (town)</td>
<td>Westmorland</td>
<td>2,039</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>86,471</strong></td>
<td><strong>15,512</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.9%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other ‘urban’ towns &amp; villages</td>
<td>See Table 2B</td>
<td>17,364</td>
<td>2,638</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ‘URBAN’</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>103,835</strong></td>
<td><strong>18,150</strong></td>
<td><strong>29.5%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ‘RURAL’</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>248,054</strong></td>
<td><strong>24,714</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.6%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL POPULATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>351,889</strong></td>
<td><strong>42,864</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.2%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-District</th>
<th>Census District</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Number of Anglicans</th>
<th>Percentage of Sub-District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td>Kings &amp; Albert</td>
<td>1,906</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marysville</td>
<td>York</td>
<td>1,837</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmundston</td>
<td>Victoria &amp; Madawaska</td>
<td>1,821</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milltown</td>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>1,804</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalhousie</td>
<td>Restigouche</td>
<td>1,650</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shediac</td>
<td>Westmorland</td>
<td>1,442</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Falls</td>
<td>Victoria &amp; Madawaska</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorchester</td>
<td>Westmorland</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. George</td>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Andrew's</td>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough</td>
<td>Kings &amp; Albert</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richibucto</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton</td>
<td>Kings &amp; Albert</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gagetown</td>
<td>Sunbury &amp; Queens</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>17,364</td>
<td>2,638</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Exhibit 3:** Distribution of Anglicans in New Brunswick by Major UrbanCentres & Their Environs - 1911

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anglicans as % of Total</th>
<th>St. John</th>
<th>Moncton</th>
<th>Fredericton</th>
<th>Sussex</th>
<th>Other Major Anglican Centres: (all in Kings County)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Anglicans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hampton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total Anglicans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kingston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in NB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rothesay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9,880</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>1,853</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42,511</td>
<td>11,348</td>
<td>7,208</td>
<td>1,906</td>
<td>522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City + S.J. County</td>
<td>12,446</td>
<td>940</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural + Environs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53,572</td>
<td>17,778</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kingston + Environs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rothesay + Environs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Westfield + Environs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Major Anglican Centres: (all in Kings County)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Waterford + Environs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>544</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6,256</td>
<td>679</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kingston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Anglicans in New Brunswick, 1911:</td>
<td>42,864</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rothesay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Westfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Waterford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,028</td>
<td>6256</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: 1911 Dominion Census, Vol. II - Table II: Religions of the People, 18-24*
Exhibit 4: 6th Canadian Mounted Rifles - Origins of the Officers and Men

Presumed Residency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presumed Residency</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Brunswick Summary:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint John &amp; Co.</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moncton &amp; Westmorland Co.</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussex &amp; Kings Co.</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland Co.</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fredericton &amp; York Co.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens Co.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restigouche Co.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All other counties</strong></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NB Total</strong></td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of these:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NB-born</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British-born</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other nations</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary by Nationality:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canadian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other provinces</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Canadian</strong></td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>594</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Exhibit 5: New Brunswick Men of the Former 6th Canadian Mounted Rifles Who Died at the Battle of Mount Sorrel, June 2 – 16, 1916**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Regimental No.</th>
<th>Residence*</th>
<th>Denomination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin, K.G.F</td>
<td>Corporal</td>
<td>111020</td>
<td>Dalhousie</td>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best, H.J.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>111034</td>
<td>Coldbrook</td>
<td>Wesleyan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, F.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>111131</td>
<td>Saint John</td>
<td>Anglican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolan, J.F.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>111145</td>
<td>Fredericton</td>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson, R.C.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>111171</td>
<td>Campbellton</td>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flaherty, F.E.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>111175</td>
<td>Saint John</td>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haworth, J.A.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>111219</td>
<td>Saint John</td>
<td>Anglican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hegan, W.J.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>111223</td>
<td>Hampton</td>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiltz, D.J.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>111232</td>
<td>Petitcodiac</td>
<td>Wesleyan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith, P.C.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>111266</td>
<td>Moncton</td>
<td>Baptist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lammon, A.G.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>111274</td>
<td>Saint John</td>
<td>Baptist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamont, J.W.</td>
<td>Corporal</td>
<td>111275</td>
<td>E. Glassville</td>
<td>Baptist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacDonald, A.T.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>111298</td>
<td>Welsford</td>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McClusky, W.S.</td>
<td>Corporal</td>
<td>111351</td>
<td>Saint John</td>
<td>Baptist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMullon, J.H.</td>
<td>Corporal</td>
<td>111379</td>
<td>St. Andrews</td>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrissey, G.</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>177771</td>
<td>Saint John</td>
<td>Anglican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodwell, A.L.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>111394</td>
<td>Norton</td>
<td>Baptist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otty, N.D.O.</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>Lieut.</td>
<td>Hampton</td>
<td>Anglican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still, D.H.</td>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>111474</td>
<td>Chatham</td>
<td>Anglican</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Place of birth, or next of kin

**Sources:**
- Canadian Expeditionary Force, 6th Regiment Canadian Mounted Rifles, Nominal Roll of Officers, Non-Commissioned Officer and Men; Canada at War: [www.canadaatwar.ca/memorial/world-war-i](http://www.canadaatwar.ca/memorial/world-war-i)
### Exhibit 6: Battalions by Religious Denomination, New Brunswick Men (1914 - 1916)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>12th</th>
<th>26th</th>
<th>6th CMR</th>
<th>55th</th>
<th>104th</th>
<th>115th</th>
<th>140th</th>
<th>145th</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>1,457</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1,151</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1,006</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesleyan</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregational</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Christian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Given</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>266</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>5,023</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:**

*Canadian Expeditionary Force Nominal Rolls of Officers, Non-Commissioned Officers and Men.*


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origin*</th>
<th>12th</th>
<th>26th</th>
<th>6th CMR</th>
<th>55th</th>
<th>104th</th>
<th>115th</th>
<th>140th</th>
<th>145th</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban Centres</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fredericton</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Stephen</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moncton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Andrews</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sackville</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbellton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodstock</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. George</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatham</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorchester</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gagetown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milltown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Falls</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marysville</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathurst</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richibucto</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalhousie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmundston</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shediac</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Urban</strong></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rural</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1151</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*conforms to the 1911 census definitions of urban and rural
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