THROUGH A ROYALIST LENS:

NEW BRUNSWICK, ROYAL TOURISTS, AND THE ANGLOPHONE PRESS, 1901-1959

by

Barry Richard MacKenzie

B.A. (Honours), St. Francis Xavier University, 2007
M.A., University of New Brunswick, 2009
Ph.D., University of New Brunswick, 2019

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in the Graduate Academic Unit of History

Supervisor: Greg Marquis, Ph.D., History

Examining Board: Sasha Mullally, Ph.D., History
Wendy Churchill, Ph.D., History
Jennifer Andrews, Ph.D., English

External Examiner: Nicole Neatby, Ph.D., History
St. Mary’s University

This dissertation is accepted by the
Dean of Graduate Studies

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW BRUNSWICK

August 2019

© Barry Richard MacKenzie, 2019
ABSTRACT

Over a nearly-sixty-year period, three generations of the Canadian royal family visited New Brunswick, sometimes at important moments in the province’s history. Each of these tours provided an opportunity for local leaders and boosters in Saint John, Fredericton, and Moncton to present a carefully staged version of their communities to an assortment of royal tourists, all the while supported in their work by the local anglophone press. These royal itineraries, supervised by Ottawa but largely of local design, varied only slightly in many respects, and yet by examining a variety of elements of these tours, the historian can learn a great deal about the times in which they took place, specifically with respect to the status of the military in civil society, the role of women, the variety of competing identities, the reinforcement of tradition, and various local issues which emerged during the planning and execution of the visits.

Drawing upon coverage of these tours which appeared in the anglophone press, this dissertation contributes to a greater understanding of New Brunswick identities, specifically how the anglophone majority, and especially its middle class, perceived the province during the first six decades of the twentieth century, a period of important constitutional and cultural evolution. It fills gaps in our historical understanding of the period, while also building on the work which has been carried out on topics such as Britishness and the Loyalist Myth. Specifically, it adds to an ongoing debate about imperialism and Canada’s place in the British World after the Great War. Most importantly, this study adds another dimension to the expanding field of
commemoration, and demonstrates the value of ceremonial occasions as markers of identity. The people of New Brunswick gathered by the thousands in the streets and along railroad sidings to catch glimpses of kings and princesses on every occasion between 1901 and 1959. The press suggested that these royal tourists captured the hearts and imaginations of the people who came out to cheer them. While spectators may have thought they were getting to know these royal guests, in fact they were learning far more about themselves.
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INTRODUCTION

The monarchy, though it seems in the last few decades to have lost a degree of the magic which once kept its subjects spellbound, is still the subject of fascination among Britons and Canadians alike. The CBC, our national broadcaster, still carries, and produces, a broad array of royal programs and documentaries. Canadian newspapers and magazines, though they no longer publish royal news on a regular basis, still on occasion find room for stories and photographs chronicling the movements of the Queen and her family, particularly during royal milestones like weddings and jubilees, and during royal tours. In New Brunswick, the media are no exception. There is little doubt that the monarchy still periodically captures the imagination of many anglophone New Brunswickers, even if their conception of its connection to Canada, if they conceive of a connection at all, is difficult to pinpoint. That, however, is not something which this dissertation seeks to prove or disprove. To comprehend the fascination many people have about the monarchy, one would necessarily have to somehow differentiate between old fashioned loyalty to the Crown, and the popular interest in, and identification with, royals as celebrities. One recent poll suggests that 54% of Atlantic Canadians oppose the abolition of the monarchy in Canada, whereas only 43% of Canadians overall feel the same way.¹ This complicated duality did not emerge in the age of Charles and Diana, or William and Kate, however, but generations earlier. In the nineteenth century, the monarchy became more visible to the people of the British

Empire through a growing media, and the public’s access to the royal family has only increased over time. As such, it has become increasingly difficult to determine the rationale behind people’s interest in the monarchy. With the marriage into the royal family of American actor Meghan Markle in May 2018, this has rarely been more difficult.

Discernible enthusiasm for royal tours has fallen dramatically during the past several decades. When the Prince of Wales and the Duchess of Cornwall visited New Brunswick in 2012, crowds at CFB Gagetown and in Saint John numbered in the hundreds rather than the thousands. A couple of generations earlier, however, the level of fascination was far greater, and all the more so a century and more ago. The drastic reduction in the numbers of people who gather along royal procession routes during royal tours today could be explained in a variety of different ways, and at least part of the apparent indifference on the part of increasing numbers of Canadians has something to do with the fact that the Queen and her family are no longer remote figures only seen in photographs. Television and film may have contributed to something the English constitutional commentator Walter Bagehot warned his readers

---


3 Throughout this dissertation, the spelling Saint John (as opposed to St. John) will be used, with the following exceptions: when quoting another source which used the latter spelling, when referring to the St. John River, and when referring to the St. John Fusiliers, whose official name used the abbreviated spelling between 1900 and 1925.
about in 1867: “We must not let in daylight upon magic.” 4 Whatever the change, that important discussion is not within the parameters of this dissertation.

Diminished crowds and abandoned collections of royal memorabilia aside, the apparent reduced interest in the monarchy generally, and royal visits specifically, often obscure the fact that for the first half of the twentieth century and beyond (perhaps even as late as the 1980s), most Canadians did embrace the institution. During royal tours, enthusiasm for the royal family was especially pronounced, as the English-language newspapers reported on the thousands of people who crowded into cities like Fredericton, Saint John, and Moncton, just to get a glimpse of a duke or a queen. Those New Brunswickers who were among the “dense throngs” certainly have vivid memories of the day, none more so that those who remember exactly where they were when they saw King George VI and Queen Elizabeth during their 1939 tour of Canada. Yet, the sense of anticipation and the extensive preparations made for these events have largely been left out of the histories written about the province and its communities.

For example, in a history of Moncton published by that city in 1965, the author dedicated only one paragraph (in a book exceeding 430 pages) to the royal tour of 1939, even while referring to the crowd which gathered for it as “the most densely packed throng ever assembled in Moncton.” 5 There is no mention whatsoever of the visit of Queen Elizabeth II to the city during the tour of 1959, which had taken place just six

---

5 Lloyd A. Machum, *A History of Moncton: Town and City, 1855-1965* (Moncton: The City of Moncton, 1965), 337. A slightly longer paragraph in the same chapter is dedicated to the city’s reaction to the death of King George V in 1936.
years before the publication of the book. A collection of essays published in 1948 to commemorate the centennial of Fredericton’s incorporation includes only a brief mention of that city’s long history of royal tours. Royal visits of 1860 and 1939 are mentioned in the context of the “notables” who had worshipped in the city’s Christ Church Cathedral. W. Austin Squires, in his bicentennial history of the city published in 1980, gave far greater detail about certain of those visits. Even royal visits to Saint John have been lightly commemorated beyond what appeared in contemporary newspapers. The exception is a beautiful volume produced by John R. Hamilton to commemorate the royal tour of 1901, which includes detailed information about royal tours of the Saint John region dating back to 1794. For all the contemporary media coverage these visits attracted, then, little has been recorded about the history of royal tours by New Brunswick writers. A student of New Brunswick history could easily be forgiven for assuming that kings and princesses have never deigned to visit this humble province, or, if they did, that there was nothing particularly remarkable about those visits.

This absence of this important story from the historiography of English-speaking New Brunswick and Canada is disappointing, especially considering the rich insights which these visits can provide. This dissertation seeks to correct this oversight by drawing on the opinions of the anglophone press to unpack the complex and varied

---

7 W. Austin Squires, History of Fredericton: The Last 200 Years (Fredericton: City of Fredericton, 1980), 133-5.
8 John R. Hamilton, Our Royal Guests: A Souvenir of the Visits of the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York and Other Members of the Royal Family to St. John and the Province of New Brunswick, Canada (Boston: Beal Press, 1902).
representations of various people and groups which made up provincial society at these five important moments in time. As John Tomlinson has said, “The ‘lived reality’ of national identity is a reality lived in representations...” The same can certainly be said for provincial identity. New Brunswick is not unlike its fellow provinces in that royal tours have figured very little in the telling of their histories, and until just a few decades ago, historians (particularly academic ones) who study the Commonwealth had virtually ignored royal tours and other royal occasions as valuable subjects of historical enquiry. In the last several decades, however, academic historians have begun to recognize the many ways in which the study of these events can reveal far more than just the amount of bunting on public buildings and the number of aldermen attending a municipal reception. As this dissertation argues, tours can in fact tell us a great deal about the way in which the people who organized, took part in, and observed royal tours, thought about these visits and about the place in which they lived. The focus here will be on the representation of various identities (British/imperial, Loyalist, and, to a lesser extent, Acadian and Indigenous), the ceremonial space granted to or claimed by women, the role of the armed forces, the reinforcement of tradition, as well as the ways in which these royal tours have brought out local issues. As such, this dissertation contributes to the growing bodies of literature on twentieth-century anglophone New Brunswick, Britishness, commemoration, and, to a lesser extent, gender history.

---

A variety of groups, it can be argued, benefitted in some way from these royal tours. For the (predominantly anglophone) elite of the province, the visits were opportunities to rub shoulders with royalty and to reaffirm their status in the community, as was also to case for people of British and Loyalist origin who felt a particular attachment to the institution by virtue of ethnicity and history. The tours also provided an opportunity for members of the militia and the armed forces and veterans to reinforce their own special place in civic society, to say nothing of their particularly close relationship with the monarchy. For other groups, including women and Acadians, these visits gave them an occasion to claim ceremonial space and affirm their loyalty to the state. In the case of Indigenous New Brunswickers, who were almost always absent from press coverage of the tours, they were more often part of the décor, quaint reminders of New Brunswick’s natural heritage. Importantly, these occasions even provided a platform for debates of a provincial and even local nature to be played out. Businesspeople and civic boosters also benefitted in their own ways, as the tours inspired New Brunswickers to travel to the towns and cities to see the royal tourists, and convinced people to spend money on decorations and souvenirs. In short, these tours benefitted, or were leveraged by, a great variety of people and groups. If there is doubt that these groups, and others, were invested in the invented tradition of these royal tours, consider that these occasions were paid for to varying degrees by all levels of governments. As will be discussed throughout the dissertation, the cost to the province, and to local communities in particularly, was often the subject of conversation, and
sometimes debate. Communities were quite literally invested in these visits, though admittedly for reasons more varied than patriotism and enthusiasm for the monarchy.

The main sources for this dissertation are a selection of English-language newspapers published in New Brunswick (most of which were dailies). Although there is some debate among scholars about the reliability of the press as an indicator of public opinion, this study posits that the press is in fact a useful indicator. That is not to say that newspapers reflected the views of all anglophone New Brunswickers, of course, as there has always been a diversity of opinion. However, newspapers in the early to mid-twentieth century occupied an influential place in the lives of most Canadians. By 1931, for example, census statistics suggests that four newspapers and periodicals were being produced for every household in Canada.\(^{10}\) This significant role suggests, therefore, that the public had an appetite for news, and it stands to logical reason that people were attracted by newspapers which reflected their opinions and interests. In the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the majority of newspapers supported, and were supported by, a particular political party. Beginning in the 1890s, the trend was towards a more ‘independent style’ of journalism, though this should not be taken to mean that owners and editors did not express partisan or biased viewpoints. Jeffrey McNairn suggests that newspapers after 1900 were “designed to attract the eye and pocket change of readers.” More importantly, he argues that “[w]ith readership, rather than partisanship becoming progressively more important, newspapers had to be made more

appealing to readers.”

Mary Vipond, too, has written that by the turn of the twentieth century, publishers “had begun to shake free of traditional partisan ties to produce newspapers geared more to the needs, interests, and reading level of the new urban masses.”

Overall, because newspapers were driven by the marketplace, they tended, in the words of the pioneering Canadian media historian Paul Rutherford, to “reflect moods and attitudes evident in the country.” Moreover, Rutherford contends, they were “likely to uphold the overall values and strategies of the nation’s leaders.” Some scholars have suggested that “the media are not mirrors but “megaphones” by which ruling-class ideas are amplified and dispersed.” Critical theorists have concluded “that the media do act to maintain the existing order, to deflect challenges to those with economic power, and generally to support the status quo.”

As historical sources, newspapers are valuable and provide unique insight. As Leslie Williams has written, “Newspapers and periodicals are privileged as primary sources for historians because of their immediacy as an archive of passing events and opinions regarding those events. But these sources provide traces of agency as well as archive.” Moreover, in the twentieth century they became increasingly useful as a measure of public opinion. According to John Nerone, “the function of the press is and

14 Vipond, The Mass Media in Canada, 121.
15 Ibid, 122.
has usually been to ‘represent’ rather than to ‘inform’ public opinion.”\textsuperscript{17} This is especially valuable in the first several decades of the twentieth century, for which reliable and sophisticated opinion polls are unavailable, and during which time as Nerone has argued, “The press was the most influential and arguably the most reliable mechanism of representing public opinion.”\textsuperscript{18} Dominique Marquis, too, has posited that “As concrete evidence of a past that has more or less disappeared, [newspapers] are recognized as rich sources of information: they reveal what were the important events of their period and – through their editorials, commentaries, and even advertisements – they are valuable indicators of the ideologies and mentalities that marked their era.”\textsuperscript{19} Moreover, Marquis suggests, the information-based press of the twentieth century “concentrates on the news and moves away from political commentary that would risk creating divisions among its readers. It sees itself as more of a unifying force: even if it still offers commentary and editorial opinions, it no longer aims solely at defending a particular idea and attacking those of other newspapers.”\textsuperscript{20} Most importantly for this study, Marquis argues that “the information press is attentive to the tastes and expectations of its readers.”

There are limitations to newspapers, of course. Specifically, one must be mindful that they are not representative of all people in a given region. In the context of New

\textsuperscript{18} Ibid, 744.
\textsuperscript{20} Ibid, 29.
Brunswick, papers which catered to the anglophone majority often provide little insight into the opinions of members of minority groups, including Acadians and Indigenous peoples. In the case of Roman Catholics, their views were theoretically reflected by the *New Freeman* from 1919 onward, although since it was an official organ of the Diocese of Saint John, it would have also reflected the attitudes of the church hierarchy, which in this period tended to be supportive of legitimately constituted authorities, including the monarchy. As such, this dissertation seeks to instead make observations about the ceremonial space which members of these communities were afforded, or claimed for themselves, even while their voices are not always easily reconstructed. One must also acknowledge that even though newspapers can help to reconstruct the nature of this ceremonial space, it cannot necessarily answer questions about why certain groups were included or not included, and who made those decisions (the groups themselves, or tour organizers).

In New Brunswick, there were a large number of daily papers at the turn of the twentieth century, although these were gradually merged between the 1920s and 1950s. In some cases, one owner might own multiple competing newspapers, a reality with which New Brunswickers are all too familiar.\(^{21}\) This was the case in Saint John, where the two dailies, the *Evening Times-Globe* and the *Telegraph-Journal*, came under

\(^{21}\) Howard P. Robinson was, for example, principal shareholder of a Saint John company which controlled both the *Telegraph-Journal* and the *Evening Times-Globe* from the 1920s, before he sold out to Kenneth Colin Irving in 1944. Irving eventually bought all of the province’s daily newspapers, and in 1998 came under the management of the Irving-owned Brunswick News. See Don Nerbas, "Howard Robinson and the "British Method": A Case Study of Britishness in Canada during the 1930s and 1940s," *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association* 20, 1 (2009): 139-160; Douglas How and Ralph Costello, *K.C.: The Biography of K.C. Irving* (Toronto: Key Porter Books, 1994).
the ownership of Howard P. Robinson. Previously, the *Globe* was under the editorial leadership of John V. Ellis (1867-1913) and his son John B. Ellis (1913-1927). Both the *Globe* and the Saint John *Daily Sun*, edited by S.D. Scott from 1900-1906, were founded as Liberal or Liberal-Conservative papers.\(^22\) The Saint John-based *New Freeman* was the official organ of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Saint John, founded in 1900 in tribute to Timothy Anglin’s earlier Saint John paper *The Freeman*, itself modelled on the Dublin nationalist *Freeman’s Journal*.\(^23\) In Fredericton, the *Daily Gleaner* was under the leadership of James H. Crockett (1880-1930) and later his sons, Alexander and Wallace, until the newspaper was purchased in 1950 by transplanted British newspaperman Brigadier Michael Wardell, a friend and former employee of Max Aitken, 1st Baron Beaverbrook.\(^24\) Richard Wilbur has called James Crockett “a militant Tory.”\(^25\) Wardell has been described by political scientist James Laxer as “a swashbuckling character” who ran the Gleaner “in the manner of a Loyalist organ, affecting a staunchly anglophone posture...”\(^26\) In Moncton, the *Daily Times* operated under the management of T. Sutton Boyd from the 1870s until his death in 1934; David Greig served as an editor from 1936 until sometime after 1965.\(^27\) Boyd was “highly regarded as a Conservative editorial writer...”\(^28\) Although at the turn of the twentieth century many of these papers had


\(^{23}\) Ibid, 78.


\(^{27}\) Machum, *A History of Moncton*, 119, 324.

political connections, they seem to have by and large supported the British connection and the status quo *viz a viz* identities during royal visits.

There is no evidence that any of the papers consulted for this project published negative opinions about the nature of the monarchy in Canada generally, or royal tours specifically. The one exception could be the Saint John *Freeman*, whose Irish-Canadian priest-editor in 1901 suggested that the time would come when Canada realized that it was too grown up to support such a dated constitutional system. That antipathy towards the monarchy seems to have dissipated by 1919. Generally speaking, there was little variety of opinion on matters monarchical, and much of the editorial comment on the monarchy during royal visits was heavily cloaked in references to the Empire and to Britishness. From the homogeneity of the newspaper coverage and editorial opinion, then, one might assert that the newspapers were reflective of the general opinion of New Brunswickers surrounding issues relating to the monarchy and royal tours, even if it cannot be suggested that there was uniformity of opinion across the board. While historians like Rutherford have commented on the power of the media to sway public opinion, he argues that generally the “media has been the abode of orthodoxy...” Unfortunately, there are no public opinion polls on which to rely until the 1940s, against which one might compare the overall positive attention given to the monarchy and to the British connection more generally. However, through examination of the media

---

29 *The Freeman*, 19 October 1901, 4.
coverage of these five royal tours, one can analyze the exposure New Brunswickers had
to pro-monarchy and pro-British ideologies through the pages of the anglophone press.

The public opinion which was reflected in New Brunswick newspapers was,
admittedly, limited in that it was largely urban and bourgeois, but it has utility
nevertheless. As Rutherford has argued,

What the daily newspapers and the consumer magazines did was to alter and
standardize, even more to popularize the mores of the urban middle class.
Bourgeois organizations, from the boards of trade to the associated charities,
received the sympathetic attention of the news columns of the dailies. Better
yet, the values and causes of this class were advanced by the press.\textsuperscript{31}

This dissertation looks, then, not to explain how or why the people of New Brunswick
explained or expressed their enthusiasm for royal tours between 1901 and 1959, but
rather how the historian can use press coverage to explore the province and its
communities at these particular points in time.

In the first six decades of the twentieth century, Canada underwent a myriad of
changes, ranging from its global economic status to its relations with the United States.
As the nation lurched towards its centennial in 1967, these and a variety of other changes
marked a significant departure from the Canada which John A. Macdonald and his fellow
Fathers of Confederation had envisioned in 1867. One of the key changes involved a
gradual withdrawal from the British sphere of influence, and the evolution of competing
conceptions of the Britishness with which Canada was connected until the 1960s, both of
which can be measured in part by the study of Canadian attitudes towards the

\textsuperscript{31} Ibid, 73.
monarchy.\footnote{Britishness in the first decades of the twentieth century would have meant different things to different people. As Kurt Korneski has written, “Britishness was not primarily about the perceived realities of life on the British Isles, the present, or even necessarily the corporeal world. Instead, it reflected and spoke to geopolitics, spiritual qualities, politico-ethical principles, and visions of the future.” As such, it was flexible and often subjective. “The centrality of Britishness to Canadian national imaginings from the mid-nineteenth to the mid-twentieth centuries,” Korneski argues, “reflected the fact that most observers, historians included, understood the Dominion as an integral part of the British Empire, and many lauded that fact.” See Kurt Korneski, “Britishness, Canadianness, Class and Race: Winnipeg and the British World, 1880s-1910s,” \textit{Journal of Canadian Studies} 41, 2 (Spring 2007): 164.} Specifically, one might consider the various tours of Canada undertaken by members of the royal family during this period as being representative of these gradual changes.

There is a great deal more, however, which the study of these tours can tell us. By using coverage from several major New Brunswick English-language newspapers, this study examines prevailing contemporary attitudes about a variety of subjects and groups in New Brunswick at specific points between the 1901 tour by the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall of York, and the 1959 tour by Queen Elizabeth II and Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh. These subjects include the role of the military in civil society, the close links between the Crown and the armed forces, the ceremonial place of women, the centrality of the British Empire to Canadian identity, the legacy of the United Empire Loyalists, and a variety of local issues.

What should also become clear after a careful analysis of the five royal tours between 1901 and 1959 is how, though they reflect a myriad of changes in provincial society, the tours were also a constant presence in Canadian national life. In his recent book \textit{Royal Tourists, Colonial Subjects, and the Making of a British World, 1860-1911}, Charles V. Reed suggests that royal tour itineraries have remained remarkably uniform.
since they first came into vogue in the late nineteenth century. He argues that “[In 1901] George and Mary [the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York] participated in a remarkably similar itinerary of events [to those undertaken by the Duke and Duchess of Cambridge in 2011], from review of imperial troops to entertainment by Indigenous peoples.”33 While First Nations people played no significant role in royal tours of New Brunswick until well into the twentieth century, Reed’s point is well-taken. Although these visits have become increasingly ‘democratic’ in the sense that, in the twenty-first century, they focus on engaging more and more of the ‘common people’ with the Sovereign or members of her family rather than just the political and social elites, much of the nineteenth-century framework still remains in place.

For this reason, one could be forgiven for assuming that the origins of these long-standing traditions of military reviews, public addresses, and others, are lost in the mists of time. However, as David Cannadine first argued in his chapter in Hobsbawm and Ranger’s now famous anthology, The Invention of Tradition, the origins are in many ways decidedly Victorian. Before that 1870s, the British – and by extension the colonies of its Empire - , Cannadine argues, were not all that adept at national ceremony, something a twenty-first-century reader might find difficult to believe. After many decades of practice, “the ceremonial is now splendidly performed, so much so that observers have assumed that this has always been the case.”34 This is precisely the reason that comments like “the

pageantry and grandeur of a thousand-year-old tradition” are so frequently heard at times of major royal ceremonials, particularly coronations, State Openings of Parliament, and the like.\(^\text{35}\)

That is not to say that these types of ceremonies were completely invented during the late nineteenth century, of course. To be sure, coronations have taken place at Westminster Abbey, in one form or other, since the eleventh century, and the royal tour (known then as a Royal Progress) was arguably a development of the first Queen Elizabeth. However, what is clear is that Victorians set the bar for royal ceremonial going forward. Reed puts it thusly:

“As young Princess Elizabeth sat on the coronation throne in 1953, she inherited a set of ritual practices that had roots in an earlier period but were developed and perfected over the course of the nineteenth century. Empire Day (now Commonwealth Day), jubilees, and royal tours of empire were the “inventions” of a nineteenth-century British state that sought to inspire obedience and loyalty in the Queen’s subjects across the globe.”\(^\text{36}\)

While it is not the purpose of this dissertation to discuss the use of royal tours as “soft power” on the part of the British government, that they were used to inspire loyalty to a shared imperial throne is important to our understanding of royal tours as they were conceived well into the twentieth century.

For all their constancy, changes have affected the royal tours of Empire/Commonwealth since the first imperial tours in the reign of Queen Victoria:

Despite the remarkable similarities between the 1901 and 2011 tours, down to the intricate details of their itineraries, they were carried out in vastly different

\(^{36}\) Reed, *Royal Tourists*, xvii.
contexts. The future George V and Queen Mary encountered an empire that was still on the march and would not achieve its greatest territorial extent until after the Great War. William and Catherine, on the other, interacted with citizens of an independent nation-state who by and large understood their British colonial heritage as secondary to their national story as Canadians.\(^{37}\)

This holds true for not only the Empire/Commonwealth as a whole, but for Canada specifically. As the chapters below will indicate, in the years (sometimes decades) between each tour, New Brunswick and Canada faced significant challenges from which they emerged forever changed. These included events such as the Boer War, the Great War, the Great Depression, the Second World War, and the associated decline of the British Empire and of Britishness in Canada. Meanwhile, women campaigned for, and received, the franchise, the Canadian military grew and was Canadianized, and the ethnic composition and place of minorities in the province and the nation shifted drastically. The various chapters will include a detailed breakdown of the communities associated with each tour and will contextualize the period and place in which each visit occurred.

The chapter on the 1901 royal tour, which included Saint John as the only official New Brunswick stop, examines the state of the anglophone community at the end of the South African War and within the context of fervent imperialist nationalism. Certainly, coverage of the tour (with the aforementioned exception of the writings of the republican editor of the \textit{Freeman}) was heavily imbued with the rhetoric dedicated to Loyalists and the British Empire. It suggests that women were involved in the tour almost exclusively from behind the scenes; in the rare instances when women were involved in the official proceedings, they were in traditionally gendered roles. The chapter also examines how

\(^{37}\) Ibid, xviii.
the visit became a platform for the airing of long-standing grievances between Saint John and the province’s capital city, Fredericton.

Chapter three, which focuses on the 1919 tour by Edward, Prince of Wales, places the visit within the context of the somewhat anticlimactic period following the victory by the Triple Entente and its Allies in the First World War. The prince’s tour took place in challenging economic times, but amidst enthusiastic celebrations of the sacrifices of the province’s young men and women, something which almost overshadowed the visit by times. By 1919, the place of women in New Brunswick society had experienced an important change, and a few local women elite had a role in the official itinerary. Despite the traditional assumption that Canadians’ attachment to the British Empire was a casualty of the war, there is still ample evidence to suggest that Britishness was very much the order of the day in the immediate postwar period.

The chapter on the 1939 royal visit draws on the richest collection of newspaper materials; the fact that it marked the first occasion on which a reigning British sovereign set foot on Canadian soil contributed to an unprecedented level of press coverage. During that tour, the predictable rhetoric about the United Empire Loyalists, and the glories of the British Empire, were employed in abundance, and despite a growing and increasingly influential francophone population in the province, the anglophone media paid them no heed. There was certainly an overarching, if at times vague, acknowledgement of the uncertain international situation, but also a dogged determination to proceed with the tour’s program and to continue to celebrate New Brunswick’s Britishness and emerging
set of identities. Women continued to play a rather inconspicuous part in the proceedings, even though Queen Elizabeth was often the star attraction.

The final chapter, which focuses on the two tours undertaken in the 1950s by at first Princess, and later, Queen Elizabeth and Prince Philip, illustrates a continued embrace of the monarchy and Britishness among anglophone-New Brunswickers, which challenges the traditional belief that old British Canada died a slow death during the Second World War, just as Canadian enthusiasm for the Empire/Commonwealth was supposed to have been a casualty of the First World War. Both of these ideas are based in a dated understanding of Canadian identity which has been challenged by recent literature and by this study. The gender of the young Sovereign is reflected in media commentary about the punishing schedule she and her husband were expected to endure, and in concerns about her physical wellbeing, something which was rarely a concern when male royals were on tour. Finally, the 1959 tour in particular served to highlight the ongoing drama following the Escuminac Disaster, which had shocked northeastern New Brunswick just weeks before the tour began.

Naturally, the communities which occupied a place in the itineraries for these five tours were each unique, and each underwent changes in the first six decades of the twentieth century. Saint John had, since the founding of New Brunswick, been the principal port and therefore the commercial capital of the province. However, the Great Fire of 1877 “hastened the decline of Saint John’s role as a shipbuilding city in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, with only a brief flurry of activity again during the First
World War.” At the same time, the city was deeply divided along social lines, a fact which is sometimes hidden by the “vitality [of] the city, nourished not only by its status as an international port but also by its thriving musical, theatrical, literary, library and Mechanics’ Institute initiatives.” The first decade of the twentieth century saw the bustling port thrive, as the city was the province’s manufacturing hub, “and Simm’s brushes, Ganong chocolates and Crosby’s molasses left the city for prairie consumers. At the same time grain and agricultural products flowed in from the west for shipment abroad.” The city continued to struggle throughout the twentieth century, despite this optimism and even as its population grew (from 40,711 in 1901 to 55,153 in 1961). The Second World War “rejuvenated Saint John shipbuilding,” but only briefly, until K.C. Irving purchased the shipyard and drydock in 1959. In the time period covered by this dissertation, Saint John was the most ethnically diverse of the province’s cities, even though throughout much of the twentieth century it identified itself with the Loyalists (and a specific type of Loyalist, too) who founded the city in 1783. More broadly, Greg Marquis has written, “Saint John was characterized by an elite class of capitalists and professionals, a growing middle class and a working class that was divided by skill and income into the “respectable” and the rest.” Significantly for this study, “the city held

39 Ibid, 14.
42 Schuyler, Saint John: Two Hundred Years Proud, 113-14.
on to its religious and ethnic history but also demonstrated loyalty to Canada and, for the most part, to the Empire.”

Fredericton, the seat of government, has been described by Dan Soucoup as having been “a small yet dynamic capital city” at the turn of the twentieth century. What industrial expansion the region had experienced in the late nineteenth century was largely halted after 1900, and the city depended on the joint forces of the provincial government and the University of New Brunswick. Until its borders were expanded after the Second World War, the old city of Fredericton was largely a Protestant, English-speaking enclave. The local Maliseet/Wolastoqiyik community was kept at a safe distance across the Saint John River. A little further out stood the cotton town of Marysville, the brainchild of the great York County industrialist Alexander “Boss” Gibson, and which was entering a slow decline at the time of his death in 1913. After several lean decades during and between the two World Wars, the period following 1945 was characterized by the beneficence of one of New Brunswick’s most famous sons, Max Aitken, 1st Baron Beaverbrook. Despite various challenges, the population of Fredericton increased from 7,117 in 1901 to 19,683 in 1961.

---

44 Ibid, 81.
46 The 1911 census noted that while there was a sizeable minority of Catholics in York County, only two percent of people enumerated were French-speaking. See Soucoup, *A Short History of Fredericton*, 125.
Moncton experienced the most impressive growth of the three cities during this period, asserting itself as the self-proclaimed “hub” of the Maritime Provinces. Its population increased from 9,026 in 1901 to 43,840 in 1961.\textsuperscript{50} Indeed, the city’s population grew by almost twenty-six percent between 1900 and 1911 alone.\textsuperscript{51} The city owed much of its prosperity to the Intercolonial Railroad, which had chosen the city as its headquarters in the 1870s, a moment which Lloyd Machum has referred to as “the real beginning for Moncton.”\textsuperscript{52} The ethnic and linguistic makeup of the population changed significantly in this period (1901 to 1961) as a growing Acadian, Roman Catholic population quietly challenged the hegemony of the English-speaking, Protestant majority. While a Roman Catholic church had served members of this denomination as early as 1872, the Acadian population had no church of their own in Moncton until 1914.\textsuperscript{53} During the Great War, an Acadian Battalion (albeit an undersubscribed one) was headquartered in the area, and in 1936 Moncton was erected as a separate Roman Catholic diocese, and Joseph Melanson became the first Acadian bishop of an Acadian diocese. In the same decade, there was a lone Acadian elected to Moncton city council, and no Acadians sat on the council in the mid-1950s.\textsuperscript{54} In the 1930s, “English Monctonians watched this growing evidence of the French presence with some apprehension, even though their political and economic domination remained unchallenged for another generation.”\textsuperscript{55}

\textsuperscript{52} Machum, A History of Moncton, 98.
\textsuperscript{53} Ibid, 90, 254.
\textsuperscript{54} Wilbur, The Rise of French New Brunswick, 146.
\textsuperscript{55} Ibid, 146.
Increasingly, the city became a centre for Acadian culture and learning, culminating in the establishment in 1963 of the Université de Moncton.⁵⁶

When understood within the context of the times and communities in which they took place, the royal tours of 1901, 1919, 1939, 1951, and 1959 provide snapshots of New Brunswick at four important points in its history, and reveal important information about the place of various, sometimes competing, identities, as well as insights into the place of women in ceremonial space in the province, and the local controversies, events, and conversations which effected the province in the period. Rather than being a retelling of the story of the tours themselves, it demonstrates how they can be used to tell a very different story about the province and its people, and how they fit into the larger imperial community.

⁵⁶ Machum, A History of Moncton, 416.
CHAPTER 1
The Monarchy, the British World, and Commemoration:
An Historiographical Review

This dissertation contributes to a variety of bodies of literature, but it is principally an addition to the historiographies of the monarchy, the British World/Britishness, and commemoration. All of these have witnessed an impressive degree of growth over the past two decades, and the field of commemoration in particular seems to be growing by leaps and bounds. This study of royal tours draws on these three rich fields because the visits had, and continue to have, several levels of meaning. They speak to Canada’s attachment to the monarchical system and to its British roots, and they are, among other things, a form of commemoration and public spectacle. Therefore, this study builds upon a rich literature on several fronts.

Until relatively recently, Canada’s monarchical connection had received very little attention from scholars. A few articles and collections of essays make up all that academic historians, political scientists and others have seen fit to produce on the relationship between Canada and the monarchy. The very fact that the Canadian monarchy continues to exist in 2019 surely suggests that the topic warrants greater academic attention, and its role as a force in Canadian history is particularly worthy of further study. As this chapter will argue, this lack of scholarly attention is being addressed by some Canadian historians, but much more remains to be done.

There can hardly be a bookshop in the Commonwealth (or in the United States, for that matter) which does not carry at least a volume or two on some subject relating
to the monarchy.\(^1\) During the 1980s, in the midst of the Diana craze, it seemed as though the public’s appetite for hardcover books of photographs of the princess and her children was insatiable. Here and there in the same period, and throughout the twentieth century, a serious biography would pop up, most often focusing on a senior member of the royal family. Occasionally, they would take the form of an official biography, such as those produced by Sir Harold Nicholson and Sir John Wheeler-Bennett on Kings George V and George VI, respectively.\(^2\) The most recent example of these was the mammoth official biography of Queen Elizabeth, The Queen Mother, produced by William Shawcross in 2009, and the large edited volume of her letters which appeared shortly thereafter.\(^3\)

Few of these royal biographies, or their ‘unofficial’ counterparts, contain more than a passing reference to Canada. The biography of George V by Kenneth Rose, for example, mentioned Canada only in the context of the imperial tour of 1901 (which he summarizes in less than 4 pages of a monograph which exceeds 400).\(^4\) The official

---

\(^1\) When I refer to the “the monarchy,” I have in mind the shared institution that is the British Monarchy, with its Canadian, Australian, and other Commonwealth dimensions. The vast majority of these books (not to mention the now half-dozen or so English-language magazines which have as their sole topic coverage of the comings and goings of Britain’s and Europe’s royal personages) are not peer-reviewed, but instead written for the popular market by journalists and celebrity writers.


biography of the same sovereign by Nicolson hardly gave Canada more attention, and relegated it almost entirely to a six-page account of the same tour (the Canadian portion of which is summarized in three sentences). Even then, the author advised the curious reader with an interest in the tour to consult Web of Empire, the official history of the 1901 tour compiled by Donald MacKenzie Wallace. Ziegler’s 1991 biography of King Edward VIII (who as Prince of Wales, as will be explained in chapter three, proved enormously popular in Canada from 1919 until almost the moment of his abdication) contained many references to Canada, particularly the many tours of the Dominion undertaken by Edward when Prince of Wales. In his own autobiography (a unique document among sources of the history of the twentieth-century monarchy) published in 1951, the former king reflected at length on his tours of 1919 and the 1920s, during which time he even purchased an Alberta cattle ranch.

Other British popular biographers have similarly given Canada scant attention. Sarah Bradford’s biography of George VI referred to Canada only in the context of the abdication crisis and the 1939 tour of Canada; she dedicated far more pages to the American sidebar to the same trip. Shawcross’ official biography of Queen Elizabeth, the Queen Mother, gave the Canadian visit similarly limited attention. Sir John Wheeler-Bennett’s official biography of George VI paid more attention to Canada than either major biography of his father, including the time the young Prince Albert spent in the

---

5 Nicolson, King George V, 66-71.
7 Bradford, George VI, 242; 381-397. The Canadian portion of the tour, which lasted four weeks, is summarized in four pages, while four days in the US were given more than eleven.
country before the Great War, as well as the brief discussion in early 1931 about the possibility of the then-Duke of York being appointed as governor general of Canada.\textsuperscript{8} A number of other passages referred to Commonwealth issues in which Canada had a vested interest.\textsuperscript{9} To the 1939 royal tour of North America, though, Wheeler-Bennett granted greater emphasis, even if a healthy portion of it focused on the significance of the American section of the visit.\textsuperscript{10} He did, however, echo the generally-accepted conclusion that the 1939 tour was a rousing success. Further, he confirmed that it had made an impact on the royal couple. “The tour had been of immense psychological value to them,” Wheeler-Bennett reasoned, “and they realized it as such. ‘This has made us’, they both said on more than one occasion.”\textsuperscript{11}

For much of the twentieth century, comparatively little consideration was given to the modern monarchy by British historians (with the exception, of course, of the aforementioned non-peer reviewed biographies), and almost nothing at all was produced until very recently by their Canadian counterparts. Until the turn of the last century, Phillip Buckner was one of very few Canadian scholars to have focused any substantial research on the monarchy in Canada. That trend, thankfully, has changed in the last decade, though a good portion of what has been written recently has been focused on the Crown as a political institution, with an excellent collection of essays

\textsuperscript{8} Wheeler-Bennett, \textit{King George VI}, 253-54.
\textsuperscript{9} Wheeler-Bennett refers, for example, to the issue of the Coronation Oath, the 1939 declaration of war, the King’s royal title, and the visit to the Dominion by Princess Elizabeth and the Duke of Edinburgh in 1951.
\textsuperscript{10} Wheeler-Bennett, \textit{King George VI}, 371-394.
\textsuperscript{11} Ibid, 392. These royal biographers, both official and unofficial, have generally produced basic narratives, with little to no criticism of their subjects.
edited by Colin Coates being one of the very few collections (albeit interdisciplinary) which focuses much attention on the monarchy as a force in Canadian history.\textsuperscript{12}

Two of the most significant scholarly developments in the study of the monarchy have been in the fields of imperialism and commemoration. Carl Berger’s groundbreaking 1970 work on Canadian imperialism in the decades leading up to the Great War set the context for the popular support for the monarchy which was articulated through Canadians’ enthusiasm for participation in the Boer War and the Great War, their commitment to and interest in the Empire cum Commonwealth, and the legacy of “Britishness.”\textsuperscript{13} This popular imperialism, which for many anglophones went hand in hand with their own nationalism, lasted in one form or another until the 1960s, tying English Canadians to the wider “British World.” This phenomenon has been studied by a good many Canadians scholars, the various collections of essays by Philip Buckner and R. Douglas Francis being the most notable contributions to the field.\textsuperscript{14} This dissertation also builds upon the notion of “imagined communities” as first introduced by Benedict Anderson and which has so influenced studies of nationalism and national identity.\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{12} Colin Coates, ed., \textit{Majesty in Canada: Essays on the Role of Royalty} (Toronto: Dundurn Press, 2006).
The burgeoning field of studies on commemoration in Canada has also been significant to our understanding of the role played in Canadian national life by Britishness, as well as the monarchy and its representatives. The pioneering work of H.V. Nelles, *The Art of Nation-Building: Pageantry and Spectacle at Quebec’s Tercentenary*, was the first of many valuable studies of the importance of memory and commemoration, and the recent anthologies edited by Matthew Hayday and Raymond B. Blake speak to the role of monarchy and Britishness in the evolution of how Canadians have celebrated important milestones. The long-lasting popularity of Victoria Day and Empire Day similarly speak to the way in which Canadians acknowledged these important elements of national life.

**Historians and the Monarchy**

Beginning in the late twentieth century, historians working in the area of social history produced several studies on the monarchy and the British people, which have provided an alternative lens to understanding and contextualizing the institution both in Britain and in its overseas colonies. Few other studies of the monarchy in the modern age have been more influential than David Cannadine’s contribution to the now famous book of essays edited by Eric Hobsbawn and Terence Ranger, *The Invention of Tradition*. In his chapter entitled “The Context, Performance and Meaning of Ritual: The British Monarchy and the ‘Invention of Tradition,’ c. 1820-1977” Cannadine charted the

---

development in Britain of a rich body of ceremonials and rituals through the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. He also supported Hobsbawn and Ranger’s thesis about the invention of tradition, and discussed at length the way in which those rituals and ceremonies were altered and invented during the late nineteenth century.\footnote{David Cannadine, “The Context, Performance and Meaning of Ritual: The British Monarchy and the ‘Invention of Tradition’, c. 1820-1977,” in Eric Hobsbawn and Terence Ranger (eds.), The Invention of Tradition (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 101-164.}

In another work, Cannadine used the example of Queen Victoria’s Diamond Jubilee in 1897 to illustrate that, even during national celebrations, there are almost always undercurrents of conflict within communities.\footnote{David Cannadine, “Conflict and Consensus on a Ceremonial Occasion: The Diamond Jubilee in Cambridge in 1897,” The Historical Journal 24, 1 (March 1981): 111-146.} He likened the Jubilee to the Coronation of Elizabeth II in 1953: both are presented as “an act of national communion in which society corporately reaffirmed its commitment to certain values: the family, the nation, the monarchy and the empire.”\footnote{Ibid, 112.} He goes on to offer a choice between two descriptions of the Jubilee, suggesting that it “…may be seen as an example of consensual, secular religion…” or, “…as propaganda on behalf of a particular value system.”\footnote{Ibid, 113.} In this, Cannadine was echoing the conclusions of Shils and Young in their 1953 study.\footnote{Edward Shils and Michael Young, “The Meaning of the Coronation,” The Sociological Review 1, 2 (December 1953): 63-81.} Underneath the seemingly unified façade of the 1897 Diamond Jubilee, however, there lurked various local conflicts.\footnote{In the Canadian context, a conflict which lurked under the surface during the Jubilee celebrations was the issue of Imperial Defence, to which prime minister Wilfred Laurier refused to commit.} What is striking about these conflicts is that, while they did impact the way in which Cambridge (town and gown)
commemorated the Jubilee, no voice was raised in either quarter (even among the Friendly Societies) against the Jubilee itself. On the contrary, any time there was a disagreement, the parties involved made it clear that they were in favour of the celebrations in principal.23 One need not be searching for outspoken opposition to royal ceremonies and rituals to find conflict, of course. In the case of Cambridge, the celebration of the Diamond Jubilee of 1897 provides a backdrop for understanding local class tensions. As Cannadine concluded, “the celebrations...were, at one and the same time, the resolution of particular conflicts, as well as embodying some more general expression of consensus.” He continues: “No study confined to an examination of the ceremonial events, on the day, and the response of the people to them can recover these varied, important and subtle nuances of meaning.”24 This dissertation will build upon these arguments as it demonstrates that royal visits to New Brunswick provided the platform for a variety of debates and conversations about important local and regional issues.

Several scholars have built upon or challenged Cannadine’s work on the invention of tradition and the ritual of the British monarchy. Charles V. Reed, in a recent work on royal tours of the British Empire, argues that these visits, like Empire Day and jubilees, “were the ‘inventions’ of a nineteenth-century British state that sought to inspire obedience and loyalty in the Queen’s subjects across the globe.”25 Reed admits,

23 Ibid, 143.
24 Ibid, 146.
however, that the tours were not simply invented by the metropolis and imposed upon the frontier.²⁶ Phillip Buckner argues convincingly that

If in 1901 the majority of Canadians had not been able for logical reasons of their own to ‘imagine’ the British monarchy as an institution that belonged to them, no amount of propaganda and pressure, external or internal, could have persuaded them to embrace the monarchy as embodying an historical tradition which was part of their heritage and which continued to have relevance to them.²⁷

This is not to say that there was no effort to manipulate royal symbolism during royal tours, however, and Buckner concedes that such manipulation was in evidence during the royal tours of Canada in 1957 and 1959, when prime minister John Diefenbaker sought to Canadianize the monarchy.²⁸ This effort will be discussed further in chapter five.

Ilse Hayden’s work explores the differences between the “grand” and the “minor” events in the royal ceremonial calendar.²⁹ Hayden identified in 1980 royal ceremonies and rituals as the primary way in which Elizabeth II and her family can become part of the lives of her people.³⁰ For the average person, then, the Queen’s role in the political system is something with which they choose not to concern themselves.

²⁶ Ibid, xxi.
²⁸ Phillip Buckner, “The Last Great Royal Tour: Queen Elizabeth’s 1959 Tour to Canada,” Canada and the End of Empire, ed. Phillip Buckner (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2005), 69. In the late 1950s, in response to the decline of the British Empire and the eroding of old “British” Canada, Diefenbaker sought to impress upon Canadians the idea that Elizabeth II was as much their Queen as she was Queen of the United Kingdom or Queen of Australia. For his part, Buckner suggests that Diefenbaker’s efforts were generally unsuccessful.
³⁰ Ibid, 1.
Her appearances on state occasions, however, are the context in which they understand her role as Sovereign. The same could be said for the monarchy in Canada, where royal tours provide one of the only obvious expressions of the Queen’s role in Canadian society. The ‘grand’ occasions of which Hayden writes include coronations, weddings, and funerals, and “They distort time and thereby accentuate awareness of it. They proclaim the continuity of past and present.”

The modern day versions of these occasions, and here Hayden argues Cannadine’s point, were “made up in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.” “One does not just see the Sovereign ride by on these occasions,” Hayden argues, “but rather all the Sovereigns from the Conqueror on down.” Furthermore, she suggests that these grand events seem to “arouse in those assembled, whether along the procession route or in front of the television screens, beliefs and sentiments held in common.”

Thus, grand events of state seem to level society and make the populace feel like part of the royal family, while also elevating the Sovereign above her subjects. The “minor” royal occasions are the ones which occupy a much larger portion of the Queen’s time and which “slip by relatively unnoticed,” although it is during these day-to-day activities that the Queen meets at close distance most of her subjects and when the human side of her double identity, and symbolic personhood, most reveals itself. During a royal tour, features of the ‘grand’ and ‘minor’ occasions are blended together, increasingly so in the mid-to-

31 Ibid, 5.
32 Ibid, 5.
33 Ibid, 5-6.
34 Ibid, 6.
late twentieth century. As this dissertation demonstrates, they include elements of
grand state occasions (like the granting of royal assent to bills by George VI during the
1939 tour) and the myriad walkabouts and hum-drum occasions that characterize all of
these visits.

Vernon Bogdanor’s *The Monarchy and The Constitution*, which is in many ways a
defense of the institution, challenges the notion of the “invention of tradition,” arguing
that institutions can rarely truly re-invent themselves as Cannadine has suggested. 36
That is not to say that the British monarchy is static, of course, and Bogdanor freely
admits that the “most remarkable feature in the history of the monarchy remains the
skill with which it has adapted itself to changing conditions.” 37 This is something entirely
different from the invention of tradition, but it is made possible by the fact that the
monarchy is, to use Bogdanor’s words, “an institution of the imagination.” 38 As such, it
can be represented in any number of different ways by different groups and individuals.

Canadian historians, too, have challenged Cannadine’s argument about invented
royal traditions. For example, Wade A. Henry calls Cannadine’s view on national identity
“too narrowly focused,” and points out that he mistakenly links “invention” with
“falsity,” which is inaccurate. 39 He argues that Cannadine and, more generally
Hobsbawn and Ranger, “interpret the representation as having been consciously
contrived by a dominant culture in order to deliberately manipulate the attitudes and

37 Ibid, 302.
38 Ibid, 305.
39 Wade A. Henry, “Royal Representation, Ceremony and Cultural Identity in the Building of the Canadian
behavior of subordinates.” As Henry suggests, this is highly problematic. Certainly there is some evidence of this, but not all royal ceremonies are used to manipulate the masses. Instead, he argues, “Royal representation reflected the way in which cultural producers imagined their nation and their place within it.” As Ian McKay has argued, “Shaped by ideologies and social processes of which they were not fully aware, cultural producers did not conspire to falsify the past.” Henry extrapolates this point to include the royal ceremonies which typified late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Canada, and posits that “The version of the nation [the cultural producers] imagined may have reflected their social identities and, accordingly, served their class and gender-based interests and concerns, but their use of royal representation in building the nation cannot be reduced to simply a social control conspiracy.” Indeed, this was exactly the case during the royal visits to New Brunswick as various groups clamored for a place to bask in the reflected glories of the monarchy.

Were scholars to accept that royal ceremonies, like all other such ceremonies, were simply used to manipulate society, Henry argues, we would be ignoring the fact that there are multiple groups and ideas at play. “Taken as forms of symbolic communication” he argues, “royal ceremonies can be understood as hegemonic processes involving multiple social groups and interweaving a variety of

---

40 Ibid, 12.
41 Ibid, 13.
representations.” How else do we explain the apparent popularity of the monarchy in Canada through the first several decades of the twentieth century? In fact, it represented different things to many different groups, a sort of “unity in diversity.” Royal ceremonies and representatives “comprised a fundamental feature in national imagery and played a vital part in the building of the Canadian nation.” He notes that more recent historians have identified this notion of the monarchy as a symbol of national unity as a nineteenth-century phenomenon, whereas in an earlier period, royal ceremony was about the exercise of power. This change, Cannadine has suggested, was at least partially facilitated by the “invention” of ceremonies and rituals.

Even if one challenges Cannadine’s thesis about the invention of tradition, that there has been some evolution in how royal ceremonies are designed and carried out, and for what purposes, is beyond doubt. For example, Kenneth Munro’s work on Canada’s participation in twentieth-century coronations offers a Canadian take on a very British ceremony. Unlike Buckner, who has denied that Canadians have ever embraced the monarchy as their own, Munro argues that “As the relationship changed between Britain and Canada and became increasingly equal, so did the relationship with the sovereign change to become an institution deeply rooted in Canadian soil and one that has become distinctively Canadian.” For the dominions of the British Empire, their

---

44 Ibid, 22.
46 Ibid, iii.
49 See discussion later in this chapter of Buckner’s article “The Last Great Royal Tour.”
50 Ibid, 21.
perspective of early twentieth-century coronations was “ambivalent, because of growing aspirations for national status and internal politics. It was also somewhat colonial in the sense that recognition and participation at the centre was important for the folks back home.”

That perspective underwent an evolution, Munro contends, as successive Canadian governments sought to carve out for Canada a more formal role in Coronation proceedings. Munro argues that “Canada’s attempts at exercising influence over parts of the ceremony, her participation, and use of specific dress codes were all attempts at integrating Canada more directly into the [1937] Coronation service in order to root the Crown more firmly as a Canadian institution.”

Increasingly meaningful participation in four successive coronations, Munro concludes, “allowed Canadians publicly to celebrate their ideals as a people and reflect this “national” character to the world through a Monarchy which had become thoroughly Canadian.”

Certainly, this process of the “Canadianization” of the monarchy was particularly evident during royal visits, but the nascent literature on the history of the monarchy in Canada has said little about this, with the exception of Phillip Buckner’s work on the royal tour of 1959.

Historians have, of course, contributed more to the historiography of the British monarchy than a debate over Cannadine and the invention of tradition, and the body of research continues to grow. In 2007, for example, Andrzej Olechnowicz edited a volume of essays written by leading British historians which explore the reasons behind the continuing popularity and, indeed, the existence of the monarchy in an age (post 1780)

51 Ibid, 22.
53 Ibid, 42.
where the monarch has exercised less and less practical authority. The editor asks two fundamental questions: “What has been its function in the political and social life of the nation?” and “Why, for much but by no means all of the modern period, has it been so popular with its subjects?”

In a chapter on the historiography of the institution, Olechnowicz highlights the limitations of the literature on the modern monarchy until the 1980s, which was often lacking in critical approaches and excessively biographical (even hagiographical), as noted above. Jonathan Parry’s chapter focuses on the political role of the monarchy in Britain, and identifies it as a key symbol of national identity and a rallying point in times of crisis. Clarissa Campbell Orr’s essay focuses on the feminization of the monarchy, and she concludes that “perhaps it is the case then that in a constitutional – feminized – monarchy, royal women are better than royal men in combining elements of ‘feminine’ as well as ‘masculine role-playing demanded of modern royal persons: as Elizabeth II has demonstrated for over half a century.”

The chapter by Philip Williamson argues that the monarchy remained popular during the reigns of George V (1910-1936) and George VI (1936-1952) “because it became more purely the symbol and exponent of a particular set of public values, values promoted by
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55 Andrzej Olechnowicz, “Historians and the modern British Monarchy,” in The Monarchy and the British Nation, 9-10. When Harold Nicolson was being given instructions for his biography of George V by Sir Alan Lascelles, private secretary to George VI, he was told that the book was “not meant to be an ordinary biography. It is something quite different. You will be writing a book on the subject of a myth and will have to be mythological.” When he asked Lascelles how he should proceed if he found something damning in the king’s papers, he was told that his “first duty will always be to the monarchy.” Quoted in Olechnowicz, “Historians and the modern British monarchy,” 10.
almost all public organizations and respected by most of the general public.” Several of these themes are explored in this dissertation, and all have received little attention from Canadian historians.

The monarchy has been part of a renewed scholarly interest since 2000 in the British World, an area which has been the particular focus of scholars like Phillip Buckner and R. Douglas Francis. This is indicative of a renewal in the way the history of the Empire is researched and discussed. For generations, British Imperial history was taught focusing on the view from the Empire’s centre, but scholars in recent decades have turned their focus towards understanding the histories of Britain’s colonies and dominions on a more individualized basis, and within the context of their place within the wider Empire. Buckner and Francis have edited and contributed to a number of influential studies on the Empire in general, and of Canada’s relationship to the Empire (or, to use their moniker, the British World) in particular. Each of these collections has made a valuable contribution to the resurgence of academic interest in the British Empire/World, a topic to which academics had for many years, Buckner has argued, given scant attention. Among the research about Canada and its place in the British World have been several articles relating to royal visits and their role in shaping English Canadian identity and serving various imperial purposes.

An extension of this relatively new focus on the monarchy in the context of the British World is Philip Murphy’s work on the monarchy after the Second World War, a period which is characterized by the decolonization of the Empire.\(^{59}\) Other scholars, including John Plunkett, Neil Blain and Hugh O’Donnell, have examined the relationship between the monarchy and the media, an important consideration for any project seeking to understand how the influence of an institution can be successfully transmitted and transplanted to a far-flung Empire cum Commonwealth.\(^{60}\) Plunkett argues that “the growth of a mass print and visual culture in the nineteenth century was a vital influence upon the development of the British monarchy.”\(^{61}\) Certainly the same could be said of media coverage of the royal family in Canada as well. In addition, the way in which the monarchy was presented on public occasions and in the anglophone media in New Brunswick reaffirmed dominant ideas about the importance of the institution in the social and political life of the province.

Victoria R. Smith has focused on representations of Queen Victoria in England, India and Canada. She attempts to understand the ubiquity of Victoria, the queen who gave her name not only to an age but also to countless communities, monuments and institutions across the Empire. As Smith argues, in a reference to the oft repeated cliché about the sun and the British Empire, “It could be said that the sun never set on the queen, for no matter how far one travelled from the imperial metropolis, Victoria was


\(^{61}\) Plunkett, *First Media Monarch*, 1.
still there.”62 In particular, Smith highlights the fact that the “imagined Victoria, who bore little resemblance to the small woman who, in reality, refused to wear state robes, reflected the desire of late nineteenth-century Britons to see their nation as glorious and triumphant. The enthroned Victoria, the subject of monument and monumental drawings, was a Britannia-like figure, ruling the waves and the empire.”63 Despite the image of the “Britannia-like” Victoria, many more representations of the Queen “portrayed [her] not on her throne but in humble settings, caring for sick soldiers or visiting children.”64 Indeed, this dual image of the Queen is representative of the seemingly contradictory vision of the Sovereign that seemed still to be common even later in the twentieth century, as New Brunswickers and Canadians waxed poetic about a Sovereign’s majesty while also commending his/her deeply human qualities. This reveals to us more about contemporary society than it does about the regal individuals themselves. Smith’s work also reveals that “in the construction of Victoria aspects of consumer and imperialist culture, ideas about gender and class, discourses of nationalism and imperialism, and the practices of public memory are revealed.”65 For example, she argues that “Pro-empire Canadians found in Victoria a figure who personified the ties which bound Britain and Canada together, and which they hoped to maintain.”66 Victoria’s descendants occupied that role for those who maintained and promoted the Loyalist myth in New Brunswick decades after her death. For English
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Canadian women, “Victoria...functioned as the ideal role model for women who wished to play the part of good daughters of the imperial family.”\(^{67}\) During royal tours of New Brunswick in 1901, 1939, 1951 and 1959, the same characteristics were applied to three different generations of royal women. The way in which female figures, both historical and contemporary, were represented has also been the study of prominent scholars like Colin Coates and Cecilia Morgan, whose work on Madeleine de Verchères and Laura Secord has become a benchmark in the growing field of commemoration in Canadian history.\(^{68}\)

Wade A. Henry, mentioned above, has made a similarly valuable contribution to our understanding of the meanings of how monarchy is represented in Canada. Highlighting jubilees, royal tours, and coronations, Henry argues that each of these “figured prominently in the efforts of the state and civil society to define and unify the Canadian nation during this period of dramatic growth and sometimes turbulent development.”\(^{69}\) Moreover, Henry argues that royal ceremonies are more than just symbols. “Reflecting the attitudes and values of their producers,” he writes, “the articulation of royal imagery was also a means of attaching a particular interpretation of social relations, status, and authority onto the nation.”\(^{70}\) These Canadian celebrations were dominated by middle class males who “articulated representations of themselves, women, the upper and lower classes, and the monarchy in order to legitimize their
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social authority and consolidate themselves as a cultural hegemony in the new national society.”  

That is not to say that Henry suggests that the rest of Canadian society merely acquiesced to the way in which the male middle class attempted to mold these events. “In turn,” Henry argues, “women and the upper and working classes resisted these representations with images of their own designed to empower themselves.”  

For the upper classes, this meant ensuring that society at large recognized their elite leadership, whereas women and the working class sought an equal place in the nation.  

As Henry explains, minorities attempted to use royal ceremonies to “counter the dominant interpretations emanating from Protestants and whites.”  

Bonnie Huskins and others have touched on the way in which women and other minorities have sought to carve out their share of the public space. This phenomenon is discussed in each chapter of this dissertation. Overall, research on memory, representation and commemoration continues to develop, and stresses the many layers of meaning inherent in the public memory of Canada’s history.

Only in recent years have academic historians in Canada, some mentioned above, begun to consider the Canadian monarchy a specific topic worthy of serious academic research. For many years, most Canadian books on the topic were penned by amateur historians, or academics seeking to appeal to a popular audience. Robert
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Stamp’s 1987 book *Kings, Queens and Canadians: A Celebration of Canada’s Infatuation with the British Royal Family*, is, for example, a rather tongue-in-cheek history of Canada’s relationship with monarchy, even if does cover a large expanse of Canadian history without missing a significant royal personage in its overview. One of the first Canadian historians to give the monarchy much attention, Stamp also produced a popular biography of Queen Victoria’s daughter Princess Louise and her husband, the Marquis of Lorne, who served as governor general of Canada from 1878 to 1883. Pierre Berton and John Fraser, both respected Canadian journalists, have also produced books on the monarchy and its ties to Canada. Both were aimed at a popular readership.

Political scientists have made a significant contribution to scholarship on the monarchy in Canada. In 1976, Frank MacKinnon produced *The Crown in Canada*, which though far from a history is foundational reading for any student in search of a fuller understanding of the constitutional function of the Canadian monarchy. Writing at a time when the Trudeau government appeared to be sweeping the Crown “under the rug,” MacKinnon provided an explanation of what the Crown was, its functions, and why he felt it was important to Canada. He argued also that “always the Crown encourages both tradition and change. This is not the fashionable view, which tends to concentrate on the tradition but not the change.” Certainly, critics in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries have sometimes pointed to the stilted nature of royal tours of Canada, neglecting to realize that for the Prince of Wales to have played street hockey
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in Saint John during his Diamond Jubilee Tour in 2012 was indeed a marked departure from the items on the itinerary when his grandparents King George VI and Queen Elizabeth visited the same city 73 years earlier. “The Queen’s tours,” MacKinnon posited, “are major occasions which only a sovereign’s presence can provide. Official ceremonies, visits to institutions, and other events give opportunities to thousands of citizens to see a world figure who represents centuries of political tradition, national sovereignty, and contemporary international friendship.”

David’s Smith’s 1995 book The Invisible Crown is not an historical work, but, like many political science volumes, a political account with rich historical and historiographical overtones. While the usefulness of Smith’s book is limited in an historical project, it does provide some important insights, not the least of which is his observation that “The Crown has woven itself into Canadian life in distinctive ways – through its settlement and expansion, colonial government and federal innovation – that have nothing to do with an established church, hereditary aristocracy, or, even, a royal family.” Partly because of the lack of these trappings, which are so entrenched in the context of the British monarchy, the Canadian monarchy has been allowed to function in the background, attracting relatively little praise or criticism. Indeed, Smith observes that “[since the 1960s] the monarchy has been overshadowed by the quest to
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reform the efficient institutions of government and federalism.”

Instead, in the rare instances when Canadians have much that is substantive to say about the monarchy, it seems to be part of what Smith calls a “preoccupation with the reserve powers of the Crown…”

Meanwhile, most Canadians remain unaware that “The Crown is an integral part of a practical form of government, and as such it has a direct and substantive part to play in the lives of all Canadians.” However, Smith suggests that “for many Canadians, constitutional monarchy is seen either as irrelevant or as largely symbolic. Yet that interpretation severely underestimates its significance for Canada.” This again operates under a problematic presumption that Canadians equate the Crown (in this context, read monarchy) with the broader institutions of Canadian government. Royal visits serve as important reminders about the function of the monarchy at the centre of government, though the itineraries increasingly tended to focus on the more philanthropic and social side of the institution.

The aforementioned renewed interest in the British World in the early twenty-first century has been accompanied by a growth of scholarship on the role played by the monarchy in this relationship. As such, several interdisciplinary collections of essays have been released. In his introduction to the anthology *Majesty in Canada: Essays on the Role of Royalty*, Colin Coates emphasizes the centrality of the monarchy to Canadian identity well into the twentieth century. He suggests that it “provided the intellectual,
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literary, and cultural framework within which Canadians lived.” Reflecting the varied contents of this collection, Coates observed that “majesty in Canada is there but not there; Canada has had monarchs, but they didn’t belong to it. Nonetheless, the monarchy retained an ineffable presence, impressing tourists and Canadians – on occasion – and providing a link to a British homeland, for some. The theme of majesty in Canada offers insights into issues concerning symbolism and identity; it also reveals much about the nature of power in a North American colonial context.” The collection includes contributions by Philip Buckner, R.W. Sandwell and Keith Thor Carlson who analyze three distinct Canadian royal and vice-regal visits and their legacies. A 2013 collection also contains new scholarship from J.R. Miller and Stephanie Danyluk on the relationship between the Crown and First Nations, a topic with increasing relevance in the era of truth and reconciliation. The Canadian Kingdom: 150 Years of Constitutional Monarchy, the most recent collection of essays on the Crown, similarly contains a few pieces of historical scholarship on the subject, though much of it was drawn from previously-published work by historians like Barbara Messamore and Nathan Tidridge.
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Royal Tours Considered

In the past three decades, a number of valuable articles and monographs have emerged specifically on the subject of royal tours, both of Canada and of other parts of the Empire/Commonwealth, as part of the growing literature on the British World, commemoration and public celebrations. Most of this work has focused on tours of Australia and New Zealand. For example, Kevin Fewster set the stage for greater discussion of royal tours with an article in Labour History in 1980 which made important observations about the 1920 tour of Australia undertaken by the Prince of Wales.87 Fewster notes that the 1901 tour “helped set Australia’s course towards a closer imperial relationship when, if it had so desired, greater autonomy could have been won.”88 The same theme, Fewster argues, was prominent after the end of the Great War, when “the tours were also designed to...maintain the spirit of Empire.”89 There can be little doubt that the timing of the imperial tours of 1901, 1919-1920, and even 1939 (Canada) and 1947 (South Africa) was intentionally chosen so as to strengthen the bonds of the Empire/Commonwealth. By commending imperial subjects for past loyalty, royal tourists also helped ensure future loyalty.

David Colquhoun has written about the New Zealand portion of the same tour, which he suggests are “revealing about New Zealand in the immediate aftermath of the First World War. And about how New Zealanders saw the monarchy, the Empire, and
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themselves.” Like Fewster, he contends that the tour had a purpose beyond the post-war ‘thank you’ from a grateful metropolis. “Beneath that,” Colquhoun suggests,

was a deeper political purpose. The British Empire now extended farther than ever before, but to Empire believers the world seemed a more uncertain place. [...] Even the loyal dominions were beginning to assert their foreign policy. The Empire was eventually unraveled by world depression, another world war and new economic rivalries...[.] To loyalists in 1920, however, there seemed nothing that could not be fixed by more and better imperial propaganda. And a world tour by a popular Prince was a very good way to spread it.

The 1920 tour of Australia and New Zealand was just such an effort. That is not to suggest that the tour was a completely imperial pageant, for “There [were] glimmerings of a new national consciousness...in, for example, the new interest in settler history, the proud references to New Zealand’s war effort, and the self-confidence of returned soldiers everywhere the Prince went.”

Judith Bassett’s examination of the impact of the New Zealand leg of the 1901 imperial tour reveals some of the same themes highlighted by historians who have studied other aspects of that famous journey. As elsewhere, the official task of the New Zealand visit was understood to be to reward past and encourage future loyalty to the throne and the empire. As she argues, “the South African War had made the colonies a matter of more immediate concern in London.” Speaking to an element of boosterism, Bassett also underlines another level of meaning, and defines royal tours as

91 Ibid, 14.
92 Ibid, 30.
94 Ibid, 125.
“narcissistic festivals” which are “a wonderful chance to show off.” She contends that these tours provide an opportunity for a nation or a people to present to the royal tourists, and the world more broadly, a version of themselves: “An image of New Zealand crafted by the New Zealanders themselves was thus radiated and enhanced by the magic of the royal tour.” This argument has similarly been advanced by Buckner, who has written about the tour in the context of the stops made in South Africa and Canada.

The abovementioned scholars have said little about the existence of any opposition to royal visits, but Jane Connors’ 1993 article in *Australian Historical Studies* provides an insightful analysis of the conspicuous lack of opposition to the 1954 tour. Connors rejects the oft-presented explanation that the tour was successful because it was foisted on the masses by the government and the conservative press. Instead, she argues that no one can seriously make this argument unless they can prove that these two institutions could rally such enormous, cheering crowds for any other cause. As to an explanation, then, for the overwhelming consensus about the tour, Connors offers four possible explanations: 1) that royalty was outside the realm of acceptable targets for criticism; 2) that the monarchy was closely identified with “white supremacy, nation, war effort and family – all elements of working-class conservatism”; 3) that the Queen’s gender protected her from criticism; or 4) that the tradition and ritual of the monarchy
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still held sway in the wake of the coronation. Connors adds to that list her hypothesis that leaders of labour and Communist groups who would otherwise have gladly led protests remained silent because the recognized that the public was generally in favour of the tour. The same absence of opposition characterized royal tours of Canada until the 1960s, and even then the criticisms were levelled mostly by French-Canadian nationalists. In another article, Connors focuses on the extent to which regular news about the monarchy has, since the 1940s, become increasingly “confined to the women’s magazines...”, suggesting that this “all but exclusive association between royalty and ‘women’s issues’ has become normalized, and it is therefore perceived today than this has always been the case.” Though men could not argue that they were not present for the 1954 tour (during which three-quarters of Australia’s population is estimated to have seen Her Majesty at least once), their interest was apparently purely patriotic and academic; as for the women, their interest in the tour was explained by their fascination with the Queen as a person. Until the 1980s, these stereotypes, according to Connors, kept royal tours well beyond the interest of serious historians.

In an article published on the 40th anniversary of the same 1953-54 royal tour, Ewan Morris argued that “the monarchy has no inherent meaning. The meanings attached to it are social constructions which vary widely across space and time and
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between different groups in society.” ¹⁰³ Some groups, he admits, are more powerful than others: “the views of the powerful inevitably have a disproportionate influence, and also tend to dominate the historical record, but relatively powerless groups who receive these ideas can reject or modify them if they conflict too much with perceptions arising from their own experiences.” ¹⁰⁴ As several others have argued, “The meaning of events associated with the monarchy…is also a social construction, and as a result we can learn much about the society by examining them.” ¹⁰⁵ Further, “Such popular ceremonial activities, which focus people’s attention on the nature of their society, are not simply affirmations of social consensus or occasions for social indoctrination. They are opportunities for different visions of society to compete, albeit not on equal terms.” ¹⁰⁶ This is clearly a challenge to the notion of manipulated and invented tradition as put forward by Cannadine and Hobsbawn and Ranger. Finally, Morris suggests that the tour took place at a time when Australia was in the midst of an identity crisis, and that the people of the nation seemed inclined to celebrate what they thought was worth celebrating. As one newspaper commentator put it: “We don’t really put up the flags for the Queen, who would probably much prefer to visit Sydney incognito and go to the beaches, but for ourselves. The Queen is the visible symbol of the nation, and we are the nation; so we put up flags and arches for ourselves, and cheer ourselves like

¹⁰⁴ Ibid, 2.
¹⁰⁵ Ibid, 2.
¹⁰⁶ Ibid, 2.
There is certainly an element of this at play during royal tours of New Brunswick as well.

Somewhat like Morris, David Lowe suggests that in the early 1950s Australian leaders like prime minister Robert Menzies were anxious to exploit “the monarchy for certainties against which to balance the consequences of international developments, and for orientation amidst the exaggerated optimism associated with Australia’s future development.” He suggests that Australians were self-conscious about their future, and refers to the certainty of the British High Commissioner that the Queen was especially important in providing “a strong source of definition for the two groups he identified as central to Australia’s future, children and immigrants.” The government’s gamble may have proved a wise one, for Lowe says that the Queen “provided an undefinable unity in diversity,” a concept Wade A. Henry has also highlighted.

In addition to his important work on royal tours of Canada, Buckner has also contributed to the scholarship about the relationships between South Africa, the monarchy, and the Empire. As has been suggested elsewhere, the 1901 tour of the white, settler dominions and colonies of the British Empire (Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa) has long been considered a benchmark in the construction of

---

107 As quoted in Ibid, 13.
110 Ibid, 8.
an imperial identity in those places. There is little doubt that this is true for the first three, but the South African case is far more complicated, Buckner suggests. For one, the South African War was still ongoing, and parts of the colony were still fighting an outbreak of plague, when the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York undertook their short tour. Their time in South Africa was markedly different from the rest of the 1901 imperial tour undertaken by the Cornwall and Yorks: it was astonishingly brief, no South African war medals were presented, and a number of groups publicly objected to the tour. Buckner concludes that while “The royal tour of 1901 did not create the sense of an Imperial South African identity among African whites…it did contribute to it.” Moreover, he notes that “while the royal tour reinforced the imperial identity of British South Africans, it reinforced their sense of South African-ness as well as their sense of British-ness.” More than in areas like Canada and Australasia, where there was never (or at least rarely) before the 1960s any real threat to the centrality of the Crown to national identity, South Africa’s situation was significantly more complicated.

Hilary Sapire and John Lambert have also contributed to the scholarly work on the monarchy in South Africa. The 1947 tour by King George and his immediate family, like its predecessor in 1901, took place during a time of tension and conflict. According to Sapi, the task of the tour generally was to “provide a means of
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associating [the Royal Family] with the empire, to parade the symbols of imperial hierarchy before the subjects of empire, and allow them the chance to display their loyalty.” She notes, however, that “the key aim [of the tour]...was to use the crown’s charisma to galvanize support for [the prime minister’s] United Party in face of an ascendant Afrikaner nationalism.” The very fact that the prime minister sought to employ this tactic is proof, according to Sapire, “that professed faith in the British monarchy as the embodiment and guardian of the rights and liberties of all peoples living under the crown was more widespread and long lived than is generally assumed.” In part because of the pro-Apartheid nationalist party’s victory in the general election the following year, “the tour can be seen,” Sapire contends, “...as both a highpoint and the swansong of black loyalism.” For his part, John Lambert focuses on the “continuing links binding English-speaking South Africans to Britain and the Royal Family during the post-war period.”

Two additional articles have been published recently on royal tours among non-white subjects in various parts of the Empire. Chandrika Kaul argues that “Among the symbols of empire none had greater resonance than that of the British Crown.” “The symbolism of the Monarchy,” she continues, “became entwined with the symbolism of the empire and for it to work what was needed was the paraphernalia of royal
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Moreover, a “central vehicle of monarchical influence was the royal tour. This was not new.” Thus, successive Princes of Wales undertook tours of the Indian subcontinent from the 1870s to the 1920s, “acting upon the Indian imagination by establishing personal contact between the Sovereign and the people...” Sapire, in writing about the Prince of Wales in India and Africa in 1925-26, asserts that “proclamations of loyalty to the crown as a riposte to colonial despotisms endured well into the twentieth century.” Moreover, Sapire echoes what numerous scholars of royal tours have said about their function: “while a key aim of the tours was to shore up loyalty where it existed and to promote it where it faltered, individuals project on to them their own alternative understandings. The tours provided an arena for discussions about identity, citizenship, and governance...” In the parts of the Empire where white settlers were in the minority, these were particularly complex discussions. As in 1947, the 1925 tour provided an opportunity to proclaim the Englishness of the Africans, but also their African-ness.

Three scholars have explicitly likened royal tours to theatre. In 1973, Les Cleveland wrote about the nature of the then-recent tour of New Zealand in 1970. He refers to the tour as a “symbolic drama of community in which underlying principles of
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social and political order were reaffirmed and the changing nature of the relationship between New Zealand and the United Kingdom was discreetly sounded,” and as “a public relations exercise in which all the skills of a highly trained band of professional actors were employed to influence the impressions of a large mass audience for a number of obvious purposes.”\footnote{129} Cleveland calls the tour “a drama of hierarchy (one of four categories of social action in dramatistic theory), that is...an opportunity for the communication of significant symbols which create and sustain the relationships that are believed necessary to social order.”\footnote{130} Moreover, he maintains that “the primary function of British Royalty is to symbolize the integrative principle of order in society whereby its ranks and traditions are sustained, while at the same time striving to maintain the hierarchical structure of authority on which that social order depends.”\footnote{131} While illustrating the place in society of “superiors, inferiors, and equals,” a royal tour also presents “the community with an idealized version of itself...”\footnote{132} Finally, royalty has a “capacity for mounting hierarchical displays and through its power to evoke the expression of sentiments, values, and beliefs widely shared by many citizens.”\footnote{133} This is very much in line with what has been written by a great many of the scholars whose works have already been discussed. In their 2009 article, Stafford and Williams also make interesting observations about the royal tour as a piece of theatre, drawing on examples of the interplay between royal tourists and non-white subjects in various parts
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of the empire. “The royal tour is a performance of royalty,” they argue. The players may change, and even some of the symbols, but the purpose of the production remains unchanged.

In his aforementioned valuable addition to the historiography of royal tours in the British Empire, Charles V. Reed contends that while the royal tour was a political tool invented by the British government, “metropolitan society had no monopoly on the cultural construction of Britishness,” and contends that “The development and reception of the royal tours was not shaped along a single circuit between the metropole and individual colony but connected across imperial networks.” It is this “co-ownership of a global British Empire” that allowed both metropolis and colony to have a say in shaping not just the tours but imperial identity as well, and individual national identities by extension. “More profoundly,” Reed argues, “colonial subjects often used the forum of the royal tour to profess a membership in the political and cultural community of empire, inspiring – even if quite accidentally – the development of decidedly modern notions of political identity and belonging in the British Empire.”

**Royal Tours: the Canadian Context**

Much of the historiography of royal tours in Canada has been popular in nature. Many books and pamphlets have been published as souvenirs of royal tours in the immediate aftermath of these visits, such as the numerous small books of photograph

---

134 Reed, *Royal Tourists*, xxi.
135 Ibid, 14.
published in 1939, 1951 and 1959. Then there are the official histories, which similarly offer little in the way of analysis of their subjects. Still other books have been contributed largely by journalists and popular historians, most of which restrict themselves to attractive photographs and a pleasant narrative. Tom MacDonnell’s book *Daylight Upon Magic* (like Buckner, he could not resist the poetry in that famous line by Bagehot), is one of the very few serious books which examines the royal tour by King George VI and Queen Elizabeth. Throughout the text MacDonnell identifies a number of themes which ran throughout the tour, including the honouring of veterans, and he draws some significant conclusions from his reading of contemporary archival
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and newspaper sources. However, like most popular histories of royal tours, MacDonnell’s work contains little rigorous analysis of the 1939 visit.

A more academic historiography of royal tours in Canada has grown in recent decades, complementing the contributions of scholars in other parts of the Commonwealth, and particularly thanks to the scholarship of Ian Radforth and Buckner. Radforth’s monograph on the Prince of Wales’ 1860 tour of North America is the most ambitious study of any royal tour to have been undertaken, and has become a benchmark for other scholars in writing the history of royal tours. It examines how the tour was planned, who had a say, the tensions between metropole and colony, “and the meaning of monarchy for various groups.” Radforth analyzes the roles played by community boosters, who used welcome ceremonies everywhere “as a means of telling visitors and the watching world something about their community...” The same point was made by Bonnie Huskins in her article about ‘boosterism’ in Saint John and Halifax during the same tour. More importantly, Radforth suggests that the very presence of this desire of communities and their promoters to present a particular image to the world speaks to the reality that this evidence can be used as a “lens through which we can view the construction of identity.”
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and non-Aboriginal people alike,” he argues, “Native participation in the public performances provided reassurance of the ties of First Nations with the monarchy at the same time as it raised troubling issues of representation...”¹⁴⁵ In the context of twentieth century New Brunswick, Indigenous Canadians had a much different experience from this mid-nineteenth century example.

David Parson’s MA thesis, building on Radforth’s work, provides a fascinating glimpse into the cultural world of New Brunswick at the time of the 1860 royal tour.¹⁴⁶ He posits that “such a spectacle provides historians a rich opportunity to study the ‘text’ of city, colony, and empire created in the preliminary debates, evolving discussions and constructed monuments, as well as in the staging of many pageants and performances.”¹⁴⁷ Parsons focuses his own analysis “on the manner in which colonial society chose to represent itself to the Prince, to the foreign and international press, and to itself.”¹⁴⁸ A particularly interesting point made by Parsons is that although the great expressions of loyalty during the tour indicated a great enthusiasm for the monarchy and the heir to the throne, we must resist the temptation to assume “that a strong imperial identity and affection for the Monarchy was a constant element within the colonial culture of New Brunswick; after all, the colony was founded by Loyalist refugees...”¹⁴⁹ This, Parsons argues, is too simplistic, and “fails to take into consideration
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the imperial relationship and colonial realities as they evolved during the quarter century before the crowds gathered for the royal tour.”

Building upon the foundational work of Radforth, and on his own work on the British World, Buckner has produced a number of valuable studies of royal tours of Canada. He argues that, “for two generations of Canadians these tours were among the most important public events to take place in their lifetime. Yet one looks in vain for even a brief mention of either tour in most modern studies of Canada.” He suggests several explanations for this dearth of attention, as several of the historians already highlighted have done. Firstly, Buckner argues that the lack of scholarly attention paid to royal tours “reflects the obsession of Canadian historians with the evolution of Canadian national identity. Particularly since the 1950s Canadian historians have been concerned with documenting the transition of Canada from colony to nation and the creation by Canadians of a set of national symbols distinct from those of the United Kingdom.” Several other scholars, it will be noted, have argued to the contrary, that the tours themselves were instrumental in the construction of a national identity, just one that embraced Canada’s British heritage and imperial connection. Secondly, Buckner suggests that the absence of scholarly attention paid to these tours is reflective of the monarchy’s irrelevance to most modern day Canadians.
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Cannadine’s thesis about the invention of tradition “cannot adequately explain the depth of popular support for an institution like the British monarchy.”\textsuperscript{155} “Indeed,” he continues, “the key agency that led the monarchy to expand its ceremonial performances so dramatically in the 1840s and to reach out for greater popular support was neither the royal family nor their advisers, who were drawn from the highest echelons of the aristocracy, but ‘pressure from without’ that came from much lower in the social hierarchy.”\textsuperscript{156}

The greatest proof of the ‘pressure from without’ argument is in the fact that “the real pressure for the [1860 and 1901] tours came from the colonial – not the imperial – authorities, and that the colonial politicians had their own agendas.”\textsuperscript{157} Queen Victoria was not keen about either of these tours, and in both cases had to be coerced by her ministers. As Charles Reed has said, “the Queen was always a reluctant partner in royal visits.”\textsuperscript{158} After Victoria’s death, her successor was equally reticent to allow the 1901 tour by his son to go ahead. We have, therefore, to dispel the notion that the Prince of Wales in 1860, and the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York in 1901, were sent on their imperial adventures solely by a manipulative metropolis bent on closer imperial unity and the indoctrination of imperial values. If they did embrace the opportunity when it was afforded to them, we must also remember that “British North American politicians, regardless of their ideological views, eagerly sought to

\textsuperscript{155} Ibid, 20
\textsuperscript{156} Ibid, 20.
\textsuperscript{157} Ibid, 23.
\textsuperscript{158} Reed, Royal Tourists, 27.
appear on the platform with Edward to bathe in his reflected glory and popularity. Even ethnic origin was no barrier. ”

Buckner, like others, is at a loss to definitively explain the apparent enormous popularity of royal tours in this era, though he does offer some possible explanations. One cannot, he argues, explain the crowds simply by citing either “curiosity [or] manipulation” – both are inadequate. However, he suggests, “the openness of the tours to anyone who was prepared to proclaim their loyalty to the monarchy allowed for a vast diversity of voices...even if their ability to participate in the ceremonies was decidedly unequal and the meanings they took from their participation were very different.” In this, Buckner is in agreement with the majority of scholars of modern royal tours. Furthermore, Canadians sought to make aspects of the two tours uniquely Canadian, and in so doing invented certain traditions, “and once again they sought to combine their imperial identity with their Canadian identity.” The “popular royalist” sentiment which was so prominent on both occasions were not, he argues, a creation of the tours; instead, the tours “could only reflect it.” Buckner has also weighed in on royal tours in the post war period, characterizing the 1957 and 1959 tours as initiatives on the part of prime minister John Diefenbaker to make Canadians realize that

---

162 Ibid, 33. This was not unreasonable. See for example: Berger, The Sense of Power; Colin Coates, ed., Imperial Canada, 1867-1917 (Edinburgh: Centre of Canadian Studies, 1997).
163 Buckner, “The Invention of Tradition?,” 35.
“Elizabeth was their Queen, and that she was, in fact as well as in theory, Queen of Canada.”

This dissertation builds upon several of these Canadian and international studies of royal tours in Canada, and it also addresses previously unanswered questions. For example, the ceremonial place of women during these visits has been studied in the Australian context, but not in any great detail in Canada. Similarly, because the Loyalist myth was so pervasive in New Brunswick (and unique only to New Brunswick and Ontario), it has not been a subject of much scrutiny of tours generally. Additionally, unlike the work of Radforth and Buckner, it provides a comparative analysis of five such visits, charting change and continuity over a sixty year period during which Canada’s Imperial relationship, and the place of women and other minority groups, underwent significant changes.

**Britishness and Commemoration**

In addition to the expanding literature on monarchy and royal tours, this dissertation is grounded in the historiographies of Britishness and commemoration, both of which continue to grow. Much of the most valuable work on Britishness and the British World has been already cited (the several collections of essays edited by Buckner and Francis), but other important scholars have also emerged in the field, and they have acknowledged the significance that many English-speaking Canadians placed on the centrality of British institutions and traditions in their own world. All of this, of course,

---

164 Buckner, “The Last Great Royal Tour,” 69.
builds upon the work completed nearly five decades ago by Carl Berger on imperialism in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In fact, as a reflection of the impact of Berger’s work, the study of imperialism in Canada until very recently focused on the period between Confederation and 1917. For example, an important collection of papers edited by Colin Coates was titled *Imperial Canada, 1867-1917*. In that collection, Coates suggests that “Canadian nationhood would develop different connotations, ones that would focus less on the connections between Britain and Canada, and on the British influence within Canada.”\(^{165}\) However, more recent scholarship has shed light upon the persistence of the sense of Britishness well beyond the end of the Great War.

Similarly, the literature on the British World and Britishness is indebted to Benedict Anderson’s theory of the imagined community, which suggests “that nationality, or, as one might prefer to put it in view of that word’s multiple significations, nation-ness, as well as nationalism, are cultural artefacts of a particular kind.”\(^{166}\) More specifically, Anderson has referred to the nation as “an imagined political community.”\(^{167}\) That is to say, the ways in which Canadians (or Britishers, Germans, or New Brunswickers) perceive their community are often artificial and molded and manipulated by a variety of forces, specifically nationalism. As Anderson has written, “It is imagined because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives


\(^{167}\) Ibid, 6.
the image of their communion.\textsuperscript{168} It is arguably this type of phenomenon which inspires tens of thousands of Canadians – from different provinces, different ethnic and linguistic groups, and different social classes – to don red and white each 1 July, wave their maple lead flags, and wax poetic about the glories of their shared nationalism. Certainly, the New Brunswick which was in evidence during royal visits between 1901 and 1959 (anglophone and of Loyalist origin), was very much an imagined community, in the same way that the British World to which so many New Brunswickers felt they belonged (although they would not have used that term) was an imagined community which crossed international boundaries. The great advantage of an imagined community is its flexibility, which may account for how Irish and Acadians New Brunswickers, and indeed anglophones of non-British ancestry more generally, found themselves part of what appears to have been a pro-monarchy and pro-Empire community. Anderson has, predictably, not been without his critics, some of whom have “rightly criticized...his unitary notion of the ‘nation,’ but ultimately his seminal book provides a basis for a broader understanding of how societies create boundaries and myths in an attempt to identify a common national history and identity for their people.\textsuperscript{169}

The imagined community of the British World has inspired a variety of valuable studies. In one such study, Kurt Korneski has examined the place of Britishness in Winnipeg at the turn of the twentieth century, a time when the city was experiencing

\textsuperscript{168} Ibid.
immense growth and rapid diversification. In the context of New Brunswick, the work of Don Nerbas has illustrated the important role played by Britishness in the 1930s and 1940s. For example, Howard Robinson, a prominent businessman and newspaper owner, believed in the benefits to Canada afforded by British institutions and traditions, and his world view was shaped by this belief. Two notable monographs by José Igartua and C.P. Champion examine the gradual decline of Britishness in Canada in the post-war period. Much additional analysis of the persistence of Britishness has appeared in the context of the expanding literature on commemoration in Canada. The eventual disappearance of Britishness as a dominant identifier in Canada may have been the result of increased diversification of the population, as well as the nation’s increased reliance on its southern neighbour. Understandably, Britishness would have had limited appeal among non-British Canadians as well as some newcomers; others, however, embraced it.

Given that so many national celebrations, at least until the centennial of Confederation in 1967, were imbued with British traditions and symbols, they present themselves as ideal case studies of Britishness. For instance, two recently released

---


173 These questions are examined at length by Igartua, Champion, Buckner, and others.
collections of essays, edited by Matthew Hayday and Raymond Blake, contain a variety of essays which speak to this, including the persistence of Victoria Day and Empire Day. These rich collections are the more recent additions to an expanding literature on commemoration in Canada, which has largely grown as a result of H.V. Nelles’ groundbreaking work on the tercentenary of the founding of Quebec in 1908. Since then, a growing number of Canadian historians have produced valuable studies of other national anniversaries and commemorations. In many ways, the growing body of work on royal tours, like that which has been produced by Buckner, contributes to this literature.

The rich literature on the monarchy, Britishness and commemoration provides a solid basis on which to build the chapters which follow, and this dissertation confirms many of the interpretations laid out by leading scholars like Buckner, while also adding more evidence to his arguments about the persistence of Britishness beyond the end of the Great War, while also enriching the debate. This study of royal tours of New

---

Brunswick from 1901-1959 explores many of the themes which have emerged from this growing, intertwined, set of historiographies. It would, moreover, have been impossible without the groundwork laid by scholars like Cannadine, Anderson, Berger, and Buckner, and others who have both challenged and affirmed their analyses and conclusions.

There is, naturally, more work to be done. Specifically, as the country seems to identify less and less with its roots as a British nation, there is ample room for further work on what role the monarchy plays in Canadian identity beyond the 1960s and into the 20th century, and whether or not it is still as linked to Britishness and the Loyalists in the way it was between 1901 and 1959.
CHAPTER 2:
The 1901 Royal Tour

In 1901, even if much about the province seemed decidedly Victorian, New Brunswick was on the cusp of a new century. The province’s largest and most industrial city, Saint John, buzzed in the late summer as officials prepared for the arrival of the first major royal visitors the province had hosted since the late 1870s. Indeed, although royal tours in the modern sense had largely been a product of the Victoria era, Canada as a whole had hosted few members of the royal family since the departure of Princess Louise from Ottawa in 1883.¹ When it was announced that the heir to the throne, the Duke of Cornwall and York, and his wife would be visiting Canada as part of an unprecedented tour of the British Empire, many Canadians threw themselves wholeheartedly into the preparations.

This chapter will examine reporting relating to the 1901 royal tour of Canada through the pages of several English-language New Brunswick newspapers, mostly the dailies the Fredericton Daily Gleaner, the Saint John Globe and Daily Sun, and the Moncton Daily Times. The press coverage of the New Brunswick portion of the tour suggests that anglophone New Brunswickers were largely enthusiastic about their royal connections, or at the very least excited by the presence of the son of the British monarch. The reporting chronicled the efforts on the part of various communities to

¹ Princess Louise, as wife of John Lorne Campbell, Marquis of Lorne, spent several years in Canada while her husband served as governor general. Their time in Canada included two visits to New Brunswick, in 1878 and 1879. Louise was preceded by the groundbreaking tour of North America by her eldest brother, Albert Edward, in 1860, and the less extensive and far less memorable visits by her brothers Arthur and Alfred.
present a version of themselves to the world which they were given the chance to mold and to develop according to their own (perceived) best interests. For that reason, New Brunswick, like other stops on the 1901 tour, was afforded an opportunity to show the royal visitors, their entourages, the press, and the Dominion, what the province’s elite wanted the province to be noted for and to represent. This “boosterism” was not uncommon in the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Maritimes, and it continues even today.²

As with all royal tours and with other ceremonial occasions, however, there are several layers of meaning present in each tour. This chapter (like the others which follow it) will examine the context in which the royal tour took place, as well as the details of the tour, but most importantly it will discuss these various elements of meaning. Like the other stops along the way, the province’s port city, Saint John (the only New Brunswick community visited), put its best foot forward as the city and provincial elite attempted to paint a positive picture of the both progressive and loyal nature of the municipality and the province. What the press coverage less consciously reveals are details regarding contemporary attitudes about New Brunswick identities, the province’s place in the British Empire, the place of women in the public sphere, and a number of more ephemeral local issues.

The anglophone newspapers offer a vivid picture of the flurry of activity which filled the weeks leading up to the brief royal tour of 1901. In the *Daily Gleaner* alone, for the month leading up to 17 October 1901, at least one story about the visit appeared in every single issue, and the tour was often the focus of the lead story on page 1. The *Globe* and the *Daily Sun* were equally replete with news of the tour’s progress, as well as the city’s preparations. The *Daily Times*, however, more often tucked their coverage of the visit into the inner pages of their paper, which could be a result of the fact that, while Fredericton was the capital, and Saint John the only city on the itinerary, Moncton and its people were far from the limelight. As the day of the visit neared, however, and the focus of coverage was New Brunswick’s welcome to the royal couple, more and more pieces appeared on page 1 of the *Daily Times*.

The editors of these papers were not merely reporting the progress of the tour, however, for dispatches about royal travels appeared in newspapers all over the world. By detailing the preparations for and execution of the visit, and by including human interest stories and editorial comment, and even by engaging in debate over local issues, they revealed details about the various layers of meaning aforementioned. Some themes are more obvious than others, but the object this chapter is to highlight the various elements present in the newspaper record for the fall of 1901.

---

3 The global media network had evolved to such an extent by this time that readers of newspapers in all corners of the British Empire and beyond could follow the progress of a royal tour without too great a delay.
The Context

At the time of the 1901 census, there were 331,120 people living in New Brunswick, of whom 300,460 were born in the province. The vast majority of others were born either elsewhere in Canada (12,718), the British Isles (10,226), or the United States (5,477). In some counties, like Sunbury and Queens, Gloucester or Kent, only a few hundred citizens were born outside the province. The largest proportion of immigrants resided in Saint John city and county (5,663, or ten percent of the population). Of the provincial immigrant community, 4,625 or thirty five percent were born in Ireland.\(^4\) In religious terms, the province was divided. The Roman Catholics represented the largest single Christian denomination at 125,698 adherents, whereas Baptists, Anglican, Presbyterians and Methodists numbered 80,874, 41,767, 39,496, and 35,973, respectively; the remainder of other Christian and non-Christian groups represented only a few thousand. In counties like Northumberland, Gloucester, Kent, Restigouche, Westmorland, Victoria and Saint John, Roman Catholics far outnumbered any other denomination.\(^5\) These were the areas of the province which boasted the largest concentrations of French and Irish. Despite the large minorities of both francophones and Roman Catholics, power in New Brunswick at the turn of the twentieth century still rested firmly in the hands of the English-speaking, largely Protestant, elite. The 1880s were, however, also characterized by the Acadian

\(^5\) Ibid, 144, 160-166. In counties including Gloucester and Northumberland, the number of Roman Catholics far exceeded the total number of other Christians.
Renaissance, and a number of Acadian leaders emerged from that period who would play a role in culturo-linguistic politics of the early twentieth century.6

The royal tour of 1901 took place on the threshold of a new century and towards the end of an Imperial war in South Africa. And yet, it was also a product of the end of the nineteenth century. In the Maritimes, the last decades of that century had been characterized by developments both encouraging and frustrating. The effects of John A. Macdonald’s National Policy, rolled out following the 1878 election, had delivered only a piecemeal and superficial boom to the region. There were success stories, of course, such as those of the cotton industry which had rapidly expanded in Milltown, Marysville and Moncton, though even as early as the 1890s it had suffered setbacks from which it struggled to recover; in other sectors, the loss of ownership to outside interests was already becoming an issue.7 No commercial export market developed for the province’s agricultural output, which was significant, and while there were gains in the fishing and forestry industries, they were not commensurate with those experienced in the rest of Canada.8 Moreover, as was the case in New Brunswick for the whole of the twentieth century, there was great disparity in the 1890s between the urban metropolises of Saint John and Fredericton and the more rural communities.9 At the beginning of the decade, one fifth of the provincial population resided in Saint John, which is likely partly the

8 Ibid, 134-135.
9 Ibid, 119.
explanation for why that city was privileged over Fredericton in the itinerary for the 1901 royal tour.

More than three decades after Confederation, the region was still divided along ethnic and religious lines. Larry McCann has even suggested that the ways in which industrialization and urbanization spread enhanced these divisions.\(^\text{10}\) Certainly, there were tension between the Protestant and Catholic communities, and within them as well, as the case of H.H. Pitts reveals. Under Pitts’ leadership, in the 1890s a “concerted effort was made to divide the province politically along racial and religious in order to,” Michael Hatfield contends, “legislate British cultural hegemony.”\(^\text{11}\) Fortunately for the cultural expression and religious traditions of the sizeable population of Acadian and Irish Catholics, the movement ultimately failed, but its initial success is illustrative of the appetite among some New Brunswickers for such action.

The South African War that broke out in the last months of the nineteenth century had an impact far beyond South Africa. Canadians volunteered in respectable numbers for that Imperial conflict, as did their counterparts in other parts of the Empire. However, the war had a more far-reaching effect on Canadian society than just upon those who volunteered. Carman Miller has written extensively about the meanings which the South African War had for Canadians in his work on Canada’s participation in the conflict.\(^\text{12}\) He points to the validity of two common, though

\(^{10}\) Ibid, 138.


seemingly contradictory, claims advanced by historians: (1) that war is “a unifying force, especially in fragmented societies – an occasion to forge lasting memories and bonds of common experience; and (2) “that war can be divisive and leave bitter memories that shape the behavior and structure of civil communities long after the guns cease firing.”

Certainly, the war in South Africa was much more enthusiastically received among English Canadians, and particularly among the British-born. There were rumours of conspirators at work, trying their best to drag Canada into an Imperial war, but Miller insists that “Canada’s decision to send troops to South Africa was a form of home brew, a reluctant, politically motivated capitulation to the demands of Canada’s pro-war advocates...”

Phillip Buckner has sought to provide more clarity on this issue, challenging the traditional idea that Canadians in 1899 were misled by the pro-Imperialists. “If they were misled,” he asserts, “it must have been because they wanted to be,” arguing that English-Canadian newspapers were almost of one voice on the issue, even though they had access to the anti-Imperial rhetoric in the American press. Imperialists among the pro-war advocates, however, did spawn resentment among most French Canadians who feared the “centralizing grasp and culturally monolithic agenda” of the Imperialist movement, Miller argues. He rejects, however, the notion that all of French Canada was against Canada’s participation, arguing that, in truth, most French Canadians were

14 Ibid, 7-8.
indifferent, although a “small, articulate group...supported the Boer cause,” while the mayor of Montreal “actively supported the British.”\textsuperscript{16} The question of why so many English-speaking Canadians were so enthusiastic in their support for the war is another question, but Buckner suggests that it may have had a great deal to do with their firm belief in the exceptional qualities of British institutions. “While many English Canadians did not question the justice of the British position, but simply rallied to what they saw as a call for help from the mother country,” he posits, “many others supported the war because they believed it to be a just war, one which would result in more liberal institutions in South Africa.”\textsuperscript{17} More on this notion of British exceptionalism and of the concept of Britishness more generally, will be discussed later in the chapter.

The response to, and role of, New Brunswickers with regards to the South African War has been a topic given little attention by historians.\textsuperscript{18} The only significant work undertaken has been a non-refereed biographical study of the New Brunswickers who served in the war by Daniel Johnson and Byron O’Leary. Their research revealed that New Brunswick recruits for “G” Company (composed of men from NB and PEI) of the special Service Battalion of the Royal Canadian Regiment were raised primarily in Saint John, and that the province’s quota (90) was quickly filled. Surplus recruits were enlisted with “F” Company, raised in Quebec City, and which was unable to fill its ranks from the local population. These initial recruits sailed for South Africa almost

\textsuperscript{16} Miller, \textit{Canada’s Little War}, 14.
\textsuperscript{17} Buckner, “Canada,” 234.
\textsuperscript{18} For example, Colin Howell, says only that “As the new century opened, the Maritime region was abuzz with talk of war.” Howell, “The 1900s: Industry, Urbanization, and Reform,” in \textit{The Atlantic Provinces in Confederation}, 155.
immediately and underwent their training there.\textsuperscript{19} Later in the war, more New Brunswickers enlisted in the third and fourth Special Service Battalions of the RCR, and the province exceeded its quota for the recruitment of volunteers for the South African Constabulary, a force modelled on the North West Mounted Police.\textsuperscript{20} Several dozen New Brunswickers were attached to additional units, including the Royal Canadian Field Artillery, the Mounted Rifles, and others. For a province with a relatively small population, then, New Brunswick’s commitment to the South African War effort was clearly expressed.

Certainly, the eight thousand Canadians (a significant percentage of whom were British-born – well over half in some units) who volunteered for South Africa pale in comparison to the 600,000 who served in the Great War a decade and a half later, but anglophone New Brunswickers demonstrated their pride in their sons who served in the Anglo-Boer conflict, and memorials were erected across the province. Riverview Memorial Park in Saint John is the most notable, for while it contains memorials to several individual soldiers, the park itself was set aside as a permanent memorial to all the men of the province who had volunteered.\textsuperscript{21} Of the tributes afforded New Brunswick’s volunteers, however, few could have matched the bestowal of the Freedom

\textsuperscript{19} Daniel F. Johnson and Byron E. O’Leary, \textit{New Brunswick Men At War: The South African War} (1899-1902) (Saint John: Daniel F. Johnson, 1989). According to Johnson and O’Leary’s research, at least sixteen other New Brunswickers served with various other companies of the RCR Special Battalion, these in addition to the 90 men of G Company, the majority of whom were raised in the province.

\textsuperscript{20} Ibid, 14.

\textsuperscript{21} The status of Riverview Memorial Park was the subject of some debate in 2015 when plans were announced that would have seen the New Brunswick Museum expand their collections centre into a portion of the park. A stone monument with a statue of a private soldier atop it wearing a uniform which contains elements of various units is the focal point of the park.
of the City upon them just hours before the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York arrived on their tour, or the presentation of South African War medals to the veterans by the Duke himself.

Saint John, the only official New Brunswick stop on the 1901 tour itinerary, was a city of some 40,711 in 1901, of which ninety three percent were British in origin, and nearly half of those were of Irish origin.\(^{22}\)

**The Tourist and the Tour**

Prince George of Wales was born at Marlborough House, London, the second son of Albert Edward, Prince of Wales, and his wife Alexandra of Denmark. As the second son of the heir to the throne, there was little expectation that young George would become King. From the age of 12, he served in the Royal Navy, to which vocation he seemed well-suited, and would likely have remained at sea were it not for the sudden death of his elder brother, Albert Victor, Duke of Clarence and Avondale (known in the family as “Eddy”) in 1893. Eddy was a feckless character, and his untimely death may have indeed spared the monarchy considerable embarrassment down the line, but it thrust the young George into a position which he was not desirous to occupy.\(^{23}\) George’s wife, Princess May of Teck, proved to be a great asset to the monarchy, and throughout the reign of her husband as George V (1910-1936) and in her widowhood

---


\(^{23}\) As it happened, the feeble Eddy died shortly after his engagement to Princess May of Teck, a granddaughter of George III through his son the Duke of Cambridge. Queen Victoria and others had thought that the match would keep Eddy in line, as May was known for her devotion to duty and faultless good sense. It would therefore have been rather a waste to allow May to slip away, and so it was agreed that she should become engaged to Eddy’s brother, George, who was now second in line to the throne.
(1936-1953) she remained a pillar of royal respectability. For his part, George was equally committed to his life in the shadow of the throne, and later upon it, and has been much eulogized for his good sense and sound judgment during the Great War and the tumultuous two decades which followed it. In the years before he ascended the throne, however, George became well-known throughout the Empire as a result of his sojourns on behalf of his father.

In some cases, these expeditions were inspired by goings-on outside of the metropolis. For example, the South African War was raging in 1900 when plans for a royal tour by Prince George and Princess Mary were first announced, despite Queen Victoria’s misgivings about the whole affair. Following her death the next year, plans for the tour ground to a halt, however, and it was only under pressure from the British cabinet that King Edward VII agreed to let the plans go forward. What had initially been conceived as a tour of the Antipodes to reward Imperial loyalty and to open the first Australian Parliament, became a months-long Imperial progress the likes of which was only ever seen on one other occasion, following the Great War. It was therefore an almost unique experience, for royal tours in the nineteenth century were far less extensive in terms of distance.

Figure 1: The Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York at the time of their 1901 tour. (Courtesy Wikimedia Commons)
For example, the triumphal progress of the then-Prince of Wales (and later Edward VII) through Canada and parts of the United States in 1860 was extensive and exhausting, but it was restricted to one continent. Subsequent tours by some of Queen Victoria’s other offspring were even more subdued. What George and Mary undertook was a “round the world” journey of epic proportions for a royal couple.

The New Brunswick portion of the 1901 royal visit took place at the end of a long and drawn out coast-to-coast tour of Canada, and following an even more arduous Imperial progress that took the Duke and Duchess to the far reaches of the British Empire. It all began in the middle of March 1901, less than two months after the death of Queen Victoria, when the Royal party embarked upon HMS Ophir at Portsmouth. Over the course of the following six months, the Ophir made calls at Gibraltar, Mala, Egypt, India, Ceylon, Singapore, Australia, New Zealand, Mauritius and South Africa. The great moments were of course in the emerging dominions of Australia (where the Duke opened the new Parliament), New Zealand, and South Africa. Events on the itinerary in the latter place did go some distance towards healing wounds caused by the ongoing war there. On the whole, according to civil servant and official tour historian Joseph Pope’s introduction to his account of the visit, “This tour afforded to the world at large a stately pageant, a unique spectacle, a royal progress, of the like of which Caesar had never dreamed.”

26 Joseph Pope, The Tour of Their Royal Highnesses The Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York Through the Dominion of Canada in the Year 1901 (Ottawa: S.E. Dawson, Printer to the King’s Most Excellent Majesty, 1903): 2.
This observation, like much of Pope’s account, may seem a bit romantic, but there is no question that this tour was an undertaking of epic proportions for any member of the royal family. Indeed, nothing quite like it was ever attempted again. Even the Imperial victory tours undertaken by the Prince of Wales after the Great War were divided up across 1919 and 1920.\(^{27}\) The Duke of Cornwall and York, a man Kenneth Rose described as preferring statistics “to picturesque descriptions,” provided his own impressive summation of the long Imperial progress of 1901 when he noted “that he and his wife were separated from home and children for 231 days; and that during those eight months they covered 45,000 miles, laid 21 foundation stones, received 544 addresses, presented 4,329 medals, reviewed 62,000 troops and shook hands with 24,855 people at official receptions.”\(^{28}\)

The month-long journey by rail across Canada, which began in September 1901, was no less arduous than the previous six months had been. It commenced at Quebec on 16 September, and the busy itinerary took the Duke and Duchess on a continental journey which included major events in Montreal, Ottawa, Winnipeg, Regina, Calgary, Vancouver, Banff, Toronto, Niagara Falls, Kingston, Saint John, Halifax, and St. John’s, with many other stops of varying length in between. The local itineraries did not vary a great deal, as was the custom for royal tours in that period. Most municipalities made arrangements for a military review of some kind, an opportunity for the presentation of

\(^{27}\) The Coronation Tour of 1953-54 by Queen Elizabeth II and Prince Philip lasted from November 1953-May 1954, and although it covered parts of the Caribbean and east Africa, as well as Australasia and colonies in the Indian Ocean, it did not include Canada.

\(^{28}\) Rose, *King George V*, 45.
medals to veterans of the South African War, the presentation of official addresses, and meeting prominent local personages. In larger centres, time might be made for a visit to a local university or the unveiling of a local monument. Indeed, this had very much been the trend during the wider tour of the Empire.\textsuperscript{29} The brief stop in Saint John would be no different.

The royal train arrived in Saint John from Sherbrooke, Quebec, at 4:05 PM on 17 October 1901, and was greeted at the station by representatives of the provincial government, the city of Saint John, and the local organizing committee. The Duke then inspected a guard of honour from the 62\textsuperscript{nd} Regiment, St. John Fusiliers, before he and the Duchess moved to the Centennial Exhibition Building in the city’s south end for the official welcome ceremonies. Although a leisurely pace had been planned for this horse-drawn procession, the lateness of the hour necessitated that the procession “passed on the trot.”\textsuperscript{30} The royal party reached the Exhibition Building just after 4:30 and were there welcomed by the mayor, Dr. John Waterhouse Daniel, and aldermen before being escorted into the building. They took seats upon a dais and were greeted by cheers from the assembled crowd and the strains of “\textit{God Save the King}” sung by several hundred school children. The mayor of Saint John then read his official address, followed by Staff Captain Thomas T. Stokes of the British Naval and Military Veterans Association of Massachusetts, who read a joint address from the various English, Scottish and

\textsuperscript{30} John R. Hamilton, \textit{Our Royal Guests: a Souvenir of the Visits of the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York and Other Members of the Royal Family to St. John and the Province of New Brunswick, Canada} (Boston: Beal Press, 1902), n.pag.
Canadian societies based in the United States which were present. In between, mayors and other dignitaries presented written copies of addresses from their cities, towns and municipalities. At the conclusion of these brief ceremonies, the Duke made a general reply to all of the addresses before presenting regimental colours to the British Naval and Military Veterans Association, which was followed by a choir of school children singing “My Own Canadian Home.” Immediately after these ceremonies concluded, the royal party walked to Barrack Square for a military review and special presentations. Upon their arrival, the Duke presented new colours to the St. John Fusiliers, the local volunteer militia regiment, though a portion of the program was omitted because of the lateness of the hour. There followed the presentation of a Sword of Honour to a recently returned veteran of the South African War, and the conferral of medals to about 100 veterans of that same conflict.

31 According to John R. Hamilton’s account of the 1901 visit, the BNMVAM was organized in 1897, with the aim of “keeping alive the attachment to the home land, mutual assistance in time of need; a free bed in hospital in case of sickness, and quiet resting place after the battle is over.” The Association successfully lobbied for the enfranchisement of British subjects resident in the United States, and among the founding members was Canadian-born Lieutenant-Colonel Alexander P. Graham, a veteran of the Northwest Rebellion.

32 In military organizations, “colour” refers to a regimental flag which, traditionally, was carried before a regiment in battle as a means of identification.

33 “My Own Canadian Home” was published in 1887 in Saint John, NB, by its author, Edwin G. Nelson, a local bookseller, and was given several musical arrangements. It was known in the late 19th century as ‘Canada’s National Song.’ Widely sung in Maritime schools and played in an arrangement for bands, it was reprinted several times in Saint John newspapers and was included in the Whaley-Royce Edition of Select Choruses and Part Songs (Toronto 1912). Though its popularity had faded by World War II, the song was revived and adopted (17 Dec 1967) as the official song of Saint John.” See Nancy Vogan, “My Own Canadian Home: E.G. Nelson’s Post Fire Patriotic Song,” in The Creative City of Saint John, ed. Gwendolyn Davies, Peter Larocque, and Christl Verduyn (Halifax: Formac Publishing, 2018), 69-74.

34 The Fusiliers were a volunteer infantry militia regiment, and were later amalgamated into the Royal New Brunswick Regiment. The St. John Fusiliers provided volunteers for the South African War.
Following the military activities the Duke and Duchess retired to Caverhill Hall, their opulent temporary residence while in the city, to prepare for the evening reception. During this time, the Duchess received a deputation of prominent ladies of the city, who presented her with a mink and ermine stole and a mink muff. Following their period of rest, the royal party returned to the Exhibition Building for an evening reception which included a two-hours-long ceremony of presentations of the elite of the city and the province to the royal couple. At the end of the regular presentations, a special delegation was received from the Governor of Maine. The assembled crowds outside were treated to a display of fireworks from scows moored in the harbour and the streets were illuminated with candles, and electric and gas lighting.

The following morning, the Duke stayed in his quarters at Caverhill Hall, while the Duchess drove out to see the Reversing Falls Bridge, wearing the furs which had been presented to her the previous evening. She was accompanied by the chief and deputy chief of police, and because plans for the drive were not made public, there were few others who took notice of her. After noon, the royal party travelled to the railway station, where “[t]here was barely room for the carriage to pass between the lines of people.” After inspecting a guard of honour and the British American veterans who had lined up, the Duke and Duchess boarded their train car. They called up Lieutenant Governor Abner Reid McClelan, and Mayor Daniel, and presented them both with signed portraits of themselves to commemorate the occasion before the train

---

35 Hamilton, n. page.
pulled out to the sounds of the cheering crowd. Brief stops were made in Sussex, King’s County and in Moncton (leaving the car only briefly), where official parties from the two municipalities were presented to the Duke and Duchess. Later that day, they continued on to Nova Scotia.\textsuperscript{36} From there, the tour wrapped up on Newfoundland.

**War and the Military**

The South African War, which had not yet come to an end in the fall of 1901, was a recurrent theme during this Imperial tour.\textsuperscript{37} Given the enthusiasm with which many anglophone New Brunswickers had enlisted for service, this should come as no surprise. Indeed, a part of the Imperial nationalism which characterized the period, and which will be discussed in detail later, was concerned with Imperial defence. Bound up in Imperial history were stories of figures like Nelson and Wellington, and now Kitchener and Roberts. Throughout the Empire, patriotic speeches and public decorations and illuminations highlighted the achievements of Britain’s victorious generals, some of whom, like Roberts, owed their fame to earlier Imperial conflicts. In local communities, however, the focus was still often on their own native sons and their role in the South African campaign.

In Saint John, the war and its veterans were certainly a primary focus of the itinerary. On October 7\textsuperscript{th}, the Saint John *Globe* carried a report that a military review

\textsuperscript{36} The parish of Sussex was a small community then, as now, with a population in 1901 of 3,206 persons. From 1885 it was the home of Camp Sussex, the summer training facility for militia units in the province. The city of Moncton was a growing railway hub, boasting 9,026 persons in the same census. *Fourth Census of Canada, 1901, Vol. I*, 34-36.
\textsuperscript{37} The war would only come to an end at the end of May 1902, after the British and Imperial troops had crushed the guerilla units.
was being considered in that city after a similar display in Halifax was cancelled because of an outbreak of smallpox.\(^{38}\) This review became the venue for honouring veterans of the South African conflict, though the majority of the men present were members of militia units from across New Brunswick who were being brought in by train and who had not necessarily served overseas.\(^{39}\) The review also highlighted the presentation and consecration of colours to the St. John Fusiliers. Following the consecration ceremony, medals were presented to the Boer War veterans, almost exclusively referred to as “the South African heroes” in the *Globe*.\(^{40}\) Among those were about 75 veterans from the Fredericton area, some of whom were also members of the local militia.\(^{41}\) In total, about 100 medals were presented.\(^{42}\)

A special feature of the review, however, was the presentation of a “sword of honor” to Captain Frederick Caverhill Jones, who had served with distinction as an officer with the 2\(^{nd}\) Battalion, Royal Canadian Regiment during the war. A number of citizens of Saint John had purchased the sword for Jones, and made overtures to the Duke of Cornwall and York to present it, to which request Prince George acquiesced.\(^{43}\) Captain Jones was the son of the prominent Saint John brewer and one-time mayor, Simeon Jones, and it was in the Jones family mansion (Caverhill Hall) which the Duke and Duchess occupied for their one-night stay in the port city. The *Globe* said relatively

\(^{38}\) *Saint John Globe*, 7 October 1901, 1.
\(^{39}\) Some New Brunswick units, of course, were still in South Africa, as were New Brunswickers who had transferred to the South African Constabulary.
\(^{40}\) *Saint John Globe*, 17 October 1901, 2.
\(^{41}\) *Daily Gleaner*, 16 October 1901, 8.
\(^{42}\) Ibid, 17 October 1901, 1.
\(^{43}\) Ibid, 8 October 1901, 8.
Figure 2: South African War Veterans receiving their medals from the Duke of Cornwall and York. (Courtesy Heritage Resources, Saint John)
little about the actual presentation of the sword: “The Duke said but a few words as he handed the beautiful sword to the gallant officer who had so bravely done his duty throughout the war. He was loudly cheered and applauded.” More ink was spent describing the sword itself, Jones’ worthiness no doubt being already well known to the paper’s readership.44 That Jones was so singled out during the tour may be a result of the status of his family within the community, or it may be an expression of the pride felt by Saint John at the heroism displayed by one of their own in an Imperial war. Though nationally the South African conflict had been controversial, in anglophone New Brunswick there was considerable pride over the role which had been played by its young men in victories like those at Paardeberg, for which the Royal Canadian Regiment received much of the credit. The events at Saint John during the royal visit gave the people of the province an opportunity to express that pride in an exceedingly public manner.

Jones’ many comrades in arms were honoured by their city in a different way when they were given the Freedom of the City of Saint John by Mayor Daniel on the morning of the visit.45 This special ceremony, perhaps because it was of a municipal rather than a provincial nature, was not included in the royal itinerary but rather took place before the Duke and Duchess arrived. It is not possible to know from the

44 Caverhill Jones married in 1902 and subsequently had two sons, all the while remaining an officer with the local militia artillery. Following the outbreak of the Great War, he went overseas with the 115th Battalion and was invalided home before dying of cancer in 1917. Saint John historian Harold Wright has located a number of Jones’ military mementoes, including a flag of surrender from the Battle of Paardeburg, but he still hunts for the Sword of Honour.
45 Daily Gleaner, 17 October 1901, 1.
newspaper coverage why the presentation of the sword to Caverhill Jones took place during the visit while the Freedom of the City was conferred before the arrival of the royal party. A cynical hypothesis would be that Jones, as a member of one of Saint John’s most noted families, was deemed worthy of such special attention, while the rank and file of the South African veterans were not. What is probably a more realistic explanation is that the city of Saint John wished to link the presentation of the Freedom of the City with the royal visit somehow; moreover, since this was a municipal honour, it would not have been a natural fit for it to take place during the time the Duke and Duchess were in the city.

The focus was not solely on veterans of the South African War. The special relationship between the armed forces and the Sovereign was almost always highlighted during royal tours, as it was on many patriotic occasions, and the 1901 tour was no different. The military was obviously a major focus at the military review, but it also featured heavily in other parts of the day’s events. For instance, following the traditional gun salutes as the royal party alighted from the royal train and a procession to the Exhibition Building, the Duke heard addresses from the City of Saint John and a joint address from the English, Scottish and Canadian veterans’ societies. All other addresses, including those from Fredericton, were simply presented to the Duke without being

---

read. In a single address designed to serve as a reply to all, the Duke made special reference to the British Veterans’ Association: “I am glad to find from the kind words of the address from the British societies and residents in Boston that though they have transferred their homes to a foreign land their hearts still beat in sympathy for the aspirations and ideals of the Empire of their birth.” Following this reply, the Duke presented colours to the British Navy and Army Veterans’ Association before being whisked off the Barrack Green for the presentation of Colours to the 62nd Saint John Fusiliers militia unit and the other aforementioned military events. The inclusion of the BNAVA in the official proceedings suggests that the bonds of Empire could still reach across boundaries, even into the republican United States.

In addition, various militia regiments were given the task of providing guards of honour, as well as guard duty at Caverhill Hall. Indeed, so anxious were the organizers and military and militia members to make an impressive appearance in Saint John that the Gleaner reported on 17 October “There are but two men, non commissioned officers left in charge of the military depot [at Fredericton], all the other being in Saint John. There is not a man in hospital. The two men left here in charge are Corp. Tanner

48 Ibid, 19 October 1901, 3. Two days later, on 19 October, the Gleaner revealed in an editorial that the provincial government had announced that it intended to pay the travel expenses of the members of the British Naval and Military Veterans’ Association contingent. The consecration and presentation of colours to the 62nd was the event given the greatest attention by the Saint John Globe. Presided over by the Anglican Bishop of Fredericton, full details of the service appeared in the Globe, including the prayers offered and hymns sung; the choir of Trinity Anglican Church, 45 members in all, participated in the service. At the conclusion of the consecration, the King’s Colour was presented by the Duke and the Regimental Colour by his Duchess, whereupon they were taken back to the regiment as the massed bands played “God Save The King.” See Saint John Globe, 17 October 1910, 2.
49 Saint John Globe, 7 October 1901, 1.
and Corp. Miles.” Given the miniscule size of the Canadian Army in 1901, it is not surprising that an event like the royal visit should have been so taxing on their human resources. The annual report of the Minister of Militia and Defence for 1901 revealed that the permanent force of the fledgling Canadian army was 960, and that only 779 men were on strength as of 31 December 1901. The general officer commanding this force asked in the same report for an increase to bring the army’s permanent strength up to 1500.50

Local Issues

A significant portion of the coverage given over to royal tours was focused on local issues, ranging from decorations and procession routes, to debates over the itinerary and public accessibility. The coverage of the weeks leading up to the Saint John stop of the 1901 tour in the pages of the Globe and the Daily Sun includes a significant amount of discussion of local issues plaguing the organizers. The most significant of all was the news which reached the city on September 19th which informed the mayor that elaborate preparations being made at the MacNutt and Jones mansions would not be required after all.51 These two prominent local families had offered up their already elegant homes to be improved and outfitted with the very best of furnishings and decor to make them fit for a future king and queen. The Globe defended the decision,

50 Department of Militia and Defence for the Dominion of Canada: Report for the Year Ended December 1901 (Ottawa: S.E. Dawson, Printer to the King’s Most Excellent Majesty, 1902): 43, 21.
51 Two of the city’s most impressive homes landmarks, the residences of Peter Stewart MacNutt (a prominent Prince Edward Island-born Saint John merchant) and Robert Keltie Jones (a brewer and member of one of the city’s most prominent families – and the father of Caverhill Jones) were volunteered by their owners for use by the vice-regal and royal parties, respectively.
attributed to the royal couple, to stay aboard the royal train for the duration of the Canadian tour so as to avoid the tedious task of unloading and reloading the royal baggage at every overnight stop: “The special train provided for them is such a luxuriant and comfortable affair, and living in it will be so much more convenient...” The reporter continued:

The festivities arranged for St. John – military and civil – will require several changes of costume by the Duke and his suite. It will easily be seen that these can much more easily be made at the train, where each member of the party will have his or her own apartments, than they could at the private houses, to which all their wardrobes would have to be transferred and where none would be familiar with the house arrangements.52

In any case, the newspapers did not seem to be optimistic that plans would change. The Daily Sun reported merely that “Mr. Robertson has gone through to Ottawa, and will exert every possible effort to induce their highnesses to change their minds and take up their abode at the palatial residences here which the provincial government are fitting up for them.”53 That the city of Saint John wished for the royal tourists to stay in these extravagant homes suggests that the city elite saw the tour as an opportunity to engage in “boosterism.” Both Saint John and Halifax engaged in the same activity during the 1860 royal tour, during which they each sought to put on display all that was impressive and progressive about their municipalities.54 At the MacNutt and Jones mansions, then, not only would the royal and vice-regal parties be treated to comfortable surroundings,

52 Saint John Globe, 19 October 1901, 8.
53 Daily Sun, 20 September 1901, 5.
but visitors and journalists alike would see the material progress of the city and spread the word in their own communities and publications. Highlighting the two mansions may also have gone some distance towards reinforcing the social exclusivity of the tour.

In a surprising turn of events, the decision not to use the two mansions was later reversed. On 27 September, the Globe reported that the original plans for the Jones and MacNutt houses to be used as royal and vice-regal residences had been restored. That was, in one sense, great news for Saint John, and especially its elites, for it meant an opportunity to show off to the royal party and the press the impressive homes of the city’s leading men. In a more practical sense, it was fraught with difficulties:

...now that the original plans have been reverted to with regard to the royal visit in St. John, there will be some difficulty in getting [the Jones] house finished in the time at first stated. Five of the men who worked on [the house] up to the official notification upsetting the first arrangements are now painting on another job...All the local government is doing on the house is decorating the dining room, the royal bed chamber and making a few other changes. Mr. Jones is painting and handsomely decorating the remainder of the big house, and already has given out work to the extent of eight hundred dollars.55

As the Daily Sun expressed, “[the] time to get ready is considerably shorter than it was when the committee last had the matter in hand.”56 Despite the time crunch, however, work on the royal and vice-regal residences was completed on time and to the great satisfaction of the Globe. On the second day of the visit, the Globe carried engravings of both mansions, alongside incredibly detailed descriptions of their interior decoration, on

55 Saint John Globe, 28 September 1901, 1.
56 Daily Sun, 28 September 1901, 4.
There is no indication that John V. Ellis, editor of the *Globe*, had any qualms with the expenses being incurred during the renovations:

New carpets and curtains will be placed in the house for the day the Duke and Duchess are in the city. After the regal visitors depart, the carpets and curtains will be sold at auction. The bathroom in the Jones home has been tiled with costly tiles at its owner’s expense, but the other fittings – all new and modern – are being installed by the government.

Every morning and evening the lawn in front of the home is sprinkled, and this good care is being shown, for it is still rich and healthy grass. It would appear that journalists like many others anticipated the lavish expenditures, even for an event of such short duration. Questions of the expense of royal tours would not arise in the papers under investigation until the 1930s.

Other complications surrounding the arrangements for the 1901 tour found expression in the pages of the press. In some cases, they were class based. As early as 4 September, the local firemen in Saint John were reported to be in a disagreement with the Citizens’ Executive Committee because not all fire stations had been asked to send representatives to a meeting of the sub-committee in charge of a torchlight procession. In response to this, the sub-committee met and agreed to appoint members from the Carleton (west end) and Portland (north end) stations, but the firemen’s committee, out of principle, threatened not to participate in the procession at all in protest of the perceived slight to their jurisdictions. On 7 September, the *New Freeman* reported that the $1,000 which had been set aside by the local organizing committee had been

---

57 *Saint John Globe*, 18 October 1901, 3.
58 Ibid, 28 September 1901, 1.
59 Ibid, 4 September 1901, 4.
cancelled. The following week, on 12 September, the *Globe* carried a report that the South End Polymorphian Club had passed a resolution not to participate in the procession because they were only asked to do so after the disagreement with the fire stations. The following day, the *Globe* reported that at a meeting of the Portland Polymorphian Club, “Mr. Edwards declared that the Portland people felt that the Duke would one day become the king of the poor men as well as the rich. The reception to their Highnesses should not be a “four handed” show.” At a meeting of the organizing committee later in September, “it was decided that there shall be no invitations to the reception...but that all ladies and gentlemen costumed as required by the regulations will be received.” If this sounds democratic, one must keep in mind that the proportion of the city’s population which could have afforded to be “costumed as required by the regulations” was small. A follow-up note in the *Daily Sun* referred to “those who are desirous of attending in proper attire.”

If this sounds democratic, one must keep in mind that the proportion of the city’s population which could have afforded to be “costumed as required by the regulations” was small. A follow-up note in the *Daily Sun* referred to “those who are desirous of attending in proper attire.”
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60 *New Freeman*, 7 September 1901, 1.
61 *Saint John Globe*, 12 September 1901, 2. Polymorphian Clubs were a curious nineteenth-century phenomenon. Bonnie Huskins discussed them at length in 1991 PhD dissertation from Dalhousie University. Like the Calithumpians, which were equally a nineteenth-century oddity, the Polymorphians were burlesque theatrical clubs created expressly for participation in parades and processions. Huskins notes that the Polymorphian productions tended to be more ‘respectable’ than those of the Calithumpians, as the lower-middle and upper-working class men who dominated the former were possessed of a desire for respectability. Women were included in Polymorphian productions by the close of the nineteenth century. See Bonnie Huskins, “Public Celebrations in Victorian Saint John and Halifax” (PhD diss, Dalhousie University, 1991), 218. Saint John’s own South End Polymorphian Club even published a short newspaper, at least one copy of which, printed at the time of Queen Victoria’s Diamond Jubilee in 1897, survives. The Haymarket Square Club, also of Saint John, published at the very least a commemorative souvenir of the Queen’s Golden Jubilee in 1887. The same Club was responsible for the erection of a fountain in Haymarket Square in 1883, as part of the commemoration of the centennial of the arrival of the Loyalists. Several other clubs existed in the Saint John area, as well as in Moncton.
63 *Daily Sun*, 25 September 1901, 8.
64 Ibid, 28 September 1901, 1.
allegations were being made by people in the street. Certainly the Polymorphians boasted a number of working class members who may well have espoused such a view. In 1901, the power of the local labour movement was on the rise, perhaps more than in any other part of New Brunswick, and class concerns were on the rise.

The debate simmered on for several more weeks, for on 11 October the Globe carried the news that the Polymorphian Clubs were still making demands, including one that the torchlight procession not take place during the civic reception:

Mr. Sears did not think the royal visitors were coming here for the purpose of meeting the four hundred of St. John. They were coming to see the people generally, and those should have equal chances with the four hundred. Let all who could take part in the demonstration in their honor, and he would regret to have it occur while the Duke and Duchess were receiving the chosen few.

In addition to their concern over the procession, the various clubs were demanding financial assistance from the central organizing committee, which was willing to spend $200–300 per club. However, the Globe pointed out that the Haymarket Square Polymorphian Club alone had spent $1,000–$1,200 for the Diamond Jubilee in 1897, and thus $200–$300 seemed an insufficient sum for a royal visit. There is no evidence in either the coverage in the press or in Hamilton’s souvenir account of the tour to suggest that the torchlight procession went ahead. Successful processions were undertaken by the Polymorphians on the occasions of Queen Victoria’s Golden and Diamond Jubilees in 1887 and 1897, but this particularly colourful tradition seems to have been missing from

---

66 Saint John Globe, 11 October 1901, 2  
67 Ibid, 11 October 1901, 2.
the festivities in 1901, even if the “illuminations” and fireworks were reported to have been quite attractive.68 Whether the abandonment of the plans for the procession were due to the apparent snub of the Polymorphians and firemen, the city’s reluctance to grant financial assistance, or an entirely separate set of reasons, is difficult to determine.

The editor of the Moncton Daily Times also found cause to complain, however mildly, about the arrangements for the 1901 royal tour. As Saint John was destined to be the only official stop in the province, arrangements at whistle stops tended to be modest. These stops along the route of the Intercolonial Railway were brief, and probably tedious for the royal tourists, but were no less thrilling for the onlookers. Moncton in 1901 was a city of just more than 9,000 people, seventy-five percent of them British and twenty one percent French in origin.69 There were two such short stops in Moncton during the 1901 tour, one very brief when the train was en route to Saint John, and the other when the royal party was returning from that city en route to Halifax. As for the former, the reaction of the crowd was a little less enthusiastic than the editor of the Times had expected. The Duke and Duchess appeared briefly at the rear door of their car at the train station to greet the crowd which had gathered to greet them: “The cheer given was a little weak, but that was due to the fact probably that the people were not accustomed to seeing royalty everyday, and were slightly stage struck.

68 Daily Gleaner, 18 October 1901, 3. It is possible that torchlight processions, which had been common for generations, were no longer de rigeur by the turn of the century, but the fact that they had been part of the celebration of Queen Victoria’s Diamond Jubilee just four years earlier suggests that they still had some resonance in Saint John at the turn of the century.
The citizens of Moncton should try to do better to-day.” To be sure, the visit of royalty was not an everyday occurrence in Moncton, and the “weakness” of the people’s cheer may have been as much the result of awe as the editor suggests. Unfortunately, it only became clear at the eleventh hour that the Duke and Duchess would be at the station long enough during the second stop for the people of that city to greet them properly. On October 18th, the editor wrote that “in the absence of the mayor and other citizens who were taking part in the demonstration in St. John it has been impossible to prepare any apt reception.” There was, the editor believed, a silver lining: “But it may be that, after so much formality, an impromptu expression of our regard will be quite as pleasing to our future King and Queen as anything else could be.” In the end, the royal couple were said to have seemed reluctant to leave their car, “until the Mayor’s wishes were conveyed to them and they came out.” The Duke appears to have kept rather quiet, though the Duchess received two bouquets and asked questions of the mayor about population, principal industries, and other topics, as no doubt she felt obliged to do during many such stops.

For their part, the Times reported, the onlookers were likely somewhat disappointed. Despite the fact that “without any positive assurance that the Royal visitors would show themselves,” a “vast crowd” assembled. The majority of the people in the crowd saw nothing, however, unless they were in “an elevated position,”
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70 Daily Times, 18 October 1901, 3.
71 Ibid, 18 October 1901, 2.
72 Ibid, 18 October 1901, 2.
73 Ibid, 19 October 1901, 4.
74 Ibid, 19 October 1901, 4.
and “thus did Moncton see the passing of Royalty.”\textsuperscript{75} The writer referred to a “carpeted ring” into which the Royal party was led, the view of which was significantly restricted. This was not uncommon during official stops at this time, and lends some further credence to complaints out of Saint John that the elite of the cities were being given privileged access to the royal tourists. The only other criticism put forward by the \textit{Times} editor was of the plan for Duke and Duchess to ride in an American-built rail car while travelling on the Intercolonial Railroad. \textsuperscript{76} This perceived slight to the railway industry in Canada may have been keenly felt in Moncton, the home of the Intercolonial Railway shops.

Even the decorations which adorned buildings both private and public caused a stir in the pages of the press in one instance in 1901. One month before the visit, contracts were awarded for the “complete erection, decorating, illuminating and removal of three Arches...”\textsuperscript{77} Triumphal arches of welcome were a fixture of royal tours in this period, and they were common across the Empire. An impressive volume of photographs taken by the prominent Saint John photographer Isaac Erb at the time of the tour includes vivid shots of each of the arches which were erected in Saint John, and offers proof that they were no mean feats. On 10 October the \textit{Globe} reported the commencement of a beautiful double arch at the corner of King and Germain Streets which they indicated “promises to be a beauty.”\textsuperscript{78} But the construction of that same

\textsuperscript{75} Ibid, 19 October 1901, 4.
\textsuperscript{76} Ibid, 21 September 1901, 2.
\textsuperscript{77} \textit{Saint John Globe}, 9 September 1901, 2.
\textsuperscript{78} Ibid, 10 October 1901, 1.
Figure 3: The controversial arch at the corner of King and Germain streets in Saint John. (Courtesy Heritage Resources, Saint John)
arch came under scrutiny some days later when it was revealed that the work had been conducted on a Sunday.

At the turn of the century, business and leisure activities on the Sabbath were frowned upon by a strict Protestant community which banned non-essential pursuits. Catholics were generally more accommodating in their attitudes towards commercial activity on Sunday afternoons. In various parts of Canada, the Lord’s Day Alliance sought to ensure that this strict code of behaviour was adhered to. One report in response to the arch controversy indicated that in “several city churches last evening the matter was referred to in no uncertain tone.” The Daily Sun reported that the pastors of two different Methodist churches in the city were particularly critical, one of whom proclaimed from the pulpit “there is not bunting enough in this broad land to beautify a broken commandment.” The citizens’ committee in charge of local arrangements, given the occasion, felt that this criticism was unwarranted, and at a meeting on 14 October a resolution was unanimously passed which read:

Whereas, In order to provide further safety of the citizens, and for the stability of the arch which had already been erected on King street, it became necessary to continue to work through a part of Sunday: Resolved, That, in the opinion of this committee, the workmen were fully justified.

---

79 New Brunswick passed a law regulating what people could and could not do on Sundays in 1899, in step with much of the rest of the country. Exceptions were made everywhere, and according to Paul Laverdue, “The Roman Catholic Church discouraged manual work but little else.” See Paul Laverdue, Sunday in Canada (Yorkton, SK: Gravelbooks, 2004), 2.
80 In 1906, the Laurier government introduced the Lord’s Day Act, which prohibited the conducting of business on the Sabbath; the Act was only struck down in 1985.
81 Daily Times, 14 October 1901, 1.
82 Daily Sun, 14 October 1901, 4.
83 Saint John Globe, 15 October 1901, 2.
The transgression was therefore forgiven by city officials (though not by the Lord’s Day Alliance) and work was able to continue. The debate was thought newsworthy enough, however, to be printed in the pages of the *Daily Gleaner* and the *Daily Times*. In the end, eleven men were reported by the police “for desecrating the Sabbath.”

In a letter to the editor of the *Sun*, Thomas F. Fortheringham, Presbyterian clergyman and president of the Lord’s Day Alliance, indicated that his organization was “not organized for the purpose of laying informations and conducting prosecutions.”

Once the arches were in their finished state it was no doubt apparent to the public why it had been necessary to use the Sabbath to work on them. Certainly photographs give some testament as to the workmanship involved in their construction, but so too does the enthusiastic praise given them by an anonymous “English gentleman” reporting to the *Globe* that “they are the best he ever looked upon, and the detail with which the designers and artisans have worked out their ideas is quite refreshing. No hackneyed plans or old time designs have been used. Everything is novel and fresh alike in spirit and erection. St. John, at least, far outdoes its former efforts along these lines of decorations and greeting.”

The same article described the aforementioned King and Germain arch in detail:

> It is white in color, the four supports octagonal in shape, five feet on each of the eight sides. Each pillar is surmounted by a half sphere, upon which is a flag staff. The really beautiful effect of the whole structure is in the large globe, sixteen feet in diameter, surmounting the arch. It is painted after the map of the world with all the British possessions in brilliant red and these lighted by tiny
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84 *Daily Sun*, 15 October 1901, 8.
85 Ibid, 15 October 1901, 6.
86 *Saint John Globe*, 17 October 1901, 6.
incandescent. At night the whole arch is to be illuminated by electricity. [...] At night the hundreds of vari-colored electric lights and revolving sphere blazing proudly forth a ___ of red spots, will surely inspire a justifiable pride in the hearts of royalty and commonality alike.\textsuperscript{87}

Quite obviously, the city of Saint John and its boosters had gone to no small amount of trouble in orchestrating a memorable display for their royal visitors.

\textbf{The Fredericton-Saint John Rivalry}

Something which became apparent in the coverage of the 1901 royal tour was the still-simmering nineteenth-century rivalry between Fredericton and Saint John. The debates which will be described below are excellent evidence of the rivalry which thrived between New Brunswick’s capital and its port city at this time. The roots of this rivalry run deep and have their origin in the eighteenth century, when New Brunswick was first created by the partitioning of the old colony of Nova Scotia. At the time of the arrival of the Loyalists in 1783, Fredericton (then known as St. Anne’s Point) was a tiny and insignificant settlement along the St. John River. Saint John, on the other hand, was a growing port and military installation. Thus it was met with much surprise in Saint John (granted city status in 1785) when the colonial Governor, Thomas Carleton, announced that Fredericton would be the seat of government for the new province. Carleton argued, and probably for good reason, that the location was militarily more advantageous than Saint John, which had been captured by American rebels during the Revolutionary War. Indeed, so logistically unprepared was Fredericton for such an

\textsuperscript{87} Ibid, 17 October 1901, 6.
honour that the colonial legislature had to meet in Saint John until 1788, when the capital finally moved upriver.\textsuperscript{88}

Many of the leading citizens of Saint John had difficulty accepting this move, and throughout the nineteenth century certain factions in the port city went to significant efforts to have Fredericton stripped of its status.\textsuperscript{89} On three separate occasions, Saint John boosters petitioned to have the capital restored to Saint John, and Ged Martin has noted that “the theme of righteous restitution was never far below the surface of [the] various campaigns, especially as late as 1880.”\textsuperscript{90} This debate over the suitability of Fredericton as the capital of New Brunswick was a cornerstone in the foundation of the long-standing rivalry between the two cities. Martin notes that it “was not simply Fredericton’s location which aroused hostility, but the aloof and privileged conception of government that it was seen to embody.”\textsuperscript{91}

Saint John prided itself on its lack of pretention when compared to the colonial capital. C.M. Wallace, in writing about boosterism in Saint John in the middle of nineteenth century, states “Rare was the traveller who did not remark about the lack of a “courtly air” in Saint John, to say nothing of the disdain for it.”\textsuperscript{92} This was made

\textsuperscript{88} The best source on this period is David Bell, \textit{Early Loyalist Saint John: the Origin of New Brunswick Politics, 1783-1786} (Fredericton: New Ireland Press, 1983).
\textsuperscript{90} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{91} Ibid. The derisive nickname “The Celestial City” was given to the capital by critics in Saint John; Fredericton embraced it.
\textsuperscript{92} C.M. Wallace, “Saint John Boosters and the Railroads in Mid-Nineteenth Century,” \textit{Acadiensis} VI, 1 (Autumn 1976), 73. Local elites in cities like Saint John and Halifax sought to promote their communities in various ways, and having prominent visitors tour factories and civic projects was a common tactic.
evident during the visit to the two cities by Albert Edward, Prince of Wales, in August 1860. David Parsons has written of the debate in the province at that time over what to highlight. Saint John participants in the planning wanted to celebrate industrial achievements in the region (namely the recently-completed – and grandiosely-named - European and North American Railway line), while in Fredericton, “deference, rank, title and the importance of religious conformity were the cultural operatives.” Parsons went on to note, “Though in both communities the desire to host the Prince was strong, the reasons for and meaning behind the visit were markedly different.” The differences in the cities’ itineraries, indeed even among the reactions of their citizens, were representative of the struggle between liberalism and paternalism which, according to Parsons, characterized the differing attitudes of the two communities in this period. Further, the reactions of the press in the two cities is equally representative, though not surprising. After all, one Fredericton newspaper wrote, in 1880, “St. John...is not so important as its people think. It is not the whole of the Province.”

Characteristic of this long-standing disagreement, a faux pas which took place during the 1901 Royal visit to Saint John received much attention in the pages of the Daily Gleaner and the Daily Sun. A delegation from the Saint John Common Council showed up unannounced and unexpected at the Union Depot railway station with the expectation of joining the official welcoming party for the arrival of the Duke and Duchess. They were turned away by premier Lemuel J. Tweedie. On 18 October the
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93 Parsons, “City, Colony and Empire Defined,” 69-70.
94 Ibid, 80.
95 Quoted in “Fredericton versus Saint John.”
Gleaner explained the background to this embarrassing situation and came to the conclusion that “Obviously the Attorney General meant that they could appear somewhere else, but they appeared at the station and had to be told that their presence was not according to the programme.”96 The Gleaner, however, did not take pity on those members of the Council whose pride was thusly wounded. In fact, further examination of the editorial reveals that the Fredericton editor felt that this awkward situation was indicative of a larger problem:

The mistake was probably more fundamental than appears from the news reports. It arose from the impression St. John apparently had that the ceremonial was principally intended for St. John and not for the Province. That the Province was paying the bills was not to their minds an important circumstance, for St. John is quite capable of taking that as a tribute to their very great merits. Without expressing any opinion about these merits, which are undoubtedly very great, we may say that the reception yesterday was of a Provincial and not of a municipal character. St. John was chosen as being the most convenient place for the Provincial reception and St. John should be more grateful than it apparently is that it had the opportunities which the choice gave to its citizens. Some of the inconveniences referred to above arose from this misunderstanding and could have been avoided if the St. John committees had realized that their part in the function was after all a subordinate one.97

The editor concluded: “It was a snub no doubt, but they had brought it on themselves, and they don’t deserve much pity. Indeed in our opinion the only person to be pitied was the Premier who had to administer the snub to their rather exaggerated opinion of their own importance.”98 According to the Gleaner, Frederictonians could hardly be
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96 Daily Gleaner, 18 October 1901, 4.
97 Ibid, 18 October 1901, 4.
98 Ibid, 18 October 1901, 4.
expected to feel sympathy for the Saint John men whose pride precipitated their embarrassment.

The Sun, in contrast, was quite disturbed by the perceived snub: “Whatever the cause for the action of the government, the committee are naturally greatly aggrieved, and the proceeding has aroused much unfavorable comment throughout the city.” 99 

When the dust settled after the tour, editor Scott called Tweedie’s conduct “without excuse.” He went on to suggest that the snub “was a decided and unpardonable impertinence...” After all, “Who complains because Mayor Atkinson met the Duke and Duchess at Moncton?” 100 

Crockett, editor of the Gleaner, seems to have had other axes to grind, and, for instance, made even more of the apparent poor organization of the military review on Barrack Green:

An item in one of the newspapers early last week conveyed the information that no tickets to the Royal presentation of medals at the Barracks Square, St. John, had been sent to Fredericton people. Seeing that some 4000 of such tickets were issued it was not easy then to understand why this limitation was imposed on the citizens of the Capital. But the mystery has been cleared up. The committee rightly divined that visitors from Fredericton and, doubtless, other outside places would be going to St. John solely to see the Duke and Duchess. While on the other hand, the 4000 tickets would admit to a space of ground from which only the rear end of a couple of pavilions could be seen by the on-lookers. This has consequently, instead of being a slight, proved to be an act of rare consideration for the people of this city, and on their behalf we extend sincere thanks to the committee for their thoughtfulness. 101

99 Daily Sun, 18 October 1901, 8.
100 Ibid, 21 October 1901, 4.
101 Daily Gleaner, 21 October 1901, 4
From the editor’s description of events, the Pavilion which had been erected on Barrack Green was positioned in such a way that “It is not exaggerating to say that not one of the four thousand admitted...could see either the Duke or the Duchess...” The back of the Pavilion faced the grandstand, and its sides were shielded “by a private balcony occupied by a few officers’ favorites, of the one hand, and the Governor General’s pavilion on the other.” The frustration of the teeming crowds, having patiently waited for hours for the arrival of the royal party, came to a head when it became apparent that there was no good view to be had of the royal visitors from behind the barriers. The result was “a most disorderly scene.” The Gleaner described the “scene” in great detail in an editorial:

The people broke down the wire fencing or jumped over it, and swarmed into the space reserved for the troops. The result was that the pavilions, both of the Duke and Lord Minto [the governor general], were surrounded on three sides by an eager and determined mob some of whom clambered up by the railings and supports of the pavilion and peered into the faces of the Royal party and their suite. Others pressed forward in order to get a good view, finding the other impracticable and these had to be driven back over and over again by the troops with fixed bayonets. It is said that the Duke himself expressed his annoyance at this riot, and the ceremonies were cut short, so that the Royal visitors could escape from a well-meaning and respectable, but certainly unruly and intolerable mob. It is safe to say that ever after the disorderly intrusion, not twenty-five percent saw the Duke and Duchess and most of the minority who did, got the briefest glimpses of side faces and came away dissatisfied.

To be sure, a great many people were disappointed by the arrangements. The editor of the Sun was similarly disgusted: “The afternoon on the grounds was, on the whole,
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102 Ibid, 21 October 1901, 4.
103 Ibid, 21 October 1901, 4.
104 Ibid, 21 October 1901, 4.
unsatisfactory... Toward the latter part of the program the vicinity of the pavilion was a confused mass of soldiers and civilians all seemingly ignorant of what they were doing or what they wanted to do.”\textsuperscript{105} Whatever careful planning may have gone into the arrangements at Barrack Green very quickly unraveled, and the provincial media were unimpressed.

What seems to have angered the Gleaner’s editor more than this “outrage” itself was the fact that some of the press in Saint John seemed to ignore this disturbance in the program and to be more focused on the snub of the councilors at the railway station:

But we again remark that St. John is apparently more concerned about a petty thing as this occurrence, while it forgets that the public outside of St. John who pay the bills for the entertainment were not treated with proper consideration by St. John authorities. It may be, as St. John people apparently believe, that outside of St. John there are only country bumpkins unworthy of all consideration but St. John ought to cultivate the grace of being superior without showing their superiority too obviously. It is sometimes rather galling, especially when the inferiors pay the piper and St. John wants to call the tune.\textsuperscript{106}

This is not entirely fair, as the disorder was mentioned in the pages of the \textit{Daily Sun}, although an editorial suggests that “No doubt the delay in the arrival of the royal train was a great strain on the patience of the people, thousands of whom waited...from shortly after noon until nearly sundown before they saw the Duke and Duchess.”\textsuperscript{107} The whole affair seems to have touched a nerve with the editor of the \textit{Gleaner}, and an additional editorial was devoted to the debate surrounding this snub and that snub the

\textsuperscript{105} \textit{Daily Sun}, 18 October 1901, 1.
\textsuperscript{106} \textit{Daily Gleaner}, 22 October 1901, 4.
\textsuperscript{107} \textit{Daily Sun}, 18 October 1901, 4.
following day. Perhaps it was the democratic ideals for which Saint John was apparently well known that inspired members of the Common Council to assemble at the railway station for the arrival of the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York. That the local committee organizing the military review at Barrack Green would obscure the view of the royal party from the mass of the people seems incongruous with this theory, but then it is not a theory which has been empirically tested.

**Reinforcing Tradition and Boosterism**

As in other jurisdictions, a recurring theme in the reporting of royal tours in the anglophone New Brunswick press has long been the rehashing of stories and anecdotes about previous tours of the province. There are potentially two explanations for this trend. One could simply be that newspaper editors understand that nostalgia sells: readers enjoy reliving past events, and royal stories are conveniently on file. However, one could also argue that the constant references to past tours, both in the newspapers and in the planning of the tours, was an effort at the “invention of tradition,” or at the very least the reinforcement of tradition, invented or otherwise. The study of public spectacles and commemoration occasions owes much to Hobsbawm and Ranger’s theory about the invention of tradition, as well as to Anderson’s work on the building of “imagined communities.” One theme in this literature is that, during the commemoration of historical events, planners and boosters sometimes choose to “invent” an historical tradition for their own purposes. The memorialization and invention of a royal tradition in Saint John was part of the efforts on the part of the city to “celebrate Saint John’s role in a larger national and Imperial history.” This would later
be especially evident during the DeMonts-Champlain tercentenary in 1904. In the case of New Brunswick in 1901, the frequent references to the royal tours of 1794 and 1860 suggest that planners and newspapers were attempting to establish a long tradition of royal connections to the province.

Though the 1901 tour was only the fifth such tour in half a century, and only the second of any great significance, there were nevertheless several references in both the Saint John Globe and the Daily Gleaner to the 1860 tour by Albert Edward, Prince of Wales. As early as 4 September, John V. Ellis used that memorable royal progress as a benchmark upon which the planning and execution of the 1901 tour could be measured. He referred specifically to the way in which the tour was being planned, noting that far more decision-making power was vested in Ottawa than in New Brunswick, a marked contrast to the Prince of Wales’ visit 41 years earlier.

He reflected, “Perhaps all of this is necessary, inasmuch as the country has grown in greatness in the intervening period.” No doubt part of the explanation for greater control in the hands of Ottawa bureaucrats is the constitutional changes which had taken place in 1867: New Brunswick was a colony in and of itself in 1860, but in 1901 it was a small part of a growing Dominion. Like the rest of the colonies of British
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109 The Moncton Daily Times featured but one such story, on October 16th, and that was a reprint from the Saint John Star. Daily Times, 16 October 1901, 1.
110 Saint John Globe, 4 September 1901, 4.
Figure 4: A royal welcome from the Daily Gleaner, 17 October 1901, page 1.
North America, it had traded the influence and oversight of Britain for that of the Canadian parliament. That had come at a cost, as the province continued to wait in eager anticipation for the economic boom which Confederation had promised but on which Ottawa had largely failed to deliver.

The *Globe* referred to the Prince of Wales’ 1860 visit again when reporting on the progress being made on the decoration of public buildings a week prior to the arrival of the Duke and Duchess: “Elder folk are not done talking yet of the time King Edward was here as Prince of Wales. So all have been expecting right along a right royal welcome.”¹¹¹ The writer does not venture to make a comparison between the two efforts at decorating the city. Ellis, editor of the *Globe*, made one further comparison on the day of the arrival of the Royal couple: “...when the son describes [to his father] the Canada which he visited he will be able to tell the King of what the King had very little conception of when he was in this country, the vastness of this Dominion.”¹¹² This hypothetical scenario served two purposes: firstly, to humanize the monarchy; and, secondly, to create a sense that this was indeed a voyage of discovery for the young heir to the throne.

In the canon of royal reminiscences in the province, the royal visit of the Prince of Wales loomed largest in Fredericton as well, where the recent death of Gabriel Acquin, or “Sachem Gabe” as the founder of the St. Mary’s First Nation was more commonly known, brought to mind an incident from that tour which the *Gleaner*

¹¹¹ Ibid, 11 October 1901, 6.
¹¹² Ibid, 17 October, 4.
recalled: “It may not generally be known that the only time that King Edward the Seventh of England was upon the water in a birch bark canoe was on the St. John river at Fredericton in company with Gabe, because the story has not heretofore appeared in print; but such is the well authenticated fact.”\(^{113}\) The *Gleaner* went on to describe in detail an intimate encounter between the well-known Maliseet leader and the Queen’s son. Regrettably for the province’s First Nations peoples, there would be no opportunities for such encounters between any of their number and the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York in 1901. It would be many decades before visiting members of the royal family gave intimate audiences to this particularly marginalized group. Given the lack of ceremonial space afforded to Indigenous peoples at the time, it should come as little surprise. Greg Marquis has written about whites being dressed as natives during the recreation of the Champlain-De Monts expedition in 1904.\(^{114}\) True, Saint John had no visible, organized Indigenous community, but there were certainly a number of reservations within a relatively short distance of the city. In the nineteenth century, Halifax had invited First Nations peoples during the 1860 visit by the Prince of Wales (although admittedly only to offer a touch of the exotic), and certainly many

\(^{113}\) *Daily Gleaner*, 5 October 1901, 5. Gabe Acquin was a prominent Maliseet leader and known widely for his skills as a hunter and guide. He guided befriended two lieutenant governors, John Henry Thomas Manner-Sutton and Arthur Hamilton Gordon, and was invited to attend the International Fisheries Expedition in London in 1883. According to Andrea Bear Nicholas: “With his canoe and wigwam and wearing an outfit beaded by his wife, an extraordinarily talented craftsman, he set up camp on the ponds of South Kensington, renewed old friendships with royalty and officers he had known, and became, in the words of William Austin Squires, ‘the greatest social lion of the day.’” (Andrea Bear Nicholas, “ACQUIN, GABRIEL,” *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 13, University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–, accessed January 16, 2015, http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/acquin_gabriel_13E.html)

\(^{114}\) Marquis, “Celebrating Champlain in the Loyalist City,” 34.
Indigenous people were part of spectacles in Ontario and further west, even in 1901 and 1919, but New Brunswick gave them no ceremonial space in 1901.

At the turn of the century, as now, newspapers often picked up on local interest stories about people in the community with a special connection to a past royal tour or some member of the royal family. On 14 October 1901, the *Gleaner* carried one such report of a local man with a collection of “mementoes” of the 1860 tour by Prince Albert Edward:

Mr. John H. Reid still has, and shows with considerable pride, the Royal Standard which flew over Government House here on the occasion of the visit of the Prince of Wales...forty years ago. Mr. Reid, who took a very active part in the reception of His Royal Highness, has also several other interesting momentoes [sic] of that event, as well as a vast store of anecdote and incident in connection with the occasion.115

This nostalgic journalism became increasingly common during royal tours as writers had more and more visits on which to look back. However, the overall trend of linking past with present was not a new one, even in 1901. At the time of the 1860 royal tour, there was some discussion of the visit to the colony by Prince Edward, Duke of Kent, in 1794. It could be said that in reflecting on past tours, a royal visit became as much about commemorating a long history of association as it was about the tour of the day. The trend continues even today. Any locally-produced coverage of any major royal milestone is usually littered with memories of local people of “the time I saw the Queen.”
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115 *Daily Gleaner*, 14 October 1901, 8.
Whether consciously or unconsciously, the reporting of royal tours in the early twentieth century tended to include comparisons between the present tour and all previous tours. Moreover, in each case, the comparison is a favourable one; in fact, to read much of the coverage from the period, the casual observer could only conclude that each royal tour was more successful than the last. One might infer from this that the apparently long-standing connection between New Brunswickers and the royal family only grew closer with time. In fact, this may just as likely be explained as a type of boosterism. The hype with which newspapers promoted and commemorated these tours could be interpreted as a means to draw tourists to the region, whether to see visiting royalty or to visit the sites which they had seen.

In predictable fashion, the Daily Gleaner gushed on the day of the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York’s arrival in New Brunswick: “St. John has had many gala days and has entertained great throngs of visitors, but never before in its history were the crowds of visitors so dense as on this auspicious occasion.” The writer continued: “The city, in gala dress for its royal holiday, presents an appearance of splendor that transcends anything in its history.” Later in the same issue the Gleaner reported: “According to advices received by passenger agents there will be such a crush to-day as St. John never experienced in its history.” An article in the same paper the following day postulated: “The Duke and Duchess of York saw St. John under conditions more favorable than perhaps were ever accorded to any previous visitors, and the reception
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given them was what might be expected from this ancient city of the loyalists.”\textsuperscript{118} In a further column it was suggested that there were in the city some “25,000 visitors as well as the people of St. John themselves. Probably never in its history was the old Loyalist city clothed in such a garb of brilliance.”\textsuperscript{119} The \textit{Globe} gave equal credit to the city’s decorations: “From Queen Square to the Exhibition buildings...the outlay of bunting and decorative materials is a record breaker.”\textsuperscript{120} It is impossible for the historian to determine whether or not the decorations were more beautiful or the crowds greater during this particular tour than during any previous visit. The \textit{Daily Sun} predicted that “[t]he display of fireworks...will be the best ever seen in the history of the city”; to achieve this, a Hamilton, Ontario-based company was engaged to ensure that the “very latest and best devices and features” would be employed.\textsuperscript{121} More generally, the same paper gushed that “[t]he decorations, illuminations, public and private, will be on a grander scale than ever before in the history of St. John.”\textsuperscript{122} The casual reader would have been forgiven had they assumed that the 1901 visit was indeed the greatest thing ever to have happened to New Brunswick’s commercial hub. As the chapters which follow will demonstrate, however, this trend was not unusual, and claims as to the history-making nature of the events were commonplace.

This view of the 1901 proceedings translated into something larger as well, which is particularly clear in the press following that particular royal visit to New

\textsuperscript{118} Ibid, 18 October 1901, 3.  
\textsuperscript{119} Ibid, 18 October 1901, 3.  
\textsuperscript{120} \textit{Saint John Globe}, 17 October 1901, 6.  
\textsuperscript{121} \textit{Daily Sun}, 30 September 1901, 3.  
\textsuperscript{122} Ibid, 10 October 1901, 2.
Brunswick. Crockett of the *Daily Gleaner* was, despite the critical commentary previously examined, positively bursting with pride over the success of the first day of the New Brunswick visit. In his editorial that evening, the editor lauded the whole of the Canadian portion of this Imperial tour in a very poetic comparison: “Our Royal visitors may well say to Canada what the Governor of the marriage feast of Cana of Galilee said, ‘Every man at the beginning doth set forth good wine; and when men have well drunk, then that which is worse; but thou hast kept the good wine until now.’ For that is in effect what has happened.” He went further in the next paragraph: “Canada has kept her good wine until now and nowhere in the whole area of this vast and great Dominion have they received such a loyal and enthusiastic reception as they are getting today.”

The editor’s counterpart at the *Globe* was equally proud of his city’s welcome: “Since they left England in April last their Royal Highnesses have been welcomed in many important cities, both at the antipodes and in Canada, but nowhere could they have received a warmer, heartier, more cordial greeting than they received in St. John.”

The *Sun* reported that “in the opinion of some who have witnessed the Upper Canadian displays, [Saint John’s welcome was] superior to anything that has greeted the royal party in Canada.” These are subjective opinions, undeniably, but they do speak to an effort on the part of the press to prove the loyalty of the people of Saint John and of New Brunswick, and to reinforce the dominant narratives about loyalty which existed in the province at that time.
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Identities

New Brunswick is not, nor has it ever been, culturally or linguistically homogeneous. Long before it was officially bilingual, or tacitly multicultural, the province was home to people from a variety of different backgrounds. As such, there has never been an easily definable New Brunswick identity. In part, this dissertation seeks to examine the multiple identities which were present in the rhetoric of the tours and their coverage in the anglophone press. Naturally, because of the dominance of the press in most major New Brunswick towns and cities by a British-Canadian elite, it is their pro-Imperialist attitude which shines through most brightly. Rhetoric invoking the late-18th Loyalists, which will also be explored below, had become tied up in the same Imperialist-nationalist outlook which came to dominate the province until the middle of the twentieth century. Few other identities are visible in the pages of the New Brunswick, save for the pseudo-republican sympathies of the Irish Catholic editor of the Saint John Freeman in 1901 which shall be discussed later. Even among the Acadian elite of the period, for example, “Britishness” was a powerful force.126

The rhetoric of Empire was common throughout the New Brunswick press during royal tours of the early twentieth century.127 Certainly, Imperialist sentiment was high


\[127\] One cannot add descriptions of general decorations to this body of evidence, given that Canada had no distinct official national flag and thus use of the red, white and blue of the Union Flag was widespread by convention rather than as an expression of Imperial patriotism. That said, in the 19 October 1901 issue of the *Globe*, a writer referred to decorations on City hotels which were “resplendent in all the colors dear to British hearts.” (6). Similarly, the *Daily Sun* referred to “triple cloud bursts of British colors.” See *Daily Sun*, 30 September 1901, 3.
among most English-speaking Canadians during the South African War, and there is nothing unusual about the presence of Imperial rhetoric in the newspapers coverage of this royal tour.\footnote{128} Indeed, historians have argued that the 1901 royal tour was organized largely to achieve Imperial goals. In that same period, as Buckner has argued, Imperial enthusiasm and Canadian nationalism both grew stronger, and not in a way which was mutually exclusive.\footnote{129} As Carl Berger, Colin Coates, and others have argued, at the turn of the century “It was possible to be both a nationalist and an Imperialist.”\footnote{130} Even Cannadine has conceded that “For the majority of Canadians at this time [between 1867 and 1917], nationalist sentiment and ethnic identity were not Canadian but British.”\footnote{131} The Imperial rhetoric in the New Brunswick press, then, certainly supports this thesis that the British Empire was still central to English-Canadian identity (though it was nuanced and included occasional criticism of Britain). For example, one editorial in the \textit{Globe} declared:

\begin{quote}
And all through this land as over the older land, which the King [Edward VII] knows, the flag of England floats, the King’s writ runs, and there are hosts of people living glad lives, because the King rules. But this is not a feeling merely. It is a belief, a dogma, a faith, due in a very large degree to the consciousness which exists in the new lands as well as in the old that under British institutions freedom and justice are surely guaranteed, order is maintained without
\end{quote}

\footnote{128} Some of the imperial rhetoric was linked explicitly to the South African War, including one editorial which claimed that “among these who welcome the son of the King here, are some who have fought for the Empire in distant lands, and many who are ready to do so if they are needed, and some who mourn their dead in Africa, without regretting that they gave them up.” See \textit{Daily Sun}, 17 October 1901, 4.
interference with livery, and opportunity is given for the ample development of the highest and noblest qualities which are in the human race.\textsuperscript{132}

That hyperbolic glorification of British freedoms and British justice was not unique to the pages of the \textit{Globe}. Indeed, the \textit{Daily Times} editor was equally sensational:

[The Duke and Duchess] have made this extraordinary [30,000 mile] journey touching at land points under the British flag and through waters dominated if not absolutely controlled by British ships. Before they leave Canada they will have traversed this continent entirely on British soil, witnessing demonstrations of loyalty that have not been excelled anywhere.\textsuperscript{133}

S.D. Scott, the editor of the \textit{Daily Sun}, wrote in the days after the visit to Saint John:

The Dominion of Canada...has given the British Empire a power and influence on this continent...We had imperialists in this province and in other colonies then, but now Canada, as a Dominion, is imperialist, and will be a stronger influence in the direction of British unity than any other part of His Majesty’s domain.\textsuperscript{134}

In the \textit{Messenger and Visitor}, Black referred to:

[t]he feeling of contentment and pride in British connection, the confidence that Britain’s throne and rule stand for justice, liberty, enlightenment and all that is sanely progressive in government and human affairs, and the conviction that...God has chosen Britain to be His servant, and has furnished and inspired her for noble and gracious ministry among the nations of the world.\textsuperscript{135}

There was clearly a sense that the New Brunswick portion of the 1901 tour was part of something much larger which brought together the Dominions of the British Empire.

It is this all-encompassing sense of Britishness or the “British World” which has attracted the attention of a number of scholars in recent decades. The idea that British justice and traditions were superior were as much behind these Imperial exaltations as

\textsuperscript{132} \textit{Saint John Globe}, 19 October 1901, 4.
\textsuperscript{133} \textit{Daily Times}, 19 September 1901, 2.
\textsuperscript{134} \textit{Daily Sun}, 18 October 1901, 4.
\textsuperscript{135} \textit{Messenger and Visitor}, 23 October 1901, 4.
Canada’s membership in a political Empire. Kurt Korneski has suggested that pro-
Imperialists at the turn of the century “viewed the British or Anglo-Saxon race as the
premier example of humanity.” Moreover, he argues, “In these years Britain was the
world’s wealthiest nation and the foremost Imperial power. The expanse of its Empire
stood as evidence that British moral and spiritual qualities, traits, and propensities, and
the political, economic, and cultural orders that embodied them,” were superior to all
others.136 The anglophone press in New Brunswick and beyond, in some way an
extension of the middle class elite, played a key role in building and reinforcing Imperial
identity and solidarity. As members of the business community, owners and editors of
newspapers sometimes served as the “most important proponents of the Canadian
national project.”137

Alongside the Imperial rhetoric which was so ubiquitous during these tours, the
image of the Loyalists who settled in the province following the end of the American
Revolutionary War was never far away. For many decades, New Brunswick boosters
actively promoted an image of New Brunswick as “the Loyalist Province,” a title which
only fell into disuse in the 1980s.138 This was certainly true during the 1901 royal tour by
the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York, which took place at about the half-way
point between the 100th and 150th anniversaries of the arrival of the first Loyalists in

136 Kurt Korneski, Race, Nation, and Reform Ideology in Winnipeg, 1880s-1920s (Lanham, MD: Fairleigh
Dickinson University Press, 2015), 205.
137 Ibid, 16.
138 Greg Marquis, “Commemorating the Loyalists in the Loyalist City: Saint John, 1883-1934,” Urban History
(Spring/Printemps 2004): 3-26; and Jones, “Loyalist City.”
New Brunswick in May 1783. Greg Marquis has written about celebrations of these important anniversaries, and argues that they were part of the formation of a “Loyalist myth” which persisted for many generations. The myth of the Loyalists, he argues however, was not merely a static image of a few boat loads of refugees who founded and built the city of Saint John and the province as a whole. Rather, it was flexible and adaptable, evolving so far as to include under its umbrella the Acadians and the Irish of the province, the result being that it continued to appeal “to both conservative and Whig interpretations of New Brunswick and Canadian history.”

Taking place as it did during the South African War, the royal tour of 1901 provided an opportunity to link together the sacrifices of the province’s Loyalists “founders” and of the young men fighting the Boers.

Certainly, the Loyalist myth was widely promoted in the rhetoric employed during Saint John’s commemorations of the 1604 landing of Samuel de Champlain and Pierre Dugua, Sieur de Mons, in that city. During these celebrations, which were organized with tourism very much in mind, a public lecture given at an event hosted by the Royal Society of Canada focused not on these founders of Acadia and New France, but on “The Influence of the United Empire Loyalists on the History of North America.” Indeed, Marquis argues that “For the most part, the 1904 celebrations focused not on Champlain or the beginning of Acadia but on the European discovery of

---

139 Marquis, “Commemorating the Loyalists,” 31.
140 Marquis, “Celebrating Champlain,” 33.
141 Ibid, 36.
the Saint John River as well as Loyalist Settlement and the South African War.” 142 There seems to have been little objection to the hijacking by anglophone civic boosters in Saint John of the commemoration of an important moment in the history of French Canada. Indeed, Marquis notes that the “Saint John audience, even in the midst of a Champlain celebration, found ready comfort in the message that the Loyalists were the true founders of Canada.” 143 Despite the fact that by the turn of the twentieth century, Saint John’s demographic makeup had changed dramatically from what they had been a century before, there seemed little indication that the Loyalists would be usurped from their place as founders of the province.

During the 1901 royal visit to Saint John, the Loyalist myth was certainly in evidence. One headline in the Daily Sun on 17 October 1901 referred to the “City of the Loyalists”; extensive coverage in the next issue of that paper referred to the “Loyalist city.” 144 The Daily Gleaner went so far on 21 September 1901 as to refer to New Brunswick as “the Loyalist Province”; the editor used the same title in another editorial on 17 October. 145 The Loyalist Society, which had been founded in 1889, also presented a poem to the Duke and Duchess which had been composed by Charles Campbell; the text of the poem was printed in the Saint John Globe in August 1919. 146

The Loyalists featured most significantly in the addresses presented to the Duke and Duchess. That which was presented by the city of Saint John read, in part: “We

---

143 Ibid, 36.
144 Daily Sun, 17 October 1901, 6; Saint John Daily Sun, 18 October 1901, 1.
145 Daily Gleaner, 21 September 1901, 4; 17 October 1901, 4.
146 Saint John Globe, 15 August 1919, 3.
would remind your Royal Highness that our city was founded by a band of devoted people who endured great hardships that they might testify their faith in and loyalty to British institutions by perpetuating them upon this continent.”¹⁴⁷ Oddly, no such mention of Loyalists appeared in the address from the City of Fredericton (where, during the winter of 1783-1784, many Loyalists who had arrived too late in the fall to build proper shelters, died from exposure and starvation).¹⁴⁸ The York County address was not so quick to forget the Loyalists, and it “desire[d] to give expression of our unswerving loyalty to the Crown which we have inherited from the Loyalists founders of the province of New Brunswick. Similarly, Sunbury County referred to a desire to offer “the homage and devotion of a people not less loyal than our forefathers the founders of this province who abandoned homes of ease and luxury for the hardships and dangers of a life in the wilderness in order that they might leave to their posterity a country under the dominion of the British crown.”¹⁴⁹

The Loyalists were given some mention in the address from the City of Moncton (where their descendants were held up, along with the descendants of the French pioneers, as emblematic of loyalty and devotion to British institutions).¹⁵⁰ In a reference to the pre-Loyalist Planter population which was settled in the Moncton area following the expulsion of the Acadians, the address read: “Notwithstanding the fact that our city is one of the newest cities of Eastern Canada, it is filled with that ancient loyalty which

---

¹⁴⁷ Pope, *The Tour of Their Royal Highnesses The Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York*, 289.
¹⁴⁹ Pope, *The Tour of Their Royal Highnesses The Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York*, 297.
¹⁵⁰ Ibid, 291.
has upheld the British flag in every quarter of the globe, and which peopled this land originally with a hardy and energetic population devoted to British institutions.”\(^{151}\) Aside from this, there was no other mention of the Acadians. The *Daily Sun* did record that some “French” flags could be seen in Saint John among with those of England, Scotland, and Ireland; whether this was the Acadian flag or the flag of France is impossible to ascertain.\(^{152}\) The anglophone elite were, as usual, speaking on behalf of a diverse group of New Brunswickers as though they were homogenous.

Along with the conspicuously Loyalist-free contribution from Fredericton, neither was their mention of the Loyalists in addresses from the towns of Chatham, Newcastle, Grand Falls and Woodstock, or the counties of Saint John, Albert, Northumberland, Carleton, and Kings. These municipalities focused more overtly on the sacrifices the Empire was making in the war in South Africa. So too did the Sunbury County address. Unsurprisingly, the addresses which focus most on the Loyalists were drawn up in areas where they settled heavily. The absence of mention of them in the addresses from the City of Fredericton and the County of Saint John could be explained by their conspicuous mention in the address of the County of York and the City of Saint John. Since these addresses were drawn up well in advance of the visit, and were submitted to tour officials for approval, it is entirely conceivable that geographically close municipalities made some effort to avoid duplication in their key themes. What we can observe is that in four of the fourteen addresses (less than one third) emphasized the province’s

\(^{151}\) Ibid, 291.
\(^{152}\) *Daily Sun*, 17 October 1901, 6.
Loyalist origins as a means of expressing their municipalities’ contemporary loyalty. For his part, the Duke of Cornwall and York put important emphasis on the same, tying the Loyalist myth to recent New Brunswick sacrifices in South Africa. In his reply to the addresses the Duke said: “Your forefathers, the founders of the city (of Saint John), gave proof of their loyalty to the king and attachment to British institutions by heavy privations and hardships, patiently borne. The same sentiments animate their descendants to the present day. They have emulated the example of their ancestors in devotion to their Sovereign by services gladly rendered and lives nobly sacrificed to uphold the principles of freedom and justice.” It could well be argued that in this instance the Duke was commandeering the Loyalist myth as so many had done before and were continuing to do at the time. Granted, the addresses read by the Duke throughout his tour would have been crafted by speech writers who knew far more about local issues and sensitivities than the Duke, but that does not change the fact that these official replies helped to solidify the claim to legitimacy of these local identities.

New Brunswick, and Saint John in particular, had a large Roman Catholic population. For the Acadians among them, there was little apparent inclusion of their community in official functions. They were not excluded completely from ceremonial spaces in New Brunswick at the beginning of the twentieth century, as Pierre-Amand Landry’s role in the Champlain tercentenary suggests, but as a public force in many ways

153 Pope, The Tour of Their Royal Highnesses The Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York, 303.
An amusing, if ridiculous phase of the visit of the Duke and Duchess of York and Cornwall to St. John is the avidity of relic-hunters to get possession of some souvenir of their Royal Highnesses. The china service used on the royal table is now, we are informed, selling at ten dollars a plate, and we expect to hear that the royal cutlery will sell at a tremendous premium. A cigar stub of the Duke’s is already shown set in a background of purple velvet; a prominent jeweller has an order for a case to enclose a tiny morsel of fruit cake which was left over after the Duchess had lunched, and a piece of bread bearing the imprint of the Duke’s molars is now being waxed with a view to its preservation. The Jones’ residence will henceforth be consecrated to the memories of the stay of the royal couple within its walls, and will be duly pointed out to the sight-seeing tourist as one of the curiosities of our cities. All this because of a sentiment which, rightly or wrongly, possesses the minds of more of our citizens. Yet these same people are shocked at the Catholic practice of showing respect to the relics of the saints. The saints while on earth were models of the virtues which elevate and civilize, and in the royal court of Heaven they stand high in the favor of God. If then the sentiment which leads men into such degrees of courtship towards royal personages on earth as to cause them to collect souvenirs of a passing visit, can find defenders, where does the idolatry come in when Catholics show a similar sentiment towards the relics of the friends of God? The sentiment is alike human in both cases, with this exception, that religion not human respect animates the Catholic practice of conserving souvenirs of the saints.

Figure 5: An editorial from The Freeman, 26 October 1901, page 4.
they took a back seat.\textsuperscript{154} The outward opinions of Irish Catholics, too, are largely absent from the anglophone press, with the exception of a few off-hand comments from the Irish-Canadian editor of the \textit{The Freeman}.\textsuperscript{155} An editorial in the \textit{Freeman} suggested that “our good friends the P.P.A.’s [Protestant Protective Association], whose organization still pursues an underground existence in this city, do not relish the public eulogy which the Duke of York and Cornwall, heir apparent to the British crown, pronounced on the Catholic church in Canada the other day at Quebec.”\textsuperscript{156} Regarding the loyalty of Catholic clergy to the crown in 1776 and 1812, the same editor quipped: “The hierarchy and clergy of Quebec saved Canada to England at a time when loyalty meant much more than it does today. We pray our Protestant friends not to lost sight of this fact.”\textsuperscript{157} This thinly-veiled contempt can be attributed at least partly to the tensions between Protestants and Catholics in New Brunswick in the decades after Confederation, which included a bitter dispute in the 1870s over separate schools, and the ongoing presence in the province of the Loyal Orange Lodge and the Protestant Protective Association.\textsuperscript{158}

\textsuperscript{154} Marquis, “Celebrating Champlain in the Loyalist City,” 38. As Marquis points out, Landry’s participation in the Champlain tercentenary, which was more about Imperialism and boosterism than about celebrating the French origins of the province, was a result of his Imperialism, not his Acadian roots.

\textsuperscript{155} The editor was probably Rev. William C. Gaynor, who was later disgraced for having fathered a child. W.D. Hamilton, \textit{The Dictionary of Miramichi Biography} (Saint John: Miramichi Books, 1997), 142-143.

\textsuperscript{156} \textit{The Freeman}, 21 September 1901, 4.

\textsuperscript{157} Ibid, 21 September 1901, 4.

\textsuperscript{158} George F.G. Stanley, “The Caraquet Riots, 1875,” \textit{Acadiensis} 2, 1 (Autumn 1972): 21-38. Although one could be tempted to think that the turn of the twentieth century heralded greater ecumenical understanding between Protestants and Catholics, Mark McGowan has suggested that developments in the late nineteenth century had in fact led to a hardening of “Canada’s two religious solitudes; see Mark G. McGowan, “Rethinking Catholic-Protestant Relations in Canada: The Episcopal Reports of 1900-1901,” \textit{Historical Studies} 59 (1992): 12.
The Freeman’s editor could not hide his indifference, if not his hostility, to the royal tour. He made a variety of tongue-in-cheek references, and printed an exasperated editorial criticizing the hunt for “relics” of the visit:

An amusing, if ridiculous phase of the [royal visit] ...is the avidity of relic-hunters to get possession of some souvenir of their Royal Highnesses. The china service used on the royal table is not, we are informed, selling at ten dollars a plate, and we expect to hear that the royal cutlery will sell at a tremendous premium. A cigar stub of the Duke’s is already shown set in a background of purple velvet; a prominent jeweller has an order for a case to enclose a tiny morsel of fruit cake which was left over after the Duchess had lunched...\textsuperscript{159}

The writer was obviously bemused. “All this,” he continued, “because of a sentiment which, rightly or wrongly, possessed the minds of more of our citizens. Yet these same people are shocked at the Catholic practice of showing respect to the relics of the saints.”\textsuperscript{160} If his discomfort over relic-hunting was apparent, it was tame compared to his obvious contempt for monarchy as an institution:

Inasmuch as it affords the self-governing colonies of Great Britain an opportunity to testify to their satisfaction with the stable and easy-riding form of government for which the British monarchy now stands, this royal visit is not without its advantages. That it will, however, afford the British government the needed assurance of the acquiescence of the Canadian people in the undemocratic ideas which hedge around royalty, cannot be admitted for a moment. There is no disguising the fact that we are a democratic people, to whom feudalism and the ancient claims of the divine right of kings to govern, are unmost palatable; all our illuminations and street parades to contrary notwithstanding. In honoring our visitors, therefore, we were but paying a tribute to the form of government to which for the time we choose to pay allegiance... Should the time come, as it surely will, when we shall feel that our connection with the outworn ideas of Europe...should be abolished, we will proceed duly to abolish it. In the meantime

\textsuperscript{159} The Freeman, 26 October 1901, 4.
\textsuperscript{160} Ibid, 26 October 1901, 4.
we are having an object lesson in the cost of royalty, and we have had an experience of what the few can do to enthrall and tax the multitude.\textsuperscript{161}

The extent to which the editor’s harsh criticism of the monarchy as an institution was an expression of opinion personal or popular is difficult to determine. Certainly, the \textit{Freeman} served as the newspaper of the anglophone Roman Catholic community in the province, which was largely of Irish extraction, though being Irish did not necessarily equate with disloyalty. This open criticism of the monarchy specifically, and of British institutions more generally, was rare among English-language newspapers at the turn of the century. Even anglophone papers which objected to Canada’s participation in the Boer War did not generally offer such blatantly republican opinions. That being said, there were definable lines dividing Saint John along Protestant and Irish Catholic lines during this period, as is evidenced by the separate festivities held in the city in 1904 during the DeMonts-Champlain tercentenary.\textsuperscript{162} The \textit{Freeman} often “expressed a fervent Irish nationalism” during the early decades of the twentieth century, for although it was a Catholic paper, it was “free of clerical control” and could take a stance on political issues.\textsuperscript{163} That said, its overt political expressions in favour of Irish independence were limited to the period after the Great War, when there was a

\textsuperscript{161} Ibid, 19 October 1901, 4.
\textsuperscript{162} Marquis, “Celebrating Champlain in the Loyalist City,” 40-41. Sectarian strife (indeed violence) had plagued Saint John since the arrival of large numbers of Irish refugees during the Great Famine in the 1840s and 1850s, though it had been a problem as early as the late eighteenth century. See Scott W. See, “The Orange Order and Social Violence in Mid-Nineteenth Century Saint John,” \textit{Acadiensis} 13, 1 (Autumn/Automne 1983): 68-92.
\textsuperscript{163} Robert McLaughlin, \textit{Irish Canadian Conflict and the Struggle for Irish Independence, 1912-1925} (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2013), 63-64. Being “free of clerical control” obviously did not mean that it was a secular paper, as early editors included Rev. William C. Gaynor and Rev. D.S. O’Keefe. The nationalist views of many supporters of Irish reform in New Brunswick were defined by the extension of dominion status to Ireland, and as such many envisioned constitutional monarchy and membership in the British Empire as Ireland’s future.
movement towards greater autonomy within the white settler states of the emerging Commonwealth.

**Gender**

Until 1951, the central figure in each royal tour of New Brunswick was, in theory at least, a senior male member of the royal family. With the exception of the vice-regal tour by the Marquis of Lorne and Princess Louise in 1878, no female royal participated in a royal tour of Canada until the Duchess of Cornwall and York accompanied her husband on his lengthy tour in 1901. No female royal made an appearance again until 1939. In both cases, the female half of the royal pair was married into the family. Indeed, only when Princess Elizabeth and Prince Philip made their trek across Canada in 1951, just months before her father’s death, did a woman in immediate line of succession to the throne of Canada step foot on Canadian soil. Nevertheless, the female consorts of royal visitors played an important role, and in the case of the Duchess of Cornwall and York in 1901, often became the focus of the particular attention of Canadian women, as the press coverage suggests. The rise at the turn of the century of organizations like the Imperial Order Daughters of the Empire (first founded in Fredericton in 1900), the Canadian Council of Women, and the Women’s Canadian Club meant that middle class women were claiming a space in the nation, and often they adopted the existing pro-Imperial English-Canadian focus in their own activities.¹⁶⁴ This is apparent during the 1901 royal tour.

¹⁶⁴ Several historians have examined this phenomenon. See, for example, Cecilia Morgan, *Creating Colonial Pasts: History, Memory, and Commemoration in Southern Ontario, 1860-1980* (Toronto: University of
The decades leading up to the turn of the twentieth century had heralded some advances in the status of women in Canada, including the granting of the municipal franchise in New Brunswick in 1892. A proposal in the legislature to extend the provincial franchise to women in 1894 was defeated by four votes.\textsuperscript{165} Three more such bills were introduced during the 1890s, all of which were defeated or allowed to die on the Order Paper.\textsuperscript{166} For the most part, the women’s organizations which proliferated were committed more generally to reform rather than the suffrage movement, which was still condemned by influential elements of society.\textsuperscript{167} One exception was the Women’s Enfranchisement Association of New Brunswick, which was founded in 1894.\textsuperscript{168} Based in Saint John, it was the “first and only reform society with equal suffrage for women as its primary objective.”\textsuperscript{169} Aside from limited enfranchisement, then, traditional gender norms meant that most women continued to occupy a domestic role in their communities, even if they were making a claim on ceremonial space through their involvement in local clubs and organizations.

In his detailed account of the 1901 Saint John visit, John R. Hamilton recorded that the original intention had been for a subscription to be taken up from women.

\textsuperscript{165} McCann, “Fragmentation and the New Social Order,” 152-153.

\textsuperscript{166} A History of the Vote in Canada (Ottawa: Office of the Chief Electoral Officer of Canada, 2007), 66.

\textsuperscript{167} McCann, “Fragmentation and the New Social Order,” 152-153.

\textsuperscript{168} A History of the Vote in Canada, 60.

across the province in order to purchase a gift for the Duchess, but time constraints necessitated that the project be restricted to the women of Saint John. The choice gift was a mink and ermine stole and a mink muff, with clasps of the New Brunswick coat of arms and the Royal Standard in enamel. On the evening of the arrival of the royal party in Saint John, a deputation of distinguished women of the city, including the wives of the lieutenant governor, the mayor of Saint John, and deceased father of Confederation Samuel L. Tilley, among others, was received by the Duchess of Cornwall at Caverhill Hall. Along with the stole and muff, which were presented to the Duchess in “a case of silver birch lined with white satin and finished with silver mountings,” the women also presented a short address to accompany their gift.

The ladies of Saint John were not the only women in the province to make special presentations to the Duchess of Cornwall and York, however. Although no time was set apart in the itinerary for formal presentations, at least two other gifts were received by the Duchess during her time in the province. One which received much attention in the Moncton press was a lace handkerchief, the work of hundreds of hours by Mrs. George H. Pick of that city. The Sun reported that “at the reception the

---

170 Hamilton, Our Royal Guests, n.pag. A report from a “meeting of ladies” at the invitation of Mrs. Anna McClean, wife of the lieutenant governor, confirms this. See Daily Sun, 12 October 1901, 5.
172 Hamilton, Our Royal Guests, n. pag.
173 Originally conceived by Mrs. Pick as a fundraiser for the troops in the South African War, it was to have been presented to Queen Victoria. Due to a period of ill health, the handkerchief took many more months to finish than Mrs. Pick intended, and when the old Queen died in January 1901, she decided instead to present the delicate work of art to a future Queen. Furthermore, this was no ordinary handkerchief. The Moncton Daily Times printed the full text of the letter which accompanied it. It reads in part: “Permit me further to say that the design and work are all my own; that it contains four thousand yards of thread and occupied 130 days of ten hours each in making. In the four corners there are the Crown, the Lion, the Union Jack and the Beaver, representing Royalty, Imperialism, Loyalty and Canadian Industry, with the
Duchess told one of her neighbours that she never received a more welcome gift, expressing surprise that anyone should have the patience to produce it.”

The Duchess was also the recipient of another handkerchief crafted by Moncton’s Mrs. J. S. Squibb. The Times noted that this was not the first instance in which Jessie Pick’s handiwork was presented to Royalty; she “had the honour of making part of the Irish point lace given to Queen Alexandra as a wedding present, and also made the lace on the Christening robe of His late Royal Highness the Duke of Clarence.”

The Daily Times paid more attention than either the Daily Gleaner or the Globe to the interest of New Brunswick women in the Duchess of Cornwall and York. In the same issue of the paper which detailed the presentation of the handkerchief from Mrs. Pick, J. Sutton Boyd, the editor of the Times, entitled one of his editorials, “THE WOMEN’S WELCOME,” beginning by saying “The women of Canada have a right to be deeply interested in the Duchess of York.” The editor went on to extol the virtues of the Duchess as a mother and homemaker. One cannot say without examination into other

wreath of maple leaves, emblems of our Canada. / The silver casket which contains this offering is designed as a memorial of the four New Brunswick men of G Company of the Royal Canadian Regiment, who fell at Paardeberg. Their names are inscribed upon silver seed pods of the maple leaf on the case.” (Daily Times, 17 October 1901, 1). Mrs. George Hamilton Pick was the former Jessie Evelyn Rogers, and she died at the Provincial Hospital in Saint John in 1961. In 1901 her husband was employed as an inspector with the Intercolonial Railroad.

Daily Sun, 21 October 1901, 7.
Annie Squibb was born in Ireland, and her maiden name is unknown; in 1901 her husband John was listed in the census as a labourer.
There is no obvious explanation for this. However, it might be largely because of the local interest stories about the gifts made for the Duchess by Mrs. Pick and Mrs. Squibb.
Boyd, a Moncton native, had joined the staff of the Times in the 1870s and eventually succeeded the founding editor, Mr. H.T. Stevens. Boyd served as editor of the Times until his death in 1934, having also sat for several terms as an alderman of the city of Moncton. Lloyd Machum, A History of Moncton, Town and County: 1855-1965 (Moncton: Moncton Publishing Co. Ltd., 1965): 119, 161-163.
contemporary writing about the personal lives of the Duke and Duchess whether this was purely a result of the editor trying to flatter the Duchess with the attributes he felt would flatter any woman, or whether this was the conventional wisdom of the day. Biographies and autobiographies of the Duchess, her husband, and their children have hinted at a far more distant figure than the one described thusly:

What a love she has for child-life. She is a musician, and so enjoys the children's singing. She feels the thrill of their presence, too. She has a mother's affection, and a mother's instinct; a mother's affection, and a mother's sympathy. Away across the sea four little hearts are hungry for her caresses and she thinks of them as she looks into the faces of the little folks she meets and greets in Canada.¹⁷⁹

That little personal information about members of the royal family in this period was truly known outside royal circles seems not to have stopped Boyd from providing this generous assessment. Certainly, other papers made claims about the Duchess's female virtues. An article in the Baptist Messenger and Visitor claimed, “[t]he illustrious examples of noble womanhood set forth by the late beloved Victoria and Her Majesty Queen Alexandra, appear certain of perpetuation in the person of the wife of the King's son.”¹⁸⁰

For all their minor roles in the proceedings, however, one cannot help but notice that it was not the women, but the men of the city were given the greatest access to the royal visitors. The issue of the place of women in ceremonial occasions has been

---

¹⁷⁹ *Daily Times*, 21 October 1901, 2.
¹⁸⁰ *Messenger and Visitor*, 25 September 1901, 1. The editor of this paper in 1901 was Rev. Samuel McCully Black (a native of Amherst and Baptist clergyman, who died in Saint John in 1909). See *Harvard College: The Class of 1876* (Boston: The Merrymount Press, 1902), 8
examined by Wade Henry in his research focused on royal celebrations in Canada between 1860 and 1911. Henry argues that middle-class men, the very type who dominated the presentations at the Exhibition Building in 1901, “articulated representations of themselves, women, the upper and lower classes, and the monarchy and consolidated themselves as a cultural hegemony in the new national society.” For their part, he argues, “women and the upper and working classes resisted these representations with images of their own designed to empower themselves.”181 Those efforts, however, could only be so effective when final decisions about the itinerary for royal tours were left to public officials, i.e. elite males. Despite the fact that women played a conspicuous role in the 1901 proceedings, it is worth noting that the activities with which they were associated were largely in the traditional and accepted sphere of femininity. For example, the women who made the news in 1901 included Jessie Pick and Annie Squibb, producers of fancy work, and the wives of Saint John’s elite, presenters of furs. Little fault could be found in the desire of these women to acknowledge the presence of their illustrious visitor. In case there was any doubt as to whether their various presentations, all private, were indicative of a quest for greater female participation in public life, an aforementioned editorial in the Daily Times approved of the great interest shown by women in the Duchess, a woman who, though “accomplished in many ways...is especially skilled in home-making.”182

182 Daily Times, 21 October 1901, 2.
Bonnie Huskins has written about the “ceremonial space” of women in the nineteenth century, and she points to a shifting of boundaries with the “separate spheres” ideology which dominated this period. In the latter decades of the century, women were increasingly involved with parades and other public events, even if their roles remained largely restricted to those which complemented their alleged mothering instincts. Huskins argues that “[the] varied participation in public processions also illustrates the complex and sometimes contradictory nature of separate spheres ideology. The more frequent inclusion of women in public processions in the late Victorian period shows that the boundaries of separate spheres were changing,” and that “women continually negotiated the boundaries of the public “ceremonial space”…” ¹⁸³ The royal tour of 1901 is supportive of this theory, given the peripheral role played by women during this tour, and particularly the changing nature of those roles from one tour to the other later in the twentieth century. For instance, as was noted above, while a small deputation of women was received by the Duchess of Cornwall and York in 1901, the only other women whose names stood out in the press were the two craftswomen who presented her with additional, private gifts. As Huskins has pointed out, ceremonial traditions in Halifax and Saint John “featured men as the leading organizers and performers. Separate spheres ideology confined most women to nurturing and supportive roles, such as spectators and behind-the-scenes helpers.” ¹⁸⁴

¹⁸⁴ Ibid, 147.
The everyday women of New Brunswick were limited by both their gender and their class, therefore, as to the means of their participation in ceremonial occasions. They were not absent, however, and Huskins describes them as “[lining] the procession routes, cheering and waving their handkerchiefs and parasols, and some even [tagging] along behind [entries in parades].”185 It was this class of women, undoubtedly in the majority, who would have been most in evidence, though less obvious than their social superiors, during the royal tour of 1901. They would only gain greater access to the proceedings with the passage of time and the relaxing of social constraints which dominated royal tours and other official occasions for much of the first half of the twentieth century.

Conclusion

The New Brunswick portion of the 1901 royal tour of Canada, though the planning took many months, was of short duration. During the weeks that led to the visit, and for days afterwards, many of New Brunswick’s anglophone newspapers, especially those in Fredericton and Saint John, filled their pages with reports of the preparations for, and execution of, detailed plans which were put in place to give the royal visitors a warm welcome and a taste of New Brunswick. As windows into the attitudes and concerns of the middle class, the newspapers of the day reveal some fascinating themes. Drawing on past tradition, the military played significant roles in the 1901 tour, and the South African War was particularly highlighted. This was tied closely

185 Ibid, 147.
to the rhetoric of Empire which was prevalent, and which revealed a province still tied closely to its roots as a colony, continually evolving as part of the Dominion of Canada and linked with the British Empire. Similarly, the invocation of the Loyalists, which was so characteristic of Saint John in this period, reveals that local elites and the press placed a great deal of value on linking their communities with the province’s colonial founders. A focus on issues surrounding the planning of the local itineraries is also indicative of a keen interest among the people of New Brunswick (at least those living in the Saint John and Fredericton areas), and of Saint John in particular, in the tour. There was no questioning of expenditures, but there is evidence of the keenness among certain parties to ensure a quality welcome to the royal visitors. The 1901 tour also became fodder for the ongoing rivalry between Fredericton and Saint John, suggesting that royal tours were not immune from being dragged into local issues. Neither were tours above being used by civic boosters in their efforts to promote their communities, or used to demonstrate the continuity of the province’s relationship with the British Crown. Finally, the part played by women during both tours speak volumes about their emerging and evolving role in the province’s public spaces. The newspaper coverage of the 1901 royal visit to Saint John presents far more than simply a minute-by-minute record of the proceedings. It also offers a window into the time in which the tour was held and into the minds of the people who organized the visit, those who reported on it, and the people who witnessed and read about it.
By the time New Brunswick hosted another major royal tour in 1919, the province was recovering from a world war, by which tens of thousands of its people were profoundly affected. The spirit of optimism which had characterized the beginning of the century had been severely tested by more than four years of conflict. And yet, shaken though its people may have been, Canada and Canadians provided what the media characterized as a rapturous welcome for the young Prince of Wales when he undertook his weeks-long tour of the dominion in the late summer of 1919. Like its predecessor in 1901, the progress was a sort of ‘victory tour,’ and as such it was designed in part to offer Britain’s thanks for Canadians’ contributions during the recent war with Germany. Additionally, though, there was a “deeper political purpose. The British Empire now extended further than ever before, but to Empire believers the world seemed a more uncertain place.” The place of monarchies in the postwar world was indeed less secure than it had been before 1914. What also made this tour different was the prince’s image as a handsome, charming bachelor; moreover, he was also a veteran of the Great War, and had developed a solid reputation among the Canadian troops with whom he had served. Remarking on the cheerfulness of the ‘Knucks’ he met in 1918, he wrote that “I wish I had been across to Canada, and living amongst them

---

makes me just long to go there.” One Canadian colonel wrote that the Prince of Wales “had been the best force in real Empire building that it was possible for Great Britain to have, because he absolutely won the hearts of the many he came in contact with.” It was no doubt with these factors in mind that this royal veteran was commissioned to undertake several imperial tours after the end of the war, and after so many other empires had been brought to their knees.

There were, of course, other things which made the 1919 royal tour different from the one undertaken in 1901. For one thing, Canadian women had demanded and been granted a far greater role in civil society during the Great War, and had even achieved the franchise federally, and in all provinces except Quebec. Their overall place in society was still subordinate to men, however, as this chapter will note, and the vast majority of women still worked only in the home. By and large, however, the New Brunswick which greeted the Prince of Wales in 1919 was not drastically different from the one which had greeted his parents less than eighteen years earlier. Loyalty to the British Empire (both in the contemporary sense and in the references to the province’s Loyalist forebears) still permeated the rhetoric of the visit, and the English-language newspapers facilitated an understanding of New Brunswick identity that was both English-speaking and British in outlook. Although Canada was still firmly within the Imperial fold in 1919, an evolution was underway which would only be fulsomely defined by the Imperial Conference of 1926 and the Statute of Westminster, 1931.

4 Ibid, 74.
As they had done in 1901, many anglophone newspapers in New Brunswick spilled great quantities of ink chronicling the planning and execution of the visit to Saint John, as well as the rest of Canada. In particular, the Prince’s visit occupied a great deal of space in issues of the Saint John Globe, although less attention was given the tour by the editor of the Fredericton Daily Gleaner, and even less by the editor of Moncton’s Daily Times. This could be explained in part by the fact that Saint John was the only New Brunswick stop on the itinerary. In any case, through their coverage of the tour these newspapers provided a valuable snapshot of the province as it was, or more accurately as it wished to be seen, in the summer of 1919. They reveal attitudes about the Empire, provincial identities, the war, gender, and local issues. The tour provided an opportunity for elite of New Brunswick to present to the prince, the media, and the wider world a specific image of the province, and the newspapers of the day helped to affirm the nature of this image by the way in which they covered the planning and the execution of the local itinerary.

The Context

In 1919, the estimated population of New Brunswick was 379,882. At the time of the 1921 census, taken just twenty months after the Prince of Wales’ tour, there were 387,876 people living in the province, the largest population centres being Saint John and Westmorland counties. Of this total population, 366,418 were Canadian born.\(^5\) The vast majority (345,607) of these Canadian born residents were natives of the province,

and most of the non-Canadian born hailed originally from the United States (8,268), and the British Isles (9,547). Immigrants were therefore in the minority, and they were mostly found in Charlotte, Madawaska, Saint John, and Westmorland counties, where the “foreign born” (including those born in British possessions) exceeded 1,000 in each jurisdiction (more than 2,200 in Saint John). As it had been in 1901, New Brunswick remained divided along religious lines. Roman Catholicism was still the single-most common Christian denomination, with 170,532 adherents, while the Baptists, Anglicans, Presbyterians and Methodists claimed the greatest number of Protestants for their own (86,254, 47,020, 41,277, and 34,872). Roman Catholics represented the majority of the population in Gloucester, Kent, Northumberland, Restigouche, Madawaska, Saint John and Albert, and Westmorland counties. These remained the areas of the province most dominated by Irish and Acadian New Brunswickers. The latter group accounted for just over thirty-one percent of the provincial population.

The death of Queen Victoria and the accession of King Edward VII in 1901 had ushered in the so-called Edwardian Era, which is popularly characterized by the relaxing of the allegedly strict social codes of the Victorian Era, which more recent historiography has revealed were not so prudish after all. Often referred to as the “Long Edwardian summer,” the period of 1901-1914 has been romantically remembered for the peace and prosperity which the British Empire seemed to enjoy.

---

during this time. The reality was more complicated than that, of course. The first decade and a half of the twentieth century in New Brunswick was relatively peaceful, but those who expected the period to usher in an economic boom in Maritime Canada were to be disappointed. Colin Howell has described the 1900s as a decade characterized by “crusading liberalism” (commonly linked with the Social Gospel movement) which saw a proliferation of movements and programs to alleviate the various ills plaguing society at that time. Despite threats of reform even among political parties, little change was achieved in this decade, for, like its fellow Maritime provinces, New Brunswick “continued to operate under significant fiscal disabilities within the larger Confederation.” What did emerge during the period was an effective “marriage of progressive reform proposals and the defence of regional interests within Confederation [which] became a common formula for political success in all the [Maritime] provinces.” Otherwise, there was some economic growth in the province and the region, but it was more window dressing than anything else. There were developments on the labour front, as strikes effected communities of all sizes, the most notable of which in New Brunswick was the Saint John Street Railwaymen’s strike and riot in 1914. If one had wandered into downtown Saint John on 23 July 1914, one might have encountered angry rioters, some of whom had “overturned two streetcars, thwarted a cavalry charge, smashed every window in traction company offices, and poured cement

11 Ibid, 158.
12 Ibid, 160.
on a dynamo, plunging the city into darkness.” These and other challenges manifested the continued hemorrhaging of New Brunswick’s youth population as they sought employment in the Boston States. If there was any illusion, then, that the period before the Great War in the province was idyllic, there seems to be much evidence to the contrary. As Ian McKay writes, “This optimistic period has the melancholy charm of all Indian summers.”

There were, too, problems of a national nature which challenged the relative calm of the Edwardian period; chief among these was the 1911 federal election, which resulted in a complete shift of power, for the Liberal-Conservative split of 133 to 85 from 1908 was reversed to 85 to 132. There were multiple factors at play, but chief among these were the Naval Bill of 1910 and the debate over reciprocity with the United States. When rumours began to circulate about Germany’s ambitious naval policy in 1908, Prime Minister Laurier proposed the creation of a Canadian navy which would protect domestic coastlines and cooperate with its British counterpart, as opposed to the financial contribution to the Royal Navy which was being proposed by

---

some. Following the lead of Tory leader Robert Borden, many English-Canadian Conservatives felt that Canada was duty-bound to provide direct financial support to the British Admiralty, and French-Canadian Conservatives thought the whole affair was none of Canada's business. Their dissent over the Naval Bill echoed some of the same complaints regarding Canada's participation in the South African War. "The French Canadian," Brown and Cook have written, "insisted that he was loyal to the British Empire, loyal to the Crown, but in his own way. For him that meant a responsibility to defend only that portion of the British Empire which was his homeland: Canada."16

When Laurier began to talk about a reciprocal trade agreement with the United States, the Canadian businessmen who had long been his supporters withdrew their backing for his party. When Canadian electors went to the ballot box in September 21, 1911, they overwhelmingly through their support behind Robert Borden and his Conservative party. Whether they were swayed on the issues of the "tin-pot" navy or reciprocity, or for entirely different reasons, is less clear. In New Brunswick, however, the Liberals held on to eight of their eleven seats, the Conservatives gaining only three to bring their total to five. In that same period, the Legislative Assembly in Fredericton was dominated by the Tories.17

The relative calm of Edwardian New Brunswick was not long-lasting. By 1914, the tense and complex affairs of Europe boiled over into what was to become one of the deadliest armed conflicts in human history, and the British Empire dove headfirst into
what was termed the Great War. In Canada alone, over 600,000 men (as soldiers) and women (as nurses) participated in the conflict, of whom more than 400,000 served in Europe; of these, 65,000 made the supreme sacrifice. The Canadian contribution and sacrifice to the war effort were significant, but only part of a greater effort by the nations of the British Empire. Estimates vary, but the casualties (killed, wounded, and missing) from the Empire amounted to over 3,000,000, to say nothing of the millions more who served.

The Great War had varied effects on Canadian society. “For King and Country” was a rallying cry for many Canadians, particularly those English-speakers with familial ties (recent or historical) to the mother country. Certainly the motivation behind enlistment for most recruits had more to do with coming to the aid of the United Kingdom and its Empire, which had found itself at war due to a complex series of treaties and alliances, than it did with protecting civilization from the evils of the German Empire as the propaganda suggested. For other Canadians, however, the war offered an opportunity for adventure, though it proved to be a costly one for many. Still others went to war simply because it was the thing to do.

As they had done during the South African War, New Brunswickers signed up for overseas service in large numbers at the outbreak of the war, and “ten battalions were recruited in the province during the war under the voluntary enlistment system.”\(^\text{18}\) Of these, the 26\(^\text{th}\) Battalion was “the only infantry battalion to continuously represent the

province...at the battlefront in France and Belgium during the war.”¹⁹ It was also the first battalion recruited in the province. The estimated population of New Brunswick at the time of the outbreak of the war was 371,000, and by war’s end 27,061 men and women volunteered or were conscripted in the province, of whom 17,016 served overseas.²⁰ Although based in Saint John, the 26⁰ Battalion was initially recruited from among many of the province’s existing militia units, including those at Chatham, Woodstock, Fredericton, Sussex, and Saint John, as well as Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island.²¹ Certainly the story of “the Fighting 26⁰” is not the story of every New Brunswick man and woman who served during the Great War, for fewer than 6,000 men served in it. Its status as “the New Brunswick Regiment,” however, ensured that it became the symbol of the province’s contribution to the war effort. As we shall see, their prominent place in the province’s memory of the war was glaringly obvious when the Prince of Wales visited Saint John on his 1919 Victory Tour.²²

For every Canadian male of military age who volunteered, however, there were approximately two who did not. The historiography for many years upheld the belief that this statistic was particularly demonstrative of the “shirking” of francophone Canadians. More recent scholarship has suggested that Québécois and Acadians initially enlisted in high numbers, until conscription was enacted in 1917.²³ There were many

---

¹⁹ Ibid, 1.
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²¹ Ibid, 3.
²² J. Brent Wilson, A Family of Brothers: Soldiers of the 26⁰ New Brunswick Battalion in the Great War (Fredericton: Goose Lane Editions/New Brunswick Military Heritage Project, 2018).
other groups of Canadians who refused to enlist, however. Tim Cook has written that “...the vast majority of young Canadian men did not object to serving overseas on moral grounds. These Canadians were simply unwilling to leave their communities, jobs, and families, or were critically needed to grow food, manufacture munitions, work the mines, and operate the railway system.” This explanation was not readily apparent during the War itself, however, and those who chose not to volunteer were subsequently criticized and sometimes vilified.

Such was the experience of many Acadians in New Brunswick (who in 1910 represented fully one quarter of the population). In late 1915, an Acadian battalion was created under the command of Lieutenant Colonel Louis-Cyriaque D’Aigle, “in an apparent attempt to shore up the already sagging recruiting campaign among New Brunswick’s French-speaking citizens. By September 1916...it still needed 200 men.”

Andrew Theobald has studied the Acadian enlistment phenomenon, and concludes that “Acadian opposition [to conscription] was founded upon settlement and occupational factors rather than ethnic ones...” Furthermore, he rejects the long-held belief that Acadian enlistment numbers were lower than those of their anglophone counterparts. Other scholars have pointed to an enlistment rate among New Brunswickers as a whole

---
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which was lower than some other provinces.\textsuperscript{29} If enlistment rates among Acadians were similar to those of anglophones in the province, then it can be assumed that there was something else at play which kept numbers down. Theobald argues that the majority of New Brunswickers in this period fell into the category which contained those least likely to enlist: “locally born, long-settled and distant from European affairs.”\textsuperscript{30} One might argue that a large rural population in New Brunswick (seventy-two percent in 1911) meant that more young men of fighting age were required for farm labour than would have been the case in provinces with larger urban populations, although statistics from the prairies, where enlistment rates were very high, may dispute this.\textsuperscript{31}

Young men of recruiting age were not the only people in Canada struggling in this period. Those Canadians with roots in the enemy nations, particularly Germany, were often vilified. In the most glaring example, the city of Berlin, Ontario, became Kitchener; Prussia, Saskatchewan, became Leader; and Carlstadt, Alberta, became Alderson.\textsuperscript{32} In New Brunswick, named in honour of the Hanoverian dynasty which ruled the British Empire at the time of the province’s founding in 1784, there was even talk of a need to rebrand the Loyalist Province.\textsuperscript{33} In other places, German street names were replaced by British ones, and there were even anti-German riots in some cities.\textsuperscript{34} As such, the Great War was, for all the rhetoric about “coming of age,” in many ways a

\textsuperscript{29} McKay, “The Stillborn Triumph of Progressive Reform,” 208.
\textsuperscript{30} Theobald, “Une Loi Extraordinaire,” 89.
\textsuperscript{32} Moogk, “Uncovering the Enemy Within,” BC Studies, 182 (Summer 2014): 70.
\textsuperscript{33} McKay, “The Stillborn Triumph of Progressive Reform,” 214. The New Brunswick Historical Society unanimously resolved that New Brunswick should be rebranded Acadia.
\textsuperscript{34} Moogk, “Uncovering the Enemy Within,” 54.
divisive moment for Canada, as the “terrible strains of the seemingly unlimited war effort from 1914 to 1918 caused a fracturing of Canadian society along linguistic, regional, class, ethnic, and cultural lines.”35 “Initially,” writes Ian McKay, “the war had apparently accomplished the impossible: it seemed to bring almost everyone together in a common project.”36 Four long years of tragedy and mudslinging had undone most of that.

Meanwhile, there had been developments in Ireland which had some impact in New Brunswick, specifically the 1916 Easter Rising in Dublin and the 1919 Anglo-Irish War, which lead to the partitioning of Ireland in 1921. In a province like New Brunswick, with a sizeable and vocal Irish Catholic minority, the issue was bound to be the subject of some debate. In 1916, for example, the newspapers buzzed with coverage of the Easter Rising, and they paid particular attention to the story of a former New Brunswicker, Daniel J. Bailey, who was involved with Sir Roger Casement in a plot to import weapons for the rebels which had been procured in Germany.37 The Daily Gleaner called the rebels “deluded Irish revolutionists” and the Chatham Commercial referred to the same group as “fanatics.”38 The Chatham Gazette carried a report of a speech by Rev. C.J. McLaughlin, a New Brunswick priest attending the national convention of the Ancient Order of Hibernians in Boston, who spoke out in favour of the loyalty of Irish Canadians to the British flag, even in the midst of the Rising.39 There were

37 Union Advocate, 24 May 1916, 3.
38 Daily Gleaner, 4 May 1916, 6; Commercial, 9 May 1916, 4.
39 Chatham Gazette, 2 August 1916, 3.
others in the province, however, who supported the movement for Irish independence, such as the members of the Self-Determination League for Ireland. Irish Catholics were a large minority in Saint John, which had the largest percentage of people of Irish heritage of any city in Canada by 1921, and many there were sympathetic to the Home Rule movement.\textsuperscript{40} Constitutional changes in Canada were more forthcoming. Plans made during the 1917 Imperial Conference, which shall be discussed later, laid the groundwork for the emergence of the modern Commonwealth of Nations, something which Ireland would avail itself of in a far different way than Canada would.\textsuperscript{41}

The war had consequences that reached far beyond Canadian national unity and constitutional affairs, of course. The Great War was the death knell for many monarchies around the world, on both sides of the struggle. Thrones were toppled in Russia, Germany, Austria-Hungary, the Ottoman Empire, and elsewhere, as the nations of the western world grappled to find their way in a post-war world soaked in blood and covered with the dust and debris of a Europe shattered by four long years of conflict. The British monarchy, perhaps by virtue of its longstanding ability to adapt to changing circumstances, and certainly because it was on the winning side, survived the destruction and emerged unscathed on the face of it. However, there had been challenges. In 1917, King George V had changed the name of the Royal House from

\textsuperscript{40} Robert McLaughlin, \textit{Irish Canadian Conflict and the Struggle for Irish Independence, 1912-1925} (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2013), 64.

\textsuperscript{41} Canada’s place within the British Empire was somewhat impacted by the fact that it emerged from the Great War as one of the very few “net creditor nations,” while the United Kingdom had been virtually bankrupted. Therefore, Britain was indebted to Canada for more than just men and foodstuffs; it would take time before the trade deficit between the two nations would be adjusted. Good relations between Canada and Britain were therefore of particular importance, and the tour may have served a valuable purpose on that front as well.
Saxe-Coburg and Gotha to Windsor, and several German princes who also held British princely rank and seats in the House of Lords were stripped of these titles and their peerages. Members of the British royal family, including the King himself, relinquished all German styles and titles, and the King compensated some by creating British-sounding peerages for them.\(^42\) In a very personal act, the King even removed from St. George’s Chapel, Windsor, the banners of the German Knights of the Most Noble Order of the Garter. At the same time the style “Royal Highness” was restricted to the children of the Sovereign, the children of the sons of the Sovereign and the eldest living son of the eldest living son of a Prince of Wales.\(^43\) These may seem like inconsequential technicalities which were only too logical whatever the circumstances. But the changes made were tremendously significant; the King was making changes and allowing for the evolution of the Monarchy so as to quell the arguments for its abolition which were all too likely to be raised.

With tens of thousands dead and many thousands more permanently disabled (both mentally and physically), the world should have settled back to peace in late 1918. Conditions, however, were not ideal for the return of many Canadian men. As Ian McKay has written, “There was not much jubilation when, after more than four years, the war finally ended.”\(^44\) Jobs were scarce, and many found the readjustment to civilian

\(^{42}\) By this change, Prince Louis of Battenburg, who earlier in the War had been forced to resign as First Lord of the Admiralty because of his German roots, became the Marquess of Milford-Haven. Similarly, Prince Alexander of Teck, Queen Mary’s brother, became the Earl of Athlone. In an interesting twist, Athlone served as governor general of Canada during the next World War. Prince Louis went on to become grandfather to Prince Philip of Greece, later consort of Queen Elizabeth II.

\(^{43}\) Nicolson, *King George V*, 310

\(^{44}\) McKay, “The 1910s: The Stillborn Triumph of Progressive Reform,” 221.
life difficult after the brutality of the front lines. The Winnipeg General Strike of 1919 was the most spectacular example of the growing frustrations among Canadians living in this uncertain time. In New Brunswick, where the Maritime economy had not boomed to the same extent as it had done in central Canada, conditions were even more dire as the region entered a period of recession which was to last for years. To complicate matters further, the Spanish Influenza outbreak which followed the Armistice killed tens of thousands of Canadians at home and abroad, including many in New Brunswick, where the recently established Department of Health under William F. Roberts shut the province down to halt the spread of influenza.45

Many veterans and people more generally were, unsurprisingly, disillusioned.46 In response to this, New Brunswickers protested the distressing post-war situation with their ballots, and during the 1920 provincial election demonstrated their dissatisfaction with the Liberal and Conservative parties. Nine United Farmers and two independent labour candidates were elected, a move which undermined the position of the Conservatives in the province in particular.47 As Jonathan Vance has written, “in the months after the Armistice, thousands more [Canadians] died of wounds, disease, accidents, foul play, and suicide. The first year of peace was not a happy time in Canada.”48 Despite the fact that progressive reformers had achieved their goals of

prohibition (1917 in New Brunswick) and national female suffrage in 1919, “The 1910s were the [province’s] last years of abundant hope.”

In spite of the harsh reality which many Canadians faced after the Great War, or partially because of it, the visit of the Prince of Wales in the late summer of 1919 was a welcome distraction for soldiers and Canadians more generally. Vance has suggested, “After four years of war, a deadly epidemic, and a summer of discontent, Canadians let their emotions go” when the Prince of Wales came to visit. Following the Armistice, some felt that there was a great need to show the people of Britain and its Dominions and Territories that the monarchy was relevant and essential in a world which had been changed “beyond recognition” since 1914. The imperial tours made by the Prince of Wales (later, briefly, King Edward VIII) in 1919 and 1920 were at least partially designed to do just that.

The Tour and the Tourist

The Prince of Wales’ series of post-war imperial tours began when he landed at St. John’s Newfoundland, in early August 1919 to begin a lengthy progress across North America and back again before undertaking a visit to the United States. Like the tour undertaken by his parents before him, the Prince of Wales’s itinerary was an exhausting one, for his schedule did not let up until the Prince departed for home in October. The itinerary included stops in all of Canada’s major cities, where the principal focus on the

50 Vance, Maple Leaf Empire, 114.
celebrations tended to be on acknowledging the contributions of Canada’s fighting men to the victory over the Triple Alliance in the First World War. In addition, the Prince laid the cornerstone for the present Centre Block of the Parliament buildings at Ottawa, its predecessor having been destroyed by fire in 1916.

On 14 August, Saint John feted the province’s returned veterans with a “Soldiers’ Joy Day.” On 15 August, after arriving on the battle cruiser HMS Renown from Newfoundland, and landing sharply at 11 o’clock, the Prince stepped ashore, as his grandfather had before him, at Reed’s Point Wharf in Saint John, to the sound of “God Save the King” and a gun salute. Because this was his first arrival on Canadian soil, he was greeted by representatives of the provincial as well as the federal government, including the governor general, the Duke of Devonshire. Edward inspected a guard of honour, drawn up from the ranks of the 26th Battalion, after which there was a musical presentation by 1,000 school children and, in the words of the newspapers, an “allegorical welcome” presented by young women dressed in costumes representing Canada and its provinces.52

The party afterwards moved by car to King Square, where the Prince was treated to further musical selections before moving on to the Armoury for the presentation of official addresses from the province and the city of Saint John.53 Next on the itinerary was the presentation and consecration of new colors to the 26th Battalion of the

---

52 Each young woman wore a white gown and a crown of maple leaves, and held a shield bearing the arms of her home province.
53 Returned local veteran George Parlee was given the task of being chauffeur to the Prince.
recently disbanded Canadian Expeditionary Force, after which medals were presented to several returned men and one Boy Scout. Another brief stop was made at Riverview Memorial Park, where the Prince inspected the monument erected in 1904 in honour of New Brunswick men who fell in the South African War. A subsequent stop at the Military Hospital in the nearby municipality of Lancaster included another program of singing by local school children, as well as a tour of the various wards. Then it was off to the central post office in Saint John, where the Prince unveiled a plaque erected by the local branch of the Women’s Canadian Club in honour of the New Brunswick veterans of the Great War, a program which included yet another address (by the Club president Mrs. Mary Kuhring) and brief reply (by the Prince). After a full morning, the Prince of Wales was entertained to luncheon at the private, men-only Union Club on Germain Street, after which he motored to Rothesay, a smaller community fewer than twenty kilometers from Saint John, for a garden party at the residence of lieutenant governor William Pugsley. The Prince and his party returned in the evening to Reed’s Point Wharf, where the Guard of Honour was again assembled, and boarded his tender as the guns boomed out a final salute. The Prince’s ship, the cruiser HMS Dragon, and its escort, left

54 This particular park is filled with memorials associated with the South African conflict. The park itself is a monument to all New Brunswick men who fought in South Africa, while the monument and several trees commemorate the ultimate sacrifice paid by those who did not return. In 1904, during the tercentenary celebrations of the Champlain-De Monts expedition, which were characterized by what Greg Marquis has called an “ahistorical connection” made between the French explorers and the imperial war in South Africa, included an event at Riverview Memorial Park. It was obviously an important site of public memory in early twentieth-century Saint John, at least until it was overshadowed by the city’s monuments to the dead of the Great War. See Greg Marquis, “Celebrating Champlain in the Loyalist City,” Acadiensis 33, 2 (Spring/Printemps 2004): 27-43.
for Halifax early the following morning. The next time the Prince returned to the province, he was on a private fishing trip as Duke of Windsor.

Beyond the itineraries, the coverage of the 1901 and 1919 royal tours of New Brunswick reveal a great deal more than appears on the surface. As we shall see below, the themes of war and the military, local identities, the place of women, the ‘invention of tradition’, and a number of local issues were played out, both consciously and unconsciously, in the pages of the anglophone press.

The young prince who undertook the 1919 royal tour was very much a product of his times. Prince Edward of York was born at White Lodge in Richmond Park, the eldest child of George and Mary, the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York. Unlike his father, David (as he was known to his family) was born in direct line of succession to the throne, and it was always expected that he would one day be King. After several years in the Royal Navy, the sort of training which the Prince’s father thought most suitable for a boy in his position, David was made Prince of Wales on his sixteenth birthday. After an unremarkable eight terms at Oxford University (from which institution he received no formal qualifications), he joined the Grenadier Guards in June 1914. When war broke out in August, the Prince was keen to participate, but there were grave misgivings in both Royal and Government circles. Only after much insisting that he be given the chance to serve as other men his age were doing was he allowed to embark for Europe,

---

Figure 6: The Prince of Wales aboard HMS Renown during his Canadian tour. (Courtesy Wikimedia Commons)
where he experienced trench warfare first hand and gained a large measure of popularity among the men he met there. At the end of the war, the Prince of Wales began a long succession of overseas tours on his father’s behalf, including two official visits to Canada (1919 and 1927), in addition to several private visits to his Alberta ranch.\footnote{The Prince of Wales made at least two other trips to Canada as heir to the throne, both of which were private visits to the Alberta ranch which he purchased during the 1919 Tour. As Duke of Windsor he made several other private visits, including one to a fishing lodge in northern New Brunswick in 1945.} It was during the 1920s that a sort of celebrity status grew around the Prince, both within the Empire and without, and particularly in the United States. As Frank Prochaska has argued, “the Prince of Wales was in the vanguard of internationalizing royalty.”\footnote{Frank Prochaska, “A Prince in the Promised Land,” \textit{History Today} 58, 12 (Dec 2008): 18.}

**War and the Military**

Given its proximity to the conclusion of the Great War, the 1919 royal tour by the Prince of Wales largely focused on the military, much like the visit which was undertaken by the Prince’s parents eighteen years previous. Similar to that earlier tour, the Prince of Wales’ progress across Canada was largely planned as a “Victory Tour” following the conclusion of the Great War, and indeed the Prince often appeared in uniform.\footnote{Admittedly, the South African War continued officially until mid-1902, but peace was on the horizon in late 1901.} Although historians acknowledge that there were multiple meanings to this, as with any tour, the idea that the tour was ostensibly a thank you from the King for his Imperial subjects’ service in time of war was widely accepted. Indeed, the editor of the \textit{Globe} wrote on 15 August 1919 that the Prince of Wales’ tour would be “no pleasure
jaunt, but a serious mission, undertaken with the two-fold purpose of bringing to the people of Canada the Sovereign’s thanks for their magnificent war services, and of enabling his son and successor to acquaint himself at first hand with the greatest of those overseas dominions he will one day be called upon to rule.” As such, everywhere he went the royal visitor was hailed as the “Soldier-Prince” who had won the admiration of Canadian men and women by his service in the field. The Globe predicted that “everybody can be depended upon to greet him in the manner which he deserves, not only as our next king but a jolly good fellow in the fighting ranks of the late war and a young man of hearty democratic ideals.” A letter to the Globe from the president of the local branch of the Great War Veterans’ Association read in part: “On account of the Prince of Wales’ close association with the Canadian corps on the battlefield of Europe, I feel as I believe you all do, and take a secret pride in the fact that he rather belongs to us and is one of us.” The Prince’s reputation among the soldiers of the Canadian Expeditionary Force seems to have made the scheduling of the “Soldiers’ Joy Day” celebration the day before “Prince’s Day” a natural choice. At King Square, an arch over the fountain included “an appropriate inscription of welcome and a figure of a soldier in khaki.”

From the outset, the New Brunswick portion of the itinerary was heavily imbued with a military flavour. In mid July 1919, the Globe announced that at a meeting of the

60 Ibid, 2 August 1919, 3.
61 Ibid, 6 August 1919, 4.
citizens’ reception committee (which organized the tour in Saint John) it was proposed to schedule an extra day of celebrations the day before the arrival of the Prince of Wales, “in honour of the returned soldiers of New Brunswick.”63 This additional day of celebrations was given the name “Joy Day” and was given equal billing with the visit of the Prince.64 In August of 1919, the last Canadian troops were still awaiting their chance to be transported back to Canada after what had been a long and frustrating waiting period. The men of the 26th Battalion were not required to wait quite so long as this, although it was 16 May 1919 before they disembarked from Halifax and travelled to Saint John by train. The returned veterans had been greeted with a half-holiday and general rejoicing.65 More than one honour went the 26th Battalion during the Prince’s visit just three months after their return to Canada. One hundred veterans of the battalion were assembled on Reed’s Point wharf in a Guard of Honour as the Prince of Wales stepped ashore, and they were more particularly honoured later in the morning when the Prince presented them with ceremonial military flags known as Regimental and King’s Colours.66 Despite their impressive war record, the men of the 26th had not previously been presented with Colours, and so a set had been donated by the Royal Standard Chapter of the Imperial Order Daughters of the Empire (IODE).67 Two weeks

64 “Joy Day” was Saint John’s official celebration of the end of the Great War.
66 Regimental and King’s (or Queen’s) Colours are ceremonial flags carried by military units. Historically, Regimental Colours were carried into battle, and some Battalions of the Canadian Expeditionary Force did the same during the Great War. The 26th Battalion, however, had not been gifted with colours before their embarkation for overseas.
67 Founded in 1900, the Imperial Order Daughters of the Empire were often at the centre of women’s charitable and patriotic war work during the Great War. For a study of their role, see Katie Pickles, Female
Figure 7: The Prince of Wales presents colours to the 26th Battalion, Saint John Globe, 21 August 1919, page 4.
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before the presentation, the *Globe* commented, “It seems to have turned out that the
disappointment experienced by the officers and men of St. John’s crack battalion, the
26th, at not being privileged to carry colors across the Rhine, is, after all, a matter of
congratulation, since this deferred ceremony of presenting regimental flags is to be
done at the hands of the heir to the throne in the home city of that intrepid unit.”68 The
Colours were presented to the battalion at Barrack Green, the site of at least two
previous royal occasions. The Prince “mentioned the remarkable work of the unit at Hill
70... [and] wished the unit continued success and said he felt assured that should the
Mother country ever need again to call on Canada for assistance, there would be a
prompt response.”69 If anyone present remembered the British government’s earlier
promise to codify the evolving relationship between the Dominions following the
adoption of *Resolution IX* at the 1917 meeting of the Imperial War Cabinet, it did not
prevent these types of dramatic promises of future military support being made by the
Prince and Canadians alike.70

In his reply to the Prince, commanding officer Colonel W.R. Brown, DSO and Bar,
reflected on the significance of August 15th for the battalion as the anniversary of their
participation in Hill 70 (an important Canadian victory which forced the German Army to
go on the defensive and provided a strategic diversion from the bloodbath at
Passchendaele), as well as the presentation of their Colours by the son of their

---

69 Ibid, 15 August 1919, 1.
70 The new constitutional reality of an evolving Empire *cum* Commonwealth will be further discussed in the
next chapter.
Sovereign. He assured the Prince (as paraphrased by the *Globe*), “If ever again the
Mother Country called on Canada in the hour of need, New Brunswick would respond as
it had in the Great War which has been brought to so successful an issue.” Further, he
stressed, “If that time should come, the sight of the colors received from the hands of
His Royal Highness would be an incentive and an inspiration, in that they came from a
soldier-Prince who is beloved by all the peoples of the nations within the Empire.” The
tone and spirit of Brown’s promises were not unusual in the rhetoric of royal tours, but
they must have been poignant to many in a province which had lost so many young men
and women in the war.

The Great War more broadly was an overarching theme of the day, and this was
manifested in the presentation of medals to five veterans during the Prince’s time at
Barrack Square. Their names and ranks appeared in the *Saint John Globe*, but little else
about them was printed at that time. More attention was paid to the other major
function on the Saint John itinerary, the unveiling of a plaque in the post office. Erected
by the Saint John branch of the Women’s Canadian Club, it commemorated the New
Brunswick men who enlisted for overseas service during the Great War, and featured a
lengthy list of all the units which departed from the province for overseas service. The
address read by the president of the Women’s Canadian Club, Mrs. Gustav A. (Mary)

---

72 According the website of the Hamilton branch of the Club, “The Canadian Club originated in Hamilton in
1893. Canadian Clubs formed quickly across Canada. A national organization was created in 1909, and
incorporated into a national “Association of Canadian Clubs” by an Act of Parliament in 1939.” Their goal
seems to have been to foster pride in things Canadian. Although the Saint John branch no longer exists,
there are active branches in cities including Ottawa, London, Toronto, Hamilton and Calgary.
Kuhring, read in part: “We wish to express our deep appreciation and thanks that the high honors we desire to pay to the men who went out in His Majesty’s forces in the late war should be so greatly enhanced by the presence and interest of Your Royal Highness on this occasion.” The unveiling itself was a relatively straightforward affair, the Prince’s remarks being limited to one line: “I am very glad to unveil this tablet as a tribute to the splendid service of the New Brunswick men who went overseas.” There is a certain degree of irony in the fact that a tablet which commemorated the service of the men of the province who enlisted (and not the women who served as nursing sisters) was erected by the Women’s Canadian Club, a fact which will be discussed later.

Local Issues

As has always been the case leading up to and during royal tours, much of the attention of the provincial media was focused on local issues and concerns. In the coverage of the planning and execution of the 1919 royal tour, additional issues arose. Some of these were brought to the public’s attention by letters to the editor. Such

74 Ibid, 15 August 1919, 7. A month before the Prince’s arrival in Saint John, the Daily Gleaner reported that the Prince was expected to unveil a second plaque, at the General Hospital, which had been erected in memory of Nursing Sister Anna Irene Stamers and Major Josias L. Duval, M.D. Nothing else in the coverage of the day in any of the three papers consulted, or in the official schedule of the day, suggests that this unveiling by the Prince of Wales took place. Nursing Sister Stamers was drowned when the H.M.H.S. Llandovery Castle was struck by an enemy torpedo on 27 June 1918. Born in Saint John in 1888, Stamers enlisted as a Nursing Sister in 1915, and was one of thirteen Canadian nurses who died when the ship was sunk on a voyage between Halifax and Liverpool. Major Duval was a native of Quebec and graduate of McGill Medical School, and set up a practice in Saint John around the turn of the century. Mentioned in dispatches during the Second Battle of Ypres, he died in England in August 1915 of wounds received during an evacuation of patients in the area of St. Jean. His family arranged for his remains to be repatriated, but to their horror the ship bearing Major Duval was torpedoed en route from Liverpool to Montreal in September 1915; 32 passengers were lost, along with the remains of Major Duval. See The Daily Gleaner, 15 July 1919, 4.
75 Letters to the editor were not a regular feature in this period in New Brunswick papers, though they become increasingly common by the middle of the century.
letters to the editor in the *Globe* made suggestions on how to improve Saint John’s welcome to the Prince of Wales. One published on August 1st from a reader who signed their letter “QUILLER FOX” wanted the committee in charge of parades for the August 14th and 15th celebrations to be mindful of the speed at which the parades would travel, noting that during the visit to Saint John of Prince Arthur of Connaught in 1906 the visitor “was driven with such speed through the streets that not a dozen people on King street knew he had gone by.” “QUILLER FOX” further suggested that the prince be mounted on horseback so that he might be more easily seen by the assembled crowds, or at the very least seated in a carriage by himself.76 A fellow *Globe* reader, who signed their letter “MUSIC”, was critical of the existing method of singing “God Save the King” as practiced in Saint John:

> It is also a great pleasure to learn that the conductor is endeavouring to have this beautiful anthem of prayer, rendered in a proper and dignified manner, such as is sung in England. It is to be hoped that his efforts will be loyally assisted, as from a musical and poetical standpoint the rendition of our National Anthem in St. John, during the last few years, has been anything but what it should be, all through carelessness and want of proper phrasing.77

The writer concluded by saying that he “trusts [the anthem] will be sung in the above way, “the English way,” which will tend to produce that devotion which is in the hearts of a truly thankful and loyal people.”78 A writer from Prince William, NB, styled “WALES”, in a letter to the *Daily Gleaner*, had his/her own suggestion about how to welcome the Prince of Wales, namely ensuring that the Welsh flag was displayed.

---

76 *Saint John Globe*, 1 August 1919, 4.
77 Ibid, 1 August 1919, 4.
78 Ibid, 1 August 1919, 4.
“WALES” writes, “I may say that the Prince is more than Prince of Wales in name only, he takes a deep interest in all things Welsh, and has a knowledge of the Welsh language. It is as well that the correct flag be flown, as the Prince would be the first to notice if it were not so.”\textsuperscript{79} “WALES” found support from “CANADA”, who wrote from St. Stephen to the \textit{Gleaner}: “No bunting could wave a better welcome to him, as he is truly Prince of the Welsh nation, and his interest in all things Welsh has no limit.” “CANADA” went further to suggest the formation of a choir of Welsh-Canadians to sing the Welsh Anthem “and other Welsh airs, which I think are as wonderful as their ancient hills and dales, and I think it would be a treat for all.”\textsuperscript{80} That these four letters appear in 1919 suggest an interest on the part of members of the public in having their say in the royal tour arrangements, and a certain interest in the tour as a whole. They also reflect a population not entirely content with merely waving the Union Jack and touting the province’s British/Loyalist (read: English-speaking) origins and traditions. Interestingly, three of them are promoting the notion of making the event more British in nature by way of “the English way” of singing “God Save The King” and the use of Welsh banners and songs to pay homage to the Prince’s connection with Wales. Of course, letters to the editors are not an exact measure of public opinion, for just as today, there were sometimes opinionated writers of such letters. Moreover, there always exists the

\textsuperscript{79} \textit{Daily Gleaner}, 23 July 1919, 4. The current and familiar flag of Wales was only officially adopted by the government of the United Kingdom in 1959, although variations had been in use since the 15\textsuperscript{th} century. One cannot be sure as to which flag WALES referred.

\textsuperscript{80} Ibid, 5 August 1919, 2.
possibility that editors were selective in which letters were printed, or even that some letters were crafted by newspaper staff themselves.81

That the press and its consumers were taking an interest in the tour’s arrangements proved beneficial in practical ways, too. An editorial comment in the *Globe* prevented what could have become an embarrassing mistake during the 1919 Saint John itinerary. On August 5th, the following appeared in the *Globe*: “At a meeting of the Soldiers’ Joy Day executive on Monday, among the questions taken up was the possibility of having the Prince of Wales go for a short sail on the river as far as Harding’s Point on the Kingston Peninsula to see the tree planted by his grandfather, the late King Edward VII.” Certainly, Edward VII, as Prince of Wales in 1860, had made a trip up the St. John River from Saint John to Fredericton. J.C. Chesley, who proposed the short river trip, was appointed by the committee to consult lieutenant governor Pugsley on the matter.82 Fortunately, the following day, the editorial team at the *Globe* saved the Joy Day executive considerable embarrassment:

For the sake of historical accuracy it is hoped no attempt will be made to convince the Prince of Wales that his grandfather planted the beautiful elm at

81 J.M.S. Careless, in his review of Jack Kapica’s book *Shocked and Appalled: A Century of Letters to the Globe and Mail*, suggests that letter writers engaged in “a fourfold urge to get into the public press: to push causes ...; to express idiosyncratic knowledge...; to let off steam...; and, finally, to indulge in personal whimsies...” J.M.S. Careless, *Shocked and Appalled: A Century of Letters to the Globe and Mail*, ed. by Jack Kapica. *Canadian Historical Review* 67, 3 (September 1986): 440-441. Sigelman and Walkosz have also warned that “Failure to recognize the unrepresentativeness of many letter writers can occasion radical misleading of public opinion. Moreover, most newspaper print only a fraction of the letters they receive, and the winnowing process can add biases of various sorts to the opinions expressed in letters. Many newspaper prefer letter consistent with their own editorial stance, while others look for letters that are especially iterate, novel or extreme....Accordingly, it has often been suggested that the letters column is more reflective of the editorial staff than of the general public.” See Lee Sigelman and Barbara J. Walkosz, “Letters to the Editor as a Public Opinion Thermometer: The Martin Luther King Holiday Vote in Arizona,” *Social Science Quarterly* 73, 4 (December 1992): 939.

82 *Saint John Globe*, 5 August 1919, 2.
Harding’s Point, generally called the Prince of Wales elm. That particular tree looks to-day much as it did half a century ago and takes its name, not from any association with King Edward VII, but because of its structural resemblance to the three ostrich feathers which are the emblem of the Prince of Wales.\textsuperscript{83}

No further discussion ensued. What is curious is that, at least for those who suggested the side-trip, the 1860 royal visit had entered enough into the folklore of their community for the story of the origin of the Prince of Wales’ elm to have become muddled over time. The short-lived plan to show the tree to the serving Prince of Wales is indicative of a larger trend present in most royal tours, even those of today, to highlight past tours and various royal associations. This topic will be discussed at length in the next section of this chapter. It is also indicative of a common trend in that period to focus media coverage on relatively trivial events which might appeal to readers’ “human interest,” whereas today these types of details about royal itineraries are kept secret until the schedule is fully set.

There were also minor disagreements over arrangements in Saint John at the time of the 1919 tour. The editor of the \textit{Globe}, for example, commented at length in early August about the tedious nature of the itinerary:

\begin{quote}
Receptions and speeches and unveilings and processions must be a weariness to [the Prince’s] young life. He will be pleased, beyond a doubt, with his welcome, because Saint John is a loyal city and will heartily voice its appreciation and its interest and its love for this royal soldier Prince. But he is young and enthusiastic and adventurous, and when the miles upon miles of addresses that he will have to hear before he returns to England, there to be again addressed on his safe return, are remembered, and when it is remembered too that he has come to
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{83} Ibid, 6 August 1919, 4. The “Prince of Wales elm” tree stood at Harding’s Point on what was known by some people as “Prince’s beach” well into the twentieth century until it succumbed to Dutch elm disease. It is commemorated in an interpretive panel in the Brundage Point River Centre in the town of Grand Bay-Westfield. See http://www.town.grandbay-westfield.nb.ca/visitors/brundage-point-river-centre-interpretive-panels/prince-of-wales-elm/
Canada to express in his coming the sympathy the Old Land feels for the
sacrifices the younger country made to preserve inviolate the ideals of the
Empire, the desire is to make his day one of unusual happiness, and not a
routine holiday similar to those familiar to him since his first public
appearance.  

No successful effort seems to have been made to make the Saint John portion of the
Prince’s itinerary less arduous or dull than the rest of the daunting schedule, for he was
still expected to undertake the familiar round of official duties, even if his rather
egalitarian attitude made him more personable on a one-to-one level that many
previous royal visitors to the province.

Inventing Tradition

As was suggested in chapter two, royal visits were often the occasion for
newspapers and tour planners alike to engage in a certain amount of nostalgia and
associated tradition making, a part of the building of “imagined communities.” Often,
this came in the form of printing stories in the papers which recalled local memories of
visits from another era. Certainly, when Edward, Prince of Wales, came to New
Brunswick in 1919, there was considerable reflection upon previous royal tours in the St.
John Globe, where most references were made to the 1860 visit by Albert Edward,
Prince of Wales. The Globe printed a selection from Royalty in the New World by
Kinahan Cornwallis, a correspondent from the New York Herald who followed the elder
Prince and his entourage throughout his lengthy tour of British North America. It also

84 Saint John Globe, 2 August 1919, 4.
85 Kinahan Cornwallis observed a noticeable lack of cheering at Saint John in 1860: “The cheering at the
landing stage at St. John’s [sic] was not as enthusiastic as it might have been, but I rightly attributed it to a
lack of manner rather than of feeling, for I observed an awe, amounting to reverence, pictured in the faces
published extracts from other books and reports of the 1860 tour, including a list of all the women who danced with the Prince of Wales during the ball held at Province Hall in Fredericton. The later Prince became in 1927 the subject of a popular British song “I’ve danced with a man, who’s danced with a girl, who’s danced with the Prince of Wales.”

Following a trend in New Brunswick papers to suggest that each tour was the greatest ever witnessed in the province (the decorations more decadent, the crowds more voluminous), there were many claims, which are impossible to substantiate, about the quality of the city’s greeting to the Prince of Wales. The Globe indicated that Commissioner Thornton “advised that he is preparing to have the city buildings decorated on a scale hitherto unprecedented in local annals…” Similarly, the entertainment coordinator for the Saint John stop, Walter H. Golding, said that “the celebrations of August 14 and 15 next would surpass in extent and interest, any previous endeavor in the annals of Saint John.”

Analyzing the 1919 visit of the Prince of Wales is a little more challenging than for other tours, primarily because it represented one day of a two-day celebration, the general theme of which was Canada’s victory in the Great War. Overall, there is far less coverage in the New Brunswick papers under review of the 1919 tour than of the 1901 tour, but a significant amount of attention was given to covering the planning for and execution of Soldiers’ Joy Day. One might suggest that the combination of the two

86 Saint John Globe, 9 August 1919, 10; 12 August 1919, 2; 13 August 1919, 5.
88 Ibid, 1 August 1919, 9.
events would account for the unusually low amount of media coverage in the papers examined. Alternatively, the greater focus on 1901 may have something to do with the fact that “At the turn of the twentieth century, Saint John...was at the height of its metropolitan ambitions.” This would imply that in 1901 those behind the Saint John portion of the royal tour were especially keen to boost the image of their city as an integral cog in the wheels of the British Empire.

Even if the reporters and editors covering the 1919 tour were not as generous with their praise as their predecessors had been in 1901, effusions of pride were not unique to the coverage of the 1901 tour. In 1919, the editor of the Globe, after the departure of the Prince of Wales, wrote that the many welcomes to come in towns and cities across Canada “cannot anywhere be more hearty, more spontaneous, more demonstrative than was our rainy-day greeting.” Later in that same issue came the comment, “St. John set an example for Canada that will require tremendous effort and unique efficiency to better.” These are subjective opinions, but they do speak to an effort on the part of press to prove the loyalty of the people of Saint John and of New Brunswick. Furthermore, they underline and reinforce the dominant narratives present in Saint John and in New Brunswick in the early twentieth century about loyalty and the province’s part in the Empire.

89 Marquis, “Celebrating Champlain in the Loyalist City,” 28.
90 Saint John Globe, 16 August 1919, 4.
91 Ibid, 16 August 1919, 11.
Identities

Although some historians have suggested that the British Empire and Canadians’ attachment were weakened by the Great War, there are others (like Phillip Buckner and John Herd Thompson) who have convincingly argued that Canadian attachment to the Empire survived for at least another generation after 1918. Instead of a break with Imperial sentiment, what Thompson observes is a relationship between the Dominion and the Empire which was evolutionary. For his part, Buckner agrees, suggesting that “It is a pervasive myth – but a myth nonetheless – that Canadians emerged from the First World War disillusioned and alienated.” He argues that “...English-speaking Canadians revealed their commitment to the empire in a small way during the South African War and in an even clearer way during the First World War,” and that “Even in the interwar years there is no evidence that the majority of Canadians wanted to end the imperial relationship, although they did want the power to decide for themselves when they would follow British leadership...”

Although Canada was inching towards legislative independence from the United Kingdom in the early decades of the twentieth century, an attachment to the British Empire remained strong among English-speaking

93 Philip Buckner, “Introduction,” in Canada and the End of Empire, ed. Phillip Buckner (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2004), 4. Certainly, many Canadians, particularly veterans and their families, were disillusioned in the early 1920s with the post-war world more generally, but this cannot be taken as proof that they were frustrated specifically by Canada’s place within the Empire. In the Maritimes, such disillusionment coalesced in some circles around the Maritime Rights Movement, but that placed much more of the blame for regional ills at the feet of the federal government in Ottawa than on anything external.
Canadians into the interwar years. A different reality evolved following the Second World War, and will be discussed later.

The pro-Imperial sentiment was certainly still alive and well in 1919 when the Prince of Wales undertook his tour of Canada. The editor of the Globe referred to “the sympathy the Old Land feels for the sacrifices the younger country made to preserve inviolate the ideals of the Empire...”\(^94\) In an editorial on the eve of the 1919 celebrations the editor again wrote: “the Soldier Prince...brings his father’s message of thanks to the people of Canada for their devotion to the Empire and the great principles for which the Empire so nobly fought.”\(^95\) The Globe carried the text of the premier’s address to the Prince, which included a line referring to “the unity of our race and of the glorious destiny of our worldwide Empire”; in his reply to the address the Prince referred to “the great cause for which the Empire fought.”\(^96\) Canadians may have been disillusioned about the Great War in some ways, but that does not mean that they therefore rejected their membership in the British family of nations. The Canadian path to autonomy which had been advanced by Canada’s war record would not include calls for the breaking of ties with Britain and the monarchy until many decades later, and even then only in some circles.

The Loyalists, who had been the focus of various commemorations in late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century New Brunswick, received a healthy amount of

\(^{94}\) *Saint John Globe*, 2 August 1919, 4.
\(^{95}\) Ibid, 13 August 1919, 4.
\(^{96}\) Ibid, 15 August 1919, 1. It is impossible to know the parameters of the premier’s notion of the British “race” – whether it exclusively included non-Anglo-Saxons, or also non-whites, is unclear.
attention in the addresses presented to the Prince of Wales in 1919. The address of the provincial government, read by premier Walter E. Foster, included the following: “The City of Saint John, which was founded by the United Empire Loyalists about one hundred and fifty years ago, has lost none of its devotion to the Throne of England and to the Empire of Great Britain, and now greets you...with the same fervour of affectionate loyalty as caused our forefathers to abandon all they had that they might better serve the Throne and Empire.”

Similarly, the address by the City of Saint John included the phrase “the City of the Loyalists” in a reference to the city’s founders. In his reply to the city’s address, the Prince of Wales said: “The City of St. John was founded by men whose loyalty to the British Throne and Empire rose triumphant from a terrible ordeal, and I know that the spirit of your founders is still strong in you to-day.” In his earlier reply to the provincial address, and in reference to the World War, he noted his “pride that [New Brunswick’s sons] proved worthy of these founders of your Province who sacrificed their all for loyalty to British institutions and the British Throne.”

Later in the afternoon, when the Prince was entertained to luncheon at the elite Union Club, premier Foster reflected:

Although I can confidently affirm that in all parts of this country he will be accorded most complete evidence of devotion and loyalty to all the institutions essential to the Empire, and among them to the Crown itself, yet, in my view, it is indeed a most happy circumstance, that he has first set his foot on Canadian soil within the Province of New Brunswick... For not only within this city, but in many places throughout this Province, a welcome goes out to him from descendants of men, who, by reasons of their fidelity to British interests, ignored their vested and personal interests and endured great hardships to make homes

---

for themselves under the British Flag, and it is with the utmost pleasure and satisfaction that, as Prime Minister of this Province, at the present time, I welcome the Royal Heir to Britain’s Throne to the homes and hearts of the people of the Loyalist Province of New Brunswick.100

Although the Great War cast a large shadow over the 1919 tour, it is quite clear that for the elite and much of the population of Saint John, the Loyalist myth was still a significant part of what it meant to be a New Brunswicker, inasmuch as it is used as an explanation of the twentieth-century loyalty of New Brunswickers (at least on holidays and special occasions like royal visits). Indeed, the Daily Gleaner argued the day after the visit: “Sailor, Soldier, Sportsman, Gallant Gentleman, Edward Albert, Prince of Wales was given such a reception during the first day of his Canadian visit as to renew afresh the claim of St. John to the title of the Loyalist City.”101 That only a relatively small portion of the provincial population had Loyalist roots and yet were exposed to and sometimes embraced this type of rhetoric is strong evidence for the strength of “imagined communities.”

The influence of the Roman Catholic Church in New Brunswick was gaining ground after the Great War. Whatever anti-British or pro-Irish Home Rule loyalties had driven the harsh commentary in The Freeman in 1901 were long gone when its namesake the New Freeman covered the next major royal tour in 1919. The editor urged readers that “it is befitting that the best honors at our disposal, our very best and cheeriest of welcomes, be extended to [the Prince of Wales].”102 Poetically, they claimed later than “History was made in St. John last week but history, to be fully

100 Ibid, 15 August 1919, 7.
101 Daily Gleaner, 16 August 1919, 8.
102 New Freeman, 9 August 1919, 4.
appreciated, must be seen through the dusty spectacles of time. Generations, yet
unborn, will speak of the two big days in St. John in 1919...”\textsuperscript{103} The Fredericton \textit{Daily Mail} which reported that:

Rev. Father Carney during service at St. Dunstan’s Church Sunday referred to the recent visit of [the prince]. The Prince as the future ruler of British territories deserved the homage and respect of all British subjects. The preacher made extended reference to the excellence of the form of British government enjoyed by all under it and contrasted it with conditions prevalent in other parts of the world. If free government existed it made little difference whether the titular head was Emperor, King or President.\textsuperscript{104}

Aside from the last line, the comments could just as well have come from the mouth of an Anglican bishop as an Irish Catholic priest. Moreover, the \textit{New Freeman’s} coverage of, and commentary on, the 1919 visit was decidedly uncontroversial. That trend would continue in this Catholic paper throughout the rest of the period in question. Irish-Canadian attitudes towards Great Britain and its Empire were complicated, to say the least. Consider, for example, the great numbers of Irish Catholics who enlisted for service with the Canadian Expeditionary Force during the Great War, a time when their brethren in Ireland were championing Home Rule. As Mark McGowan has noted, the \textit{New Freeman} supported the notion, popularized by Ottawa’s Fr. John J. O’Gorman, that “Britain’s engagement in the Great War was just and honourable.”\textsuperscript{105} Ironically, on Easter Monday, 1916, the Irish Canadian Rangers in Montreal were in the midst of launching a recruiting drive while the Irish Republican Brotherhood was attempting to

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\bibitem{103} Ibid, 23 August 1919, 4.
\bibitem{104} \textit{Daily Mail}, 18 August 1919, 4.
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Figure 8: The New Freeman reflects on the success of the 1919 tour, 23 August 1919, page 1.
occupy government buildings in Dublin.\textsuperscript{106} Evidently, then, whatever the personal proclivities of the editor of the \textit{Freeman} in 1901, they were not shared widely enough for there to have been similar press opposition in 1919.\textsuperscript{107} The attitudes of Irish-Canadians generally were complex in the wake of the Great War, and despite the enthusiasm for the royal tour of 1919, there was widespread support of the Self-Determination League, which called for Canada-inspired Dominion status for Ireland.\textsuperscript{108}

\section*{Gender}

Although the royal tourist of 1919 brought no female consort with him, or perhaps because of that fact, there is much that may be gleaned about gender and women’s place in society from the press’s coverage of the tour. The status of women in New Brunswick had changed markedly since 1901, despite the lack of a unified women’s movement in the province, and the fact that calls for suffrage were “repeatedly rebuffed.”\textsuperscript{109} After debating the issues off-and-on for decades, the members of the Legislative Assembly finally granted New Brunswick women the provincial franchise in 1919, although they were initially denied the right to stand for public office.\textsuperscript{110} At the federal level, women who met certain qualifications received the national franchise in

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{107} Interestingly, a public meeting of the Irish Self-Determination League was held in Saint John in 1920, despite the opposition of local citizens who were pro-Ulster who wanted to mayor to ban the meeting.
\textsuperscript{108} McLaughlin, \textit{Irish Canadian Conflict and the Struggle for Irish Independence, 1912-1925}, 194-198. Indeed, Miles Agar, a local leader with the League, stressed that Ireland wanted the same status as Canada enjoyed within the Empire.
\textsuperscript{110} Ibid, 228.
\end{flushright}
1917 under the terms of the War-time Elections Act, and those aged 21 and over received the unqualified right to vote federally in 1920. The decision by the government of Sir Robert Borden to grant some women the right for vote in 1917 “had less to do with women’s right that with the pressing political issue facing Borden’s government: conscription.”¹¹¹ When the government moved to extend universal suffrage in 1918, they still faced opposition from MPs like Jean-Joseph Denis, who declared, “I say that the Holy Scripture, theology, ancient philosophy, Christian philosophy, history, anatomy, physiology, political economy, and feminine psychology all seem to indicate that the place of women in this world is not amid the strife of the political arena, but in her home.”¹¹² But most New Brunswick women 21 and over were enfranchised at all levels of government by 1919, even if they would continue to face serious challenges in other arenas for several more decades. Women continued to have an impact on the movement for temperance and prohibition and in other avenues of social reform, and some of their concerns in the latter arena were addressed by the new Department of Health which was established in 1918.

In the aftermath of the Great War, which had in many ways facilitated their enfranchisement, at least some women had their roles to play during the 1919 royal tour. In fact, women were among the very first subjects to greet the Prince when he arrived at Reed’s Point Wharf. One of the features of the initial welcome proceedings was what the organizers and newspapers described as an “allegorical welcome.” This

¹¹² Ibid, 67.
idea seems to have been hatched not long before the start of the tour, and was first mentioned in the *Globe* on August 5th. During performances of “God Bless The Prince of Wales” and “The Maple Leaf Forever” by assembled school-children,

a pretty allegorical welcome will be extended the Prince by twelve dancing maidens who will represent the provinces of Canada, the Northwest Territories, the Yukon and the city of St. John. These maidens will be dressed in flowing white robes, and as the large chorus behind them are singing they will enact a welcoming pantomime in which St. John will be the central figure, surrounded by the maritime provinces... 113

Each “maiden” was to “step forward in a line and individually make obesance [sic] to the Prince, greeting him on this, his first landing in Canada.” 114 This tableau, photographs of which were widely seen in Canada and elsewhere, showed the young women looking like what one might term daughters of Empire, dressed as they were in their flowing white robes and wearing crowns of maple leaves.

That the organizers of the 1919 tour chose to select young women to fulfil these roles should not be surprising. Britannia, the female personification of Britain and its Empire, was ubiquitous in British patriotic tradition during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. As a maternal figure, Britannia was seen as the mother of Canada and its fellow colonies. The use of women to portray these and other similar characters was not unusual for the period. Bonnie Huskins has pointed out that “Women primarily appeared in symbolic roles – that is, they did not appear as themselves, but as feminine

Figure 9: Young New Brunswick women participate in an allegorical pageant to welcome the Prince of Wales to Saint John. (Courtesy Heritage Resources, Saint John)
personages far removed from their own actual experiences.” Jane Nicholas has similarly referred to the role of women during the celebrations of the Diamond Jubilee of Confederation in 1927 as being generally passive, and “Miss Canada” (Canada’s equivalent of Britannia) as a “representation of power and not the bearer of it.”

Robert Cupido, who has written extensively on the Diamond Jubilee of Confederation, has also written that in the official commemorative celebrations of that milestone, there were no images of women as pioneers, suffrage campaigners, temperance leaders, teachers, nurses, or social workers, assuming an independent role outside the home. The idea of progress extolled by official nationalism, conceived mainly in terms of economic, technological and constitutional development, did not encompass the social and political emancipation of women.

Indeed, it seems that inasmuch as women were permitted to play a role in official proceedings, their role would be carefully controlled.

Women in Saint John in 1919 were not restricted to playing allegorical parts, however. For example, a bachelor Prince was always much in demand at any occasion at which there might be some dancing, and such was the case when the Prince of Wales took part in some dancing at the garden party hosted by the lieutenant governor at Rothesay. Moreover, women were much more integrated into the official program than ever before. Indeed, it was the Royal Standard Chapter of the Imperial Order Daughters

---

of the Empire which gifted the 26th Battalion with the King’s and Regimental Colours which were subsequently presented to the Battalion by the Prince of Wales. The Saint John Women’s Canadian Club erected the tablet in the Post Office which the Prince unveiled in honour of the New Brunswick men who enlisted during the Great War. The growing number of these groups gave women greater opportunities to claim ceremonial space in their communities, which their place during this tour demonstrates.

If women appear to have assumed a more prominent position in the 1919 visit than they had in 1901, however, they still took a backseat to men in the ceremonial space. Nowhere was this more apparent than at the Union Club, where the guest list of nearly 150 people included not a single woman. Moreover, the participation of women in the itinerary was limited in various ways. Most strikingly, it was largely confined to events and roles which conformed to traditional gender norms. It cannot be easily ascertained the degree to which the heightened role of women in the 1919 itinerary was a direct result of the women’s movement of the early twentieth century, but it certainly seems to be reflective of it. Two women, Mrs. J. Pope (Agnes) Barnes and Mrs. James H. (Florence) Frink after all, carried the Regimental and King’s Colours onto the field for the consecration service. Their status in the community was likely linked to that of their husbands (James H. Frink was a wartime mayor of Saint John and J. Pope Barnes was a prominent dry goods merchant) and was no doubt heightened by their

\[118^\text{It is impossible to know whether or not this was a reflection of the men-only rule maintained by the Union Club in this period.}\]
Figure 10: An invitation to the garden party hosted by lieutenant governor Pugsley at Rothesay. (Author’s Collection)
being champions of projects which aided the war effort. In the case of the unveiling of the plaque, women were even more formally involved in the ceremony itself, providing a more direct link with royalty than had heretofore been offered to New Brunswick women. Interestingly enough, however, the Women’s Canadian Club appear not to have used the opportunity to its full potential. In her address to the Prince of Wales, Mrs. Kuhring noted that the plaque was “to be a silent tribute to the eager patriotism and noble self-sacrifice of these men of our times...” No mention was made of the nursing sisters who enlisted for overseas service, some of whom died in the line of duty. It has already been noted that the allegorical welcome at Reed’s Point was a reflection of the age-old image of Britannia as a mother to her Empire.

An important distinction must be made about the class of women that was most closely involved with these groups. Many women’s organizations of the time, particularly those with a patriotic or community focus, were largely dominated by the wives of local male elites, with memberships drawn from the middle class. Of similar organizations active in the United Kingdom in the same period, John MacKenzie has written, “only one or two enjoyed wider, more populist membership.” Women like Mrs. Kuhring of the Women’s Canadian Club (the wife of an Anglican clergyman), and Mrs. Frink and Mrs. Barnes (the wives of prominent citizens) were therefore

119 It was not unusual for the IODE to be involved in such a project. In Lethbridge, Alberta, the local chapter of the organization presented a complete set of regimental pipe drums to the local 113th Highlanders. See Robert Rutherford, *Hometown Horizons: Local Responses to the Great War* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2004), 213.
120 *Saint John Globe*, 15 August 1919, 7. Mary Kuhring was the wife of Rev. Gustave A. Kuhring, an Anglican rector who had served as a chaplain with the Canadian Expeditionary Force during the Great War.
121 Quoted in Pickles, *Female Imperialism and National Identity*, 23.
representative members of their organizations. Their particular class of women was undoubtedly involved in the 1901 royal tour; even though newspaper reports give little indication of their direct participation, this should not suggest that they were uninvolved. Indeed, many women played behind-the-scenes roles in the planning of any number of public events in the late nineteenth century. Again, Huskins explains this is terms of the ideology of the time, arguing that ceremonial traditions in Halifax and Saint John kept men in the limelight while women worked behind-the-scenes.\textsuperscript{122}

Equally significant to any discussion of the role of women’s groups in this period are their motives and primary goals. Members of many women’s societies in this period were “moved by humanitarian, class and egalitarian concerns to attempt the redemption of society.”\textsuperscript{123} For some societies, that desire to facilitate redemption may have found expression in the alleviation of poverty, the spreading of a particular religious message, or the demand for prohibition of alcohol. For other groups, the IODE in particular, the mission was focused on promoting patriotism and loyalty to the British Empire, although they also did charitable work. As such, groups like the IODE and the Women’s Canadian Club found expression for their patriotism during the royal tour of 1919. Their activities, however, were within the realm of separate spheres as they were understood at the time. For example, the donation by the Royal Standard Chapter of the

\textsuperscript{122} “The Ceremonial Space of Women,” 147. Interestingly, a number of women (about whom little can be ascertained) attended a public meeting on 1 August 1919, including one Mrs. Flewelling, vice-president of the Housewives’ League. I found no further mention of that organization having any official role during the Tour. See the \textit{Saint John Globe}, 1 August 1919, 9. An online exhibit hosted by the New Brunswick Museum suggests that the Housewives’ League had been involved in promoting war gardens during the Great War. “Mark Our Place: World War I,” New Brunswick Museum, accessed January 24, 2019, \url{http://website.nbm-nmb.ca/MOP/english/ww1/dosearch.asp?browse=3&results=50&q=saint}

\textsuperscript{123} Quoted in Pickles, \textit{Female Imperialism and National Identity}, 21.
IODE of Colours for the 26th Battalion was within the nurturing role ascribed to women. Katie Pickles refers to this broadening of the definition of what constituted women’s work during the Great War in her history of the IODE. She notes that even fundraising for weapons and supplies for the military was “justified with an appeal to domesticity.”

Conclusion

The coverage by a selection of anglophone newspapers in New Brunswick of the royal tour of 1919 reveals something about the nature of the province in the immediate aftermath of the Great War, although editors and their readers likely made a conscious effort to put aside prevailing concerns about the uncertain economic future that most New Brunswickers seemed to be facing at the time. The central role of the military, particularly the 26th Battalion, in the proceedings continued an age-old tradition, but it also brought attention to the sacrifices made by the men of New Brunswick who had served in the recent conflict, while simultaneously celebrating their victory over the Triple Alliance. The rhetoric of Empire and Loyalism, and the general lack of any reference to Acadians or Indigenous New Brunswickers (both admittedly small minorities in this part of the province) in the anglophone press, speaks volumes about the dominant narratives about identity in the province. Similarly, the place occupied by women on the itinerary reflects their slowly evolving place in the ceremonial space of the province.

124 Pickles, Female Imperialism and National Identity, 43.
After the conclusion of his Canadian and American tours in the late summer of 1919, the Prince of Wales returned to his home in Britain, although he seems to have been impressed by Canada and its people. An incredibly popular figure among his father’s subjects, especially the working class, the Prince of Wales seemed well-poised for a successful reign. Under the smiling facade, however, was an individual who had an innate distaste for many of the more formal aspects of kingship. However, it was his taste for older, married women that proved to be his undoing. After a series of affairs with rich, married women, the Prince of Wales became enamoured with Wallis Simpson, who was an American, married, and already once divorced. Shortly after David became King following his father’s death in 1936, two facts became clear to his ministers: that the new King had little interest in the day-to-day business affairs of the monarchy, and that he intended to marry Mrs. Simpson. After a brief reign (less than eleven months), the King abdicated in favour of his brother, the Duke of York, when he was told in no uncertain terms by his British and Commonwealth prime ministers, and by the Church of England, that he could not marry Mrs. Simpson and keep the throne. Like the other Dominions, Canada was consulted by the British government on the matter. Although prime minister Mackenzie King was hesitant to take sides for fear of implicating Canada in a battle between the King and the British cabinet, in Canada the press was very critical of Edward in a move Gordon Beadle called revealing of “a deep attachment to the Monarchy as an institution and widespread concern for its survival.”

Windsor, as he then became known, spent the rest of his life in exile, largely in France, with his Duchess by his side.\textsuperscript{126} Their international travels while in exile included a brief fishing holiday in New Brunswick in the summer of 1945.\textsuperscript{127} The duke died in France in 1972. He remains today a controversial figure, largely due to his pro-German sympathies and strong racialist views, about which the public knew little in the 1930s.

\textsuperscript{127} \textit{Campbellton Tribune}, 18 July 1945, 1.
CHAPTER 4:
The 1939 Royal Tour

After the triumphant victory tour of Canada by the Prince of Wales in 1919, two decades passed before New Brunswick again officially welcomed a member of the royal family. Although travel technology and communications had improved, circumstances prevented King George V from undertaking any visit to Canada after his accession in 1910. Indeed, his Imperial travels were largely limited to a single visit to India in 1911, to attend the Delhi Durbar, a massive event at which his accession as Emperor of India was acknowledged and celebrated. Otherwise, the King stayed relatively close to home, as was the custom of monarchs in this period. He had been well travelled in his youth and when Prince of Wales, but the burdens of kingship gave him the excuse to stay in the United Kingdom. For the most part, his subjects were exposed to George V through photographs and the printed word, although the development of radio, film, and wireless photographic technology allowed people to feel some connection to their sovereign. His elder sons, David and Bertie, in particular, became his on-the-ground, overseas ambassadors, as we have just seen in the case of the Prince of Wales’ 1919

1 As Gordon Beadle has written, “the tour was so successful that the modern reader may find that the excited newspaper accounts of his visit have an air of unreality about them. Living as we do in a more cynical and less romantic age, far removed from the euphoric optimism that prevailed in the Allied countries immediately after the conclusion of the Great War, it is not easy to understand how the mere appearance of royalty could generate such enthusiasm.” See Gordon Beadle, “Canada and the Abdication of Edward VIII,” Journal of Canadian Studies 4, 3 (Fall 1969): 34.

2 Durbars were held on two other occasions, in 1877 and 1903. Only in 1911 did the Sovereign attend the celebrations. It should come as no surprise to anyone that Queen Victoria did not attend her Durbar in 1877, given that she participated to a minimal degree in national celebrations between the death of her Consort, Prince Albert, in 1861, and the celebration of her Golden Jubilee, in 1887.

3 There is ample evidence that King George V was a homebody.
tour of Canada. There were Canadian tours in the 1920s, most significantly the visit of the Prince of Wales and his brother the Duke of Kent as part of the Diamond Jubilee of Confederation celebrations in 1927, but that itinerary did not include New Brunswick. The 1930s, during which the country, and much of the western world, was gripped by the Great Depression, were no time for lavish expenditures. This meant that very few tours to any Dominion were undertaken, the 1934 tour of Australia by Prince Henry, Duke of Gloucester, the King’s third son, being an exception. This paucity of visits may partly explain the great enthusiasm displayed by Canadians during the 1939 tour. Significantly, however, the tour took place in the shadow of an impending war with Germany, and was an important moment for Canada as a member of the Empire/Commonwealth and an ally to Britain.

The Context

The interwar period was one of immense change for many people, as Canadians sought to make sense of the postwar world and get on with their lives. No other group found this more challenging than the veterans of the Great War, who returned to a hero’s welcome but to a limited job market and various other challenges, some of which have been enumerated in the previous chapter. The 1920s in New Brunswick had little in common with the bustling and booming decade enjoyed south of the border, or indeed in Central Canada. Indeed, while a certain degree of postwar boom helped to regenerate many regions of North America, the Maritimes saw very little of that, and instead were faced with harsh economic realities. As David Frank has written, “During the summer of 1920 the short boom associated with the end of the First World War
came to an abrupt end, and as the world returned to normal, the Maritimes lost the temporary advantages caused by wartime conditions.”

Farmers and fishermen struggled as their markets were either made unreachable or swamped by large producers, and wage earners in cities and towns faced uncertain futures as the economy stumbled. As a result of these and other unfortunate circumstances, demographers estimate that some 122,000 people left Maritime Canada during the decade, a greater loss than in any single decade. Maritime leaders did what they could in order to redress what they felt were issues brought upon their region by the conditions of an unequal Confederation. In response to the Maritime Rights Movement, the federal government appointed a Royal Commission on “Maritime Claims” to investigate the issues, and several actions were taken to address the imbalance between the Maritime Provinces and the rest of Canada, but it was not to be an overnight solution. The problems were widespread and deep-rooted, and modest decreases in freight rates and a small amount of investment in harbours and wharves could not hope to addresses the dramatic drop in prices for fish and lumber, the two products upon which the New Brunswick economy was dependent. There was some

---


5 Ibid, 234. This massive haemorrhage of people was nothing new to the region, having begun in the 1860s and 1870s as young Maritimes flocked to central and western Canada and to the mill towns of New England. Estimates at the overall migration stand upwards of 700,000. As a result of this, and because New Brunswick benefitted very little from immigration, the only growth in the population of the province in this period was among the Acadians population.

limited growth in the forest industry in New Brunswick, but almost solely in pulp and paper; problematically, this industry depended on outside investment and development.\textsuperscript{7} Otherwise, the provincial government did make significant progress in the building of roads and other public works schemes, largely in an effort to attract tourists from New England.\textsuperscript{8} Despite these efforts, New Brunswick was still struggling towards a new decade when things took a turn for the worse.

It was only when the continental economy collapsed at the end of the 1920s that many Canadians living outside the Maritimes fully understood what it meant to be depressed. The 1930s saw little relief for the region, as depression gripped the country as a whole. An old adage suggests that the Depression did not impact the Maritimes as much as it affected other regions, because the provinces were already facing a serious crisis when the stock market crashed in 1929.\textsuperscript{9} Ernest Forbes has suggested that “The decade of the 1930s was coloured throughout by the Great Depression. Dependent upon primary production and international trade, the Maritime economy was hit harder than that of any region east of the prairies.”\textsuperscript{10} While there was some further expansion of the pulp and paper industry at Dalhousie, Bathurst and Grand Falls in 1929-1930, by the middle of the decade many of the northern counties, where some residents were on the verge of starvation, were virtually bankrupt.\textsuperscript{11} One of the greatest drains on the

\textsuperscript{7} Frank, “Resistance and Accommodation,” 243.
\textsuperscript{8} Ibid, 264. In 1922, the province adopted the American practice of right-hand driving on its roads, which had previously followed the left-hand, British practice.
\textsuperscript{9} David Frank has argued the conditions faced by the Maritimes in the 1920s had been developing for at least a generation. Ibid, 234.
\textsuperscript{11} Ibid, 273-5.
public purse during the period was poor relief, as unemployment reached dramatic levels. In some counties, people lived on less than $1 per person each month, and Acadians, First Nations, and Black New Brunswickers were particularly vulnerable.\textsuperscript{12} A change in government at Fredericton in 1935 (Leonard P.D. Tilley’s Conservatives were replaced by the Liberals under Allison A. Dysart) did little to alleviate the suffering, and only Hitler’s invasion of Poland in September 1939 and the declaration of war which followed seemed to be able to drag the region out of its sorry state. “The outbreak of war…,” Forbes has argued, “allowed the Maritimes to leave the decade with some of the optimism with which they had entered it,” while in fact the region was still on the decline. “Maritimers,” he continued, “confidently expected to participate in the industrial expansion of a wartime boom, but never before had they been in such a weak position to do so.”\textsuperscript{13} The royal visit to New Brunswick of June 1939, then, was a short brief bit of sunshine in the midst of an otherwise dreary decade.

In addition to the political and economic changes that characterized New Brunswick in the 1920s and 1930s, events on a national scale affected the place of the province and Canada within the Empire. Although scholars have often suggested that Canadians’ attachment to the British Empire was weakened by the Great War, recent work suggests that old “British” Canada was still alive and well, if a little war weary, in the interwar period.\textsuperscript{14} By extension, relations between Canada and the monarchy

\begin{small}
\textsuperscript{12} Ibid, 276, 283.
\textsuperscript{13} Ibid, 305.
\textsuperscript{14} Phillip Buckner and R. Douglas Francis, eds., \textit{Rediscovering the British World} (Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 2005); Buckner and Francis, eds., \textit{Canada and the British World: Culture, Migration, and Identity} (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2006); Buckner, ed., \textit{Canada and the End of Empire}
\end{small}
remained strong, even though they were changed in essence (if not in substance) by the
Statute of Westminster, 1931. In the spring of 1917, the British government had
called an Imperial War Cabinet in recognition of the sacrifices being made by its
various overseas dominions. For delegates like Canadian prime minister Robert Borden,
it was a small victory, but it provided a platform for discussions not only concerning
imperial military policy but also the constitutional arrangements of the Empire. During
the first of two Imperial War Conferences, the Cabinet passed a series of resolutions,
one of which, Resolution IX, resolved that after the war “the readjustment of the
constitutional relations of the component parts of the Empire...should be based upon a
full recognition of the dominions as autonomous nations of an imperial
Commonwealth.”15 Although Canada’s victory at Vimy Ridge is often held up as the
war’s greatest legacy for Canada (and that has been the subject of some debate as of
late),16 Resolution IX was arguably an equally significant landmark in the development of
Canadian nationalism, and the advancement of the Empire towards a Commonwealth of
Nations. Bloodless resolutions, however, do not have the same sort of emotional appeal
as the triumph of colonial soldiers in a seemingly impossible mission.

After the Treaty of Paris and the return to peace, the prime ministers of Britain
and the dominions were obliged to consider exactly how the new “Commonwealth”

---

16 See, in particular, Ian McKay and Jamie Swift, The Vimy Trap, or, How I learned to stop worrying and love the Great War (Toronto: Between the Lines, 2017).
which they had put into words could become a legal reality. In 1926 an Imperial Conference would put the wheels formally in motion for the drafting of the Statute of Westminster, but there were in the meantime a number of significant landmark events in Canada’s relationship with the mother country. The first of these was the Chanak Crisis of 1922, an event which John Herd Thompson and Allen Seager have called “the most important single event in Mackenzie King’s career.” 17 News broke in August 1922 that the British were requesting the military cooperation of the dominions in a show of force against an army of 80,000 Turks which threatened the small British garrison located on the eastern side of a narrow passageway linking the Mediterranean and Black Seas. When this news reached Mackenzie King, the prime minister was outraged. Accordingly, he refused to support a military intervention to drive back the Turks, and although no attack ever took place and King’s refusal therefore had no direct impact upon the crisis itself, it was an important moment vis a vis dominion autonomy. King felt that there was no longer any appetite in Canada for the “Ready, aye ready” type of response given to London’s call to arms in 1914, and he was insulted that the British government took Canada’s support for granted. 18

The next significant moment in this evolution of dominion autonomy came a year later, in 1923, when Canada negotiated a treaty with the United States regarding the Pacific halibut fishery. Such a topic may seem banal enough, but not when one considers that this was the first instance in which a commercial treaty was negotiated

18 Ibid, 44-45.
and signed by a Canadian official; since 1907, when the Canadian government began to negotiate such treaties, the practice had always been for them to be signed by the British ambassador to the other treating country. Thompson and Seager suggest that few Canadians appreciated the significance of this at the time, but the practice was endorsed by the Imperial Conference held in London later the same year, and soon became the practice in the other dominions as well.\(^{19}\) These two events, though most Canadians have never heard of them, were significant markers in the roads towards Canadian autonomy, a process which had been commenced generations earlier.

The most significant, though only slightly better known, moment was a direct result of Resolution IX. At the Imperial Conference of 1926, the Inter-Imperial Relations Committee, chaired by former British prime minister Arthur Balfour, issued a declaration which endorsed the 1917 resolution, declaring that the dominions of the British Empire\(^{20}\) shall be “autonomous Communities within the British Empire, equal in status, in no way subordinate one to another in any aspect of their domestic or external affairs, though united by a common allegiance to the Crown, and freely associated as members of the British Commonwealth of Nations.”\(^{21}\) The language is significant, for although the title ‘Commonwealth’ had been coined in the nineteenth century, its use in this context paved the way for official recognition of the co-equal nature of the senior states of the empire. One of the immediate effects of this declaration was the

\(^{19}\) Ibid, 51.
\(^{20}\) In 1926, those Dominions were Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, India, Newfoundland and the Irish Free State.
appointment of High Commissioners to the dominions, as previously this role was occupied *ex officio* by the governor general of Canada. As such, the change broke the age-old (and problematic) convention by which the governor general was responsible both to the legislature of Canada, and the British government. The final step in the process begun in 1917 was to enshrine the Balfour Declaration in law. *The Statue of Westminster* was official recognition of this new constitutional reality by the Parliament of the United Kingdom, and it established legislative independence for the dominions. Up until that point, although the dominions were self-governing, Westminster reserved the right to legislate on their behalf. In effect, granting legislative independence amounted to allowing the dominions to become sovereign nations, and resulted in the phenomenon known as the divisibility of the Crown. This meant that there was, legally, a sovereign of Canada who was legally separate from the sovereign of the United Kingdom, a reality which was not widely discussed until the reign of George VI. In the meantime, most Canadians were more immediately concerned with the effects of the Great Depression and most would have been quite unaware of the implications of the change in Canada’s constitutional status.

---

22 Until the Statute was passed, the British Parliament not only technically reserved the right to draft legislation for the dominion without its consent, but also to reject acts of the Canadian parliament which conflicted with British imperial laws.

23 This has been discussed in the Australian context in Anne Twomey, “Responsible Government and the Divisibility of the Crown,” *Public Law* 8 (Winter 2008): 742-767. The transition was not yet complete, of course, as there were several more steps to complete before the Canadian Constitution was patriated in 1982, including the Citizenship Act and the recognition of the Supreme Court of Canada as the highest court in the land (replacing the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in London), both of which will be discussed in the next chapter.
In late 1936, the implications of the *Statute of Westminster* on Canada first became clear, during the crisis which preceded the abdication of King Edward VIII. Had a King or Queen abdicated before December 1931, the British parliament could simply have passed an act which would have applied to the Empire as a whole. The *Statute of Westminster*, however, removed the power of the imperial parliament to legislate on behalf of the dominions. As such, Canada and its fellow dominions had to pass their own legislation assenting to Edward VIII’s wish to relinquish his throne. In writing about the reaction to the crisis in Canada, Gordon Beadle has remarked on the conspicuous lack of coverage in Canadian newspapers, which had so enthusiastically followed the King as Prince of Wales, both during and after his triumphant 1919 victory tour. In Britain, there was a longstanding gentleman’s agreement not to print stories of a scandalous nature regarding the royal family. As such, many Britons were unaware of the King’s indecision over what to do about his affair with Wallis Simpson. Canadian newspapers, which got much of their news from the American Associated Press, were certainly positioned to have all the latest gossip, but chose not to publish it. When news of the King’s conundrum finally burst onto the pages of Canadian papers, readers were taken almost completely by surprise. If the sovereign expected the support of Canadian journalists, he did not get it. There were even personal attacks on the King and Mrs. Simpson in some papers, but the prime minister stayed silent on the issue until after it was over. Immediately after the abdication went into effect, editorials proliferated

---

25 Ibid, 36.
praising the abilities of the new King, George VI. In reality, he was terrified at the prospect of kingship.26

In January 1937, when the House of Commons resumed its sitting, the prime minister moved a motion of loyalty to the new king, which was objected to by J.S. Woodsworth on the grounds that, according to the Statute of Westminster, special legislation would need to be passed in order to legalize the position of Canada’s new King. The British Abdication Act had in fact been consented to by an Order-in-Council in Ottawa, but the prime minister (perhaps trying to cover himself) declared that legislation would be drawn up, which it duly was. The Succession to the Throne Act, 1937, ratified cabinet’s consent and was passed on 19 January 1937.27 Beadle argues that “Although Edward VIII was almost universally condemned in Canada, the Canadian reaction to the abdication crisis nevertheless revealed a deep attachment to the Monarchy as an institution and widespread concern for its survival.”28 The Canadian press, of which Edward had been a darling from 1919 through the 1920s, had turned on the King when he appeared to be putting his personal life before his duty, suggesting that it felt that a sovereign’s actions were significant to Canada and Canadians. Within a few months, towns and cities across the nation were celebrating the coronation of his successor, King George VI. New Brunswick, in common with its fellow provinces, sent a delegation to the coronation in Westminster Abbey, and a booklet detailing the activities of the delegation, as well as celebrations at Fredericton, Saint John, and

26 Ibid, 40.
27 Ibid, 42.
28 Ibid, 45.
Moncton, was available to New Brunswickers as a souvenir.\textsuperscript{29} Across the province, the coronation was front page news in the anglophone papers. Despite the increasing encroachment of American radio programs, movies, books and magazines, as this chapter will demonstrate, there was still a great interest in, and appetite for, Canada’s British traditions, at least among the English-speaking majority.

By the close of the 1930s, however, the eyes of Canada, like those of most western nations, were on Adolf Hitler and Nazi Germany. In 1937, Canada rejected centralized defence planning at the Imperial Conference, and even after the Munich Crisis of 1938, the prime minister was willing to consider only modest rearmament. There remained a certain element of the population which favoured isolationism in the face of the international crisis, and King seemed to toy with the idea on occasion as well. “The Achilles heel of Canadian isolation, however,” write Thompson and Seager, “was the emotional bond that the English-Canadian majority felt with Britain, a bond that transcended region and class.”\textsuperscript{30} The prime minister, who “knew what he would do if war came...never lost hope that war could be avoided.”\textsuperscript{31}

With each passing month in 1939, however, the likelihood that a major European conflict would break out seemed ever more certain, and the majority of Canadians sadly took for granted that they would become belligerents.\textsuperscript{32} The Great War, very much a part of the frame of reference of the vast majority of Canadians, had been widely hailed

\textsuperscript{29} n.a., \textit{New Brunswick’s Part in the Coronation} (Moncton: Maritime Press Limited, 1937).
\textsuperscript{31} Ibid, 316-9.
as the “war to end all wars” when it reached its conclusion in 1918. Many expected that the safeguards which had been put in place after the Treaty of Versailles, including the League of Nations, would do what they had been designed to do and defuse volatile political situations in Europe. By the late 1930s, however, the efficacy of the League of Nations, and of the type of soft diplomacy being employed by men like Neville Chamberlain, was becoming increasingly clear. War clouds loomed low and dark on the horizon. Amidst all of this, a new monarch was finding his way following a crisis which shook the monarchy to its core.

**The Tourist and the Tour**

Prince Albert of Wales was born at York Cottage on the Sandringham estate, the second son of the Duke and Duchess of York (later King George V and Queen Mary). At the time of his birth, any possibility of his eventual accession to the throne seemed remote, given that his grandfather, father, and elder brother were ahead of him in the line of succession. As a child, he was close to his elder brother, David, and the two were sent off to join the Navy together when the younger York brother was just 13. Though he was a poor student academically, he was committed to his career in the Royal Navy, a career which during the Great War was interrupted by frequent bouts of ill health. Despite this, the prince, by then second in line to the throne, did see action aboard HMS *Collingwood* during the Battle of Jutland in 1916. He later
Figure 11: King George VI and Queen Elizabeth in Ottawa during their 1939 tour. (Courtesy Wikimedia Commons)
transferred to the burgeoning Royal Air Force towards the end of the Great War, and following the armistice studied briefly at Trinity College, Cambridge. Taking an active interest in the welfare of the working class, he founded the Duke of York’s Camps, which brought together boys from different social backgrounds. Having been created Duke of York in 1920, the prince undertook an increasingly heavy load of royal duties on his father’s behalf, something in which he was aided immeasurably by his wife, Lady Elizabeth Bowes Lyon, whom he married in 1923. A witty and charming member of an old and titled Scottish aristocratic family, Elizabeth in many ways brought the royal family down to earth after her marriage. She was the guiding hand which helped the Duke, with the aid of Australian speech therapist Lionel Logue, to overcome his at-times debilitating stammer. The pair became great favourites during their tours of communities and countries throughout the empire, and the world followed with great interest the births and activities of their two daughters, Princesses Elizabeth and Margaret Rose.33

The then-startling events on 1936 brought great change to the lives of the Duke and Duchess and their daughters. When King George V died in January of that year, the crown passed to his son, David, a bachelor with a preference for the company of married women and who acceded the throne as King Edward VIII. During the abdication
crisis which followed eleven months later, there was little communication between the
King and his heir, and the Duke of York likely despaired more than any other person in
the empire when his brother finally renounced the throne in order to marry the twice-
divorced Wallis Simpson. Reluctant though he was, the new King set about to make right
all the damage done to the monarchy by the crisis. He chose the regnal name George VI
in homage to his late father, and he made a further attempt at continuity when he
chose to be crowned on the same date which had been set aside for that of his brother.
At the time of this coronation, the King’s Canadian prime minister, MacKenzie King,
invited King George to undertake a tour of Canada; the King accepted the following
year.

The 1939 royal tour of Canada looms very large in the public memory of pre-war
Canada. Indeed, it is the earliest tour which continues to exist in living memory, and
Canadians of a certain vintage can declare with certainty exactly where they were when
they witnessed the spectacle of the King and Queen’s journey through Canada.34 As
Cannadine has written, “…the state visit of King George VI and Queen Elizabeth was the
most sensational event in the history of the dominion. Today, when royal visits have

34 Stamp, *The World of Tomorrow*, viii. Admittedly, for many of these individuals, who were but children at
the time of the Tour, their memories have as much to do with the general hub-bub surrounding the stop in
their particular community, and to creative means of transportation often used to get to the location, as
they do with seeing the Royal couple. For example, the late Fernand Ouimet (b. 1924) of Vankleek Hill,
Ontario, recalled vividly making the trip to the now-long-forgotten spa town of Caledonia Springs to see the
Royal Train, which spent the night on the siding there. Jerry Donahue (b. 1935) of Miramichi, NB, recalls
waiting for the passing of the Royal limousine at the home of a family friend just outside Newcastle (now
part of Miramichi), while the owner of the house was kept busy finding more and more seats for the growing
number of friends who wanted to watch the procession from his property. On one such trip into his house
to fetch yet another chair, the man returned to his guests only to find out that he had missed the King the
Queen entirely! Fernand Ouimet, Interview with Author, 15 July 2007; Jerry Donahue, Interview with
author, 1 June 2014.
become commonplace, it is hard to realize what an extraordinary episode this was. But at the first visit ever by a reigning British monarch to one of the few great dominions, it brought Imperial Canada alive.” There is little wonder that so many retained vivid memories of these occasions. Firstly, the hype leading up to the tour was tremendous, ostensibly because, although Canada had hosted many members of the royal family on previous occasions, a reigning sovereign had never before set foot on Canadian shores. Secondly, never before had a royal itinerary included so many communities, both large and small. It was, as tradition dictated, a rather punishing schedule. Thirdly, the addition to the tour programme of a side-trip to the United States (a key potential ally in what by now seemed the inevitable war with Germany) added another exciting dimension to the planning and contributed to the general hype. That enthusiasm has not completely evaporated either. More books have been written about the 1939 visit than to any other single Canadian tour, one of which was published 65 years after the visit, but all have been popular histories containing little to no analysis. British and American

36 See Gustave Lanctot, The Royal Tour of King George VI and Queen Elizabeth in Canada and the United States of America 1939 (Toronto: E.P. Taylor Foundation, 1964), XII-XIII.
37 Consider, for example: Arthur Bousfield and Gary Toffoli, Royal Spring: The Royal Tour of 1939 and the Queen Mother in Canada (Toronto: Dundurn, 1989); Tom MacDonnell, Daylight Upon Magic: The Royal Tour of Canada – 1939 (Toronto: MacMillan of Canada, 1989); R.B. Fleming, The Royal Tour of Canada: The 1939 Royal Visit of King George VI and Queen Elizabeth (Toronto: Lynx Images, 2002); in addition are Lanctot’s official history and contemporary and commemorative books of photographs published in many provinces across Canada. It is worth mentioning that two of these popular histories of the tour (those by Bousfield and Toffoli, and MacDonnell) were released in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the tour, the only such known instance of a book being published in Canada to commemorate the anniversary of a royal tour. Such was the significance of this anniversary that Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth, The Queen Mother, visited Canada in the summer of 1989 to pay tribute to that famous journey. Articles on the tour have also been produced, including Mary Vipond, “The 2003 Presidential Address of the CHA: The Mass Media in Canadian History: The Empire Day Broadcast of 1939,” Journal of the Canadian Historical Association 14, 1 (2003): 1-21; and Simon J. Potter, “The BBC, the CBC, and the 1939 Royal Tour of Canada,” Cultural and Social History 3, 4 (2006): 424-444.
scholars have weighed in on the significance of the visit to the United States to Anglo-American relations during the Second World War.\textsuperscript{38}

After many months of planning, the tour commenced in mid-May 1939, several days behind schedule due to heavy fog on the North Atlantic which had slowed the progress of the RMS \textit{Empress of Australia}. But if the fog had delayed the proceedings, it certainly does not seem to have dampened the spirits of the people who assembled at Quebec to bid the King and Queen welcome as they landed (at Wolfe’s Cove, no less).\textsuperscript{39} Twenty-five thousand school-children alone were assembled on the Plains of Abraham, where they sang “God Save the King.” From Quebec the royal party moved on to Montreal, where the infamous Camilien Houde was mayor and lived up to his colourful reputation, and where the crowds were said to have given them a welcome “which rivalled that offered by Quebec.”\textsuperscript{40} The visit to Ottawa which followed certainly provided for some of the most memorable events of the tour. These included the unveiling of the National War Memorial (ironically finished just in time for Canada to be embroiled in yet another bloody international conflict) and an official ceremony in the Senate Chamber, during which the King gave Royal Assent to several bills. For spectators (and protection officers), the former was the more memorable moment, for following


\textsuperscript{39} Wolfe’s Cove was the site from which the British, under General James Wolfe, launched their sneak attack on the fortress of Quebec in 1759, an engagement which culminated in the Battle of the Plains of Abraham and the eventual Conquest of New France.

\textsuperscript{40} n.a., \textit{Their Majesties’ Visit to Canada, The United States and Newfoundland} (London: MacMillan & Co., 1939), 16.
the official unveiling, the King and Queen went “walkabout” among the many veterans in attendance, being virtually swallowed up by the crowds.41

After the successful stop in Ottawa, the royal party moved westward, making major stops in Toronto, Winnipeg (where the King delivered an Empire Day broadcast via radio),42 Regina, Calgary, Vancouver and Victoria. At every major stop the well-wishers numbered in the tens of thousands. Returning eastward, stops included Edmonton, Saskatoon, and yet another (this time brief) stop at Winnipeg to meet a group of veterans who had earlier been overlooked. Crossing into the United States, the King and Queen became the guests of President Roosevelt, who gave them an official welcome at Washington, followed by a more intimate holiday at the Roosevelt cottage at Hyde Park on Hudson in New York State. In between, the Royals toured the World’s Fair in New York City. The time spent in the United States received a huge amount of press attention in North America and beyond, and the King and Queen’s private time with the President and First Lady has even been featured in more than one film.43 An enduring story about the visit to Hyde Park on Hudson is the famous, so-called “Hot-Dog Summit,” a Roosevelt family event at which the royal pair were served the ubiquitous American food of that name, the means to eat which, legend says, the Queen was at a loss to determine. The American portion of the 1939 royal tour was significant, for some

41 MacDonnell, Daylight Upon Magic, 89. For more on the unveiling of the memorial, including insights into the King’s speech (written by the prime minister, see David L.A. Gordon and Brian Osborne, “Constructing national identity in Canada’s capital, 1900–2000: Confederation Square and the National War Memorial,” Journal of Historical Geography 30 (2004): 618-42.
42 See Vipond, “The Empire Day Broadcast of 1939.”
43 These include the 2012 film Hyde Park on Hudson, featuring Bill Murray, and Bertie and Elizabeth (a 2002 TV movie).
have suggested that the personal exchanges between the King and the President (who was thirteen years the King’s senior and a much more experienced public figure), coupled with the immense amount of interest of Americans in the Royal couple, helped to solidify American support for the Allied war effort.44 One magazine journalist has gone so far as to suggest that “These hot dogs helped save the Western world from the Nazis.”45

Whatever the effect of those tubular treats, the King and Queen were soon back aboard the royal train and moving across the border into Quebec before making their way to the Maritimes on the CNR line, where they were greeted at Newcastle on the Miramichi River. At Newcastle, they were welcomed by representatives from the town

44 Admittedly, the American Government did not enter the War until the Japanese attack on their Pearl Harbour base in December 1941. Earlier in the war, however, the Americans did provide support for the Allied cause, including the 1940 Ogdensburg Agreement, which established a Permanent Joint Board of Defense between Canada and the United States, and the Lend-Lease Agreement, which provided Allied nations with weaponry and arms in return for leases to build military bases on Allied territory.


Although this may be giving the hot dogs a bit too much credit, there is still much reason to attribute significance to the visit as a whole. David Reynolds has written that “this ostensibly ceremonial event was gradually invested by the president with considerable diplomatic significance.” Reynolds continues, “[Roosevelt] wanted it to symbolize Anglo-American amity in a striking way for his countrymen, the British, and the dictators, while not laying himself open to isolationist critics at home. He saw it as a means of strengthening ties with Canada and of helping to make the British monarchy more human and democratic in American eyes. He also used the talks with George VI to continue his attempt to toughen Britain’s policy and to develop new contacts with her leaders.” See Reynolds, FRD’s Foreign Policy and the British Royal Visit to the U.S.A., 1939,” 472.

The menu for this picnic obviously cannot explain Roosevelt’s support of Canadian defense, which he had made clear during a 1938 speech at Queen’s University in Kingston, Ontario, when he declared: "The Dominion of Canada is part of the British Empire. I give to you assurance that the people of the United States will not stand idly by if domination of Canadian soil is threatened by any other empire.” See Robert Bothwell, *Your Country, My Country: A Unified History of the United States and Canada* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 201.
of Newcastle and the County of Northumberland. The Queen received the customary bouquet of flowers and the King reviewed an assembled group of Great War veterans. After what was a brief stop in this northern New Brunswick town, the Royal couple left the comfort of the royal train behind at that station and instead motored across central New Brunswick towards the capital at Fredericton. There was no official stop scheduled for the 108-mile (174-kilometre) journey, but the itinerary was first thrown off ever so slightly as the car passed through the rural community of Millerton, which tendered such a welcome to Their Majesties that they wished to acknowledge it by an impromptu stop. The decorations stretched over half a mile, with a double row of spruce trees flying small flags, interspersed with several arches of firs adorned with bunting. More than five thousand people hailed Their Majesties with lusty cheers.46

A second (allegedly) impromptu stop further along the Miramichi River valley proved even more memorable.

During the long, dusty drive along the Miramichi and the Nashwaak rivers, which must have provided beautiful spring views of the river valley as well as a welcome break from constant press attention, a short stop was made at Doaktown (about half way between Newcastle and Fredericton) at a guest house operated by James and Addie Gilks.47 The people of Doaktown were shocked when the royal limousine pulled up in front of the Gilks House, when they had expected to see only a royal blur passing through their small village. When the party had been served refreshments and had

46 Lanctot, The Royal Tour of King George VI and Queen Elizabeth, 108.
47 While there is a persisting legend in New Brunswick that the stop was completely unscheduled, an account of the day written by Mrs. Gilks suggests that arrangements were made a few days beforehand for the Royal Party, which included not only the King and Queen but also the prime minister, Mr. Mackenzie King, to take tea in a quiet setting.
spent some time chatting with the owners, and after Her Majesty had received a bouquet of lilacs, hastily picked and presented by Brownie Olive Weaver, the limousine and entourage pulled back onto the highway and continued on its journey to Fredericton. In the provincial capital, the King and Queen undertook a similar round of engagements to all major stops along the tour, all the while cheered by a crowd estimated to be in the range of 50,000 people (five times the city’s population of 10,000). Salutes were fired, and the streets were lined with militiamen, veterans, Girl Guides and Boy Scouts. The official ceremonies, which included welcomes from premier Allison Dysart and mayor Hedley Forbes and the review of Great War veterans (including two ‘local’ recipients of the Victoria Cross) by the King, took place inside and in front of the Legislative Assembly building. A provincial government luncheon followed on the campus of the University of New Brunswick, and the visit was capped by a drive through the city of Fredericton, including a slow passage in front of the Victoria Public Hospital, before the royal couple entrained at Salamanca to begin their journey to Saint John.

At Saint John, the city’s population of approximately 50,000 was swelled by visitors from across southern New Brunswick (to say nothing of an estimated 12,000

---

48 MacDonnell, *Daylight Upon Magic*, 239-244. It could be argued that this (allegedly) _extempero_ stop is the most vibrant in the oral history of the 1939 Tour in New Brunswick. Exactly 75 years to the day of this memorable occasion, the author gave a public talk on the 1939 tour as part of a four community lecture series on the subject. The crowd was larger in Doaktown than in Miramichi, Fredericton and Saint John combined. Olive Weaver, by 2014 in her mid-80s and Mrs. Olive O'Donnell, was among them, and was presented, fittingly, with a bouquet of lilacs. On display were two chairs, fitted with brass plaques, which denoted that they were the seats used by the King and Queen during their stop at the Gilks House. That 25-minute stop is still the stuff of legend in Doaktown.

Figure 12: Doaktown’s welcome arch. (Courtesy Olive O’Donnell)

Figure 13: Brownie Olive Weaver presents a bouquet to Queen Elizabeth at Doaktown, 13 June 1939. (Courtesy Olive O’Donnell)
There, the King and Queen were greeted by more veterans, Boy Scouts, Girl Guides, militiamen and police, as well as the official dignitaries, who entertained them to tea at Government House, the Cobourg Street home of lieutenant governor Murray MacLaren. A drive through the city and neighbouring municipalities drew criticism because the royal procession did not slow down as it passed the Lancaster Military Hospital (something which the Queen attempted to make up for by sending a letter of apology to the hospital). After reviewing more veterans, the King and Queen bade farewell to Saint John and continued along the CNR line towards Nova Scotia, greeted sometimes by thousands at various rail stations along the way, and making short stops at Sussex and Moncton, at which latter place the brief official ceremonies at the train station were floodlit, taking place as they did after 9pm. The royal couple spent the night aboard the royal train at Cape Tormentine on the Northumberland Strait, and although the next morning they awoke to driving rain, fully twenty thousand spectators were on hand to cheer them as they departed by HCMS Skeena for Prince Edward Island. Thus ended what was a visit to New Brunswick which lasted just more than 24 hours. It is worth noting that the itinerary, though it was the most geographically comprehensive of any royal tour of New Brunswick to date, did not include stops in any of the predominantly Acadian areas of the province, even though about thirty-five percent of the population gave French as their mother tongue in the 1941 census.

---

50 Eighth Census of Canada, 1941, Vol. I, 590; Lanctot, The Royal Tour of King George VI and Queen Elizabeth, 111.
51 Lanctot, The Royal Tour of King George VI and Queen Elizabeth, 115.
52 Eighth Census of Canada, 1941, Vol. II (Ottawa: Edmond Cloutier, 1944), 3, 750. There was an Acadian minority in Northumberland county, but not in the immediate vicinity of Newcastle. Even in more recent decades, stops in predominantly Acadian communities have been rare, and royal itineraries more often
remainder of the 1939 tour included stops in Charlottetown, Pictou and New Glasgow, Truro, and Halifax. A short visit to Newfoundland (“the Empire’s oldest colony”\textsuperscript{53}) was added on to the end of the visit, even though the island would not become part of the Canadian Confederation for another decade.

**War and the Military**

For those who witnessed it, the royal tour of 1939 must have been the last significant opportunity for celebration before the clouds of war rolled over the nation, where they remained for six long years. Certainly, the front pages of the province’s newspapers in the winter and spring of 1939 were filled with stories about the deteriorating situation in Europe, illustrating that New Brunswickers, like Canadians everywhere, were very much on edge as war increasingly seemed an inevitability. So real was the threat, in fact, that in early April 1939, there were mumblings about whether or not it was advisable for the King and Queen to leave the United Kingdom at all, let alone to cross the U-boat ridden Atlantic Ocean. The *London Daily Express* was suggesting that the King and Queen should not travel to Canada aboard HMS *Repulse*, a battle cruiser which had been specifically refitted for the royal tour over a period of five months between October 1938 and March 1939, their argument being that the ship could not be spared from the fleet at such an unstable time.\textsuperscript{54} The editor of Saint John’s

---

\textsuperscript{53} Lanctot, *The Royal Tour of King George VI and Queen Elizabeth*, 135.
\textsuperscript{54} In 1939 the *Express* was owned, coincidentally, by the Ontario-born, New Brunswick-raised Max Aitken, First Baron Beaverbrook.
Evening Times-Globe wondered “[if] the need for ships, however, is such that the Repulse and her escort – the escort would be there probably in any case – cannot be spared, the risk is too great to expose the persons of the King and Queen to it.”  

Several days later, the same paper expanded upon the subject, taking a realistic approach to the question of the tour’s cancellation: “Only a situation so grave as to make the practical objections to the visit stronger than its advantages will effect a change in the plan; and such a situation will be not far short of actual hostilities. [...] Let us get this into our heads: if reasonably possible the royal visit will take place. Up to the last minute, however, there will be a chance of its cancellation.... We may therefore cease worrying, brush gossip aside, prepare for the visit and take things as they come, remembering that the present odds are nine to two on.”  

In the end, hostilities in Europe did not begin until the fall of 1939, and the tour was able to go forward, although the King and Queen travelled aboard the Empress of Australia rather than HMS Repulse. The Daily Times revealed that this was in fact the King’s suggestion.  

Although it took place neither during nor in the immediate aftermath of a particular military conflict, the 1939 royal tour still possessed many of the same military trappings as its predecessors earlier in the century, even if there were very few regular Canadian troops stationed in New Brunswick at this time. Veterans of the Great War, many of whom had seen the Prince of Wales during his victory tour in 1919, were fathers and grandfathers twenty years later, and still they were asked to turn out in  

55 Evening Times-Globe, 10 April 1939, 4.  
56 Ibid, 13 April 1939, 4.  
57 Daily Times, 28 April 1939, 1.
huge numbers to form guards of honour at civic events across the nation. New Brunswick’s Great War veterans were no exception, turning out in their Canadian Legion uniforms at stops throughout the province. As early as April, Fredericton’s *Daily Gleaner* carried news that for the short stop at Newcastle alone, authorities would be depending upon the participation of “The North Shore Regiment, the 12th Field Battery, and a volunteer force of ex-servicemen from Northumberland, Restigouche, Gloucester and Kent counties...assisted by representatives from the fire corps of Newcastle, Chatham and other North Shore towns, [as well as] 1,000 to 2,000 civilians.”\(^58\) At Fredericton, the *Gleaner* reported, the guard of honour would be provided by the Canadian Officers’ Training Corps at the University of New Brunswick, accompanied by the military bands of the New Brunswick Rangers, the Carleton and York Regiment, and other non-military organizations.\(^59\) In Moncton, old and infirmed veterans were provided with special seating, and forty amputees and South African veterans were reviewed there by the King and Queen during the couple’s short stop.\(^60\) “For all those ex-servicemen,” the *Daily Times* proposed, “as well as for the King and Queen themselves, it was indeed a happy interlude, one which all present will ever remember.”\(^61\)

---

\(^58\) *The Daily Gleaner*, 26 April 1939, 3. It is worth noting that even with these resources at hand, there was still a need for volunteers on the day of the Royal visit. The author’s grandfather, then aged 22, was selected from the crowd by a local RCMP constable, given a gold-coloured arm band, and told to join the ranks along the procession route.

\(^59\) Ibid, 25 May 1939, 9. Each of these were volunteer militia groups; the permanent force of the Canadian Army in 1939 was miniscule, and so the tour’s organizers were forced to rely on volunteers.

\(^60\) *Daily Times*, 13 May 1939, 6; *Daily Times*, 14 June 1939, 1.

\(^61\) Ibid, 14 June 1939, 4.
At Newcastle, the King was introduced to Neil Morrison Jordan, the most-decorated veteran of the Great War from the Miramichi River valley. At Fredericton, two recipients of the Victoria Cross (VC), Herman J. Good and William H. Metcalf, were presented to their King. Good was a resident of Bathurst in the north of the province, and had earned his VC for conspicuous bravery in the face of the enemy in August 1918. Metcalf, though an American by birth, had served with the Canadian Expeditionary Force, and earned his VC in September of the same year. Though he was again living in Maine, where he spent his life, Metcalfe was feted in Fredericton during the tour. *Daily Gleaner* coverage of the visit included stories entitled “How Herman J. Good Won Victoria Cross” and “How ‘Billy’ Metcalf Won Victoria Cross”, and were featured alongside a photograph of the King and Queen taken at Washington, D.C.

Aside from the fact that militia and veterans were highlighted in the itinerary across the country, there was limited direct reference to the threat of war, and one cannot help but notice that coverage of the deteriorating international situation was often pushed to the periphery of the front pages of New Brunswick’s newspapers. The *Evening Times-Globe* quoted the New Brunswick-born president of Canadian Cottons, Ltd., Dr. A.O. Dawson, as saying “The visit of the King and Queen has helped very much. It has tended to take the public mind off the European situation. We don’t hear so much as we did about Mussolini and Hitler.” Dawson belied his vested interest as a manufacturer when he added, “People are not so frightened of the war, and this is a

---

63 *Daily Gleaner*, 13 June 1939, 4.
good thing, because fear destroys business.” Dawson was not the only person who appreciated the distraction. A.C. Irwin wrote a letter to the editor of the *Evening Times-Globe* in which he praised the paper for giving less attention to the European situation during the tour:

> Throughout the past month we have followed with extraordinary interest minute details of their tour...and to our profound satisfaction their activities have at all times been front page news relegating that of bombastic Hitler and his war scares to a position of insignificance almost to the point of entire elimination.

In future, Irwin advised, newspapers should not give so much attention to “the activities of the totalitarian powers of Europe...and thereby render an invaluable service to our dear Canada.” Those who fully recognized the immediate threat of those totalitarian powers may well have applauded the one-legged veteran of the 26th (New Brunswick) Battalion who told the Queen that “he and many other Canadians would be glad to support the Motherland in the event of another war.” The Queen replied, “That’s the spirit, only I hope we don’t need you.”

**Expressions of Identity**

The newspaper coverage of the royal tour of 1939 also provides evidence about various elements of contemporary New Brunswick society. These expressions of elements of provincial identity are most evident in the elaborate decorations which adorned public and private buildings. In particular, the lengthy description of the

---

64 *Evening Times-Globe*, 7 June 1939, 9.
66 *Daily Times*, 14 June 1939, 10.
decorations on the Legislative Assembly building in Fredericton provides some insight into the types of images which the organizers felt should be associated with the province. It began with the description of the four pillars in front which were covered in fir tips, “in front of which stand two life-size and life-like moose having the effect of stepping out from the forest.” Below the moose were the shields of Canada and New Brunswick. Britannia stood, as she continues to do today, above the portico holding her shield and trident. “This a reminder,” the *Daily Gleaner* remarked, “that New Brunswick is essentially a Maritime country, and is also a compliment to His Majesty and his Naval record.” Additional panels on either side of Britannia included the shields of St. George and St. Andrew. Other panels, along the front of the Legislative Assembly building, bore images “of the early life of the Province, its discovery, its game and the chief products.” Included among these were paintings of Samuel de Champlain, a Maliseet chieftain, a Mi’kmaq warrior, native trees, and a pair of white-tailed deer. The shields of England, Wales, Ireland, Scotland and New Brunswick completed the décor.”

Conspicuously absent were any traditional symbols of the province’s Acadian population. With the exception of the portrait of Samuel de Champlain (who spent a very short time in the region), there was no acknowledgement of the French origins of the province. Even at the official luncheon hosted at the University of New Brunswick, the *Evening Times-Globe* announced that the King and Queen would be treated to the traditional airs of Scotland, England, and Ireland, but they make no mention of music.

---

67 *The Daily Gleaner*, 6 June 1939, 12.
from France or French Canada.68 One exception may have been the fleur-de-lis which were featured on some of the decorative shields lining the royal route in Fredericton.69

Even then, however, the fleur-de-lis was a symbol with ties not to Acadia but to New France, and those two communities were keen to demonstrate their differences (which suggests that the decorator may not have known well their history).70 The absence of Acadian symbols could not have been lost on some prominent Acadians, including the province’s representative in the federal cabinet, Joseph-Enoil Michaud, a native of the provincial border community of St-Antonin, Quebec, who had represented Restigouche-Madawaska in Parliament since 1933.71

By 1941, Acadians represented thirty-five percent of the population of New Brunswick, so it is indeed strange to think that their cultural markers were left out of the tour planning entirely, as they had been in 1901 and 1919.72 This may be explained by the fact that both Fredericton and Saint John were predominantly anglophone communities in 1939, while in Moncton the Acadian population was growing.73

---

68 *Evening Times-Globe*, 8 June 1939, 16.
69 *The Daily Gleaner*, 13 June 1939, 16.
70 The most commonly-used Acadian symbol today, the Acadian tricolour flag with the gold star, was only adopted for official use in New Brunswick in 1984, although it was adopted at the Acadian National Convention in 1884. See *Flying and Displaying Flags in New Brunswick* (Fredericton: Government of New Brunswick, 2016), 6.
71 Michaud’s son, Jacques, told journalist Tom MacDonnell (for his 1989 book, *Daylight Upon Magic*) that Michaud was deferential to the monarchy. In relating an anecdote about his father’s time with the Royal Couple in June 1939, the younger Michaud noted “[My father] also had an immense respect for the Monarchy, as did most French Canadians at that time.” I do not mean to suggest that for all French Canadians and Acadians at this time there was an automatic deference, for one can only imagine there must have been a few raised eyebrows among francophones in the crowds that day.
73 Richard Wilbur has referred to the growth of the Acadian community in Moncton as “the growing French fact,” and suggests that “To the outside world, as well as to its French citizens, Moncton’s English maintained their position.” See Richard Wilbur, *The Rise of French New Brunswick* (Halifax: Formac, 1989), 146.
Certainly, there was little direct evidence that Acadians were hostile towards the monarchy. At the time of Queen Victoria’s Golden Jubilee in 1887, *Le Moniteur Acadien* claimed “there are no more loyal subjects of the British Crown than the Acadians.”74 Other Acadian papers in the same period were generally positive about the monarchy, if less enthusiastic than *Le Moniteur*. As the previous chapter demonstrated, Acadians did not hesitate to respond to the call to arms of the empire during the Great War. Despite this positive record of cooperation in the province, however, the Acadians were still very much a political and cultural minority in New Brunswick before the Second World War, and really until the 1960s. David Frank has even suggested that in the 1920s they were “in danger of being relegated to the realm of the picturesque...” and that they suffered from a “crisis of leadership...”75 While Peter J. Venoit had become premier in 1923 after the resignation of Walter Foster, he failed to win the 1925 election, and the provincial legislature had a disproportionately low number of Acadian representatives. Only in the 1930s did an organized group of Acadians begin to push for educational reforms and other policies which would help their community in the future.76 Their achievements were gradual, and as such, aside from the members of the Acadian elite who were part of official delegations invited to meet the royal couple, Acadians and their history and culture were largely swallowed up by the anglophone-New Brunswick majority. This, despite the fact that people of French descent made up about 35% of the provincial

75 Frank, “Resistance and Accommodation,” 266.
76 Ibid, 268, 283-284.
population at the time. It would only be much later, when Acadians became integrated into the political and business elite of the province, that they would be represented at royal and other ceremonial occasions in a manner befitting their status as a large minority in the province.

For their part, the paintings of the Maliseet Chief and the Mi’kmaq warrior were almost the sum-total of the representations of and by Indigenous peoples during the New Brunswick portion of the tour. The only other Indigenous symbols used for decoration and which are mentioned in the press coverage of the tour are included in a description of the shields along the Royal route: “Moose-heads, beavers, Indian heads and other emblems were on the shields. The maple leaf also lent itself to the decorative scheme.” Somehow, profiles of the province’s Indigenous peoples ended up in the same category as elements of the natural world, something not uncommon in popular portrayals of natives in the 19th and 20th centuries. Their role as the original inhabitants of the territory that became New Brunswick was certainly overlooked, likely in part because by the end of the Great Depression their population was less than 2,000, or just 0.4% of the provincial population.

The people of Kingsclear First Nation (located approximately 15 kilometres west of Fredericton) occasioned mention in the article about the decorations at the Legislative Assembly building, though only enough to indicate that they had been

---

77 In the Census of 1941, 35.8% of New Brunswickers identified as being of French descent, second only to Quebec. *Eighth Census of Canada, 1941, Vol. I*, 227.
78 *The Daily Gleaner*, 13 June 1939, 16.
79 *Eighth Census of Canada, 1941, Vol. I*, 720. In 1941, the ‘Indian’ population was just 1,939, up from 1,465 and 1,331 in 1901 and 1921, respectively.
engaged in the tying of bunting made of “fir and spruce and pine to be draped from windows.” The *Daily Gleaner* also reported on a special ceremony at the Devon Indian School (for students of the St. Mary’s Reserve, located across the St. John River from Fredericton in 1939, but now surrounded by the expanded city) on 9 June, during which two maple trees were planted in commemoration of the visit, in the presence of the Indian agent. The school was decorated by the same company which was charged with the decoration of the Legislative Assembly building, and commemorative medals were presented to the students. A similar ceremony was scheduled for the Oromocto First Nation on 10 June. All three of these First Nations communities are Wolastoqiyik (then known by non-Natives as Malecite or Maliseet). The same paper went on to note that space would be allocated in the stands for schoolchildren from the Kingsclear, Devon and Oromocto reserves: “Indians from the Kingsclear Reserve and Chief William Polches and all the Indians in their regalia with the Chief and the Councillor from the Tobique reserves [located northeast of Fredericton and near the Maine-New Brunswick border] will be in one spot at the intersection of Brunswick and Smythe Street” (emphasis is mine).

For all the apparent welcome, a feigned inclusiveness at best, which had been extended to the First Nations, a Canadian Press (CP) article which appeared in the *Gleaner* reduced their presence to a mere spectacle: “The presence of Indians from three reservations – men, women and children dressed in native costume – added a

---

80 *The Daily Gleaner*, 6 June 1939, 12.
81 Ibid, 9 June 1939, 12.
82 Ibid, 10 June 1939, 12.
picturesque touch.”83 A Fredericton correspondent echoed this sentiment under a headline which read “Indians Were There”: “Massed about the memorial to the 104th New Brunswick Regiment at the juncture of Smythe and Brunswick streets, the band of Indians from the Kingsclear Reservation made a picturesque group in full tribal costume.”84 A more detailed mention was afforded the First Nations peoples who gathered in Fredericton by reporter Gerald Waring in the *Saint John Evening Times-Globe*:

The Great White Father and his gracious Consort were accorded a boisterous welcome here today by representatives of New Brunswick’s once numerous Micmac and Maliseet Indian tribes...Augmented by delegates from allied tribes in Maine, and by copper-hued visitors from far off Oklahoma, the Indians were gathered in a body at the upper end of Brunswick Street. As Their Majesties’ car rounded the corner, Indian cries of welcome rose from the contingent of 150.85 Waring referred to their “colorful spectacle in their tribal dress of deerskin, buckskin, eagle feathers and ermine skins.” He also pointed out that “[the] Indians were under the supervision of District Indian Agent R. Lee McCutcheon and their tribal chiefs.”86

Another CP article in the *Evening Times-Globe* referred to Indigenous peoples who stood along the route between Newcastle and Fredericton: “At two or three points there were Indians, from the reserves, survivors of the once great Micmac tribe, the squaws wearing dresses bright with colored ribbons.”87

---

83 Ibid, 13 June 1939, 1.
84 Ibid, 13 June 1939, 16.
86 The Indian Agent was the chief government official in charge of Indigenous affairs in a given district.
87 *Evening Times-Globe*, 14 June 1939, p5. Many of the Mi’kmaq and Wolastoqiyik people in New Brunswick were targeted for centralization by the federal government in the 1940s, but that plan eventually failed, largely due to the actions of the Wolastoqiyik. See Martha Walls, “Countering the “Kingsclear blunder”:
These latter news articles, though brief, are remarkable for two reasons. Firstly, both writers point to the “once numerous” and “once great” tribes of Mi’kmaq and Wolastoqiyik peoples of the region, and they do so without offering any sort of explanation. It should have been, though it probably was not, obvious to the average reader that there must be a reason why these two First Nations groups were no longer “numerous,” and why they were no longer “great.” It was not uncommon, however, for the Indigenous peoples of Canada to be referred to in such terms, and these beliefs were part and parcel to a larger misconception about Indigenous Canadians which Daniel Francis has written about in *The Imaginary Indian*. Francis refers to the centuries-old idea of the “Noble Savage” which was so often invoked by Europeans who encountered Indigenous peoples, and one might safely add the idioms used in the coverage of the 1939 visit to New Brunswick to the list of paternalistic phrases employed to describe them. Consciously or otherwise, to a 1930s newspaper reporter, First Nations groups seem to have warranted inclusion in the coverage of the King and Queen’s visit not because they were Canada’s founding peoples or because of their special relationship with the British Crown, but because they provided a splash of
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Figure 14: The Daily Gleaner announces plans for “Indian” children to gather along royal route, 10 June 1939, page 12.
additional colour, and perhaps because they were a relic of the distant past, of a world foreign to most readers of the New Brunswick press.89

Certainly, the notion of Indigenous peoples being a disappearing race was nothing new in 1939. Daniel Francis points to the publication in 1859 of a memoir by Paul Kane, an artist who travelled through Rupert’s Land in the 1850s painting First Nations peoples. One reviewer of the book wrote: “One must make haste to visit the Red Men. Their tribes, not long since still masters of a whole world, are disappearing rapidly, driven back and destroyed by the inroads of the white race. [...] The Indians are doomed; their fate will be that of so many primitive races now gone.”90 Francis also quotes the missionary John Maclean who wrote three decades later: “…native songs, wafted on the evening breezes, are the dying requiem of the departing savage.” News coverage in New Brunswick from half a century later still further confirms that First Nations people were considered to be on the decline. Kane, for his part, recognized the cause of the significant decrease in the Indigenous population, but for many Canadians the decline was simply an accepted fact. If New Brunswickers in 1939 were ignorant of the causes of the decline of the Indigenous civilization, they should not have been. Certainly observers had been talking about the “doomed” race of “Indians” in Canada for generations, and many had identified the incursion of Europeans as the primary cause for that sad reality. As Francis has written: “The belief in the inevitable

89 Daniel Francis refers to this status as a relic: “Any Indian was by definition a traditional Indian, a relic of the past. The only image of the Indian presented to non-Natives was therefore an historical one. The image could not be modernized.” See Daniel Francis, The Imaginary Indian (Vancouver: Arsenal Pulp Press, 1992), 59.
90 Ibid, 23.
disappearance of the Indian was genuinely held by many Canadians. It was a piece of 
conventional wisdom that was never questioned. It is interesting, however, that almost 
no one ever suggested doing anything about it.\textsuperscript{91} Even if by the 1930s officials with the 
Department of Indian Affairs were beginning to recognize that status Indians were 
neither disappearing nor assimilating, a royal tour was apparently not the time at which 
to dwell on such heady matters. 

Second, various correspondents took the trouble to note that the First Nations 
peoples gathered in Fredericton for the visit were under the “supervision” of their chiefs 
and of the Indian agent, suggesting that, like children, First Nations people could not be 
left to their own devices but instead required overseers to ensure their safety and/or 
good behaviour. The only other group of spectators to have required supervision were 
the schoolchildren, echoing back to a long-standing characterization of First Nations 
peoples as “Children of the Forest.” Indeed, Ian Radforth refers to the popular 
conception during the 1860 royal tour by the Prince of Wales eighty years earlier of “the 
North American Indian as an innocent child of nature.”\textsuperscript{92} To non-Indigenous people, the 
kinship language which was often used to describe the relationship between the Crown 
and First Nations groups only served to reaffirm this Euro-centric, paternalistic view of 
things. Terms like “Great White Mother” and “Great White Father,” along with 
“Brother” and “Children,” meant different things to the two sides, both of whom 
understood the language, as Jim Miller has pointed out, “from their own cultural 

\textsuperscript{91} Ibid, 58. 
background.\textsuperscript{93} For example, “when Europeans used terms like the British “Father” and his North American “Children,” it was often with a connotation of subordination of the children to the parents.”\textsuperscript{94} In First Nations societies, things worked much differently; this, however, was not a distinction which most non-Indigenous New Brunswickers would have appreciated in 1939 or at almost any other time.

New Brunswickers could not have been totally unaware of Indigenous issues in the province. Certainly, the Indigenous community was small demographically, numbering 1,922 in 1939 in a province with a population exceeding 450,000.\textsuperscript{95} However, they lived on reserves throughout the province, each of which were in turn administered by an Indian Agent operating out of one of the three Indian agencies, one of which was situated at Fredericton (the one at which McCutcheon worked).\textsuperscript{96} These agents reported to Ottawa, and were not accountable to the Indigenous communities in which they worked, although they “monitored and reported on virtually all facets of Native life. Agents’ reach into communities was extensive; they supervised schooling and band governance, coordinated health care services and economic initiatives, and acted as “moral watchdogs” by enforcing temperance.”\textsuperscript{97} The various First Nations reserves in the province were served by six churches and eleven schoolhouses, and all of them were identified as Roman Catholic.\textsuperscript{98} The Report of the Indian Affairs Branch for

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{93} Miller, “The Aboriginal Peoples and the Crown,” 258.
\item \textsuperscript{94} Ibid, 258.
\item \textsuperscript{95} \textit{Report of Indian Affairs Branch for the Fiscal Year Ended March 31, 1940} (Ottawa: Edmond Cloutier, Printer to the King’s Most Excellent Majesty, 1941), 200.
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the year ending 31 March 1940 noted that “New houses have recently been constructed and housing conditions have shown a marked improvement.” As for their means of survival, the same document reported that farming is generally restricted “to the growing of potatoes for their own use. A number of the Indians find employment in lumber camps and other works as day labourers. In the southern part of the Province they are engaged commercially in the manufacture and sale of Indian wares.” More generally, the director of the Branch reported that “Conditions among the Indians of the Maritime Province do not vary greatly although gradual improvement is noted from year to year.”

Although this document does not present a glowing report on “conditions among the Indians,” neither does there emerge a sense that the province’s Indigenous people were dying out.

Recent scholarship has identified several instances where First Nations communities, particularly those along the St. John River, resisted efforts by the government to centralize them and asserted their traditional fishing rights. For years before the 1939 visit, there were conversations in the Indian Affairs Branch about moving and centralizing the reserves in the Fredericton area. In one instance, the St. Mary’s Reserve on the banks of the St. John River across from the capital was relocated inland to its present location on the north side of the river. In the 1940s, the government pushed for the centralization of several First Nations communities at Kingsclear, a move the communities successfully resisted. Local Wolastoqiyik led a
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successful anti-centralization campaign which “had the desired result of swaying both public and federal opinion.”

Similarly, the Wolastoqiyik community at Kingsclear, among them the same people who appeared along the streets of Fredericton in 1939, campaigned to defend their fishing rights between 1945 and 1990. If non-Indigenous New Brunswickers, then, envisaged that the Mi’kmaq and Wolastoqiyik of the province were a doomed people, First Nations people in the Fredericton region were keen to display their own strength in maintaining their traditional rights, building on what James Kenny and Bill Parenteau have characterized as a longstanding resistance to Indian policies which they believed violated the Treaties of Peace and Friendship. That being said, David Bell has suggested that it was only in 1946, during the trial of Peter Paul (convicted for harvesting ash saplings), that the idea that Indigenous Maritimers had “ancient rights still operating in the modern world” first gained some traction.

It is important to consider that the role of Indigenous peoples during the New Brunswick portion of the royal tour was far more passive than it was in the other parts of Canada, and certainly than during previous royal tours. Granted, First Nations peoples never played a prominent role in New Brunswick’s royal tour itineraries, but in other places this was not so. Radforth suggests that, historically, “the Aboriginal people have Canada have played a prominent part in public spectacles of national celebration.”

102 Ibid, 29.
104 Ibid, 194.
106 Radforth, “Performance, Politics, and Representation”: 1.
This might seem odd, given the many ways in which Indigenous peoples were marginalized and abused, but “governments have nevertheless found it advantageous to include Indigenous people in celebrations that define and affirm an imagined national community.” That was certainly the case in certain parts of Canada in 1860, and again in 1901 and 1919, when various royal personages were treated to traditional dances and other spectacles of Canada’s First Nations population. In an official report, the Director of the Indian Affairs Branch noted that “During the visit of Their Majesties, the King and Queen, the Indians of Canada participated in the receptions at four points.”

Those four points were Port Arthur (the site of “an Indian village”), Calgary (where First Nations people assembled a camp site of thirty teepees), Vancouver (where twenty war canoes provided an escort), and Brantford (where the King and Queen signed a bible given to the Six Nations in the eighteenth century by Queen Anne).

There was no precedent in New Brunswick for engaging First Nations peoples for such purposes, and in rare cases where Indigenous characters were a necessary part of a commemorative celebration (such as the 300th anniversary of the arrival in the Maritimes of the first voyage of Pierre du Gua, Sieur de Mons, and Samuel de Champlain) their parts were often played by non-Natives. As Greg Marquis has noted in reference to the 1904 Champlain Tercentenary, “[at] this time the Aboriginal population of the province, numbering roughly 2,000, was far removed from public life.”
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107 Ibid, 1.
108 ___________, Report of Indian Affairs Branch, 183.
1939 royal tour suggests that this continued to be true nearly four decades later. Among the numerous groups and organizations who were given space on Barrack Green in Saint John to assemble and show their loyalty (the New Brunswick Museum, the Women’s Institutes, Scouts, Elks, other service clubs, nurses, fraternal societies, the Catholic Women’s League, veterans organizations, etc.), there was no mention whatsoever of First Nations peoples. The same was true for Moncton, where only the disappointed members of the Fort Folly Mi’kmaq Reserve (near Dorchester, the shire-town of Westmorland County) attracted the attention of the Daily Times. The paper reported that

the Royal train steamed past the place where the aborigines were located along the tracks too fast to get a real glimpse of the Great White Father and his Consort. All the Indian population was lined up to extend their greeting, three being garbed in the colorful costumes of the Micmac tribe to which they belong. They were headed by “chief” Louis Knockwood who had organized the gathering to pay homage to Their Majesties.

Two specific things are worth noting about this short report. Firstly, the reporter has condescendingly placed the Knockwood’s title in quotation marks, suggesting they were reluctant to acknowledgement the legitimacy of his position with his community. Secondly, the report notes that Knockwood organized the gathering, with no reference being made to an Indian agent. In the context of the First Nations people who assembled at Fredericton to see the King and Queen there, the local agent was referred to explicitly. The temptation must be resisted to hypothesize that the Fort Folly
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110 *Evening Times-Globe*, 14 June 1939, 16. This could, of course, be explained by the fact that there was no local reserve in the Saint John area.
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(Dorchester) First Nations people were more loyal that their counterparts from the St. John River area because they gathered without the direction of the Indian agent, but his absence is significant nonetheless. In all the other coverage in the Times, no other mention of the First Nations community emerged. Indeed, they are absent completely from the coverage of the succeeding two tours (1951 and 1959). Like the Acadians, representations of Indigenous New Brunswickers were almost wholly absent from the tour, leaving room only for the dominant British identity, an “imagined community” with which the majority of the population identified in the places on the itinerary.

The Loyalists

Of all the identities present during the 1939 royal tour, none was more conspicuous that that of the Loyalists, though only inasmuch as they had become representative of the white, British majority. As discussed in the previous chapters, the mythology of the Loyalists was prominent in the province (as well as in Ontario) throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, and they occupied the place of honour in the pantheon of New Brunswick’s founders. During moments of cultural significance, like anniversaries and public celebrations, often touted was the story of the Loyalists and their devout attachment to British institutions, and the monarchical tradition which the American rebels had so cavalierly cast aside during their revolution. As recently as 1933, for instance, there had been celebrations in Saint John to mark the 150th anniversary of the arrival of the spring fleet in May 1783. It may seem curious, then, that relatively little attention was given to the legacy of the Loyalists during the 1939 royal tour. Mostly, mention of this group of “founders” was restricted
to references to Saint John as the so-called “Loyalist City.” One exception is in a *Daily Gleaner* editorial dripping with sentiment, which referred on the day of the visit to “the forefathers of so many who join in to-day’s welcome. The contributions of those who placed loyalty to the Crown above all else played a part of tremendous importance in the historical, economic, and cultural development of New Brunswick.”\(^{112}\) This acknowledgement notwithstanding, one might be tempted to think that the Loyalists had survived in the public memory New Brunswick in name only. The fact that the Loyalist myth was prominently espoused in Saint John well into the 1970s, where it was for decades the city’s brand, suggests otherwise.

The English-language press continued its tradition of invoking the name of this “founding” group. In the *Evening Times-Globe*, the Loyalists were first mentioned in the text of a resolution passed by Carleton Branch, No. 2, Canadian Legion, which called for a half-holiday on June 13\(^{\text{th}}\) to “mark the loyalty of the people of this Loyalist City to Their Majesties.”\(^{113}\) Later that month, the same paper reported that during the annual Loyalist Day celebrations in the city, the chaplain of the United Empire Loyalist Association recounted stories about early royal visits to the region.\(^{114}\) Another CP story, this time in the *Daily Times*, noted a month before the visit that “[from] the Loyalist City’s hill thousands will glimpse a view of the procession.”\(^{115}\)

\(^{112}\) *Daily Gleaner*, 13 June 1939, 8.
\(^{113}\) *Evening Times-Globe*, 4 May 1939, 13.
\(^{114}\) Ibid, 22 May 1939, 13.
\(^{115}\) *Daily Times*, 12 May 1939, 5.
The Mayor’s Welcome

Welcome to Newcastle . . .
The Occasion of their Majesties’ Visit

The coming of the King and Queen to Newcastle is the most momentous event in our long history, and one that will live through the memory of generations to come. We have been most signaly honoured in being the first town in the Maritimes to welcome our Gracious Sovereigns — an honour deeply appreciated by us as well as by all the people of the North Shore of this Province.

The vast gathering of our citizens and those of the neighboring communities on June 13th will be a manifestation of loyalty and devotion to the Throne, which is the symbol of the Unity and Freedom of the British Commonwealth of Nations. To the many thousands of visitors who will come to Newcastle we extend a most hearty welcome, and are very happy and grateful to have them join with us in expressing their love and devotion to the great principle of democratic Kingship, under which, by the Grace of God, we live.

The authorities of our Town have endeavoured to make every effort for the comfort and convenience of visitors and although our facilities and accommodations are limited, we bespeak the earnest co-operation of all present in observing the rules and regulations which have been found necessary, so that every one may have an equal opportunity to see Their Sovereign and the Queen.

Mayor

Figure 15: A page from Newcastle Royal Visit program, including the text of Mayor Daniel Creaghan’s address. (Author’s Collection)
The most public proclamation of Saint John’s Loyalist origins were displayed
during the visit itself, when a huge banner over the grandstand at Barrack Green spelled
out “The Loyalist City Rejoices.”\textsuperscript{116} In an article filed aboard the Royal Train, one
reporter described the scene at Saint John as “a never-to-be-forgotten picture which
depicted in a most moving manner the loyalty of the Loyalist City.”\textsuperscript{117} Another reporter,
Douglas A. MacLennan, in a piece which oozed with enthusiasm about the day (“Unless
one were there it could not be imagined.”), referred to the short visit as “the greatest
day Loyalist Saint John has ever known in its aged history…”\textsuperscript{118} Similarly, a report in the
\textit{Daily Times} noted in an article titled “Loyalist City Filled for Occasion” that, “Saint John,
founded by United Empire Loyalists and now the second largest in the Maritimes, gave
the most stirring welcome in its history.”\textsuperscript{119} A CP story in the \textit{Daily Gleaner} less than a
week before the visit referred to “New Brunswick, where much of the population is of
United Empire Loyalist stock…”\textsuperscript{120}

Despite references to the province’s Loyalist connections, mention of this
“founding” group was conspicuously absent from several addresses presented to the
King by the province and by various municipalities, although Fredericton’s address gave
them top billing:

The City of Fredericton owes its origin to the United Empire Loyalists who came
to this country at the close of the American Revolutionary War, and who were
instrumental in founding this province and its capital city. This tradition of loyalty

\textsuperscript{116} \textit{Evening Times-Globe}, 14 June 1939, 3.
\textsuperscript{117} Ibid, 14 June 1939, 4.
\textsuperscript{118} Ibid, 14 June 1939, 11.
\textsuperscript{119} \textit{Daily Times}, 14 June 1939, 1.
\textsuperscript{120} \textit{Daily Gleaner}, 7 June 1939, 4.
has been maintained throughout the years and adds to our deep sense of
pleasure and gratitude to Your Majesty for including our City in Your Majesty’s
present tour...  

Aside from this mention, the Loyalists did not occupy as central an element of the
rhetoric as had been the case during previous royal tours. They seem to have been
replaced with enthusiasm for the not unrelated concepts of Britishness and loyalty to
the Empire, both of which are common throughout the press coverage of the tour, and
in the official address.

Britishness and the Empire

References to the province’s Loyalist ‘founders’ were relatively few in 1939, but
Britishness, the Empire, and Canada’s imperial connection were far more common in
the rhetoric in the pages of the province’s newspapers. Despite significant changes
between 1926 and 1931 regarding Canada’s status within the Empire, the enthusiasm of
Canadians for their membership in the imperial family seemed little changed, despite
the fact that some Canadian historians have argued that imperialism in Canada was
weakened by the Great War. John Herd Thompson has argued that, in contrast to what
Carl Berger and others have claimed, “English Canadians in 1939 had a distinct sense of
their own national identity. They were, however, proud that Canada was a part of the
British Empire, which they saw as a progressive institution embodying liberal values and
extending the benefits of British citizenship around the world.”

122 Thompson notes
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122 John Herd Thompson, “Canada and the Third British Empire,” in Canada and the British Empire, ed. Phillip
further, “[it] is easy to dismiss English-Canadian attitudes as a form of retarded colonialism, but English Canadians did not view Canada as a mere colony of Britain.” Buckner similarly disagrees with the myth of Canada’s disillusionment with the Empire after the Great War, and he argues that “[even] in the interwar years there is no evidence that the majority of Canadians wanted to end the imperial relationship.” The rhetoric in New Brunswick’s newspapers about the 1939 royal tour provides ample evidence to support the claims made by Thompson and Buckner, suggesting that many English-speaking New Brunswickers still defined their identity at least in part by their membership in the Commonwealth. This has similarly been argued by Don Nerbas, whose work on the bourgeoisie in Saint John in the interwar period reveals a strong identification with the “British Method” and the “British World.” In the case of Howard Robinson, publisher of the Evening Times-Globe and the Telegraph Journal in 1939, Nerbas argues that “Britishness shaped [his] view of the social structure that he had climbed so successfully; it was, indeed, ubiquitous in his world view.” Certainly, Phillip Buckner and R. Douglas Francis have argued that “well into the twentieth century, the majority of English Canadians believed that Canada was essentially a “British” nation and that its legal and political institutions and its culture and society

123 Ibid, 108. Thompson does not suggest, it should be pointed out, that Berger ever made this latter assertion.
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could be understood only within the context of its long history as a British colony.”  

Further, they add, “The Great War shook but did not destroy this Britannic vision of Canada. It is a myth that Canadians emerged from the war alienated from, and disillusioned with, the imperial connection.”

The New Brunswick English-language press towed this line in 1939. As Nerbas argues, “the enduring popular relevance of the British connection was dramatically in view when King George VI and Queen Elizabeth visited Canada on a royal tour of all nine provinces in 1939; they were greeted by nearly one third of the Canadian population, some three million people.”

New Brunswick’s English-language papers regularly infused their coverage of the planning and execution of the royal tour of 1939 with references to the Empire. On the King and Queen’s departure from Portsmouth, England, for Canada on 6 May the Daily Gleaner wrote: “A strong and primary link of Empire is emphasized, and the ties are bound even tighter as Their Majesties leave amid such hearty and heart-felt demonstration for this Dominion.”

Two weeks later, in reference to the King’s presence a day earlier in the Senate of Canada and on the occasion of his official Canadian birthday, the same editor referred to the “close links which bind the Empire,” and the same issue of the Gleaner carried a report about the members of the York-Sunbury Historical Society (based in Fredericton) pledging loyalty “to King and Empire”
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at a recent membership meeting. On 14 June, reporter Frank McCafferty wrote that “Proudly indeed Saint John stood in eager anticipation at her station on the All Red Line along which the sun makes its daily course, never to set but upon the emblem of Empire. It shone brightly here yesterday.” During the King’s short stay in New Brunswick, the Gleaner wrote, the “people of the various communities and municipalities of this Province to-day [voiced] their own personal welcome to Their Majesties, and [demonstrated] their loyalty to Crown and Empire.” In one editorial in the Daily Times, which appeared on the day the King and Queen arrived at Quebec, the words “British” and “Empire” appear no less than six and four times, respectively. In an editorial preceding Dominion Day, the Gleaner editor remarked:

There is special note too for Dominion Day of this year 1939 – that note being the warm recollection of the coast-to-coast visit only such a short time ago of Their Gracious Majesties, and the extension and demonstration of loyal tribute and affection seen everywhere on that occasion, the clear evidence of the strength and vitality of Empire links and traditions.

Over and over, New Brunswick’s newspaper invoked the Empire and Canada’s British connection. The Daily Times even spoke about the tour as not just a Canadian event, but as a one which was part of imperial history: “Canada yesterday indelibly inscribed in the saga of both Dominion and Empire an outstanding chapter...”
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Decorations, too, sometimes carried an air of the imperial, and as such were important expressions of the province’s imperial identity. Many displays featured, the *Gleaner* reported, “bunting and flags, depicting the traditions of the British Empire, Canada and the Province of New Brunswick...” as well as “the Union Jack of Empire.”\(^\text{137}\)

Another report referred to the liberal usage of “Bunting...in red, white and blue, the national colors...”\(^\text{138}\) At Moncton, too, were descriptions of decorations in “red, white and blue, with Royal Standard flying atop [the platform] and the Union Jack at either side...”\(^\text{139}\) Although the Red Ensign had only semi-official status until 1957, it had been in use by private citizens as early as the Great War, and yet no references to its use appear explicitly in the New Brunswick press in 1939.\(^\text{140}\)

Other references were made to significant imperial symbols, including a fascinating story about two flags which were displayed just outside of Fredericton along the Nashwaak River by Andrew Dodds. One of the flags was purported to bear a stain made by the blood of Admiral Nelson as he lay dying aboard HMS *Victory* in 1805. As the story goes, the flags were given to a midshipman named Abercrombie to wash after the battle; instead, Abercrombie took the flags home to his mother, who left them to her

\(^{137}\) *Daily Gleaner*, 12 June 1939, 12; 14 June 1939, 6.
\(^{138}\) Ibid, 13 June 1939, 16. It is perhaps a testament to the hold which the British Empire had over popular sentiment that the colours of the Union Jack (in 1939 still Canada’s official flag) should be considered the national colours, when King George V had declared Canada’s official colours to be red and white, a nod to the traditional colours of England and France, in 1921. See Rick Archbold, [*I Stand for Canada: The Story of the Maple Leaf Flag*](https://www.amazon.ca/dp/155013125X) (Toronto: MacFarlane, Walter & Ross, 2002): 61
\(^{139}\) *Daily Times*, 10 May 1939, 5.
\(^{140}\) It does not necessarily follow, of course, that the Red Ensign was not used, as it had been adopted for use on government buildings as early as 1921. It became sufficiently popular by the 1940s so as to inspire men like John Diefenbaker to fight for it as the official flag of Canada in the face of a growing “other quiet revolution” among English Canadians.
daughter, the great-great-grandmother of Mr. Dodds. Used by a local militia unit in the 1870s, they had been stored away safely in Mr. Dodds’ home for decades, having last been on public display in 1902 for the Coronation of King Edward VII. Whether the story about Nelson’s bloodstains was authentic or not is irrelevant. For Dodds, his neighbours, and for the numerous New Brunswick, Canadian, and international journalists who wrote about the flags, they were potent symbols of Empire, having an almost mythological origin in the midst of one of the most iconic battles in British Imperial history.

Although, as Buckner, Francis, Nerbas and others have argued, Britishness did not mean the same thing to every English Canadian, there were certain elements of Britishness which were touted by the press as being part of what made the British Empire so remarkable. One editorial from the *Daily Gleaner* included several lines which could just as easily have appeared in an editorial from the era of the South African War: “The relationship between King and People in British countries is mystifying to those nations outside the empire.” He refers also to the “British conception of royalty,” the “British citizen,” “those of British blood” and “the emotional stir which the visit of the occupant of the Throne causes in this part of the Empire.”\(^{141}\) These elements that defined “Britishness,” at least for many anglophone Canadians, were ubiquitous in the New Brunswick press and in the addresses presented by various municipalities. The *Daily Times* referred to Empire Day as an opportunity for “Instilling in the boys and girls
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of the British commonwealth [sic] the principle of patriotic devotion, the high character of their privileges as members of the greatest empire the world has ever known…”\textsuperscript{142}

The official addresses, too, contained similar rhetoric. The premier’s welcome referred to the “liberty which the British form of government ensures.” The County of Northumberland referred to the empire as “the guardian of freedom and security. To it the free peoples of the world look for guidance, and upon it depends our happiness and well being. In these days of uncertainty we rejoice in the benefits of freedom we enjoy as British citizens.” The same address closed with reference to “the inspired leadership you are giving in these troubled days [which, we feel] fosters the virtues of our race.”\textsuperscript{143}

That the British Empire remained exceptional in the interwar world was clearly taken for granted by elites and newspapers alike.

Reflecting the aforementioned connection between military service and the Empire, the editor of the \textit{Evening Times-Globe} wrote on 4 May about the complex nature of the Empire, mostly in reference to an ongoing debate over the unity of the Empire in time of war: “It is fully understood that within the British commonwealth of self-governing nations the link is the King. The King, it is recognized, is far more than a formal figure in all British constitutions....” He went on to say: “The law offices in Ottawa have recently reported to the Dominion government that, when the King makes war as sovereign of any one part of the empire, he is at war as sovereign of each and every part. [...] No dominion, therefore, can be neutral in law. To claim neutrality it must cease

\textsuperscript{142} \textit{Daily Times}, 23 May 1939, 4.
\textsuperscript{143} Ibid, 14 June 1939, 3.
to belong to the empire; it must secede.” The unity of the Empire was contingent upon the participation of its constituent parts in conflicts which threatened their shared freedoms.

Reflecting the attitudes of many English Canadians in the interwar period, there were also references to the unifying nature of the British Empire. Just after the tour’s conclusion, the Gleaner’s editor celebrated the unity of the Empire: “Between Canada and Newfoundland in North America and the British Isles the feeling will have a cordiality greater than ever, even if all are of the one flag.” Marking the (delayed) arrival of the King and Queen at Quebec, the editor of the Daily Gleaner wrote about the significance of the point of disembarkation: “They stepped on Canadian soil in the shadow of the giant cliff that General Wolfe and his soldiers scaled 180 years ago, before the battle of the Plains of Abraham that brought New France under the British Crown.” Commentary was made in newspapers across the country about the significance of the royal arrival at Wolfe’s Cove, the launching point for the most contentious battle in Canadian history. The notion of New France being “brought...under the British” has a decidedly paternalistic ring to it, and for many years English Canadian history was written in such a way as to suggest that the British soldiers who conquered Quebec were really liberators, rescuing the noble peasants of New France from the
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tyranny of their absolute monarch, meanwhile bringing to the northern part of the continent the values, freedoms, and liberties for which the British Empire was known.

This type of Whig history was common in the twentieth century, and not just among the Anglo-Protestant community. Even the Saint John-based, Roman Catholic New Freeman referred to “the stability of our Nation and the Empire.” The editor went on to say that, as Catholics, “it is our happy privilege to be subjects of the British Commonwealth of Nations.”

In Moncton, where the laying of the cornerstone of a new Roman Catholic Cathedral, Our Lady of the Assumption, took place on the morning of the visit, similar claims were made, suggesting that Catholics in 1939 reflected the late nineteenth-century idea that the Monarchy was a protector of the “rights, culture, language, and religion of national minorities.” This was doubly significant considering that the Archdiocese of Moncton, founded in 1936, was carved out of the Irish-dominated Diocese of Saint John to serve the Acadian Catholic community in southern New Brunswick.

Furthermore, the Roman Catholic Church in Canada had long been a proponent for order and obedience to civil authority. Indeed, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Moncton, Louis-Joseph-Arthur Melanson, in a pastoral letter to this flock, called for loyalty among Catholics in his diocese: “For us Catholics, as for others, the King represents and personifies the highest civil authority existing. All authority comes

---

148 The New Freeman, 10 June 1939, 4. To be sure, the New Freeman was not effusive in its praise of all elements of imperial policy. Given the Irish origins of many of the clergy of the Diocese of Saint John, the paper came to favour the Irish independence during the 1920s, even though it had denounced the Easter Rising of 1916.


from God, says St. Paul, hence the source and the reason of our profound respect
towards, and our loyal submission to our Gracious Sovereign…” Bishop Patrick Bray of
the Diocese of Saint John echoed those sentiments: Our legitimately constituted rulers
are the representatives of God for us in temporal matters, and as such we honor, love
and obey them. In the present instance we feel an equal reverence for the Crown and
for the head that wears it…” Like the Catholics – Irish, Acadian, and otherwise – who
had fought for the Empire during the Great War, the Catholics of 1939 were still
expected to offer the necessary obsequience to the nation’s legitimately constituted
authorities.

Local Issues

Just as they had done during previous royal tours, local issues were played out in
the province’s newspapers during the planning and execution of the King and Queen’s
visit to New Brunswick. The economic context in which the tour took place was the root
of some debate in Saint John over the proposed expenditures for local decorations and
preparations. Coming as it did at the end of a long decade of economic depression,
there were some who strongly opposed the spending of public dollars. In early April
1939, the Doorkeepers’ Circle of the King’s Daughters and Sons, an ecumenical Christian
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151 Daily Times, 29 May 1939, 10.
152 New Freeman, 1 June 1939, 1.
153 Carol Anne Ferguson has written about the unemployment crisis in Saint John during the Depression years, noting that a survey by the Family Welfare Association in 1939 revealed that among the poorest citizens of Saint John there was “plain evidence of slow starvation among many adults and little children” and that many lived in conditions “unfit for human habitation. Quoted in Carol Anne Ferguson, “Responses to the Unemployment Problem in Saint John, New Brunswick, 1929-1933 (MA Thesis, University of New Brunswick, 192), 225.
group, passed a resolution against the outlay of $10,000 “in view of the conditions existing amongst the city’s poor.”\textsuperscript{154} The Saint John branch of the New Brunswick Federation of Labor similarly met and unanimously opposed the budget: “It was the opinion of the council that the loyalty of the citizens should not be expressed merely by a display of flags and bunting and that no greater tribute could be expressed to Their Majesties than to give relief to needy subjects.”\textsuperscript{155} The Family Welfare Association echoed the same sentiments, unanimously adopting “a resolution protesting against any suggestion that the city council make any further grant than the $3,000 which it has already approved for the purpose of providing decorations on the occasion of the visit of Their Majesties.”\textsuperscript{156}

Later in April 1939, the central committee in charge of the tour expressed a wish that at least $6,000 should be made available, Justice W.H. Harrison arguing that the visit should be considered for its own merit and not just in light of current economic circumstances.\textsuperscript{157} During the discussion which ensured at the level of the Common Council, mayor D.L. MacLaren noted that “the city spent $2,700 for the [local celebrations in honour of] the coronation; surely the presence of the King and Queen warrants $5,000.”\textsuperscript{158} After much debate, the Council settled on MacLaren’s suggestion, increasing the municipal grant by $2,000. The editor of the \textit{Evening Times-Globe} was

\begin{flushright}
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\textsuperscript{158} Ibid, 20 April 1939, 1.
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Figure 16: The Evening Times-Globe reports the decision of the City of Saint to provide $5,000 towards the royal reception, 20 April 1939, page 11.
fully supportive of this change, justifying the expense based on the uniqueness of the scenario:

The event, the presence in our city of the reigning British monarch and his queen, is one without precedent in our history, and it is only right that it should be regarded as a gala day and something worthwhile done in the way of display to make it a memorable occasion, especially for the younger generation.159

The editor went on to point out the financial benefits which he felt the tour could be guaranteed to provide: “The visit will attract thousands of people from outside points, and from a purely materialistic viewpoint, this circumstance will bring much more money to the city than is actually spent on the display.”160 In the newspaper coverage of the debate, there is no mention of whether anyone put forward to idea of the visit being a welcome distraction from the gloom of the Great Depression and of the forthcoming world war, although this was suggested as a positive result by others.161

The Family Welfare Association was not the only agency to express concern for the needs of the needy in the face of the royal visit. The Evening Times-Globe reported that the Red Cross Society was selling flags and bunting for decorations, and that the proceeds would be used “to aid the needy.”162 The effects of the Great Depression were still keenly felt by many New Brunswickers in 1939, and further steps were taken in Saint John to alleviate their suffering during the tour. Most significantly, the central committee committed to raising funds necessary to provide hampers of food to local people on the relief rolls for the day of the visit. Their goal was $2,500, no meagre sum

159 Ibid, 21 April 1939, 4.
160 Ibid, 21 April 1939, 4.
161 Ibid, 7 June 1939, 9; 15 June 1939, 4.
162 Ibid, 24 April 1939, 11.
in the last months of the Great Depression in a largely working-class city. A special 
subcommittee was struck, chaired by mayor MacLaren, and included representatives 
from the Kiwanis, Rotary and Kinsmen Clubs, as well as the Young Men’s Christian 
Association. 163 Considerable pride was taken in this initiative, the Evening Times-Globe 
noting, “As far as can be learned to date, Saint John is the only city in Canada that plans 
to assist needy families in an effort to help them enjoy the glorious occasion.” 164 Relief 
was not, however, going to be handed out to just anyone, but rather the committee 
insisted “that strict care be exercised in seeing that each supply reaches addresses 
furnished by the proper officials.” 165 Relief programs in the Maritimes were often 
inadequate because the provinces were unable “to participate in the federal matching 
grants on which the relief programs were based.” The task of the parish relief officers, 
overwhelmed by the sheer volume of poverty and ill-equipped to deal with it, “was not 
an enviable one.” 166 

Within a week, the fund had grown to just under $1,500, and by the first of June 
it had exceeded $2,000. 167 Donations after that point largely dried up, with a report in 
the Evening Times-Globe on June 3 recording that “the amount so far received will take 
care of only the people who are on actual relief rolls, and that unless more is received 
the many “border-line” deserving cases will not be helped.” 168 Even by 12 June, the fund 

164 Ibid, 17 May 1939, 11. 
165 Ibid, 16 May 1939, 9. 
166 E.R. Forbes, “Cutting the Pie into Smaller Pieces: Matching Grants and Relief in the Maritime Provinces 
during the 1930s,” Acadiensis XVII, 1 (Autumn 1987): 38, 45. 
167 Evening Times-Globe, 25 May 1939, 13; 1 June 1939, 11. 
168 Ibid, 3 June 1939, 9.
was still $500 below its goal, and the committee decided to keep the fund open in the hope that more donations would come in.\textsuperscript{169} The committee’s hopes were not fulfilled; two weeks after the King and Queen’s whirlwind visit, the fund was still $500 short.\textsuperscript{170} That a struggling Depression-era community was about to raise by donation nearly $3,000 was impressive, and fortunately for the needy of Saint John, the committee had approved the costs necessary so that all could benefit from the generosity of their fellow citizens.

The aforementioned debate over expenditures notwithstanding, there was considerable discussion from at least the end of April over the need for Saint John to look its best for the royal visitors. The \textit{Times-Globe} editor told his readers on 24 April 1939 that it was time to start their annual “clean up and paint up” routine. “Bunting will not hide neglect,” he wrote. “The uncared-for lot and the unpainted wall, the trash-filled corner and the dump of decaying litter can’t be disguised by flags or illuminated addresses of welcome.”\textsuperscript{171} This suggests that the editor saw the royal tour as an opportunity for the residents of Saint John to address the decade of neglect on some properties which had been necessitated by the economic depression. In any case, the call to prepare the city was echoed over and over again in the weeks which followed. A banner calling for citizens to “FIX-UP PAINT-UP for The ROYAL VISIT” appeared at the top of the local section of the \textit{Times-Globe} on many occasions.\textsuperscript{172}

\textsuperscript{169} Ibid, 12 June 1939, 9.
\textsuperscript{170} Ibid, 26 June 1939, 9.
\textsuperscript{171} Ibid, 24 April 1939, 4.
\textsuperscript{172} Ibid, 1 May 1939, 9.
In Moncton and Fredericton, there do not appear to have been any such philanthropic projects. The former’s city government, however, was frustrated by the exceedingly short amount of time which had been set aside in the itinerary for a stop there. Although Moncton, a railway centre, presented itself as the “hub” of the Maritime Provinces, as a New Brunswick city it had neither the population of Saint John nor the status of the capital. As such, just 20 minutes were set aside in the initial itinerary as distributed in April 1939, about the same as that which was afforded to Newcastle, the shire town of Northumberland County which had a population of fewer than 4,000 people, less than a fifth of Moncton’s 22,000.\textsuperscript{173} The zeal with which the political and business leaders of Moncton sought a longer stop for their growing city suggests a desire to be seen on an equal footing with the larger and more influential cities in the province. Whether this was for economic or political purposes, or just about vying for status, is difficult to tell. In any case, the rumblings began almost as soon as the itinerary was released.

On 24 April 1939, a “protest meeting” was attended by representatives of a number of local societies, all of whom agreed “that present plans will give Moncton little chance to see, and show their loyalty to, the King and Queen.”\textsuperscript{174} Delegates from this meeting took the matter to the office of the mayor, W.E. McMonagle, who was surprisingly acquiescent to the plans as they were: “I can appreciate the fervent desire of every community in Canada to entertain Their Gracious Majesties indefinitely, but

\textsuperscript{173} Eighth Census of Canada, 1941, Vol. I, 587. \\
\textsuperscript{174} Daily Times, 25 April 1939, 5.
unfortunately each community has not been authorized to plan the royal itinerary, this
having been arranged by the officials of state at Ottawa, in conjunction, I presume, with
British authorities, and in humble submission to their wishes we have accepted the regal
schedule.”175 If the mayor planned for the matter to go no further, he was to be
disappointed. Charles H. Blakeny, speaker of the legislative assembly and a former
mayor of Moncton, was among those who tried to persuade the mayor to ask for more
time, but to no avail. Nothing more was said in the Times on the matter until the
following month, when a member of the local Board of Trade proposed adding a short
drive through the city to allow more people to see the royal couple, a suggestion for
which mayor McMonagle showed some enthusiasm. As late as 25 May, the city was
prepared to go ahead with plans as if the short procession had been approved, and even
the city council had not given up hope by the end of the month:

despite advices that a drive through some of the streets has been ruled out by
the Inter-Departmental Committee of the Royal Tour, [the council] are
continuing their efforts in an endeavour to secure a change of plans, fully
believing that if the request now submitted in greater detail is given fuller
consideration the proposed alterations should receive the acquiescence of those
in authority.176

The paper was at a loss to understand the government’s unwillingness to provide the
“acquiescence” which so many in Moncton sought. “Canadians in this section of the
Maritimes,” the editor exclaimed, “should, we think, be afforded the opportunity of
displaying their loyalty…just as have Canadians in other parts of the Dominion and in
some instances where centres of similar size had been allotted a longer period of time

175 Ibid, 25 April 1939, 5.
176 Ibid, 30 May 1939, 4.
than is the case with Moncton.”¹⁷⁷ The mayor, it seems, spent a good deal of time over
the next week sending telegrams to, and receiving negative responses from, Ottawa and
officials with the royal party itself, but to no avail.

When the day of the visit finally arrived, the King and Queen did end up spending
more than 40 minutes at the CNR station (watching a parade of schoolchildren, meeting
veterans, and receiving the local elite), but the Daily Times was still disappointed: “it
was indeed unfortunate that those responsible for the arrangement of the Royal
itinerary should have made Their Majesties’ stay so short in this, the second largest city
of the Province.”¹⁷⁸ For all the disappointment, however, the editor still proclaimed that
“...Their Majesties’ visit to Moncton must be recorded as a highlight in the city’s
history.”¹⁷⁹ The great fervour with which Moncton fought to receive a greater share of
the royal couple’s time suggests that, whatever the motivation, it was important for
New Brunswick communities, and their residents, to be a part of what was, for many, an
historic occasion. The debate is an example of how royal tours often provided a
platform for discussion about larger issues. Moncton, gradually becoming the
metropolis for the francophone community in southeast New Brunswick, and already an
important transportation hub in the Maritimes, would later claim greater ceremonial
space during future tours as it left its status as a late-comer among the cities of the
province behind and took its place as an expanding regional hub.

¹⁷⁷ Ibid, 30 May 1939, 4.
¹⁷⁸ Ibid, 14 June 1939, 4.
¹⁷⁹ Ibid, 14 June 1939, 4.
Inventing Tradition

As had been the case in 1901 and 1919, there were efforts by the newspapers to draw attention to the history of royal associations in the province during the King and Queen’s 1939 tour. As the previous chapters have suggested, this could be about appealing to readers’ nostalgia, or about an attempt at “inventing tradition.” Either way, it was commonly employed by the English-language press in New Brunswick, and at the very least provided the foundation for an understanding among readers of longstanding associations between the province and the monarchy.

Most references during the 1939 tour were to the 1860 visit of Albert, Edward Prince of Wales, grandfather of George VI. As early as April, the *Daily Gleaner* and the *Daily Times* carried a CP piece which reflected upon the differences between the colonies which the prince visited in 1860 and the provinces which were on the itinerary in 1939.\(^{180}\) The subject of much discussion was a chair which had been earmarked for the King’s use at the Legislative Assembly in Winnipeg. The chair was formerly used by the president of New Brunswick’s Executive Council (abolished in 1892), having also provided a moment of rest for the Prince of Wales in 1860.\(^{181}\) The news of the chair caused a reaction in Saint John, where the *Evening Times-Globe* proclaimed “Saint John possesses a chair of as much or greater interest in connection with the royal visit of [1860].” Saint John’s contender was a chair made for the visit of the Prince of Wales in

\(^{180}\) *Daily Gleaner*, 12 April 1939, 3; *Daily Times*, 2 May 1939, 3.
\(^{181}\) *Ibid*, 5 May 1939, 6. The chair, having been obtained by the province of Manitoba after the abolition of the Legislative Council, was later used by the Duke of Cornwall and York and the Prince of Wales in 1901 and 1919, respectively.
1860 and which had the added value of having been rescued during the Great Fire of 1877.\textsuperscript{182} As if these discoveries were not sufficiently thrilling, a chair and couch came to light in June 1939 which had been used by the Prince while he stayed at Chipman House.\textsuperscript{183} While one might be tempted to assume that this chair mania was restricted to members of the press, it should also be noted that hundreds of people lined up to sit in the chairs used by the King and Queen when the visited the Legislative Assembly building in Fredericton.\textsuperscript{184}

Several papers carried advertisements from Canada Life Insurance featuring images of the Prince of Wales in various locales in 1860, including one entitled “The King’s grandfather Royally Welcomed – 1860,” which, like the ads from the Banks of Montreal and Nova Scotia, had more than anything to do with emphasizing the long-standing reputation of the company.\textsuperscript{185} Historic furniture and clever advertisements aside, the \textit{Evening Times-Globe} also carried the 1860 tour reminiscences of Edward T. Sturdee, who proposed that all those who recalled the former visit should gather to witness the King’s arrival as a group.\textsuperscript{186} The grandson of another Saint John resident, A.C.O. Trentowsky related his grandfather’s memories of that visit, during which time he spoke with the prince for half an hour.\textsuperscript{187} There were passing references to the 1901 tour in the \textit{Daily Times}, as well, and one reporter went so far as to refer to the visit to

\begin{footnotes}
\item[$\textsuperscript{182}$] \textit{Evening Times-Globe}, 6 May 1939, 9.
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\item[$\textsuperscript{185}$] \textit{Daily Times}, 20 May 1939, 4. The latter ads featured the lines “Through the Reigns of Eight Sovereigns” and “Under Six Sovereigns,” respectively. \textit{Daily Times}, 13 June 1939, 6-7.
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Saint John by the Duke of Kent in 1794!188 Whatever their motivations, the press and the people of New Brunswick were keen to assure themselves that New Brunswick had a long history of royal associations.

**Gender**

In the nearly four decades which passed between New Brunswick’s first royal visit of the twentieth century, and the arrival of the King and Queen in the province in 1939, the lives of women had experienced some dramatic changes. For example, the provincial franchise was extended to women in 1919, after the end of the Great War, and most adult women across Canada were eligible to vote in the 1921 federal election. They only gained the right to hold office in New Brunswick in 1934. As David Frank has argued, “the arrival of the franchise [did little] to undermine the conventional wisdom regarding the role of women.”189 However, the gains often had more theoretical than practical application, and as such, the lives of most women continued to follow a pattern that had persisted since the beginning of the century. They received a limited education focused mostly on home economics and other skills, while their male contemporaries received a more classical education. When the boys went to work, the girls were usually employed in the home, or as domestics. Those who did enter a profession (teaching being the most common) tended to practice their craft only until
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188 *Daily Times*, 13 June 1939, 6; 14 June 1939, 1.
189 Frank, “Resistance and Accommodation,” 269.
the time of marriage, after which they were expected to tend to the needs of their husbands and children. Very few married women worked outside the home.  

Many women had joined the workforce during the Great War to take the place of men who vacated their jobs to take up arms overseas. At the conclusion of the conflict, however, most women returned to their “traditional” roles of wife and mother, with few appreciable gains in terms of opportunities for employment outside the home. “The unwritten rule of the period,” Ernest Forbes has written, “was that priority in employment should go to males with families to support.” As such, in 1911, 15% of New Brunswick women aged 15 and over were in the workforce, whereas in 1921 the number had increased to only 16%. Indeed, there was little appreciable change even in the early years of the Second World War, when that figure had risen to only 18%. One pioneering woman in the province was lawyer Muriel McQueen Fergusson, who campaigned for the Liberal party during the 1925 election; when she married in 1926, however, she “retired in support of her husband’s law practice,” only returning to work when he became incapacitated. Those women who did work outside the home (and
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190 In New Brunswick, for example, the provincial civil service did not employ married women until the 1960s. “Until then,” Tulloch writes, “they had to be separated or divorced or married to an unemployable man before they could be considered for permanent employment.
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193 Frank, “Resistance and Accommodation,” 270. Muriel McQueen Ferguson later became the first woman alderman and deputy mayor in Fredericton, and the first Atlantic Canadian woman to be appointed to the Canadian Senate. See Margaret Conrad, “The 1950s: The Decade of Development,” in The Atlantic Provinces in Confederation, eds. Forbes and Muise, 390.
they were almost exclusively unmarried women) earned far less than men were paid for
work of equal value.

Other circumstances had, meanwhile, also changed very little since the turn of
the century. Many women were involved in one or more of the many organizations
which had proliferated in the late Victoria and Edwardian eras, including the Women’s
Christian Temperance Union, Imperial Order Daughters of the Empire, the Women’s
Institute, and the National Council of Women. It was through their membership in these
same organizations that some New Brunswick women (aside from those who were
members of elite society) were able to brush with royalty during the 1901 and 1919
royal tours. In 1939, however, there were no special meetings between either the King
or the Queen and particular groups of New Brunswick women. Instead, women’s
organizations were limited to expressing their loyalty privately, or though the support of
municipal efforts. The Gleaner carried a report on 23 June 1939 of the following
resolution which was passed by the Maritime Branch of the Women’s Missionary
Society of the United Church of Canada: “Resolved that as a Christian body of women
convened to transact business for the King of kinds, we would place on record as loyal
subjects of His Majesty King George VI...and his beautiful consort, Queen Elizabeth.”

Groups like the Business and Professional Women’s Club contributed to the fund for the
needy in Saint John. The Women’s Auxiliary of the Carleton Branch of the Canadian
Legion held a banquet in honour of the visit in early June. On 20 June, Saint John

---

194 Daily Gleaner, 23 June 1939, 3.
members of the Women’s Liberal Association were treated to presentations on the Ottawa and Fredericton stops of the tour.\textsuperscript{195}

In fact, women’s groups attracted less attention in the provincial newspapers in 1939 than they had twenty years before. In the \textit{Evening Times-Globe}, for example, virtually nothing was said until 10 June 1939, when four photographs appeared on the “Page Of News Of Interest To Women” (page 6), featuring the wives of the premier (Henrietta Dysart) and the mayor of Saint John (Dorothy MacLaren), and the daughters of the lieutenant governor (Margaret MacLaren and Elspeth Hooper). The simple caption referred to the four women’s forthcoming role in the visit as “gracious hostesses.”\textsuperscript{196} Despite their connection to the province’s elite, these women were still expected to occupy a traditionally gendered place.

One group of women were singled out by the King and Queen in Saint John. Katie Broad, a correspondent for the \textit{Times-Globe}, wrote of the royal couple’s greetings to a gathering of nursing sisters, veterans of the Great War: “The Overseas Nursing Sisters had their seats next to the Royal platform for the ceremonies at the Barrack Green yesterday afternoon and were well satisfied with that honour...But greater honor was in store for each of them as Their Majesties came down their line of seats and shook each by the hand.”\textsuperscript{197} The Queen had questions for Mrs. R.A. Hughes, who wore the Mons Star, and the King paid special attention to Miss Margaret Jane Woods, a

\textsuperscript{195} \textit{Evening Times-Globe}, 21 June 1939, 20.
\textsuperscript{196} Ibid, 10 June 1939, 6. Olivia MacLaren, wife of the lieutenant governor, died in 1936, and their daughter Margaret was identified as “chatelaine of Government House.”
\textsuperscript{197} Ibid, 14 June 1939, 5.
native of Welsford, Queens County, who was the recipient of the Royal Red Cross.\textsuperscript{198} Otherwise, the women of New Brunswick simply stood alongside the men as they crowded parks and streets throughout the province.

The only significant emphasis on gender during the tour concerned the Queen herself, who was repeatedly referred to in stereotypically gendered terms. \textit{The Daily Gleaner} carried a feature on 5 May 1939 about the Queen’s many homes and her role as “mistress.”\textsuperscript{199} Suggesting that she was the ideal role model for the Canadian women, a CP piece appeared the following week which referred to the Queen’s “easy grace” and the fact that “[in] Queen Elizabeth Canadians will meet a devoted mother and a thrifty housewife.”\textsuperscript{200} An Associated Press article carried by the \textit{Gleaner} boasted the headline: “Smart Stylists Hail Elizabeth A Good Dresser.”\textsuperscript{201} Following the royal couple’s brief (and resoundingly successful) visit to the United States, a further article appeared comparing the Queen to Eleanor Roosevelt.\textsuperscript{202} One editorial in the \textit{Evening Times-Globe} referred to “the slim young man who is ruler of the British Empire and his gracious and beautiful Queen.”\textsuperscript{203} The \textit{Daily Times} repeatedly carried stories referred to Elizabeth’s feminine qualities, referring to her clothes, her beauty, and her “queenly daintiness”.\textsuperscript{204}

\textsuperscript{198} For more on the role of Nursing Sisters from New Brunswick in the Great War, see Shawna Quinn, \textit{Agnes Warner and the Nursing Sisters of the Great War} (Fredericton: Goose Lane Editions/New Brunswick Military Heritage Project, 2010).
\textsuperscript{199} \textit{Daily Gleaner}, 5 May 1939, 8.
\textsuperscript{200} Ibid, 13 May 1939, 5.
\textsuperscript{201} Ibid, 5 June 1939, 5.
\textsuperscript{202} Ibid, 9 June 1939, 8.
\textsuperscript{203} \textit{Evening Times-Globe}, 14 June 1939, 5.
\textsuperscript{204} See, for example: \textit{Daily Times}, 18 May 1939, 6; 19 May 1939, 6; 12 June 1939, 7.
Queen had anything of substance to offer on her own, as consort of an imperial sovereign, New Brunswick’s press felt that her femininity was far more important.\textsuperscript{205}

**Conclusion**

The King and Queen returned to England just days after their visit to New Brunswick. After an exhausting six week tour in May-June 1939, during which they crossed Canada twice and travelled south into the United States, a weary but gratified King and Queen returned to the United Kingdom, which was increasingly in the shadow of the gathering clouds of war.\textsuperscript{206} Beginning in September of that year, for six long years the King and Queen laboured intensively while the Allied Forces fought a brutal war against Nazi Germany and its Allies. Much credit has been given to the royal pair for their role in maintaining morale in Britain during the Second World War. This was especially true in London, where bombed-out Londoners were given hope by the knowledge that their Sovereign refused to retreat to the relative safety of the English countryside (or, as some suggested, to Canada). The war years, during which he was said to have worked tirelessly and smoked endlessly, had taken a heavy toll on the King. By war’s end, his health was noticeably poor, and for the remainder of his reign George VI was plagued by illness, though he and his family did undertake a sensitive tour of

\textsuperscript{205} The Queen more than proved during the following six years that she was “more than a pretty face,” as she stood shoulder to shoulder with the King in their defiance of the Luftwaffe’s nightly raids on London. Her alleged satisfaction when Buckingham Palace was bombed has been oft-quoted: “At last, I can look the East End in the face.” Quoted in Ian J. Cawood, *Britain in the Twentieth Century* (London: Routledge, 2013), 206.

\textsuperscript{206} The couple’s exhaustion was much in evidence (though mostly only to their entourage) by the time they reached New Brunswick, but they were quite moved when it came time to bid farewell to Canada at Halifax. See John Wheeler-Bennett, *King George VI: His Life and Reign* (London: MacMillan & Co., Ltd., 1958), 392.
South Africa in 1947. In the fall of 1951, cancer forced the King to ask Princess Elizabeth and her husband, the Duke of Edinburgh, to undertake a tour of Canada in his place. By February of the next year, the King was dead at the age of 56. His widow, now Queen Elizabeth the Queen Mother, would outlive her husband by a half-century.\footnote{Matthew, “King George VI”}

Although the Second World War and the King’s declining health meant that the royal couple would never return to Canada after 1939, the memory of their twenty-four hours in New Brunswick continues to loom large among those New Brunswickers who saw the royal couple that June day. Why the 1939 royal tour made such an indelible mark on Canadians who witnessed it would be difficult to prove conclusively, but it was at least partially due to timing. Coming as it did at the end of a long decade of economic depression, and just months before the outbreak of the Second World War, the royal tour was a brief splash of colour during a largely bleak period in Canadian history. It also took place before the bonds of Empire were tested by the fires of another war, and before the solidification of the increasingly North American (and international) attitude which flavoured Canadian affairs, both domestic and external, in the 1950s. It predated the ‘Canadianization’ of national symbols in the years leading up to the Centennial of Confederation in 1967, and the transformation of the old British Empire into a truly international (and decidedly multicultural) Commonwealth of Nations. In New Brunswick, it also came before the rapid rise of the Acadian elite in the postwar period, something which is at least partially visible during the two royal tours which followed.
The tour, like the others under investigation here, is a valuable snapshot of New Brunswick in the summer of 1939, when Great War veterans had greater access to ceremonial space than women, and when Britishness and loyalty to the empire were still the order of the day.

During the 1950s, two further royal tours would bookend the decade, both undertaken by the eldest daughter of King George VI and Queen Elizabeth. First as a princess, and later as Queen, and in both cases accompanied by her husband, the Duke of Edinburgh, the younger Elizabeth undertook the last of the grand tours of Canada which had their basis in the nineteenth century. Although they took place during what Buckner has called “The Long Farewell” between Canada and Britain, much about those tours is indistinguishable from 1939. In other ways, they demonstrate that New Brunswick society was changing, if slowly, to join the postwar world.
CHAPTER 5:
The 1951 and 1959 Royal Tours

After the Second World War, royal tours became far more commonplace in Canada and throughout the Commonwealth as a result of changes in transportation technology. The 1950s, for example, witnessed no fewer than ten visits to Canada (both official and working visits) by members of the royal family. Of these, four included New Brunswick on their itineraries.¹ The most significant were those in 1951 and 1959 undertaken by the same couple, Princess, and later Queen, Elizabeth, and her husband the Duke of Edinburgh. In both cases, the tours involved cross-country journeys of proportions unheard of after 1959. Phillip Buckner has referred to the latter tour appropriately as the “Last Great Royal Tour.” Since that time, tours have become shorter and more localized. For that reason, this final chapter examines New Brunswick’s experience with the two 1950s tours by Elizabeth and Philip to explain how attitudes towards the military, various identities, the Empire/Commonwealth, and gender, as well as a number of local issues, can be understood through coverage of the visits in the English-language press of the day. Significantly, the tours of the 1950s are characterized by an attempt to make the monarchy feel and appear increasingly

¹ In addition to these, the Duke and Duchess of Windsor visited his ranch in Alberta in 1950, the last such visit before the ranch was sold in 1962. The Duke had first purchased the ranch during his 1919 tour. See Philip Zeigler, King Edward VII: A Biography (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1991): 104-105. The two New Brunswick visits which will not be discussed in this chapter took place in 1954 (the Duchess of Kent and Princess Alexandra of Kent) and 1959 (Princess Margaret).
Canadian, and demonstrate an evolving approach to a monarchy now headed, for the first time since the death of Queen Victoria in 1901, by a female monarch.

The Context

The years which had passed since the memorable tour by the King and Queen in the late spring of 1939 had been troubling ones for Canada, and indeed for much of the world. The Second World War was the nation’s focus for half of the intervening twelve years. Although this war did not claim as many Canadians lives as the Great War which had preceded it, it looms equally large in the national memory. In 1939, Canadians generally were less than anxious for war than they had been in 1914, for the country was just beginning to recover from the gloomy days of the Great Depression. And yet, by September of that year whatever isolationism existed in Canada seems to have dissipated, or, at the very least, been reduced to a faint cry in the wilderness. Desmond Morton has credited this turnaround to two major factors: the successful royal tour of 1939, and prime minister King’s promise not to introduce conscription if Canada went to war.\(^2\) As Buckner has reasoned, “In 1939 the response of most English Canadians to the crisis in Europe was an instinctive reaction; it does not follow that it was an irrational one.”\(^3\) On the face of it, at least, Canada and Canadians seemed primed to take on Hitler and his allies.

For most Canadian volunteers, the actual fighting war did not begin until 1944, when the Canadian Army was part of the invasions of Italy and France.\textsuperscript{4} Many Canadian volunteers spent much of 1940-1944 training in England, though that certainly did not mean that the war had no effect on them. For those who served in the Royal Canadian Navy (which at the outbreak of the Great War had been miniscule and ill-equipped) and the Royal Canadian Air Force (formed after the Great War), the fight began much earlier. Significantly, the nation’s contribution was not restricted to its recruitment of uniformed men and women. One of its most notable contributions was the majority of the funding for, and operation of, the British Commonwealth Air Training Program (BCATP), which trained over 20,000 aircrew from around the Commonwealth every year of the war.\textsuperscript{5} The nation also served as an important base for the manufacture of military materials for itself and for the British government. Militarily, Canada’s contributions were mostly concentrated in the last eighteen months of the war, when it participated in the Allied invasions of Italy and Northwest Europe.

Like its predecessor, the Second World War proved eventually to be a strain on national unity, and once again the key issue was conscription. The prime minister, William Lyon Mackenzie King, had promised in 1939 that there would be no conscription this time around. In 1940, his Government introduced the “National Resources Mobilization Act,” which called up young Canadian men for short training courses but which specifically stated that these men would not be compelled to serve overseas. As

\textsuperscript{4} Canadian lives were lost during the Battle of Hong Kong in 1941 and the disastrous raid on Dieppe in 1942. 

\textsuperscript{5} Morton, A Military History of Canada, 180.
the war progressed, while France fell to the Nazis and Japan attacked the American base at Pearl Harbour, Hawaii, it became increasingly difficult for King to keep conscription off the table. As the pressure mounted, the prime minister turned to the people of Canada to relieve him of his no-conscription pledge in a plebiscite. Canadians obliged, by a nearly 2:1 margin, though the results in French-Canada revealed a people overwhelmingly opposed to mandatory overseas military service. The impact on unity between English and French Canadians was compounded, as it had been during the First World War, by the fact that French Canadians were drastically under-represented among the volunteers, even if more French Canadians served in the second war than in the first. King did his utmost to avoid the issue for as long as possible following the plebiscite, but the losses sustained by the Canadian Army in Italy and France in the first half of 1944 made it clear that Canada’s fighting army could not be kept at full strength solely by volunteers. Despite some opposition, the government moved forward with its plan. In total, 13,000 conscripts were sent overseas, and 69 were killed out of the nation’s 44,000 war dead.

There were differences, of course, between the Canadian experiences during the two world wars. For German-Canadians, there was far less overt discrimination during in the Second World War than there had been during its predecessor. However, more than 21,000 Japanese Canadians (more than 90% of the entire Japanese population in
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6 Ibid, 190.
8 Morton, A Military History of Canada, 221.
9 Buckner, “Canada and the End of Empire,” 110.
Canada, and the vast majority were Canadian-born) were removed from British Columbia and interned in a series of camps, a reaction to the attack on Pearl Harbour by the Empire of Japan in December 1941.\(^{10}\) Others who were interned included enemy aliens, troublemakers, and dissidents like Camilien Houde, the former mayor of Montreal who had so charmed the King and Queen during their visit in 1939.

In New Brunswick, the response to the outbreak of war was as the government would have hoped, and 46.8% of the eligible male population volunteered for military service.\(^{11}\) While the province mobilized generally, the wartime boom was particularly beneficial to certain parts of the province. Carman Miller notes that there was a labour shortage in Saint John, and Moncton boomed as people moved into the city and built homes.\(^{12}\) There was even growth in smaller urban centres like Chatham on the Miramichi, a place which had “stagnated since the First World War.”\(^{13}\) Despite these apparent gains, however, the province still faced a number of challenges, particularly financial ones. As R.A. Young has observed, “Although New Brunswick incomes rose because of troop concentrations, port activity, and the sale of old products from existing plants, its competitive position had deteriorated.”\(^{14}\) Moreover, some in the province realized that the wartime boom would be temporary. In addition to these uncertainties, the government of John B. McNair wrestled with the crippling debt which the province

\(^{10}\) W. Peter Ward, *The Japanese in Canada* (Ottawa: Canadian Historical Association, 1982), 14.


\(^{12}\) Ibid, 311.

\(^{13}\) Ibid, 314.

\(^{14}\) R.A. Young, “‘and the people will sink into despair’: Reconstruction in New Brunswick, 1942-52,” *Canadian Historical Review* 69, 2 (June 1988): 134.
had accrued during the Great Depression. Even though it had spent less per capita on relief than most other provinces, it had invested heavily in public works projects in an effort to kick-start the economy.\textsuperscript{15} The McNair administration won elections in 1944 and 1948 on a reconstruction platform, but despite modest improvements to staples industries and the introduction of social services and better health care, the province resumed its slow decline after 1951.\textsuperscript{16}

There were challenges in New Brunswick which extended beyond economics as well. In the 1940s, the province had the highest infant and maternal mortality rate and the highest rate of illiteracy in the country, and spent less on education, per capita, than every other province except for Prince Edward Island.\textsuperscript{17} In 1949, the appalling conditions of the province’s poorhouses were identified in a special report, and when Hugh John Flemming led the Conservatives to power in 1952 (for the first time since 1930), he faced a bankrupt treasury, while simultaneously committing himself to alleviating the poverty of New Brunswickers. Along with his counterparts in Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and Newfoundland, Flemming sought to achieve unity among the Atlantic Provinces and better terms from the federal government. When those better terms were not forthcoming, the province overwhelmingly turned away from the Liberals in the 1958 federal election and returned seven Conservatives to the Liberals’ three (a complete reversal of the results of the 1953 general election). This was the first time that the Conservatives, now led by John Diefenbaker, had a majority of

\textsuperscript{15} Young, “Reconstruction in New Brunswick,” 131.
\textsuperscript{16} Ibid, 166.
\textsuperscript{17} Miller, “War and Rehabilitation,” 327, 329-30.
federal seats in New Brunswick since the Bennett administration during the Great Depression.\textsuperscript{18} For all the efforts by political and business interests in the province during the 1950s, however, only the drastic changes proposed by the Louis Robichaud-led Liberal government in the 1960s, and the Conservative government of Richard Hatfield which followed in the 1970s, were able to achieve significant change.\textsuperscript{19}

Meanwhile, there were other, larger developments in Canada which impacted New Brunswickers, and many of these related to Canada’s growing sense of a separate nationhood. prime minister Mackenzie King argued that “The reality of nationhood has long been achieved, but certain of the appearances, the outward symbols, of nation are still lacking.”\textsuperscript{20} King’s Liberal administration pledged to address this during the 1945 election campaign. As this chapter will later point out, however, the changes and movements for change which resulted should not be taken as proof of the argument that Canada’s ties to the emerging British Commonwealth of Nations, or indeed English Canada’s Britishness, were weakened by the Second World War.\textsuperscript{21}

The first of these moves was to adopt a distinctive Canadian flag, but the divisive debate which followed convinced the prime minister that the time was not yet ripe for such a change. The government turned its energies instead towards drafting legislation

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{18} Forbes and Muise, “Election Data,” in \textit{The Atlantic Provinces in Confederation}, eds. Forbes and Muise, 523.
\item \textsuperscript{19} Margaret Conrad has called the founding of the Atlantic Provinces Economic Council a landmark moment in regional development. See Margaret Conrad, “Regionalism in a Flat World,” \textit{Acadiensis} XXXV, 2 (Spring/Printemps 2006): 141.
\item \textsuperscript{20} José Igartua, \textit{The Other Quiet Revolution: National Identities in English Canada, 1945-71} (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2006), 16.
\end{itemize}
to define national citizenship, the first of its kind when it was adopted as the *Citizenship Act* in 1947. Until the introduction of the Act, “It had hitherto been regarded...as a fundamental part of the concept of Empire and Commonwealth that there should be a common nationality and that the common law rule, by which all persons born within the king’s dominions were British subjects, should remain unimpaired.” However, Canada and its fellow Dominions had emerged from the Second World War forever altered, and “[by] reason of limited practical validity and in other ways, the old concept, deriving from more spacious times, no longer appeared either realistic or acceptable overseas.”

After some sensitive deliberations in Canada and within the Commonwealth, “[the] Canadian legislation, taking account of the objections to it, transformed the basis of citizenship, by defining the conditions of Canadian citizenship and then providing that all Canadians citizens were British subjects.” The latter phrase is noteworthy; the Citizenship Act specifically *pointed out* that Canadians remained British subjects. This is hardly the action of a nation determined to cut its ties with the British World. As José Igartua has suggested, the Act “did not fundamentally change the nature of Canadian citizenship.”

This change, unlike the prime minister’s plan to adopt a new flag, received support from both sides of the House of Commons. Secretary of State and prominent Liberal MP Paul Martin Senior believed that “For the national unity of Canada and for
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23 Ibid, 320.
24 Ibid, 320.
25 Igartua, *The Other Quiet Revolution*, 17.
the future and greatness of this country it is felt to be of utmost importance that all of us, new Canadians and old, have a consciousness of a common purpose and common interests as Canadians; that all of us are able to say with pride and say with meaning: ‘I am a Canadian citizen.’”

Conservative Member of Parliament John Diefenbaker, providing evidence of the pro-British world view for which he would become so famous, welcomed the bill also, defining his own identity as “a citizenship which maintains in this part of North America the great heritage of British peoples everywhere in the world.”

Although British subjecthood was later dropped from the definition of Canadian citizenship, in the late 1940s and the 1950s the 1947 legislation was generally welcomed by both French and English Canadians. Similar bills were later introduced in the United Kingdom and in a number of Commonwealth countries. As Nicholas Mansergh has noted, “[r]eflected in these changes was recognition of the fundamental status of “the Nations”, as against “The Commonwealth” they comprised.” This evolutionary process continued throughout the postwar period, and reached a climax in the 1960s when English Canada “shed its definition of itself as British and adopted a new stance as a civic nation...” The most public of these changes included the adoption of new symbols (like the maple leaf flag in 1965), but changes of various kinds led to a dramatic transformations across the country. Indeed, Lara Campbell and Dominque Clément have
referred to the 1960s “not as a decade in Canadian history, but as a social, political, cultural, and economic phenomenon.”

If the Second World War inspired Canada’s further assertion of nationhood, it also had a significant impact upon relations between Canada and its other imperialist ally, the United States. As Donald Creighton has suggested,

[e]verybody agreed that the war had changed Canada’s status. A few, amongst whom Mackenzie King himself could occasionally be numbered, privately suspected that Canada had simply exchanged the free and equal association of the Commonwealth for an increasing economic and military dependence on the United States.

Certainly, Canada emerged from the war with a number of new continental commitments that suggested a turning away from Europe. The movement towards the North American sphere of influence was not a new phenomenon, of course. As Buckner notes, by 1939:

America had already replaced Britain as Canada’s major source of capital investment, it provided Canada with the bulk of its imports, and it was the chief market for Canadian exports. The movies that English Canadians watched, the radio programmes they listened to, the popular fiction they read, and the sports they played were largely American in origin.

During the Second World War, however, a number of important developments drew the Canadians still further into the sphere of influence of their southern neighbours.
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32 Creighton, The Forked Road, 127-128.
The first of these developments came in 1940 when President Roosevelt and prime minister King signed the Ogdensburg Agreement, which called for the establishment of a Permanent Joint Board on Defence and which, it has been argued, “bound Canada to a continental system dominated by the United States and largely determined Canadian foreign and defence policy for the next thirty years.”\textsuperscript{34} This new defence body was symbolic of Canada’s move away from its traditional military relationship with the British armed forces, upon which it had largely depended for military protection (in a naval capacity at least) until the First World War. A further agreement between King and Roosevelt, signed at Hyde Park in 1941, allowed for the production of military equipment in Canada for American use and paid for with American dollars. The ‘Lend-Lease’ arrangement which resulted helped equip the Allies with American-built destroyers in return for long-term leases of Canadian and Newfoundland territory for the construction of US military bases.\textsuperscript{35}

After the conclusion of the war in 1945, Canada’s identity crisis continued. While Miller and Buckner are correct in their assertion that the British connection survived the war intact, Canadians found themselves torn between loyalties to the Old and New Worlds as the 1940s progressed. The problem was exacerbated when the Canadian government found itself drawn into the Cold War following the defection of Igor Gouzenko to the RCMP, revealing the existence of a Soviet spy ring in Canada. Eventually, Canada took a leading role in the creation of the North Atlantic Treaty

\textsuperscript{34} Creighton, \textit{The Forked Road}, 44. 
\textsuperscript{35} Ibid, 54.
Organization, an American-dominated defence alliance. During the Korean War (which was still raging at the time of the 1951 royal tour), Canada strained its relationship with the United States by pressing for an armistice, but in the end supported the terms of the peace negotiated by the Americans. With a few exceptions, this remained the foreign affairs pattern of successive Canadian governments for much of the rest of the twentieth century. The ratification by the Diefenbaker government of the North American Aerospace Defense (NORAD) agreement further placed the country in the American sphere of influence. And yet, until the 1960s, Buckner argues that “a majority of English-speaking Canadians continued to embrace the notion that Canada was essentially part of a family of British nations.” Somehow, Canada’s Britishness had survived the war and was still informing the frame of reference of English-speaking Canadians. This phenomenon will be discussed further below.

The Tourists and the Tours

Following the end of the Second World War, during which King George VI and Queen Elizabeth had proved to be important focal points for British and Commonwealth morale and resistance, a new face emerged to cheer the royal scene in the person of their young daughter, Princess Elizabeth. Born on 21 April 1926, the daughter of the then-Duke and Duchess of York, the young princess was not expected to occupy anything more than a minor role in the royal family, which with its rules of male

---

preference primogeniture favoured princes over princesses.\textsuperscript{38} And yet, following the abdication of her uncle, King Edward VIII, in December 1936, she found herself first in line to the throne at the age of ten. At this stage in their lives, it was unlikely that her parents would have a son to take her place in the line of succession, so the fate of Princess Elizabeth was clear: she would someday be Queen of Great Britain and the Empire-Commonwealth.\textsuperscript{39}

With her younger sister, Princess Margaret, Elizabeth spent the war largely secreted away behind the ancient and sturdy battlements of Windsor Castle, the royal family’s Berkshire home, emerging in the last months of the war as a junior commander with the Women’s Auxiliary Territorial Service. Her service in the British Army during the war had won her the admiration of many of her father’s subjects at home and abroad. It was symbolic of the more active part played by women in the armed forces during the Second World War, as opposed to the traditionally nurturing role many occupied as nurses during earlier conflicts. Elizabeth’s marriage in November 1947 to Lieutenant Philip Mountbatten, a penniless Danish-Greek prince was, as Churchill described it, “a flash of colour on the hard road we have to travel,” an obvious

\textsuperscript{38} Male preference primogeniture is the legal tradition by which the eldest son, regardless of whether he has older sisters or not, inherits the throne from his father. This is different from Salic Law, the British tradition by which hereditary titles are inherited by the closest male relative, to the exclusion of all females. It was because of the continued observance of Salic Law for dynastic purposes that the Kingdom of Hanover (which had been ruled since 1714 by King George I and his descendants, who were also Kings of Great Britain) passed upon the death of King William IV, to William’s brother, Prince Ernest Augustus, Duke of Cumberland, and not to his niece, Victoria, who had inherited William’s British kingdom. King Ernest Augustus of Hanover is the great-great-great-great-grandfather of Prince Ernst of Hanover, duke of Brunswick and Luneburg, the husband of Princess Caroline of Monaco.

\textsuperscript{39} Andrew Marr, \textit{The Diamond Queen: Elizabeth II and Her People} (London: MacMillan, 2011), 76, 86-7.
Figure 17: Prince Philip and Princess Elizabeth in 1950, a year before their Canadian tour.  
(Courtesy Wikimedia Commons)
reference to the austere conditions under which Britons were still living more than two years after the cessation of hostilities. Four children were born to the couple, beginning in 1948.

The relative quiet of the early years of Elizabeth and Philip’s marriage was brought to a halt by the failing health of her father. The King’s health had suffered during and immediately after the war, both due to fatigue and to his chain smoking. He underwent an operation for arteriosclerosis in one of his legs in 1949, postponing a scheduled trip to Australia and New Zealand. When the King had recovered from that surgery, the Antipodean tour was rescheduled, although this time with Elizabeth and Philip replacing the King and Queen and at a later date. A second major surgery in September 1951 resulted in the complete removal of the King’s left lung, causing a delay of one week in the commencement of the 1951 royal tour of Canada. Throughout the royal couple’s journey across Canada, best wishes for the King’s recovery were extended to them by mayors and politicians from all corners of the country. In February 1952, just days after the King bid them goodbye before the daunting tour of the Pacific Commonwealth, however, the Duke of Edinburgh broke the news to his wife that her father had died in his sleep; Elizabeth found herself Queen at the age of 25. The young Princess’ accession to the throne so soon after her return to the United Kingdom was a
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41 The King and Queen and their daughters also made a memorable tour of South Africa in early 1947, just a year before prime minister Jan Smuts was defeated in a general election and the victorious Reunited National Party of D.L. Malan instituted a policy of racial segregation. This Tour was organized both as a ‘thank you’ to the people of South Africa for their service to the Allied cause during the Second World War, and also as a move to garner support for the Smut administration.
shock to many, both in Britain and the Commonwealth. And yet, there was hope for a
‘new Elizabethan age’, with a glamorous young woman on the throne and dashing sailor
and two little children in tow.\textsuperscript{42} The first decades of her reign, in fact, witnessed the
dismantling of much of the former British Empire and the emergence of a new type of
Commonwealth for which Elizabeth has served as a “mother figure.”\textsuperscript{43}

The 1951 royal tour of Canada was a tour of several firsts. It was the first during
which the principal focus was on a female member of the royal family, and it was the
first for which the transatlantic crossing was made by commercial airliner.\textsuperscript{44} Although
the visit was to have begun with a ceremonial welcome at Quebec, this was replaced
with the decidedly unceremonious landing by plane at Dorval airport near Montreal.
What followed over the course of the next month was a punishing schedule which saw
the couple cross the nation from Quebec to British Columbia and back to Ontario, south
to Washington, and then onto the Maritimes.

One of the most memorable scenes of the 1951 tour was commemorated in a
painting by Hilton Hassel: the Princess and the Duke square dancing at Rideau Hall (the
Duke in blue jeans and a checkered shirt, no less). Equally colourful was the snowy, cold

\textsuperscript{42} Marr, \textit{The Diamond Queen}, 59.
\textsuperscript{43} Philip Murphy, \textit{Monarchy and the End of Empire} (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 13.
\textsuperscript{44} In all previous instances, most female members of the royal family were visiting as the wives of senior
male royals. One could make the argument that Princess Louise, daughter of Queen Victoria, as chatelaine
of Government House and wife of the Marquis of Lorne, the governor general, travelled as a high-profile
female royal, but in the end she too was in Canada by virtue of her status as wife of the Vice-Regal
representative. The decision in 1951 to travel by commercial airliner was made so as to make up for some
of the time lost when the tour was postponed due to the King’s ill health. The tour in Canada was
undertaken on the royal train, the standard means of travel for royal tours since the nineteenth century.
See Arthur Bousfield and Gary Toffoli, \textit{Home to Canada: Royal Tours, 1786-2010} (Toronto: Dundurn, 2010),
170.
mini-stampede conducted in Calgary for the benefit of the royal visitors. In a throwback to the royal tour of 1939, five young women from Corbeil, Ontario, were introduced to the royal couple: the famous Dionne Quintuplets, who had met the King and Queen twelve years earlier. But for the average individual, in locales both small and large, each stop was no doubt memorable. That could have been true as equally for one of the half million spectators, who crowded into the streets of Montreal to watch the Royal procession pass, as it was for mayor Charlotte Whitton of Ottawa, who presented the keys to Ottawa to Elizabeth and her husband. The royal couple, like generations of royalty before them, were afforded an opportunity to visit Niagara Falls and to watch the RCMP Musical Ride at Regina. The return journey eastward included the New Brunswick stops with which this chapter is most concerned. Afterwards, the royal pair moved on to Nova Scotia, where they spent time at Halifax, and later Charlottetown and St. John’s.

In New Brunswick, the 1951 tour consisted of stops in the three major cities: Fredericton, Saint John, and Moncton. At Fredericton on November 6, the royal couple commenced their visit at Union Station, where they received the dignitaries from the provincial and city governments. A drive through the city ended outside the Bonar Law-Bennett Library on the campus of the University of New Brunswick, of which the couple was given a tour.\(^45\) Afterwards, a trip to Christ Church Anglican Cathedral included the obligatory signing of the Bible presented to the church in 1860 by the Prince of Wales,

\(^{45}\) Andrew Bonar-Law and Richard B. Bennett were both New Brunswick natives who had successful political careers in the United Kingdom (Bonar-Law was briefly prime minister of Britain and Bennett was prime minister of Canada from 1930-1935). The building now houses the Provincial Archives of New Brunswick.
and another short drive ended in front of the Legislative Assembly building, where the princess received the addresses of welcome and met war veterans who had gathered to see them. A luncheon hosted by the provincial government at the Lord Beaverbrook Hotel capped off the visit to Fredericton. In Saint John, a stop at the Lancaster Military Hospital was followed by an evening dinner at the Admiral Beatty Hotel. The stop in Moncton the following day, November 7, was restricted to a short drive through some of the city’s principal streets, as well as a civic reception in a city park. A brief visit to the nearby town of Sackville brought the New Brunswick portion of the visit to a conclusion.

The reaction of New Brunswick’s English-language press to the death of King George VI a few months later mirrored that from around the Commonwealth. The front page of the Daily Gleaner on February 6 bore a black and white banner which read, in large, bold print, “THE KING IS DEAD / LONG LIVE THE QUEEN,” and in equally bold type the Saint John Telegraph-Journal proclaimed: “FREE WORLD MOURNS KING / ELIZABETH IS NOW QUEEN.” The Moncton Daily Times, which like the aforementioned papers featured portraits of the late King and his successor on the front page, carried a CP article titled “Sorrow in Canada / Nation Mourns Passing.” The Gleaner wrote solemnly of the news which the people of the city has received “with the deepest sorrow and shock.” “The demands made upon [the King],” the editor wrote, “were very heavy. These demand [sic] were increased beyond measures during the war. But at all times he succeeded in carrying out his onerous duties, at no little personal sacrifice, in a manner

46 Daily Gleaner, 6 February 1952, 1; Telegraph-Journal, 7 February 1952, 1.
47 Daily Times, 7 February 1952, 1.
which won for him the admiration, the love and respect of his subjects, who soon realized that here was a man among men.” For the new Queen, he had a wish: “May God grant her the courage and the strength to carry on in the manner to which he has been accustomed. And may she live to reign long and gloriously.”

The editor of the *Daily Times* focused more on the new sovereign, beginning his editorial with pomp and circumstance:

All Hail to the Queen! Long Live the Queen! So today, above the beat of muffled drum and strain of mournful dirge in tribute to the memory of the departed, beloved and lamented Monarch, King George VI, such salutation re-echoes around the far-flung British Commonwealth and Empire on the accession to the Throne of our new Sovereign – Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen Elizabeth II...From her realm in Canada...Her Majesty can be assured of the continuing fealty of all loyal Canadians to the Crown and of their profound devotion to her...

Services of thanksgiving were organized in churches across the province, and government offices and commercial businesses were closed on February 15, the day of the King’s funeral. Across the country, Canadians seemed genuinely to mourn the passing of their King, “George the Good.”

At the time of the young Queen’s Coronation sixteen months later, the nation again appeared united in its enthusiasm. Special services were held in communities across New Brunswick, and throughout the province people flocked to local cinemas to watch the proceedings; the Coronation was, after all, the first big international
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television/cinema moment. Suggesting an enthusiasm that crossed social divides, the
_New Freeman_ observed that “In every cathedral throughout Canada, in small country
churches and in the far off missions of the North, clergy and faithful turned their
thoughts in a special manner to the significance of the coronation and to a
manifestation of their fidelity to the highest civil authority.” Whether or not some of
this language is simply boilerplate text, it seems that, as Shils and Young have suggested,
that the Coronation of Elizabeth II was “an act of national communion.”

After her coronation, the new Queen, accompanied by the Duke of Edinburgh,
undertook an exhausting six-month tour of the Commonwealth (largely focused on New
Zealand and Australia). Canada would have to wait its turn for a royal visit until 1957,
when the Queen presided over the opening of Parliament at Ottawa. New Brunswickers,
however, would only have their first opportunity to pay homage to their new sovereign
in 1959, during what Phillip Buckner has referred to as “The Last Great Royal Tour.”

After a transatlantic flight (which since 1951 had become the preferred method
of royal travel), the tour began at St. John’s, Newfoundland, on 18 June 1959. Shortly
thereafter, the royal couple boarded the Royal Yacht _Britannia_, which would carry them
up the St. Lawrence, initially to Quebec. In a long-standing tradition, the Queen
undertook engagements on the Plains of Abraham, that most fabled and controversial
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site of public memory in Canada, when she presented colors to the Royal 22nd Regiment. While in the city, the Queen also made her first official address, which was broadcast on television, at a state dinner at the Chateau Frontenac. A formal dinner and ball were similarly held in Montreal by that city two days later, a day before the penultimate event on the royal itinerary, the official opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway. During the official ceremonies, which represented a project requiring international cooperation with Canada’s closest neighbour, the Queen was joined by President Dwight D. Eisenhower. In her second official speech of the tour, the Queen addressed the president: “I am delighted that this occasion which marks the inauguration of a great joint enterprise between our two countries [emphasis mine] should afford me the first opportunity of welcoming you and Mrs. Eisenhower to Canada. It is with the warmest feelings of friendship that I do so on behalf of the Canadian people, myself and my husband. [...] The President of the United States will always be welcome here, but today there is an added pleasure and a special warmth in our greeting.”56 In a speech perfectly encapsulating the reality of Canadian identity in the 1950s, the Queen took ownership of her Canadian realm, while also expressing Canada’s close ties to its American allies.57 That the Queen was invited to jointly open the St. Lawrence Seaway was continuing a long-established tradition, and she noted that the opening of the Seaway was taking place within sight of the spot from which her great grandfather had opened the Victoria Bridge in 1860. Then, in a touch which could only have been provided by royalty, the

56 The Royal Tour 1959: Canada, the United States and the St. Lawrence Seaway (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1959), n.p.
57 Buckner, “The Last Great Royal Tour,” 67-68.
official party passed through the opening locks of the new Seaway on board the stately Royal Yacht *Britannia*. This addition to the visit is one of the many things which made it the ‘Last Great Royal Tour.’

From there it was off to Kingston, Toronto, and Ottawa, for more official functions, state dinners, and the unveiling of a memorial to members of the British Commonwealth Air Forces who served in Canada and have no known graves. The presentation of Queen’s and Regimental Colours to three Canadian regiments on 1 July, Canada’s national ‘birthday,’ was another highlight. A brief sojourn across the American border to Chicago followed stops in southern Ontario, and then the royal couple headed west across the prairies (where at Calgary they got to see the Stampede), and then on to the Pacific Coast. From there the Queen and Prince Philip travelled to the Yukon, where the Queen had to cancel several engagements when her undisclosed pregnancy made it impossible to keep up the demanding schedule. From the North the royal couple headed eastward, making a number of stops in communities which were not included in the westward journey, including one in Tuxford, Saskatchewan, where they visited a family farm, and another in Regina where they witnessed an exhibition of folk dancing by representatives of the various immigrant groups which had populated the prairies at the turn of the century (another display of this ethnic variety was staged at Winnipeg). A further stop in Winnipeg provided the opportunity for the Hudson’s Bay Company to pay its traditional Tribute.\(^5\) After a trip down into an International Nickel Company

\(^5\) According to its 1670 charter, the Hudson’s Bay Company was required to pay a rent of two elk heads and two beaver pelts to the sovereign whenever he/she was present in company territory. This ceremony occurred for the first time during the 1939 royal tour. See Bousfield and Toffoli, *Home to Canada*, 114.
mine in Sudbury, Ontario, the tourists boarded a plane for the Maritimes. Events in New
Brunswick were followed by others in Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia (including a
garden party and a visit to another farm, and the presentation of Colours to the Royal
Canadian Navy) before the royal party departed Halifax by plane on 1 August.

In New Brunswick, the royal couple arrived by plane at the Fredericton airport on
28 July, where they were greeted by provincial officials before driving to the Legislative
Assembly building to receive the usual addresses of welcome from the provincial
government. A reception and tea followed on the grounds of Old Government House
(then the provincial headquarters of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police) before the
presentation of 112 Queen Scout awards in Phoenix Square in front of City Hall. Later
than evening, the royal party were treated to an evening of harness racing at the
Fredericton Raceway (a first for the Queen; her sister Princess Margaret had been
introduced to the sport the year before while visiting the city) and a private dinner
hosted by lieutenant governor J. Leonard O’Brien at the University of New Brunswick. At
Saint John and Moncton the following day, 29 July, the Queen and Prince Philip were
warmly welcomed, and in Saint John the couple visited the Lancaster Military Hospital.
In Shediac later that afternoon, in what was one of the most moving moments of the
tour, they met families of men lost in the Escuminac Disaster the previous month,
during which 35 men and boys were drowned in the waters of the Northumberland
Strait. From Shediac the royal party boarded HMY Britannia and headed for Prince
Edward Island.
Identities

The newspaper coverage of royal visits in the 1950s affords the historian the opportunity to examine some of the various identities present in New Brunswick and which were sometimes competing for ceremonial space. The dominant identity was that of the British majority, something which will be discussed later. An increasingly prominent competing identity, however, was that of the Acadian community, which was growing in size and influence in the middle of the twentieth century. As the previous chapters have demonstrated, the presence of the French-speaking population of New Brunswick was virtually absent from anglophone press coverage during all previous royal tours. As this chapter will demonstrate, that omission was at least partially resolved in the 1950s.

Demographics in New Brunswick continued to change in favour of the Acadians throughout the 1940s and 1950s. Whereas in 1921 Acadians had made up 31.2% of the provincial population, by the 1950s that percentage had risen to 40%. Certainly, the increase in the Acadian population during the twentieth century led some English-speaking New Brunswickers to warn of the threat of “French Domination” particularly during provincial election campaigns in the 1920s. Acadian lobby groups proliferated in the 1940s, and in the 1952 provincial election, the electorate returned a significant proportion of French-speaking candidates, even though several were not Acadian in

60 Ronald Rudin, Remembering and Forgetting in Acadie: A Historian’s Journey through Public Memory (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009), 50.
Three years later, the Acadians marked the bicentennial of the deportation of their ancestors in 1755. Ron Rudin has noted that the rhetoric of the bicentennial attempted not to offend English-speaking New Brunswickers, and as such there were few references to the deportation itself. Instead, references were made to “The Trials of the Acadian People.” In Moncton in particular, Acadian organizers of the bicentennial were sensitive to the uncertainties felt by English-speakers about the growing French-speaking community there.

The increased influence of this burgeoning group was particularly noticeable in the province’s hub city, where the Acadian population had been significant since at least the turn of the twentieth century. At the turn of the century, about 20% of the city’s population was francophone; by 1961, the proportion had increased to 36%. In 1916, Moncton’s voters had elected two Acadian aldermen for the first time in the city’s history, and yet the city remained an English enclave for decades afterwards.

As Richard Wilbur has suggested, as late as the 1930s “[to] the outside world, as well as to its French citizens, Moncton’s English maintained their dominant position. They refused to recognize the growing French fact, even though the great spire of the new cathedral rose to dominate the city skyline and more French stores and elementary schools gave a truer indication of Moncton’s bicultural state.” During the interwar period, however,
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61 Wilbur, The Rise of French New Brunswick, 165, 182. There were ten French speakers in the Liberal opposition, but several were Quebeccois from northwestern New Brunswick.
62 Rudin, Remembering and Forgetting in Acadie, 201.
the emerging Acadian leadership (inspired by their forebears who had led the Acadian Renaissance of the late nineteenth century) sought to address educational reform and other issues of particular interest to their community. By the 1950s, it was impossible for any anglophone Monctonian to ignore the growing “French fact,” and this is reflected in the address which the city presented to Princess Elizabeth in November 1951.

While the tradition of paying tribute to the history of cooperation between English and French-speaking Canadians was longstanding in other parts of Canada, New Brunswick rarely pursued that angle. In 1951, the City of Moncton’s bilingual address to Princess Elizabeth lauded the successful results of this cooperation: “Our greatest achievement is that here persons of Anglo-Saxon descent live happily and trustingly with Acadians of French inheritance, and that members of these two great races are united as Canadians in respect for our new common culture and the British tradition which made possible its development.” Aside from the text of Moncton’s address, however, no other reference to the Acadian community appeared in the English-language press in 1951. In 1959, the Acadian community in Moncton was far more in evidence. An editorial which appeared in the Daily Times referred to the nation’s origins:

[Canada] is a nation predominantly of two basic ethnic groups – the Anglo Saxon and the French. With its bilingual social structure and dual culture, each maintained and nourished side by side in a spirit of nationwide amity and
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66 Ernest R. Forbes, “The 1930s: Depression and Retrenchment,” in The Atlantic Provinces in Confederation, eds. Forbes and Muise, 284-85. Education was considered key for Acadian advancement, not surprising given that Acadian children were five times more likely to drop out of school before grade five than their English-speaking counterparts.
67 Daily Times, 8 November 1951, 12.
friendly cooperation in all endeavors towards the advancement of Canada as a nation, it constitutes an important and unique example to the world.”

Moncton’s official address, too, referred to cooperation between English and French, those “two great races and cultures, living together in harmony and with a devotion to the Crown and Commonwealth which unites all our citizens...” By the middle of the twentieth century then, the English speakers in New Brunswick’s southeastern city were finally beginning to come to terms with the bilingual and bicultural nature of their community.

An interesting (and apparently new) feature of the decorations for the royal tour of 1959 was the inclusion in Moncton, “a city of French- and English-speaking citizens...” of “a number of Acadian tricolor flags with yellow stars along with the usual Union Jacks and Red Ensigns.” The Acadian banner was first developed in the 1880s amid a great revival of Acadian culture in the region, but it did not immediately gain widespread support among the common people; indeed, Perry Biddiscombe has argued that “the spread of flag usage was very slow.” Although the flag gained acceptance before the outbreak of the Great War, Biddiscombe argues that “Acadian nationalism entered a long period of dormancy” (after 1914) which only ended in the 1950s. It was during this latter renaissance that we see this mention of the flag in the context of a royal tour. It is significant that the anglophone press saw fit, for the first time in 1959 as far as can
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68 Ibid, 30 June 1959, 4.
69 Ibid, 30 July 1959, 5.
70 Evening Times-Globe, 30 July 1959, 1.
72 Ibid, 144-145.
be determined, to make note of the use of the Acadian tricolour among the decorations in Moncton. Specifically, the reporter mentions its presence, along with Union Jacks and Red Ensigns, as symbolic of the city’s dual-linguistic identity. Of course, there was nothing officially bilingual about New Brunswick in 1951 or 1959, but it is significant that some Moncton journalists, and presumably the city officials in charge of decorations, saw their community’s dual-heritage as something to celebrate. Unlike 1939, when symbols of Canada’s French heritage were almost completely absent from the royal tour, in 1959 there seemed to be at least tacit acknowledgement of the apparently successful cooperation between Canada’s ‘two founding races.’ Representations of Indigenous people, on the other hand, were completely absent from the coverage in the province English-language dailies. Indeed, they would not be able to claim ceremonial space during a royal visit for many more years.

In 1959, the province made a very strong statement in their choice of their official gift for the royal couple, announcing that it would be inaugurating a fund which would provide for ten annual scholarships, five each going to students whose mother tongue was English and French respectively.73 This was part of a nationwide movement away from expensive, ostentatious gifts (or, as the CP described them, “expensive and often useless”) and towards those which could benefit Canadians.74 In the case of New Brunswick’s gift, the criteria were equally significant, given that five each would be awarded to French and English students. The province was still one year away from the
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73 Daily Times, 29 July 1959, 2.
74 Daily Gleaner, 2 July 1959, 1.
Figure 18: Princess Elizabeth and Prince Philip are presented with travelling rugs decorated with the New Brunswick coat of arms during the 1951 tour. (Courtesy Hank Williams)
election of the government of Louis Robichaud and his policy of Equal Opportunity, and a decade away from the adoption of the *Official Languages Act* which made New Brunswick the first, and only, officially bilingual province in Canada. Along with the increased presence of the Red Ensign (to be discussed later in this chapter), there was probably no greater symbolic shift than the one which incorporated the province’s French heritage. And yet, older and more established identities persisted.

As it had been in the interwar period, the Loyalist myth was still alive and well in at least some parts of New Brunswick in the 1950s. As William S. Jones has noted, the myth had over time become more generally acceptable to groups like Irish and French Roman Catholics. Indeed, he suggests that even in the 1970s, by which time Canada had officially embraced multiculturalism, “many orators [in Saint John] would slip into the discourse of the Loyalist myth during civic celebrations.” This was certainly apparent during the royal tours of the 1950s. Several months before the full itinerary for the 1951 tour was announced, the president of the Municipal Chapter of the Imperial Order Daughters of the Empire was quoted in the *Evening Times-Globe* saying that “it was difficult to imagine Saint John not being one of the places of interest to be of particular interest to the Royal party” ostensibly because of “[t]he special significance of Saint John as a Charter City, and as a Loyalist City…” An editorial in the same paper on the
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75 Regrettably, although the literature on the Loyalist myth in the province continues to grow, most of it has focused on Saint John. These include William S. Jones, “The Loyalist City: The Imposition of the Loyalist Image in Saint John, New Brunswick, 1883-1983 (MA thesis, University of New Brunswick, 2011); Greg Marquis, “Commemorating the Loyalists in the Loyalist City: Saint John, New Brunswick, 1883-1934,” *Urban History Review* 33, 1 (2004): 24-33; and other works which have been cited in previous chapters.  
76 Jones, “The Loyalist City,” 70.  
77 *Evening Times-Globe*, 6 July 1951, 11. Of course, such logic presupposes that that officials in charge of the royal itinerary were aware of Saint John’s history.
day of the royal couple’s arrival in New Brunswick harkened back to 1783: “Among the Canadian communities which have greeted Their Royal Highnesses, Saint John occupies a unique position. Unswerving loyalty to the Crown not only characterized this city ever since its founding, but also made possible its founding.” The following day, reporter Bill Smith referred to the “fleeting six hours” which the couple spent “in the city of the Loyalists...” For his part, the mayor of Fredericton was not about the let Saint John lay exclusive claim the Loyalists, however, and in his address of welcome he also paid tribute to the city’s Loyalist “founders”: “Founded in large measure as we were by those men and women who could not endure to be separated from the Mother Country, our loyalty to the Crown which you represent burns as deeply as when open expression of that loyalty meant the loss of home and fireside.” The Gleaner editor suggested loyalty was therefore inherent in the people of the capital city, referring to “the loyal people of this province whose love and respect for the crown are an integral part of their character.” This sort of boiler-plate editorializing was not uncommon even in the 1950s, but it is significant that the editor claims to speak for the whole of New Brunswick as though the province was as homogeneous as the capital city was at that time. The same “boilerplate” editorial copy which characterized the early twentieth century persisted in the middle of the century.
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Even in 1959, with what Igartua has called the “Other Quiet Revolution” (a modern, English-Canadian nationalism with no external ties) on the horizon, the Loyalists were still on the minds of journalists and political leaders alike. At the beginning of the New Brunswick visit, one editor wrote “The Queen and her husband come now into a province which was one of the earliest settled lands in what is now Canada – a province whose staunch devotion to the Crown has written inspiring pages of history and has been manifested again and again by the immediate response of her people when danger has threatened Great Britain and the Commonwealth.”

This is another example of a twentieth-century editor rooting contemporary loyalty in the myth of eighteenth century settlers. Suggesting a cause-and-effect linkage, in presenting the royal couple with a gift, the mayor of Saint John, D. Laurence Maclaren, called it “a tangible token of the loyalty and affection towards the British Crown that has always been displayed by the inhabitants of this old Loyalist city.”

Fredericton’s mayor William T. Walker also invoked the city’s forebears, who “came to this country at the close of the American Revolutionary War and who were instrumental in founding this province and its capital city. This tradition of loyalty has been maintained through the years and adds to our deep sense of pleasure and gratitude to Your Majesty for including our city in Your Majesty’s present tour…” The editor of the Gleaner echoed the mayor’s sentiments: “Loyalty to the Crown has deep roots in New
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Despite the fact that an increasingly large proportion of New Brunswickers in the 1950s had no direct link to the Loyalists of the 1780s, the rhetoric of the Loyalist myth came up again and again during these royal tours, maintaining the preeminence of this “imagined community.” At times like these, with communities across Canada trying their best to demonstrate their fealty to the Canadian monarchy, New Brunswick had an advantage in its long association, mythical or otherwise, with loyalty to the Crown.

**The Commonwealth and Britishness**

As was the case throughout much of Canada in the 1950s, Britishness and enthusiasm for the Empire-Commonwealth loomed large in New Brunswick. After the end of the Second World War, however, the British Empire took on a new identity. Although it had officially been known as the British Commonwealth of Nations following the adoption of the 1931 *Statute of Westminster*, the term British Empire was still common during the Second World War, and had certainly been widely employed during the 1939 royal tour.\(^86\) In 1949, however, at the same time as it was reorganized in order to admit nations who no longer recognized the King as their Sovereign, it became simply the Commonwealth of Nations. Although the new name did not reflect any new constitutional reality in Canada, it did reflect an evolution in the British World. The Empire had begun its process of disintegration, and in its wake left the new and
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\(^{85}\) *Daily Gleaner*, 28 July 1959, 4.

\(^{86}\) This dichotomous confusion can be explained most readily by the fact that the self-governing dominions made up a “Commonwealth of Nations,” but that Britain still directly ruled a large number of non-white settler colonies which made up its Empire. In that sense, the Empire continued to exist well into the 1960s; indeed, an argument could be made that it still exists, inasmuch as Britain governs a number of dependent colonies even today.
unfamiliar Commonwealth, which to many Canadians (and other white subjects in the settler dominions), meant much the same thing. It was only in the late 1960s that the Commonwealth became sufficiently differentiated from its imperial predecessor to which many Canadians found it difficult to relate.

A popular element of the mythology about the Second World War is that is facilitated the final collapse of the British World. Given that the 1940s, 1950s and 1960s saw the achievement of independence of more than two dozen former colonies (thus dismantling the old Empire), one could be forgiven for taking that myth at face value.

“Canadian historians,” Buckner contends, “argue that the Second World War ended the sense of belonging to a wider British World, and in retrospect it does seem clear that by the end of the war Britain lacked the ability to hang onto its Empire.” What we cannot do, however, is to buy into the mythology that the war also destroyed the imperial bond between Britain and its old dominions like Canada. Francine MacKenzie has written that “World War II fuelled imperial sentiment where it remained vibrant, renewed interest in the Commonwealth where it had lapsed, and generated new enthusiasm for the Commonwealth among those who had little interest in it.” While there is no denying that continentalism was an important factor by the late 1950s, Buckner and Francis argue that “The Second World War reinforced English Canada’s sense of belonging to a family of British nations.”

“Even the British monarchy emerged from the war more popular both in Britain and in Canada than ever before.” Further, Buckner argues, many institutions which supported the British connection persisted well into the post-war period – groups like the Orange Lodge, the Imperial Order Daughters of the Empire, and the Royal Canadian Legion. And although he argues that the 1960s saw support for the British connection come to a rather abrupt and unceremonious end, Buckner contends that it “survived well into the twentieth century because the imperial relationship had real meaning to a majority of English-speaking Canadians and fed into their sense of national identity.”

One need look no further than the Diefenbaker Conservatives, who accused the St. Laurent government of having betrayed Britain during the Suez Crisis.

Tied up with Canada’s membership in the Commonwealth was, as always, the issue of Anglo-Canadian relations. Although Canada had emerged from the Second World War with many obligations to North American continental defence, it still remained a firm partner with the United Kingdom. That friendly cooperation was nearly imperiled, however, during the Suez Crisis of 1956. On 26 July of that year, Egyptian president Gamal Abdel Nasser nationalized the Suez Canal, infuriating the British government, which owned 44% of the canal. The British prime minister, Anthony Eden, presumed that Canada would join Britain in a formal protest; like Mackenzie King before him, Canadian prime minister Louis St. Laurent resented this presumption and refused

---

90 Ibid, 2.
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to be drawn into the debate, especially because the Americans were watching the British with disapproval. In the end, a suggestion by Canadian diplomat Lester B. Pearson saved the day, but the temporary damage to Anglo-Canadian relations was done.93 Many in English Canada were upset by the prime minister’s refusal to come to the aid of the British in what was really an issue with no impact upon Canada whatsoever. "The Suez Crisis of 1956...,” Buckner and Francis argue, “did not weaken the belief among English Canadians that Canada ought to be a British nation. Indeed, John Diefenbaker’s election victory in 1957 was at least partly due to a desire by many English Canadians to reaffirm the importance of the British connection.”94 Even if English Canadians’ sense of belonging to the Commonwealth were still stronger than the Liberal government’s North American-centric policy, the nation had turned its back on Britain in order to stand alongside the United States; Canada’s commitment to Britain and its former Empire was beginning to waver.

The only thing holding the whole bundle of nations together, it seemed, was the monarchy. An editorial in the Evening Times-Globe at the time of the 1951 tour referred to “the significant influence of the Royal Couple in strengthening the bonds of Commonwealth and Empire and in helping to bring the British nations into still friendlier association with other countries.”95 An editorial from the same week in the Daily Times used similar language: “In this part of New Brunswick the people are deeply conscious of

93 Creighton, The Forked Road, 273-276.
94 Buckner and Francis, “Introduction,” Canada and the British World, 3. For French Canadians (particularly Quebeois), any residual attachment to a British World was long dead by the 1950s.
95 Evening Times-Globe, 6 November 1951, 4.
the great significance of the monarchy to the Commonwealth and Empire; they realize that the Princess who, with her Consort, they welcome here today is a perfect, living symbol of it.” 96 This suggests a belief that the sovereign was the unifying factor among the nations of the Commonwealth. To their credit, too, some newspaper editors were attuned to the crisis of identity facing the Empire-cum-Commonwealth. In the Daily Times, the editor reflected: “Truly, the Royal Tour has been more than a fascinating pageant, a continental-wide demonstration of popular acclaim. It has proven a refreshing inspiration, particularly significant at a time when the destiny of the British Commonwealth and Empire has become gravely imperiled.” 97 Evidently it was felt that the hope of the Commonwealth’s survival lay in the Royal Family. This idea has been explored by Philip Murphy. Building on the work about the end of the British Empire which has been carried out by Buckner, John MacKenzie, and a number of others, Murphy suggests that the monarchy played a significant role in the 1960s and 1970s when the Commonwealth was really evolving into the institution which exists today: diverse and equitable. 98 Certainly, the editor of the Daily Times in 1959 suggested that “it can in all truthfulness be said that the entire British Commonwealth and Empire...would lose much if Queen Elizabeth did not stand before it as a kind of living ideal, an embodiment of man’s aspirations for dignity, quality and moral uprightness.

96 Daily Times, 7 November 1951, 4.
97 Ibid, 13 November 1951, 4.
98 Murphy, Monarchy and the End of Empire. Until the independence of India and the emergence of a number of other non-white members of the evolving Commonwealth, the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meetings looked much like the Imperial Conferences of yesteryear. In the late 1950s and early 1960s, however, the faces at the table began to represent a greater diversity among the free and sovereign member states of the organization.
Unfortunately we have few such symbols left to us."99 This was characteristic of the generally optimistic outlook for the Commonwealth in the 1950s, as evidenced by the Colombo Plan of 1950 which sought to facilitate the “raising of living standards” in south and southeast Asia.100

By 1959, the idea of the modern Commonwealth seems to have been more fully grasped than it had been in 1951. An editorial in the New Freeman referred to “[the] happy position of Canada within the Commonwealth, that great union of self-governing states over which Her Majesty reigns, [which] emphasizes the growing importance of this nation in world affairs.”101 An editorial in the Daily Gleaner referred to Fredericton as “the seat of one of the governmental units of Commonwealth and Empire of which the Queen is constitutional head.”102 Premier Hugh John Flemming’s welcome to the Queen and Prince Philip similarly referred to “those expressions of loyalty which are the common heritage of our citizenship in the Commonwealth and the particular mark of humble devotion to the Crown in this province.”103 The use of the phrase “citizenship in the Commonwealth” is significant. It implies a much more active membership in the Commonwealth than Canada’s place in the British Empire ever could.

100 Mansergh, The Commonwealth Experience, 410.
102 Daily Gleaner, 28 July 1959, 4.
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If the nomenclature had changed, however, the ideas about what it meant to be a member of the British family of nations had not. In a 1959 editorial, the *Gleaner* enthused:

> In proudly welcoming Canada’s Sovereign, we have again proclaimed our faith in the ideas and ideals we share with the other nations over which she reigns. We have rededicated ourselves to the principles of stable and ordered government in the framework of which freedom can and does flourish – freedom of thought, freedom of expression, freedom of enterprise, freedom for all the Queen’s subjects.\(^\text{104}\)

These are likely the same common inheritances to which premier John B. McNair referred in his 1951 welcome speech as “the ties which bind the peoples of Your Majesty’s Commonwealth” which he wished would “remain strong and enduring for the sake of peace and justice in the world.”\(^\text{105}\) Just before Dominion Day 1959, the *Daily Times*, too, noted “It is particularly appropriate that our gracious monarch should be with us at this time, for her presence adds keen emphasis to the strength and permanence of the bond which ties this country to the British Crown – a connection at once seemingly elusive yet so apparent that it sometimes puzzles those who do not live within the British Commonwealth.”\(^\text{106}\) At the time of the visit itself, the same editor waxed poetically about the “great principles as symbolized by the Crown...within the great Commonwealth of Nations...”\(^\text{107}\)

\(^{104}\) *Daily Gleaner*, 29 July 1959, 4.
\(^{105}\) Ibid, 29 July 1959, 13.
\(^{106}\) *Daily Times*, 30 June 1959, 4.
\(^{107}\) Ibid, 29 July 1959, 4.
These traditional markers of Britishness were not the only symbols of British Canada in the 1950s. As had been the case during earlier tours, the most visible symbols of the British identity of anglophone New Brunswickers were found in the decorations in the communities on the royal itinerary. In Saint John, “Public buildings in the city have recently burst forth in a blaze of red, white and blue banners, crests and Union Jacks.” In Fredericton, the *Gleaner* noted that “One two-storied [sic] on George street sported 25 Union Jacks on its windows and doors.” Similarly, the headquarters of the New Brunswick Liquor Control Board at the corner of Westmoreland and Queen Streets was so festooned with Union Jacks and bunting that a caption read “BUNTING HIDES BUILDING.” In Moncton, one reporter referred to the “red, white and blue of thousands of flags...” Many of the advertisements in the *Gleaner* from local business featured an image of the Union Jack and the Red Ensign over which was sometimes superimposed the shield from the Canadian coat of arms, or a number of maple leaves. Still other ads featured only Union Jacks or Red Ensigns, depending on the preference of the advertiser or, more likely, the ad designer. Generally, though, British imagery dominated.

During the royal tour of 1959, the Union Jack was still very visible in the province, even while Canadians increasingly discussed the idea of a distinctly Canadian flag. In Fredericton, the colour scheme for the decorations on the Legislative Assembly
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Building were “confined to the familiar red, white and blue.”\textsuperscript{113} In Moncton, the headquarters of the Canadian National Railroad were bedecked with “250 flags and six huge strips of vertical tricolor bunting.”\textsuperscript{114} This article does not indicate if the 250 flags were Union Jacks or Red Ensigns, but given the prevailing trend for the tour (and the reference to tricolor bunting), a mixture of the two seems likely. For example, for the royal arrival in Fredericton, “scores of Union Jacks and Canadian ensigns were snapping in the breeze.”\textsuperscript{115} The \textit{New Freeman} referred to “a profusion of Red Ensigns and Union Jacks [which] predominated” outside the seat of government.\textsuperscript{116}

The physical symbols of old British Canada were facing increased scrutiny in this period, however. By the late 1950s, an increasing number of Canadians were demanding the adoption of a distinctly Canadian flag.\textsuperscript{117} The desire for a resolution to the flag debate (if it could be called that before 1964) was apparent in a 1959 commentary originally published in the \textit{Vancouver Province} and which appeared in the \textit{Daily Gleaner} three weeks before the tour arrived in New

\textsuperscript{113} Ibid, 24 July 1959, 5.
\textsuperscript{114} \textit{Evening Times-Globe}, 22 July 1959, 25.
\textsuperscript{115} Ibid, 28 July 1959, 1.
\textsuperscript{116} \textit{The New Freeman}, 1 August 1959, 1.
\textsuperscript{117} Igartua, \textit{The Other Quiet Revolution}, 93-6. A 1953 public opinion poll showed that 44.7\% of English-speaking Canadians favoured the Union Jack, 7.7\% favoured the Red Ensign, and only 28.3\% wanted a completely new flag. By 1958, however, a similar poll found that more than two-thirds of English-speaking Canadians wished to have a national flag which was “entirely different from that of any other country.”
Figure 19: Union Jacks can be seen decorating this building along Union Street in Saint John in 1959. (Courtesy Heritage Resources, Saint John)
Brunswick. Vancouver City Council had decided to order equal numbers of Union Jacks and Red Ensigns for distribution to children. *The Province* suggested that the Red Ensign should be used exclusively, arguing that “in spite of all the misinformed talk to the contrary, there is a distinctive Canadian flag.” Following that line of reasoning, the commentator argued that the Union Jack represents the Commonwealth, but since the Queen was touring as Queen of Canada and not as Head of the Commonwealth, then Canada’s flag (the Red Ensign) should be used. The debate was played out in the chambers of the Saint John county council, as the members engaged in a “long debate and almost equally divided opinion,” after which a compromise was reached to fly both the Union Jack and the Red Ensign outside the county courthouse. In the end, “Deputy Mayor James W. Whitebone led a group of sixteen who were in favour of the Ensign, which they said was “more generally accepted as Canada’s national flag”; twenty-four others were in favour of the Union Jack.” By the time of the next visit by the Queen to Canada in 1964, she had already approved the design for Maple Leaf flag.

The debate over Canada’s symbols had its origins long before the 1950s, but the issue was increasingly the focus of attention of certain Canadians during the latter part of that decade, and it became particularly tense after Lester Pearson’s minority government was elected in 1963. As historian C.P. Champion has observed, the flag debate was part of a larger discussion (conscious and unconscious) about Britishness in Canada: “On both sides of the debate, the confrontation with Britishness was a struggle
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over the meaning of Canada and Canadianism, and the role of memory, history, and
heritage in imagining the Dominion...” 121 The moves, first by King and later by St.
Laurent, to do away with the word “Dominion,” were similarly contentious. In that case,
Stuart Ward has argued, “What was at stake was not merely the cherished symbolism of
Canada’s ties to Britain, but something that struck deeper for those who could not
separate their idea of Canada from its loyalist beginnings.” 122

The various collections of essays on Canada and the British World edited by
Buckner and Francis discuss in part the context in which these debates occurred.
According to his presidential address for the Canadian Historical Association in 1993,
late twentieth-century Canadian historians had all but ignored Canada’s in the British
Empire and the British World. 123 The common belief was that the British/imperial
connection was a casualty of the two world wars, and that “any lingering sense of a
shared [British] identity seems to have vanished remarkably quickly in the 1960s.” 124 In
1951 and 1959, despite the preference shown in many quarters for the Red Ensign,
there is no evidence in the New Brunswick press (admittedly a conservative one in the
1950s, under the leadership of men like Michael Wardell of the Daily Gleaner) of a
movement to replace British symbols with “distinctly Canadian” ones. Today, of course,
the Union Jack continues to be popular during royal tours, both because the

121 Champion, The Strange Demise of British Canada, 5.
122 Stuart Ward, “The Redundant “Dominion”: Refitting the National Fabric at Empire’s End,” in Celebrating
Canada, Volume 1: Holidays, National Days, and the Crafting of Identities, eds. Matthew Hayday and
Raymond B. Blake (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2016), 336.
123 Phillip Buckner, “Presidential Address: Whatever Happened to the British Empire?” Journal of the
Government of Canada has maintained it as an official flag denoting our membership in the Commonwealth, and because some Canadians either identify with the flag personally, or as a symbol of the nation’s shared monarchy. Champion suggests, to take the point further, that Britishness was not simply cast off by all Canadians in the 1950s and 1960s but that “There coexist myriad local cultures animated by Britishness within a larger British World, and it would be artificial to suggest that Canada is not part of it.”

We must consider, too, of course that prime minister Diefenbaker, in the case of the 1959 tour at least, used the visit as an opportunity to attempt to make the monarchy feel more a central part of Canadian identity, which may at least partially explain the preference in some quarters for the Red Ensign over the Union Jack during that tour by the Queen and Prince Philip.

**Queen of Canada**

For all of the references to the rich inheritance of the British tradition, and to the abiding ties of the emerging Commonwealth, there was a new catchphrase which gained ground during the 1959 royal tour in particular – that of ‘Queen of Canada.’ Although there had been a separate King of Canada in theory since the reign of George V and the passage of the *Statute of Westminster*, the title was rarely used, and the British government was quite reluctant to make any official changes to either the *Royal Styles and Titles Act* or the Coronation Oath throughout much of the twentieth century. Certainly Canadians knew that she was their Queen. However, whether they understood

---

the nuances of the separation of the Crowns which resulted from the passage of the \textit{Statute of Westminster} was another matter entirely.

As discussed in Chapter 1, Buckner suggests that the 1957 and 1959 tours were in part efforts by Diefenbaker to convince Canadians that Elizabeth II was both Queen of the United Kingdom and Queen of Canada.\footnote{126} Certainly, Canada had shared sovereigns with Great Britain since long before Confederation, but Canada after the \textit{Statute of Westminster} was legislatively independent, and therefore a sovereign nation. As such, there were efforts Canadianize the monarchy; the Queen became the first sovereign to open Canada’s Parliament in 1957; scholarship funds were set up in the Queen’s honour in 1959 in place of expensive gifts for the royal couple; and at Stratford, Ontario, the Queen became the first member of the royal family ever to meet an Inuit person.\footnote{127} Even the federal government’s insistence on the use of the world “tour” instead of “visit” was strategic, and British in origin. As Buckner notes, “[t]he change was designed to indicate that the Queen was not a mere visitor but was ‘equally at home in all her realms.’”\footnote{128} Not surprisingly, despite the best efforts of organizers, however, the 1959 itinerary was predictable, as Ottawa had little control over local programs. Chief among the government’s efforts, though, was the promotion of Elizabeth II as Canada’s Queen.

\footnote{126} Buckner, “The Last Great Royal Tour,” 69. Until at least the 1939 royal tour, these visits were generally on the initiative of the imperial government. The 1957 and 1959 tours were very much undertaken at the request of the Canadian government. 
\footnote{127} Ibid, 73-76
\footnote{128} Ibid, 66. The latter phrase comes from a letter from the Queen’s private secretary, Michael Adeane, to the governor general of Canada, Vincent Massey.
In 1951, an editorial in the *Daily Times* referred to the “young princess who some
day will become their Queen – the Queen of Canada.”\(^{129}\) A CP report published during
the same tour noted that, in Washington, the young Elizabeth had been received
“primarily as a Canadian princess...”\(^{130}\) Apparently aware of the efforts of Diefenbaker to
“Canadianize” the Crown in 1957 and 1959, and to maintaining and promoting what
Buckner called the “constitutional fiction” that the Queen of the United Kingdom was
equally Queen of Canada, the CP was quick to point out that, during her Dominion Day
address, the Queen “took the occasion...to note that she is Canada’s Queen.”\(^ {131}\)

The question remains of the degree to which Diefenbaker was successful in his
plan. Buckner concludes that the prime minister’s efforts to convince Canadians that the
Queen of Great Britain was equally Queen of Canada, ultimately failed, but the title
“Queen of Canada” did feature several times in the anglophone press in New Brunswick
in the summer of 1959.\(^ {132}\) In an editorial on the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway, the
Roman Catholic *New Freeman* posited that “It was...with pride and pleasure that Canada
opened its heart to the Queen of Canada and her Consort.”\(^ {133}\) The *Gleaner’s* editor

---

\(^{129}\) *Daily Times*, 7 November 1951, 4.
\(^{130}\) Ibid, 1 November 1951, 1.
\(^{131}\) Ibid, 2 July 1959, 14.
\(^{132}\) During the period 2006 to 2015, the Conservative administration of prime minister Stephen Harper
undertook a similar effort to emphasize Elizabeth II’s role as Queen of Canada. In a recent book chapter,
Andrew Heard tackled the question, “Is There a Canadian Monarchy?” He notes that “The issue comes down
to whether there are separate monarchies in the overseas realms. But in the case of Canada at least, there
has been no change to the legal framework that provided that the occupier of the British throne is sovereign
over Canada. She may be called, among her many titles, the Queen of Canada, but no direct action so far
has created a Canadian monarch or a Canadian royal family.” See Andrew Heard, “The Crown in Canada: Is
There a Canadian Monarchy,” in *The Canadian Kingdom: 150 Years of Constitutional Monarchy*, ed. D.
Michael Jackson (Toronto: Dundurn, 2018), 126.
\(^{133}\) *New Freeman*, 25 July 1959, 4.
certainly seems to have bought into the “constitutional fiction”: “Throughout her trip the Queen has demonstrated her affinity with Canadians. As Queen of Canada she presided at the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway; as Queen of Canada she visited the United States.”\(^{134}\) And the editor of the *Daily Times* similarly adopted the title: “This time, the Princess of almost eight years ago comes to us as Queen of Canada, and homage tendered here by the populace in this section of her Canadian realm will be in the fullest measure.”\(^{135}\) Along with the emerging and expanding acceptance of Canada’s membership in an increasingly diverse and decentralized Commonwealth, the divisibility of the Crown which had been achieved by the *Statute of Westminster* was finally being accepted by the New Brunswick press. Whether it was just lip-service, or partly an effort to shape attitudes among their readers, there was evidence that the press was willing to accept the idea that Elizabeth II was not only Canada’s Queen by virtue of their relationship with Britain and the Commonwealth, but also because she occupied a separate legal position as monarch of a sovereign nation.

**Local Issues**

Two unique conversations dominated the New Brunswick coverage of the 1959 royal tour: the Escuminac Disaster which struck Miramichi Bay on 20 June, and the Queen’s “illness” while in the Yukon. The Escuminac Disaster weighed heavily on the minds of many New Brunswickers after it claimed the lives of 35 men and boys from the

\(^{134}\) *Daily Gleaner*, 1 Aug 1959, 4.

\(^{135}\) *Daily Times*, 29 July 1959, 4.
region, 31 from the Escuminac area. On the night of 20/21 June 1959, a violent storm unexpectedly struck Miramichi Bay and the Northumberland Strait, and dozens of fishing boats were stranded on the open water as they were tossed about. Tales of bravery and sacrifice abounded, and whole families were devastated by the loss of fathers and sons. William Chiasson, for example, was lost at sea along with two of his four sons, William and Adrien. On 22 June, Max Aitken, First Baron Beaverbrook, a son of the Miramichi, pledged $5,000 to start a relief fund established by the Daily Gleaner, the Atlantic Advocate, and the Red Cross. Donations poured in from around the world, and on 14 July, news broke that the Queen and Prince Philip had made a donation of an undisclosed amount to the fund, in what was called “a departure from royal precedent.” According to the Daily Gleaner, “It is the first time the Queen has made such a donation in Canada, and possibly the first time for any cause outside the United Kingdom.” Although the amount of the donation was not disclosed at the time, a government official confirmed that “he understood the donation ‘will be a substantial one.’”

---

137 “The New Brunswick Fishermen’s Disaster Fund,” 2. The Gleaner and the Atlantic Advocate were both published by Beaverbrook’s friend and former employee, Michael Wardell. See Lawrence Earl, “Mike Wardell’s tempestuous love affair with the Maritimes,” Maclean’s, February 28, 1959, 27-35.
138 Evening Times-Globe, 14 July 1959, 1. When the disaster struck, the Queen and the Duke of Edinburgh were in Newfoundland at the beginning of their cross-Canada journey. An enquiry with archivists at the Provincial Archives of New Brunswick revealed that the exact amount of the donations was not recorded in the official records of the Fund.
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QUEEN, PRINCE MAKE DONATION TO FISHERMEN’S DISASTER FUND

Ottawa Blasted By Smallwood On Pact’s Terms

Depart From Precedent To Aid Victims Of Recent N.B. Storm; Fishing Villages Welcome News

Queen Elizabeth and Prince Philip have made a donation to the New Brunswick Fishermen’s Disaster Fund. Chancellor-Governor J. Leonard O’Brien announced today. The amount of the donation was not disclosed.

Those in Need

Postmaster-General in City,

Canada, Israel relations cited
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WIDOW, 8 CHILDREN APPEARING ON TV

‘Heartfelt Thanks’

Western Ministers attack Gromyko

Canadian Farmers Get More Capital

Fishing villages welcome news

Canada, Israel relations cited

The Daily Gleaner

The Voice of Central New Brunswick

Figure 20: The Daily Gleaner breaks the news that the royal couple have contributed to the Fishermen’s Disaster Fund, 14 July 1959, page 1.
most devastated by the storm, told reporters that “just knowing the Queen has given something will be a great help.”

An editorial in the *Evening Times-Globe* no doubt manifested the reaction of many New Brunswickers when it suggested that the donation “has tightened the already close bonds between Canadians and the Royal Family. For it is in times of distress that the family nature of those ties is demonstrated as in no other way.” The editor noted that Prince Philip had visited the site of the Springhill mining disaster in Nova Scotia the year previous while in Canada for a meeting of the English Speaking Union in Ottawa. The editor of the *Gleaner* was equally full of praise, noting that “When Queen Elizabeth heard of New Brunswick’s Miramichi Bay fishing tragedy, her sympathy went out to the bereaved. She asked to be kept informed of developments as she continued her tour of Canada. Now Her Majesty has translated words into action that will warm every heart throughout Canada and the Commonwealth.” The donation served two purposes: “as a useful financial gift and as a reminder to Canadians that the Fund is still open and that the need is still great.” Other papers in the province were similarly grateful, including the Moncton *Daily Times*, the editor of which argued that “Through that totally unexpected and eminently gracious demonstration of sympathy and understanding, Queen Elizabeth greatly uplifted the spirits of those so cruelly handled by fate, and by so doing also gave Royal endorsement to the need and worthiness of the fund.”

---

141 Ibid, 14 July 1959, 1. The Fund eventually raised a total of $438,000.  
144 Ibid, 16 July 1959, 4.  
Murphy has commented on the fact that “[f]emale members of the royal family played an important part in constructing” the connection between the royal family and “voluntary service and philanthropy.”\textsuperscript{146} Certainly, the Queen’s gesture is in line with this.

The royal donation was to be only one way in which the Queen and Prince Philip lent their support to the bereaved widows and orphans of the Escuminac Disaster. In mid-July, it was announced that the royal itinerary was to include a meeting in southeastern New Brunswick between the Sovereign and the grieving families. Curiously, a decision was reached in the corridors of power that allowed only the widows and children of victims whose bodies had been recovered to gather on the wharf at Pointe-du-Chêne; nineteen victims were still missing in late July.\textsuperscript{147} In an editorial just before the visit, the \textit{Gleaner} referred to the forthcoming meeting as having the potential to be one of the highlights of the Canadian tour. “The widows and orphans will be making the long trip to Pointe-du-Chêne in brand new busses,” the editor wrote. “They will be decked out in brand new clothes. It will be the most memorable occasion of their lives to meet and say goodbye to their friend and their Queen.”\textsuperscript{148} The editor of the \textit{Daily Times} was equally moved:

Throughout her long and at time arduous tour of Canada...Queen Elizabeth has personally met countless numbers of government officials, municipal dignitaries and representatives of many levels and areas of Canadian life. But it can truly be said that, of all her personal contacts with loyal subjects within this Dominion,

\textsuperscript{146} Murphy, \textit{Monarchy and the End of Empire}, 12.
\textsuperscript{147} \textit{Evening Times-Globe}, 28 July 1959, 16. It is not clear from the press coverage who came to this decision, whether federal tour officials or those in the province.
\textsuperscript{148} \textit{Daily Gleaner}, 24 July 1959, 4.
none will hold greater meaning for Her Majesty, or evoke more heartfelt feelings – as a wife and mother – that her meeting…with 16 bereaved widows and their families, whose hardy fishermen husbands were tragically taken from them…”  

The editor went on to applaud to the “warm and sincere gesture” and suggested that it would “further strengthen the hearts of the widows and fatherless children…” The editor of the Gleaner, predictably as pro-British and pro-monarchy as his publisher Wardell, was equally enthusiastic about what he predicted would be a memorable event:

The Queen asked to see these unfortunates out of her own compassion. The effect of bringing these women and children to Point du Chene…puts them in the international spotlight. This the Queen knows. Countless cameras and television lenses will be focused on them. The columns of countless newspapers will be opened to their plight and stories will be written by some of journalism’s leading craftsmen. [...] National attention will be drawn…to the meeting of the Queen of the storm’s victims.

Reverend Lidden M. Pepperdene, rector of St. Mary’s Anglican Church in nearby Chatham commented, “Some think it will be an ordeal, but I don’t think so. The Queen isn’t that kind of a woman. I think they’ll enjoy it – it will break the tedium of life. And these people need something like that now.” Whether or not the widows and orphans of the Disaster found the event an ordeal or not was not reported in the media. What reports did convey was a general sense of appreciation.

---
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Following the meeting at Pointe-du-Chêne, the newspapers in the province carried moving coverage of the event. As some had predicated, it was a highlight of the royal tour, and the CP agreed:

A tiny grey-haired woman in black, surrounded by 12 of her 18 surviving children, sat on a Northumberland Strait wharf here Wednesday night and blinked back the tears as she received a sympathetic smile and kind word from Queen Elizabeth. / It was a moment of solemnity that contrasted with the usually gray atmosphere of the Royal Tour.\(^{153}\)

One of the widows present was the wife of the aforementioned victim William Chiasson, who also lost two sons in the disaster. Although unable to walk and move her hand for a time after the disaster, she “wanted to come for the sake of the children.”\(^{154}\) And so did many other grieving women from New Brunswick’s northeastern fishing villages. Many were indeed touched by the gesture, including Mrs. Burton Chapman, who lost her eldest son: “It was so nice of the Queen to spend the time with us. I told her how much we appreciated it and also how much we appreciated her gift to the Fishermen’s Disaster fund. She spoke to us with such understanding and sympathy and was so kind and thoughtful.”\(^{155}\) The *Gleaner* noted that many women, including the Queen, were seen to weep as she “conversed with the widows in French and English and listened to the heart-rending stories of the wives who lost their loved ones on that fateful night and morning.”\(^{156}\) The whole event put a very human face on the 1959 visit, reminding those

\(^{153}\) Ibid, 30 July 1959, 1.
\(^{154}\) Ibid, 30 July 1959, 1.
\(^{155}\) *Daily Gleaner*, 30 July 1959, 1.
\(^{156}\) Ibid, 30 July 1959, 4.
who were present at Pointe-du-Chêne that the Queen was a young wife and mother, like many who had lost loved ones.

As many predicted, the meeting between the widows and mothers and orphans of victims of the disaster (as well as eight survivors) was a moment sure to be etched for all time in the memories of those there that day. Whether or not these grieving people were therefore “better able to face an uncertain future,” it is certain that this special event on the royal itinerary did a great deal to draw attention to their plight. Furthermore, it highlighted what the editor of the *Evening Times-Globe* identified on July 14th as the “family nature” of the ties between Canada and the royal family. Although these human connections had long been a part of the connection between Canada and the monarchy, they would become even more apparent during later royal tours; the newly-married Duke and Duchess of Cambridge re-arranged their itinerary to include a stop in the fire-ravaged areas around Slave Lake, Alberta, in 2011.\(^{157}\)

The other hot topic for discussion during the 1959 royal tour was the Queen’s “illness” while travelling in the Yukon. When the Queen was forced to cancel several engagements due to what was said to be a stomach ailment, newspapers across the country were fueled by rumours as to the cause. The editor of the *Gleaner* noted that “there is deep concern that the

\(^{157}\) The Queen similarly issued messages to those affected by the rail disaster in Lac Megantic, Quebec, in 2013, and the wildfires in Fort MacMurray, Alberta, in 2016, among many others.
Figure 21: The Queen meets widows and children of some of the men who perished in the Escuminac Disaster, Daily Times, 31 July 1959, page 5.
heavy schedule of her trip to Canada may have had much to do with her indisposition. If news dispatches from Britain are to be believed, the Queen is exhausted, utterly worn out and headed for a complete breakdown.”¹⁵⁸ Many New Brunswickers apparently agreed with this explanation, and several wrote letters to the editor of the Gleaner suggesting a more relaxed itinerary for the New Brunswick visit. ‘Gleaner Reader’ from Fredericton reflected, “Roger Banister, John Landy and Chris Chataway were undoubtedly exhausted after they ran the four-minute mile. Why shouldn’t the Queen be exhausted?... For a country which prides itself as a great place for a vacation, where’s the rest for the Queen?”¹⁵⁹ David Dickson of Fredericton echoed this sentiment when he wrote, “[New Brunswick authorities] should tell the Royal Couple NOW that their duties in New Brunswick will be limited to brief public appearances in the larger centres on the itinerary.” “In the light of the inhuman demands being made on the Royal Couple under the present program,” he continued, “the first line of our National Anthem, appears to have taken on a new and very real significance: / ‘God Save our gracious Queen’.”¹⁶⁰ More letters followed the following day, including one from Vernon C. Smitz which referred to the “rest [the Queen] sorely needs,” and another signed by ‘Eight Concerned Citizens’ which called for the City of Fredericton to cancel all public events in favour of “a complete holiday.”¹⁶¹ There seems to have been somewhat of an epiphany among

---

these writers that the young Queen was indeed human, though how much this realization was tied to her gender will be discussed later in this chapter.

This sympathy for the Queen’s condition resulted in wider calls for future tours to include a less punishing itinerary. Indeed, there was widespread belief that this would be the last of the ‘great’ royal tours, as Buckner describes it.\textsuperscript{162} As early as the beginning of July, before the Queen was forced to cancel her engagements in the Yukon, the \textit{Daily Gleaner} carried a CP piece which claimed, “Senior officials with the Royal Tour are saying that this will be the last in the grand manner insofar as length is concerned.... The alternative, using swifter means of communication now available, would be shorter visits for specific events in Canada.”\textsuperscript{163} At the end of the month, another CP article, this time in the \textit{Evening Times-Globe}, featured the headline “Queen Willing To Visit Canada Again Maybe On Reduced Scale.”\textsuperscript{164} The editor of the \textit{Gleaner} conceded that

\begin{quote}
There will be future visits from the Queen to Canada, but they will have to take a different form. Tours such as the Queen and Prince have just completed call for more endurance than the human body can safely provide. Britain is only a few hours from Canada by air, a fact which will help to set a future pattern of more frequent but shorter visits by Royalty.\textsuperscript{165}
\end{quote}

As it turned out, these predictions were accurate, as never again has Canada hosted such a tour as the one completed by the Queen and Prince Philip in the hot summer of 1959. In many ways, then, the tour was a turning point, as future tours by members of the royal family (and there have been several dozen) have been shorter, more frequent,

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{162} Buckner, "The Last Great Royal Tour," 66-93.
\item \textsuperscript{163} \textit{Daily Gleaner}, 4 July 1959, 1.
\item \textsuperscript{164} \textit{Evening Times-Globe}, 4 August 1959, 9.
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and often less formal. This was facilitated in part by the advent of convenient air travel, and the shortening of itineraries was a happy byproduct.

Although there had officially been a plan to make the 1951 and 1959 tours more informal affairs (no conferrals of honourary degrees, laying of cornerstones, or opening of institutions), local itineraries often took on a formal air.\(^{166}\) In a November 1951 letter to the editor of the *Daily Times*, Douglas E. Rice of Petitcodiac complained that “any reader cannot help but notice one outstanding bad point – that too much time has been given to officialdom and too little to the average citizen and especially the children.”\(^{167}\) Rice noted that despite criticism of this in other centres, nothing had as yet been done to rectify the problem in Moncton where, he predicted, “the children, many of whom will have travelled many miles to see their Princess and Prince, will watch them rush by to meet the officials, so that the ambition of a few may be served.”\(^{168}\) Saint John made a conscious effort to provide ample space for the children of that part of the province to view the royal couple unobstructed, as many communities did.\(^{169}\) In Fredericton, premier John B. McNair ruled out formal presentations in 1951, pointing out that “their Royal Highnesses would be here to see the people and not to meet a selected few.” The *Gleaner* noted that this “decision represented the first occasion such action has been taken since the opening of the Royal Couple’s Canadian tour, and Fredericton will be the only provincial capital where no formal presentations will be made.”\(^{170}\)

\(^{166}\) *Evening Times-Globe*, 9 August 1951, 1;  
\(^{167}\) *Daily Times*, 6 November 1951, 4.  
\(^{168}\) Ibid, 6 November 1951, 4.  
\(^{169}\) *Evening Times-Globe*, 3 November 1951, 20.  
\(^{170}\) *Daily Gleaner*, 22 October 1951, 1.
capital seems to have really taken the royal directive to heart, as the *Gleaner* reported later that the couple would “encounter a true cross section of the community...” at the provincial luncheon, where the guests would include “wage earners as well as representatives of the church and judiciary and of the Federal, provincial and civic administrations.”

In 1959 there was again to be an emphasis on “keeping the program as relaxed and interesting as possible.” Nevertheless, although the CP noted that “officials have made it clear that they are not in favor of such activities as the laying of cornerstones, official openings of hospitals, visits to legislative buildings or city halls and schools and attendance at parades,” the rules were sometimes bent. The stops in Fredericton and Saint John, for example, included visits to the provincial Legislature and the Lancaster Military Hospital, respectively. Certainly the description of the itinerary for Fredericton sounds formal enough: following the official welcome at the airport, including a 21 gun salute and a 100 man honour guard from the Black Watch, the royal couple was to meet dignitaries before heading off to the Legislative Assembly building for more events. Afterwards, it was off to City Hall for the presentation of an address of welcome, the review of Scouts, Guides, 4-H clubs and other groups, and the presentation of one hundred Queen Scout certificates, all to be followed by a reception at tea at Government House where members of the Legislative Assembly and city councilors

---

171 Ibid, 30 October 1951, 1. These workers included employees of Canadian Cottons Ltd. in Marysville, Canadian Pacific and Canadian Railways, and the three shoe factories operating in the city.
were presented. Evidently, the addition to the program of a harness race at the Fredericton track was the capital’s nod to the national directive that “The emphasis is to be on functions with scenic, historic, recreational, industrial, social or cultural significance.”\textsuperscript{174} Otherwise, the schedule was full to the brim with official functions, even if premier McNair hoped that “these final...days [would be] as interesting and relaxing as possible...”\textsuperscript{175} David Dickson in his letter to the editor of the \textit{Gleaner} had insisted that it “behooves us as Canadians to do something about [the strain on the Queen following her “illness” in the Yukon]” and that “New Brunswick authorities [should] take the lead [in reducing the official itinerary].”\textsuperscript{176} The newspapers offer no further commentary on the possibility of the provincial government making last-minute changes to New Brunswick’s section of the itinerary, and in the end, the tour went ahead as scheduled.

\textbf{Inventing Tradition}

One constant in royal tours of Canada throughout the first six decades of the twentieth century (and beyond) was the continuous effort by organizers and the media to link the present tour with those from an earlier day. This had been the practice even in 1860, when various connections were made between the itinerary of the then-Prince of Wales and elements of the life in Lower Canada and Nova Scotia of his grandfather, Prince Edward, later Duke of Kent. This practice, which continued to be popular during

\textsuperscript{174} Ibid, 24 March 1959, 14.  
\textsuperscript{175} \textit{Daily Times}, 28 July 1959, 1.  
\textsuperscript{176} \textit{Daily Gleaner}, 23 July 1959, 4.
the tours of 1901, 1919, and 1939, was employed as late as 1951 and 1959. Although this dissertation argues, as other studies have, that David Cannadine’s suggestion that twentieth-century monarchical ceremonial traditions which were purported to be of ancient origin are actually nineteenth-century creations and adaptations is too simplistic, it does concede that there seems to have been a conscious effort on the part of tour organizers and the press to draw a line between tours of the past and the present, presumably in an effort to solidify the foundations of monarchy in Canada as an engrained institution (and maybe to sell a few newspapers).177 As the editor of the Roman Catholic New Freeman suggested in 1951, “Royal visits are not uncommon to Canada. In fact they go away back in our nation’s history. In Saint John, York Point, [sic] recalls Royalty and Halifax, too, has its memories of visits of members of the Royal Family.”178 In a later issue, the same editor wrote, “Plans have been completed for a truly great reception recalling visits of Royalty to this province in the past.”179 Such historical legitimacy, such as that which is provided by the Loyalist myth, allows for a continued acceptance of the status quo. Indeed, the Evening Times-Globe, in a special supplement issued the day before the beginning of the 1951 visit, featured an overview of the royal visits to New Brunswick of 1794, 1860, 1861, 1869, 1879, 1901, and 1919.180 What greater proof of historical continuity could be found?

177 This speaks in some ways to the discussion about newspapers as a reflection of public interests and opinions. Publishers, whatever their political or ideological leanings, had to meet their bottom lines.
178 New Freeman, 13 October 1951, 4.
179 Ibid, 3 November 1951, 4.
180 Evening Times-Globe, 6 November 1951 (supplement), 5.
Leading up to the 1959 tour, the editor of the *Gleaner* remarked that the St. John River had been the “Royal Road” along which tourists had travelled to the provincial capital for generations, and noted that “It is unfortunate that the Royal Visit of 1959 to Fredericton does not in any way feature the river. Queen Elizabeth will miss the finest attraction of Fredericton, which her great-grandfather saw in 1860.”\textsuperscript{181} During the 1951 tour, the editor of the *Daily Times* reminded readers of the visit to Canada by King George VI and Queen Elizabeth 12 years earlier, when they “traversed the same route [Princess Elizabeth and Prince Philip] are now following.”\textsuperscript{182} Civic addresses presented to the royal couple also harkened back to the 1939 visit, including one illuminated address presented by the mayor of Moncton: “Your presence in Moncton recalls the visit of Their Majesties…and in welcoming you, their daughter and heir presumptive, we experience the same emotions of affection and patriotism which stirred us then, and which were an inspiration to us in the dark days of the late war…”\textsuperscript{183} Fredericton’s official address included a similar reference: “The thoughts of your visit will live with the happy memories which still linger in our minds of the gracious visit we enjoyed from the King and Queen in 1939.”\textsuperscript{184}

In 1959, municipalities continued to refer to the growing list of royal visits to the province, as Fredericton’s Mayor William T. Walker did when he referred in his address of welcome to both the 1951 and 1958 royal visits, and premier Hugh John Flemming...
nostalgically referred to the twenty years which had passed since the King and Queen “visited this province to receive those expressions of loyalty which are...the particular mark of humble devotion to the Crown in this province. Time has not lessened that devotion.”

Though it did not originate in the province, the Daily Times picked up a CP report about a message sent to the Queen by Samuel Bronfman of the Canadian Jewish Congress, which quoted “a prayer for the Royal Family used in Canadian synagogues since their first establishment in Canada in 1768.” In this latter case, Bronfman’s address may have been an attempt to claim for Canada’s Jews equal access to the Crown, which has been the goal of minorities and the disenfranchised for generations.

There were far less formal connections to past tours, as well. The Times-Globe carried correspondence from a journalist with the East Toronto Weekly, who reminisced about his memories of seeing royalty in Saint John in 1901 and 1919. The Daily Times published a CP report about a musician from Amherst, Nova Scotia, who played for the couple as part of the band of the Royal Canadian Legion in that community and who had previously performed in the presence of Queen Victoria and Kings Edward VII, George V, Edward VIII, and George VI. A slightly less ancient, though no less impressive, connection was reported by the Evening Times-Globe. Hugh B. Yearwood was asked to
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be the bugler for Beating the Retreat in Saint John during the 1951 tour. Yearwood had been a private with the 115th Infantry Battalion of the Canadian Expeditionary Force during the Great War when he was sent to Sunningdale military hospital in Sussex, England, to convalesce. His friends purchased a silver bugle for the young Yearwood and asked King George V, who was inspecting the camp, to present the bugle to their comrade, to which request the King assented. In 1951, an older Yearwood would not enjoy the same close quarters with Elizabeth as he had with her grandfather, but he was confident that his role would not go unnoticed. “It is quite possible that the Royal Couple will not actually see the ceremony in front of the hotel,” the *Times-Globe* remarked, “but Bugler Yearwood is sure of one thing: ‘They may not see me, but they’ll sure hear my bugle. You can get quite a range with a silver bugle, especially one that has been presented to you by your king.’”

There were more tangible reminders of New Brunswick’s royal history, including a display of mementoes of past visits which were put on display by the New Brunswick Museum in 1951. These included two figureheads (carved by local ship carvers) which had been erected on arches in 1860, a ‘picture’ of firemen pulling the coach of the Prince of Wales in 1860, a silk map and timetable from 1901, and other royal souvenirs not related to tours. The *Times-Globe* carried a further report about a necklace, which had been worn by Mrs. Howard D. Troop when she danced with the Prince of Wales in 1860, which had survived the Great Fire of 1877, and which was now in possession of
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Figures 22 and 23: The Edward VII Bible, showing the signatures of several generations of the Royal Family who visited Christ Church Cathedral. (Courtesy Hank Williams)
her daughter. In some cases, royal relics even became features of the itinerary. For example, while in Fredericton’s Christ Church Cathedral, the Princess and her husband were shown the Bible which had been gifted to the congregation by her great-grandfather, the Prince of Wales, and a gold altar cloth which had been used in Westminster Abbey at the Coronation of King William IV, among other priceless heirlooms.\textsuperscript{192} The royal couple was invited to sign the Bible, as the Princess’ parents had done in 1939.\textsuperscript{193}

Similarly, there were nods in the itineraries to previous tours, including the private dinner in the Lady Beaverbrook residence at the University of New Brunswick, which was the site of official events during the tours of 1939 and 1958.\textsuperscript{194} In other cases, memories of earlier tours were inspiration for decorations. In 1959, the \textit{Daily Gleaner} called for a return of the triumphal arches which had been such a prominent feature of the decorations in 1860, noting that when “the queen’s father and mother...drove across central New Brunswick from Newcastle to Fredericton in 1939, they passed under triumphal arches in many rural communities.”\textsuperscript{195} In the end, at least one arch did feature in the Fredericton décor. While it may be possible to argue that newspaper features on historical tours could just have been attempts by journalists and editors to appeal to the innate nostalgia in their readers, the inclusion in nostalgic elements in itineraries and the languages of official addresses were just as likely to have been

\textsuperscript{192} Ibid, 7 November 1951, 3.
\textsuperscript{193} This tradition continues to this day, and several other members of the royal family have signed what has become known as the King Edward VII Bible.
\textsuperscript{194} \textit{Daily Gleaner}, 29 July 1959, 15.
\textsuperscript{195} Ibid, 25 July 1959, 4.
deliberate efforts by tour organizers and participants to reinforce a monarchical tradition in New Brunswick.

**The Military**

The context in which the royal tours of the 1950s took place was markedly different in many ways from the context in which George VI and his predecessors had visited Canada. Many of these changes have already been highlighted. Significantly, although Canada was involved to some extent in the Korean War from 1950-1953, more generally Canada was not in or approaching a state of war. In 1901, the country was still reeling from the debates over participation in the South African War, while in 1919 the nation was still celebrating victory over the Triple Alliance in the Great War. In 1939, Canadians knew well that the world was again on the brink of a major conflict. This context played an important role in the level to which the Canadian armed forces were central to these three major tours. While military rhetoric played a role during the 1951 and 1959 royal tours, the context of the times meant that it was less prominent than it had been during previous tours. However, despite the relative peace which enveloped Canada during that period, the deep and abiding connections between the armed forces and the monarchy meant that Canada’s men and women in uniform still played a significant role in most communities. New Brunswick was no exception, not least because a sizeable proportion of the population was made up of veterans of the two world wars and their families, and because a permanent peacetime military force was

196 Canadian troops were serving in the Commonwealth Division. See Champion, *The Strange Demise of British Canada*, 26.
stationed at bases in Oromocto, Chatham, and elsewhere, a result of Canada’s Cold War commitments.

In the 1950s, in addition to guards of honour and troop inspections, Canada’s veterans and fighting forces still had an important place in royal tours both large and small. Stops at the Lancaster Military Hospital near Saint John in both 1951 and 1959, where the royal couple met a number of veterans, were two such acknowledgements of the special relationship between sovereign and military. These stops went some way towards making up for the perceived slight felt by patients and staff of the same hospital who had felt neglected when King George VI and Queen Elizabeth had failed to stop to greet them in 1939. Elizabeth and Philip surprised organizers, too, when in 1951 they chatted with veterans during a period reserved for rest.197 In Fredericton that year, the official bouquet was presented to the Queen by Miss Sharon Green, whose father had been killed during the Second World War.198 In Moncton, among various groups present in Victoria Park were several Silver Cross Mothers.199 At Fredericton, one Great War veteran was singled out with his wife for an invitation to the official luncheon at the University of New Brunswick on account of their work in support of Canadian Legion educational and humanitarian programs.200 Aside from serving members of the armed forces, veterans and cadets did their part by serving as guards to keep crowds off the streets during royal processions.201 In 1959, the itinerary provided a similar degree of
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Figure 24: Princess Elizabeth and Prince Philip with Albert Angel (A Great War veteran who served in England and France with the 104th and 26th Battalion Bands), Nursing Sister Sarah Miles, a Second World War veteran, and mayor Tom Horsler of Fairville. (Courtesy Heritage Resources, Saint John)
public space to the military. In addition to the standard guards of honour and gun salutes, there was a gathering of veterans and Silver Cross Mothers in Moncton, although they were amongst a varied group of organizations and societies.\footnote{Daily Times, 7 November 1959, 3 and 14.} The most visible presence was outside Camp Gagetown (the huge military training facility erected during the early years of the Cold War about twenty five kilometres from Fredericton) where more than 5,000 soldiers lined the sides of the highway for 1.5 miles.\footnote{Evening Times-Globe, 29 July 1959, 1.} The approach to the airport in Saint John, too, was lined by militia, cadets, and members of the Women’s Royal Canadian Naval Service and the Canadian Women’s Army Corps.\footnote{Ibid, 30 July 1959, 3.}

The presence of the military during these two tours of the 1950s was proof of the enduring connection between the monarchy and the Canadian armed forces. In addition, however, it was also a reflection of the place of the military in Canadian society at that time, a period in which the Canadian military was experiencing almost exponential growth as the government tried to live up to its Cold War obligations, including the aforementioned bases in various parts of the province.

What made the 1951 and 1959 tours different, however, was the additional emphasis placed on other civic organizations in New Brunswick communities, whereas their participation in official events had been less prominent before the Second World War. Although Boy Scouts and women’s groups had long been represented at official events, their presence was far more noticeable, and less passive, in the 1950s than ever before. The province’s newspapers reported on groups representing Boy Scouts, Girl
Guides, 4-H clubs, the Red Cross, St. John Ambulance, and a variety of other veterans and civil groups. Moreover, these groups played an increasingly visible role in the itineraries. Most significantly, more than one hundred Boy Scouts from across the province were presented with their Queen’s Scout awards during a special ceremony in front of Fredericton City Hall in July 1959 which the newspapers referred to as a “youth rally.”

This diversification of royal itineraries, which was deliberately requested at the outset of both tours in directives aimed at making royal visits more informal, set the tone for the future. This did not mean, however, that the traditional role played by the armed services would be replaced, only augmented.

**Gender**

The 1950s royal tours were novel in that the primary royal tourist was a female. This had not been the case since 1878-1879 during the tours undertaken by Princess Louise and the Marquis of Lorne, but even then, Louise was in Canada by virtue of her husband’s position as governor general of Canada. For the first half of the twentieth century, the monarchy was dominated by a series of kings and princes. The gender of Elizabeth, the Princess and the Queen, does seem to have had an impact on how she was treated by the media. Philip Murphy has suggested that “During the reign of Elizabeth II, the presence of a woman on the throne has...complicated the way in which the monarchy has presented itself,” and that Elizabeth’s gender has had a significant impact on the monarchy as a whole and how she has fulfilled and molded her role as
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Head of the Commonwealth. In essence, Britain’s (and, by extension, Canada’s) monarchy has been feminized because it seeks to associate itself with philanthropy and voluntary service; this “voluntarist approach to welfare – with its echoes of the nurturing functions of the family – [is] essentially ‘feminine’ in contrast to the ‘masculine’ character of an impersonal welfare state.” Clarissa Campell Orr, in contrast, dates this feminization not to the twentieth century, but to the early nineteenth century. Jane Connors has suggested that the “gender of the monarch clearly made a great difference to the tour. There is no doubt in my mind that [the 1954 royal tour of Australia] would have been a smaller and more solemn affair had George VI been able to make it in 1949 or 1952 as planned.” However, that is not to say that Elizabeth’s gender necessarily altered the image of the monarchy more broadly, the institution having been “feminized” in the nineteenth century, as Campbell Orr has demonstrated, but it certainly had an impact on how people viewed it.

Most markedly, during both tours, and particularly in 1959, the newspapers expressed concern for this young Queen’s wellbeing. In 1951, an editorial in the Evening Times-Globe expressed concern about the exhausting schedule: “The less we ask of the Princess and the more we do for her will be evidence of our qualities as hosts to this
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charming young woman who will one day be our Queen.”211 Recall that it was only in 1959 that Elizabeth was known to have suffered any fatigue. One cannot help but suggest that it is unlikely that any editor in the early 1950s would have made such an observation about a Prince; indeed, the Times-Globe editorial says nothing about scaling back the itinerary to save the Duke of Edinburgh from exhaustion. Similarly, the Queen’s brief “illness” in 1959 and the press and public reaction thereto, is remarkable. One editorial in the Gleaner referenced reports from the United Kingdom which said that the Queen was “exhausted, utterly worn out and headed for a complete breakdown.”212 Should Prince Philip have been the one to have had to cancel a few public engagements on the tour, it seems unlikely that so many Canadians would have been driven to write to newspapers and public officials to demand a less punishing schedule. For a male royal to have done so would almost just as likely resulted in the grumbling of those who felt he was shirking his duty. If there is any doubt of a double standard, consider that during a brief stop at Campbellton aboard the royal train in 1951, the couple made a three minute appearance in the cold night air before returning to their car, after which the crowd began chanting “We want the Duke.” According to the Evening Times-Globe, the crowd “apparently considered it too chilly to ask for another appearance from the Princess.” True to form, however, both the Princess and Prince returned to the platform.213 There can be little doubt that Princess Elizabeth was treated very differently
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by the media than she would have been had she been a prince, though part of this may have been the result of an almost exclusively male journalistic community.

Gender also played a role in the degree to which women in New Brunswick participated in the tours of 1951 and 1959. References to women in the provincial press are relatively few, as women in the early postwar period still occupied very few key public positions. Most women accessed these events through membership in various women’s organizations, like the local branches of the National Council of Women (NCW) and the Imperial Order Daughters of the Empire (IODE), or as wives of local dignitaries. In Moncton, the NCW advocated for placing children and young people in the forefront of the 1951 tour, and the Municipal Chapter of the IODE in Saint advocated for their home city to be included in the itinerary.\(^{214}\) In Fredericton in 1959, the NCW “forwarded letters, distributed by Boy Scouts, to residents living along the Royal route encouraging them to clean-up yards and generally make the route attractive.”\(^{215}\) Women could be involved in the tour directly, though this was still not common. Most were involved as consultants regarding decorations, as women’s groups in Fredericton were in 1959.\(^{216}\) One exception was Sister Mary Clement, on the staff of the Mountain Road School, who was asked to prepare the illuminated address from the city of Moncton in 1959. The *Daily Times* carried her photograph, as well as a detailed description of her design.\(^{217}\) In the same city, mayor Michael Baig had to offer his regrets to the royal couple that he

\(^{214}\) Ibid, 6 July 1951, 11.
\(^{216}\) Ibid, 23 July 1959, 9.
\(^{217}\) *Daily Times*, 31 October 1951, 10.
was unable to introduce “our first lady alderman, Miss H. Dell McAuley, due to the fact that she is ill.”\textsuperscript{218} If there was any doubt that Miss McAuley was quite unique in municipal councils of the period, the \textit{Evening Times-Globe} noted in reference to their own luncheon in 1959 that “Many of the guests were accompanied by their ladies.”\textsuperscript{219}

For all the advances in the status of women which had been made since 1901, men still publicly dominated royal tours in the 1950s, as they did most elements of political and public life. In New Brunswick, advances were still slow in coming, despite the fact that women were granted the provincial franchise in 1919. The first woman elected as a municipal councilor was Edna Steel in Saint John in 1948, the first female elected mayor was Dorothy McLean in Port Elgin in 1959, and the first female elected to the Legislative Assembly was Brenda Robertson in 1967.\textsuperscript{220} That 1950s women, the vast majority of whom were still defined by their unpaid home labour, occupied so few public positions while a young woman sat on the throne of Canada and was Head of the Commonwealth, is ironic to say the least.

Other gender stereotypes were also expressed by the media. For example, the CP remarked in 1951 that Philip was proving very popular: “The Prince is terrific. The women are saying it with stars in their eyes. The menfolk are saying it, too, because they think he’s a good guy.”\textsuperscript{221} Reflecting on the meeting between the royal couple and the widows and orphans of the Escuminac Disaster, the editor of the \textit{Daily Gleaner} had this
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to say: “Tears were shed by some of the women, and the Queen herself was seen to be on the verge of tears more than once.... It is right that women should weep. Tears are the natural reaction to sorrow, and there is a measure of solace in them.”

No mention is made of the reaction of the several male survivors who were on hand at Pointe-du-Chêne, nor does the editor seem to suggest that men should weep even in these tragic circumstances. Finally, the Queen and Prince Philip’s donation to the Fishermen’s Disaster Fund is a nod to the “feminized monarchy” over which Elizabeth II has presided.

Conclusion

The 1951 and 1959 royal tours took place during a pivotal time in Canadian and New Brunswick history, and the way in which they were covered in the anglophone New Brunswick press reflects much about the complex and competing identities in the province during that decade. This chapter has examined many elements of that complex identity, and challenged some pre-conceived notions about people’s attitudes in the post-war period, particularly in terms of Canada’s relationship with the Commonwealth. It also explored the persistence of the special relationship between the monarchy and the armed forces, and expands upon the concept introduced in Chapter 1 of tours representing a sort of “invented tradition” in the province. In New Brunswick specifically, one can easily observe a continued adherence, at least during times of public commemoration, to the Loyalist myth which had grown and evolved in the province throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. There were new
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developments, too, however, including the inclusion of Acadian symbols and reference to the province’s French-speaking population, something which was virtually absent before the Second World War, and a gradual embracing of the so-called “constitutional fiction” of Elizabeth II’s role as Queen of Canada. However, there was no mention of the province’s Indigenous peoples, who had only officially become Canadian citizens in 1956. Gender played a significant role during this tour, too, as journalists’ and the public’s treatment of the young Elizabeth and Philip suggest. Finally, the 1959 tour served as a vessel for extending legitimacy to the sufferings of the families impacted by the devastating Escuminac Disaster.

The 1960s promised to be a tumultuous and pivotal period in the history of Canada generally, and New Brunswick specifically. Old symbols were replaced by new ones, centuries-old laws were changed to reflect a more liberal and “open” society, and the linguistic and cultural rights of French-speaking Canadians were increasingly recognized and celebrated. As Buckner has concluded

in the 1960s and 1970s fundamental changes in Canadian society made the British connection seem less and less meaningful. A growing number of native-born Canadians of all ethnic backgrounds – including Canadians with British forebears – no longer had the sentimental attachments necessary to preserve the connection with a wider British World and the symbols of Canada’s imperial past increasingly seemed to be a source of division that threatened rather than reinforced Canadians’ sense of national identity.

The royal tours of 1951 and 1959, however, reflect a province still comfortable as a part of a British World institutionalized by an evolving Commonwealth, and they reveal much
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about the state of New Brunswick’s competing identities in the middle of the twentieth century.

Since the 1950s, Queen Elizabeth II has continued to undertake her duties as Sovereign of the United Kingdom and (as of 2019) fifteen other nations throughout the Commonwealth with a dogged determination. She has in all but a very few instances avoided any serious criticism, the most serious occasion dating to September 1997 following the tragic death of her former daughter-in-law, Diana, Princess of Wales. By virtue of her essentially untarnished reputation, Elizabeth II in the seventh decade of her reign occupies an enviable position among the leaders of the world. As the veteran Canadian actor Christopher Plummer observed during the Queen’s 2002 royal tour, in celebration of her Golden Jubilee, she has “managed to keep royalty and the idea of royalty as something that is most attractive and comfortable to us, as she carried it with her well into the twenty-first century.”²²⁵ And under the watchful eye of Elizabeth II, the Canadian monarchy has continued to change and evolve, as have the royal visits which continue to be the most visible representation of the Crown’s continued presence in the Canadian system. Building upon the tradition aimed at Canadianizing the monarchy started by Diefenbaker, successive governments have asked the Queen and her family to engage in a variety of Canadian activities, including dropping the puck at a hockey game. Whether or not these efforts have been successful in convincing Canada of the reality of the Canadian Crown as a separate institution is another matter.

²²⁵ Quoted in Bousfield and Toffoli, *Home to Canada: Royal Tours, 1786-2010*, 150.
CONCLUSION

In an editorial during the 1959 royal tour, the conservative Daily Gleaner offered its opinion on the purpose of royal tours:

Royal visits serve many purposes, as does the existence of the Monarchy as part of our constitution. They serve as occasions for a holiday, as a break in humdrum routine; they stimulate business, and provide opportunity for much needed repairs and improvements to properties. But, above all, they serve as a reminder that we are a part of something bigger than ourselves. The ancient British monarchy has come in this modern age to be a double symbol – of lasting stability on the one hand, and of the greatest new political idea of the age on the other.¹

This editor understood that there were multiple levels of meaning to royal tours in his day, though even this explanation leaves a number of themes untouched. This dissertation has demonstrated that these layers of meaning are useful in understanding people and place at the time of the tours in question. Indeed, the tours successfully provided a distraction from the “humdrum routine” (a particularly welcome thing in the late spring of 1939), and they certainly gave local businesses a boost (as boosters hoped they would). More significantly, they brought to the fore discussions about Canada’s place in the British Empire, the identities of its people, the ceremonial space provided to or claimed by women, minorities, and the military, and provided a platform for local debates on a variety of issues.

¹ Daily Gleaner, 27 July 1959, 4. The “great new political idea” to which the editor refers is presumably the free association of nations within the Commonwealth.
When the 1959 tour finally came to a close after an exhausting six and half weeks, the “major lesson drawn from [it] was not to have another one.” Buckner cites a number of reasons for this conclusion. For one, the government’s best efforts to convince Canadians that Elizabeth II was Queen of Canada – a position legally distinct from her role as Queen of the United Kingdom – was lost on most people, who saw the irony in the so-called Queen of Canada being hailed amongst a flurry of British symbols. Furthermore, the tour had been too long and, in the opinion of many, had cost the government too much money. Though Buckner’s conclusions may explain why Canada has never hosted a royal tour of such length and breadth again, we should not be too quick to accept his contention that the tour did not “convince the Canadian public that the Queen’s roots were or could be made Canadian.” After all, the Queen has returned to Canada on twenty separate occasions since 1959, mostly recently in 2010; members of her family have also racked up an impressive record of Canadian tours. If the “constitutional fiction” of the Queen of Canada is not accepted by Canadians, why then does this tradition persist?

Over six decades, three generations of the royal family visited various points in New Brunswick, sometimes at important moments in the province’s history. Each of these tours provided an opportunity for municipalities to present a carefully staged version of their communities to an assortment of royal tourists, all the while supported in their work by the local anglophone press. These royal itineraries, supervised by
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Ottawa but largely of local design, varied only slightly in many respects from those
followed in other provinces, and yet by examining a variety of elements of these tours,
the historian can learn a great deal about the times in which the tours took place.
Specifically, the ceremonial space of the military, women, and minorities, the variety of
competing identities, the invention of tradition, and various local issues which cropped
up during the planning and execution of the visits, can be better understood within the
context of the visits and the way in which the press covered and commented on them.

In the period under investigation, this dissertation has argued that the press can
serve as a useful, though not foolproof, indicator of middle-class opinion, and that it was
generally a supporter of status quo ideas about dominant identities in the province and
the place of Canada within the British Empire/Commonwealth. Since most of the visits
took place in the era before public opinion polls, and because letters to the editor were
few and far between in these papers at these particular times, newspapers in twentieth-
century Canada were important indicators of what readers were interested in and
supportive of. As James Carey has written, “[a] ritual view of communication is directed
not toward the extension of messages in space, but toward the maintenance of the
society in time; not the act of imparting information but the representation of shared
beliefs.”4 This is the view which this dissertation has taken on the utility of studying
press coverage of royal visits in the twentieth century. Although one may be unable to
ascertain why thousands of New Brunswickers flocked to cities, towns, and railway

4 Quoted in Ibid, 121.
sidings for a glimpse of royalty (Were they monarchists? Just curious? Was is merely the celebrity factor which drew them in?), this dissertation maintains that they were generally interested in the proceedings and sympathetic to the symbols and rhetoric which abounded on those occasions.

The connection between the monarchy and the armed forces runs both long and deep, and even in the twentieth century, particularly during times of conflict, this special relationship was prominent during royal visits. Thus, the military and Canada’s military role within the wider British Empire was an important focus in all five of the tours examined in this dissertation, particularly those in 1901, 1919, and 1939, just as it was during similarly patriotic occasions in the first half of the twentieth century. Indeed, these three earliest tours were designed at least in part to either recognize the nation’s military contributions (1901 and 1919) or to encourage continued loyalty to the Empire in the event of future conflict (1901, 1919, and – in particular – 1939). Local communities often used these occasions to recognize the contributions of their own men and women in uniform, as was the case in Saint John in 1901 when New Brunswick veterans of the South African War received the Freedom of the City, and in the same municipality in 1919 during Soldiers’ Joy Day.

Women, whose place in the public sphere underwent some fundamental changes during the first six decades of the twentieth century, were in many ways at the margins of the official element of royal visits in this period. Even in cases where the royal tourists were female, the most prominent positions during official ceremonies were almost exclusively occupied by men. This evidence suggests that organizations like
Figure 25: An armband issued to a member of the Canadian Legion of the British Empire Service League at Fredericton. (Author’s Collection)
the Imperial Order Daughters of the Empire and the Women’s Canadian Club allowed middle class women to carve out a niche for themselves during some royal celebrations. However, even as late as the 1950s, gendered divisions, both for Canadian and royal women alike, remained. It would be difficult to imagine, for example, the male-dominated press or the people of the province more generally calling for the relaxing of a punishing schedule for a prince or a king in the way that they did for Princess and later Queen Elizabeth in 1951 and 1959.

For a province with a number of large minorities (francophone Acadian and Irish Catholics, and, to a lesser extent, First Nations peoples), the rhetoric about identity during official ceremonies and in the anglophone press was largely focused on an “imagined community,” to use Benedict Anderson’s now famous phrase, based upon the province’s Loyalist “founders” and on the associated idea of Britishness – the notion that British parliamentary, legal and cultural traditions were superior to all others, and that they united the (white, settler) colonies of the British Empire/Commonwealth. As such, in many communities, references to the Loyalists and to New Brunswick’s place in the British World were commonly found in official speeches, in newspaper editorials, and even in the decorations. Any reference to Indigenous peoples was missing during most of the tours in question, their presence along processional routes mentioned occasionally and in passing, and then only when it was clear that they were under the supervision of a local Indian Agent. The province’s francophone population was similarly marginalized for the first several decades of the century, but by the 1950s there was increasing mention of the Acadian “founders” of the province in welcome addresses and
in newspaper editorials, though almost exclusively in the Moncton area. The fact that
majority Acadian communities were denied a place on royal itineraries until the 1980s,
although it had more to do with railway routes than questions about ethnicity, is a topic
which will require further study.

Although this dissertation challenges aspects of David Cannadine’s arguments
about the invention of royal traditions as an overall construct, there can be little doubt
that tour organizers and newspaper editors in New Brunswick actively engaged in the
invention/reinforcement of a royal tradition in the province. As such, it has built upon
the idea of constructing “imagined communities” as put forward by Benedict Anderson
in 1983. Often, this took the form of drawing connections between tours past and
present, or indeed linking the province to Britain and the monarchy more generally
(local people and their recollections of the 1860 tour by the Prince of Wales, or Andrew
Dodds’ Union Flag stained with the “blood” of Admiral Nelson, for example). The
motivations behind this effort are likely varied: to appeal to the nostalgia of newspaper
readers or spectators, or to reinforce an image of New Brunswick’s Loyalist identity. In
any case, the same trend continues in royal tours in the twenty-first century.

In some cases, local issues came to the fore as a result of royal tours, some of
which were isolated incidents and others which belied long-standing tensions within the
province. An example of the former was the devastation of the June 1959 Escuminac
Disaster, following which royal support of the bereaved families spoke to the role of the
modern monarchy as a doer of good works and promoted the work of those providing
relief. There were also instances in which local tensions came to a head, as was the case
in 1901 when the longstanding rivalry between Fredericton and Saint John was played out between the editors of the *Daily Gleaner* and the Saint John *Daily Sun*. What is strikingly absent is any significant amount of anti-monarchy feeling in the papers under investigation, in either Saint John, Fredericton, or Moncton.

The nature of royal tours of New Brunswick, like those visits undertaken by members of the royal family to nations across the Commonwealth, has both changed and remained static over the course of the twentieth century. Today, more and more time is spent highlighting the achievements of individuals rather than communities, and a much more multicultural approach has brought the Acadian and Indigenous communities to the forefront. At the same time, an emphasis on the armed forces and on maintaining links with past tours persists. So, too, do the tours themselves. New Brunswick has welcomed a great many additional members of the royal family (including all four of Queen Elizabeth’s children, and all but one of them on multiple occasions) since 1959.

There is more work to be done. Acadian newspapers may provide a very different perspective than their anglophone counterparts, or they may be deferential, or at the very least benign, in their opinions about the monarchy, as francophone newspapers in the province were in the late nineteenth century. Those sources are waiting to be explored. The opinions of Irish New Brunswickers, which are difficult to ascertain among those of other English-speaking people in the province, also need to be studied, although their *New Freeman* is limited in what it can tell us about any significant Home Rule or Republican sympathies within that community. Further work
on gender during these visits would also be a welcome contribution to the literature, and would complement work done in the Australian context by Jane Connors.5

This dissertation contributes to a greater understanding of New Brunswick – or, more accurately, how many anglophones perceived New Brunswick through the press – during the first six decades of the twentieth century. It expands significantly upon our historical understanding of the period, while also building on and providing affirmation of the influential work which has been carried out on topics such as Britishness and the Loyalist Myth. More than anything, it contributes to a growing literature on royal tours which seeks to reveal how valuable these occasions are as historical moments, and adds a new dimension to an important and expanding literature on holidays, spectacles, and national symbols, demonstrating that much can be gleaned from official ceremonies and how they are covered by the press.
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