University of Calgary

PRISM Repository **https://prism.ucalgary.ca**

The Vault Open Theses and Dissertations

2016

Booze, Temperance and Soldiers on the Home Front: The Unravelling of the Image of the Ideal Soldier: 1915-1916

Wilson, Fay

Wilson, F. (2016). Booze, Temperance and Soldiers on the Home Front: The Unravelling of the Image of the Ideal Soldier: 1915-1916 (Master's thesis, University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada). Retrieved from https://prism.ucalgary.ca. doi:10.11575/PRISM/25154

http://hdl.handle.net/11023/3031

Downloaded from PRISM Repository, University of Calgary

UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY

Booze, Temperance and Soldiers on the Home Front:

The Unraveling of the Image of the Idealized Soldier in Canada: 1915- 1916.

by

Fay M. Wilson

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE

DEGREE OF MASTERS OF ARTS

GRADUATE PROGRAM IN HISTORY

CALGARY, ALBERTA

MAY, 2016

© Fay Wilson 2016

Abstract

During the Great War, Canadians were swept up in the rhetoric of a Holy War. Leading theologians presented the First World War as the purifying agent that would cleanse Canada and the world from evil influences. All hope was put upon the citizen soldier, who became the embodiment of Christ in the ultimate fight between good and evil. In the collective psyche of Canadians, the soldier was cast as the mirror reflecting the moral character and aspirations of purity. The lived experiences of soldiers stationed in Calgary and Winnipeg are examined under the pressure of being publically scrutinized with respect to their patterns of alcohol use. Alcohol became the central issue that galvanized various groups in solidarity to move towards Prohibition as the ultimate war measure. However, these efforts directly affected military recruitment. This dichotomy served to alienate the soldier and the reality of his experiences from the home front.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Dr. David Marshall for his unwavering support, wisdom, and encouragement while I researched and wrote this thesis.

I would like to acknowledge the University of Calgary and the Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada for providing the generous scholarships required to finish this work.

I must also acknowledge and thank Dr. Joe Pavelka for the long nights of listening and the discussions that spanned several continents and many glasses of wine. I could not have achieved this without your support.

Thank you to my daughters, Jillian, Genevieve and Moriah Tate, for your constant encouragement to finish and achieve my goals. I love you all beyond measure. And finally,

Barry Tate, thank you, for being the first to believe I could, and allowing me to begin and finish.

This thesis is dedicated to my mother, Elsie Wilson, who always believed in me and knew what I was capable of, when others, including myself, did not. I love you Mom.

Finally, I would like to dedicate this to the memory of my brother Neil Wilson (1966- 2014), who will be dearly missed forever.

Table of Contents

Introduction

In 1916, Calgary was the centre of several cases of severe unrest amongst the soldiers in training. Within the span of eight months, there were four violent outbursts, resulting in the complete destruction of property of three restaurants suspected of being owned or employing enemy-aliens, and in the last case, the barracks of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police (RNWMP) were destroyed. There were several injuries and one man was shot. Whitney P. Lackenbauer analyzed the riots concluding, "Calgary, in both frequency and severity, was one of the main centres of discontent."[1] The attack on the barracks was the culmination of several violent conflicts involving soldiers and alcohol in the city.

In Winnipeg, increasing animosity between the soldiers and civilians culminated in a violent exchange with city police in early April of 1916. Jim Blanchard's assessment concludes that the disturbances were largely a result of the lack of military management.[2] Lackenbauer extends Blanchard's conclusion, by arguing that the riots were a "product of miscommunication and military management."[3] He also accurately identifies boredom, a nativist mentality, and predominantly, the lack of discipline on the part of military administration.[4] However, he does not factor in the social reform movement's targeting of the behaviour of the men, nor does he explain the reason for the lack of military discipline, although he does acknowledge that by October of 1916, the soldiers saw themselves as an easy and unfair target of the Temperance

[1] P.Whitney Lackenbauer, "Under Siege: The CEF Attack on the RNWMP Barracks in Calgary, October 1916," *Alberta History* 49.3 (2001): 2.
[2] Jim Blanchard, "Winnipeg's Great War: A City Comes of Age" (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 2010), 196.
[3] P.Whitney Lackenbauer, "Soldiers Behaving Badly: CEF Soldier 'Rioting' in Canada During the First World War," in Mantle, Craig (ed.), *The Apathetic and the Defiant: Case Studies of Canadian Mutiny and Disobedience, 1812-1919* (Toronto: Dundurn Group: 2007), 195.
[4] Ibid., 217.

forces.[5] This thesis differs from previous analyses by examining the days leading up to the instigation of prohibition that had an absolute effect on the public perception of the soldiers, and also by arguing that it was far more nuanced; the military authorities were well aware of what was happening, but their hands were effectively tied. They were not able to discipline their soldiers in an efficient manner without disobeying orders that had been established before the First World War. They had to choose between threatening recruitment numbers and losing able-bodied volunteers for an unreasonable protocol that no longer served the needs of the military in 1914. This protocol was born out of a middle-class desire to reform Canada according to British Protestant values, as will be shown. Alcohol was the target of social reformers and they succeeded in their social agenda by focusing on the soldiers' behaviour. In early April of 1915, a group of social reformists publically called out the behaviour of the soldiers based in Calgary's training camp. This created an unexpected backlash from the community, largely in support of the soldiers. An exploration of the explosive public discourse highlights a thinly veiled animosity between the soldiers and social reformists, despite sharing a mutual support of the war effort.

In Winnipeg, the soldiers' unrest was also a contentious issue that deserves examination based on the theory that Prohibitionists used the First World War to convince Canadians to declare their allegiance in simplistic terms that aligned alcohol with debauchery and ultimately with the German enemy. Under these black and white terms, patriotic citizens could show their support for a righteous war by supporting the Prohibition Act. This precipitated a collision of values with the reform-minded middle class focused on purity and the military's focus on training the young men to be fighters. The soldiers were caught in the middle. The following pages examine the months leading up to complete prohibition, by noting how the interactions between

[5] Lackenbauer, "Soldiers Behaving Badly," 217.

soldiers and civilians contributed to the drive toward adopting the Prohibition Act, despite government and military efforts to downplay the soldiers' conduct.

As Western Canada's largest training camp during the Great War, Winnipeg is examined as a broader example of what was happening across Canada. Calgary is analyzed as a microcosm of very similar events taking place in Winnipeg and across the nation. The experiences in Winnipeg parallel Calgary, and similar reports in Regina, Toronto, and Niagara-On-the- Lake, indicate these were common issues which raised the concerns of the same powerful group of people, that is, the White-Anglo-middle-class. The spring of 1915 to the fall of 1916 has been chosen to study as the critical time leading up to a nationwide adoption of prohibition and the subsequent institution of conscription. As Lackenbauer also notices at this junction, "There was something the air." [6] The first contingent of the CEF had been deployed; casualties began to mount and wounded soldiers were returning to Canada. Canadians needed a higher purpose to continue in the battle. Historian James Wood questions "how the perceptions of the citizen soldier were influenced by the beliefs and values of Canadian society."[7] He purports that there have been "no studies dedicated to understanding the citizen soldier as an ideal and symbol by which Canadians ordered their understanding of armed conflicts and their notions of the citizen's duty to serve."[8] This study will offer insight by examining the lived experience of the citizen soldier in training by arguing that volunteer soldiers had become the mirror for the nation, to reflect the social construct of a strong moral character within the dominant Christian society. Social reformers used alcohol as a tool to control the soldier in an effort to uphold the collective identity of

[6] Ibid., 2.
[7] James Wood, *Militia Myths: Ideas of the Canadian Citizen Soldier, 1896- 1921*, (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2011), 12.
[8] Ibid., 11.

Canadians as they persevered through wartime.

This study contributes to the existing historiography by highlighting controversial incidents which were prevalent in the middle-class reaction to the soldiers in training. It is a response to Wood's call for a greater understanding of the role of citizen soldiers as they struggled to maintain the Canadian home front's ideal of pure and holy citizens fighting for a righteous nation.[9] This thesis shows the lived experience of the soldiers in light of the ideal symbol that was being forced upon them. It also shows that while the military and governing authorities publically went along with the rhetoric of a morally upstanding soldier, they were not operating under the illusion of the symbol of the ideal soldier.

[9] James Wood, *Militia Myths*, 11.

Setting the Context

The conceptualization of the ideal soldier was born out of the Victorian/Edwardian sensibilities that dominated the last half of the 19th Century. Additionally, the accepted values of shared sacrifice, Christian duty and the authority of the church combined to create the expectations of good citizenship. An important component to creating this atmosphere surrounded the widespread acceptance and support by the home front in their understanding of shared sacrifice.[10] In his study of idealized notions held by Canadians in this era, historian Dan Azoulay argues the war effort permeated Canadian culture to such an extent, any interests or involvements, other than war service, was taboo.[11] In a "cultural shift," many Canadians chose to give up courtship activities, dances, dinners and movies, in order to concentrate on the war effort. These activities were considered disrespectful in light of the need for "service to a higher cause."[12] Based on the tactics of cultural propaganda, historian Lynette Finch assesses how home front sacrifice was achieved; "The persuasion exercises of modern warfare are all designed to convince the population to unite behind the war- literally to own the war as their own." Finch continues, "Propaganda, or psychological warfare, is dependent on creating a pseudo-environment that will form the conditions through which people decide how to respond to war." To further Finch's explanation, Pulitzer Prize winning journalist Walter Lippman, who wrote extensively on mass culture, said, "Propaganda has been one of the crucial tools of warfare and has been enlisted to manipulate the

[10] See also Desmond Morton, *Fight or Pay: Soldiers' Families in the Great War*, (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2004).
[11] Dan Azoulay, *Hearts and Minds: Canadian Romance at the Dawn of the Modern Era: 1900- 1930* (University of Calgary Press: Calgary, 2011), 174.
[12] Lynette Finch, "Psychological Propaganda: The War of Ideas During the First Half of the Twentieth Century," *Armed Forces and Society*, April 2000, 26 (3), 374.

ideas, attitudes, conclusions and tolerance levels of civilians and soldiers."[13] In 1916, philosopher Bertrand Russell explained the government's use of propaganda. He said, "A nation cannot succeed in modern war unless most people are willing to suffer hardship and many people are willing to die. In order to produce this willingness, the rulers have to persuade their subjects that the war is about something…so important…as to be worthy of martyrdom.[14] The Borden government, theologians, and middle class citizens carefully managed concepts of sacrifice to achieve total home front participation.

As described by Jeffrey Keshen, the public's support for the war effort was paramount in its deployment, and propaganda was a tool to manipulate perceptions. In order to maintain support for a war that was clearly not going to be "over by Christmas," the government appointed Ernest J. Chambers as Chief Censor. He directed a mandate that allowed only uplifting news that supported a continued war effort to cross the ocean to Canada. Newspaper editors were continually monitored and warned of violations.[15] In this manner, Canadians were spoon-fed propaganda and remained, for a brief time, naively unaware of the realities of the war overseas. Additionally, under government mandate, the media fed Canadians a steady diet of German atrocities.[16] Peter Webb illustrates how contemporary fiction also became a "discourse of manipulation," and "regularly perpetuated or reflected the elements of manipulation, justification, mobilization and

[13] Walter Lippman, *Public Opinion* (New York: The Free Press, 1965), quoted in Lynette Finch, "Psychological Propaganda: The War of Ideas During the First Half of the Twentieth Century," *Armed Forces and Society* 26 (3), April 2000, 370.
[14] Bertrand Russell, *Justice in Wartime* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1916), 23-24, quoted in Lynette Finch, "Psychological Propaganda: The War of Ideas During the First Half of the Twentieth Century," *Armed Forces and Society* 26 (3), April 2000, 373.
[15] Jeffrey Keshen, *Propaganda and Censorship During Canada's Great War* (Edmonton: University of Alberta, 1996), 65.
[16] Ibid., 31.

demonization."[17]

Also feeding the requirement of absolute duty and sacrifice was the force and strength of the adherents of Protestantism. John Williams' study of the Great War home fronts of Britain, France and Germany reveals that all combatants believed that God was on their side. He writes, "Britain was imbued with the idea that she was somehow acting as the agent of an infinite power in a struggle from which she would emerge spiritually stronger and more united than before the war."[18] Therefore, many Protestant Church leaders were among the greatest proponents of the war effort on the home front. They led the movement by encouraging faithful Canadians to contribute to the war effort, both on the home front and overseas. Historians Michael Bliss and David Marshall examine the nature of Methodism in Canadian society during the First World War. The Methodists succeeded in convincing many Canadians that failing to support the war as a noble and holy battle was tantamount to sin. As Marshall writes, "The official position of the Methodist Church was that the war was a defensive one to defeat militarism and protect Christian civilization."[19] As the purifying agent that would cleanse Canada and the world from evil influences that were embodied in the Kaiser's Huns, the First World War quickly escalated into a Holy Crusade presented as being worthy of complete sacrifice for Canadians. The non-participation of pacifists caused them to be demonized as pro-German. As Thomas Socknat explains, "Gradually, most peace advocates were silenced by the rising tide of militant patriotism."[20] Not even the great social reformer J.S.

---

[17] Peter Webb, "'A Righteous Cause': War Propaganda and Canadian Fiction, 1915-1921" *British Journal of Canadian Studies* 24 (1), Spring 2011, 31.
[18] John Williams, *The Home Fronts: Britain, France and Germany, 1914-1918* (London: Constable and Company Ltd, 1972), 17.
[19] David Marshall, "Khaki Has Become a Sacred Colour: The Methodist Church and the Sanctification of the World War One," in *Canadian Churches and the First World War,* ed. Gordon L. Heath (Hamilton: McMaster Divinity College Press, 2014), 107.
[20] Thomas Socknat, "Conscientious Objectors in the Context of Canadian Peace Movement" *Journal of Mennonite Studies* 25 (2007), 62.

Woodsworth was immune to retribution when he abandoned the Methodist Church in 1917, disillusioned by the loss of its pacifist roots. In October 1915, Woodsworth attended a recruitment meeting at a leading Methodist Church in Toronto. He later wrote to his wife, "If I wasn't on principle opposed to spectacular methods, I would have gotten up and denounced the whole performance as [a damnable perversion] of the teachings of Jesus." Woodsworth was disgusted by the "deliberate attempt [made] through a recital of the abominable acts of the Germans to stir up the spirit of hatred and retaliation."[21] By 1916, the Winnipeg *Telegram* published an editorial that questioned, "Does Mr. Woodsworth really mean that allies are wrong in trying to whip Germany?" In his defense, the Winnipeg *Voice* lamented, "Regular church-goers have got so used to the glories of force and war that it sounded like heresy to hear a man say he did not believe in moral issues being settled by physical force."[22] These were lone voices, as Richard Jenson suggests, "Exaltation of sacrifice on the battlefield became a powerful weapon that blackened antiwar rhetoric as sacrilege and treason."[23]

How Canadians continued to show enthusiasm after the boys returned, either maimed or deceased, has been related to the unwavering faith that was expounded to the public via newspapers and the pulpit. After the First Contingent of the Canadian Expeditionary Force (CEF) was deployed, casualties quickly mounted and the names of the soldiers were published on a daily basis. This undermined the efforts at censorship, and the harshness of the war could hardly be kept a secret once Canadians on a wide scale experienced personal loss. Canadians were a deeply religious people and Bliss believes if not for deep faith, they could not have kept up such strong

[21] Kenneth McNaught and Allen Mills, *A Prophet in Politics: A Biography of J.S. Woodsworth* (University of Toronto Press: 2001), 70.
[22] Ibid., 75.
[23] Richard Jenson, "Nationalistic and Civic Duty in Wartime: Comparing World Wars in Canada and the United States" *Canadian Issues*, (Winter) 2004, 6-19.

morale throughout the war.[24] Marshall concurs, "The prevailing notions of nobility and Christ-like character persisted throughout the war because it helped many to cope with the brutality of the battlefield."[25] All hope was put upon the citizen soldier, who became the embodiment of Christ in the ultimate fight between good and evil. Jonathan Vance examines Christian imagery at length, focusing on the interwar period as the era that mythologized the war to give it meaning and purpose. These ideals were forged in the thick of fighting, both on the battlefield and on the home front. [26]

It follows therefore, that many who were engaged in the cause of temperance and other purifying methods of activism would seize on the opportunity to appeal to the prevalent sentiment of sacrifice. The use of Christian imagery and symbolism between 1914 and 1918 served to reinforce the morals, morale and political aspirations of several groups, who united in their determination to support the war. Various political groups, not necessarily aligned before the war, were brought together in solidarity. Turning the First World War into a Holy War aligned women's suffrage, temperance forces, the labour movement and farmer's concerns, forming a powerful coalition. Jenson explains that the soldiers became their symbol of unity, as the "exemplars of sacrifice, manhood, nationalism and duty" that would "purify and validate" Canada as a nation.[27] As Woodsworth's biographers show, at the beginning of the war most of these groups were very suspicious of political corruption and were aware of the "painful inequality of sacrifice that tended to alienate agrarian and working classes. But most members of these classes eventually accepted

[24] Ibid., 220.
[25] Ibid., 112.
[26] Jonathan Vance, *Death So Noble: Memory, Meaning and the First World War* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1997).
[27] Jenson, 6-19.

some compromise position."[28] Bliss and Marshall have increased our understanding of the power of these groups in shaping the way Canadians viewed themselves as individuals, and as part of a larger group intent on leading a life true to Judeo-Christian ordinances. Marshall shows how the traditional message of Christianity's focus on personal salvation was affected by the Social Reform movement, and became one of community-based holiness, instituted by the groups who called for the banning of obvious vices.[29] These included Sunday shopping and tobacco, but none were as electrically controversial as alcohol. It was believed that true and Christ-like holiness could only be lived out within the hearts of "real men."

The context of Victorian-Edwardian notions of what defined manhood is important to deconstruct in order to effectively analyze the attitudes and reactions of both the soldier and the home front. As Canadian historian Robert Rutherdale notes, "True bravery could be found only in the hearts of real men."[30] Historians have explored a myriad of ways in which the construct of masculinity has shaped perceptions and issues of identity, and agree on many key concepts. For example, John Tosh, Michael Kimmel and Jessica Meyers agree that the forms of masculinity adopted between the 1860's and 1914 were in direct response to the feminization of the home and church.[31] The doctrine of separate spheres created a crisis in society. Women were left in charge of raising boys, while men pursued interests outside of the home. Tosh writes that just as in Kimmel's findings in American men, Englishmen were responding to the New Woman, sensing that "women were staking out claims and taking initiatives in more areas and with greater energy

[28] McNaught, *A Prophet in Politics*, 66.
[29] David B. Marshall, "Khaki Has Become a Sacred Colour," 114.
[30] Robert Rutherdale, *Hometown Horizons: Local Responses to Canada's Great War* (UBC Press: Toronto, 2004), 80.
[31] Michael Kimmel, "Manhood in America: A Cultural History," (New York: Oxford University Press 2012), 33.

than ever before."[32] Women also took on more lead roles in the church, and fewer men attended. Since women formed the bulk of the congregations, the images of Christ became decidedly effeminate. The portrayals of Christ are described by Kimmel as,

> A thin, reedy man with long bony fingers, and a lean face with soft, doe-like eyes and a beatific countenance- a man who could advise his congregations to love their enemies or turn the other cheek, while gazing dreamily heavenward.[33]

Kimmel explains the goal of masculine expression was to escape from genteel domesticity and to "prove themselves with other men."[34] Meyers notes that men strived in two areas that would define their role as men. One included the military sphere and promoted the battlefield as a masculine endeavor. The second was to emphasize their role in the home as distinctly male, encompassing being "good sons, husbands and fathers, as both protector and provider."[35]

Mark Moss highlights the role of society's most influential citizens who were instrumental in creating the notion of the ideal citizen and writes that the most "relevant foundations are socialization and social control."[36] These devices were used in all levels of government: federal, provincial and municipal, school systems, welfare agencies, and doctors, who collaborated with libraries, social workers, journalists, writers and ministers. "All complemented each other [as agendas merged] with the same message being reinforced in all

---

[32] John Tosh, "A Man's Place: Masculinity and the Middle-Class Home in Victorian England," (New Haven: Yale University Press 1999), 151.
[33] Kimmel,"Manhood in America," 128.
[34] Ibid., 33.
[35] Jessica Meyers, *Men of War: Masculinity and the First World War in Britain* (Hampshire: MacMillan, 2009), 2.
[36] Mark Moss, *Manliness and Militarism: Educating Young Boys in Ontario for War* (Don Mills: Oxford University Press, 2001), 4.

areas."[37] Rutherdale agrees that this group "expressed their corresponding preferences for existing and stable social hierarchies and relations- marked by class, gender, and ethnic differences." Rutherdale also asserts, "They communicated such messages through signs of social difference that conformed to their sense of an ideal or model world."[38] Moss continues that all of this effort was "concerned with the processes of socialization, moral training, and character formation that were put in place to produce manly boys for manly deeds."[39] The modes of influence were vast among middle-class efforts to turn boys into men. From the 1860s to the eve of the First World War, the manly ideal infiltrated homes, organizations, Protestant churches, public education and young boys' literature, all under the broad auspice of the social control movement.[40]

Many historians acknowledge the link between military training and ideal masculinity.[41] In the last quarter of the 19th century, camps and youth groups were created that "stressed outdoor activity, fresh air and the strenuous character building qualities of nature."[42] Clubs such as the Boys Brigade and the Boy Scouts incorporated military aspects, such as drill, uniforms and war games, to instill "ideas of nationhood, respectability and war," and it was "present and influenced almost every aspect of modern history."[43] With these values dominating from Canada's earliest days, notions of manliness and militarism "permeated virtually every facet of society," and were

[37] Ibid., 4.
[38] Rutherdale, 90.
[39] Mark Moss, *Manliness and Militarism,* 5.
[40] For further reading on the subject of masculinity within the military culture, see Mark Humphries, "War's Long Shadow: Masculinity, Medicine and the Gendered Politics of Trauma, 1914-1939," *Canadian Historical Review* 91, 3 (September 2010): 89-110.
[41] Moss, *Manliness and Militarism,* 109.
[42] Ibid., 15-16.
[43] Ibid., 3-4 & 22.

controlled by a nationalistic fervor and an Anglo- Saxon imperialism.[44] An influx of boys' literature and schoolbook texts embodied the ideals of manly adventure, alongside the rise of aggressive sport to teach young boys the art of manliness.[45]

By 1911, a movement across America called the *Men and Religion Forward Movement* sought to bring virility back to Protestant churches. Their mandate was to teach young men to "act ethically and manfully in their communities." "Manly religion implied strength and social concern."[46] Protestant church leaders began to emphasize 'Muscular Christianity' in an attempt to draw men back into the fold. Leading evangelist Billy Sunday described the new and improved Christ as, "No dough-faced, lick-spittle proposition but the greatest scrapper who ever lived."[47] Sunday was the quintessential muscular Christian, notable in one journalist's description, "He stands up like a man in the pulpit. He speaks like a man. He works like a man…He is manly with God and with everyone who comes to hear him."[48] Another proponent of the masculine, strenuous Christian was Theodore Roosevelt, who brought his manliness into the political arena and "equated individual manliness with national strength and international power." [49] Both men embodied "a religion rippling with hard muscles, manly grit coupled with moral resolve, a faith that could move mountains."[50] These masculine attributes applied mainly to the middle class, but also sought to influence the working class, albeit with limited success.

---

[44] George Mosse, *Image of Man: The Creation of Modern Masculinity* (Cary, N.C.: Oxford University Press, 1998), 6, 9, 13-14.
[45] Ibid., 42. Rotundo's ideas are more fully explored in "American Manhood: Transformations in Masculinities From the Revolution to the Modern Era" (New York: Basic Books), 1913.
[46] Kimmel, "Manhood in America," 131.
[47] Roger A. Bruns, *Preacher*: *Billy Sunday and the Redemption of Urban America* (Grand Rapid Michigan: Eerdmans 1991), quoted in Kimmel, "Manhood in America," 137.
[48] Roger A. Bruns, *Preacher*: *Billy Sunday and the Redemption of Urban America* , (Grand Rapid Michigan: Eerdmans 1991), quoted in Kimmel, 137.
[49] Kimmel, "Manhood in America," 133.
[50] Ibid., 131.

By the onset of the war, Meyers notes the "gendered propaganda" that was used to "encourage men to enlist, evoking the associations made between participation in warfare and physically and morally virtuous masculinity."[51] For men, the role of the soldier became the "most culturally powerful identities to emerge."[52] Meyers adds,

> The figure of the soldier hero, defined by qualities of endurance, adaptability courage, and duty, was ultimately able to maintain its status in British culture as 'one of the most durable and powerful forms of idealized masculinity in the Western cultural tradition.'[53]

George Mosse stresses that masculinity was a "perfect construct" and a stereotype attributing "virtues such as will power, honour, and courage" which "presented a standardized mental picture."[54] According to Mosse, the ideal stereotype requires a countertype to contrast behaviour and conformity. "Those who stood outside or were marginalized by society provided a countertype that reflected the reverse to the social norm." Outsiders whose race, religion or language differed from the British, or anyone who did not conform to the ideal and were thus 'asocial,' embodied this countertype.[55] Regarding exclusion, Kimmel concurs, "It seemed as though men believed that by (keeping the) homo-social preserves of native-born white men, they could more reliably prove their manhood.[56] This was applied in society and in the military.

As a result, there were two types of recruits in the social structure of the British military, the career soldier and the volunteer citizen soldier. Before the First World War in Canada, citizen

---

[51] Myers, *Men of War*, 2.
[52] Ibid., 5.
[53] Ibid., 5.
[54] George Mosse, *Image of Man: The Creation of Modern Masculinity* (Cary, N.C.: Oxford University Press, 1998), 4-5.
[55] Ibid., 59.
[56] Kimmel, "Manhood in America," 33.

recruits were reservists, men who committed 36 days over three years to train and potentially be called for service. According to Mike O'Brien, romanticized depictions of volunteers from the middle class were considered ideal soldiers, who once trained, became better citizens.[57] As the countertype, career soldiers had a reputation of being coarse, hard-drinking, rough men from the working class, whose best prospects were within the military. The men who were in the standing army were considered merely "low brow mercenaries."[58] General Sam Hughes described them as "barroom loafers."[59] This discrimination supported what O'Brien calls a gender ideal, based on a middle class concept of the masculine and therefore noble qualities of the male-dominated notion of the ideal citizen.[60] But Myers contends that, "While masculinities may have been constructed within a framework of cultural ideals and social expectations concerning what made the appropriate martial and domestic male, within that framework, mens' subjective identities were fluid and potentially contradictory."[61]

This is illustrated in the military camps for boys that were set up across the country during the 1880's, and directly aimed to influence boys into becoming models of manliness. O'Brien asserts that not all were in agreement that militia camps were ideal sites to generate the desirable qualities they wished to form in young men. Instead, the camps had established a reputation for "excessive drinking and rowdy behaviour." The camps were viewed as "dirty, unsanitary places, noted for drunkenness and a wild holiday." It was understood that no respectable mother should allow her son to attend the annual drills when the atmosphere was one of smoking, drinking and

---

[57] Mike O'Brien, "Manhood and the Militia Myth: Masculinity, Class and Militarism in Ontario, 1902-1914," *Labour/La Travail*, (42) Fall, 1998, 120.
[58] Ibid., 120.
[59] R.G. Haycock, *Sam Hughes: The Public Career of a Controversial Canadian, 1885-1916* (Ottawa: Canadian War Museum, 1986), 6, in Tim Cook, "Wet Canteens and Worrying Mothers: Alcohol, Soldiers and Temperance Groups in the Great War," *Social History* 35 (70), 2002, 315.
[60] O'Brien, "Manhood and the Militia Myth,"120.
[61] Myers, *Men of War*, 16.

affiliation with the lower classes.[62] The temperance movement was the most vocal in its opposition to these camps.[63] In 1911, Hughes sought to build a network of armories for training across Canada. As he strived for the military camps to achieve middle class respectability, the teetotaling General set out to eradicate the reputation of the "godless and wicked" camps. Hughes imposed his strict stance by banning alcohol entirely and the boys were dismissed upon the first incident of drunkenness. This earned him public approval from the Women's Christian Temperance Union (WCTU).[64] However, it was viewed with disdain by most of the military personnel. Brigadier-General W.H. Cotton accurately declared it would only serve to fill the local saloons.[65]

Military training during World War I differed from the summer camps in that instead of just twelve days a year, the recruits were totally immersed into military life. The majority of recruits in the West were citizen soldiers, fresh-faced farm boys who had never been away from home. Mothers were reluctant to let their boys join the atmosphere that exposed them to the coarser nature of working class men. O'Brien's description of the culture of romanticized soldiering permeated middle class thought. Many failed to accept that the sole purpose of military training was to form a cohesive fighting unit, that is, training the boys to become hardened killers who could be relied upon to back up their comrades. Training extended far beyond the battlefield and usually began in the saloons and beer canteens. The reality was far from O'Brien's description of the "Militia Myth" which purported that reservist military training would generate both physical and mental improvement. He notes, "With respect to drinking… the divergence

[62] O'Brien, "Manhood and the Militia Myth" *Labour/La Travail*, (42) Fall, 1998, 124.
[63] Moss, "Manliness and Militarism," 33.
[64] O'Brien, "Manhood and the Militia Myth," 139.
[65] Ibid., 139.

between what militarism desired and what militarism got reflected nothing so much as the gulf between ideology and reality."[66]

James Wood clarifies that military officials were well aware of the reality; it was the mainstream middle class ideal that remained devoted to the image of the ideal soldier.[67] Perhaps popular opinion believed in the ideal volunteer, but the military was never under any such illusions. While middle class society upheld military training as the cure for many of society's ills, it could not survive the harsh realities of training for a real war. The experience of the Boer War proved to military officials that it was not mere character that won wars, rather it was the quality and quantity of training that led to success. Pursuits such as engaging in a heavy night of drinking served to forge the comradeship that was crucial as the men went into battle together. Tim Cook explains, "The act of drinking was often understood to be one of the distinguishing markers between men and boys…after the first few sputtering attempts, an infantryman learned to hold his rum, and these young soldiers soon measured up to the groups' expectations**."[68]** However, middle-class Canadians viewed alcohol as the corrupter of all that was decent, and if not managed, would be the ruin of Canadian soldiers, and by extension, all Canadians. Alcohol available to soldiers became the central issue that would galvanize various social reform groups to move towards Prohibition as the ultimate war measure in solidarity. It would also polarize those who were aware of the dire need for recruits from these groups. While military goals collided with popular social reform rhetoric, they were not above exploiting popular opinion to further enlistment requirements during the war.

Several authors have written about the problems concerning alcohol that surfaced when the

---

[66] Ibid., 138.
[67] Wood, *Militia Myths*, 8, 22.
[68] Tim Cook, "'He was Determined to Go': Underage Soldiers in the Canadian Expeditionary Force," *Social History* 41 (81), 2008, 56.

First Contingent of soldiers went overseas to arrive at a dry training camp, instigated by Hughes. As discussed by Granatstein, Cook, Morton, and Duffet, the daily rum ration given to the soldiers was a longstanding military tradition. The call to ban the rum ration resulted in heated arguments on both sides of the ocean. Most leaders, including many clergymen, were reluctant to take this simple pleasure away from the dreary, and often monotonous life of the soldier in the trenches. Most prolifically, Cook has shown how the attempt to control the soldiers by restricting alcohol resulted in a variety of problems that had widespread effects both in Britain and Canada. As shameful and alarming stories of drunken soldiers on the rampage through British villages trickled home, many God-fearing families wondered if they should allow their sons to enlist. To avoid public displays of drunkenness amongst the soldiers of the First Contingent, the head of the British Expeditionary Force, General Alderson, overruled Hughes and instituted a beer canteen at Salisbury training camp. Beer was sold at five cents a pint, and within two months, netted $100,000.00. While this greatly reduced incidences in British villages, and women and children no longer needed to hide when they saw Canadian soldiers in town, it outraged many on the home front. [69] Indeed, many members of the clergy wondered if Great Britain was worth fighting for and mothers drew their arms tighter around their sons.

As Sandra Gwyn notes, "Although never mentioned in newspapers, this problem of drunkenness (was) quite widely known back home because of all (the letters) that were crossing the Atlantic."[70] Although reports from temperance workers overseas in Britain and France told tales of drunkenness and loose women, public perception on the home front remained firm in the

69 Tim Cook, *Shock Troops: Canadians Fighting the Great War, 1917-1918, Volume II*, (Viking Canada, 2008), 175.

[70]Sandra Gwyn, *Tapestry of War: A Private View of Canadians in the Great War* (Toronto: Harper Collins, 1992), 115. Gwyn is referring to the letters between Agar Adamson and Mabel Adamson. Being a high-ranking officer, Adamson's letters were not subject to censorship.

belief that the boys were innocents led astray. The temperance force warned Canadians that the young men overseas were being enticed by the "Demon Rum," which was making them susceptible to the ensnarement by women of ill repute. Reverend Chown went so far as to question whether Britain had enough integrity worth fighting for, given that the sex and liquor trade in England were worse threats to Canadian men than the guns in France.[71] In answer to this, Marshall says, "To bolster confidence at home, they were told of examples of boys committed to living Christian lives overseas. Despite wet canteens they were assured, the army was not undermining their faith or moral character."[72] However, perceptions were different at home where the soldiers' activities were evident in the streets, and the conduct of some was undeniable. Consequently Marshall explains, "Temperance groups increased their efforts to control soldiers still training at home."[73] Predominantly, alcohol was targeted as the scourge that threatened soldiers and therefore both needed to be controlled by social-reform groups.

The knowledge that underage soldiers were being recruited for combat is rarely discussed and may account in part for the fervency of the temperance workers. Cook explains that, along with the recruiting officers, social activists turned a blind eye to underage volunteers. But alcohol threatened the purity of the young soldier who was probably away from home for the first time. "The issue of beer polluting boys' bodies seemed far more troubling than sending adolescents into the firing line to kill or be killed, is an indication of how Canadians viewed the role of underage soldiers in the ranks." It also reveals that, "The social activists drawn to temperance issues were not comfortable enough about extending their objection to the patriotic and increasingly desperate need to acquire more men in the ranks in light of the patriotic fervor of recruitment needs." Cook

[71] "Journal of Proceedings of the 9th General Conference of the Methodist Church" (Toronto, 1914) in *The Christian Guardian*, November 18, 1914, quoted in Marshall, "Khaki Has Become a Sacred Colour,"118.
[72] Marshall, "Khaki Has Become a Sacred Colour," 110.
[73] Ibid., 108.

notes, "There was barely a whisper about underage soldiers in the first two years of the war.[74] Little wonder it was relatively simple to convince Canadian mothers to support any efforts to protect their boys. Instead of protesting underage recruiting, temperance workers rallied against wet canteens, both overseas and in Canada. This fear bolstered the sixty-year-old battle for temperance in Canada. As citizens read the daily casualty lists, the image of a drunken soldier could not possibly embody the hopes and dreams that sustained the home front, nor assuage the myriad fears that accompany war. As Canadians strived for holiness, both personally and as a nation, the soldier became their mirror. He represented Christ in the crusade against the evil Hun, just as the crusaders viewed themselves as the sanctified body of Christ. Geoffrey Troughton examines similar concepts taking place in New Zealand and describes a concept of Christ who "reflected a vision of masculinity that soldiers were supposed to appreciate, He was an image of the ideal soldier, (thus) the war "made soldiers into Christ figures and Christ into a soldier."[75] Bliss confirms that by the end of the first year, the war had become "transfigured as a crusade for Christ rather than the defense of liberty."[76] The sacrifices made on the home front were an extension of the soldiers' sacrifice. This necessitated a Christ-like purity upheld in all manner of demeanor. The citizen soldier became increasingly alienated because whether he was upheld or condemned, he was never actually seen as an individual, rather he was somebody's idea- a tool- and the means to achieve the redemption of a nation.

---

[74] Tim Cook, "'He was Determined to Go': Underage Soldiers in the Canadian Expeditionary Force," *Social History* 41 (81), 2008, 63.
[75] Geoffrey Troughton, "Jesus and the Ideal of the Manly Man in New Zealand After World War One," *Journal of Religious History,* 30 (1), Feb. 2006, 51. Anthony Rotundo, "Learning About Manhood: Gender Ideals and the Middle-Class Family in 19th Century America," in *Manliness and Morality: Middle Class masculinity in Britain and America, 1800-1940,* ed., J.A. Mangan (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1987), 45-60.
[76] Michael Bliss, "The Methodist Church and World War I," *Canadian Historical Review* 49 (3), 1968, 213.

On the eve of the enacting of prohibition in Canada, tempers flared and incidences between soldiers and authorities became deepening rifts. As young men struggled with the idealistic notions of a Holy Crusade, the purpose of their training was to harden them for battle. Soldiers saw the absurdity of the circumstances being forced upon them by an idealistic and poorly informed group. As Cook writes, "The bizarre contradiction that soldiers were being made into disciplined fighting machines, but at the same time being dissuaded from drinking alcohol because it might drive them to immoral actions, was not lost on them."[77] Marshall extends this, "The soldiers' disillusionment was often rooted in their resentment toward the Methodist Church's insistence that the soldier submit to a strict moral code with respect to swearing, gambling, drinking, and sexual activity in particular." [78] Ironically, as society's most influential members galvanized the home front's participation in the war, their chosen methods were alienating the soldier.

As soldiers entered military training, they were adapting to the measures of control that the military imposed. Rachel Duffet notes, "The shock of the military environment was profound, and the home training camps were the site of the men's difficult transition from domestic familiarity to life in the ranks." In *The Stomach For Fighting,* Duffet explores the importance of food to the soldiers of the First World War, both physically and psychologically. It was the sole area in which the soldier retained any agency after he joined the army.[79] Food anthropologist Sydney Mintz describes war as, "Probably the single most powerful instrument of dietary change in human experience… large numbers of persons are assembled to do things together, ultimately

[77] Tim Cook, "Wet Canteens and Worrying Mothers: Alcohol, Soldiers and Temperance Groups in the Great War," *Social History* 41 (81), 323.
[78] Marshall, "Khaki Has Become a Sacred Colour," 104.
[79] Rachel Duffet, *The Stomach For Fighting: Food and the Soldiers of the First World War*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2012), 20.

to kill together. While learning how, they must eat together."[80] In a similar vein, Cook posits, "Alcohol was the essential and prime component of the militia's training regime (and there) was no hesitation in providing alcohol to Canadian troops who fought under British command in the South African War from 1899-1902."[81] When the soldiers moved into Canadian cities over the winter of 1915, the true meaning of what was required to form the camaraderie necessary to develop into a cohesive fighting unit became evident to city residents. Knowledge of unacceptable incidents was unavoidable and hard to keep from the public, despite censorship. Richard Jenson's study corroborates this, noting that, "Admitting there was far too much corruption at home, supporters held up the soldiers as exemplars of sacrifice, manhood, nationalism, and civic duty."[82]

The historiography thus far has shown Canadians were swept up in the rhetoric of a Holy War. Indeed, it was to be the "War to End All Wars." According to contemporary theologians, the war was to be the purifying agent that would cleanse Canada and the world from evil influences, embodied in the Kaiser's Huns. All hope was put upon the citizen soldier, who became the embodiment of Christ in the ultimate fight between good and evil. Vance examines their image at length, focusing on the interwar period as the era that mythologized the war to give it meaning and purpose.[83] However, these ideals were forged in the thick of fighting, both on the battlefield and on the home front. This is corroborated by John Morrison, who cites an interview with veteran J. Bradley MacKay, "There were few atheists in the trenches, and almost all

---

[80] Sidney Mintz, *Tasting Food, Tasting Freedom: Excursions into Eating, Power and the Past*, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1996), 25.
[81] Cook, "Wet Canteens and Worrying Mothers," 317.
[82] Richard Jenson, "Nationalistic and Civic Duty in Wartime: Comparing World Wars in Canada and the United States," *Canadian Issues*, (Winter) 2004, 6-19.
[83] Jonathan Vance, *Death So Noble: Memory, Meaning and the First World War* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1997).

associated the Allied cause with that of Christ on earth, to save mankind from the horrors of the infidel."[84] The use of Christian imagery and symbolism between 1914 and 1918 served to reinforce the morals, morale and political aspirations of several groups and therefore, issues of class, gender, labour, and agriculture were also at play. Prohibition played a key role in delineating their shared agendas

[84] John Morrison, *Hell Upon Earth: A Personal Account of Prince Edward Island Soldiers in the Great War, 1914-1918* (Summerside, P.E.I.: J. Clinton Morrison, 1995), 230.

Chapter One: An Overview of the Prohibition Movement in Canada

According to researcher Irmgard Eisenbach-Stengl, the control of alcohol has been a contentious issue that every industrialized country has grappled with.[85] Within Canada, studies are scant, however, Jan Noel contributes a valuable resource in *Canada Dry*, having conducted research in six regions of Canada, and relating the long-term effects of pre-prohibition temperance campaigns. The war for prohibition in Canada was waged as early as the 1820's, with temperance halls being built and abstinence pledges taken by the 1840's. In the previous half-century before the First World War, attempts to ban alcohol, both federally and provincially, had a strong support base and came close to success. This sentiment against alcohol began as part of a religious revival, but Noel asserts that by 1847, its strength grew as it became more of a political and class based movement. [86] She notes that many of the temperance movement's effects were negative, such as catering to religious bigotry and class interests. This shows that religious interests and material interests could not be separated, since both were a preoccupation of both religious and social institutions. Alcohol was seen as the cause of all social ills, and for the suffering of women and children. The temperance movement was successful, because according to Noel, it gave citizens from many walks of life an avenue of simple response. This social response resulted in the strength of the movement to eventually demand and win state intervention for alcohol control. [87] In her analysis of moral reform in Canada, Mariana Valverde calls temperance a "shaping of morality" as part of a "grand project that was both national and religious (and) the core of the social purity

[85] Irmgard Eisenbach-Stengl, "From Temperance Movements to State Action: An Historical View of the Alcohol Question in Industrialized Countries" in *From Science to Action: Alcohol Policies Revisited* ed. Richard Muller, (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2004), 59- 69.
[86] Jan Noel, *Canada Dry: Temperance Crusades Before Confederation*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995), 5. For more information on the early Canadian temperance movements, see A.J. Birrell, "D.I.K. Rine and the Gospel Temperance Movement in Canada," *Canadian Historical Review*, Mar/1977, 58 (1), 23-44.
[87] Ibid., vi-310.

movement."[88]

The Marxist perspective holds that the bourgeois classes were concerned with instilling moral virtues, such as cleanliness and time discipline to benefit industry; a sober population was key to this ideal. Moss states, "Those with power in society, [are] interested in the maintenance of this power, but more to the point, attempt to 'control' those without it."[89] The secular social reformists were not necessarily teetotalers, but were motivated by the literature of Charles Dickens and other authors who highlighted the plight of the poor.[90] Temperance gained a broader appeal for the merchant community as well.[91] As the Merchants' Association in Winnipeg noted, every dollar that passed across the saloon bar was not being spent on items that would boost Winnipeg's economy and did little to encourage stable growth.[92]

As a component of the larger burden of middle class Canadians, the temperance movement shared the ideal of creating a White, Protestant society, which affected race, class and gender issues. Craig Heron derides the temperance advocates, accusing them of constructing a one-sided, evil version of drinking to push their agenda. Heron believes they used this construct as a way to describe and understand the world and its troubles, and by doing so, developed a model that would address a brighter future.[93] In his examination of the American temperance movement, Jack S. Blocker Jr. maintains that the way in which alcohol is controlled gives greater understanding to the structures of demographic, social, economic, political, and cultural events.[94] Both secular and

---

[88] Mariana Valverde, *The Age of Soap and Light: Moral Reform in English Canada, 1885-1925* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008), 12.
[89] Moss, "Manliness and Militarism," 9.
[90] Noel, *Canada Dry*, 10.
[91] Ibid., 136.
[92] James H. Gray, *Booze: When Whiskey Ruled the West* (Winnipeg: Fifth House, 1972 & 1995), 13.
[93] Craig Heron, *Booze: A Spirited History* (Toronto: Between the Lines, 2003), 15.
[94] Jack S. Blocker Jr., *Alcohol, Reform and Society: The Liquor Issue in Social Context* (Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1979), x- 289.

devout reform groups were addressing the problem of alcohol as a "major social problem."[95] By the end of the 1840's, the movement used rhetoric that linked crime and drinking directly, furthering the call for reform. Women's causes soon extended into other areas of social concern such as women's suffrage, civil rights and unions. This "link to emancipation" was defined by Social Darwinist theory, and encompassed racial cleansing and xenophobic tendencies, which strengthened the cause of prohibition. Heron emphasizes that the larger agenda of the temperance movement was to create a "moral dominion" that would see a self- regulating society develop.[96] The target of this Utopian vision became working-class men, upholding Eisenbach-Stengl's argument of a movement driven by middle-class social reformists.[97]

The debate had raged on throughout the second half of the nineteenth century and the goals of the temperance cause were often frustrated, due to it being so politically inflammatory. In 1896, Wilfrid Laurier's government was elected, and part of their platform promised to hold a plebiscite for the institution of prohibition on a federal level. [98] Laurier appointed F.S. Spence as secretary to the Royal Commission on the Liquor Traffic, who published the findings of the commission in *The Facts of the Case*. It was "compiled under the direction of the Dominion Alliance for the total suppression of the liquor traffic." [99] The Dominion Alliance was the leading temperance group among many. In her tribute to her late father, F.S. Spence, Ruth Spence reiterated that the temperance movement was not a mere human movement, but one that will win, because God was

[95] Noel, *Canada Dry*, 13.
[96] Heron, *Booze: A Spirited History*, 12.
[97] Eisenbach-Stengl, "From Temperance Movements to State Action," 5.
[98] Ruth Dupre and Desire Vencatachellum, "Canadians and Prohibition: An Analysis of the 1898 Referendum" presented at the Canadian Network for Economic History Conference, Queen's University, April 15-17, 2005, 131.
[99] F.S. Spence, *The Facts of the Case: For the Total Suppression of the Liquor* Traffic, *1896* (Toronto: Newton & Treloar, 1896), 3- 336.

at the forefront of the movement. This certainty was based upon the assertion that it was built upon "great universal conditions and forces." Indeed, "Wherever you find an evil of any kind, something that curses and hurts humanity, and into contact with that evil you bring men and women of Christian character, unselfish thought, and earnest purpose, there you have the elements of a reform." Ms. Spence was emphatic that the cause of temperance was so ordained that to call it "Christian legislation" was a great affront. It was clearly God's will. [100] Ms. Spence's lofty tome contains the history of the Dominion Alliance, its various societies, and its influence across Canada. In 1898, Laurier held true to his "awkward campaign pledge" and held a plebiscite on federal prohibition, "even though they were not in agreement as to the principle of prohibition," according to contemporary Edward Porritt, who was a critic of the government's decision.[101] Ruth Dupre and Desire Vencatachellum call the referendum Canada's turning point in alcohol regulation.[102] Although Canadians voted in favour of prohibition, the Laurier government decided not to enforce it because the split was too close- 51% to 44%, and besides, only there was only a 44% turnout, which to Laurier, was hardly a fair representation of the country to enact such a divisive and politically threatening law.[103] This low turnout allowed Laurier to argue that the majority of Canadians did not support prohibition. Additionally, and perhaps more importantly, Laurier held the majority of Quebec seats in parliament and did not dare risk alienating his constituents, nor was he willing to risk splitting up the country.[104] Laurier had already gambled when he spoke against the enforcement of the Manitoba School act in favour of provincial

[100] Ruth Elizabeth Spence, *Prohibition in Canada: A Memorial to Francis Stephens Spence* (Toronto: The Ontario Canadian Branch of the Dominion Alliance, 1919), 100-01.
[101] Edward Porritt, "The Canadian Plebiscite," *The North American Review* 167 (504) Nov.1898, 632.
[102] Dupre and Vencatachellum, "Canadians and Prohibition," 2.
[103] Ibid., 10.
[104] Benoit Dostie and Ruth Dupre, "'The People's Will': Canadians and the 1898 Referendum on Alcohol Prohibition," *Explorations in Economic History*, 49 (2012), 503.

autonomy, raising the ire of the Catholic Church in Quebec.[105] As a largely Protestant evangelical endeavor, prohibition did not find wide support within the Roman Catholic or Anglican churches.[106] Statistics show that only 18% of those who voted in Quebec were in favour of prohibition, as opposed to 57% in Ontario. With this defeat, temperance advocates aimed for provincial victories. Slowly provinces began to introduce measures based on local option. In 1901, the Privy Council concluded, "The provinces had complete control of the retail trade in liquor, and the Dominion over manufacture and importation." According to Cyril Boyce, spokesman for the *Moderation League* in 1923, this decision was based on an appeal of a prohibition law passed in Manitoba that had been suspended. However, *The Manitoba Prohibition Law* did not come into force, but remained suspended after the Privy Council's judgment. Just before the war, a nearly equal split of half the province was under local option, while the other half was under a license system.[107]

The Privy Council's decision was not satisfactory; temperance advocates would not rest as long as liquor was still available and manufactured. The most vocal opponents in Canada were middle class women who had taken up the mantle as the upholders of morality and motherhood in the Edwardian-Victorian fashion. Clergymen encouraged women to enter the battle for temperance.[108] Heron has noted that the battle between the "Wets" and the "Drys" has often been contested ground between men and women. For the "Wets," the emphasis had been on the social aspect and the drawing together of community. The "Drys" also focused on the social aspect, but within the negative connotation of drunken husbands who neglected their wives and children.

[105] Roderick Stewart, *Wilfrid Laurier, A Pledge for Canada* (Montreal: XYZ Publishing) 2002, 70.
[106] Dupre and Vencatachellum, "The People's Will," 504.
[107] Cyril Boyce, "Prohibition in Canada: Prohibition and Its Enforcement" *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 109 (Sep.1923), 226.
[108] Noel, *Canada Dry,* 97.

Heron eloquently frames it as, "The lusty, uninhibited hedonist versus the downtrodden victims of misery and social dislocation looking for escape."[109] Eisenbach-Stengl notes that women entered the fray in response to wayward husbands who cashed their monthly paycheque at the saloon and used the money for drink, instead of providing for their homes. They reportedly returned home drunk and abusive towards their wives and children. Hence, saloons were targeted as the perpetuating influence.[110]

Noel records that this quickly became a class-based attack. Strict measures for taverns were legislated with fines for public drunkenness. There were also penalties for tavern keepers in incidents of accidents involving drunken patrons. A stronger criterion for licensing was enacted as well. [111] Addressing saloon culture, Madelon Powers argues that the effects of industrialization, urbanization and mass immigration were factors that aided its growth. The transition to the demands of industrialization and factory work was dramatic. Far from being a complete den of iniquity, the saloon was also a bastion of fellowship and the foundation of social movements such as unions, political involvement, and ethnic organizing. They also provided daily needs, such as "food, toilets, telephones, news about possible jobs, and even accommodation for those separated from families."[112] However, temperance groups focused on the immoral influences that exploited the working class. The radical aspects of these groups meeting were fuel enough for social reformers to demand prohibition, because in their opinion, working-class men needed protection from the demon rum.

---

[109] Heron, *Booze*, 14.
[110] Eisenbach-Stengl, "From Temperance Movements to State Action," 61.
[111] Noel, *Canada Dry*, 59-69.
[112] Madelon Powers, "The Lore of the Brotherhood: Continuity and Change in Urban American Saloon Culture, 1870-1920" in *Alcohol: A Social and Cultural History* ed. Mack P. Holt (New York: Berg, 2006), 122-145.

Regarding saloon culture, historian John Springhall notes that any efforts made to impart middle class values on the working class were misguided. He writes,

> (Those) grouped together indiscriminately as 'hooligans' were accustomed to an alternative cultural ethos of working class masculinity which place the emphasis on drinking and fighting…the manly was to be reached through swaggering, brawling and the oblivion induced by either alcohol or violence.[113]

Craig Heron conducted a study of saloons in Hamilton, Ontario, concluding that the saloon was a place where men could unwind and exert masculine expressions based on working class values, free from oppressive rules. When middle-class inspectors surveyed Ontario saloons in 1913, they found that the patrons' conduct was appalling and dangerous. The many offending qualities were based on the saloon being a home away from home for working-class men, conducive to rough male fellowship.[114] The investigators were scandalized by taverns' pictures of scantily clad women and scenes of hunting and sporting events. Discussions revolved around exclusively male activities such as hunting, fishing, sports, politics, or inevitably, relations with women. Conversations were sprinkled with "lewd and profane" language. As Heron reflects,

> In these places, men could spit, swear, whistle, sing, fart, tell off- colour jokes, laugh loudly and shout, ridicule women, and generally ignore the civilizing constraints of domesticity. There was a cockiness displayed which is evident in the surviving photographs of bodies arched against the bar, one hand wrapped around a drink, the

[113] John Springhall, "Building Character in the British Boy: The Attempt to Extend Christian Manliness to Working Class Adolescents, 1880- 1914, in *Manliness and Morality: Middle Class masculinity in Britain and America, 1800-1940,* ed. J.A. Mangan, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1987), 69-70.

[114] The rough aspects of drinking and saloon culture has been explored in a different context by Peter Delottinville, "Joe Beef of Montreal: Working-Class Culture and the Tavern, 1869-1889," *Labour/Le Travail*, 8/9 (Autumn 1981-Spring 1982), 9-40.

other on the hip, one foot on the brass rail. [115]

As a result of these and similar reports, licenses granted for saloons in Ontario reduced from seventy-five in the 1890's, to fifty-five by 1915, and all saloons were moved to undesirable parts of town. Additionally, hours of operation were limited, closing time on Saturday night was seven p.m.[116]

The need for a move towards total prohibition rather than licensing had been clear to Ruth Spence, who emphasized that, "Inefficient municipalities had allowed too many taverns to be licensed." Spence blamed this on apathy.[117] The First World War created ideal circumstances to exploit Canadian's desire to show their support for the war and cleanse the nation of its earlier apathy regarding purity. The concepts of the ideal soldier, which were shaped by the era's expectations for the ideal man, framed saloon culture as being a threat to not only the physical safety of the men, but also more importantly, to their eternal salvation. Many Canadians at the turn of the century shared the biblical injunction that "The pure would be known by their works."[118] The evidence of unbecoming and unmanly behaviours in the saloons came to the forefront with the increased fears exacerbated by the war, as will be outlined more specifically in the body of this thesis. Evidence will show that both temperance workers and military authorities responded to the mothers of volunteer soldiers, who objected to the negative influence of the saloons. Activity in the bar rooms deviated from concepts of the behaviour of the ideal man, as outlined in the expectations of masculine qualities. The exploitation of these fears garnered support for prohibition. While taverns and saloons had been monitored in the era before the First World War, they became subject

[115] Craig Heron, "The Boys and Their Booze: Masculinity and Public Drinking in Working Class Hamilton, 1890-1946," *The Canadian Historical Review* 86 (2005), 426.
[116]Ibid., 423.
[117] Spence, *Prohibition in Canada*, 124.
[118] "…a good tree bringeth forth good fruit, but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit," *Holy Bible*, "Matthew 7:16-20," (Crusade Bible Publishers, Inc: Nashville, 1970), 772.

to increasingly tighter restrictions as the war continued, and all establishments in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, were closed down by 1916.

The liquor trade across Canada was regulated in a gradual process that was unique to each province. Prince Edward Island passed a Prohibition Act in 1907, although they had to pass another act in 1917 to enforce it. In 1910, the Nova Scotia Temperance Act was passed, enforcing the whole province- except Halifax, which finally went "dry" in 1916.[119] Saskatchewan passed an alcohol ban without holding a plebiscite in 1915; it was passed by referendum in December, 1916, and also banned the transport of liquor for export.[120] By January 1914, 56 Ontario towns held voting in local options. Of these, fifteen carried, and eighteen licenses were abolished.[121] Eventually, Ontario prohibited alcohol entirely in 1916, a ban which would be subject to a vote after the war. In 1919, a referendum carried by a majority of 772, 041 to 365, 365. Manitoba and Alberta held referendums in 1916, passing prohibition in June and July respectively. New Brunswick enacted prohibition in May 1917, again subject to a vote after the war, which carried by plebiscite in 1920. Quebec agreed to wartime prohibition, but quickly returned to the sale of alcohol based on a post-war referendum carried by the vast majority.[122]

Prohibition's sweeping victory was achieved by a coalition of social reformists, led by local preachers who thundered proclamations against those with liquor interests, and equating them with the "Hun." For example, Winnipeg's Reverend A.T. Sowerby, of the Broadway Baptist Church, called "Graft and liquor our worst enemies."[123] Reverend J.E. Hughson, another vocal preacher within the temperance movement, agreed, he stated that those with liquor interests were "animated

[119] Boyce, 226.
[120] Ibid., 227.
[121] *CH*, "Ontario 56 Local Options Carried in 15," 5 January 1914, 1.
[122] Boyce, 227.
[123] *MFP*, "Rev. A.T. Sowerby Delivers a Powerful Sermon at Broadway Baptist Church," May 24, 1915, 2.

by the Prussian Spirit." He argued that the Germans had "turned to propaganda to make a favourable impression on the civilized world." Having "carried into effect a propaganda of falsehood, [they] bought several newspapers to achieve her ends." Hughson warned that the same had already happened in Alberta, where liquor interests had taken up the same tactics, and threatened to undertake in Manitoba. The worst was that "temperance leaders will soon be having their reputations besmirched by these Huns, as were the characters of some of the great temperance leaders in Alberta."[124] Research conducted in both Calgary and Winnipeg does not reveal these "tactics" being carried out, although there were plenty of accusations and recriminations against anyone who was on the "wet" side of the temperance argument. For example, the *Manitoba Free Press* (*MFP*) quoted the *Methodist Church Bulletin* warning the public of "the misrepresentations and falsehoods published by the liquor interests for the purpose of casting doubt upon the value of prohibition…they are fighting a desperate rear-guard fight."[125]

With alcohol being targeted as the worst influence affecting the outcome of the war, citizens were encouraged to seek their hearts for any hidden vice or selfishness that may be holding back the hand of God in the quest for victory against the dreaded Hun. The desire of the home front was to honour the martyrdom of the boys in khaki. The *MFP* implored that in the name of patriotism, economics and "for the sake of the other fellows," their votes must be sought. "The hard line of banning all alcohol must be towed," as the ladies of the WCTU were warned; they must be committed to do their utmost, for "each member would want to feel wither that she had helped toward victory, or that she was not responsible for failure."[126]

---

[124] *MFP*, "Library Better For People Than Bars," Nov. 29, 1915, 5.
[125] *MFP*, "Misrepresentation of Liquor Traffic," Dec. 6, 1915, 7.
[126] *MFP*, "Wants Vote of the Moderate Drinker," Dec. 9, 1915, 5.

Chapter Two: Manitoba Must Clean Her Skirts![127]

Incorporated in 1874, Winnipeg experienced tremendous growth as a result of the federal government's goal of Western Expansion. [128] By 1911, it was the third largest city in the Dominion. The *Chicago Tribune* marveled that,

> All roads lead to Winnipeg…It is a gateway through which all the commerce of the east and west, and the north and south must flow…it is destined to become one of the greatest distributing and commercial centres of the continent, as well as a manufacturing centre of some importance.[129]

Jim Blanchard calls Winnipeg circa 1912 a "City of expatriates: the Canadians, the British, the Russians, and the Austro-Hungarians." Described by Alan Arbitise as a "frontier outpost," Winnipeg was subject to what Blanchard notes was an identity crisis which British Imperialists sought to remedy.[130] With an air of irony, James Gray defines this identity crisis as

> The bawdiest, brawlingest, drunkenest, and back-breakingest era in prairie history. It was also the most puritanical, law-abiding, Sabbatarian, and pietistic…where the forces of righteousness [collided] with entrenched forces.[131]

---

[127] *MFP* "More Hotels To Close," 14 June 1915, 9.
[128] James H Gray, *Red Lights on the Prairies,* (Toronto: Macmillan Canada, 1971), 29.
[129]*Dominion Magazine* (November 1911), in Jim Blanchard, "Winnipeg's Great War: A City Comes of Age," (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 2010), 243.
[130] Alan F.J. Artibise, "Divided City: The Immigrant In Winnipeg 1874-1921" in *The Canadian City: Essays in Urban History*, ed. Gilbert Steltzer and Alan Artibise (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1979), 360, and Jim Blanchard, "Winnipeg's Great War: A City Comes of Age" (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 2010), 8.
[131] Gray, *Red Lights on the Prairies,* 1.

To social reformists, the "central cause of deviancy" in Winnipeg was that it was an "outpost of empire."[132] The spirit of reform took shape due to increasing concerns of the middle class who worried Winnipeg would remain a "western city, brash and unconventional." Gray also framed middle-class interests as having dual concerns, all connected to the success of Winnipeg's economic growth. Those dominating the church were also civic leaders in banking, real estate and retail. They understood that Winnipeg's ability to attract further capital depended upon cleaning up its reputation, from a "bawdy, brawling" centre, to a commercial powerhouse. [133] As historian John Herd Thompson concurs, the Social Gospel sweeping North American Protestantism was the common denominator for all the efforts toward reforming the city.[134] Britons from Ontario sought to transform Winnipeg into a "staid, orderly and respectable" city.[135] Now with a more feminine influence in Winnipeg, goals were set to transform the city's identity into a Christian bastion of legitimacy and respectability.[136] Maintaining "social order and the protection of the public's welfare required endless attention." [137]

Of grave concern to the ruling British population was the fact that Winnipeg had the largest population of immigrants in Canada; 25% were not British born.[138] This added up to 60,000 non-British immigrants.[139] The results of the unprecedented boom escalated tensions toward the mass immigrant population and drove British elites to enforce measures to assimilate the "foreigner" and

---

[132] Alan Artibise, "The Urban West: The Evolution From Towns and Cities" in *The Canadian City: Essays in Urban History*, ed. Gilbert Steltzer and Alan Artibise (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1979), *159.*
[133] Gray, *Red Lights on the Prairies*, 29.
[134] John Herd Thompson, "'The Beginning of Our Regeneration:' The Great War and the Western Canadian Reform Movements," *Canadian Historical Association*, Historical Papers, 7 (1), 1972, 229.
[135] Jim Blanchard, *Winnipeg's Great War: A City Comes of Age*, (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 2010), 15.
[136] Gray, *Booze*, 19.
[137] Artibise, "Divided City," 370.
[138] Blanchard, *Winnipeg's Great War, 15*.
[139] Artibise, "Divided City," 371.

attempt to recreate "the class structures and social consciousness they had left behind in the East."[140] Artibise observes, "The British majority became even more entrenched in their own group consciousness as the coherence of the new groups threatened their cherished tenet of cultural uniformity."[141] In his study of urban reform, John C. Weaver asserts that, "Throughout the period, urban reformers deluged the public with progressive rhetoric, using such diverse methods of publicity such as clergymen's civic sermons, articles in newspapers and journals, special technical reports, and speeches to conferences." [142] These same methods were employed when the prohibitionist argument enjoyed a renewed momentum due to the war.

Another cause for concern were the itinerant workers; described as a "floating population;" this was a group made up almost entirely of single males recruited for harvesting, bush contractors, and to work in manufacturing and the railway. When Winnipeg was transformed into a training centre in the spring of 1915, the concern over young itinerant men was transferred to the soldiers. Especially due to this dominance of young men, drink was not the only issue concerning Winnipeg's elite during the **G**reat War; "ladies of ill repute" were doing a splendid business. The men had plenty of choice, as by 1910 there were forty-eight brothels in Winnipeg.[143] Gray notes that in the early days of the Canadian frontier West, frequenting prostitutes was an acceptable and open activity; it was not a stigma until social reformers chose to target it.[144] Gray had grown up in Winnipeg and was a court reporter for the city of Winnipeg in 1933. In addition, he was a reporter for the *MFP* and was privy to a mass of information that was never published. Gray's twin books,

---

[140] Artibise, "The Urban West," 138, and "Divided City," 369, and Blanchard, *Winnipeg's Great War*, 9.
[141] Artibise, "Divided City,"372.
[142] John C. Weaver, "Tomorrow's Metropolis Revisited: A Critical Assessment of Urban Reform in Canada, 1890-1920," in Gilbert Stelter, *The Canadian city: Essays in Urban and Social History*, (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1984), 456.
[143] Gray, *Red Lights on the Prairies*, 13.
[144] Ibid., *xvii.*

Red Lights on the Prairies and *Booze: When Whiskey Ruled the West*, describe the "booze-brothel syndrome" as the recreational choice for many single young men on the Prairies.[145] The soldiers were not exempt from this distraction. Even before however, moral crusaders linked the issue of prostitution to alcohol as the fuel that propelled sexual vice.[146]

In response to this concern, Manitoba Liberal member G.H. Malcom had called for a referendum on prohibition in 1912, specifically for a provincial wide banning of the sale of liquor. Even under the pressure of receiving a delegation of 200 members of the *Social and Moral Reform Council*, that represented several groups including the *Trades and Labour Council* and the *Grain Exchange,* Premier Rodmund Roblin remained unmoved. He noted with disdain that there was a "packed house with clergymen and temperance workers," and moved for the motion to be stopped. Roblin announced he had no intention of allowing their goals to be achieved. The provincial population was divided on the issue of prohibition and Roblin maintained a consistent stance in his fifteen years as premier. His refusal to allow a referendum incited temperance workers, who campaigned against him in his last election. [147]

Roblin's Conservative party was in power in Manitoba from 1900-1915. In this time, most residents of Winnipeg respected his leadership in Western Canada, buoyed by the optimism of a strong economy.[148] Knighted by the Governor General, Roblin was regarded as a defender of Imperialism and as a progressive; he was also a vocal opponent to women's suffrage.[149] Many public battles ensued between he and the outspoken suffragist Nellie McClung. Also among his greatest opponents was John Dafoe, editor of the *MFP*, who contributed to the destruction of

[145] Bill Waiser, forward (1995) in James H. Gray, *Red Lights on the Prairies*, *x-xi*.
[146] Ibid., 15.
[147] Jim Blanchard, *Winnipeg 1912: Diary of a City* (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 2005), 68.
[148] Ibid.,, 58.
[149] Ibid., 55.

Roblin's reputation.[150] Roblin was a founding member of the *Winnipeg Grain Exchange,* which had advocated for a moderate approach to temperance with a policy that would institute regulations on hotel and bars. He introduced guidelines of control, but stopped short of banning the sale of alcohol.[151] Despite all their efforts and the progressively restrictive measures against liquor interests, temperance leaders were frustrated that an all-out banning of public drinking remained beyond their grasp. In this respect, the war effort provided them with an angle that would be hard for any patriotic Canadian to argue. Thus, the war arrived on the heels of the economic recession of 1913, and provided an impetus within the dauntless temperance campaign.

After the outbreak of the war, Roblin agreed to take "drastic action" by authorizing the early closing of saloons. This was "in the interest of the large number of soldiers." He also intended to cut the number of liquor licenses and to give the government "special powers" to "curtail the hours" that liquor may be sold during "times of public stress." This perhaps was to placate temperance workers, as the *Herald* reported they did not actually have those powers yet. When Roblin made the announcement, it was noted that he made special mention of the large numbers of citizen soldiers gathering in Winnipeg. He said, "These citizen soldiers, deserving as they are of the highest praise for their quick and ready response to the nation's call, are placed in a very peculiar position with their evenings at least to themselves available for social intercourse." Being they were strangers in the city, he continued, "The license house open to eleven offers (a) temptation which in the best interest of (one) of the finest bodies of men I have ever seen, should be removed so far as possible and practical."[152] The government of Manitoba was taking action to

[150] J.W. Dafoe "Early Winnipeg Newspapers," in *Transactions of the Manitoba Historical Society,* Series III, No.3, 1947, 23, in Jim Blanchard, *Winnipeg 1912,* 54.
[150] Blanchard, *Winnipeg 1912,* 58.
[151] Ibid., 56.
[152] *CH* "Liquor Traffic To Be Curtailed During the War" 1 December 1914, 11.

propose restrictive liquor legislation for the duration of the war, given there would likely be large groups of men in the various centres in Canada. "This is not a time when Canadians can afford to over-indulge in such a doubtful luxury as strong drink."[153] The Minister of Public Works, Colin Campbell maintained that "It is better to have a lawful traffic properly controlled than an unlawful traffic uncontrolled." Consequently, the Tories straddled the line between abusive liquor trade practices and absolute banning of the saloons. The number of hotels and bars decreased as they were brought under stricter regulations, but Roblin's critics accused him of acting in the interests of liquor barons. Rumours began to circulate that he had received campaign funds from hotel owners. Tales of political treating began to surface, along with other accusations of widespread corruption.[154]

Roblin's reputation was completely discredited when a scandal erupted in 1915. A *Royal Commission* had been formed to investigate the building of the new legislature. The Commission revealed that Conservative party workers had been submitting inflated pay sheets. Subsequently, only half the money allocated to construction work was actually used for that purpose. The other half funded travel expenses for Conservative political meetings and for copious amounts of alcohol treated to workers to garner votes.[155] Roblin was forced to resign and Liberal leader, Tobias Norris, became the premier of Manitoba in May 1915. Norris and his cabinet became known as "the centre of reform activity in Canada." He supported several bills of progressive legislation, including prohibition and suffrage for women.[156] The timing of a scandalous

[153] *CH* "Restricting Legislation," 2 December 1914, 4.
[154] Ibid., 54, 69.
[155] G. Paterson, *Report of the Royal Commission Constituted to Inquire into and Report on All Expenditures for Road Work During the Year 1914* (Winnipeg: Kings Printers, 1917) in Blanchard, *Winnipeg 1912*, 64.
[156] The Manitoba Historical Society, "Memorable Manitobans: Tobias Crawford Norris (1861-1936)," 1 September 2014. http://www.mhs.mb.ca/docs/people/norris_tc.shtml. Accessed 26 Feb. 2015.

government, which had denied temperance workers' ambitions, colliding with a nation focused on winning a holy war, is certainly a factor in the victory of the passing of the 1916 *Prohibition Act* in Manitoba. The connection of corruption and vice with alcohol in the upper echelons of Manitoban politics was used by social reformists as an object lesson to expose satanic devices in the liquor trade.

Increasingly, hotel and bar owners experienced persecution. A nation-wide campaign by temperance leaders painted the hotelkeeper as the scourge of society and an enemy aligned with Germany. Bar licenses in Manitoba were reduced to one third of what had been formerly allotted.[157] The limitation of licenses made them a valuable commodity that was harder than ever to obtain, and less than scrupulous measures were used to acquire them. For example, the owner of a building leased to a bar owner made it difficult for the bar owner to renew his liquor license. The building owner saw the profitability of obtaining his own license and inserted a hidden clause, making the bar owner responsible for taxes. The bar manager protested that he had already paid $7000.00 on a $17,0000.00 mortgage, plus repairs. There was no sympathy from the commissioners nor the public; the bar manager was denied renewal and was not reimbursed. Homeowners could protest a license if they desired. All it took was for six protestors to block the process. [158] Realizing the threatened demise of their establishments, many hotel owners volunteered to have their establishments licensed as temperance bars, under the direction of Provincial Morality Inspectors, William Battley and James Argue. [159] As the hotelkeepers' advocate, "Doc" Glube introduced the concept of the temperance bar to Winnipeg. The *MFP*

[157] *MFP* "Big Reduction in Bartenders" 3 June 1915, 4.
[158] *MFP* "Fifteen Brandon Hotels Held-Up" 31 May 1915, 5.
[159] *MFP* "Willing to Have Bars Regulated: Temperance Buffet Proprietors Meet Inspector Battley and License Inspector Argue," 27 May 1915, 5.

outlined the terms agreed to by the proprietors of the "jitney bars."[160] Among the terms: "To not allow boys under 16 or 18 (whatever they thought was appropriate), and to close earlier." They viewed midnight as reasonable and agreed to organize an association to make it easier for inspectors to meet and deal with them. "Doc" Glube argued that the beer sold in temperance bars was akin to "the refreshments sold in grocery stores and candy kitchens for twenty years and had no more alcohol in it than a jar of jam." "Doc" offered to donate $500.00 to any charitable institution if any of the Ministerial Organization became drunk on his "hop beer".[161] For further clarification, Carl H. Miller explains 'hop beer' or 'near beer,' it began by brewing real beer,

> …then boiling off the alcohol to conform to the one-half of 1 percent limit. Not surprisingly, a goodly share of the real stuff never made it to the de-alcoholizer, either by clever deceit of the brewer of by greed of the crooked Prohibition agent…Near beer was delivered to customers with a separate package containing a portion of the raw alcohol boiled off. The drinker then squirted the alcohol back into the near beer with a syringe, thus making what was commonly called 'needle beer.'[162]

"Doc" Glube's $500.00 was probably safe in his pocket. Additionally, he explained, "They also sold coffee, milk, tea and all sorts of other drinks as well as beer. Glube noted that their free lunches were a boon to the unemployed. He expressed a willingness to consider any suggestions that Battley and Argue might offer, though these agents were reluctant to give any advice before a report had been handed in to the attorney general. They did "advise keeping out boys and women

[160] Jitney was slang for 'nickel'.
[161] "Willing to Have Bars Regulated: Temperance Buffet Proprietors Meet Inspector Battley and License Inspector Argue," *MFP*, 27 May 1915, 5.
[162] Carl H.Miller, *We Want Beer: Prohibition and the Will to Imbibe*, Part I, http://www.beerhistory.com/library/holdings/prohibition_1.shtml, Accessed September 2014.

for the present at least."[163]

The persecution of the hotel owners is a further example of a class-based attack, with the middle class profiting while openly appearing righteous. Temperance leaders continued to hone in on the saloon owners, with no concern for their future livelihood. The approximately 1000 members of the *Bartenders' Union* fought the attacks by hiring Clarence Darrow, a prominent civil rights lawyer from Chicago.[164] He argued that, "Prohibition was an infringement of personal freedom." The *Bartender's Union* brought Darrow to Winnipeg in December of 1915 to deliver a series of speeches aimed at convincing the province's residents to adopt a moderate approach to the control of alcohol. His arguments were sound and based on evidence from areas where prohibition had been attempted. Darrow linked rising crime rates on poverty apart from alcohol, which challenged one of the temperance movements' more popular arguments, but to no avail. However powerful and articulate he was, he was no match for the artillery brought in by the temperance force. These included Nellie McClung, several well-known ministers, the "noted cartoonist," J.W. Bengough, who gave "entertaining chalk talks," and the irascible, outspoken evangelist Billy Sunday.[165] Darrow's opponents exposed him as one who had exhibited sympathy for Germany in writings published in the United States.[166] This served to solidify the case arguing that to harbor any liquor interests was tantamount to enabling the enemy.

Despite this rhetoric, the editors of the *MFP* evidently felt justified in continuing to run advertisements for hotels, breweries and distilleries.[167] Articles targeting temperance bars and the

[163] "Willing to Have Bars Regulated: Temperance Buffet Proprietors Meet Inspector Battley and License Inspector Argue," *MFP*, 27 May 1915, 5.
[164] Clarence Darrow of the famed "Scopes Trial."
[165] "Temperance Fight," *MFP*, Dec. 7, 1915, 7, also "Denying Statements- Social Service Council Attacking Liquor Interests," 9 December 1915, 11.
[166] Gray, *Booze,* 94.
[167] "Famous Calgary Lager" *MFP*, March 4, 1915, 4.

temperance beer they served were flanked by advertisements in the *MFP* for whiskey and beer, including the "Famous Calgary Lager Beer," as was the case across Canada in 1915.[168] They also published a series of full-page rebuttals paid for by the *Bartenders' Union*, although this was not without controversy.

In the months of December, 1915 and January, 1916, a series of four articles had been sent out to the *MFP* and the *Winnipeg Tribune*. The *MFP* had refused to run the first article on the principle of refusing "undesirable content," but their rival, the *Tribune,* had published it. This caused a flurry of discussions, according to the editor of the *MFP*. The considerable revenue being declined by the *MFP* was questioned and the representative of the *Tribune* said, "If you people won't publish these advertisements, then quite obviously we can't either." The *MFP* defended their stance with pious objections to any defense of the liquor trade. Ultimately, the *MFP* ran the other three articles in defense of this decision they claimed that the articles were placed in "special trade issues."[169] This public discourse occurred after the *Social Service Council (SSC),* a group made up of temperance executives, social gospel ministers and social reformers, held meetings when concerns were raised regarding the number of liquor advertisements appearing in local newspapers. "The feeling of the meeting was that while no attempt to dissuade the proprietors from accepting such advertisements," it was suggested that the proprietors "might insist that the names of the party inserting the advertisements and articles should be placed at the foot of the article."[170] The public shaming of the liquor interests transferred all responsibility from the newspapers that were able to profit from them, while they remained above reproach.

Additionally, in December of 1915, the *MFP* ran a full page devoted to Winnipeg hotels.

[168] "Weed Out Booze Joints Of City," *MFP*, 21 May 1915, 5.
[169] "Facts For the Information of the Public," *MFP*, 26 January 1916, 10.
[170] "Wants Names Put in Liquor Ads," *MFP*, 18 December1915, 15.

The article declared that, "The hotels of Winnipeg have contributed largely to the advancement of the city." In addition to the value of the structures themselves, they also employed "many hands and spent hundreds of thousands of dollars to butchers, grocers, laundries, furnishers, etc." They played an 'important role in the industrial progress of the city, inasmuch as the capitalist gets when he is visiting a city often hales to decide him as to whether he liked the place or not."[171] There were no less than thirteen advertisements for hotels, complete with pictures. It may be surmised that this shows the class separation between the barkeepers and the owners of the hotels, and gives a clearer understanding about the prior example of the license being wrenched away from the keeper, by the owner of the building.[172] The hotel owners saw the need to show the respectability and necessity of their businesses to Winnipeg's continued financial success.

The *Bartenders' Union* also tried to give relevant arguments for the saloon's continued existence, first by stressing the detrimental economic implications of eradicating all the saloons in Manitoba. They also tried to show the "proven" health benefits of beer.[173] The lobby stressed the need to differentiate between hard liquors and the lower alcohol content of beer and wine. They warned the public that in areas that had enacted prohibition, "Blind Pigs" were operating booming illegal businesses and "the sale of poisonous drinks and all manner of corruption had been the result."[174] Additionally, they stated that their objective in publishing was to "face the facts before our fair-minded citizens in defense of our property…which has taken a lifetime to acquire." [175] They also posed the argument that the timing of the referendum was grossly unfair to the soldiers fighting for Canadians, who would have no say in a debate that would affect them. But they

[171] "The Winnipeg Hotels," *MFP* ,15 December1915, 8.
[172] As described on page 35, *MFP* "Fifteen Brandon Hotels Held-Up," 31 May 1915, 5.
[173] "What is Wrong With Some Milk?" *MFP*, 2 March 1916, 7.
[174] "In Defense of Liquor Interests," *MFP*, 15 December 1915, 10.
[175] "What Prohibition Would Mean To Manitoba,"*MFP*, 11 December 1915, 10.

weakened their credibility when they published statistics to show a comparison of the insanity rates of "Dry" Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland. They argued that the much lower insanity rates of "Wet" Alberta and Manitoba thus proved the link between insanity with the drastic measure of prohibition.[176] In this, they displayed the increasing desperation of the "wet" argument. Temperance advocates were quick to point out that the reason for the low insanity rates was that the "wet" provinces had shipped their asylum inmates to the "dry" provinces. The *SSC* was quick to "explode the dissemination of wrong information" with vehemence. The "wet" argument was met with ridicule and public scorn.[177]

The temperance workers were also indignant about the newly formed *Prohibition League,* which espoused moderation and encouraged due diligence in enacting the Prohibition act. The Leagues' appeals for rational thinking caused great suspicion that they were actually acting in defense of the liquor interests. The challenges to class interests were deemed by temperance leaders to be induced to "cause strife" and were being "injected into the minds" and "taken up and forwarded by people with perfectly good intentions." The League had also brought in arguments concerning the rights of women and soldiers to vote in the referendum.[178] The temperance leaders, in tandem with the press, worked hard to discredit the *League* and consequently, their platform of moderation did not garner many followers. The *MFP* continued to publish slanted newsworthy articles regarding the temperance battle as it unfolded across the United States and Canada. Alarming stories such as, "Blind Pigger Kills Sheriff and Deputy- Two Men Shot by Harry Denning in Brocton, Montana," continued to demonize those with "liquor interests."[179] Gray notes that all the British based newspapers in the country (save two) used tactics that linked Germany

[176] "It Looks Like Class Legislation," *MFP*, 4 December 1915, 10.
[177] "Temperance Fight," *MFP*, 7 December 1915, 4.
[178] "What Prohibition Would Mean To Manitoba," *MFP*, 11 December 1915, 10.
[179] "Blind Pigger Kills Sheriff and Deputy," *MFP*, 31 May 1915, 2.

and whiskey, and the cause enjoyed strong support in the province of Manitoba.[180]

Thus, as the focus of the nation turned to the war effort, social reformists transferred their attention to the soldiers. In this endeavor, the efforts of the reformists were at odds with politicians and military leaders. While they fully supported the Great War as a holy crusade, by calling attention to the soldiers' misbehavior, reformists became so entrenched in the purity of their cause that it distracted them from realizing the implications of their strategy to enact prohibition upon recruitment. Recruiters understood the importance of the perception of the soldiers being pure and Christ-like. It was also understood that the successful recruiting of fine young men depended largely upon the willingness of the women to encourage and support the war effort. The next chapter will outline the focus on the soldiers by the temperance leaders.

[180] Gray, *Booze*, 93.

Chapter Three: The Lived Experience of the Soldiers Training in Winnipeg.

At the onset of the First World War and with economic advantage in mind, Western cities began to appeal to the government for training camps to be erected in the West. They argued that the revenue should stay in the areas that were providing the bulk of the recruits. The First Contingent of the CEF had been trained in the hastily built Valcartier Camp in Quebec. As the brainchild of the compulsive Sam Hughes, the camp was poorly organized and criticized by many.[181] Winnipeg businessmen outlined the potential revenue figures that a training base would generate; these numbers were published in the *MFP*. An editorial by an anonymous author reasoned, "The Dominion government allows $0.75 for each man per day and $0.50 per day for each horse. Over the course of six months of training, 30,000 men adds up to $4,050,000.00 per man and $1,350,000.00 per horse." This meant if the men were sent to Valcartier, the West would lose $5,400,000.00.[182] The Borden government conceded and promised Camp Sewell would not be overlooked, in addition to Calgary and Niagara.[183] Men mobilized as far west as Calgary and were to gather at the Manitoba Camp.[184] It was scheduled to open on 1 May 1915.[185]

On 19 May 1915, the first wave of soldiers had begun to arrive, the *Free Press* proudly noting, "3000 Soldiers of the Third Canadian Contingent From Entire West."[186] The first published article about soldier relations in the city was favourable. The growing alarm regarding the presence of "enemy aliens" in their midst, encouraged Winnipeg's citizens to look to the recently enlisted

---

[181] Fred Bagley, *A Legacy of Courage: Calgary's Own 137th Overseas Battalion* (Calgary: Plug Street Books, 1993), 9.
[182] "Train the Troops In the West," *MFP*, editorial, 5 March 1915, 9.
[183] "Canada to Have an Army of 250,000." *MFP*, 4 December 1915, 5.
[184] "Troops to Start to Sewell Camp," *MFP*, 24 March 1915, 16.
[185] "Plans Made for Quartering Troops," *MFP*, 27 October 1915, 16.
[186] "3000 Soldiers of the Third Canadian Contingent From Entire West," *MFP*, 19 May 1915,12.

soldier for a sense of protection. The soldiers were able to halt the exodus of enemy- aliens from crossing into the United States, presumably to travel back to Europe through the United States and join the German army. The soldiers effectively controlled what was feared could become a dangerous uprising.[187] As was the case in most Canadian cities during World War I, the enemy alien was of grave concern and they were under constant scrutiny and control.[188] Incidences of violence by citizens and by soldiers against the Austro-Hungarians occurred all across Canada throughout the duration of the war.[189] It is possible that targeted violence was unofficially encouraged behavior within the military. These type of incidences provided opportunities for the men to band together against the enemy and carry out acts of aggression. The value would be two-fold; fostering group allegiance forged a growing trust in each other, thus reinforcing solidarity against the enemy. Regardless, in light of the fear of enemy-aliens, certainly the citizens of Winnipeg felt safer under the guardianship of the military.

By 21 May, the Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA) dispatched four men to work with the troops. On 26 May, the "Officer in command of the 28th Battalion expressed thanks to residents of Winnipeg for kindness shown to the Battalion, the general public and especially the Imperial Daughters of the Empire, St. John's Ambulance and various service clubs and churches." He also thanked "the ranks for performing duties and adhering to discipline, and hope they continue to."[190] The remainder of May of 1915 does not mention the soldiers' presence within the city, although concern for the war, recruitment, daily casualty lists and the care and well being of

[187] "Young Soldiers Stem the Throng," *MFP*, 15 May 1915, 14.
[188] For more information regarding the enemy alien during the First World War, see B.S. Kordan, *Enemy Aliens, Prisoners of War: Interment in Canada During the Great War* (Montreal/Kingston: McGill Queen's University Press), 2002.
[189] "Soldiers Guilty," *MFP*, 7 March 1916, 1.
[190] "Thanks to Winnipeg," *MFP*, 26 May 1915, 5.

returning wounded were constants. Clubs and dances and other activities were established and society ladies opened their homes to entertain the young men. The Patriotic Fund sought donations continually, and efforts to send tobacco overseas for the boys were evident.

In the spring of 1915, the main focus of the *MFP* was upon the increased restrictions on bars and hotels, outlined in detail in chapter one. There was a perceived lack of enforcement by liquor inspectors, who were ignoring apparent issues of non-compliance on the part of saloonkeepers. By mid June 1915, concerned articles about some of the soldiers' conduct began to surface in the *MFP*. A soldier at Camp Niagara-On-the-Lake was "Discharged in ignominy and sentenced to three months hard labour."[191] To quell local fears, Winnipeg's police inspector visited Camp Sewell and announced there was not a "drop of liquor in camp."[192] A cryptic editorial written by influential and prominent Doctor Speechly hinted that trouble was beginning to stir in the city.[193] H.M. Speechly had served with many social institutions, including the Boy Scouts and the Dominion Health League and from 1916-1919, and had served overseas as a medical officer.[194] By 25 June, Morality Inspector W.J. Battley admitted he was dealing with alcohol and prostitutes just outside the camp.[195] To show they had the men under control, the military reported that the Grenadiers were being kept busy doing field operations, including long marches, and night out posts."[196] Throughout the summer of 1915, the only reports of the soldiers regarded rigorous training and long marches, likely all organized to control negative behaviour.

---

191 "Military Authorities Abolish Liquor at Niagara Camp," *MFP* 21 May 1915, 6.
192 "Police Inspector Visits Sewell and Approved," *MFP*, 19 June 1915, 2.
193 "The Indictment of the Crow," *MFP*, editorial, 21 June 1915, 5.
194 "Speechly Stansfield Family Fonds, 1866-1953," Archives and Special Collections, University of Manitoba, 1998. http://www.umanitoba.ca/libraries/units/archives/collections/complete_holdings/rad/mss/speechly_stansfield.shtml, accessed 15 December 2015.
195 "May Investigate Sewell Reports," *MFP*, 25 June 1915, 5.
196 "Grenadiers Kept Busy," *MFP*, 9 October 1915, 5.

However, by October several incidents in Canada and Great Britain exhibited an increasing concern for the soldiers' behaviour when they were exposed to alcohol. In British parliament, Labour politicians were asking for "Stricter Control Over 'Tommy.'" [197] In Toronto, an "unfortunate incident in the sergeants' mess" resulted in alcohol being "absolutely forbidden." This measure was imposed upon the officers' mess hall and included dinners and banquets.[198] Once again, the details are tantalizingly scant. Within three days of this announcement in Ontario, the provincial government of Ontario decreed that all bars would be closed by 7 p.m., and would remain so until the end of the war, and further, soldiers were banned from entering at all. The military gave considerable support to the soldiers, stating that this drastic move was unfair; all soldiers should not be punished because of the wrong doing of a few. Workmen even sent a delegation to Ottawa in protest.[199] The public required constant reassurance that the incidences were rare and always involved an element of the undesirables of society- the countertypes of the ideal men that they believed made up the bulk of the volunteer service. In Winnipeg, "It was unanimously resolved that the military authorities be requested to exercise strict control over the soldiers respecting intoxicants, but that the government be requested to leave the matter of closing of bars to a referendum vote of the people."[200]

City authorities realized that a preemptive strike must be made in advance of the men moving from the tented barracks of Camp Sewell to warmer shelter within the city for the winter. The minutes of a meeting of the *SSC* advised, "No discrimination be made against the soldiers." However, because they would be dwelling in the city, the bars should be closed during the winter,

---

[197] "Soldiers And Use Of Intoxicants," *MFP*, 7 October 1915, 9.
[198] "Liquor Prohibited- Col. Logie Issues Order Affecting Entire Toronto Military Division," *MFP*, 11 October 1915, 7.
[199] Ibid, 7.
[200] "Ontario Bars To Close At Eight," *MFP*, 14 October 1915, 8.

again reiterating it was not targeting the soldiers. In an argument referring to the British monarch's promise to not indulge in alcohol throughout the duration of the war, it was declared, "If it is bad for the farmers, it is bad for all and King George's example should be noted." The group reasoned that for national efficiency and for the economy, it was appropriate to "demand and fully warrant closing all bars and the sale of liquor." They had an objective to raise $50,000.00 in order to organize a publicity campaign devoted to the temperance crusade.[201] The group did not intend to take anything away from the soldiers without replacing it with something better. The *SSC* accepted donations to furnish and outfit "good club rooms." They appealed to the concerns of churches and promised they would not control the clubrooms, but leave that to the battalions.[202]

A propaganda campaign of another sort was at work by the military authorities, indicated by the full two-page article the *MFP* published in the same edition, a few pages forward. It highlighted how Canadian soldiers were "fulfilling the war effort on both fronts," by harvesting their own provisions that were being sent overseas, and making $4.00 per day by helping with the harvest.[203] If the soldiers were portrayed as contributing and valuable, perhaps more support and thus- recruits- could be raised from a sympathetic city.

Just three days later, an outcry from the pulpit shattered the peaceful relations between the soldiers and the citizens. "In vigorous tones of indignation," Reverend Hindley, a member of the executive committee of the Congregational Union of Canada addressed the Ministerial Association, deriding an incident of 500 Winnipeg soldiers being treated to liquor at a Winnipeg brewery. [204] The Reverend was outraged that just ten days after the King's decree that there be no

[201] "Soldiers to Have Good Club Rooms," *MFP*,2 October 1915, 5.
[202] "Soldiers Clubs Will Be Provided," *MFP*, 30 October 1915, 4.
[203] "Pitchfork Patriots Highest Paid Heroes," *MFP*, 5 October 1915, 6-7.
[204] The Canadian Congregational Yearbook, 1915-1916.
http://www.archive.org/stream/canadiancongrega1915cong/canadiancongrega1915cong_djvu.txt

more treating of soldiers in uniform, "Many boys from clean Christian homes were publically marched to a brewery." Colonel Ruttan, the camp's D.O.C., answered that while it was not in violation of the rules of the War Department, it nevertheless was "unwise." He assured the public that while some men were treated to beer, many of the men chose soda pop instead.[205] Ruttan was responding to the fragile relations with reformists and an increasingly tarnished image of the soldier. Those controlling the public consciousness regarding the war understood that the goals of the reformers were at odds with recruitment. While the churches fully believed the war was a holy crusade, their crusading zeal against alcohol exposed the trouble and spiritual danger military life presented to the soldiers' morality. In order for the home front to stand behind the war and give up their boys, they needed to know soldiers were protected from the perils of sin and that their souls would remain intact.

At this time, the decision to prohibit the men from eating downtown was announced. As mentioned, the delegation of the *Retail Merchants Association* had been looking forward to the increased business upon the arrival of the soldiers to Camp Sewell. Instead, Colonel Ruttan declared the men would be treated the same as if they were on active service, meaning they would eat at the "various headquarters of the several battalions." He sought tenders for applications for a supply of goods for distribution to various headquarters for the corps. The savings would be substantial, with a difference of $0.35 per day per man, by not eating in restaurants.[206] The *Moderation League* petitioned to restore liquor licenses to bars, as now that most hotelmen had been unable to sell alcohol, 'blind pigs' had opened up and "drunkenness was worse now that

Accessed 29.10.2016.
[205] "Treated Soldiers At City Brewery," *MFP,* 5 October 1915, 5.
[206] "Soldiers Will Not Eat Down Town," *MFP,* 5 October 1915, 5.

liquor was available all night."[207] Their concerns were largely ignored as the *League's* roots and origins remained suspicious in the eyes of temperance workers, and their concerns were considered to be self-serving. The *League* was consistently aligned with liquor, and therefore German interests. With the soldiers moving into the city for the winter, the fear of the temperance workers was that they would be able to "resort to the bar freely and become uncontrollable." Therefore, all bars should be closed immediately, without waiting to take a referendum.[208] Blind faith and common sense were clearly colliding.

Tensions continued to escalate. In late October, the headlines announced, "Magistrate Gives Soldiers Warning- Disturbance at Queen's Hotel and On Streets Result in Fine and Reprimand." The six men were "husky railway men, miners and woodmen," from the "dockside city of Vancouver;" clearly the working class element of undesirables. Crown Prosecutor Graham warned police that in the future, they must bring the soldiers before civil court and not turn them over to the Military Police, who would release them "as soon as the police were out of sight." He charged three with being disorderly in a public place and three with being disorderly on the street. Additionally, one civilian was charged with cursing at the policemen and inciting crowds to rush policemen who were arresting the soldiers.[209] From this incident, it is evident that class lines were being reinforced and relations between the military and city police were weakening. The soldiers required more discipline than the Military police were exerting. On the heels of this incident was the announcement that 8000 troops were to be quartered in Winnipeg and the numbers could go as high as 10,000.[210]

---

[207] "No Trifling With Suspension Orders," *MFP*, 7 October 1915, 9.
[208] "What Will Be Done With City Saloons?" *MFP,* 8 October 1915, 12.
[209] "Magistrate Gives Soldiers Warning," *MFP,* 26 October 1915, 5.
[210] "Plans For Quartering Troops- Eight Thousand To Be Stationed In Winnipeg," *MFP,* 27 October 1915, 2.

In Brandon, five hotels lost their liquor licenses, but they were reinstated when they promised to tighten up rules, especially concerning serving soldiers and some even considered "cutting out the boys in khaki."[211] Efforts to provide a soldier's club were redoubled. The benefactors "felt confident that the soldiers would be able to find enjoyment and profitable entertainment in the patronage of these clubs as they will minimize very greatly the attraction of the bar room." The canteens would provide refreshments and be run by returning wounded soldiers and would surely be self-supporting. The Catholic Club, not mentioned often in the discourse of alcohol, offered their gym, baths and showers for $0.75 per day and would welcome everyone, "irrespective of class or creed."[212] The next day, Colonel Ruttan declared his gratification for the efforts made for the soldiers' social welfare. The clubrooms promised to be as free of restraint as possible and be available downtown for soldiers stationed in the city over the winter. This provision of clubrooms, meant to shore up the safety of the city, was a generous but rather naïve act of philanthropy. One soldier writing home disclosed that these clubrooms were utilized mostly by the officers and not by ordinary privates.[213] This aligns with Springhall's assertion that the clubhouses did not provide the type of activities that would appeal to many of the young men who were from working class homes.[214]

The growing animosity between city businesses and the military continued to widen the breech and increase tensions. By 6 November, 7000 men had moved into the city and it was "hard to look anywhere and not see a man in uniform." As with Duffet's argument about food being the final target of the soldier's agency, the men had lost control of even that. They had to "march from

---

[211] "Brandon Hotels Resume Business," *MFP*, 27 October 1915, 2.
[212] "Soldiers Clubs Will be Provided,"*MFP*, 30 October 1915, 4.
[213] Blanchard, *Winnipeg*, 151.
[214] John Springhall, "Building Character in the British Boy: The Attempt to Extend Christian Manliness to Working-Class Adolescents, 1880-1914," in *Manliness and Morality: Middle Class masculinity in Britain and America, 1800-1940*, J.A. Mangan ed., (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1987), 69.

the drill hall to the garage on Good Street at meal time and they (were) served half a battalion at a time." In a bid to retain their last avenue of agency, the men refused to eat "grub unfit for human consumption."[215] Their disgruntlement was noted in news accounts, but not taken seriously. The men remained unseen as their frustrations with social control were consistently overlooked, and amidst training, they were still expected to demonstrate an impossible Christian ideal.

The pulpits continued to demand the necessity of waging entire war against evil. Reverend Christie exhorted, "Weep not for Canadian dead, heroic soldiers had laid down their lives for a great cause…the saddest words he had ever heard was a mother who would rather see her son dead than living a sinful life."[216] The war provided a platform for the Christian citizens of Winnipeg to highlight the superiority of their beliefs, and offered assurance to the faithful. It gave solid, tangible examples of living a life worthy of Christ, lending legitimacy to their efforts. When everything could be shrouded in Christian vernacular, the meaning of life culminating in a glorious death comforted a nation reeling with endless grief.

However, maintaining the myth of the saintly soldier became more challenging. It appeared that they were rejecting the efforts and good intentions of the community to enrich their lives through wholesome entertainment and activities. Instead, many of the soldiers gravitated to the bars and brothels, fighting in the streets, and generally ignoring the Christ-like mandate that had been thrust upon them once they donned the uniform. This behaviour undermined the faith that Canada was undergoing a God-ordained cleansing, with the war as the catalyst, and the soldiers as the pure sacrifice who would see the battle for righteousness through to victory. But the demon rum threatened to destroy all that was pure and lovely and hand the victory to the evil Kaiser.

Throughout November, the reports of fighting and drunkenness increased. On 15 November,

[215] "Army Service Corps Feeding the Soldiers," *MFP*, 6 November 1915, 11.
[216] "Weep Not For Canadian Dead," *MFP*, 11 June 11 1915, 1.

Private Peter Stevens was treated in hospital for severe cuts on the back of his head, inflicted by a bottle wielded by Private James Kotoy. On 20 November, Kotoy was sentenced to four months imprisonment for the "drunken fray on Dufferin Avenue." The judge gave him the chance to rejoin the 53rd Battalion, but the commanding officer refused to allow this; he was an "undesirable person."[217] This served to stress that there were always a few 'bad apples' but more importantly, they were quickly rooted out from the majority of good soldiers. On November 21, a private wrote a letter to the editor, lamenting,

> I know of one reason that recruiting does not go as well as it should. There are hundreds of young men who were respectable citizens and gave up good positions to fight for what they considered right. As soon as they got in to uniform and into a strange city, they were snubbed and hints of the immorality of soldiers etc. were flung at them.

This private was objecting to more than just the alienation he was experiencing. He also resented the implication that all soldiers were a lower class of men:

> There seems to be a class of people who cannot know that many soldiers are just as responsible as other citizens, the only difference being that they are in uniform, training for a contract they have signed to lay down their lives, if necessary. Surely, you could put an article in your paper explaining that a volunteer is different from a regular. And also that there are two distinct classes of volunteers, viz; those who enlist because of no work elsewhere and those who sacrifice good wages and enlist for the most honorable reason.[218]

As O'Brien explains, it was important for this private that an understanding of the different classes of men, evident in the reasons for enlisting, be distinguished. Additionally, Wood's

[217] "Soldiers Fight In Winnipeg," *MFP*, 15 November 1915, 5.
[218] "Soldiers Snubbed- Private Calls Attention to Grave Injustice," *MFP*, 21 November 1915, 5.

argument can be furthered; the incessant demands of recruitment did not discern between 'respectable' and 'undeserving,' while causing an apparent confusion regarding what type of men were making up the CEF.[219] To reassure the public, the military issued a statement reporting that those who made up the bulk of the men in training were "a comparatively sober lot, therefore, "No drastic measures as limiting the open hours of bars or other restrictions of a similar nature are being considered by local military authorities."[220]

However, city enforcers remained concerned with the increasing incidents of military men engaging in public drunkenness. Chief Argue of the Licensing Department believed the introduction of wet canteens at some barracks would "relieve the situation in the city this winter." The *MFP* quoted Argue's assertion that "several authorities" said the "results would be good, with only light beer and the men not allowed to take enough to become intoxicated." If wet canteens were opened, then bars would have to be placed out of bounds.[221] Despite this advice, the next day Hughes' orders were issued for all canteen equipment to be removed. Each unit would run their own dry canteen and no outside interests were allowed. All profits must go to the regimental funds.[222] Already, propaganda was coming from Hughes regarding the Shorncliffe camp, which reported an inquiry revealing the "troops have not averaged one percent of drunkenness."[223] Denial was the order of the day, as the truth compromised the manpower required to continue Canada's participation in the war, and reveals how deluded Hughes was regarding alcohol in the military as he struggled to retain the support of temperance groups. By denying something the established military knew was a morale boost, he further alienated the

[219] Wood, "Militia Myths," 217.
[220] "Sober Soldiers," *MFP*, 2 December 1915, 5.
[221] "Wet Canteens Likely," *MFP*, *3* November 1915, 5.
[222] "No Wet Canteens," *MFP*, 4 November 1915, 3.
[223] "Fine Record For Temperance," *MFP*, 9 November 1915, 1.

men from the home front by upholding naïve perceptions of the ideal soldier.

The growing animosity between the soldiers and the merchants was evident by mid December. Lt.-Col. Wayland of the 44th Battalion called the reporting of soldiers not settling their bills before being deployed overseas, "wicked and malicious lies." Wayland accused the merchants of charging his men "considerably more that country merchants, and also "secretly paid canteen employees large commissions to obtain business." Wayland ended his telegram stating, "Officers and self feel keenly willful slander against regiment." The *MFP* defended the reports saying they were based upon "specific statements made to this newspaper by responsible business parties and organizations"[224]

Winnipeg had more soldiers in training than any other city.[225] The *MFP* reminded the community of how the soldiers were contributing, with a potential of "$550,000 per month in spending power. The soldiers are good spenders, and whatever may be their faults, they cannot be said to be possessed of miserly spirits." War was good business, as "a large amount of the money spent for military purposes is circulated in pay-rolls." Indeed, "every class of merchant (benefits)."[226] Two days later, the paper announced it was payday for soldiers, with an expected sum of "close to $500,000" at their disposal. [227] Payday for the soldiers usually meant a busy night for police and the *SSC* continued to exert their influence on by-law regulations. As the *SSC* met with Chief Licensing Inspector Argue, the *MFP* reported that their meeting was disrupted by the training operations on the 6th floor. The 144th Regiment made such a noise tramping on the hardwood floors, it was "hard to overcome."[228] This is a rather amusing report,

[224] "Soldiers and Merchants," *MFP*, 13 December 1915, 1.
[225] Winnipeg Soldiers Receive $20,000 Daily," *MFP*, 15 December 1915, 6.
[226] "More About Soldiers' Salary," *MFP*, 15 December 1915, 8.
[227] "Soldiers' Pay Day Yesterday," *MFP*, 17 December 1915, 5.
[228] "Tramp of Soldiers Disturbing," *MFP*, 17 January 1916, 7.

but it highlights how the soldiers were becoming quite the nuisance to the order of business in Winnipeg. The *Social Service Council (SSC)* was seeking for ways to control the soldier by exerting more regulations on the saloons over the course of the late winter of 1916.[229]

The *MFP* kicked off 1916 with inspiring tales of soldiers in the trenches, maintaining that, "Tens of thousands of them are members of churches, and when at home are active workers in spreading by various means, the glorious gospel of the race of God."[230] At Westminster Church, Dr. Christie spoke to 300 men, "with special emphasis on the character of the victory to be won by the British Empire." Christie reminded the young men that they were "fighting in a holy crusade and they must accomplish their work without the spirit of vengeance, hate or vindictiveness."[231] Once again, this shows the discrepancy between how the military trained young men for war, and how the church encouraged Christian citizenry.

Brandon's Rev. R.S. Laidlaw maintained that, "The business of the moment for the citizens of Manitoba is to leave no stone unturned to ensure the passing of the March referendum." Laidlaw challenged businessmen to show any evidence that the liquor industry did nothing but destroy the efficiency of labour and capital. Laidlaw quoted Admiral Jellicoe, Commander of the Grand British Fleet, who said that the military preferred men who abstained from liquor, as it made them both mentally and physically more efficient. Laidlaw quoted Jellicoe as testifying, "Men were 20 per cent worse in shooting efficiency after rum rations."[232] The Minister of Militia mandated the following order in February,

> Neither wanton rowdyism, nor ruffianly misconduct is discipline, nor does either become a soldier. Such actions may find no place in the

[229] "Treating Returned Soldiers An Evil," *MFP*, 6 January 1916, 2.
[230] "Young Christian Soldiers," *MFP*, 1 January 1916, 5.
[231] "Battalions Attends Westminster," *MFP*, 1 January 1916, 5.
[232] "Business Hurt By Traffic In Liquor," *MFP*, 17 January 1916, 4.

> Canadian service. The donning of a soldier's uniform does not exempt any man from his bounden duties and responsibilities as a reputable citizen; on the contrary, being in uniform should be, and in any properly constituted corps is, guarantee of manly behaviour.[233]

One of "Winnipeg's foremost lawyers, G.H. Aitkens, spoke at Grace Church, demanding that Prohibition must be complete. "The unusual social relations in the battalions are compelling young men to drink who were not in the habit of doing so and that many officers and men had begun to drink only since enlisting." He was quoted the next day,

> The speaker went on to say that there could be no half measures, that prohibition must be complete at least till the end of the war, backing this up with the statement that while the boys at the front had the reputation of being great fighters, they were also known as heavy drinkers. In this war, he said, there could be no half measures, the most efficient army would win and that temperance was a great factor of efficiency.[234]

The publishing of this sermon raised the ire of soldiers who wrote to the editor. "If this is true, and we doubt it, it reflects very much on the boys and is quite untrue in every respect as far as the drinking is concerned. What right has Mr. Aitkens to make such remarks? Where does he get his facts?"[235] There was absolutely no public speculation that perhaps the correlation of great fighting and heavy drinking on the front indicated some advantageous effects of alcohol for men in combat. The public silence on the possible benefits of alcohol for soldiers included the silence of the military authorities who understood the value of the myth of the saintly

---

[233] "Orders Regarding Soldiers' Conduct," *MFP*, 17 February 1916, 2.
[234] "No Half Measures," *MFP*, 7 March 1916, 9.
[235] "No Heavy Drinking at the Front," *MFP*, 6 March 1916, 5.

soldier. The Christian focus on the salvation of the soldiers made no allowance for drunkenness because, according to St.Paul, “no drunkard shall inherit the Kingdom of God.[236]

[236] I Corinthians 6:10, see also Galatians 5:21.

The Soldiers' Vote

By January 1916, temperance leaders were putting together the criteria to hold a referendum on prohibition in March. They were disappointed when the legislature quoted a provision of the British North America Act that, "No province shall pass a law which shall interfere with trade and commerce between provinces." This meant that there could be no prohibition against the importation of liquor.[237] Consequently, their aim honed in on the saloonkeepers. A March date had been decided on in order to enact prohibition by 1 July. The advocate for the liquor interests, R.T. Ferguson, expressed his dismay regarding the decision to hold a referendum at such a time where there would hardly be a "representative expression of public opinion," with nearly 25% of the population on active service. He urged that provisions be made for servicemen to participate in the referendum. In answer to this, Premier Norris said all would be done to try to get the soldier vote, but there would be no booths outside the constituency they were from. Norris said, "A very large percentage of them had high ideals of life." The *MFP* reported, "He paid a glowing tribute the soldier boys and said he was heartily in accord with giving them every opportunity to vote.[238] Provisions were made to establish polling booths in the Winnipeg, Brandon and St.Bonafice barracks. At the same time, it was decreed that because the voters' lists were already made up, women would not be allowed to participate. Mrs. Duff Smith, a representative of the *WCTU*, was thankful that the soldiers would be allowed to "express themselves, for she felt that most of them recognized in the traffic a greater foe than the German army."[239]

---

[237] "Record Day's Work Down in the Legislature," *MFP*, 15 January 1916, 5.
[238] "Will Abide By the Will of Majority," *MFP*, 15 January 1916, 2.
[239] "Women Cannot Vote on the Referendum," *MFP*, 21 January 1916, 2.

By this time, the temperance leaders were asking for a postponement of the vote until June. By then, the soldiers were scheduled to leave the area, either to the trenches or for further training at stations in the East. The *SSC* was opposed to allowing the soldiers to vote, believing that allowing them to vote would play into the strategy of those with liquor interests.[240] Undoubtedly, the *SSC* feared the soldiers' vote would influence the outcome with a negative response to enacting the Prohibition act. On the other side, R.T. Ferguson said, "We gage that the soldiers will be at least 80% with us, if therefore the vote [is] postponed until June, our favourable vote would be considerably diminished." He contended that temperance advocates wanted to "get as many soldiers out of the way as they can, " insinuating that the soldiers' vote would fall on the side of moderation and control, instead of the outright prohibition of alcohol. The proposal for postponement was not raised until the "wets" had asked that the soldiers be allowed to vote. The anticipated voter turn out for the referendum on prohibition considered the soldier's vote "the most important phase of the fight." Therefore they would be given a leave of absence to vote.[241] A full-page advertisement exhorted soldiers to "Follow the King and Vote Yes."[242] By the end of February, the *SSC* was relieved to discover that only 1500 men had registered to vote.[243] "Contrary to popular opinion" regarding the importance of the soldiers' vote, it was revealed that only a "very small percentage" actually had a vote however, those who did were being given leave.[244]

Finally, after a sixty-year battle for complete prohibition on the sale of alcohol, success was won through appealing to the home front population embroiled in the larger issue of

[240] "Soldiers to Vote On Referendum," *MFP*, 23 January 1916, 5.
[241] "No Half Measures- G.H.Aitken Says Prohibition Must Be Complete," *MFP*, 6 March 1916, 5.
[242] "Attention Soldiers!!!" *MFP*, 2 March 1916, 10.
[243] "Soldiers' Vote," *MFP*, 22 February 1916.
[244] "Soldiers Given Leave To Vote," *MFP*, 11 March 1916, 2.

engaging in an international war, making it politically expedient**.** On 14 March 1916, a victorious headline celebrated the decision: "Manitoba Endorses MacDonald Act By More Than Two To One." The "drys" across the province led by 24, 366 votes. Only two seats carried wet by 88 votes in St. Bonafice and Winnipeg North.[245] In Winnipeg, the majority led by 3454. The front page stated that all soldiers had voted dry, and had voted overwhelmingly in favour in Winnipeg, Brandon, Portage, and Selkirk.[246] This was probably a specious claim, as Thompson notes even though all military polls in the Western provinces' referendum returned a "dry" majority, "evidence about the soldier's opinion on the prohibition question is contradictory." Thompson cites a letter received by *Calgary Brewing and Malting Company* owner A.E. Cross in 1918 from a private who promised that he and his fellow soldiers "would be solid for to be back to the good old days again."[247] Actual numbers regarding how many soldiers participated in the referendum is not known, other than one printed result from the barracks in Brandon, listed at 127 to 68.[248] However, studies of the Prohibition movement in British Columbia reveal that their overseas vote in 1917 overturned the pro- Prohibition civilian vote overwhelmingly by 12,719 to 2893, with the soldiers still stationed in British Columbia voting against it with a small majority.[249]

Premier McBride's government was accused of carrying out the overseas vote in an

[245] "Victory of Temperance Forces in Province is Complete," *MFP*, 14 March 1916, 1.
[246] "Soldier Polls All Voted Dry," *MFP*, 14, March 1916, 1.
[247] Calgary Brewing and Malting Company Collection, W. Towers to AE Cross, Glenbow 1.1.18 f.577, in John Herd Thompson, "The Beginning of Our Regeneration": The Great War and the and Western Canadian Reform Movements, *Canadian Historical Association*, Historical Papers, 7 (1), 1972, 231.
[248] "Soldier Polls All Voted Dry," *MFP*, 14, March 1916, 1.
[249] Patricia Roy, Boundless Optimism: Richard McBride's British Columbia, (UBC Press: Vancouver, 2012) 307.

"irregular" manner.[250] The situation got very ugly, with the "wet" component accusing the "drys" of bribing soldiers to make false statements. By the time of the inquiry, McBride's government had been toppled and the new Premier promised to reverse the decision if any evidence was found to disqualify the overseas vote. The commission investigating the charges decreed that many ballots had to be disqualified because the names of the soldiers could not be traced. The report also declared that some soldiers had voted up to four times and that beer was used as an inducement to get the men to vote.[251] The decision was reversed and prohibition became the law on 29 September 1917.[252] Albert Hiebert writes that soldiers in British Columbia "bitterly resented prohibition which they claimed had been foisted upon the people of British Columbia while the soldiers were gone."[253] Prohibition was overturned in British Columbia in 1921, after being denounced by the "returned sons of certain prominent Methodist and Presbyterian families."[254] In the referendum in Manitoba, just as in British Columbia, there were probably questionable dealings on both sides of the argument and the truth of the soldiers' vote remains obscure.

To the jubilation of the temperance leaders, all 200 bars in Manitoba would be shut down by 1 July 1916. With likely much less jubilation, the government had to contend with the fact that the annual revenue loss for the licensing department alone would escalate to $12,750.00. The subsequent effect of closing all the bars was also felt in the police force that would suffer an estimated reduction of fifty men. The men had been ordered to enlist, but this was retracted when they were reminded of a prior promise made to the 100 who had already enlisted. They

[250] Albert John Hiebert, "Prohibition in British Columbia," *Masters Thesis*, Waterloo University College, 1969, 88-89.
[251] Ibid, 90.
[252] Ibid, 91.
[253] Ibid, 106.
[254] Ibid, 107.

had been guaranteed their jobs once they returned, without losing their seniority. However, with the anticipated drastic reduction in crime rates expected due to prohibition, this posed potential problems at the war's end.[255]

As discussed, saloonkeepers were the counterpart to exemplary patriots and they were constantly compared to the German enemy. Social reformists judged them harshly as the worst type of citizen; there was no concern for their future prospects or survival. The impact of prohibition upon the hotel owners cannot be dismissed lightly. The imminent backlash, caused by the impending loss of livelihood, probably caused more than one bar owner having nothing left to lose to flagrantly break pre-prohibition liquor rules. By the end of February, investigations were completed on incidences that had been occurring over the past two months in the town of Selkirk. It was decided that the blame was squarely on the shoulders of the town counselors and businessmen, who had neglected to provide any alternatives to the saloons. The bar rooms were the only source of amusement for the "free-spending soldiers" of Colonel Bradbury's Battalion. Chief License Inspector Argue had closed two hotels and the wholesale liquor store. Conditions in Selkirk were appalling. The *MFP* reported that two soldiers had died due to exposure. Women had been insulted and "on the street, revolting scenes were frequent." In one week, one man counted 100 men who were served more alcohol while already intoxicated. The hotelkeepers denied responsibility, citing the presence of "blind pigs" where men could obtain illegal alcohol. Reports of passed out soldiers were frequent, with one lying across a railroad track, and his drunken friend trying to pull him off. Drunkenness was rampant and this was not normal for Selkirk. One witness, Mr. Proust, testified that he had considered Selkirk a sober town before the soldiers came. It was only since the Battalion arrived, that

[255] "Will Reduce Force-Fifty Policemen May Go When Bars Close," 20 March 1916, 4.

complaints of this nature had been reported. Proust was quick to add that he was not "casting slurs on men in uniform. They had money to spend and no place to spend it." Proust confirmed that there were illegal sources of alcohol and civilians were drunk as well. He also affirmed prohibition, agreeing that the bars should be closed. Additionally, military authorities were criticized for not placing hotels out of bounds for soldiers. Dr. Ross, the mayor of Selkirk, assured investigators that "arrangements had finally been made to open a reading room in the basement of the library, where a refreshments booth was installed." [256]

These provisions proved sadly lacking, as on 25 March 1916, license department spotters were sent to investigate and confirm rumours that soldiers were being allowed into the Selkirk Hotel, putting their liquor license in jeopardy. Hotels were in "worse condition than before."[257] The following Friday, both Selkirk bars were closed with a "new plan" to make them unavailable over the weekend, and reopened on Tuesday. This was payday for the soldiers, so in the interests of both soldiers and hotelkeepers, the bars would be closed to give them a chance to "dispose of their pay at other places." The paper reported, "Most of the trouble in the past few weeks has been with soldiers and the hotel men claim they cannot control the situation. During the dry spell when the liquor places were closed up for two weeks, Selkirk was tranquil." More ominously, the report furthered, "Military pickets will guard the hotels from damage by special request of the proprietors, who fear the soldiers will try to force their way into the bars."[258]

Their prophecy was fulfilled in the early evening of 1 April 1916 when soldiers from all the Winnipeg Battalions, including 500 more from Selkirk, where the bars had been closed,

[256] "Investigation to Be Complete Today," *MFP*, 21 February 1916, 1.
[257] "Hotel Licenses In Jeopardy,"*MFP*, 25 March 1916, 2.
[258] "Selkirk Bars Closed," *MFP*, 31 March 1916, 5.

descended on downtown Winnipeg. Police on patrol came across a group of soldiers in front of the Imperial Hotel; one man was lying drunk in the doorway. City police began to haul him away and the crowd reacted angrily. One man further agitated the group by stating the police had beaten up a soldier the day before. The crowd was determined to prevent the police from beating up this man. Military police tried to help, but the crowds were too thick. A patrol wagon arrived and picked up the drunk. An estimated 3000 men filled the Main Street, blocking traffic.

In his detailed account of this incident, Blanchard notes confusion over the jurisdiction between military and city police.[259] In the past, they had purportedly worked in tandem in dealing with soldiers, but on this particular night, when military police attempted to gain control over the soldiers, a city policeman insisted the soldier be left to him to arrest, no doubt acting on the orders of the police court magistrate. The ensuing riot involved the city police beating the military police and others in the crowd with batons, including a one legged man, "probably" a returned soldier. This served to aggravate the crowd further. They picked up whatever form of weapon was available, chunks of ice, wood, and bricks, and surrounded the police station. Eventually military troops were deployed and successfully took hold of the rioters, who were marched back to their barracks.[260]

When the riot was investigated, the soldiers reported being beaten bloody by city police. Several had been arrested and detained in the city jail. Civilian witnesses corroborated the beatings. Some described the police as being in a "brainstorm of hysteria."[261] The next morning, crowds of soldiers and civilians once again surrounded the police station and demanded the release of the men. Once again, rocks, ice and bricks were being thrown through the windows.

[259] Blanchard, *Winnipeg's Great War,* 155.
[260] Ibid., 151.
[261] Ibid.,159.

Troops from the 90th Battalion marched in with bayonets and took away the soldiers being held. Once outside, the men were pulled away and managed to melt into the crowd. When the riot was finally calmed, the military had convinced city police to leave, but the troops patrolled for several days. The men were disciplined with confinement to barracks and all leaves cancelled. Not surprisingly, all bars remained closed to soldiers.[262]

Proceedings took place before Magistrate Hugh John MacDonald, who tried both civilians and soldiers. Most were given five or ten dollar fines. Some men had been brought before the Military Court of Enquiry. Significant to this thesis is that the men in charge of the court, whom Blanchard describes as members of the Winnipeg establishment, downplayed the riot. Blanchard records that they denied any real conflict between the military and civil police and that the civilians involved added greatly to the disturbance. "The fact that hundreds of troops had been rampaging in the streets while their officers seemed powerless to stop them, was not commented upon in the findings of the court."[263] Blanchard argues this was due to rivalries between Winnipeg and Toronto and Montreal, and the incidences shed a bad light on Winnipeg as a city. However, as this thesis argues, the increasingly poor reputation of the soldiers and subsequent reductions in recruitment numbers probably also affected the manner in which it was handled. Also, as will be shown in subsequent chapters, because Sam Hughes had such stern opinions regarding soldiers and alcohol, these reports were dealt with as quickly and quietly as possible.

Blanchard also notes that the story was censored until the middle of the week and was not given much news coverage across Canada, although it was run in the United States when the *Associated Press* picked it up. On the surface, Blanchard writes, "Things returned to normal in

[262] Ibid.,159.
[263] Ibid.,159.

the city." Officials attempted to display the troops in wholesome settings, such as parades, and giving band performances in theatres. However, troops continued to patrol the city and a permanent guard remained in front of the police station.[264] Although the Manitoba Prohibition Act was enacted on 1 June 1916, it did not solve the problems that the reform movement so fervently fought for. Chapter Four explores the City of Calgary in light of the events that took place in Winnipeg. As a booming frontier city growing on the heels of Winnipeg, the parallels are striking and represent the intrinsic actions taking place in this time period.

[264] Ibid.,160.

Chapter Four: "Come to Calgary. The Aquarium City, Full of Sharks! Boozorium Park!"[265]

Alberta quickly became another area in the west to be defined by social class, as businessmen from eastern Canada exploited its vast resources of land, oil and timber.[266] Calgary was incorporated in 1884 and designated as a city in 1886. By 1901, a population of 4000 foreshadowed rapid growth as a result of the CPR rails, in tandem with an agricultural boom. Further growth ensued when oil was discovered in Turner Valley in 1914, and Calgary became the administrative center of the burgeoning oil and gas industry.[267] Calgary's stunning growth, which included many non-British immigrants, was a factor in the great concern for social cleansing which parallel the reactions of social reformists in Winnipeg. [268]

At the turn of the century, Calgary was also well on its way to becoming another "booze, brothel, and gambling capital of the far Western Plains, according to Gray.[269] Over a span of five blocks downtown, there were ten bars along 9th Avenue's "Whiskey Row."[270] By 1911, Calgary was in the later transitional phases of growing out of a predominantly masculine, lawless, frontier mentality to one that was dominated by a business minded, middle-class community, now infiltrated with a feminine influence. Churches competed with brothels and barrooms, with over thirty Protestant churches filling their pews every Sunday.[271]

According to historian David Jones, the backbone of the agrarian myth was rooted in a

---

[265] Bob Edwards, *The Calgary Eyeopener, 5 October 1912,* in *The Best of Bob Edwards*, Hugh Dempsey, ed. (Edmonton, Hurtig Publishing: 1975), 243.
[266] John Kenney, "The Business Career of RB Bennett: 1897-1927" *Master's Thesis*, Concordia University, Montreal, 1977, 1.
[267] Wayne K. D. Davies in David J.Wishart ed. *Encyclopedia of the Great Plains,* University of Nebraska-Lincoln, 2011. http://plainshumanities.unl.edu/encyclopedia//doc/egp.ct.008).
Accessed 1 December 2014.
[268] David Jones," Census figures," *Alberta History* 56.1 (2008), *World History in Context*. http://ic.galegroup.com 29 Nov. 2014, 9.
[269] Gray, *Red Lights on the Prairies*, 141.
[270] Ibid., 142.
[271] Ibid., 143.

belief of a pure life lived out in the scope of hard working, God-fearing communities. The promise of prosperity began with a strong emphasis on the character of the people who would successfully tame the landscape. The demographic of a dominant agricultural community strongly supported the reform movement's efforts to shape and influence acceptable behaviors. As immigrants poured into the province, many flowed into the outlying areas to farm. Jones describes the effects as creating a powerful "Zeitgeist", which was infused with an identity with the land.[272] This spirit was manifested in the creation of the agricultural fair, to highlight the best qualities of those working the land. As opposed to the jaded cosmopolitan cities in Central Canada, which were by then less inclined to allow the imposition of old-fashioned puritan ideals, Alberta's population was predominantly rural.[273] Additionally, as James Pitsula examines in his history of Regina during the Great War, as a "cultural group," British Canadian Protestants, drove the direction of the values held by government, business and church leaders. Not all homesteaders were of British descent, however they were expected to assimilate into British society.[274]

The dominant agricultural community also accounted for a strong nativist mentality that permeated Western Canada.[275] This was also the case in Regina. Pitsula explains that Protestants felt "under siege" as foreign immigrants were perceived to threaten them. Consequently, Prohibition became a "flashpoint" to describe the "larger struggle to defend "Britishness" against

[272] Jones, "Census figures," 43.
[273] For more on the Central Canadian experience of the First World War, see Ian Hugh Miller, *Our Glory and Our Grief: Torontonians and the Great War* (Toronto: University Press, 2002).
[274] James Pitsula, *For All We Have and Are: Regina and the Experience of the Great War*, (University of Winnipeg: Winnipeg, 2008), 4.
[275] For the period after the war, see Howard Palmer, *Patterns of Prejudice: A History of Nativism in Alberta* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1982).

its enemies, both here and abroad."[276] Concerns regarding immigration were similar to Winnipeg. In 1912, Germans were the largest non-British immigrant group in Calgary. The implications held ominous consequences during the First World War, culminating in violence against this population of 3500 and ultimately, in the internment of anyone of Austro-Hungarian descent by 1916. [277]

As in Winnipeg during the Great War, the German population in Calgary was subjected to extreme forms of prejudice and violence, with little recrimination on the part of offenders. The war, according to Pitsula, was a polarizing event that juxtaposed identities into binary positions of "good and bad."[278] In 1915, *The Legion of Frontiersmen* wrote to city council, warning that preparations must be made for the inevitable trouble that enemy aliens were expected to raise. The Police, Fire, Waterworks and all other departments should expect "grave" conditions by the fall and plans should be in place for the safe evacuation of women and children.[279] However the reverse proved true. Violence against the enemy-alien was commonplace, with no accounts of uprisings within the German community in the Calgary district of Riverside. Soldiers in training across Canada often targeted German-owned businesses and homes.[280] In Calgary, as Lackenbauer details, soldiers were particularly violent and targeted several businesses they believed were owned by Germans, or perhaps employed Germans in early 1916.[281] Lackenbauer examines

---

[276] Pitsula, 75.
[277] "1912: Rush of Immigration," *Alberta History* 53.2 (2005), 8. http://peel.library.ualberta.ca/bibliography/9021.53.2.html. Accessed 29 Nov. 2014. For further reading, see John Thompson and Francis Swyripa, "Loyalties in Conflict: Ukrainians During the Great War" (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1983).
[278] Pistula, 75.
[279] City of Calgary Archives, City Clerks Department, Box 91, #665, letter from Sergeant F.A. Robinson, Honourable Lieutenant and Quartermaster for *Calgary Commerce Legion of Frontiersmen*, to City Council, 24 August 1915.
[280] Similar incidents occurred later in Toronto, see Ian Hugh Miller, *Our Glory and Our Grief: Torontonians and the Great War*, (Toronto: University Press, 2002), 64.
[281] Lackenbauer, "Under Siege," 2-12.

soldier riots that took place across Canada beginning in 1916, and concludes that the main reason for their unruly behaviour stemmed from a pervasive nativist mentality, combined with boredom in the training camps, but ultimately, from a lack of discipline within the military's administration.[282] However, he does not give an earlier context to the events that took place before the riots that targeted the enemy-alien. This thesis demonstrates that there were deeper issues in the culture of the home front. The animosity between the soldiers and the home front grew, in large part, because of the meddling of social reformists and the pre-war decisions of Sam Hughes, all which held alcohol as the root of all evil which had to be eradicated.

Prohibition historian Richard Mole argues that federal and provincial governments were far more concerned with national security and reducing the risk of espionage in Canada than they were with enforcing prohibition laws.[283] This is evident in the correspondence of the city Clerk's office at the *City of Calgary*. By 1916, in a bid to assuage concerns for returning soldiers, authorities were scrambling to find viable employment for them. Orders to all city departments were to fire any enemy-alien still in employment. Council wrote a memo stating, "Naturalized British subjects born in enemy-alien territory and employed in any department of the city to be discharged from City services and returned soldiers be employed in their stead."[284] The results of these dismissals held unfortunate consequences for those affected. For example, Walter Ahrens was dismissed from the street cleaning department. His impassioned pleas touched the heart of Maude Riley, wife of Alderman Harold Riley, also a prominent businessman and generous benefactor of the Central Methodist Church. Mrs. Riley asked her husband to intervene, who in

---

[282] P. Whitney Lackenbauer, "Soldiers Behaving Badly: CEF Soldier "Rioting" in Canada During the First World War," in *The Apathetic and the Defiant: Case Studies of Canadian Mutiny and Disobedience, 1812-1919*, ed., Craig Mantle, 195.
[283] Richard Mole, *Whiskey Wars of the Canadian West: Fifty Years of Battles Against the Bottle*, (Calgary: Heritage, 2012), 77-78.
[284] City Clerk's Department, Box 102, #732, memo, 12 January 1916, City of Calgary.

turn, advocated for Ahrens and vouched for his honour as "loyal, British subject" who had served in the British military.[285] Mayor Costello answered that effectively his hands were tied because it was "a matter of policy."[286] This is an example of the conflicting goals of the political authorities for security and the requirements inherent to sustaining recruitment, with social reformers exhibiting an impartial compassion for the innocent, and their concerns for larger social issues apart from the war effort.

In 1914, Alberta reformists began an "Abolish the Bar" movement "to inundate the province" with meetings set up across Southern Alberta villages.[287] Chapters of the *Moral Reform and Temperance League (MRTL)* covering Southern Alberta joined together, involving most of the Protestant denominations." Their first plan of attack, according to *Calgary Herald* reports, was to conduct a preliminary educational campaign. Ministers were encouraged to specifically prepare sermons dealing with the temperance question. They explained that their idea was "to get people gradually interested and adjusted up to the point where a vigorous campaign can be brought on with hope and success."[288] As noted by historian Anne M. White, "The potential for expansion and evangelistic opportunity was not lost on the Methodists of central Canada on the Western Canadian frontier."[289] Just as Western business ventures, the morality lecture circuit flowed out of the east, through Winnipeg and on to Calgary, Edmonton, and Vancouver. In *The Liberal Party in Alberta*, Lewis Thomas records, "The prohibitionists relied

[285] Harold Riley to Mayor Costello, 21 February 1916, City Clerks Department, Box 103, #735, City of Calgary.
[286] Mayor Costello to Harold Riley, 22 February 1916, City Clerks Department, Box 103, #735, City of Calgary.
[287] "Abolish the Bar," *CH*, 7 January 1914, 1.
[288] "Moral Reformers Planning Great Temperance Fight," *CH*, 14 January 1914, 12.
[289] Anne M. White, "Evangelicalism, Revivalism and the Female Contribution: Emily Spencer Kerby," *Historical Papers*, 1996 pi.library.york.ca, 89.

upon clergymen, local politicians, and the likes of Nellie McClung to offer their case."[290] In addition to McClung, the Rev. J.G. Shearer, and the well-loved Rev. George Kerby, were keynote speakers who exhorted Protestant values that upheld the cornerstone of the Social Purity movement sweeping North America. Their message always culminated in exhorting the continued fight for prohibition. W.M. Davidson, editor of the *Albertan* supported reform minded work and published corresponding speeches and articles on a regular basis.[291] Highly political groups such as the *United Farmers of Alberta* and newspapers such as the *Western Producer* and the *Albertan* contributed to the culture bolstering this community, all emphasizing a near complete embracing of social reform in the West, accompanying an assimilation of British values.[292]

In January 1914, reformers were contending with the "evils" present in Calgary; the greatest in their estimation were drunkenness and immoral young men. These were prominent subjects in sermons. Rev. Marshall warned the young people of his congregation at the Central Methodist Church to guard against "Impure thoughts, immoral behaviour, immoral literature, obscene pictures and immoral women. Evil companions had the greatest effect on the character, perhaps the strongest." This was why the *MRTL* wanted to eliminate the bar room.[293] The City of Calgary still believed a licensing program and not absolute prohibition was the best way to control alcohol, but were dealing with the how to handle the licensing department. By February, they had decided to move it from under the auspices of the City and hand it over to the Police department to

[290] Lewis G. Thomas, *The Liberal Party in Alberta*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1959), 159.
[291] Hugh A. Dempsey, "The Day Alberta Went Dry," *Alberta History* 58.2 (Spring 2010), 4.
[292] Ibid., 10. See also Bradford James Rennie, *The Rise of the Agrarian Democracy: The United Farmers and Farm Women of Alberta, 1909-1921*. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001).
[293] "Problems of the Present Day Are Preacher's Topics," *CH*, 14 January 1914, 12.

manage, although the City did want a share of the license fees.[294]

The *MRTL* was ramping up to hold a convention in mid February and they began with pre-convention rallies to stir up the people with a "Spirit of hostility against the liquor traffic."[295] The speakers present agreed the liquor traffic was a "crime against humanity." Rev. Fulton, a guest speaker from the United States, said he had seen more drunks on the streets of Calgary at one time than he had witnessed on the streets of Chicago, which was acknowledged to be the worst city in the States. While he agreed that they could always count on the farmers' support, considering the amount of crops absorbed into alcohol, "the great fight will be right here in Calgary, in Edmonton, and in Lethbridge." [296] The convention opened on 18 February 1914, with 133 delegates representing several towns, villages and cities across Southern Alberta, and presided over by Calgary mayor Herbert A. Sinnott, and with Dr. Kerby sitting as chairman.[297] As they discussed the mandates they would pursue, several resolutions were passed, including an anti-cigarette clause. The Total Prohibition resolution passed with a majority of 126-34 calling for legislation that would enact the "full extent of Powers" of the Provincial government. [298] Rev. Fulton "denounced" the provincial government for its license policy, because "Saloons would always defy the law." Fulton's logic was that if the doors were supposed to close early, they would just open the back door. Similarly, if they were told to close entirely, they would "conduct their trade in the cellars," and no matter what regulations were introduced, the saloons would always defy

[294] "Battle Royal Promised Before Manarey Gives Up the Keys of Office," *CH*, 3 February 1914, 1, and "City Wants Share of License Fees," 6 February 1914, 1.
[295] "Big Mass Meeting On Sunday," *CH*, 6 February 1914, 1, and "Strong Resolution Aganst the Liquor Traffic," 9 February 1914, 11.
[296] Powerful Address By Rev. Fulton," *CH*, 9 February 1914, 11.
[297] Sinnott served as mayor from 1913-1914. The City Of Calgary, (2011), "The City of Caglary Municipal Handbook," www.calgary.ca/.../Historical-information/gallery/Mayors_Galleries.xml. Accessed 5 November 2015.
[298] "Prohibition Resolution Passed at Temperance Conference" *CH*, 9 February 1914, 1.

them. Therefore, he believed that the only possible means to control them was to enact full prohibition. Perhaps this logic only seems flawed in hindsight, but Fulton was emphatic. He also knew that this was a "stern fight which only a man could undertake." It could not be "enforced by a jellyfish." With "real men behind us to enforce" the legislation, only then would we "be able to appreciate all that prohibition means." The delegation also elected men into various offices, some of those chosen would participate in the "notorious report" that will be examined in detail. [299]

On the second day of the convention, the president of McArthur Baptist College, Rev. Dr. Sharpe, "started a lively discussion when he moved a resolution (to) make a moral survey of the province of Alberta." He reasoned that it was important to gather as much information as possible and it could only be done properly with an appointed committee to carry it out. His suggestion was objected to by a few based on the amount of money it would cost to undertake such a work, however, the motion was passed by a "small majority." It is significant to note that not all members of the *MRTL* were willing to use such tactics. It was also agreed that the government be asked to cancel all club licenses in the province. The fact that many small Alberta towns had more bars than was lawful created a demand for the government to "take steps to remedy this." It was agreed that there should be a law banning any man who held liquor interests to be allowed to run for the office of mayor or alderman in any Southern Alberta town. Further, there should be laws that would jail "Interdicts and Indians" who were caught with liquor and who would not disclose who supplied the alcohol. [300] It was a very productive day. This report concluded the first convention of the Southern Alberta chapter of the *MRTL*.

The inundation of headlines regarding prohibition influenced concerns across Alberta. In Macgrath, aldermen tackled the issue of "blind pigs." Alderman Hindley was "reasonably sure that

[299] "Stephens Elected President of Alberta Moral Reform League," *CH*, 19 February 1914, 12.
[300] "Will Raise Big Sum For Temperance Campaign," *CH*, 20 February 1914, 13.

there were two or three (operating), regularly importing from Lethbridge." Provincial authorities had promised to appoint a special inspector to "ferret out the illicit dealers," but "it looked like a friend of the interests was going to get the job." The alderman predicted that an "almost uncontrollable" situation was inevitable. [301]

Presumably, reform workers were busy throughout the month of March presenting their resolutions to the provincial government. The *Herald* did not report on the response of the government directly, but by April, there were concerted efforts to curb the liquor traffic along the southern boundary of Alberta.[302] The decision to distribute advertisements in newspapers was taken on by the churches. As the *Herald* reported, "Those behind this new progressive idea represents nearly all the churches of this city. The majority of them are businessmen who understand the power of modern publicity." Regarding promotion, it was argued that if businesses, political and charitable groups "have been built up, it is logical to conclude that any who may be lukewarm or indifferent…may be influenced and led to unite in pushing ahead the most important undertaking on earth by advertising."[303]

[301] "'Blind Pigs'," Infest Local Option Area," *CH,* 21 February 1914, 1.
[302] "Heavy Liquor Fines," *CH,* 2 April 1914, 5.
[303] "Will Advertise Work of Church In Newspapers," *CH,* 11 April 1914.

How many men do you know who let their religion interfere with their business?[304]

The Calgary business community was a small group of men of British descent who were intrinsically connected through their shared monopoly in land acquisition and development and accompanying manufacturing companies such as lumber mills and cement factories.[305] R.B. Bennett was one of the most significant actors of this era in Alberta. As a lawyer, businessman and politician, Bennett's influence reached into virtually all areas of life in Calgary's early days. With Max Aitken (later Lord Beaverbrook) as his campaign manager, Bennett became the first leader of the Alberta Conservative Party in 1905.[306] He was Alberta's sole representative as an MP in the House of Commons in 1911 and become a valued aid to Robert Borden and his administration.[307]

Bennett's attitude towards alcohol was conflicted. He had been raised in a strict Methodist home and adhered to Wesleyan tenets all of his life, including "Feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, comforting the sick, assisting the stranger and relieving the afflicted." According to biographer Ernest Watkins, Bennett sought holiness and maintained strict personal discipline and eschewed alcohol all of his life.[308] In the 1898 Prohibition Referendum, Bennett campaigned doggedly in its favour. The "evils of strong drink" drove his passion to speak against alcohol in these early years.[309] This position did not serve him well as a politician, and he was often publically attacked and ridiculed for his stance, especially by Calgary's favourite lampoonist, Bob Edwards, editor of the *Calgary Eye Opener*. As historian John Boyko records, "Bennett was

---

[304] Bob Edwards, 2 May 1908, *The Calgary Eyeopener*, in Dempsey, ed. "The Best of Bob Edwards," 61.
[305] John Kenney, "The Business Career of RB Bennett: 1897-1927," *Master's Thesis*, Concordia University, Montreal, 1977, 12.
[306] Kenney, "The Business Career of RB Bennett," 12.
[307] Canada History, "Prime Ministers: R.B.Bennett." http://www.canadahistory.com/sections/politics/Prime%20Ministers/RB%20Bennett.html, accessed 19 January 2015.
[308] Ernest Watkins, *RB Bennett: A Biography* (London: Secker & Warburg, 1963), 6.
[309] P.B. Waite, "In Search of R.B. Bennett," (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2012), 104. Also, Boyko, 42.

criticized for claiming to be a religious man but allowing his campaign staff to work Sundays. Newspaper articles questioned his support of temperance when it was common knowledge that some of his workers plied political supporters with alcohol." [310]

By the early 1900's, Bennett had softened his stance on alcohol. Despite reports that he had once judged Max Aitken harshly for buying a bowling alley, he no longer let his religion affect his political or business decisions.[311] Over time, Bennett cultivated a friendship with his former rival, Bob Edwards and they stayed close until Edwards' death in 1922. Gray notes that by 1911,Bennett had "backed away from Prohibition as a way to combat alcoholism." Indeed, most of Bennett's friends imbibed, although he remained an abstainer.[312] Still, "his Liberal opponents circulated reports" of a temperance speech he had given in a Calgary church, and "indicated to Calgary drinkers that Bennett was a Prohibitionist who would shut off access to their favourite bar and beverage."[313] To this charge, Bennett told the *Calgary Herald*,

> I am a total abstainer and always have been and I am not personally in favour of the liquor traffic. But I realize that…any reforms that may be brought about in the matter of temperance must be brought about by education of the people and not through the enactment of regulations restricting the traffic if such regulations be not in accord with the will of the people.[314]

When F.S. Spence and his daughter Ruth led Canadian temperance leagues to Ottawa to demand Dominion wide prohibition as described in Chapter One, it was Bennett who reasoned in

[310] Boyko, 50.
[311] Kenney, "The Business Career of RB Bennett," 7.
[312] James Gray, *R.B.Bennett: The Calgary Years* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991), 167.
[313] Ibid., 167.
[314] *Calgary Herald*, quoted in Gray, *R.B.Bennett,* 168.

Parliament that it should rather become a provincial prerogative.[315] The measure protected larger breweries and distillers from the worst aspects of prohibition and imposed the burden on the bar and saloon owners. The ultimate result was that by the early 1920's, according to *Calgary Brewing and Malting Co*. accounts receivable, virtually all the hotels under contract to buy their beer had transferred the deeds of their land and properties over to the brewery, in lieu of payment.[316]

The summer of 1914 is silent on the issue of prohibition, with all eyes turned onto unfolding world events. Members of the *MRTL* were making inroads into positions of government. Dr. Kerby, president of Mount Royal College, announced his candidacy for the school board.[317] Rev. A.R. Aldridge, who had been the assistant secretary for the *MRTL* resigned his position and accepted the nomination for Edmonton South. Although it was not published in their list of resolutions, it is not a stretch to assume the *MRTL* intended on infiltrating public offices with prohibition-minded adherents.[318]

When war was declared and recruiting began, Calgary hosted several regiments, and it was not long before the issue of soldiers and immorality came under the spotlight. In November, the *Herald* defended the young men, calling them "earnest and honest," resulting in not one reported case for the garrison guard to deal with. However, "It would be almost too much to ask that the guard room will remain unoccupied during the whole time that the soldiers are with us." It certainly was a wonderful target to aim for though, and suggestions were made on how citizens could help in "the good cause." At this point, the First Contingent had arrived on Salisbury Plains

---

[315] Ibid.
[316] Hotel Ledger, 1905- 1924, Mortgage Ledger, M-8581-313, series 16, Calgary Brewing and Malting Co. GAI.
[317] "Dr.Kerby Candidate For School Board," *CH*, 24 November 1914, 1.
[318] "Rev. Aldridge of Edmonton Accepts Nomination for Edmonton South," *CH*, 24 November 1914, 1.

and Canadians were already aware of the men who had "disgraced their uniforms by over indulgence in strong drink." The *Herald* warned that this same fate was in store for the Second Contingent "even before they cross the water, if they show themselves weak enough to fall by the wayside." Calgarians were already concerned with the soldiers' first payday. Similar to Winnipeg, Calgary residents feared the boys would waste their money at the saloons instead of benefiting the local economy.[319] When the boys are "flush with money, it will be the easiest thing imaginable for unwise friends to help some of the soldiers into serious trouble." The worst possibilites could be ameliorated with a "world of caution."[320]

By the first of December 1914, also the first payday for the soldiers at the Calgary garrison, efforts were already being made to curtail their activity. The police courts were filled with young men that had reached the city intending to enlist, but instead were charged with drunkenness. As a result, the demand to begin restrictions in their best interests was exacerbated.[321] As seems to be the common case where unruly drinking takes place, it was noticed that more "disorderly houses" had been raided, since the soldiers arrived.[322] These conditions led to the decision to delay the soldiers' payday from December 16 and deferring it to the 22, "on account of the nearness of Christmas." Officials noted the soldiers would have to stretch their wages into the New Year. But probably the most compelling reason for the announcement was "the probability that the absent minded beggars would spend all their cash before the festive season and then repent while others had coins jingling in their pockets." The community responded to the paymaster's decision "with delight," because it would "keep them out of temptation but when the pay does come it will be much larger. The result will be that Tommy Atkins in Calgary will be able to have a right jolly

[319] See pages 46, 59 and 67.
[320] "Where Citizens Can Help," *CH*, 24 November 1914, 6.
[321] "Would Be Soldiers Throng Police Court," *CH*, 2 December 1914, 4.
[322] "Detectives Gather In Undesirable Citizens," *CH*, 2 December 1914, 7.

Christmas."[323] The holidays passed without reported incident, but by the middle of January 1915, the *Herald* was recommending that bars be closed at 7 P.M. for "good business policy" and for the good of the public. They argued that "On several occasions lately, this paper has drawn attention to the temptations in the way of young men who are in camp here and too many of whom were to be found in uniform in the hotel bars." The editor also urged the public to stop treating the soldiers or tempting them in any way to drink.[324]

As previously mentioned, Westerners resented how the bulk of volunteers were drawn from the western provinces yet were still being shipped to train at Valcartier. [325] Along with Winnipeg, Calgary leaders approached Hughes to keep the men in the West. In March 1915, the *Calgary Herald* noted the desire to have troops remain in their respective cities to boost the local economy, with the added bonus of increasing employment to the area.[326] With Hughes' approval, soldiers became a constant presence on the streets of several western cities.[327] At this point, nobody objected to their presence because of the economic potential they brought. Calgary became the headquarters for Military District 13.[328] Work began to prepare Sarcee Camp in April 1915, it was suitable for housing and training troops later that summer. A site located north of the Elbow River was selected as a training area but to Edmonton's disappointment, was the only camp in Alberta. The understood value of a military presence was illustrated in 1916 when Bob Edwards referred to Calgary's rival city and generously declared that

---

[323] "Soldiers Will Not Be Paid Till Dec. 22," *CH*, 15 December 1914, 4.
[324] "Close Bars At 7 P.M.," *CH*, 14 January 1915, 6.
[325] "Calgary May Lose All Troops Soon," *Calgary Herald* (*CH)*, 20 March 1915,1.
[326] "What Winnipeg Did," 20 March 1915, 16, *CH.*
[327] L. James. Dempsey, "Monuments on the Hill: World War I Emblems in Calgary," *Alberta History* 57.2 (Spring 2009), 16.
http://www.albertahistory.org/default/index.cfm/membership/. Accessed 15 October 2014.
[328] L. James Dempsey, "Monuments on the Hill: World War I Emblems in Calgary."*Alberta History* 57.2 (Spring 2009), Historical Society of Alberta.
3.http://www.albertahistory.org/default/index.cfm/membership/, accessed 15 October 2014.

> Our sister city is surely entitled to a share of the vast sums of money that are daily out in circulation through the encampment of 1000's of men. The businessmen of Edmonton have been, and are now suffering from trade depression the same as the rest of us down here and are entitled to the same consideration.[329]

Sarcee Camp was originally designed to accommodate about 6,000 troops, but often held almost double that number. Calgary historian L James Dempsey notes that "It was a tented city with several wooden buildings (erected) for administrative staff and supply services. Roads were constructed and the camp was serviced with running water and electricity."[330] A temporary streetcar line was approved by city council.[331] However, in the winter and spring of 1915, the regiments were still quartered in the downtown district around Victoria Park. Inherent problems followed. Again, due to Hughes insistence that all training camps both in Canada and in England be "dry," no beer canteens were allowed. Inevitably, the soldiers took to the local saloons, just as they had in England, Winnipeg and all points between.[332] In the land where temperance groups were holding a growing and powerful influence, this was deemed intolerable.

When the Prohibition issue came to a head in 1915, Bennett was abroad. He had accompanied Prime Minister Borden to Britain, where they were met by Sam Hughes to inspect conditions on the front. Through his connections with Aitken (now Lord Beaverbrook), Bennett "participated in a number of high level, bilateral military and political meetings."[333] He was present when Borden promised Britain an additional 500,000 soldiers to fight the war.[334] Military

[329] Bob Edwards, 8 April 1916, *Calgary Eye Opener,* 3.
[330] Dempsey, "Monuments on the Hill," 3.
[331] City Clerks Department memo, "Temporary Streetcar Line to Military Camp," 09 April 1915, Box 86, file # 635. City of Calgary Archives.
[332] "Strong Plea From Church For Sobriety," *CH,* 5 April 1915, 1.
[333] Boyko, 97.
[334] Kenney, "The Business Career of RB Bennett," 46.

historian Mark Humphries calls this promise "Borden's decision to purchase influence with Britain through blood sacrifice, which cast the fight as a national crusade for a greater role in imperial affairs."[335] Bennett was very active in support of the war effort and although unable to join the military, he took on significant roles in loyal service. He gave $100,000 from his personal account to raise a regiment in Calgary, which later joined the Princess Patricia Light Infantry in Valcartier, Quebec. He was the President of the *Alberta Red Cross* and was a board member for the *Canadian Patriotic Fund,* set up to support soldiers' families. A gifted orator, Bennett also gave patriotic speeches to boost morale and encourage recruitment.[336] Being acutely aware of how public perception affected recruitment goals, his speeches focused on the aspects of shared burdens in light of the soldiers' ultimate sacrifice. He described the soldier's martyrdom as "The highest Christian ideal, with his Bible as his sword of truth, he went forth to battle with the embodied forces of evil, and it was our duty to support and reinforce his efforts in every possible way that they should be effective." Likening the soldiers' commitment with the redemption Christ offered in the crucifixion, he stated, "The cardinal principal of Christianity is the sacrifice of the Man-God for the good of all." Bennett exhorted the 'muscular Christian' ideal that this was "The highest form of Christianity," and this was his rhetoric throughout the duration of the war.[337]

[335] Mark Humphries, "Between Commemoration and History: The Historiography of the Canadian Corps and Military Overseas," *The Canadian Historical Review*, 95(3), Sept. 2014, 385.
[336] Boyko, 92.
[337] R.B. Bennett, "Scrapbook: 1915-1916." GAI, M126, 6.

Time To Crack Down

While the *Herald* tried to uphold the moral character of the soldiers, author James Gray highlights the seedier side of Calgary as one of brothels and barrooms.[338] The legal case files of prominent Calgary lawyer J. McKinley Cameron show Calgary's downtown provided a lively and prolific clientele for several brothels. Cameron was a criminal defense lawyer who would later take on the famous trial of Emilio Picariello and Filomena Losandro in 1922.[339] In one particular incident, case files show depositions taken from two policemen, three soldiers, and a woman who was charged with keeping a common bawdy house. The woman pleaded not guilty. In the evidence brought forth against her, the first soldier testified he was there with the others looking "for a piece of tail." However, nothing happened because the police got there too soon. The second man volunteered to Cameron's objection that he was in the 50th Battalion and testified that he and two other men went to a house "for the usual thing," where he was let in through the back door. When asked if he was at the right house, he said he had no idea because, "There was no satisfaction on my part." When asked if he had been served anything to drink, the private testified he merely sat in the kitchen alone with a glass of water. The third private testified he had been to the house on the Thursday before. On the night in question, he had gone alone, but the "girl had turned him away." This private had learned about the house while he was in the latrine of the barracks. He maintained that some of his acquaintances told him there was "nothing doing there," but he took a chance and sure enough, "there was nothing doing." Police Sergeant Brechen swore he watched the house for three hours that night and saw three soldiers go in, whereupon he and Sergeant Taylor entered the premises. Brechon had watched the house on prior

[338] Gray, *Red Lights on the Prairies*.
[339] J. McKinley Cameron, "The King vs. Emilio Picariello, 1922. Re Liquor Offence, Blairmore 450," GAI, M-6840-344.

nights and testified that "It looked like a picket parade, two were on sentry and several called there." The brothel under investigation was said to be just two blocks from the barracks. After reviewing this deposition, court magistrate Gilbert Sanders pronounced the madam guilty and fined her $50.00. The soldiers were quietly freed and this very common incident was not reported in the newspapers. [340]

At the end of February and during the first week of March 1915, the *Morning Albertan* published a series of editorials by Dr. Blow**,** a prominent eye, ear and nose specialist, who was outraged that prominent Calgarians were supportive of a wet canteen for the military. According to the Calgary historian Manfred Baum, Blow "played a significant role in Alberta's early economic and political development" and "was responsible for the construction of a number of downtown office blocks and served for ten years on the Alberta Legislature, commencing in 1913."[341] A history of Alberta compiled in 1912 featured Dr. Blow as a man of such fixed "character for morality and integrity," he had "attained the highest measure of perfection possible. He has not only kept pace with the onward march of progress but has been a leader in the vanguard."[342] From this book, it can be ascertained that Calgary businessmen held formidable clout. With such men protesting conditions in Calgary, Calgary's do-gooders never-the-less earnestly campaigned against allowing soldiers access to local bars and called for an outright ban on this practice, as was beginning to be legislated in Ontario. Concerns and charges grew for and against prohibition, all bringing the issue of soldiers' choices of activities to the forefront. On 3

[340] J. McKinley Cameron, "The King vs. Ethel Marie Wood, 1915, re Inmate of disorderly house," GAI, Series M-6840-55,138.
[341] Manfred Baum, "Calgary: Atlantic Avenue Inglewood, Historical Walking Tours, " *Old Town Calgary Society*, 10, http://www.culture.alberta.ca/heritage-and-museums/resources/historical-walking-and-driving-tours/docs/Tour-Calgary-Atlantic-Inglewood.pdf, accessed 26 November 2015.
[342] Archibald Oswald MacRae, *History of the Province of Alberta*, (The Western Canada History Company: Calgary, 1912), 636.

March 1915, the *Morning Albertan* published the discussion of a meeting of the Calgary Presbytery concerning soldiers' conduct. It was their conclusion that "The commanding officer of the troops should declare all barrooms out of bounds and that he and the chief of police should cooperate" to prevent a further "disgraceful condition of affairs where soldiers were allowed to drink at hotels freely."[343]

Bob Edwards addressed the lack of a beer canteen at the military camp, crediting the character and morale of the soldiers as follows, "So few of them have taken undue advantage of the personal liberty allowed them while off duty." In early April, Edwards acknowledged there were a few whose behaviour was "more conspicuous," but the "good example of the majority have brought the ultra-jovial to their senses, (with the) "incorrigibles" already weeded out. Edwards continued to sing high praise for the men "One would have to travel a long, long way before meeting such a splendid, earnest body of men as we have here in training, They (look) the part they have been called to play with credit and distinction."[344] As one who perpetually made fun of the pious Victorian middle class, Edwards also understood the necessity of portraying the soldiers in a positive light for the war effort.

[343] "Want Hotel Bars To Be Declared 'Out of Bounds,'" *MA*, 5.
[344] Bob Edwards, "Eyeopeners," *Calgary Eyeopener*, April 3, 1915, 1.

Gallons of Trouble Can Come Out of a Pint Flask.[345]

Behind closed doors, the published meetings of Calgary's most prominent and morally influential men heightened the perception that the public must be made aware of the soldiers' conduct, and serious action taken. The following actions are reminiscent of Craig Heron's analysis of a 1913 survey taken in working class saloons in Hamilton, Ontario. Heron writes that activist Bryce M. Stewart came to Hamilton to oversee "a cross-country series of 'preliminary social surveys' jointly sponsored by the Methodist and Presbyterian Churches." Their aim was to gather information on "poverty, public health, housing, moral purity, and other features of contemporary urban life in Canada." A group of volunteers entered fifty-seven Hamilton hotels and barrooms on a Saturday night in April 1913, to count the patrons and observe their behaviour in order to produce a census. Their findings of profane and unmanly, lewd behaviour are detailed in Chapter One.[346]

In similar fashion, between 1 March and 1 April 1915, a self-appointed citizens committee composed of Calgary clergymen and deacons, embarked on a holy mission. This was the germination of the idea first suggested by Rev. Sharpe during the *MRTL* convention in February. They stood outside of ten bars between the hours of seven p.m. and ten p.m. and counted 1043 soldiers in uniform and 1709 civilians. On 5 April, they announced their findings at a meeting at the Central Methodist Church, where the report was drawn up with the facts of the case to present to Calgary newspapers. Not only was it imperative to alert the good citizens of Calgary but it was also agreed that a delegation should be sent to the legislature in Edmonton immediately. They intended to demand from Premier Clifford Sifton an enactment of the early closing of bars and to ban soldiers from entering saloons at all. This delegation would be comprised of prominent

[345] Dempsey, ed, "The Best of Bob Edwards," 137.
[346] Heron, "The Boys and Their Booze," 424.

members and clergymen, representing several Alberta towns and cities.[347]

The *Morning Albertan* published the full report the next morning and the *Calgary Daily Herald* listed the findings in detail. Both papers' front pages were devoted to the issue noting the subsequent reactions being expressed throughout the city. The report accused soldiers of "allegedly" drinking and "misconduct" with women of ill repute. Additional charges concerned a disturbing amount of young women "carrying on illicit relations" with the soldiers. They charged that this was leading to large, unnamed business establishments firing young women in their employment if they were seen accompanying men in uniform. They contended that "This is a case where the innocent must suffer with the guilty. We have, therefore, every reason to believe prostitution is widespread in our city." Conditions were "far more serious than the public at large are aware of." When Rev. Sharpe refused to disclose these businesses, *Herald* reporters called around to several prominent local business owners who all denied ever issuing such orders.[348]

The report of 1915 was received by many leading citizens, including the newly elected Mayor Costello, as a slanderous attack on the fine boys in khaki. Michael Copps Costello served as mayor of Calgary from 1915-1919. There had historically been a certain amount of friction between Calgary's mayor and the chief of police, but Costello had maintained excellent relations with the police force.[349] Costello "expressed the opinion that the attitude of certain adherents of prohibition might do the cause more harm that good."[350]

---

[347] "Calgary Soldiers Resent Insinuations Against Sobriety and Moral Standards," *MA* 8 April 1915, 1, *CH*, and, "Recommend That The Bars Of Province Close At 7 P.M.," 8 April 1915, 1,.
[348], "Won't Give Name Of Firm Issuing Order," *CH*, 8 April 1915, 1.
[349] David Bright, "Technology and Law Enforcement: The Transformation of the Calgary Police Force, 1900-1940," *Urban History* 33(2), Spring 2995, 34.
[350] "Unity is Essential, *MA*, 9 April 1915, 7.

"If Everyone Minded Their Own Business, What a Happier, Brighter World It Would Be."[351]

Along with Mayor Costello, Calgary Police Chief Alfred Cuddy was indignant with the publication of the following statement that "Your committee is of the opinion that the police department is not taking hold of this matter with the firmness which the situation demands." The committee called for greatly enlarging the force as long as Calgary was a garrison city, in addition to greater force being taken with the houses of ill fame. Cuddy's answer to this charge was to place the blame on parents who should be keeping their girls home at night, and that this alone would be more effective than enlarging the force by even fifty.[352] The police were accused of not taking control of intoxicated soldiers but instead were turning them over to the military authorities. Mayor Costello answered these charges by acknowledging Calgary may not be ideal, but enforcement had been very satisfactory. He also upheld the character of the soldiers, having known many when they were still civilians.[353]

The citizen's report charged that several 'spotters' had been chased through the streets and assaulted by soldiers and civilians. Therefore, they argued,

> We strongly protest against that condition which permits several hundred drunken and drinking soldiers and civilians to molest law-abiding citizens and we recommend that our police department deal with all drunks (with no partiality).[354]

This denunciation of the police department would have been particularly galling to Cuddy, who had been hired in 1911 to implement a stronger police presence due to the concern for the rise of

[351] "Make Mountains Out of Molehills," *MA*, 9 April 1915, 7.
[352] Ibid., 7
[353] "Mayor and Police Chief Make Denial," *CH*, 9 April 1915, 1.
[354] "The Report," *CH*, 9 April 1915.

non-British immigrants and rampant lawlessness in the eyes of reformers. When he arrived, Calgary held the reputation as a wide-open, lawless city that was "soft on crime."[355] According to Thomas Thorner, the police force was highly criticized for being too lenient.[356] Records from the annual police reports allow a comparison over five years. In 1907, the population was 15,000 and charges for drunk and disorderliness were just 483. By 1912, the population skyrocketed to 49,906, with the same charges hitting 2829. Naturally this drew the attention of "the moral reform groups and especially women's groups."[357]

Under Cuddy, the police force was at its greatest strength.[358] David Bright notes that Calgary's "sudden transformation from a small frontier town into a complex urban society" required drastic changes.[359] Before Cuddy's arrival in 1911, the police force was not one of trained competence, but of brute strength. The average police officer was quickly spotted due to his height, giving criminals plenty of time to run away.[360] Cuddy transformed the force with discipline, creating a "hard-nosed morality squad."[361] He established a physical fitness program for officers, opened a Criminal Investigations Bureau, and established more police stations around the city.[362] Cuddy's measures produced results, evident in charges of drunk and disorderly behaviour being reduced from 1744 in 1914, to 920 in 1915.[363] In March of 1915, just before the eruption of the citizen's report, the *Morning Albertan* declared that even though it was among the

[355] Gray, *Red Lights on the Prairies*, 163.
[356] Ibid., 46.
[357] Thomas Thorner, "Keeper of the King's Peace: Colonel Sanders and the Calgary Police Magistrate's Court, 1911-1932," *Urban History Review* 12 (3), 46-47.
[358] Ibid., 41.
[359] Bright, David. "Technology and Law Enforcement: The Transformation of the Calgary Police Force, 1900-1940s," ***Urban History Review*** 33.2 (Spring 2005): 34.
[360] Gray, *Red Lights on the Prairies*, 158.
[361] Ibid., 171.
[362] Thorner, "Keeper of the King's Peace," 41.
[363] Ibid., 47.

most difficult to run, Cuddy's department gave no citizen cause for alarm therefore he must be kept in Calgary if at all possible.[364] Gray argues that it was not Cuddy alone who was responsible for sweeping the city clean, because the First World War was "the most important factor."[365] Gray's assertion contributes to the argument that the war gave new impetus to the goals of the social reformists.

The most indignant of all were the soldiers stationed at the Victoria Park barracks. The *Herald* describes them as a "seething mass" as the report was passed around the camp. By parade time, they were threatening mutiny and rumored to have refused to "stand to." Lt. Colonel Bell called a special parade and warned the soldiers that their actions could exacerbate the issue and bring further discredit to them. He trusted that Calgarians would wisely judge the report. Col. Cruikshank was out of town therefore there was no official military response that week. Colonel Mason took responsibility for damage control by insisting there was no truth to the soldiers' refusal to parade. Instead he said, the men had been on a long march the night before and had gone to bed after midnight, so reveille was postponed one hour later the next morning. Soldiers at the 124th Mounted Rifles barracks wanted to hold a meeting to discuss the slur against them, but were not allowed due to regulations against such meetings. On the evening of the publication, many soldiers marched to the Palliser Hotel and proceeded to protest in front of the homes of the citizens' committee. The *Morning Albertan* reported, "To maintain strict discipline was almost a superhuman task, a hundred or so of the men made a rendezvous at the Palliser Hotel. In double file they made a march of protest to the houses of the members lilting the refrain, "Are We Bums?" "Are We Toughs?" [366]

---

[364] "Control of Resources," *MA,* 21 March 1915, 3.
[365] Gray, *Red Lights on the Prairies*, 169.
[366] "Soldiers At Barracks Greatly Excited Over Committee's Allegations," *CH,* 8 April 1915, 1.

At the urgent request of the terrified committee, they remained under the watchful eye of Cuddy's officers. Regarding the soldiers' response, the *MA* headlines of 9 April reported, "They declare that the report published yesterday is untrue, unjust and generally unfair."[367] Another private told the *MA* that the tainted report caused him to be spat upon by three girls at a theatre. [368] This shows the results of the deepening divide being experienced by the soldiers and citizens of Calgary, due to the influence of the reformists. It was at this point the *MA* changed the direction of their allegiance after the soldiers also lined up outside the office of the newspaper, "under the misapprehension that the morning paper was a member of the committee." They issued a "Stirring appeal to submerge personal feeling during the strife and present a united front for the sake and good of the empire."[369]

The report was commissioned by over fifty of Calgary's most pious and influential citizens, whose headquarters were at Bennett's Central Methodist Church. It was signed and authorized by the following men: the chairman of the committee, Rev. R. Sharpe, prominent businessmen; F.E. Werry, Thomas Underwood, A.H. Cushing, and J.P. Woodhall, and ex-alderman W.G. Hunt. However Hunt, Woodhall and Underwood immediately repudiated signing when it was clear that it would not be accepted in the spirit intended. Many local residents were fiercely defensive regarding the judgment against the soldiers. This report could be construed as unpatriotic. It is interesting that William George Hunt would deny his involvement, because this was not his first foray into exposing immorality in Calgary. In 1906, Hunt was part of a "Citizens' Committee" demanding more stringent measures to be taken with the local prostitutes.[370]

Hunt was on the Resolutions Committee of the Calgary chapter of the *MRTL,* and was a

[367], "Soldiers resent the Statements of the Committee", *MA*, 9 April 1915, 1.
[368] "Unity is Essential," *MA*, 9 April 1915, 5.
[369] "Created A Sensation," *MA*, 9 April 1915, 1.
[370] Gray, *Red Lights on the Prairies*, 148.

prosperous businessman.[371] He was from Montreal and arrived in Calgary in 1904. He encouraged the purchase of Kananaskis Falls for the development of *Calgary Power* and was successful in many business ventures. He was associated with the Massey Harris Company for twenty-one years and owned the Hope Block on 15 Avenue and 1st Street West. He served as an alderman from 1905-1906, and held another term from January 1914- January 1915 [372] He ran against Costello for mayor in the spring election of 1915. Costello's files show a bitter animosity toward Hunt during the mayoral campaign period, which may have affected Costello's outrage and denunciation of the report.[373]

During this mayoral campaign, the political leanings of the *Calgary Herald* and the *Albertan* were obvious. The *Herald* denounced Hunt in editorials, and over the course of the last few days of the election, added a headline across the top of the front page instructing readers to vote for Costello.[374] The *Herald* criticized Hunt for his "Big Business" tactics of offering labourers twenty cents an hour, which was not a living wage. Costello offered "A living wage, progressive construction, strict scrutiny of expenditure and a square deal to all."[375] During the campaign, Hunt tried to bring in prohibition as a topic of discussion, which had been eschewed by Canadian politicians of all stripes. The *Herald* called this an act of desperation and charged that Hunt "has hit upon this bogeyman stunt to endeavor to swing the temperance and prohibition voters of Calgary to his support. It is an old election dodge but can have no effect on this occasion." The *Herald* maintained that city Council had nothing to do with the liquor interests

[371] "Alberta Temperance and Moral Reform League Opens Convention Here," *CH*, 18 February 1915, 1.
[372] City of Calgary, "Biography of William George Hunt," *City of Calgary Past Mayors and Aldermen*, http://www.calgary.ca/CA/City-Clerks/Pages/Corporate-records/Archives/Historical-information/Past-Mayors-and-Aldermen.aspx, accessed 25 Feb 2015.
[373] Dr. M. Costello, "Bitter Warfare is Waged by Costello Against Hunt," 2 December 1911, GAI Scrapbook of Clippings, M-2743.
[374] "Electors of Calgary," *CH*, 11 December 1915, 1.
[375] Hunt Offers: Big Business," *CH*, 10 December 1914, 1.

and that Hunt would have "the liquor men after his scalp."[376] Even Dr. Kerby distanced himself from Hunt, the *Herald* citing that "Rival newspapers tried to link them in last ditch attempts to beat Costello." It also described Kerby as being "very indignant" and he "at once repudiated it." He told the paper, "It is true that I have been invited to attend the meeting and address the gathering, but I have no intention of speaking on anything except school matters." Kerby reiterated that Hunt was not a running mate.[377] Hunt and his ilk were already being edged out due to their misguided fanaticism, and perhaps after the disastrous election, he realized fairly quickly that the citizens' report was about to turn into another debacle he would have to live down.

Hunt's biography shows the strong link between Calgary's middle-class businessmen and their contributions to morality-based activities in an effort to create stronger commerce activity. Thomas Underwood was also featured in the Alberta history of 1912. He was chronicled as one "honoured for his straightforward methods he has followed." He was also noted as occupying "a more enviable position in business circles."[378] Underwood's position on the *MTRL* was on the Policy and Platforms committee.[379] In similar fashion, Polycarp Spurgeon Woodhall was "one of the most successful businessmen in Calgary." [380] The *Morning Albertan* published a letter from a soldier hinting at the animosity the committee aided in creating. The soldier "strongly criticizes one of the members of the committee, an owner of a large block in this city." He wrote, "We take our oath to be faithful and honest to death. If it wasn't for these same Tommies, how much business would there be in Calgary?" The soldier perhaps correctly identified the hypocrisy of certain business owners. He demanded an apology from the committee and threatened that the

[376] "He Should Dream Again," *CH*, 10 December 1914, 10.
[377] "Dr. Kerby Has No Connection With Hunt's Campaign," *CH*, 12 December 1914, 10.
[378] MacRae, 510.
[379] Alberta Temperance and Moral Reform League Opens Convention Here," *CH*, 18 February 1914, 1.
[380] MacRae, 926.

ranks would lobby for transfer to another city.[381]

When Hunt, Underwood, and Woodhall denied signing the report, the breech in the ranks of the temperance people quickly widened. Woodhall claimed he had not read the full report and did not stand behind many of the accusations. Hunt said he did not agree with "some of the statements." Nor did Underwood "concur" with some of its findings. F.H. Werry of the *Temperance and Moral Reform League* challenged this, saying they were present, heard the report, and agreed with it. Although Hunt had a few objections that had been struck from the report, Werry countered that Hunt had stood behind every word, even though, "The report as first drafted was far worse than when it finally appeared. If any of the moral reformers of Calgary repudiate the report, then it is time they were reformed themselves."[382]

It is possible that the three men who recanted became aware that moral reform objectives were colliding with their business interests and reputation in the community. The citizens' committee did not represent all of Calgary's Christian leaders. Public opinion did not support the efforts of the citizen's committee, nor was the reaction of local ministers in solidarity with the findings of the report. The churches were divided on the issue. Rev Fallis of the Trinity Methodist Church defended the intention to "simply awaken the public's interest." He maintained that the report was compiled to "protect the soldier from the things that spelled harm to them," but he was not sure it was used in the wisest of ways. Rev. Thompson of the Anglican Church was quick to argue that the proper tactic would be to help the soldier and create alternatives to the saloon; he distanced his congregation from the "fanatics." [383]

Understanding the allegiances of the respective newspapers reveal how the citizens' report

[381] "A Soldier's Protest," *MA*, 10 April 1915.
[382] "Two Members Of The Committee Refute The Report," *CH*, 6 April 1915, 1.
[383] "Report Gets Praise and Blame in City Pulpits," *MA*, April 12, 1915, 5.

was discussed in the public forum, and further, how they framed the soldier's conduct in the public eye. Bob Edwards' paper, *The Eyeopener*, was more satirical and contained more editorials than actual news, but always poked fun at social reformists. The *Calgary Herald*, while not publically upholding liquor interests, did not support prohibition and thought moderation made more sense. The *Albertan* stood behind Prohibition minded citizens. The *Herald* understood the value of portraying the soldiers in a positive light so as not to cause alarm among citizens. The *Albertan*, bent on changing the landscape of Calgary to reflect middle class values and morality, was willing in the first few days of the revelations to feature the soldiers as an example of those under the threat of liquor interests. Covering the citizen's report on April 8, the *Albertan* called the results of the statistics taken by the committee "of a sufficiently startling nature to justify the following actions…" The committee was to send a delegation to Edmonton to petition Premier Sifton for an act that would close the bars at seven p.m. and also to institute prohibition earlier than 1 July 1916, preferably by Christmas, if the proposed referendum was successful. The delegation would stress the need for greater action by the police force and to drive out the "denizens" operating the houses of ill fame. Further, Sifton should be made aware of the negligent parents who allow their young daughters out in the evening without a chaperone.[384]

The *Albertan* highlighted the charges of assault while noting the complete lack of police presence during the incidents. Sharpe was quoted as saying, "We do not want to harass the soldiers, (only to) see conditions such that the men in uniform are not disgraced by those members who apparently yield to the temptations allowed to lie in their path." While the same statistics are listed, the *Albertan's* choice of wording highlights the scandalous nature of the

[384] "Clean Up The City," *MA*, 8 April 1915, 2.

implications of the report. They also published the report in full, probably at the request of the committee, entitled "To Protect the Boys in Uniform," addressed to the citizens of Calgary. The importance of their mission was introduced as, "We, the committee of citizens' appointed by representative citizens to gather reliable information concerning conditions in our city, particularly with reference to the drink and immorality problems." Who they were representing is the most important consideration in this statement. In truth, they acted as the conduit for the self-appointed citizens' committee. Within a few days, the *Calgary Herald* refused to allow further discussion of the report. Within a week, the incident disappeared from public debate in both papers, likely due to a letter written by Gilbert Sanders to federal authorities.

Gilbert Sanders was the court magistrate who dealt with all the drinking and bawdy-house infractions. Calgary's reputation of leniency in 1911 had also resulted in a call for a new magistrate. Therefore as the former head of the N.W.M.P., Sanders was appointed to reside over the courts.[385] He had served the Prairie West since 1887 and presided over some of the most notorious cases, including against Louis Riel. Calgary historian Thomas Thorner notes that Sanders held the support of Calgary's Liberal party.[386] He had a solid reputation as a magistrate who imparted fair and impartial judgments, and who believed most crime was linked to the rising immigrant population. He "echoed the prevailing middle class obsession which placed the responsibility on crime on a lack of both religion and discipline in the home." He was never publically vocal in support of moral reform. [387] Later, during the interwar period, Police Chief Cuddy criticized Sanders as being too lenient in both the *Liquor Act* legislation and in criminal cases. Sanders was not supportive of prohibition legislation, believing it was a demoralizing act

[385] Thomas Thorner,"Keeper of the King's Peace," 47.
[386] Ibid., 47.
[387] Ibid., 49.

and was "satisfying the whims of the fanatic, the politician, and the bootlegger, and in the long run (was) making poor legislation." In his mind, prohibition only "promoted disrespect for the law."[388] He differed from many of the middle class in his conception of the crux of the problem of drunken soldiers.

In April of 1915, Sanders wrote a memorandum to the federal government in response to the citizens' committee charges of drunkenness and immorality amongst soldiers. Sanders maintained that Sam Hughes had overridden the King's regulations by ordering that the soldiers of the *CEF* be immediately discharged after the first charge of drunkenness, a rule Hughes endorsed while reorganizing the training camps before the war. The harsh decree deprived the *CEF* of many valuable men. Therefore the military authorities had responded by overlooking all cases of drunkenness within the ranks "for fear of losing good soldiers." He added, "This order is one which apparently applied to the Permanent Militia in time of Peace and it is causing amongst the Expeditionary Force, a serious loss of men whom a large amount of time and money has been expended in their training." Sanders concluded by stating, "This operates against good discipline." [389] The federal government responded with a vague answer calling his charges "unanswerable." The Commissioner assured Sanders that "The King's orders should not be over-ridden," as Hughes had done, and "possibly some good may come from his memorandum." [390] There is no discernable "good" indicated except that the newspapers continued to highlight the positive qualities of the men in khaki. Just as the reports from overseas were prohibited from entering Canada, the Chief Censor probably ordered this conflict to be ignored. As in Winnipeg, this incident foreshadowed deeper conflicts between city authorities and the soldiers.

---

[388] 3 March 1914, *CH*, in Thomas Thorner, "Keeper of the King's Peace," 48.
[389] Gilbert Sanders, Letter to Federal government, 10 April 1915, *GAI*, M-1093.
[390] Gilbert Sanders, Letter From The House of Commons, 10 April 1915, Personal Papers, *GAI*, M-1093, File 74.

The conflict hearkens back to the concerns of Winnipeg's Crown Prosecutor Graham, who shared Cuddy's desire to enforce the liquor laws more stringently. As noted, Graham had warned Winnipeg city police to bring drunken soldiers to him instead of releasing them to the military police. Sanders and Cuddy represent the dichotomy between social reform and recruitment commitments. Cuddy understood his responsibility to Calgarians. Unfortunately, his notion of "Calgarian" was a small representation of citizens that excluded the working class and catered to the voice of the middle-class, who needed to retain the perception of the saintly soldier. Cuddy's reputation as a strong enforcer of the law was at stake and his measure of success was based on how well he cleaned up the city and protected the purity of the enlisted men. Sanders' loyalty to the cause of the Great War is evident in that he left the court to join the *CEF* in later 1915. He returned to the Magistrate's office after the war, but William Davidson replaced him from 1915-1918, and upheld Cuddy's strict philosophy of enforcement.

Despite the poor reception of the citizen's report, the *MRTL* was successful when they lobbied the provincial government, demanding a referendum on the subject of the sale of alcohol. A plebiscite for the Prohibition Act in Alberta was set for 21 July 1915. The day before the vote, the *Herald* promised full coverage, with returns announced on flashing bulletin boards on First Street West, in addition to extra editions of the paper.[391] Additionally, they printed a synopsis of the ten pertinent items that would be legislated under the Act. These items outlined what was considered an intoxicating alcohol, who would be allowed to buy, sell and distribute alcohol, and restrictions surrounding where limited quantities may be stored. Liquor could still be manufactured in Alberta and shipped out of province in compliance with the British North American Act. Individuals could purchase liquor from out of province vendors. But liquor

[391] "Herald Will Have Complete Returns of Tomorrow's Voting," *CH*, 20 July 1915, 1.

manufactured within Alberta could not be sold in Alberta. This act targeted the working class and provided many lucrative loopholes during the Prohibition era for distilleries and breweries.[392]

The day after the election, the *Herald* reported a record day at the polls, with "a constant stream of voters so heavy that long before noon, it was estimated that from one-fifth to one-half had registered their vote." There was "a great dissatisfaction" reported at many polling booths, because of the inconvenient and limited places to vote. Also, "licensed victuallers were highly incensed at the tactics adopted by their opponents." It was noted that the temperance people tried to take over the booths and prevent any "wets" from casting a ballot. One representative told the *Herald*, "Not the least active member of the opposition who were harassing voters, was W.G. Hunt, who was resorting to every conceivable device in challenging the voters." [393] The editorials of 21 July 1915 featured a poem submitted by an overseas soldier protesting the desire of prohibitionists to take away the rum ration,

> I suppose we're a lot of heathens,
> Don't live on the angel plan,
> But we're sticking it here in the trenches
> And doing the best we can.
>
> While preachers over in Canada,
> Who rave about kingdom-come,
> Ain't pleased with our ability
> And are wanting to stop our rum.
>
> Water, they say, would be better,
> Water! Great Scott! out here?
> We're up to our knees in water,
> Do they think we're standing in beer?
>
> Oh! It sounds all right from a pulpit,
> Where you sit in a cushioned pew,
> But try four days in the trenches
> And see how water would do.

[392] "The Chief Provisions of the Proposed Alberta Liquor Act," *CH*, 20 July 1915, 1.
[393] "Vote on Liquor Act is Expected to Be Record Poll Here," *CH*, 21 July 1915, 1.

They haven't the heart to say "Thank you,"
For fighting in their behalf.
Perhaps they object to our smoking,
Perhaps it's a fault if we laugh!

Some of those coffee-faced blighters,
I think must be German bred,
It's time they called in a doctor
For it's water they have in their head.
G. Drewett[394]

The liquor act passed with a majority with equal representation in both rural and urban populations.[395] Before the final results were in, the numbers were moving from an original 19,054 down to 17,808, still a confident win, but the results of the Edmonton area had not been counted.[396] The soldiers' vote was challenged. Not many were able to vote, but those who did were called back to prove that they were actually entitled to vote. The *Herald* noted that it was very unlikely that military authorities would give the men another day's leave to appear "Hence, the soldiers who had their votes challenged will lose them," because if they failed to appear, their vote would not be counted. The mandate applied to nearly every soldier who voted. An estimated 1000 men showed up to vote; Chief Cuddy said about a third more appeared, but left when they grew tired of waiting in the hot sun.[397] The following day, the *MRTL* issued a statement regarding the validity of the soldiers' votes, and decided to cancel the challenge due to the sweeping majority of votes in favour of the Act.[398] Despite the criticism of this obvious prejudice shown by the "drys," the *Herald* vowed to "support the government in the utmost in a stringent

[394] "From the Trenches," *CH*, 21 July 1915, 6.
[395] "Majority for Liquor Act in Neighborhood of 20,000," *CH*, 21 July 1915, 1.
[396] "Dry Majority Now in the Neighborhood of 18,000," *CH*, 23 July 1915, 1
[397] "Large Number of Voting Soldiers Are Summoned," *CH*, 22 July 1915, 1.
[398] "Disputed Ballots Are Abandoned By Both Interests," *CH*, 23 July 1915, 6.

enforcement of the law as endorsed by yesterday's vote."[399] The soldiers' voice was rendered absolutely inconsequential.

Attempts to quell drinking were not successful. The long winter eventually took its toll on the bored soldiers still awaiting deployment. In February of 1916, soldiers descended upon three restaurants believed to be either owned by Germans, or guilty of employing Germans. They destroyed the establishments and yet later, the incidences were referred to as "small," because the targets of the men were enemy aliens.[400] Lackenbauer acknowledges that the "soldiers stationed in Calgary soon perceived themselves to be an easy and unfair target." The destruction began, according to Lackenbauer, when an employee of a downtown cabaret supposedly declared that "he was there to serve gentlemen and not soldiers."[401] The riots were inspired by a shared hatred for the Germans and provided the means to prove allegiance to the ranks. Eventually, the saloons were forced to forbid soldiers from entering and charges were laid against anyone who sold alcohol to them. These measures were enforced until Prohibition became the law of the land.

[399] "Yesterday's Vote," *CH*, 22 July 1915, 6.
[400] James Abel Hornby, "Letter to Costello," Personal Papers, M-537-2, l12 October 1916, *GAI*.
[401] Lackenbauer, "Under Siege," 4.

John Barleycorn Is Down And Out.[402]

On 1 July 1916, Alberta enacted the Prohibition Act to the delight of temperance workers.[403] On June 30, 1916, every saloon in Calgary was filled to capacity and drunken soldiers trundled to their barracks with their pockets loaded with the last legal offerings of ale and whiskey. To their disappointment, it was confiscated upon their rowdy arrival at camp.[404] The Act promised to regulate the behaviour of those regarded as being the most vulnerable to the ravages of alcohol and who needed outside influence to control their impulses. In the 60 years previous, this targeted group was composed of the working-class, but in 1916, nobody needed the guidance of the forces of social reform more than the citizen soldier boy. Further, nobody needed the reassurance that this was happening more than the middle-class citizen who labored for the cause of purity and holiness. Unfortunately, reality proved that purity and holiness was harder to achieve and could not simply be legislated. Despite punitive legislation to prevent bootlegging and supplying alcohol to soldiers, it was common for police to haul in drunken soldiers on a regular basis.

The summer of 1916 passed and the controversy of drunken soldiers remained. The police and the new court magistrate Davidson imposed harsh fines for soldiers who broke the liquor laws. While fines for citizens for drunkenness were minimal at $4.00- $5.00, soldiers were fined $50.00 per offense. This was a nearly impossible sum to pay; consequently those who could not were shipped to the Lethbridge prison to serve 30 days. Lackenbauer analyses the resulting actions created by these harsh terms as follows:

---

[402] "Alberta Went Dry Without Much Disturbance," *MH*, 3 July 1916, 1.
[403] Hugh Dempsey, "The Day Alberta Went Dry," *Alberta History*, Spring (58) 2, 2010, 13-14.
[404] Sanders, Harry M. "Calgary's King Edward Hotel," *Alberta History* 51.4 (2003): 46- 50, *World History in Context*. Web. 29 Nov. 2014, 48.

On the night of 11 October 1916, 200 soldiers marched to the barracks of the RNWMP to demand the release of six soldiers being transported to Lethbridge and rumoured to be confined at the barracks until morning. Local citizens joined the group as they made their way to the holding area. The soldiers were fueled by alcohol and stormed the barracks demanding their release and proceeded to destroy the building. Several officers were seriously injured, and one was shot.

Local authorities were at a loss as to how to curtail such incidents. On 12 October 1916, Alderman James A. Hornby wrote to R.B. Bennett to appeal for government intervention. Hornby believed it was "time for Ottawa to make a careful inquiry and make arrangements so that there were no further occurrences of this nature." Hornby was most concerned that enforcement of the liquor law was not being properly enforced among men who, once they donned the uniform, "feel that they are amenable only to their superior officer." He also requested that the Provincial Attorney General inquire into the "incumbent of the Magistrate's chair. I have watched his judgments very carefully (and) they are being made (in many cases) more especially to the military men."[405] Hornby was a prosperous contractor and also a member of the *MRTL*. He was reported to be a man of "sterling purpose" who had "always been interested in the welfare of the City of Calgary and (had) devoted a great deal of his time and energy to that end, always believing Calgary was destined to be a great city."[406] He was very concerned with the conditions of relations between the soldiers and citizens of Calgary. Bennett's response of 21 November 1916 was to place the responsibility on local civic authorities. Bennett rejected Hornby's charge regarding the attitude of the men, writing, "I am not disposed to think that citizen soldiers should believe that they are not subject to the civil law of the country, and I doubt very much (it) would be sound policy to carry into effect the suggestions you make." Bennett

[405] James Abel Hornby, "Letter to R.B. Bennett," 12 Oct 1916, Personal Papers, *GAI*, M-537-2.
[406] MacRae, 1017.

called the proposed interference of the federal government upon the appointment of the magistrate as "impertinent." Bennett agreed, however, that the "outbreak" negatively affected the views towards the discipline of the District.[407] There is no evidence that the federal government was ever willing to interfere with military authorities. Lackenbauer argues this demonstrates the lack of discipline the military had on the soldiers.[408] While this is accurate, it must be acknowledged that Sam Hughes effectively tied the hands of military authorities to act appropriately in cases of drunkenness in his insistence on immediate discharge for the first offense.

As Magistrate Sanders had warned, recruitment needs had exceeded the dwindling supply of volunteers. While Bennett was conceding there was a discipline problem within the District, he did not speak to the reasons for the lack of discipline, as had been explained by Magistrate Sanders a year earlier. Federal and military officials were not willing to officially acknowledge the damaging effects upon recruitment that was inevitable when reformers demanded tighter moral regulations in light of the growing animosity. Discharging men for behaviour that historically was not only acceptable, but as an integral part of the military experience, forced them to turn a blind eye to this particular offense. The melding of total war sacrifice with the idealistic faith that the war was the purifying agent for Canada could not be sustained without consciously overlooking these indiscretions. Recruitment numbers could not be filled amidst so many public displays of drunkenness, and so an impasse was created.

[407] James Abel Hornby, *GAI* "Letter from Bennett," 21 November 1916.
[408] Lackenbauer, "Under Siege," 2-12.

Conclusion

As has been discussed, the temperance cause gained momentum directly as a result of the war. The most obvious examples of the dangers of vice in Calgary were the citizen soldiers in training, and they were quickly targeted. Sam Hughes embodied the dichotomy of the age. He was in charge of the Canadian Expeditionary Force and ultimately for recruiting. But his commitment to his prohibition stance and his pre-war promise to Canadian mothers to maintain the purity of their sons contributed to the breech in relations between the military, the government, and local citizens.[409] The implementation of the Prohibition Act in provinces across Canada did not stem the animosity between civilians and soldiers that had grown as a result of the draconian measures taken to control their behaviour. Outbreaks and disturbances by soldiers occurred nationwide, as has been evident in reports in the *MFP* and *CH*.

Another riot occurred on 10 March 1916 in Toronto, when, "Several hundred soldiers and civilians presumably opposed to prohibition, attacked a huge temperance rally procession, on its way to the parliament buildings." Many demonstrators were wounded and most of their banners were destroyed. It began in front of the Central YMCA. As the procession began to move, "convalescent soldiers at the military hospital assembled in front and expressed themselves regarding the efforts of the *Committee of One Hundred* to bring prohibition to Ontario." When their most imposing banner arrived, the soldiers started a riot that lasted about fifteen minutes. The soldiers pulled the banner to pieces and beat the marchers over the head and injuring more with chunks of ice. The riot was quelled upon the arrival of Brigadier General Logie, who promised to "hold a strict inquiry and punish those found guilty." Within a few days, companies of soldiers were stationed downtown to patrol every night "after 6:30 until a late hour." They

[409] "Dry Canteens For All Military Units," *CH*, 5 April 1915, 7.

were to deal with any misbehavior of their fellow soldiers.[410] This episode, as the ones in Winnipeg and Calgary, was the common response of the soldiers when the social control groups used alcohol as a tool to manipulate public discourse in order to enact their pet project of prohibition. By censuring the soldiers' actions, they failed to see the man under the uniform. The soldiers were supposed to embody the Edwardian/Victorian ideal of masculinity. As we have seen, this was a British ideal that encompassed holding the British Protestant values of "manly" strength, self-control and purity.

Gilbert Sander's letter written in April of 1915 to the federal government described the contradiction within the military and explains the cause of the tensions between the public, the courts, and military authorities in the matter of discipline. Moral reformers were reacting to soldiers' drunken behaviour. Their Edwardian/Victorian worldview influenced them to believe that purity and holiness was possible only if "the boys" were under their guidance and kept away from immoral influences. It would seem the absolute factor for this disconnect was a matter of faith for social reformers, or lack of on the part of military officials. In light of this, the appointment of the egocentric Sam Hughes is most puzzling. His banning of wet canteens in 1911 should have been enough to replace him when war was declared and his apparent lack of ability to apply reason over faith.

There were two factions among the West's elite. The first were made up of the businessmen such as Hornby and Hunt who were active in their churches and benefited from increased security. There were also those such as Harold Riley and Dr. Kerby, who genuinely believed that the only way for Canada to win a Holy War was for the soldiers to do battle as Christ's emissaries on the battlefield, just as citizens were attempting on the home front. The military as

[410] "Ontario Wets To Out Stiff Fight Prohibition Procession," *MFP*, 10 March 1916, 4.

the second faction was responsible for actually carrying out the war and understood it could only continue with an abundance of recruits. This was a mandate from the government and was borne out in the creation of the Chief Censor's position. They understood recruitment would be affected if the public were made aware of soldiers' conduct as they prepared their minds and bodies for war. R.B. Bennett was of the former group, but refused to publically acknowledge the problem of soldiers drinking. As Borden's man, he was committed to seeing the Prime Minister's promise of a half a million soldiers followed through to fruition. Bennett's myriad interests show a man who knew the value of compromise and when to act in the best interests of his colleagues, while maintaining an air of respectability and faithfulness to his beliefs. When the delegation representing the Calgary citizen's committee brought their concerns to the legislature in Edmonton, Premier Sifton, who was no friend to Bennett but understood the negative implications of using temperance as a political platform, effectively stopped them. He did eventually concede to holding a referendum on prohibition.[411]

In Winnipeg, the social order was such that the masses did not need to be convinced to legislate prohibition. As has been shown, prohibition was already in place in half of the province under local option before the war. The other half was under a licensing system, which was the preferred method of control by Roblin. Once Norris became premier, he was not afraid of implementing social reform policies and succeeded in passing several bills that Roblin resisted, including the franchise for women. In Manitoba, the difference was contained in the political motives of the Norris Liberal government, once they were granted power. The will of the people seemed to largely gel with the aspirations of the politicians. The demand for prohibition was so strong that no utterances of political posturing were heard after the Roblin government fell in

[411] Visit To Premier," *MA*,"10 April 1915, 1.

disgrace.

In Calgary, the device of using the soldiers as a means to achieve prohibition was met with a major consensus decrying such tactics. Even the *Morning Albertan* immediately stopped publishing anything that criticized the men in khaki and denounced any who would use such measures to further their temperance agenda. Only four short days after the report was published, and the day after the sympathetic but firm Premier Sifton refused to bow to partisan tactics, Mrs. Woodhall, whose husband had signed and then quickly repudiated the report, spoke about the duty of women in the temperance cause. She "called upon the women of the city to do their share in seeing that the plebiscite carried in July, (it) was the privilege and duty of the women of Alberta to create a public sentiment that the men would be almost compelled to vote."[412] Temperance workers were shifting the focus to the importance of the role of women to achieve their agenda, and away from soldiers' conduct. By Saturday, the *Morning Albertan* had labeled the citizen's committee report as "The Notorious Report."[413] Even though it has been demonstrated in Cameron's legal case files, and in the revelations of James Gray, the soldiers were indeed engaging in illegal and immoral activities.

The soldiers' attitude towards controlling measures was very similar across the country, and they resented the imposition of social control efforts. This resentment was apparent in their choice of activities and in their reaction to being denied the right to drink. Soldiers' letters indicate that they were not happy with the reputation they held on both the home front and overseas. The soldiers in training were in a liminal phase as a rite of passage, so described by noted ethnographer Arnold van Gennup, who posited that this phase was fraught with danger and uncertainties, due to the social order

[412] "Women are Called Upon To Aid the 'Dry' Campaign," *MA*, 12 April 1915, 5.
[413] "Calm Succeeds Storm," *MA*, 10 April 1915.

they were being forced to enter.[414] The soldiers were stepping into a new world, shedding their civilian rights and coming under the control of the military. With alcohol being the historic ritual accompanying the military's rite of passage as described by Tim Cook, the citizen soldiers necessarily had to step away from a world of social control and holiness in order to become men who could face death and destruction in cataclysmic proportions.[415]

"Fear gives rise to policies," writes political scientist and social anthropologist Iver Neumann, "many which are geared towards heightening security." These policies may have many effects, he explains, including marginalizing those in the liminal phase. [416] Members of the social reform movement were motivated by deep fears that accompany war and sought to maintain control in areas where they could see their influence. Their fears heightened their faith; the assurance of faith was born out in behaviour that strived to be as pure and holy as Christ. The soldiers may very well have carried this faith also, however in the new world of combat training, there was no room for a serious entertaining of Christian values lived out in the same manner as civilians were able to.

Still, the war served as a springboard for Prohibitionists which, in 1914, had called for "real men" to lead the fight.[417] The rhetoric based on the British values of sacrifice and duty was emphasized in recruitment and was also used by Prohibitionists to further their agenda. They declared that if war was to be the purifier of the nation, then Prohibition must be complete. It was a firmly held position that Canadians would never achieve the God-ordained purity it was meant to as long "King Alcohol" ruled. Church leaders, some who were formerly pacifists, began to

---

414 Iver Neuman, "Introduction to the Forum on Liminality,*"* *Review of International Studies* 38, 2, (April 2012): 473.
415 Tim Cook, "Wet Canteens and Worrying Mothers," *Social History* 35, 70, (2002): 317.
416 Neuman, "Introduction to the Forum on Liminality," 473.
417 "Real Men to Enforce Liquor Act," *CH*, 19 February 1914, 12.

convince their congregations that the war held a noble purpose and touted its potential to purify individual Canadians, and the nation of Canada, as pure silver which had gone through the fire.[418] Though deeply religious, this was not an age of grace. The salvation of Christ had to be earned. Scripture highlighting the promise of purity through pain was directed to both individuals and the nation, and was quoted regularly from the pulpit and in newspaper headlines. The fiery sermons usually served to create fear and trembling and were aimed against those who would threaten the purity of the faithful, but ultimately, these fears produced obedience in the listeners. For this generation, the enemy had a tangible face. The Biblical enemy, once an otherworldly devil, had become personified in the Kaiser and his minions. On the home front, the bar owners became emissaries of the Kaiser and therefore, Satan. James Pitsula also notes the carefully managed notions of duty and sacrifice contrasted with the "evil Hun," associated with the liquor trade.[419] These examples, and those cited throughout the body of this essay, show the philosophy behind the creation of the ideal image of the soldiers, who were expected to reflect the social construct by which Canadians ordered their understanding of sacrifice and duty.

While the sacrifice of Christ offered redemption and comfort, it became the soldiers' duty as His representatives to bear the cross in word and deed, and to personify the ideal image of Christ. This Christ, as has been shown, was a heroic and masculine entity. American evangelist, Billy Sunday, a popular and oft-quoted speaker, equated manliness with Christ and abstinence.[420] This was the example used for youth cadets before the war began, its energy harnessed by Hughes in a bid to win public favour. Additionally, the "ideal soldier," it was believed, came from a middle-

[418] For Biblical references, see Psalm 66:10, I Peter 1:7, I Cor.3:15, Ps. 17:3, Ps. 26:6, Zach. 13:9, Job 23:10, Ps.7:9, Ex. 15:25 and Mal. 3:3.
[419] James Pitsula, "For All We Have and Are: Regina and the Experience of the Great War," (University of Winnipeg Press: Winnipeg, 2008), 4.
[420] "Sunday May Come," *MFP*, 9 December 1915, 9.

class home; therefore the negative influence of working-class habits caused great concern. In December of 1915, an advertisement appeared in the *MFP* to promote a class through the YMCA called "The Secret of Success." The three key components were ability, application and honesty. However, sobriety was the most commendable asset in a businessman.[421] Hence, it is not surprising that if sobriety was a sought for ideal for the businessman, it became of the utmost importance for the soldier to demonstrate this model image. An article calling for total abstinence cited earlier in the *MFP* said, "It has been proven by the most careful Scientific Experiments and completely confirmed by actual experience in Athletics and War." The article "proved" that alcohol slowed the powers to see signals, confused proper judgment, spoiled accurate shooting, hastened fatigue, lessened resistance to disease and exposure and increased shock from wounds. It concluded by stating that, "We therefore most strongly urge you for your own health and efficiency that at least as long as the war lasts, you should become Total Abstainers."[422] Just before the plebiscite on the Prohibition Act in Manitoba, David Lloyd George exhorted,

> We are fighting Germany, Austria and drink and as far as I can see, the greatest of these three deadly foes is drink…if we are to settle German militarism, we must first of all settle with the drink. Drink is doing more damage than all the German submarines put together.

To further his case against liquor, Lloyd George also quoted historical accounts in India written by Sir Charles Napier, "The Conqueror of Scinde," "I knew two regiments in this country, one drank, the other didn't drink. The one that did not has been almost destroyed, while the one that didn't was one of the finest regiments and got on as well as any in existence."[423] This runs counter to the military's longstanding tradition of the rum ration as an important morale

[421] 9 December 1915, "The Secret of Success," *MFP*, 9.
[422] "Kitchener Climbs on Water Wagon for War," *MFP*, 8 March 1915, 3.
[423] "Soldiers! Attention!" *MFP*, 8 March 1915, 3.

boost, and therefore an important aspect of fighting. Although not stated, this also demonstrates the class lines held, regarding the manly, middle class behaviour of the best regiment in India, and the drunken regiment that could best be summed up in the coarse behavour found in working class recruits.

The working-class was historically the target of social reformists, who believed this class inhabited the dark bar rooms where dangerous uprisings and every manner of immoral behaviour took place. The working class were not regarded as being capable of free thought to decide for themselves, but were led astray in the saloons because there was nowhere else to go. Social reform groups had been working on improving the conditions of the laboring classes and wrought some truly beneficial improvements. These included public health, education, and recreational outlets such as parks, libraries, the Boy Scouts, and the YMCA. Efforts were redoubled for the soldiers and using their prior experience, reformists created clubrooms and activities, and supported the Red Cross and the tobacco fund. In addition to these and many more efforts, they supported the returning soldiers. Through the Patriotic Fund, they assisted the wives and children of the men. But the good coming out of these attempts was always overshadowed by the specter of alcohol, which was largely blamed on the working class soldiers who were considered base. They were corrupting the middle class boys.

However, the melding of these various classes of men was necessary to form cohesive fighting units. Prohibition was a divisive factor in the military; it separated the men and after it was adopted, and created an imbalance within the ranks. The military authorities could not embrace Prohibition for these reasons, but this was lost on Sam Hughes. To maintain recruitment, the military had to publically uphold Prohibition values. By mid 1916, as Robert Rutherdale notes, “The pool of willing and able recruits had all but dried up,” and the newspapers began to

discuss the possibility of conscription.[424] One of Canada's greatest and most divisive crises- conscription- was enacted in 1917, and had the war not ended in 1918, threatened to dismantle Canada; its effects are still felt within relations between Francophone and Anglo Canadians.

It has been argued that after the Battle of the Somme, coincidentally beginning on 1 July 1916, Victorian/Edwardian ideals were swept away, ushering in the existential crisis of modernity. This rendered a complicated and jaded society that would influence Western society for decades to follow.[425] Prohibition could not last under the disillusionment of the interwar period. In Canada, it was the returning veterans who were most vocal in demanding the repeal of prohibition. It is not unreasonable to characterize Prohibition as the one of the greatest failed experiments of social control. It targeted the marginalized and accommodated the wealthy. First World War soldiers were the ideal foil to highlight the need for absolute measures and could veil the larger issues of class and race.

While the military was engaged in an imperative effort of recruitment, they were willing to utilize the idea of a Holy War and the image of the idealized soldier. All the while the scrutiny of the temperance movement unveiled the soldier as being very human and susceptible to alcohol. He was no longer the glorified and Christ-like soldier. This unraveling of the idealized soldier to some degree complicated recruitment efforts and played on the fears of the home front. Historians Robert Bothwell, Ian Drummond and John English agree that "The Union government reflected the nation in its own nervousness… (and) the confidence in the ability of the state to direct the

[424] Robert Rutherdale, *Hometown Horizon: Local Responses to Canada's Great War*, (UBC Press: Toronto, 2004), 80.
[425] For further reading, see Modris Eckstien, *Rites of Spring: The Great War and the Birth of the Modern Age*, (New York: Houghton Miffin Co., 1989) and Paul Fussel, *The Great War and Modern Memory*, (Oxford: University Press, 1975).

economy and *to enter new areas of social concern weakened."*[426] In 1917, the ultimate answer to waning recruitment became conscription. Although my research does not directly point to the implementation of conscription, these issues may have contributed as a factor leading to it. This essay by no means addresses the larger issues taking place across Canada at the time. Although Prohibition was eventually realized across the nation, how it was achieved and how the populations accepted it were varied and are worthy of individual studies. Additionally, the conflagrations that took place in Quebec, both regarding prohibition and conscription, deserve a more thorough analysis than this space is able to offer.

[426] Robert Bothwell, Ian Drummond and John English, *Canada: 1900- 1945,* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987), 133.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Boyce, Cyril D. "Prohibition in Canada: Prohibition and Its Enforcement." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 109 (Sep. 1923).

The Canadian Congregational Yearbook, 1915-1916.
http://www.archive.org/stream/canadiancongrega1915cong/canadiancongrega1915cong_djvu.txt
Accessed 29.10.2016.

MacRae, Archibald Oswald. *History of the Province of Alberta*. Calgary: The Western Canada History Company, 1912.

Porritt, Edward. "The Canadian Plebiscite." *The North American Review* 167 (504) November, 1898, 630-633.

.

Spence, F.S. *The Facts of the Case: For the Total Suppression of the Liquor Traffic. 1896*. Toronto: Newton Treloar, 1896, 3- 336.

Spence, Ruth Elizabeth. *Prohibition in Canada: A Memorial to Francis Stephens Spence*. Toronto: The Ontario Canadian Branch of the Dominion Alliance, 1919, 1-623.

City of Calgary Archives.
City Clerks Department Fonds.

Michael Copps Costello.

Glenbow Archives

Bennett, R.B. Personal papers, scrapbook.

Cameron, J.McKinley. Legal Case Files.

Costello, M.

Hornby, James Abel.

Sanders, Gilbert. Personal Papers.

Manitoba Free Press. University of Calgary Archives.

"Our Future, Our Past." *The Alberta Digitization Project.* http://www.ourfutureourpast.ca/newspapr/np_page2.asp?code=n6wp0750.jpg.

Calgary Herald.

Morning Albertan.

Peels Prairie Provinces. http://peel.library.ualberta.ca/bibliography/9021.53.2.html.

University of Manitoba Libraries. *Archives and Special Collections*. "Speechly Stansfield Family Fonds, 1866-1953." http://www.umanitoba.ca/libraries/units/archives/collections/complete_holdings/rad/mss/speechly_stansfield.shtml, 1998. Accessed 15 December 2015.

Secondary Sources

Artibise, Alan F.J. "Divided City: The Immigrant In Winnipeg 1874-1921." In *The Canadian City: Essays in Urban History*, edited by Gilbert Steltzer and Alan Artibise, Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1979, 360-391.

Artibise, Alan F.J. "The Urban West: The Evolution of Prairie Towns and Cities to 1930. In *The Canadian City: Essays in Urban History,* edited by Stelter, Gerald and Alan Artibise, Ottawa: McClelland and Stewart: Ottawa Institute of Canadian Studies, Carlton University, 1979, 109-133.

Azoulay, Dan. *Hearts and Minds: Canadian Romance at the Dawn of the Modern Era: 1900-1930.* University of Calgary Press: Calgary, 2011.

Bagley, Fred. *"A Legacy of Courage:" Calgary's Own 137th Overseas Battalion, C.E.F. Calgary*: Plug Street Books, 1993.

Blanchard, Jim. *Winnipeg's Great War: A City Comes of Age.* Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 2010.

Blanchard, Jim. *Winnipeg 1912: Diary of a City.* Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 2005.

Bliss, Michael. "The Methodist Church and World War I." *Canadian Historical Review* 49 (3) 1968, 213-233.

Bothwell, Robert, Ian Drummond and John English, *Canada: 1900- 1945.* University of Toronto Press: Toronto, 1987.

Boyko, John. “Bennett: The Rebel Who Challenged and Changed a Nation.” Toronto: Key Porter Books, 2010.

Bright, David. “Technology and Law Enforcement: The Transformation of the Calgary Police Force, 1900-1940s.” *Urban History Review* 33.2 (Spring 2005): 30-44.

CanadaHistory.com, *Canada History*, “Prime Ministers: R.B.Bennett.” http://www.canadahistory.com/sections/politics/Prime%20Ministers/RB%20Bennett.html Accessed 19 January 2015.

Blocker Jr Jack S. *Alcohol, Reform and Society: The Liquor Issue in Social Context*. Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1979, x- 289.

City of Calgary. “Biography of William George Hunt.” “Biography of Michael Copps Costello.” *Past Mayors and Aldermen*. http://www.calgary.ca/CA/city-clerks/Pages/Corporate-records/Archives/Historical-information/Past-Mayors-and-Aldermen.aspx Accessed 25 Feb. 2015.

Cook, Tim. “’He Was Determined to Go’: Underage Soldiers in the Canadian Expeditionary Force.” *Social History* 41 (81) 2008, 41-74.

Cook, Tim. *Shock Troops: Canadians Fighting the Great War, 1917-1918, Volume II*, Toronto: Viking Canada, 2008.

Cook, Tim. “Wet Canteens and Worrying Mothers: Alcohol, Soldiers and Temperance Groups in the Great War.” *Social History* 35 (70) 2002, 311-330.

Davies Wayne K. D. Quoted in *Encyclopedia of the Great Plains.* Ed., David J.Wishart. University of Nebraska- Lincoln, 2011. http://plainshumanities.unl.edu/encyclopedia//doc/egp.ct.008). Accessed 1 December 2014.

Delottinville, Peter. “Joe Beef of Montreal: Working-Class Culture and the Tavern, 1869-1889.” *Labour/Le Travail* 8/9(Autumn 1981-Spring 1982), 9-40.

Dempsey, Hugh A. “The Day Alberta Went Dry.” *Alberta History* 58.2 (Spring 2010), 10-16.

Dempsey, Hugh. *The Best of Bob Edwards*, Edmonton: Hurtig Publshing, 1975.

Dempsey, L James. “Monuments on the Hill: World War I Emblems in Calgary.”*Alberta History* 57.2 (Spring 2009) COPYRIGHT 2009 Historical Society of Alberta. http://www.albertahistory.org/default/index.cfm/membership/. Accessed 15 October 2014.

Dostie, Benoit and Ruth Dupre. “The People’s Will”; Canadians and the 1898 Referendum on Alcohol Prohibition.” *Explorations in Economic History* 49 (2012), 498-515.

www.elsevier.com/locate/eeh. Accessed 14 December 2015.

Duffet, Rachel. *The Stomach For Fighting: Food and the Soldiers of the First World War.* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2012.

Dupre Ruth and Desire Vencatachellum. "Canadians and Prohibition: An Analysis of the 1898 Referendum." Presented at the *Canadian Network for Economic History Conference.* Queen's University, April 15-17, 2005.

Eisenbach-Stengl, Irmgard. "From Temperance Movements to State Action: An Historical View of the Alcohol Question in Industrial Countries." In *From Science to Action: Alcohol Policies Revisited.* Ed. Richard Muller. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2004, 59-69.

Finch, Lynette. "Psychological Propaganda: The War of Ideas During the First Half of the Twentieth Century." *Armed Forces and Society* 26(3) (H.W.Wilson- SSA) April 2000.

Gray, James. *Booze: When Whiskey Ruled the West.* Winnipeg: Fifth House, 1972 & 1995.

Gray, James. *R.B. Bennett: The Calgary Years.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991.

Gray, James. *Red Lights on the Prairies*, Toronto: MacMillan of Canada, 1971.

Gwyn, Sandra. *Tapestry of War: A Private View of Canadians in the Great War*. Toronto: Harper Collins, 1992.

Herd Thompson, John. "The Beginning of Our Regeneration:" The Great War and the Western Canadian Reform Movements. *Canadian Historical Association,* Historical Papers, 7 (1), 1972, 231-245.

Heron, Craig. *Booze: A Spirited History*. Toronto: Between the Lines, 2003.

Heron, Craig. "The Boys and Their Booze: Masculinity and Public Drinking in Working Class Hamilton, 1890-1946." *The Canadian Historical Review* 86, 2005.

Humphries, Mark. "Between Commemoration and History: The Historiography of the Canadian Corps and Military Overseas." *The Canadian Historical Review* 95(3), Sept. 2014, 384-397.

Jenson, Richard. "Nationalistic and Civic Duty in Wartime: Comparing World Wars in Canada and the United States." *Canadian Issues* (Winter) 2004, 6-19.

Jones, David. "Census figures." *Alberta History* 56.1 (2008): 9. *World History in Context*. http://ic.galegroup.com 29 Nov. 2014.

Jones, David C. "The Zeitgeist of Western settlement and the Calgary Stampede." *Alberta*

History 60.3 (2012): 43+. Academic OneFile. http://go.galegroup.com.ezproxy.lib.ucalgary.ca/ps/i.do?id=GALE%7CA299061083&v=2.1&u=ucalgary&it=r&p=AONE&sw=w&asid=7730f2c77ffbd23589e20730c2ebe9d6. Web. 14 Jan. 2015.

Kenney, John. "The Business Career of RB Bennett: 1897-1927." *Unpublished Master's Thesis*, Concordia University, Montreal, 1977.

Keshen, Jeffrey. *Propaganda and Censorship During Canada's Great War*. University of Alberta, 1996.

Kimmel, Michael. "Manhood in America: A Cultural History." New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Korneski, Kurt. "Liberalism in Winnipeg, 18890's- 1920's: Charles Gordon, John W.Dafoe, Minnie J.B. Campbell, and Francis M. Beynon." *Proquest Dissertations and Thesis,* 2004, 195-239. Accessed 25 October 2014.

Lackenbauer, P. Whitney. "Soldiers Behaving Badly: CEF Soldiers "Rioting" in Canada During the First World War." In *The Apathetic and the Defiant: Case Studies of Canadian Mutiny and Disobedience, 1812-1919.* Ed., Mantle, Craig. 195-260.

Lackenbauer, P.Whitney. "Under Siege: The CEF Attack on the RNWMP Barracks in Calgary, October 1916." *Alberta History* 49.3 (2001): 2-12. Web. *Canadian Periodicals Index Quarterly.* 27 May 2015.

Lackenbauer, P. Whitney. "Partisan Politics, Civic Priorities, and the Urban Militia: Situating the Calgary Armoury, 1907-1917." *Urban History Review* 33(2005), 45-60.

Marshall, David B. "Khaki Has Become a Sacred Colour: The Methodist Church and the Sanctification of the World War I." In *Canadian Churches and the First World War*, edited by Heath, Gordon L. Hamilton: McMaster Divinity College Press, 2014, 102-32.

McNaught, Kenneth. *'A Prophet in Politics': A Biography of J.S. Woodsworth.* Toronto: University Press, 2001.

Miller, Carl H. "We Want Beer: Prohibition and the Will to Imbibe, Part I." http://www.beerhistory.com/library/holdings/prohibition_1.shtml Accessed September, 2014.

Mintz, Sidney. "Tasting Food, Tasting Freedom: Excursions into Eating, Power and the Past." Boston: Beacon Press, 1996.

Mole, Richard. *Whiskey Wars of the Canadian West: Fifty Years of Battles Against the Bottle*, Calgary: Heritage, 2012.

Morrison, John. *Hell Upon Earth: A Personal Account of Prince Edward Island Soldiers in the Great War, 1914-1918.* Summerside, P.E.I.: J. Clinton Morrison, 1995.

Moss, Mark. *Manliness and Militarism: Educating Young Boys in Ontario for War.* Don Mills: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Mosse George. *Image of Man: The Creation of Modern Masculinity.* Cary, N.C.: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Meyers, Jessica. *Men of War: Masculinity and the First World War in Britain*. Hampshire: MacMillan, 2009.

Neuman, Iver. "Introduction to the Forum on Liminality." *Review of International Studies* 38(2), April 2012, 413-436.

Noel, Jan. *Canada Dry: Temperance Crusades Before Confederation.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995.

O'Brien, Mike. "Manhood and the Militia Myth: Masculinity, Class and Militarism in Ontario, 1902-1914." *Labour/La Travail* (42) Fall, 1998.

Baum, Manfred. "Calgary: Atlantic Avenue Inglewood, Historical Walking Tours." *Old Town Calgary Society*. Alberta Community Development, 1999. http://www.culture.alberta.ca/heritage-and-museums/resources/historical-walking-and-driving-tours/docs/Tour-Calgary-Atlantic-Inglewood.pdf, accessed 26 November 2015.

Pernick, Martin."Defining the Defective: Eugenics, Aesthetics, and Mass Culture in Early 20th Century America," in *The Social Medicine Reader*. Gail Henderson et al,. New York: Garden City Publishing, 2005.

Pitsula, James. "For All We Have and Are: Regina and the Experience of the Great War," University of Winnipeg Press: Winnipeg, 2008.

Powers, Madelon. "The Lore of the Brotherhood: Continuity and Change in Urban American Saloon Culture, 1870-1920." 122- 145. In *Alcohol: A Social and Cultural History*, edited by Mack P. Holt. New York: Berg, 2006.

Roy, Patricia. *Boundless Optimism: Richard McBride's British Columbia.* UBC Press: Vancouver, 2012.

Rutherdale, Robert. *Hometown Horizons: Local Responses to Canada's Great War*, UBC Press: Toronto, 2004.

Sanders, Harry M. "Calgary's King Edward Hotel." *Alberta History* 51.4 (2003): 46- 50. *World*

History in Context. http://ic.galegroup.com/ic/whic/AcademicJournalsDetailsPage/AcademicJournalsDetailWindow?failOverType=&query=&prodId=WHIC&windowstate=normal&contentModules=&display-query=&mode=view&displayGroupName=Journals&limiter=&currPage=&disableHighlighting=false&displayGroups=&sortBy=&search_within_results=&p=WHIC&action=e&catId=&activityType=&scanId=&documentId=GALE%7CA109578881&source=Bookmark&u=ucalgary&jsid=9396fd189b111f3c1685601c1e4feee4From *World History in Context.* Web. 29 Nov. 2014.

Springhall, John. "Building Character in the British Boy: The Attempt to Extend Christian Manliness to Working Class Adolescents, 1880- 1914, 69-70. In *Manliness and Morality: Middle Class masculinity in Britain and America, 1800-1940,* edited by J.A. Mangan. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1987.

Socknat, Thomas. "Conscientious Objectors in the Context of the Canadian Peace Movements." *Journal of Mennonite Studies* 25 (2007), 61-74.

Stelter, Gerald and Alan Artibise. *The Canadian City: Essays in Urban History.* Ottawa: McClelland and Stewart: Ottawa Institute of Canadian Studies, Carlton University, 1979.

Stewart, Roderick. *Wilfrid Laurier, A Pledge for Canada.* Montreal: XYZ Publishing, 2002.

Stretch, Dianne Kathryn. "From Prohibition to Government Control: The Liquor Question in Alberta 1909-1929." *MA Thesis*, University of Alberta 1979.

The Manitoba Historical Society, "Memorable Manitobans,:Tobias Crawford Norris(1861-1936)," 1 September 2014. http://www.mhs.mb.ca/docs/people/norris_tc.shtml. Accessed 26 Feb. 2015.

Thorner, Thomas. "Keeper of the King's Peace: Colonel Sanders and the Calgary Police Magistrate's Court, 1911-1932." *Urban History Review* 12 (3), 45-55.

Thomas, Lewis G. *The Liberal Party in Alberta*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1959.

Tosh, John. "A Man's Place: Masculinity and the Middle-Class Home in Victorian England." New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999.

Troughton, Geoffrey. "Jesus and the Ideal of the Manly Man in New Zealand After World War One." *Journal of Religious History* 30 (1) Feb. 2006, 45-60.

Accessed 13 November 2014.

Vance, Jonathan. *Death So Noble: Memory, Meaning and the First World War*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 1997.

Waite, P.B. “In Search of R.B. Bennett.” Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2012.

Watkins, Ernest. “RB Bennett: A Biography,” London: Secker & Warburg, 1963.

Webb, Peter. “‘A Righteous Cause’: War Propaganda and Canadian Fiction, 1915-1921.” *British Journal of Canadian Studies* 24(1) Spring 2011, 31.

Weaver, John C. “Tomorrow’s Metropolis Revisited: A Critical Assessment of Urban Reform in Canada, 1890-1920.” In Stelter, Gilbert *The Canadian city: Essays in Urban and Social History 109*. Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1984, 456-477.

White, Anne M. “Evangelicalism, Revivalism and the Female Contribution: Emily Spencer Kerby,” *Historical Papers*, 1996 *pi.library.york.ca*, 89, 85-104.

Williams, John. *The Home Fronts: Britain, France and Germany, 1914-1918,* London: Constable and Company Ltd., 1972.

Wood, James. *Militia Myths: Ideas of the Canadian Citizen Soldier, 1896- 1921*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2011.

Valverde, Mariana. *The Age of Soap and Light: Moral Reform in English Canada, 1885-1925.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008.