

ROYAL REPRESENTATION, CEREMONY, AND CULTURAL IDENTITY
IN THE BUILDING OF THE CANADIAN NATION, 1860-1911

by

WADE ANDREW HENRY

B.A. (Hons.), The University of Manitoba, 1992

M.A., The University of Manitoba, 1993

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

(Department of History)

We accept this thesis as conforming
to the required standard

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

September 2001

© Wade Andrew Henry, 2001

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and study. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the head of my department or by his or her representatives. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Department of History

The University of British Columbia
Vancouver, Canada

Date September 17, 2001

Abstract

The process of nation-building in nineteenth century Canada involved the production of national symbols which could transcend sub-national loyalties, such as class, gender, ethnic, and religious identities, and unite the residents of the Canadian nation. While the symbols were many and varied, in this study I analyse the manner in which the Canadian state and civil society used royal ceremonies and representations to define and unify the Canadian nation between 1860 and 1911. The study focusses on the Canadian observances of Queen Victoria's Golden and Diamond Jubilees, her Memorial Services, the Coronation and Memorial Services of Edward VII, the Coronation of George V, and the royal visits of the Prince of Wales (Edward VII) in 1860 and the Duke of Cornwall and York (George V) in 1901.

Regarding society and social relations as neither static nor fixed, but multiple and contradictory, I use the concept of cultural hegemony combined with elements from the "new" cultural history to examine the complex nature of power, identity, and royal representation in the nation-building process. Specifically, I argue that male members of the middle class articulated representations of themselves, women, the upper and lower classes, and the monarchy in order to legitimise their social authority and consolidate themselves as a cultural hegemony in the new national society. In turn, women and the upper and working classes resisted these representations with images of their own designed to empower themselves. The traditional élite claimed public and royal affirmation of their leadership; women and the working class sought an equal place in the nation. Complicating matters, however, were ethnic and religious identities which impinged upon class and gender loyalties and further altered the nature of royal

representation and the formation and negotiation of a cultural hegemony. French Canadians, Irish Catholics, Jews, African and Asian Canadians, and the Peoples of the First Nations added their voices—and imagery—to the process of nation-building as each articulated representations of the monarchy in order to counter the dominant interpretations emanating from Protestants and whites. By doing so, they sought to either negotiate themselves a place within a wider hegemony or demand that their rights—and their place within the Canadian nation—be respected. Royal ceremonies and representations, then, were not trivial events in Canadian history. They comprised a fundamental feature in national imagery and played a vital part in the building of the Canadian nation.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Table of Contents	iv
List of Figures	v
Acknowledgements	vi
 CHAPTER I: Introduction	 1
 PART ONE: CLASS, GENDER, AND NATIONAL IDENTITY	
 CHAPTER II: The Royal Tour of 1860	 33
CHAPTER III: Queen Victoria, 1861-1901	98
CHAPTER IV: The Edwardian Era, 1901-11	148
 PART TWO: RELIGION, ETHNICITY, AND NATIONAL IDENTITY	
 CHAPTER V: Protestantism, Irish Catholicism, and French Culture, 1860-1901	 240
CHAPTER VI: Religion and Ethnicity During the Edwardian Era, 1901-11	306
CHAPTER VII: Aboriginal Tradition and Royal Representation, 1860-1911	348
 CHAPTER VIII: Conclusion	 426
 Bibliography	 431
Curriculum Vitae	472

List of Figures

2.1:	Map of the route of HRH the Prince of Wales through British North America and the United States, 1860	58
2.2:	Albert Edward, Prince of Wales, ca. 1860	77
2.3:	The Grand Ball given by the Mayor and citizens of Montreal in honour of the Prince of Wales, 27 August 1860	83
2.4:	Grand finale of fireworks in honour of the Prince of Wales and the successful completion of the Victoria Bridge, 1860	87
3.1:	Queen Victoria with her second daughter, Princess Alice, ca. 1862	107
3.2:	Queen Victoria, 1896	131
3.3:	Attending Funeral Service of Queen Victoria, Greenwood, BC, 2 February 1901	146
4.1:	Map of the route of the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York's tour of the British Empire, 1901	179
4.2:	School children await the arrival of the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York at Moose Jaw, 27 September 1901	188
4.3:	Letting the people see (?) the Duke—The official idea of how to encourage a hearty Canadian welcome, 1901	196
4.4:	Presentation of addresses at the Royal Pavilion on Parliament Hill, Ottawa, 20 September 1901	200
4.5:	Sir Wilfrid Laurier presents an address to the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York at the Royal Pavilion on Parliament Hill, Ottawa, 20 September 1901	202
5.1:	The Prince of Wales in Canada—The Orangemen's Arch at Toronto	290
7.1:	The Duke of Cornwall and York replies to an address at Shagannapi Point, 28 September 1901	403
7.2:	Natives assembled at the "Great Pow-wow," 28 September 1901	412

Acknowledgements

The completion of this dissertation would have been impossible without the assistance and support of a number of different people and organisations. Before I had even contemplated my doctoral program, Barry Ferguson, Peter Bailey, James Muir, and others during my Undergraduate and Master's studies at the University of Manitoba cultivated my interest in the issues I explore here. Ed Rea's superior research seminars prepared me for the rigorous work ahead. In conducting my research, I was aided by the knowledgeable and always accommodating reference staffs at the National Archives of Canada, the National Library, the Archives of Ontario, the British Columbia Archives and Record Service, the Provincial Archives of Manitoba, the City of Toronto Archives, the Vancouver City Archives, the Vancouver Public Library, and the University of British Columbia Library's Humanities and Social Sciences Division and Special Collections. The staff of the UBC Library's Interlibrary Loan Department deserves singular thanks for their unfailing assistance in fulfilling my countless requests for diverse and, sometimes, obscure material. I also must acknowledge—not due to any formal obligation, but by an honest appreciation—the financial support of the John S. Ewart Memorial Fund in providing financial support for my research trips to the National Archives. At the National Archives, I consulted, amongst so many other records, the papers of the 5th Marquis of Lansdowne for which I gratefully acknowledge the permission of the 9th Marquis of Lansdowne. Similarly, Sir William Gladstone afforded me permission to refer to portions of the 5th Duke of Newcastle's correspondence copied from the Glynne-Gladstone MSS at the Flintshire Record Office, Wales.

In the arduous process of transforming raw research and partially formed theories into a coherent dissertation, Bob Kubicek and Joy Dixon, as members of my Supervisory Committee, provided me with much valuable advice and encouragement for which I am indebted. Bob McDonald provided me with a new appreciation for the complexities of "class," although the explanation I provide in the following pages, no doubt, still does not conform to his better judgment. In this and, indeed, in all of the other shortcomings found in this dissertation, I am alone to blame. Helping me to minimize such faults and flaws every step of the way has been Allan Smith, my Supervisor, who transformed my garbled sentences into coherent prose and saved me from many an embarrassing mistake. I am indebted for his wise counsel, superior copy-editing skills, and encouragement.

For encouragement, of which I needed much, I am also grateful to my former co-workers—and continuing friends—at V.I.A. Canada Customs who, with their constant prodding, ensured that I would finish what at times seemed unfinishable. I incurred yet another debt—to which I am thankful—in the final stages of my work when Brygida Cross, Chief of the Vancouver Documentation Centre, Immigration and Refugee Board, decided to hire and then accommodate the constant leave requests of a doctoral student heavily involved in the demands of finishing a dissertation. Making this final, stressful period less burdensome has been Kaoru Sakazaki who has been a welcome distraction from my work. Finally, and certainly not least, I wish to thank my parents and family for their love and support. It is to them that I dedicate this work.

CHAPTER I

Introduction

In recent years the Canadian historical profession has come under increasing criticism from within. Prominent historians such as Michael Bliss, Jack Granatstein, and Doug Owram have complained of the “sundering” of Canadian history and the sinking of the profession into a “malaise,” developments they largely attribute to the rise and ascendancy of “limited identities” in Canadian historical scholarship and the subsequent abandonment of a nationally coherent vision of the country’s past.¹ Coined originally by Ramsay Cook, but popularised by J.M.S. Careless in his influential article of the same name, “limited identities” signified those other identities besides the nation which impinge on the Canadian experience, such as class, ethnicity, and region.² The study of these identities by some historians in many ways marked a reaction against the emphasis on the nation and national unity, the dominant perspective among Canadian historians until the late 1960s. While acknowledging that the study of labour, women, Natives, and other groups had been long overdue, some scholars express the concern that the study of these other identities one at a time has turned into too much of a good thing, much to the detriment of “national history.” The limited identities perspective, Jack Granatstein argues, was “almost openly anti-nationalist: it was not the nation that mattered, but ‘smaller, differentiated

¹Michael Bliss, “Privatizing the Mind: The Sundering of Canadian History, the Sundering of Canada,” *Journal of Canadian Studies* 26, no. 4 (1991-2): 5-17; J.L. Granatstein, *Who Killed Canadian History?* (Toronto, 1998); Doug Owram, “Narrow Circles: The Historiography of Recent Canadian Historiography,” *National History* 1 (1997): 5-21.

²J.M.S. Careless, “Limited Identities in Canada,” *Canadian Historical Review* 50, no. 1 (1969): 1-10.

provincial or regional societies'; not Canadians as a whole, but the components of the ethnic mosaic; not Canadians as a society, but Canadians in their social classes." In response to this perceived fragmentation of Canadian history, he advocates a return to considering "Canada as a nation, as a whole, as a society, and not simply as a collection of races, genders, regions, and classes."³

Despite its seeming image of grandeur in analysing Canada as a whole, Granatstein's call for a return to the study of Canada as a nation is actually very narrow in its scope.⁴ His definition of "national history" is limited to the political, diplomatic, and military events which purportedly united Canadians and his approach downplays the diversity and divisions in the Canadian past uncovered by the new social history. Far from a truly "national history," Granatstein advocates a return to a study of *his* definition of the nation. Yet, "the nation" is not a static unit which can be taken for granted. Indeed, as illustrated by the significant differences in opinion between Granatstein and the historians of the new social history, the nation is open to interpretation. Nevertheless, the suggestion for a return to a national perspective should neither be dismissed simply as a step backwards nor as a revocation of recent Canadian social and cultural history. While the decline of the nation-state's power in the days of globalisation

³Granatstein, *Who Killed Canadian History?*, 72, 77.

⁴For critiques of Granatstein's argument see: Graham Carr, "Harsh Sentences: Appealing the Strange Verdict of *Who Killed Canadian History?*" *American Review of Canadian Studies* (1998): 167-176; Chris Lorenz, "Comparative Historiography: Problems and Perspectives," *History and Theory* 38, no. 1 (1999): 23-39; A.B. McKillop, "Who Killed Canadian History? A View from the Trenches," *Canadian Historical Review* 80, no. 2 (1999): 269-299; Brian D. Palmer, "Of Silences and Trenches: A Dissident View of Granatstein's Meaning," *Canadian Historical Review* 80, no. 4 (1999): 676-686.

has influenced the demise of the nation as the central focus in Western historiography,⁵ the nation as a category of historical analysis remains relevant by the mere fact that it had been a central characteristic of the historical imagination and a fundamental feature of politics and society from the early nineteenth century to the 1960s. Accordingly, if any understanding of the “national era” is to take place the nation as a distinct historical category needs to be taken seriously and studied assiduously. The calls by nationally-minded scholars should be accepted as a challenge to historians to reconcile and integrate what have come to be regarded by some as two diametrically opposed perspectives into a “New National History.” That is, a national history not in the narrow sense of merely the political evolution of the nation-state nor in the fragmented terms of limited identities, but in a history in which all cultural identities are examined together in relation to the development of the nation.⁶ As Doug Owram has suggested, historians need to move beyond the analysis of a specific identity to look at the interplay between several and their relationship to the nation as a whole.⁷ Identities should not be regarded as “limited” and separated, but as multiple and interconnected. People hold many identities, any one of which may supercede the others at any given point in time depending upon the context.⁸ Furthermore,

⁵Lorenz, “Comparative Historiography,” 23-39; McKillop, “Who Killed Canadian History?” 285.

⁶For an example of such an approach to national history see Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837* (New Haven, 1992).

⁷Owram, “Narrow Circles,” 18.

⁸Allan Smith, “Introduction: The Canadian Mind in Continental Perspective,” in *Canada—An American Nation? Essays on Continentalism, Identity, and the Canadian Frame of Mind* (Kingston and Montreal, 1994), 9; Ramsay Cook, “Identities Are Not Like Hats,” *Canadian Historical Review* 81, no. 2 (2000): 260-265.

the fact that Canadians hold an array of different identities does not necessarily mean that they have been incapable of sharing a sense of national identity. "It is simply not the case," Phillip Buckner points out, "that most Canadians have seen a conflict between a sense of national identity and their regional, provincial or local loyalties...."⁹ Indeed, since at least the mid-nineteenth century Canadians have recognised that their community was divided by class, ethnicity, gender, religion, and other identities and they have tried to cross these so-called "limited" identities and divisions with a national vision which could unite them.

Lacking cultural uniformity, but requiring a consensus to survive, the Canadian state sought ways to encourage its diverse peoples to identify with the national political entity. In addition to the implementation of a series of "national" economic and political policies, such as John A. Macdonald's "National Policy" of tariff reform and railway building, the process of nation-building in nineteenth century Canada also involved the production of national symbols and metaphors which could transcend other loyalties and unite the residents of the Canadian state.¹⁰ While the national images constructed were many and varied, perhaps no other symbol received more attention as an instrument to consolidate the state and unify the nation than the monarchy. Indeed, from the first royal tour of British North America by a Prince of Wales in

⁹Phillip Buckner, "Whatever Happened to the British Empire?" *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association* 4 (1993): 20-21.

¹⁰Sean Purdy, "Building Homes, Building Citizens: Housing Reform and Nation Formation in Canada, 1900-20," *Canadian Historical Review* 79, no. 3 (1998): 492-523; Allan Smith, "Metaphor and Nationality in North America," in *Canada—An American Nation?*, 127-158; Idem, "National Images and National Maintenance: The Ascendancy of the Ethnic Idea in North America," in *Canada—An American Nation?*, 159-194; William Westfall, *Two Worlds: The Protestant Culture of Nineteenth Century Ontario* (Kingston and Montreal, 1989), 3-4; Randy Widdis, *With Scarcely a Ripple: Anglo-American Migration into the United States and Western Canada, 1880-1920* (Kingston and Montreal, 1998), 15-16.

1860 to the Dominion's observance of the Coronation of George V in 1911, royal ceremonies and regal representations figured prominently in the efforts of the state and civil society to define and unify the Canadian nation during this period of dramatic growth and sometimes turbulent development. Placed at the centre of a process of self and national definition, however, royal representations and ceremonies became more than mere national symbols. Reflecting the attitudes and values of their producers, the articulation of royal imagery was also a means of attaching a particular interpretation of social relations, status, and authority onto the nation. Using the concept of cultural hegemony combined with elements from the "new" cultural history, then, this dissertation will examine the complex nature of power, identity, and royal representation in the nation-building process. While, specifically, the dissertation focusses on this process in the Canadian experience between 1860 and 1911, the methodology laid out later in this introduction and applied in the following chapters offers a method of exploring the issues of power, representation, and national identity in other contexts as well.

Historiographical Analysis

Although it has not received adequate attention and analysis, the view that the monarchy has acted as a symbol of Canadian national unity in order to ameliorate social divisions and achieve social and political cohesion is not a new one. In large part a response to Quebec separatism and the Americanisation of the Canadian economy and culture in the 1960s and 1970s, scholars such as Frank MacKinnon, Jacques Monet, and W.L. Morton promoted the monarchy as a symbol of Canadian democracy, freedom, and unity.¹¹ They argued that allegiance

¹¹Frank MacKinnon, *The Crown in Canada* (Calgary, 1976); Jacques Monet, "The Canadian Monarchy: 'Everything That Is Best and Most Admired,'" in *The West and the Nation:*

to the Canadian Crown permitted cultural pluralism in ways in which the covenant ideology of the United States and its pressure for uniformity could not provide. In return for their allegiance, the monarchy respected the rights of its subjects and thus allowed a diversity of cultures, in particular English and French, to flourish in a single nation united by a common loyalty to the Crown. "In the Crown," Jacques Monet argued, "are symbolized the permanent aspirations of all Canadians...First among these has been and must continue to be a belief in the equal dignity of each individual person, regardless of class, religion, or ethnic origin." "The Canadian Crown is thus the living strength and majesty of this plural society. It is the sign and cause of our allegiance to each other...."¹² In comparison with the American Republic's imposition of cultural conformity to achieve national cohesion, the attainment of Canadian unity came through the monarchy's recognition of cultural difference and respect for freedom.

Despite their recognition of the importance placed on royal symbolism by the state in realising Canadian national unity, the work of MacKinnon, Monet, and Morton has been clouded by their motivation to justify the relevancy of the Crown in the 1970s and their open expressions of affection for the institution.¹³ The end result has been a scholarship which emphasises

Essays in Honour of W.L. Morton, eds. Carl Berger and Ramsay Cook (Toronto, 1976), 321-335; Idem, "La Couronne du Canada," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 11, no. 4 (1976): 27-32; Idem, *The Canadian Crown* (Toronto, 1979); W.L. Morton, *The Canadian Identity*, 2d ed. (Toronto, 1972). For similar arguments, see John Farthing, *Freedom Wears a Crown* (Toronto, 1957); Eugene A. Forsey, *Freedom and Order: Collected Essays* (Toronto, 1974); Ralph Heintzman, "The Meaning of Monarchy," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 12, no. 4 (1977): 1-2, 115-117.

¹²Monet, "The Canadian Monarchy," 324, 334.

¹³More recent studies of the monarchy in Canada have also been marred by sentimentality. See, for example, Arthur Bousfield and Garry Toffoli, *Royal Observations: Canadians and Royalty* (Toronto, 1991); Tom Macdonnell, *Daylight Upon Magic: The Royal*

sentimentality and downplays analysis.¹⁴ Furthermore, these studies have not recognised historical context nor contestation. Not only do they suggest that the Canadian Crown is inherently a guarantor and symbol of freedom and pluralism, but they contend that it has always been regarded, by nearly everyone, as such. Yet it is misleading to assert that the monarchy has any innate meaning and that the symbols that may be connected to the Crown at one particular time have always been related to it.¹⁵ As Ewan Morris points out in the Australian context, “the monarchy has no *inherent* meaning. The meanings attached to it are social constructions which vary widely across space and time and between different groups in society.”¹⁶ The idea that the monarchy permitted a unity in diversity to develop, for example, was not born in the 1960s, but had antecedents in the nineteenth century. At that time the concept was understood differently by various ethnic and religious groups and was developed and used in very different contexts to

Tour of Canada, 1939 (Toronto, 1989); Robert M. Stamp, *Kings, Queens, and Canadians: A Celebration of Canada's Infatuation with the British Royal Family* (Markham, Ont., 1987).

¹⁴For example, MacKinnon's analysis of royal ceremonial does not go much beyond defending it as a cost effective public relations measure. He does not recognise that it *means* anything besides preventing public business from being “boring” and giving politicians' wives “something to do and talk about.” MacKinnon, *The Crown in Canada*, 138-144.

¹⁵Canadian scholars have not been the only ones to make such assumptions. In their well-known analysis of the Coronation of Elizabeth II, the sociologists Edward Shils and Michael Young concluded that “the Coronation was the ceremonial occasion for the affirmation of the moral values by which society lives.” However, they offered no discussion of how these moral values were arrived at nor what makes them shared. For similar conclusions, and problems, see J.G. Blumer, J.R. Brown, A.J. Ewbank, and T.J. Nossiter, “Attitudes to the Monarchy: Their Structure and Development During a Ceremonial Occasion,” *Political Studies* 19, no. 2 (1971): 149-171; Philip Ziegler, *Crown and People* (London, 1978).

¹⁶Ewan Morris, “Forty Years On: Australia and the Queen, 1954,” *Journal of Australian Studies*, no. 40 (1994): 2.

serve sometimes diametrical interests.¹⁷ To understand the relationship between the monarchy and nation-building, then, consideration has to be given to *how* and *why* the monarchy came to symbolise national unity for some groups in society, what was the nature of this royal representation, and how and why did this symbolism vary between different groups and change over time.

Since the advent of the “new” cultural history in the 1980s, historians have paid greater attention to these questions. Influenced by literary theory and anthropological models, cultural historians have interpreted symbolic practices as “texts” permeated with multiple and contested meanings to be read and deciphered. Representation is no longer taken as a given, but as convoluted and inseparable from its context.¹⁸ Considering the position royal ceremonies hold at the centre of power, their age, and the variety of rituals involved in their staging, regal activities have excited some of the greatest interest from cultural historians. Scholars examining the workings of the monarchical state prior to the French Revolution have focussed on the “symbolics” and “theatre” of power articulated through royal ritual. Regarded as fundamental to the monarch’s exercise of power, royal imagery presented the ruler as supreme and vested with sacral qualities in order to legitimise his or her right to rule.¹⁹ In their study of the

¹⁷The association of the monarchy with the concept of unity in diversity in nineteenth century Canada is examined in Part Two below.

¹⁸Lynn Hunt, ed., *The New Cultural History* (Berkeley, 1989); Raphael Samuel, “Reading the Signs,” *History Workshop Journal*, no. 32 (1991): 88-109; Idem, “Reading the Signs: II. Fact-grubbers and Mind-readers,” *History Workshop Journal*, no. 33 (1992): 220-251.

¹⁹For example, see Peter Burke, *The Fabrication of Louis XIV* (New Haven, 1992); David Cannadine and Simon Price, eds., *Rituals of Royalty: Power and Ceremonial in Traditional Societies* (Cambridge, 1987); Linda Ann Curcio, “Saints, Sovereignty, and Spectacle in Colonial Mexico” (Ph.D. diss., Tulane University, 1993); Clifford Geertz, “Centers, Kings,

nineteenth century, however, historians note that growing class and ethnic divisions within states arising out of industrialisation, urbanisation, and the spread of nationalism prompted a shift in the nature of royal ceremonial to emphasise the monarch as a symbol of national unity. From analysing states and empires from Japan to Britain, scholars have concluded that the governing élites invented and manipulated royal ceremonies to represent the monarchy as a symbol of national identity in order to cultivate reverence for the institution, arouse respect for the social order, and unite the people.²⁰ The well-known work of David Cannadine and Eric Hobsbawm provides a case in point.

Hobsbawm explains that dramatic social changes in the late nineteenth century “called for new devices to ensure or express social cohesion and identity and to structure social relations... This required new methods of ruling or establishing bonds of loyalty.” One of these “new methods” was to use royal ceremonial to make the monarch the focus of his people’s unity—a symbol of the country’s greatness and permanence. As Cannadine put it, the monarch

and Charisma: Reflections on the Symbolics of Power,” in *Culture and Its Creators: Essays in Honor of Edward Shils*, eds. Joseph Ben-David and Terry Nichols Clark (Chicago, 1977), 150-171; Richard S. Wortman, *Scenarios of Power: Myth and Ceremony in Russian Monarchy. Volume One: From Peter the Great to the Death of Nicholas I* (Princeton, 1995).

²⁰David Cannadine, “The Context, Performance and Meaning of Ritual: The British Monarchy and the ‘Invention of Tradition,’ c. 1820-1977,” in *The Invention of Tradition*, eds. Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger (Cambridge, 1983), 101-164; Linda Colley, “The Apotheosis of George III: Loyalty, Royalty and the British Nation, 1760-1820,” *Past and Present*, no. 102 (1984): 94-129; Idem, *Britons*; Takashi Fujitani, *Splendid Monarchy: Power and Pageantry in Modern Japan* (Berkeley, 1996); Freda Harcourt, “Gladstone, Monarchism and the ‘New’ Imperialism, 1868-1874,” *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 14, no. 1 (1985): 20-51; Eric Hobsbawm, “Mass-Producing Traditions: Europe, 1870-1914” in *The Invention of Tradition*, 263-307; William M. Kuhn, *Democratic Royalism: The Transformation of the British Monarchy, 1861-1914* (New York, 1996); James Shedel, “Emperor, Church, and People: Religion and Dynastic Loyalty During the Golden Jubilee of Franz Joseph,” *Catholic Historical Review* 76, no. 1 (1990): 71-92.

“was no longer, as his predecessors had been, just the head of society, but was now seen to be the head of the nation as well.”²¹ The purpose of this enterprise was to keep the old hierarchy of power intact through the advancement of deference which an increasingly visible monarchy—presented as above class and party and embodying the interests of the nation—could supposedly accomplish. In demonstrating that royal symbolism is neither static nor innocuous, but pliant and political, the work of Hobsbawm and Cannadine influenced a series of studies examining the relationship between ceremonies and national identity. Despite its value in emphasising the relationship between ceremonial, power, and national identity, however, their work as it relates to the nature of nation-building has two serious limitations—shortcomings which can be found to some degree in most of the scholarship on the modern British monarchy.

First, their analysis of nation-building is too narrowly focussed. Since the groups they argue to have been served by royal ceremonial are limited to the upper and middle classes, they ignore other collective cultural identities besides class which also impinge on the construction of the monarchy as a symbol of national identity. Anthony D. Smith points out that the nation “draws on elements of other kinds of collective identity, which accounts...for the way in which national identity can be combined with these other types of identity—class, religious or ethnic...A national identity is fundamentally multi-dimensional...”²² It is this consideration of multi-dimensionality that is required in studies of national identity because, according to Denise Riley, “most commonly, you will skate across the several identities which will take your weight, relying

²¹Hobsbawm, “Mass-Producing Traditions,” 263, 282; Cannadine, “The Context, Performance and Meaning of Ritual,” 122, 133.

²²Anthony D. Smith, *National Identity* (Reno, 1991), 14.

on the most useful, for your purposes of the moment...."²³ It is erroneous to give priority and precedence to one cultural identity, such as class or gender, and to subordinate all other categories to it since, as Joy Parr explains, "there are times when the relative positions of class and gender relationships are reversed, times when racial, ethnic, or national identities assume greater prominence with respect to both gender and class."²⁴ Unfortunately, most historians of the modern monarchy, such as Cannadine and Hobsbawm, have not taken into account the possibility that other identities outside of class have played a part in the way in which the monarchy was presented as a symbol of national identity.²⁵ Likewise, Canadian historians have been slow to follow Parr's lead in applying these considerations to their work, in particular to the study of the formation of Canadian national identity where little work has been done on the relationship between national identity and other collective cultural identities.²⁶

Another problem with Cannadine's and Hobsbawm's work, again, characteristic of most

²³Denise Riley, *"Am I That Name?" Feminism and the Category of "Women" in History* (Minneapolis, 1988), 16.

²⁴Joy Parr, *The Gender of Breadwinners: Women, Men, and Change in Two Industrial Towns, 1880-1950* (Toronto, 1990), 10-11.

²⁵In recent years a few studies have considered the gendered representations of British royalty, Queen Victoria in particular. See Anna Clark, "Queen Caroline and the Sexual Politics of Popular Culture in London, 1820," *Representations*, no. 31 (1990): 47-68; Margaret Homans and Adrienne Munich, eds., *Remaking Queen Victoria* (Cambridge, 1997); Margaret Homans, *Royal Representations: Queen Victoria and British Culture, 1837-1876* (Chicago, 1998); Gail Turley Houston, *Royalties: The Queen and Victorian Writers* (Charlottesville, 1999); Adrienne Munich, *Queen Victoria's Secrets* (New York, 1996); Victoria R. Smith, "Constructing Victoria: The Representation of Queen Victoria in England, India, and Canada, 1897-1914," (Ph.D. diss., Rutgers University, 1998); Dorothy Thompson, *Queen Victoria: The Woman, the Monarchy, and the People* (New York, 1990).

²⁶Phillip Buckner drew attention to this gap in his presidential address to the Canadian Historical Association. Buckner, "Whatever Happened to the British Empire?," 3-32.

of the literature on the modern monarchy, is that they associate the “invention” of royal ritual, and the version of national identity it presents, with falsity. In their analysis of the formation of royal ritual from the 1880s to the First World War, Hobsbawm and Cannadine claim that these ceremonies were designed as “invented traditions” in order to portray the monarchy as a “unifying symbol of permanence and national community.” According to Hobsbawm, “‘Invented tradition’ is taken to mean a set of practices, normally governed by overtly or tacitly accepted rules of a ritual or symbolic nature, which seek to inculcate certain values and norms of behaviour by repetition, which automatically implies continuity with the past.” Moreover, he adds that “the peculiarity of ‘invented’ tradition is that the continuity with [a historic past] is largely factitious.” Cannadine underscores this point as he asserts that “the continuity which the invented traditions of the late nineteenth century seek to establish...is largely illusory.”²⁷ Cannadine, Hobsbawm, and others have associated royal ceremonies with falsity largely because they interpret their representations as having been consciously contrived by a dominant culture in order to “deliberately” manipulate the attitudes and behaviour of subordinates. According to this view, the governing élite constructed royal ceremonial “to control and indoctrinate” the masses and legitimise their privileged position in the social order.²⁸

²⁷Eric Hobsbawm, “Introduction: Inventing Traditions,” in *The Invention of Tradition*, 1-2; Cannadine, “The Context, Performance and Meaning of Ritual,” 122, 161.

²⁸Hobsbawm, “Mass Producing Traditions,” 263, 265, 270, 282; Cannadine, “The Context, Performance and Meaning of Ritual,” 122, 124; N. Birnbaum, “Monarchs and Sociologists: A Reply to Professor Shils and Mr. Young,” *Sociological Review*, n.s., 3, no. 1 (1955): 5-23; Robert Bocoock, *Ritual in Industrial Society: A Sociological Analysis of Ritualism in Modern England* (London, 1974); Colley, *Britons*; Ilse Hayden, *Symbol and Privilege: The Ritual Context of British Royalty* (Tucson, 1987); Tom Nairn, *The Enchanted Glass: Britain and its Monarchy* (London, 1988); David Sinclair, *Two Georges: The Making of the Modern Monarchy* (London, 1988).

While there is evidence to support this conclusion, there is also reason to believe that many historical actors did not use royal ceremonial to *consciously manipulate* the public's behaviour.²⁹ Royal representation reflected the way in which cultural producers imagined their nation and their place within it. According to Benedict Anderson, "communities are to be distinguished, not by their falsity/genuineness, but by the style in which they are imagined." That is, the modern nation requires people to create an "imagined community" because "the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion."³⁰ Identities, whether class, gender, or national, are not fixed, but socially constructed and contextually defined. Consideration has to be given to the historical circumstances which produce and transform these categories in different situations and over time. The formation of identity is a *process* in which representations, such as in royal ceremonial, are used to articulate the sense of belonging

²⁹Specifically in regards to "invented traditions," an added criticism of Cannadine and Hobsbawm is that there is substantial reason to believe that many large-scale popular royal rituals were not "invented" in the late nineteenth century as they claim. Walter Arnstein points out that royal ceremonies were not lacking in the beginning of Queen Victoria's reign and work by R.O. Bucholz and Linda Colley confirms that royal ceremonial was used to gain the loyalty of the public long before the Victorian period. Also, William Kuhn's study of key figures involved in the planning of Victorian and Edwardian royal ceremonial demonstrates that they were "obsessed with adhering to precedent." From this perspective alone, then, it can be misleading to assume that modern royal ceremonies have been "invented" or "fabricated." Royal "traditions" have been altered over the years with changes implemented to impress different values and to meet new expectations in society, but they were also often based on some precedent and demonstrated a certain amount of continuity. Walter L. Arnstein, "Queen Victoria Opens Parliament: The Disinvention of Tradition," *Historical Research* 63, no. 151 (1990): 178-194; R.O. Bucholz, "'Nothing but Ceremony': Queen Anne and the Limitations of Royal Ritual," *Journal of British Studies* 30, no. 3 (1991): 288-323; Colley, "The Apotheosis of George III"; Idem, *Britons*; Kuhn, *Democratic Royalism*, 1-14.

³⁰Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, rev. ed. (London, 1991), 6.

amongst the people of an imagined community and to mediate social relations by defining who does not belong or is excluded from the nation.³¹ At issue is not whether the representations are true or false, but, as Richard White explains, "what their function is, whose creation they are, and whose interests they serve."³² Certainly, conscious actions are involved in this process, but so are unconscious ones. "Shaped by ideologies and social processes of which they were not fully aware," Ian McKay writes, "cultural producers did not conspire to falsify the past."³³ The version of the nation they imagined may have reflected their social identities and, accordingly, served their class and gender-based interests and concerns, but their use of royal representation in building the nation cannot be reduced to simply a social control conspiracy. Indeed, as William Kuhn suggests in his examination of a few of the organisers of Victorian and Edwardian royal ceremonies, image-makers and organisers directed the ceremonies and their symbols at themselves as much as at the masses.³⁴ Nation-building involves more than the moral regulation of the working class, women, and ethnic minorities, but also consists of a process of self-definition on the part of the cultural producers, generally white, male, and upper and middle

³¹ Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall, *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class, 1780-1850* (Chicago, 1987), 29, 450; Parr, *The Gender of Breadwinners*, 6-8; Idem, "Gender History and Historical Practice," *Canadian Historical Review* 76, no. 3 (1995): 354-376; Joan Wallach Scott, *Gender and the Politics of History* (New York, 1988), 42-49; Mariana Valverde, *The Age of Light, Soap, and Water: Moral Reform in English Canada, 1885-1925* (Toronto, 1991), 9-11.

³² Richard White, *Inventing Australia: Images and Identity, 1688-1980* (Sydney, 1981), viii.

³³ Ian McKay, *The Quest of the Folk: Antimodernism and Cultural Selection in Twentieth Century Nova Scotia* (Kingston and Montreal, 1994), 40.

³⁴ Kuhn, *Democratic Royalism*, 1-14.

class. Furthermore, the representations produced by this élite to unify the nation, consolidate themselves as a bloc, legitimise their status and power, and regulate and control other social groups did not go uncontested as implied by the social control theorists.³⁵ Racial and religious minorities, women, and the working class were not duped by, nor powerless to resist, the élite's regal representations, but countered them with images of their own and other forms of resistance.

The current theoretical frameworks on the study of royal ceremonial and national identity provided by the social control theorists, such as Hobsbawm and Cannadine, and those who are oblivious to the influence of cultural politics, such as Monet and Morton, have thus led to an "interpretive dead-end."³⁶ Some recent studies, however, have pointed to new directions for the study of royal ceremonial. Works by Gail Turley Houston, Margaret Homans, Adrienne Munich, and Victoria Smith have focussed on the complexity of Queen Victoria's representations. By incorporating gender into their analyses, these scholars have demonstrated that the Queen has "meant different things to different groups"; specifically between middle class men and women. Despite the Queen's own agency in projecting her image, Homans and Munich note that Victoria's image was so malleable and open to contradictory representations that her image was "created even as it is read." Moreover, Houston points out, as a symbol of both majesty and female domesticity, Queen Victoria became situated in a site "at which British cultural capital was exchanged, contested, and represented." According to these studies, then, the Queen's image became involved in a complex web in which her gendered representations served to

³⁵Jane Connors, "The 1954 Royal Tour of Australia," *Australian Historical Studies* 25, no. 100 (1993): 371-382; Morris, "Forty Years On," 1-13.

³⁶McKay, *The Quest of the Folk*, 16.

support and challenge power relationships. As useful as these studies are in this respect, however, they still lack an appreciation of the ethnic and religious dimensions of royal representation. In exploring primarily the role of class and gender in the relationship between royal representation and power, these scholars conclude that the Queen's image was one of duality (constitutional ruler and domestic woman) when, in fact, it was one of multiplicity. Taking Victoria Smith's examination of the Queen's representations in Britain, India, and Canada as an example, she does examine the representation of the Queen by nationalists in India and, in doing so, addresses the issue of ethnicity, but does so within the same narrow perspective of "duality" applied to her analysis of the Queen's representation in Britain. As well, in exploring the Queen's image in Britain and, especially, Canada, Smith focusses entirely on Anglo-Saxon Protestants and neglects the different perspectives of Catholics, French Canadians, and other groups. The result is a study which, while more appreciative of the gendered and class nuances of royal representation and its relationship to power, still falls short of appreciating its ethnic and religious dimensions.³⁷

Unlike these studies of Queen Victoria, H.V. Nelles' examination of the Quebec Tercentenary in 1908, in which the Prince of Wales was the centre of attention, pays significant attention to the "multivocality of the experience" and, in particular, to the different perspectives of French Canadians, British Protestants, and the Peoples of the First Nations in this spectacle of nation-building. Nelles, however, does not regard the ceremony and its varied representations as a site in which power relationships were asserted, negotiated, and challenged in any real sense.

³⁷Homans, *Royal Representations*; Homans and Munich, *Remaking Queen Victoria*; Houston, *Royalties*; Munich, *Queen Victoria's Secrets*; Smith, "Constructing Victoria."

Instead he understands the representations as mere “reflections” of the social structure in Quebec at a particular point in time. “The primary importance of the event,” he argues, “lay not in how it *affected* things, but rather in how it *reflected* the world around it.” Since multiple meanings and competing interests struggled for control at the Tercentenary, he asserts that no hegemony could be achieved and, therefore, the concept of “reflexivity—the capacity to reflect upon and change behaviour as a result of participation in cultural performances”—seems to be limited. To Nelles, representation is not power, it only “reflects power.”³⁸ A close examination of the concept of cultural hegemony, however, when combined with Benedict Anderson’s “imagined communities” and an appreciation of the multiplicity of social experience demonstrates that representations, including royal ones, are more actively involved in the struggle for power and the related process of enhancing collective identities than Nelles gives credit for. In addition, such an approach would address the shortcomings of the recent studies of Queen Victoria by incorporating the study of ethnic and religious identities into the analysis and, thus, offer a method of understanding the role of royal representation in the process of nation-building in its class, gender, ethnic, and religious dimensions.³⁹ More than just reflection of power or involving just class and gender groups, then, royal ceremonies should be understood as hegemonic sites involving multiple social groups and interweaving a variety of representations.

³⁸Nelles, *The Art of Nation-Building: Pageantry and Spectacle at Quebec’s Tercentenary* (Toronto, 1999), 12, 154-158, 171, 317-318.

³⁹For similar formulations see McKay, *The Quest of the Folk*, 4-40; Patrick Brantlinger, *Crusoe’s Footprints: Cultural Studies in Britain and America* (New York, 1990), 102-106.

Hegemony and Royal Representation

The traditional definition of hegemony refers to political rule or domination in state and class relations. The Italian Marxist Antonio Gramsci, however, made an important, and influential, distinction between "rule" and "hegemony." Equating "rule" with political coercion, he interpreted "hegemony" as a process by which a social group acquires and maintains leadership through the consent of other, subordinate groups in a society.⁴⁰ The dominant culture attains this political legitimacy not merely by imposing its rule through the apparatus of the state, but "by weaving its own cultural outlook deeply into the social fabric."⁴¹ "As Gramsci understood," Jackson Lears explains, "the hegemonic culture depends not on the brainwashing of 'the masses' but on the tendency of public discourse to make some forms of experience readily available to consciousness while ignoring or suppressing others." The dominant culture seeks to legitimise its power, ratify the contemporary social order, and achieve social cohesion by validating its ideas, values, and experience in public discourses.⁴² Furthermore, in addition to serving to maintain its hegemony, the dominant culture's representations also give it an awareness of its members as a culture, that is, an identity. The establishment of approved social identities, and the necessary denial of alternatives, plays as critical a part in the formation and

⁴⁰Raymond Williams, *Marxism and Literature* (Oxford, 1977), 108.

⁴¹Walter L. Adamson, *Hegemony and Revolution: A Study of Antonio Gramsci's Political and Cultural Theory* (Berkeley, 1980), 149; Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, eds. and trans. Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Smith (New York, 1971), 5.

⁴²T. Jackson Lears, "The Concept of Cultural Hegemony: Problems and Possibilities," *American Historical Review* 90, no. 3 (1985): 577, 574.

maintenance of a hegemony as economic relations.⁴³

While Gramsci emphasised that class served as the basis of the dominant culture's identity and stood at the root of the hegemonic struggle, scholars such as Stuart Hall and R.W. Connell have recently demonstrated that race and gender are also entwined in the hegemonic process. Just as one class is culturally exalted over another so too are race, religion, and not only men over women, but also within each gender category one form of masculinity or femininity over another.⁴⁴ Due to scholars' recognition of the significance of these other identities in building hegemony, Stuart Hall explains that "the 'hegemonic' moment is no longer conceptualized as a moment of *simple* unity, but as a process of unification (never totally achieved), founded on strategic alliances between different sectors, not on their pre-given identity." The process of forming hegemony cannot be reduced simply to the ascendancy of one class over another in which class unity is assumed *a priori*. While classes share certain common characteristics, they are also fragmented by conflicting interests and segmented by different identities. Consequently, the unity of a class, an élite, or a culture has to be continually produced and reformulated through economic, political, and cultural practices.⁴⁵ To achieve cultural hegemony, the members of a given group must form a world view which can both cross the divisions within

⁴³Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, 5; Williams, *Marxism and Literature*, 115; Gary Kinsman, *The Regulation of Desire: Homo and Hetero Sexualities*, 2d ed. (Montreal, 1996), p. 38.

⁴⁴Stuart Hall, "Gramsci's Relevance for the Study of Race and Ethnicity," in *Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*, eds. David Morley and Kuan-Hsing Chen (London, 1996), 411-440; R.W. Connell, *Gender and Power: Society, the Person, and Sexual Politics* (Stanford, 1987), 183-186; Idem, *Masculinities* (Cambridge, 1995), 77, 214; David H.J. Morgan, *Discovering Men* (London, 1992), 200-202.

⁴⁵Hall, "Gramsci's Relevance for the Study of Race and Ethnicity," 437, 423.

their own ranks, providing it with a measure of group cohesion, and, at the same time, appeal to other groups to have them consent to their rule.

In order to appeal to a diversity of interests and maintain support and solidarity over time and changing conditions, a hegemonic group has to adapt, reconstruct itself, and accommodate subordinate cultures through incorporation. Rather than being a static system or a passive form of dominance, hegemony is a lived process which is continually renewed, defended, modified, and renegotiated in response to challenges from competing interests within the hegemonic bloc and from the resistance of subordinate groups. While a hegemony by definition is always dominant, Raymond Williams explains that "it is never either total or exclusive. At any time, forms of alternative or directly oppositional politics and culture exist as significant elements in a society." The existence of these elements affects the hegemonic process itself as the dominant culture continually incorporates, controls, and counters other groups and their representations.⁴⁶ The concept of hegemony, then, offers an interpretive framework to consider and analyse the complex nature of power, hierarchies, and the social production and influence of culture since it moves beyond interpreting them as static structures supported by social indoctrination and coercion to considering them as complex processes involving conscious and unconscious acts, consent, contestation, and negotiation in which both dominant and subordinate groups participate, though unequally.⁴⁷

While hegemony is sustained on a whole series of fronts, Gramsci argued that language was central to the installation of a given group's social and moral authority over both its

⁴⁶Williams, *Marxism and Literature*, 112-113.

⁴⁷Brantlinger, *Crusoe's Footprints*, 98.

immediate supporters and society as a whole.⁴⁸ The Italian Marxist, however, did not analyse the inner workings of language and symbols and, therefore, did not explore the full implications of his assertion. Although unaware of the theoretical formulations of his Italian contemporary, the Russian literary theorist Mikhail Bakhtin articulated an understanding of symbolic communication not only compatible with the notion of hegemony, but, when applied to the analysis of social relations, demonstrative of the significance of signs in the hegemonic process. As Gramsci posited that social relations and hegemony are not static, but ever-changing, Bakhtin similarly argued that language as a sign system is not a fixed unit, but a complex modified and transformed in specific conditions. Words have multiple meanings since they have been "shot through" with the earlier intentions of others. Consequently, their meanings are shaped by the contexts in which they are utilised. "Language is not a neutral medium," Bakhtin concluded, "expropriating it, forcing it to submit to one's own intentions and accents, is a difficult and complicated process."⁴⁹ The sign was to be studied not for only what it meant, but for the ways in which competing groups sought to appropriate and infuse it with their own meanings. Symbolic communication became a field of contestation as it reinforced the authority of the dominant group and, at the same time, opened up opportunities for resistance from subordinate groups by the very nature of its multiple and contradictory character.⁵⁰

⁴⁸Lears, "The Concept of Cultural Hegemony," 589.

⁴⁹Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M.M. Bakhtin*, ed. Michael Holquist, trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin, 1981), 293-294.

⁵⁰Terry Eagleton, *Literary Theory: An Introduction* (Minneapolis, 1983), 117; Lears, "The Concept of Cultural Hegemony," 591; David K. Danow, *The Thought of Mikhail Bakhtin: From Word to Culture* (New York, 1991), 33-37.

Taken as forms of symbolic communication, then, royal ceremonies can be understood as sites of hegemonic processes involving multiple social groups and interweaving a variety of representations.⁵¹ As Stuart Hall once commented, "hegemonizing is hard work"⁵²—and to analyse it is no less daunting—but that is the essence of the concept and the approach. Society and social relations are neither static nor fixed, but multiple and contradictory and the concept of cultural hegemony combined with elements from the "new" cultural history, such as imagined communities, offers a way to consider and analyse the complex nature of power, identity, and royal representation in the nation-building process. From the mid-nineteenth to the early twentieth centuries, the Canadian state and civil society's élite wrestled with these issues as they sought to uphold order, promote unity, and build a national identity in an increasingly industrial, urbanised, and democratic society. In addition to political and economic programs and the creation of usable pasts and traditions,⁵³ royal ceremonies and representations were invoked by

⁵¹Mary Kay Vaughan made a similar formulation in her study of Mexican festivals. Mary Kay Vaughan, "The Construction of the Patriotic Festival in Tecamachalco, Puebla, 1900-1946," in *Rituals of Rule, Rituals of Resistance: Public Celebrations and Popular Culture in Mexico*, eds. William H. Beezley, Cheryl English Martin, and William E. French (Wilmington, Del., 1994), 213-245.

⁵²Stuart Hall quoted in George Lipsitz, "The Struggle for Hegemony," *Journal of American History* 75, no. 1 (1988): 147.

⁵³Recent studies on the construction of Canadian traditions and symbols include: Robert Cupido, "Appropriating the Past: Pageants, Politics, and the Diamond Jubilee of Confederation," *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association* n.s. 8 (1998): 155-186; Alan Gordon, "Contested Terrain: The Politics of Public Memory in Montreal, 1891-1930" (Ph.D. diss., Queen's University, 1997); Norman Knowles, *Inventing the Loyalists: The Ontario Loyalist Tradition and the Creation of Usable Pasts* (Toronto, 1997); McKay, *The Quest of the Folk*; H.V. Nelles, *The Art of Nation-Building*; Keith Walden, *Visions of Order: The Canadian Mounties in Symbol and Myth* (Toronto, 1982); Idem, *Becoming Modern in Toronto: The Industrial Exhibition and the Shaping of a Late Victorian Culture* (Toronto, 1997).

members of the state, religious denominations, civic organisations, voluntary associations, the press, and the public to consolidate the expanding state and unify the Canadian nation around the central image of the monarchy. The royal representations produced during this period were as diverse as the contexts and the ceremonies in which they were displayed. The composition and interests of organisers and audiences influenced the images as did the location and manner of their presentation. Changing economic, political, and social conditions further impinged on the nature of royal ceremonial as the élite refashioned representations to meet new challenges and consolidate their hegemony. Furthermore, the changing face of royalty demanded that the national images produced be continuously altered and renewed in order to meet a monarch's changed circumstances or fit an entirely new king or queen. Nevertheless, over the course of the fifty-one years between 1860 and 1911 several definable features characterised royal representation as it related to Canadian nation-building and the articulation of class, gender, religious, and racial identities which will be explored in the following chapters.

Outline and Scope of the Dissertation

Considering the complexity of the interaction of multiple identities of class, gender, religion, and race with national identity in the Canadian experience, the dissertation has been organised into two parts, each featuring three chapters. Part One examines the interaction of class, gender, and national identity in royal representation and follows a chronological progression. The first chapter in this section, Chapter II of the dissertation, focusses on the Royal Visit of Albert Edward the Prince of Wales (King Edward VII) to British North America in 1860. The Royal Tour was a hegemonic site in which organisers and participants articulated

their place within the social order of British North America by propagating representations of themselves, each other, and the Prince of Wales framed by class and gender interests. At address presentations, levees, militia reviews, balls, and industrial openings, men of the upper and middle classes produced competing images of each other and struggled for privileged access to the Prince in order to establish and assert their cultural authority. In this struggle, women and the working class were pushed to the periphery of the Royal Tour or, when included in an event, portrayed as persons lacking the qualities of their social superiors. Chapter III continues the examination of the way in which the male middle class used royal representations and ceremonies to not only express their sense of place within the British Empire, but also to legitimise their power within the community. Focussing on representations of Queen Victoria produced in biographies and newspaper articles from the 1860s until her death in 1901 and the Canadian observances of the Golden Jubilee of her reign (1887), the Diamond Jubilee (1897), and her Memorial Services, it is argued that her image as a paragon of middle class femininity served to both support male dominance while, at the same time, enabling maternal feminists to legitimise an expanded role. The Queen, as any image, did not possess a fixed identity, but was open to interpretation. Nevertheless, in both cases the status of the middle class was confirmed as the Queen came to represent a distinctly bourgeois version of the nation. The Edwardian era, as demonstrated in Chapter IV, similarly witnessed a series of royal ceremonies in which members of the middle class sought to reaffirm their social and cultural authority. However, during the Royal Tour of the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York (George V and Queen Mary) through Canada in 1901, the Coronation of Edward VII (1902) and observance of his death (1910), and the Coronation of George V (1911) royal representations were refashioned in order

to meet new socioeconomic conditions, images of manliness, and the reformulation of hegemony. The rise of working class consciousness and activism, the movement for women's rights, and the dissimilar values and physiques of Edward VII and George V influenced the manner in which the dominant culture imagined its identity and articulated its power with royal representations. Yet the male middle class addressed these issues through a constant process of redefinition, assertion, and legitimation. Through royal ceremonies and with the use of royal representations it acted to legitimise its cultural authority in the face of challenges from the working class, women, and even dissidents within its own ranks.

Complicating the formation of a cultural hegemony—and the construction of royal representations—would be the manner in which issues of ethnicity, race, and religion impinged upon class and gender identities, thus making the image of the Canadian nation even more difficult to frame. Part Two focusses on the relationship between ethnicity, race, religion, and national identity in royal representation and, in doing so, integrates these identities into the class and gender analysis of Part One. Chapter V examines the contested representations of the monarchy between Protestants and Catholics and between English, French, and Irish Canadians from 1860 to 1901 while Chapter VI does the same for the period 1901 to 1911. Composed of several ethnic groups and further divided by religious affiliations, during this period Canada could remain a cohesive unit only through the cooperation and integrations of the main ethnic groups and religious sects. The concept of unity in diversity as embodied in the monarchy provided a focal point for British Protestants, French Canadians, and Irish Catholics to come together in common loyalty. As French Canadians and Irish Catholics embraced the image of the Sovereign as the embodiment of religious tolerance and constitutional liberty who stood for

the equality of all subjects irrespective of ethnic background or religious affiliation, British Protestants upheld the monarchy as a Protestant institution and a continuing link to the British Empire. The broadness of these representations, though, permitted resistance to occur from ethnic and religious groups not included in the dominant group's images of the nation. African, Jewish, and Asian Canadians also upheld the image of the King and Queen as supporters of their liberty in order to legitimise their right to equality and inclusion in royal ceremonies. Meanwhile, members of the Orange Order rejected Catholic accommodation and asserted the cultural ascendancy of Protestants in Canada by defending the Protestant character of the monarchy. Royal representations and ceremonies from the Royal Tour of 1860 to the Coronation of George V, then, were as much sites of ethnic and religious negotiation in the building and maintenance of a cross-cultural hegemony as areas of class and gender empowerment and resistance.

Chapter VII emphasises the verity of this argument from the perspective of the relationship between Aboriginal tradition and royal representation. Covering the entire period from 1860 to 1911, this chapter explores the way in which the complex history of Indian-white relations involving French precedents, Native traditions, and British paternalism and colonialism had led to the Native conviction that they had a special relationship with the monarch based upon mutual respect, trust, and sympathy. Whites, on the other hand, manipulated royal imagery in order to consolidate their hegemony and reaffirm the inferior place accorded to Natives in their imagined community. Taking a central event during the Royal Tour of 1901 as an example, the "Great Pow-wow of 1901" served as a contested site in Indian-white relations as both groups structured, manipulated, and imagined representations of themselves, each other, and, above all, the monarchy in order to maintain and challenge the hegemonic order.

Before proceeding further, four explanations regarding the scope of the dissertation are required. First, since the process of state formation in nineteenth century Canada coincided with the process of nation-building, a project also deeply involving the officers and mechanisms of the state, the two processes sometimes seem to be confused in the work of some historians. In fact, even the terms "nation" and "the state" have been used interchangeably and produce varying definitions from scholars. For example, at times "the state" has been narrowly defined as the main institutions of the government, in particular the executive, the legislature, and the judiciary, while at other times it is conceived to encompass government institutions and many of the agencies of civil society as well including schools, churches, and even the family, a conception so broad as to make "the state" indistinguishable as a distinct entity and almost synonymous with "the nation."⁵⁴ According to this latter view, in the project of state formation the state spreads its authority throughout society and its institutions to such an extent that all other agencies and individuals are subsumed under the state's control and mantle.⁵⁵ Drawing from models supplied in the work of Allan Greer, Ian Radforth, and J.I. Little, however, the state can be distinguished from civil society by considering it as the government, civil service, the police and military, and the judiciary—in short, "the constellation of agencies and officers sharing in the sovereign authority."⁵⁶ Following this definition, state formation, though concerned with the regulation

⁵⁴Allan Greer and Ian Radforth, *Colonial Leviathan: State Formation in Mid-Nineteenth Century Canada* (Toronto, 1992), 9-10.

⁵⁵Philip Corrigan and Derek Sayer, *The Great Arch: English State Formation as Cultural Revolution* (Oxford, 1985); Eric Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*, 2d ed. (Cambridge, 1990), 83-92.

⁵⁶Greer and Radforth, *Colonial Leviathan*, 10; J.I. Little, *State and Society in Transition: The Politics of Institutional Reform in the Eastern Townships, 1838-1852* (Kingston and

of society, refers fundamentally to the establishment, expansion, and consolidation of state institutions. Nation-building, on the other hand, is a process which involves both the state and civil society and while it has some similar and complementary goals, i.e. moral regulation, its emphasis is more expansive than state formation.

Another reason why the “nation” and “nation-building” have been confused with the “state” and “state formation” has been because some scholars perceive that “the nation” is solely a state construction. According to Eric Hobsbawm, from the end of the eighteenth century the ruling group of Europe became increasingly alarmed at democratisation which implied a reduction in deference and, thus, loyalty to the established élite and the state. In order to ensure socio-political cohesion in the democratic age states sought a “civic religion” which could unite the residents of the state as a people—the “nation.”⁵⁷ The “nation” came to signify a cultural and political bond uniting the people of a community with shared values, symbols, and traditions. “By the use of symbols,” Anthony Smith writes, “members are reminded of their common heritage and cultural kinship and feel strengthened and exalted by their sense of common identity and belonging.”⁵⁸ The state had a vested interest in nation-building because the concept of the nation seemed to offer a way to maintain social unity, order, and, hence, the integrity of the democratic state. Yet, while it may have played a major role in this process, the state was not the sole actor in the building of the Canadian nation. According to Mariana Valverde it is erroneous to assume that the state is the only agent in history because many of the institutions

Montreal, 1997), 5-12.

⁵⁷Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780*, 83-92.

⁵⁸Smith, *National Identity*, 14-17.

of civil society "were far more concerned about nation-building and even about strengthening the state than the state itself...."⁵⁹ As has already been noted, the members and institutions of civil society also contributed to the nation-building project, working in concert with the state or independently with compatible programs. In constructing and maintaining an identity of interests among the diverse and conflicting groups within the state, nation-building involves a variety of actors within the dominant culture of which the state, though central and influential, is only one player. Consideration also has to be given to the press, churches, fraternal organisations, trade unions, and voluntary associations which contributed to the nation-building project, a process which simultaneously sought to unify the denizens of the Canadian dominion as it defined the Canadian nation in the image and interests of a dominant white, male, and middle class culture, thus stabilising and legitimising its hegemony.

Secondly, while several other dates could have been selected for the beginning of the dissertation, including the accession of Queen Victoria (1837), the death of Prince Albert (1861), and Confederation (1867), the Royal Tour of 1860 was chosen as a starting point for a number of reasons. Most significantly, the Tour signified not only the first major royal visit to British North America, but the first momentous royal ceremony in the colonies when compared to the observance of coronations and funerals of sovereigns past. The Tour also virtually coincided with the end of the first phase of Queen Victoria's reign and the beginning of the next following the death of the Prince Consort in 1861, a date often adopted by scholars of the British monarchy as a starting or ending point in their own studies. Finally, the 1850s and 1860s marked a significant period in Canadian history witnessing the growth of many of the social and political

⁵⁹Valverde, *The Age of Light, Soap, and Water*, 25-26.

developments which would generate the conditions and desire for a unifying symbol as embodied in the monarchy. The date for ending the dissertation was selected for similar reasons. The Coronation of George V in 1911 marked not only the end of the Edwardian period and the beginning of a new modern style of monarchy, but also coincided with political developments in the Dominion and the world including the end of Sir Wilfrid Laurier's term as Prime Minister and, more importantly, closely approximated the start of the First World War and with it the end of an era.

Thirdly, the dissertation does not examine the Governors-General nor the Lieutenant-Governors as they figured as local representations of the monarchy.⁶⁰ While it is acknowledged that they imitated royalty by conducting royal ceremonies, and thus assisted in the strengthening of the monarchical tie between Canada and Britain, the nature of their representations differed considerably from that of actual royalty. They lacked the aura and charisma of royalty and were largely regarded as political figures. Consequently, the Canadian public was more critical of them and did not accord them the same respect as royal persons. Indeed, at times the criticism

⁶⁰Excluding biographies, the main studies of the political, social, and cultural functions of the Governors-General and Lieutenant-Governors in Canada are: Eugene A. Forsey, *Freedom and Order*; Mark Francis, *Governors and Settlers: Images of Authority in the British Colonies* (London, 1992); R.H. Hubbard, *Rideau Hall: An Illustrated History of Government House, Ottawa, from Victorian Times to the Present Day* (Kingston and Montreal, 1977); Anthony H.M. Kirk-Greene, "The Governors-General of Canada, 1867-1952: A Collective Profile," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 12, no. 4 (1977): 35-57; MacKinnon, *The Crown in Canada*; Barbara J. Messamore, "The Social and Cultural Role of the Governors General, 1888-1911: British Imperialists and Canadian 'Nationalists,'" in *Imperial Canada, 1867-1917: A Selection of Papers Given at the University of Edinburgh's Centre of Canadian Studies Conference — May 1995*, ed. Colin M. Coates (Edinburgh, 1997), 78-108; Gwendoline Neuendorff, *Studies in the Evolution of Dominion Status: The Governor Generalship of Canada and the Development of Canadian Nationalism* (London, 1942); John T. Saywell, *The Office of Lieutenant-Governor: A Study in Canadian Government and Politics* (Toronto, 1957); David E. Smith, *The Invisible Crown: The First Principle of Canadian Government* (Toronto, 1995).

of them was damning and the ridicule some writers bestowed upon them relentless. By contrast, rare was the critical comment of Queen Victoria or Edward VII. Considering the differences in their roles and images, then, it would be difficult to examine both royal persons and Governors-General together without making such a study too large and unmanageable.

Lastly, although the monarchy played a vital role in Canada's constitutional and political development, the focus in this dissertation is entirely on its social and cultural symbolic manifestations. There is, to be sure, much to be said for the argument of David E. Smith that

casting debate about the Crown in terms of symbols diverts attention from the pervasive influence it exerts on the institutions and practices of government. More particularly, the language of symbols disguises the practical contribution the Crown makes to the primary feature of Canadian government—executive dominance.⁶¹

Because of this, the preceding and following pages do not endeavour to minimise the significance of the monarchy's constitutional contributions nor do they aspire to repudiate political history. Their emphasis is, nonetheless, on a fundamental feature of the modern monarchy of which even contemporary constitutional scholars recognised the importance. Indeed, although the English constitutional expert Walter Bagehot detailed the constitutional limits of monarchical power and influence in his well-known terms of "to consult, to encourage, and to warn," at the same time he stressed the symbolic function of the Crown. "In such countries as ours," he wrote, "it is the function of the throne to be rather a symbol of national unity than its cause...An ornamental throne is a most valuable auxiliary to the popular imagination in realising the unity of the

⁶¹David E. Smith, *The Invisible Crown*, 179.

nation...."⁶² By focussing on the symbolic functions of the monarchy, then, it is not intended to depreciate the significance of its role in government, but, rather, to underscore the equal importance of the monarchy's cultural influence. As well, the emphasis on the social and cultural aspects of the monarchy over political history should not be regarded as yet another example of the "sundering" of the Canadian past in favour of "trendy" and "trivial" subjects. Nation-building involved many actors and took a variety of forms, of which political and economic programs comprised only one, though important, facet. The aim of this dissertation is not to suggest that John A. Macdonald's National Policy was unimportant in the nation-building project, but, instead, to point out that political programs and economic policies were not the only means by which politicians and members of civil society sought to unify the nation. Side by side with politics and economics, social and cultural programs sought to complement these plans and further the consolidation of the Dominion. Royal ceremonies and representations were not "trivial" events in Canadian history. They comprised a fundamental feature in national imagery and played a vital part in the building of the Canadian nation.

⁶²Walter Bagehot, "The Income of the Prince of Wales," 10 October 1874, in *The Collected Works of Walter Bagehot*, vol. 5, ed. Norman St. John-Stevs (London, 1974), 419.

PART ONE: CLASS, GENDER, AND NATIONAL IDENTITY

CHAPTER II

The Royal Tour of 1860

The year 1860 has attracted little attention from scholars studying the dissemination of royal representation during the Victorian period and has received even less scrutiny from historians analysing the development of imperial sentiment in the British Empire. Instead, historians have generally begun their examinations of the relationship between Victorian royal ritual and national identity in the 1870s and of its intermingling with imperialist overtones in the 1880s at the earliest.¹ Prince Albert, however, had celebrated 1860 as an eventful year for both the monarchy and the Empire as two members of the royal family assisted in the process of engendering national sentiment and imperial unity through their participation in the staging of two elaborate royal ceremonies, one in British North America and the other at the Cape of Good Hope. Writing to a family friend in April of that year, the Prince Consort and husband of Queen Victoria noted that "It will be a strange and noteworthy circumstance" that in the very same week of August in which Albert Edward, the Prince of Wales, would be opening the colossal Victoria Bridge in Montreal, his younger brother, Prince Alfred, would be laying the foundation

¹Walter L. Arnstein, "Queen Victoria's Diamond Jubilee," *American Scholar* 66, no. 4 (1997): 591-597; David Cannadine, "The Context, Performance and Meaning of Ritual: The British Monarchy and the 'Invention of Tradition,' c. 1820-1977," in *The Invention of Tradition*, eds. Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger (Cambridge, 1983), 101-164; Freda Harcourt, "Gladstone, Monarchism and the 'New' Imperialism, 1868-1874," *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 14, no. 1 (1985): 20-51; Margaret Homans, *Royal Representations: Queen Victoria and British Culture, 1837-1876* (Chicago, 1998); William M. Kuhn, *Democratic Royalism: The Transformation of the British Monarchy, 1861-1914* (New York, 1996); John M. Mackenzie, *Propaganda and Empire: The Manipulation of British Public Opinion* (Manchester, 1984), 4.

stone to the breakwater for the harbour of Cape Town. "What a cheering picture is here of the progress and expansion of the British race," he commented, "and of the useful co-operation of the Royal Family in the civilisation which England has developed and advanced! In both these young colonies, our children are looked for with great affection, and conscious national pride." At a dinner speech he delivered a few weeks later in London, Prince Albert expanded upon these thoughts as he told his audience that he considered the Montreal and Cape Town events as evidence of the greatness of the British Empire and the sureness of her continued prosperity. In particular, he credited the "important and beneficent...part given to the Royal Family of England to act in the development of those distant and rising countries, who recognise in the British Crown, and their allegiance to it, their supreme bond of union with the mother country and with each other."²

While the Prince Consort's remarks may have been coloured by self-interest, his observations nonetheless reflected the attitude of many colonials. In both the Cape and British North America the local residents had welcomed the sons of Victoria and Albert with much fanfare and ceremony as tens of thousands participated in the staging of a variety of activities prepared for the entertainment—and imperial enlightenment—of their royal visitors.³ As the Prince Consort had predicted, the royal visits had permitted colonials to express their loyalty to

²Prince Albert quoted in Theodore Martin, *The Life of His Royal Highness the Prince Consort*, 3d ed., vol. 5 (London, 1880), 88.

³According to descriptions of Prince Alfred's reception at the Cape, the young Prince was received with the utmost enthusiasm by all races. Even on his trips to the republics of the Orange Free State and the Transvaal it was reported that the Afrikaners did their best to entertain the Prince. *Times*, 26 September, 29 October 1860; John Van der Kiste and Bee Jordaan, *Dearest Affie...: Alfred, Duke of Edinburgh, Queen Victoria's Second Son, 1844-1900* (Gloucester, 1984), 35-36.

the Mother Country by embracing the young princes as symbols of their “national pride”—the British Empire. For the residents of British North America, however, the tour of their future sovereign produced representations beyond that of a shared sense of place in the British Empire. In articulating an interpretation of their nation, organisers and participants produced competing images of the Prince, themselves, and their place in the British North American community. In this struggle of representations an emergent male, middle class hegemony asserted itself through the presentation of imagery which defined their place, and that of women and the upper and lower classes, within the community they lived in.

While issues of race and religion also manifested themselves during the Prince of Wales’ progress through the four maritime colonies and the Canadas, these, important as they were, gave place to class and gender as the crucial foundations of the Victorian social order and world view.⁴ Indeed, as will be argued in this chapter, representations articulated during the Royal Visit of 1860 were framed by class and gender interests in order to challenge and defend the hegemonic order in the colonies of British North America. While part of this dynamic involved relations between the working class and the higher classes, as élites shunted the lower orders to the fringes of the celebration and as working people were pushed back as “disorderly” spectators, the Royal Tour was more a constitutive experience for the middle class. In the late 1840s and 1850s the introduction of democratic initiatives, the expansion of the apparatus of the

⁴Religion and ethnicity in the Royal Tour of 1860 will be examined separately in Chapter V. Issues of politics also arose during the Tour of the Canadas as the Grits accused the Conservatives of exploiting the Royal Visit for political ends. Partyism, however, will only be examined in so far as it impinged on matters of cultural identity as it did during the Orangeman disturbance, also to be discussed in Chapter V. Donald Creighton describes the political impact of the Tour in: Donald Creighton, *John A. Macdonald. Volume One: The Young Politician* (Toronto, 1952), 298-307.

state, and the spread of industrial capitalism and commercial enterprise provided the context for a growing professional class and a rising business class to identify a common set of values and interests distinctive from manual labourers and the idle rich. As an emergent—and ambitious—social formation, this middle class of doctors, merchants, and manufacturers sought to transplant its workplace authority into the public realm and thus challenge the upper class' hegemony in society. The Royal Tour of 1860 assisted the middle class in this endeavour since the presence of royalty and the numerous public events connected with the Tour allowed it to repeatedly broadcast representations of itself, the upper and lower classes, and the monarchy in order to claim social recognition and authority. With addresses, reviews, and processions and at levees, balls, and exhibitions, the middle class articulated a sense of identity based upon respectability, industry, and democracy in opposition to the “gushing,” “idle,” and “aristocratic” upper class. In turn, the traditional élite resisted the incursions of the *nouveau riche* into what they regarded as their social prerogatives and, consequently, attempted to exploit the visit of the Prince of Wales by seeking public—and royal—affirmations of their leadership. Needless to say, however, in all cases the representations articulated by the middle and upper classes during the Royal Visit endorsed patriarchy and male dominance. In 1860 the struggle for hegemony remained an exclusive male preserve.

Middle Class Formation in Mid-Nineteenth Century B.N.A.

The period from 1847 to 1860 was marked by a series of political, economic, and social developments which provided the context for the growth of the number of businessmen, professionals, and manufacturers in British North America and for their identification as a

distinctive middle class. Although the British North America of 1860 remained a predominately rural and agricultural society, since the late 1840s rapid growth in industrialisation, urbanisation, and transportation networks had transformed the economies and social structures of such urban centres as Montreal and Toronto and, consequently, had influenced the nature of power relations in the colonies. Although the experiences of Montreal and Toronto were hardly emblematic of all of the communities of British North America, developments in these two centres will be emphasised because the cities, and the industry and progress exhibited therein, were emphasised during the Royal Tour. Moreover, the leaders of these cities wielded significant influence in the management of the Canadas—and the Royal Tour—and represented the shift in power occurring in the colonies.

Montreal's rise to commercial predominance in mid-nineteenth century British North America received a boost from the enlargement of the Lachine Canal and the improvement of other canals along the St. Lawrence in the late 1840s which opened the river to large-scale shipping. Historically a transshipment point from Europe to the interior of North America, Montreal was now able to expand its role as a commercial centre in the international trade of grain, timber, and manufactured goods as banking, insurance, warehousing, and other service industries were either started or expanded in order to feed the commerce of shipping and supply. In addition, the Lachine Canal stimulated industry thanks to its harnessing of water power. Flour mills, iron foundries, wool and cotton mills, tanneries, sugar refineries, distilleries, and woodworks established themselves around the Canal only to grow as the expansion of rail increased the level of trade flowing through the city. From a mere 66 miles of track in 1850, rails laid in subsequent years in the Canadas numbered more than 2000 miles by 1860. The

completion of the Grand Trunk Railway from Montreal to Toronto in 1855 consolidated Montreal's position as the hub of Canada's transportation network and, consequently, the centre of British North American commerce and capital. Based in Montreal, the Grand Trunk Railway works consisted of foundries, engine and machine shops, and clothing factories, but, like its canal counterpart, its industrial impact did not end there as a number of producer-goods and service industries sprang up to supply and cater to the new railway and the businesses riding its rails.⁵

Toronto also felt the impact of industrialisation during the 1850s, though not yet to the degree of Montreal. The population boom in Canada West spurred demand for goods and services and Toronto's favourable harbour and established banks provided the city with a commercial advantage in the upper province. Supplying the growing agricultural population with manufactured goods and providing the commercial services required for the large scale export of staples products and importation of refined goods, Toronto witnessed the rise of a commercial group who challenged the position held by the old Toronto families.⁶ According to the census, between 1850 and 1860 the commercial class of Toronto grew from 1417 to 2063 persons and the professional class from 454 to 759. Though significant, the numbers still paled in comparison to the numbers of persons employed in these professions in Montreal where the commercial class

⁵Stanley Triggs, et al., *Le Pont Victoria: Un lien vital/ Victoria Bridge: The Vital Link* (Montreal, 1992), 23; Bettina Bradbury, *Working Families: Age, Gender, and Daily Survival in Industrializing Montreal* (Toronto, 1993), 22, 26; John McCallum, *Unequal Beginnings: Agriculture and Economic Development in Quebec and Ontario Until 1870* (Toronto, 1980), 6, 94-95; Gregory S. Kealey, *Toronto Workers Respond to Industrial Capitalism, 1867-1892* (Toronto, 1980), 8-9; Bryan D. Palmer, *Working-Class Experience: Rethinking the History of Canadian Labour, 1800-1991*, 2d ed. (Toronto, 1992), 83.

⁶McCallum, *Unequal Beginnings*, 58-60; Kealey, *Toronto Workers Respond to Industrial Capitalism*, 8-9; Peter G. Goheen, *Victorian Toronto: Pattern and Process of Growth* (Chicago, 1970).

swelled from 2458 to 5469 and the professional class from 451 to 1036 during the same time period. Other parts of British North America experienced economic development and a growth in the size of the commercial and professional classes during the 1850s too, but at a much slower pace.⁷

Changes in the political realm also altered the nature of the state, economy, and social structure in the mid-nineteenth century since the establishment of responsible government in 1847-48, the expansion of popular elections, and greater access to state offices permitted the growing and rising class of professionals and businessmen to gain public office and challenge the hegemony of the upper class in the legislatures and municipal councils. While the expansion of state institutions under their auspices granted them a powerful medium for promoting their values and confirming their place in the social order, the state also assisted merchants, manufacturers, bankers, and entrepreneurs in their commercial transactions and thus further increased their wealth and social stature. Most indicative of the middle class-friendly policy of state intervention in the economy were the financial guarantees, subsidies, loans, and monopolies granted to railway companies, in particular the Grand Trunk Railway.⁸ During the process of state formation in the mid-nineteenth century, the state had become infused with the politics of

⁷For example, from 1850 to 1860 Quebec City's commercial class doubled from 1571 to 3056, though the number of professionals increased marginally from 458 to 578. Meanwhile Nova Scotia's commercial class only grew by about 300 persons (from 7728 to 8105), but its professional class exploded from 556 to 2012. Canada, *Censuses of Canada, 1665-1871*; Palmer, *Working-Class Experience*, 83-84.

⁸Andrew C. Holman, *A Sense of Their Duty: Middle-Class Formation in Victorian Ontario Towns* (Kingston and Montreal, 2000), 100-102; Kealey, *Toronto Workers Respond to Industrial Capitalism*, 8; Brian Young, *George-Étienne Cartier: Montreal Bourgeois* (Kingston and Montreal, 1981), 111; Triggs, *Le Pont Victoria*, 19, 21.

class as professionals and businessmen identified a common set of interests and sought to promote and protect them. As with changes in the economy, reforms to the political process and state apparatus contributed to the process of "class formation."

Since the 1960s, most studies of class formation have been influenced by the neo-Marxist work of E.P. Thompson and, more specifically, his premise that class arises when a group of people share a common experience and articulate the identity of their interests amongst themselves and against those of others. Furthermore, according to Thompson, "the class experience is largely determined by the productive relations into which men are born—or enter involuntarily." Hence, in capitalist society the class lines have been drawn between those who own the means of production and those who do not and, consequently, have to sell their labour. For the most part, historical analysis of class formation has focussed almost exclusively on the making of this latter social formation, the working class. Initially, studies of the Canadian working class adhered closely to the Marxist tenet that class emanated solely from the economic relations of production, but historians such as Bryan Palmer expanded the analysis of the working class to include an appreciation for the cultural reinforcements of their common identity. While conceding that the working class grew out from the economic relations of production, Palmer (influenced by Thompson) asserted that it was also refined and reproduced over time in taverns, families, and social rituals.⁹

In recent years greater attention has begun to be paid to the process of middle class

⁹E.P. Thompson, *The Making of the English Working Class*, (1963; reprint, London, 1988), 8-9; Kealey, *Toronto Workers Respond to Industrial Capitalism*; Bryan D. Palmer, *A Culture in Conflict: Skilled Workers and Industrial Capitalism in Hamilton, Ontario, 1860-1914* (Kingston and Montreal, 1979); Idem, *Working-Class Experience*.

formation as scholars have recognised that the owners of the means of production and those whose interests and skills have led them to identify with the owners, such as professionals and managers, were as concerned to constitute themselves a class as they were to impose class roles and identities on others. As Mariana Valverde notes, "class formation is a dialectical process; it takes place in the bourgeoisie as much as in the working class, and often through the same practices."¹⁰ As studies of the working class did, then, historians of the middle class have initiated their identification of the composition of the middle class according to occupation and experiences at work. Andrew Holman's examination of the formation of the middle class in two Ontario towns argues, for example, that occupation was the "principal determinant of class status" in mid and late nineteenth century Ontario. With their numbers growing rapidly under the processes of industrialisation, urbanisation, and commercial expansion already noted, professionals, manufacturers, and businessmen derived workplace authority from their occupational identities which emphasised their financial independence, status as experts and leaders of progress, work ethic, and position as non-manual workers. Each of these components distinguished them from the upper class of inherited wealth, gentry, and speculators, whom they regarded as idle, unproductive, and, therefore, unrespectable, and the working class. Having developed separate but similar occupational identities and a sense of common stature and ambition, Holman concludes that "non-manual workers became a middle-class by effectively broadcasting their workplace authority into the public realm." With their work and occupational identities acting as the building blocks of their formation as a class, the middling ranks of society

¹⁰Mariana Valverde, *The Age of Light, Soap, and Water: Moral Reform in English Canada, 1885-1925* (Toronto, 1991), 29.

“congealed” into a middle class by distinguishing themselves from other groups on the level of culture and image.¹¹

Indeed, most studies of the formation of the middle class in Canada, Europe, and the United States have emphasised the role of cultural processes in the construction of its identity and the importance of representations in the attainment and maintenance of middle class hegemony. Noting that a “class is defined as much by its *being-perceived* as by its *being*,” Pierre Bourdieu points out that due to their ambiguous position in the social structure the middle class was keenly aware of the significance of the symbolic and, accordingly, struggled for hegemony in the field of representation. Adopting elaborate codes of behaviour, a moral order, and social values which mirrored their work ethic, the middle class assumed the public image of a respectable, cultivated, industrious, and, therefore, superior class in society. Such representations not only served to fix their own identity, but also permitted them to claim social authority and, thus, challenge the hegemony of the upper class while, at the same time, prescribing proper behaviour to the lower orders.¹²

¹¹Holman, *A Sense of Their Duty*; Christopher J. Anstead, “Fraternalism in Victorian Ontario: Secret Societies and Cultural Hegemony,” (Ph.D. diss., University of Western Ontario, 1992), 72-73; R.D. Gidney and W.P.J. Millar, *Professional Gentlemen: The Professions in Nineteenth-Century Ontario*, (Toronto, 1994), 3-25.

¹²Pierre Bourdieu, *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, trans. Richard Nice (Cambridge, 1984), 253, 483; Stuart M. Blumin, *The Emergence of the Middle Class: Social Experience in the American City, 1760-1900* (Cambridge, 1989); Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall, *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class, 1780-1850* (Chicago, 1987); Holman, *A Sense of Their Duty*; John F. Kasson, *Rudeness and Civility: Manners in Nineteenth Century Urban America* (New York, 1990); Cecilia Morgan, *Public Men and Virtuous Women: Gendered Languages of Religion and Politics in Upper Canada, 1791-1850* (Toronto, 1996); Dror Wahrman, *Imagining the Middle Class: The Political Representation of Class in Britain, 1780-1840* (Cambridge, 1995).

The public behaviour, self-image, and social discourse of the middle class stood, purposely, as a stark contrast to that of the upper class. Adopting values and behaviour premised on self-control, emotional discipline, dignity, sincerity, industry, thrift, and dedication to the family, the middle class denigrated the traditional élite by portraying them as the binary opposite to their "respectable" moral standards. The upper class, thus, became ridiculed in the bourgeois press as pretentious social climbers, would-be aristocratic flunkys, and idle, unprogressives who earned their keep on the labour of others. The upper class, however, was not unswayed by the challenges put to its social authority by the middle class. Members of the traditional élite, too, drew around themselves boundaries of social distinction based upon public office, social precedence, and privilege. Though composed largely of a consortium of property owners, high ranking legal professionals and churchmen, and members of such well-established and wealthy families as the Merritts, Robinsons, Jarvises, and Boultons, membership in the upper class of British North America, like the rising middle class, was not only marked by wealth. Until the incursions of the middle class, the upper class had almost exclusive control of all political offices and possessed a "patent of nobility" in the form of magistrate's or militia officer's commissions which they jealously guarded through a system of patronage. They also claimed precedence at public occasions owing to the status gained from their wealth, public positions, and, in some cases, Loyalist ancestry. As with the middle class, members of the traditional élite recognised the importance of representation in the struggle for hegemony as they constantly represented themselves as the natural leaders of their community.¹³

¹³J.K. Johnson, *Becoming Prominent: Regional Leadership in Upper Canada, 1791-1841* (Kingston and Montreal, 1989), 25, 158; Anstead, "Fraternalism in Victorian Ontario," 46-47; Robert A.J. McDonald, *Making Vancouver: Class, Status, and Social Boundaries, 1863-1913* (Vancouver,

While the middle class continued to form its identity through representations in opposition to the upper class, it also sought to control the behaviour of the growing working class. As industrialisation and urbanisation contributed to the rise of the middle class, so too did they give birth to a class of urban workers who, during the 1850s and 1860s, grew not only in numbers, but organisation as well. In Montreal, for example, the industrial class numbered 4659 in 1850, but more than doubled to 10,508 ten years later. Toronto also witnessed growth in the numbers of industrial workers as they increased from 3270 to 4427 over the same period.¹⁴ Particularly vocal during this period of mechanisation were skilled workers such as shoemakers, mechanics, and typographers as they organised into their own unions, or affiliated with international ones, and utilised strikes in order to preserve control over their own crafts and to improve pay and working conditions. While the emergence of industrial society had contributed to the growth, consolidation, and ascendancy of the middle class so too did it give rise to a class of working people who identified a set of interests against those of the middle class and led them to attempt to disrupt middle class influence and power.¹⁵

Members of the middle class were aware of the irony of the situation and, consequently, as they promoted industrialisation they also sought to control its excesses—labour unrest, workers' challenges to authority, social disorder—by introducing new methods of attaining social stability, harmony, and order. Under the leadership of middle class reformers, for example, the educational system became an institutionalised method of teaching working class youth the

1996), 152, 161-162.

¹⁴Canada, *Censuses of Canada, 1665-1871*.

¹⁵Palmer, *Working-Class Experience*, 86-92; Bradbury, *Working Families*, 95.

importance of punctuality, cleanliness, self-reliance, and, above all, obedience and respect for authority.¹⁶ Similarly, Norman Knowles points out that from the 1850s onward political leaders became increasingly “interested in the creation of an official history that could be used to promote unity, build a national identity, and uphold social and political order.” Actively supporting the production of literary and historical works, the middle class hoped that the past could provide Canadian society with a common sense of place and, thus, establish a greater measure of social stability and unity.¹⁷ Civic celebrations, exhibitions and fairs, and, as will be seen, royal ceremonies were also viewed as opportunities to instill order and a respect for authority in the working class.¹⁸ Accordingly, during the Royal Tour of 1860 the middle class in areas experiencing the greatest social dislocation and labour discontent arising out of industrialisation and urbanisation, i.e. Montreal and Toronto, made concerted attempts to control the behaviour of the working class by limiting their movements and prescribing to them “proper” behaviour, that is, the conduct of the middle class *male*.

As Joan Scott has noted, “the concept of class in the nineteenth century relied on gender for its articulation.”¹⁹ For the middle class of mid-nineteenth century British North America, her

¹⁶Alison Prentice, *The School Promoters: Education and Social Class in Mid-Nineteenth Century Upper Canada* (Toronto, 1977).

¹⁷Norman Knowles, *Inventing the Loyalists: The Ontario Loyalist Tradition and the Creation of Usable Pasts* (Toronto, 1997), 26-27.

¹⁸Nancy B. Bouchier, “‘The 24th of May is the Queen’s Birthday’: Civic Holidays and the Rise of Amateurism in Nineteenth-Century Canadian Towns,” *International Journal of the History of Sport* 10, no. 2 (1993): 159-192; Keith Walden, *Becoming Modern in Toronto: The Industrial Exhibition and the Shaping of a Late Victorian Culture* (Toronto, 1997).

¹⁹Joan Wallach Scott, *Gender and the Politics of History* (New York, 1988), 48.

assertion does not hold less true as the middle class used gender, as defined in the concepts of separate spheres and the ideology of domesticity, to not only justify male dominance and relegate women's place to the home, but also to propagate a distinctive bourgeois moral order and code of behaviour. Moreover, and especially evident during the Royal Tour, middle class men had developed a form of manliness which served to both empower them over males from the upper class and to prescribe controlled behaviour to the lower orders. In addition to such markers as occupation and income, manly behaviour figured strongly in establishing a man's class credentials vis-à-vis his peers and his subordinates.²⁰ Under the influence of the middle class, the ideal of the gentleman became the culturally exalted form of masculinity in society, the sure marker of social status, and, as such, acted as a "hegemonic masculinity" for those who demonstrated its features. The gentlemanly ideal held a great attraction to the middle class male since it based social acceptance and authority on manly behaviour and quality, rather than the upper class pretensions of wealth and tradition. The qualities of the gentleman reflected the middle class tenets of self-control, independence, rationality, responsibility, selflessness, and all of those values falling under the rubric of respectability such as sobriety, cleanliness, honesty, decorum, sober dress, and good conduct. To be recognised as a gentleman meant that one had made a successful claim to authority and social status. Since, moreover, working class men could afford neither respectability nor practice financial independence and since upper class males were regarded as selfish and emotional idlers, that claim could be made exclusive.²¹

²⁰John Tosh, "What Should Historians do with Masculinity?" *History Workshop*, no. 38 (1994): 183.

²¹Geoffrey Best, *Mid-Victorian Britain, 1851-1875* (London, 1971), 268-270, 278-282; R.W. Connell, *Masculinities* (Cambridge, 1995), 77; Gidney and Millar, *Professional Gentlemen*, 3-25;

Crucial to the maintenance of middle class hegemony was the production of “exemplary masculinities”—models of manliness, either real or imagined, which represented the cultural ideals of manhood.²² During the Royal Visit of 1860, the touring Prince of Wales found himself represented as an exemplary masculinity as members of the middle class portrayed him as a person possessing all of the qualities desired in a man of leadership—charm, courtesy, selflessness, respectability, and heterosexuality—virtues middle class men claimed for themselves. Indeed, both the Prince of Wales and the activities surrounding his visit were used by middle class men to project their values onto the Prince, and society as a whole, in order to gain public approbation of their status and to challenge the hegemony of the upper class. The Royal Tour of 1860 was a constitutive experience for middle class men and, as such, inevitably affected men and women of the upper and working classes. The processes of hegemony and of class and gender formation are developed in relationships and representations and, inasmuch as it involved a mass convergence of people and images, the Royal Tour of 1860 became a site entangled in the articulation of identity and power for all those involved.

The Origins and Organisation of the Royal Tour of 1860

The idea of inviting a member of the royal family to visit British North America originated from a failed petition to Queen Victoria circulated in 1858 by John Gustavus Norris, a “private gentleman” and self-described “Esquire” from Toronto. At first, the petition seemed

Philip Mason, *The English Gentleman: The Rise and Fall of an Ideal* (London, 1982), 12-16; Prentice, *School Promoters*, 68; David H.J. Morgan, *Discovering Men* (London, 1991), 200-202.

²²R.W. Connell, *Gender and Power: Society, the Person, and Sexual Politics* (Stanford, 1987), 183-186; Idem, *Masculinities*, 214.

innocuous enough since it did no more than respectfully prayed that a member of the royal family visit Toronto to open the Canadian Exhibition at the city's newly constructed Crystal Palace. As an expression of loyalty, the petition had little difficulty in attracting the signatures of such leading politicians as John A. Macdonald, George Brown, D'Arcy McGee, E.P. Taché, and George-Étienne Cartier. Despite its strong backing, however, the document never reached the foot of the throne as Edward Bulwer Lytton, the Secretary of State for the Colonies, was compelled to reject it. By deputing himself as the colony's ambassador, Norris sought to present the petition to the Queen himself and had, therefore, breached colonial protocol which demanded that all petitions from private individuals be transmitted through the Governor General. In view of this violation of proper procedure, Bulwer Lytton declined the petition and, upon his return to Toronto, Norris found himself rebuked by the signatories who claimed that they had signed the document in good faith believing that Norris would follow appropriate channels.²³ Despite the embarrassing outcome, Norris' initiative—illustrative of the role of non-official culture in promoting loyalty to the monarchy—sparked the imagination of politicians who decided to draw up an official petition a few months later.

On 14 May 1859, both Houses of Parliament unanimously approved an address to be

²³ Although Norris claimed that he undertook the mission solely to contribute to the strength and unity of the Empire and proclaimed that he had "never asked for nor does he expect" any reward for his actions, in 1871 he based his request for a patronage appointment in British Columbia from George-Étienne Cartier upon his petition. It seems doubtful that Norris received any appointment since he moved back to Ontario in 1876. Ironically, Norris was not in Canada when the Prince visited in 1860. National Archives of Canada [hereafter NAC], George-Étienne Cartier Papers, MG27 ID4, vol. 3, pp. 1431-1432, Edward Bulwer Lytton to J.G. Norris, 11 September 1858 (copy), pp. 1428-1430, J.G. Norris to G.E. Cartier, 16 November 1871; John Gustavus Norris, *Mr. J.G. Norris, and the Visit to Canada of H.R.H. the Prince of Wales* (Ottawa, 1876); Henry James Morgan, *The Tour of H.R.H. the Prince of Wales Through British America and the United States*, by "A British Canadian" (Montreal, 1860), 11-12.

submitted to Queen Victoria on behalf of all Canadians. Humbly praying that she or, on her behalf, the Prince of Wales visit the province the following year in order to afford “the inhabitants the opportunity of uniting in their expressions of loyalty and attachment to the Throne and Empire,” the address also provided a specific reason for the state visit—the opening of the mammoth Victoria Bridge. Hailed as the Eighth Wonder of the World, its completion, the parliamentarians assured the Queen, “would afford to Your Majesty a fitting occasion to judge of the importance of your Province of Canada....” Carried to London by Henry Smith, the Speaker of the House of Assembly, the invitation was received by the 5th Duke of Newcastle, the new Secretary of State for the Colonies, who promptly consulted, first, the Queen, and then Sir Edmund Head, the Governor General. Noting that “Her duties at the Seat of the Empire prevent so long an absence, and at so great a distance as a visit to Canada would necessarily require,” the Queen respectfully declined the invitation, but, in her stead, approved of the Prince of Wales’ attendance at the opening of the Bridge.²⁴

It appears that the Queen needed little encouragement from the Duke of Newcastle in letting her heir undertake a lengthy tour of the North American colonies. Considering her growing hostility towards her eldest son, she probably welcomed the opportunity to be rid of him for an extended period of time. Throughout his late teenage years—and beyond—Albert Edward was the source of constant anxiety and despair for his parents as he had demonstrated nothing in his life, according to his mother, but “systematic idleness” and “laziness.” Just after his seventeenth birthday in November 1858, the Queen confided to one of her daughter’s that

²⁴Morgan, *The Tour of H.R.H. the Prince of Wales*, 13-15; NAC, 5th Duke of Newcastle Papers, MG24 A34, reel A-1610, pp. 22-23, Duke of Newcastle to Edmund Head, 9 August 1859.

Poor Bertie! He vexes us much. There is not a particle of reflection, or even attention to anything but dress! Not the slightest desire to learn...I only hope he will meet with some severe lesson to shame him out of his ignorance and dullness.

Dreading the moment that he would come of age and feeling that "we can't hold him except by moral power," the Queen confessed that "I try to shut my eyes to that terrible moment!" While she had resigned herself to the belief that "Bertie" would never be fit to be king, the Queen, nonetheless hoped that the education and experiences which came from tours and visits could shake him out of his "ignorance and dullness."²⁵

While the Queen may have been motivated by personal reasons in permitting the Prince of Wales to travel to Canada, the Duke of Newcastle advocated the Royal Tour from an imperial standpoint. Considered a "liberal imperialist," the Duke believed that the continued strength and unity of the British Empire depended upon responsible government and local independence with imperial defence being the main link to Great Britain. In addition to defence linkages, though, he was convinced that the colonies could be retained by appealing to their sense of affection and loyalty to the Mother Country. During his two terms as Colonial Secretary, first from 1852 to 1854 and then from 1859 to 1864, he accordingly endeavoured to tie them closer to Britain with "bonds of mutual sympathy and mutual obligation." He thought this task could be in part accomplished by introducing "the innovation of a little praise and sympathy" in speeches delivered about the colonies; even better would be the institution of regular royal visits to the outposts of the Empire. With Prince Alfred set to travel to the Cape of Good Hope, Newcastle

²⁵Queen Victoria to Victoria, the Princess Royal, 8 March 1858, 17 November 1858, 9 April 1859, *Dearest Child: Letters between Queen Victoria and the Princess Royal, 1858-1861*, ed. Roger Fulford (New York, 1964), 73, 144, 173-174.

encouraged the Queen to permit the Prince of Wales to accept the Canadian invitation on her behalf. Not only would the presence of royalty in the New World strengthen the colony's ties to Britain through its sentiment for the monarchy, but a royal visit would also formally thank the Province of Canada for its contribution of a regiment to the Crimean War (1853-56) and, therefore, assist in securing its continued military support in future wars. As well, Newcastle informed Queen Victoria that if the Prince of Wales' visit could be extended to include the United States, the Prince's presence in Washington as a guest of President Buchanan could soothe uneasy relations between the two nations, strained due to a boundary dispute between Vancouver Island and the state of Washington. Confident that the allure of royalty was not limited to members of the British Empire, Newcastle assured her "that nothing would so much gratify Mr. Buchanan as a visit from His Royal Highness to the United States during his Presidency...." The Queen agreed, but instructed her Colonial Secretary to ensure "that the State Visit to the Colonies should be the main feature of his journey, & not an adjunct to a visit to the United States...."²⁶

Shortly after it was learned that the Queen had expressed her desire that the Prince of Wales should visit Canada, the Duke of Newcastle was met with invitations from the Maritime colonies requesting that the Prince extend his visit to their provinces. Newcastle gratified his

²⁶F. Darrell Munsell, *The Unfortunate Duke: Henry Pelham, Fifth Duke of Newcastle, 1811-1864* (Columbia, 1985), 238, 242, 256, 287; James A. Gibson, "The Duke of Newcastle and British North American Affairs, 1859-64," *Canadian Historical Review* 44, no. 2 (1963): 142-156; Duke of Newcastle to Queen Victoria, 26 September 1859, *The Letters of Queen Victoria, 1837-1861*, eds. Arthur C. Benson and Viscount Esher, vol. 3 (London, 1908), 373; Ged Martin, "Queen Victoria and Canada," *American Review of Canadian Studies* 13, no. 3 (1983): 215; Newcastle Papers, reel A-307, vol. C1, pp. 107-108, Duke of Newcastle to Lord Palmerston, 18 January 1860; Kinley E. Roby, *The King, the Press and the People: A Study of Edward VII* (London, 1975), 56-59.

Maritime petitioners by informing them that visits to Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island have "from the first formed part of His Royal Highnesses' projected tour."²⁷ Soon after President Buchanan's invitation was received and accepted, Newcastle then set about making arrangements for the Tour in his capacity as official advisor to the Prince and leader of the royal party, positions he had been instructed to assume by Prince Albert.²⁸ Since arrangements for the Royal Visit were mostly to be made in the localities concerned, and in view of his belief that his colonial officers were better attuned to the feelings and expectations of colonials, Newcastle entrusted the Tour's programme to the Governor General and the Lieutenant Governors. As he explained to Sir Edmund Head in February 1860, he needed only to know that the Prince would leave Britain around July 10 and return by October 1 (a date later extended to the end of October); beyond that, matters would be in Head's hands. He added, however, that the programme would be reviewed by Queen Victoria "so that Her Majesty may have the opportunity of considering it with regard to the time to be occupied and other considerations."²⁹

Sir Edmund, in turn, entrusted John Rose, the Chief Commissioner of Public Works, with organising the Tour in the Province of Canada. Rose's main responsibility was to arrange

²⁷NAC, Colonial Office, Nova Scotia, original correspondence, MG11 CO 217/226, reel B-1102, Earl of Mulgrave to Duke of Newcastle, 22 May 1860; NAC, Colonial Office, New Brunswick, entry books, MG11 CO 189/20, reel B-2330, Duke of Newcastle to J.H. Manners-Sutton, 19 April 1860; NAC, Colonial Office, Nova Scotia, entry books, MG11 CO 218/36, reel B-1824, Duke of Newcastle to Earl of Mulgrave, 19 April 1860; Morgan, *The Tour of H.R.H. the Prince of Wales*, 15-19; Munsell, *The Unfortunate Duke*, 239.

²⁸Newcastle Papers, reel A-1610, Journal of the Royal Tour of 1860, 9 July 1860.

²⁹*Ibid.*, reel A-1610, Duke of Newcastle to Edmund Head, 17 February 1860.

transportation and accommodation for the progress of the royal party which numbered between 250 and 300 persons when guards of honour, police, couriers, and attendants who were to accompany the Prince on his travels were included. No expense was spared for the government's entertainment of the Prince. All of the royal residences were renovated and refurnished with furniture bearing the crest of the Prince of Wales, an image which was also imprinted upon flags, chinaware, and countless other ephemera. Including the one hundred man military escort from the Royal Canadian Rifles and the hiring of horses and carriages, the Canadian government's expenses came to approximately half a million dollars.³⁰

While the governments of Canada, Newfoundland, and the Maritime colonies arranged the logistics surrounding the Royal Tour in their own locales, most of the responsibility for the planning and arrangement of decorations, public events, and entertainments for the Prince rested with municipal councils and "Citizen's Committees." The municipal planning of the celebration followed a similar pattern throughout British North America. First, a city, or county, would call a meeting of its citizens "for the purpose of making the necessary preliminary arrangements for the reception and entertainments of HRH the Prince of Wales, on his proposed visit to this City." As Bonnie Huskins points out in her analysis of public celebrations in Victorian Saint John and Halifax, these public meetings served as a "forum for the views of the most prominent elements" in the communities concerned. The meetings also served to allow those elements to dominate appointments to Citizen's Committees to assist in the planning of the celebration. The public meeting held for this purpose in Toronto, for example, resolved that a committee be appointed

³⁰NAC, Thomas Wiley Papers, MG29 E1, "A Reminiscence of the Visit of the Prince of Wales to Canada in 1860," March 1883; David M.L. Farr, "Sir John Rose," *Dictionary of Canadian Biography* 11 (1982): 766-772.

by city council “to make such arrangements for [the Prince’s] reception as to them shall seem advisable” and that the committee consist of the Mayor and Aldermen of the city in addition to select members of the community, i.e. male members of the traditional ruling families and legal professions such as John Beverley Robinson, W.H. Boulton, and John Hillyard Cameron.³¹ The forms of public celebration, entertainments for the Prince, and admission to royal events thus conformed to the values, aspirations, and exclusionary beliefs of a dominant culture. Although, as will be seen, plans and actions did not go uncontested, each of the main types of celebration and entertainment held during the Royal Tour of 1860—civic receptions, levees, reviews of the local militias, and royal balls—served to strengthen the social authority of the ruling élite and to augment the influence of its world view.

Since each of these events were played out in similar fashion from colony to colony and from city to city, what follows examines the patterns they combined to make up rather than the individual occurrence. First though, a brief overview of the Royal Tour of 1860 is presented in order to provide further context for the performance of the royal ceremonies and princely entertainments.

A Chronology of the Royal Tour of 1860

As soon as the projected date of the Prince’s arrival in each colony was announced, a bustle of activity swept British North America. The inhabitants of every city, town, and rural enclave along the royal route busied themselves with civic improvements and the erection of

³¹City of Toronto Archives, City Council Minutes, 1860, Appendix no. 98, Adam Wilson to the Council of the Corporation of the City of Toronto, 4 June 1860; Bonnie L. Huskins, “Public Celebrations in Victorian Saint John and Halifax,” (Ph.D. diss., Dalhousie University, 1991), 31-33.

temporary decorations such as illuminations, triumphal arches, flags, evergreens, banners, and window displays. Describing his impression of the work done in Halifax, for example, the correspondent for the *London Times* observed that "Even a week before the Prince's arrival, scarcely a house but was preparing its illuminations and transparencies, not a street so small as to be without its triumphal arch. In some there were constantly as many as ten or five, in others more than ten: a perfect vista of flags and evergreens." Indeed, by the time all was complete "the town was perfectly concealed under such a mass of triumphal arches, illuminations, decorations, arcades, flags, and banners, that Halifax proper was no longer to be seen, but in its stead was a town of colours, tinsel, wreaths, lamps, flowers, and evergreens...."³² The scene in Halifax was repeated throughout the colonies and, as journalists tried their best to describe the extent of the preparations made for His Royal Highness, perhaps none better captured the frenzy overtaking the colonies than Rafael De Cordova, an American observer who, in mocking the royal delirium, wrote in verse

Write the letters! Sweep the halls!
 Erect the arches! Deck the walls!
 Charge all the guns! Subscribe for *balls*!
 Polish the engines! Clean the hose!
 Pipe-clay the belts for soldiers' clothes!
 Burnish the bayonets! Buy new dresses!
 Drill the children! Write addresses!
 Let the Common Council all
 Beflag and deck the City Hall!
 Hang out the banners! Light the groves!
 Hire coaches! Purchase gloves!
 Adjourn Courts! Postpone Sessions!
 Buy Roman candles! Form processions!
 For hark, the trumpets! Hark the drums!

³²N.A. Woods, *The Prince of Wales in Canada and the United States* (London, 1861), 16-17.

The Princely Heir of England comes!³³

On the one hand, the decorations demonstrated the loyalty of colonists and acted as an expression of their affection towards the Prince and his mother. With the exception of Canada East where the tricolour was added to the jumble of images, the reigning iconography attached to and inscribed upon arches, banners, transparencies, and window displays remained essentially the same in every part of the colonies. "God Save the Queen," "Welcome Albert Edward," "Long Live the Prince," and "Loyalty" were the most popular words and phrases while images of crowns, maple leaves entwined with the rose, thistle, and shamrock, Union Jacks, and the three plumed emblem of the Prince of Wales added symbolic resonance to the loyalty of residents. The displays of decorations and pyrotechnics amazed the royal party. Describing their carriage ride through New Brunswick, for example, Henry Acland, Regius Professor of Medicine at Oxford and physician to the Prince, recalled that

For nearly three miles we wound away between living walls sided by fir trees, planted by the way side for ornament the whole way, where they were not by nature. I became at the last quite overpowered—We passed through an Arch 50 feet high made of boughs and fir trees most beautiful to behold, surmounted by trees 12 feet high.

Faced with either an elaborate display and/or the cheers of thousands at every turn, Acland was compelled to ask ironically "Is England separated from her colonies?"³⁴ The Duke of Newcastle found himself lost for words in describing what the royal party witnessed during their travels through British North America. Lacking the ability to encapsulate the wondrous displays and

³³Rafael J. De Cordova, *The Prince's Visit: A Humorous Description of the Tour of His Royal Highness, the Prince of Wales, Through the United States of America in 1860* (New York, 1861), 9-10.

³⁴NAC, Henry Wentworth Acland Papers, MG40 Q40, vol. 1, letter 3, 2 August 1860.

outpouring of affection for the Queen and her son, he could only assure Queen Victoria and Lord Palmerston that every community had spared no expense or effort in honouring the Prince: the cheers everywhere “were absolutely deafening.”³⁵

The first of these cheers rang out on July 23 as the royal party arrived in the harbour of St. John's, Newfoundland aboard the *HMS Hero* to begin their two-month tour of British North America which would take them from Newfoundland and the Maritimes through the Canadas and into America at Detroit from where they would set off for a further month touring the major cities of the American Midwest and the Northeast [Figure 2.1]. Joining the Prince, Acland, and the Duke of Newcastle in the royal entourage were Newcastle's private secretary, the Lord Steward of the Royal Household, two equerries, and Major-General Robert Bruce who, with Newcastle, had been instructed by the Prince Consort to direct the Prince's entire course of actions. As the Prince's Governor, General Bruce had the added duty, as specified by Queen Victoria, to “be always lodged under the same roof as the Prince, and generally as near him as is convenient.”³⁶

After spending a couple of days in the Newfoundland capital the Prince embarked for Halifax arriving there on July 30. In Halifax, as in St. John's, he was received on the wharf by local dignitaries and presented with a few loyal addresses. Shortly thereafter, he was paraded through the streets in a procession to Government House under the gaze of thousands. As the Prince dined at a banquet in the evening, the public flowed through the streets to see the grand

³⁵Newcastle Papers, reel A-307, vol. D, Duke of Newcastle to Queen Victoria, 7 August 1860; vol. C1, Duke of Newcastle to Lord Palmerston, 2 September 1860.

³⁶*Ibid.*, reel A-1610, Duke of Newcastle to Edmund Head, 13 June 1860.

display of fireworks and illuminations which, due to a heavy downpour, was no more than a sputter. The Prince's first full day in the Nova Scotian capital was, like the day of his landing, observed as a general holiday as shops and stores closed and little business transacted beyond the selling of newspapers and souvenir items by an enterprising few. The Prince began his day on the common reviewing the regulars and volunteers from two regiments of the local garrison who marched and drilled before him. After the review, the Prince returned to Government House only to venture out again in the evening for the Grand Ball. The next day featured a regatta followed by a levee in the afternoon at Government House. On August 2, the Prince and his entourage left Halifax for Saint John, Fredericton, and then Charlottetown where the same pattern as displayed and performed in Halifax repeated itself—reception and addresses, levee, ball, and entertainment for the public in the form of fireworks and illuminations—a dull routine, again ridiculed by Rafael De Cordova in rhyme:

[A]s for the Canadas! Loyalty's run
Into madness almost for VICTORIA's son.

...
They have dined him, and wined him, in manner most royal,
Addressed and harangued him to prove they were loyal,
They have bored him in parks, and they've bored him in halls;
Danced him almost to death in no end of balls.

...
[T]hey rode him and boated him, church'd him and speech'd him,
Feasted him, toasted him, ball'd him, and preach'd him;
And, wishing all possible honor to do him,
Made him review them, that they might review him.³⁷

Indeed, the Prince's visit to the Canadas, which began with his landing at Quebec on August 18, differed little from his Maritime tour and De Cordova's poetic parody. Following

³⁷De Cordova, *The Prince's Visit*, 11-13.

his stay in Quebec City—it featured the inevitable succession of addresses, a levee, a ball, pyrotechnical displays, and visits to the Ursuline Convent, Laval, and the Plains of Abraham—he ventured to Montreal on August 24 to be similarly fêted, but with a couple of new additions. The celebration of industrial progress was reserved for one day as the Prince inaugurated the Industrial Exhibition of Montreal and then, the highlight of the Tour, opened the Victoria Bridge. And, besides the most elaborate ball yet held during the Tour, Princely entertainments included the performance of Indian games, a cantata by the Oratorio Society, and a trip down the Lachine rapids.³⁸

The visit to Ottawa was remarkable only for the Prince's laying of the foundation stone for the still to be constructed Parliament Buildings on September 1. While significant in its underscoring of Ottawa's new found place as the political centre of Canada, as designated by the Queen in 1857, it had little general meaning. According to the *Times* correspondent "The ceremony of laying a foundation stone is...like opening a bridge...or inaugurating waterworks, or any other meagre and unsatisfactory State ceremonial which Royalty is occasionally compelled to endure in deference to public feeling. At this the splendid silver trowel was, of course, an object of interest second only to the Prince himself...."³⁹ Far more interesting, but for all of the wrong reasons, was the Prince's jaunt by steamer from Brockville to Toronto. Though the Prince arrived at Kingston at about noon on September 4 the royal party did not—and would not—land because of a demonstration by Orangemen who had erected their own arch for the Prince to pass under. Since the Duke of Newcastle would not permit the Prince to land and, by

³⁸An analysis of the Indian games is contained in Chapter VII below.

³⁹Woods, *The Prince of Wales in Canada and the United States*, 159.

so doing, condone the actions of a group not only outlawed in Britain but offensive to the large Roman Catholic population of Canada, the royal steamer left Kingston for Belleville. There it was met with a second Orange reception. Refusing to give in, Newcastle ordered the steamer to its next destination, Cobourg, where Orangemen had received the Duke's message loudly and clearly and desisted from demonstrating.⁴⁰

Notwithstanding an Orange presence at the Prince's arrival in Toronto, the Prince nonetheless landed on September 7 to receive his dose of addresses, levee presentations, balls, and militia reviews from the inhabitants of the western province's chief city. In addition to the regular events, the Prince found himself hustled about opening Queen's Park, inaugurating the Horticultural Society's grounds, and attending a grand reception at Osgoode Hall. Upon leaving Toronto on September 12, the royal party headed for London (to hold a levee and attend a ball) followed by short stops along the rail line at Sarnia, Woodstock, Paris, Brantford, Niagara Falls, Queenston Heights, and finally Hamilton (to hold a levee and attend a ball). After holding his last levee, opening his last Exhibition, and attending his last ball in British North America at Hamilton, the Prince left Canada on September 20 as he crossed into Detroit for the American leg of his tour. His non-state tour of the United States would last a further month and would take him west to Chicago, down to St. Louis, and back east to Richmond, Washington, Philadelphia, New York, Boston, and the final destination of Portland, Maine from where he and his entourage sailed back to England on October 20.⁴¹

⁴⁰The Orange demonstrations and other events of an ethnic and/or religious character, such as the Prince's visits to Laval and the Ursuline Convent, are examined in Chapter V below.

⁴¹Analysis of the Prince's Tour of the United States is beyond the scope of this dissertation.

Receptions, Addresses, and Levees

According to many observers and participants, the Royal Tour of 1860 had been a wonderful success in uniting the inhabitants of British North America and strengthening their loyalty to the Mother Country through their affection for the Queen and Prince. Commenting on the impact of the Prince's visit to Prince Edward Island, the Lieutenant Governor told Newcastle that "The enthusiasm towards His Royal Highness among all classes is unbounded. His courtesy and winning manners have elicited but one feeling: that of admiration and loyal affection."⁴² Dr. Henry Acland reached a similar conclusion in Quebec where he was convinced that "all classes have united" to make the Prince's visit "acceptable from its unanimity, acceptable from its loyalty, acceptable from its splendour...."⁴³ Members of the press also emphasised the "unity of all classes" as they, too, reported that the public "thought of nothing but their eagerness to show their devotion to their Sovereign, and her representative." "All the citizens," it was reported of Toronto, "vied with each other [as to] who should do the most to indicate the joyous enthusiasm with which all classes were eager to greet the advent of the Prince of Wales...."⁴⁴

While there is little disputing the "joyous enthusiasm" displayed by the public, it is an exaggeration to state that everyone "thought of nothing" but selflessly pleasing the Prince. Some members of society had, to be sure, "vied with each other" but not entirely in the way suggested. There had been, in fact, a good deal of competition between members of the middle and upper

⁴²Newcastle Papers, reel A-309, George Dundas to Duke of Newcastle, 13 August 1860.

⁴³Quoted in J.B. Atlay, *Sir Henry Wentworth Acland, Bart., K.C.B., F.R.S., Regius Professor of Medicine in the University of Oxford: A Memoir* (London, 1903), 269.

⁴⁴Robert Cellem, *Visit of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales to the British North American Provinces and the United States in the Year 1860* (Toronto, 1861), 213, 224.

classes as they sought access to the Prince along with the social recognition—and authority—that such an honour could bestow. Consequently, opportunities to honour the Prince at address presentations and at levees were contested as members of the upper class showered the Prince with addresses and jockeyed for position at levees while the middle class looked on, criticised the behaviour of the “would-be gentry” and then offered an alternative in the form of the more “respectable” behaviour it thought appropriate to the leaders of society.

Shortly after the public announcement of the Royal Visit to the colonies, the press—largely a vehicle for the expression of middle class opinion—warned of the possible overzealousness of a segment of society inclined to “push themselves forward, and to take to themselves airs” at public occasions. The *Globe* argued that if those “persons whose only qualification is impudence” gain control of the organising committees, then the Prince’s journey through Canada would become “a punishment instead of a pleasure” given their tendency to “go crazy” in the presence of royalty. Such a result “will undoubtedly ensue,” the writer concluded, “unless the arrangements for the royal progress be placed in the hands of discreet and fitting men.”⁴⁵ The *Quebec Chronicle* concurred arguing that the object of their city’s organising committee should be to see that “the display harmonize[s] as far as possible with the habits and tastes of a well-bred gentleman, to leave the Prince as much as may be to select his own mode of enjoying his visit, neither impeded by a superabundance of officious zeal, or made miserable by incessant worship and adoration.”⁴⁶ Reserve, respect, and dignity, and not the excessive

⁴⁵*Globe*, 18 May 1860. Newcastle also feared that a “good deal of *self-seeking*” may be indulged in and asked Head to try to assert some “controlling influence.” Newcastle Papers, reel A-1610, Duke of Newcastle to Edmund Head, 9 May 1860.

⁴⁶*Quebec Chronicle* quoted in the *Globe*, 21 June 1860.

emotionality and public clamouring exhibited by those who supposed themselves Canada's upper tenth, were the signs of true leadership.

In Halifax, too, the *Morning Sun* predicted that if "the Prince be surrounded with the military and other officials of the Government, to the exclusion of the people, then I say it will most certainly be a sad affair," if not "a *Barnum* affair."⁴⁷ By summer, however, it had become clear that members of the upper class, as in other British North American cities, had come to control the organising committees in Halifax and were seeking to monopolise the Prince's attentions for themselves. The *Acadian Recorder*, though, believed that the lack of "respectable" conduct on the part of the upper class would lead to its undoing as its "impudence" would insult proper etiquette and, as a result, lead to its being "taken down in [its] own social self-estimate." As the press had predicted, the Prince's tour of Nova Scotia did lead to his being surrounded by "hangers-on...like so many beagles around a slain fox, as if they had never saw a human being before." Commenting on the Prince's arrival in Windsor, Nova Scotia, one observer noted that "from the moment [the Prince] stepped from the cars he was surrounded by a host of the would-be gentry of our own county, from the head of the Council to the smallest member of the Ministerial tail, who hid him entirely from the view of the many thousands present, who looked for His Royal Highness with anxious eye."⁴⁸ As the upper class sought to legitimise its position in the social order by gaining exclusive access to the Prince, the middle class, in turn, attempted to discredit it by portraying its members as a group of unrespectable toadies:

⁴⁷*Morning Sun*, 30 May 1860, quoted in Huskins, "Public Celebrations in Victorian Sain John and Halifax," 33.

⁴⁸*Acadian Recorder*, 9 June, 14 July, 11 August 1860.

Perhaps even more important to the upper class during the reception of the Prince, and even more galling to the middle class, were the presentations of addresses on these occasions. The prospect of not only being seen with the Prince, but of presenting an address of loyalty to the son of Queen Victoria on behalf of the inhabitants of one's town or county generated a frenzy of address-writing throughout the colonies.⁴⁹ As early as May, the *Globe* noted that addresses were already in production everywhere by the "cart-load." Explaining that "We see no reason why the Prince should be subjected to the fearful infliction of being read at for days and weeks," the editors argued that the presentation of only a few would be more courteous and respectful.⁵⁰ Despite the *Globe*'s suggestion, the councils and Citizen's Committees of every town and county along the royal route prepared an address to be presented by their members upon the Prince's reception in their community.

Although generated by different corporations all over British North America, the addresses to the Prince of Wales were remarkably similar. Beginning by offering their "humble" and "heart-felt welcome" to the son of "our Most Gracious Queen," they emphasized the "unprecedented honour" the Prince has "condescendingly" afforded them to express their "devoted loyalty and unwavering attachment to the Throne," the Prince, the Queen, and the Prince Consort. Each address would then offer a brief description of the wealth and prosperity of its community and end with even more profuse expressions of loyalty, affection, and

⁴⁹Ian Radforth, "'Called to the attention of the whole civilized world': The Visit of the Prince of Wales to British North America, 1860" *Zeitschrift für Kanada-studien* 20, no. 1 (2000): 188-189.

⁵⁰*Globe*, 18 May 1860.

attachment to the Queen and Empire.⁵¹ For some members of the public, it was too much to bear. Commenting on the address presented by the Executive of the Nova Scotian government—which differed little from any other address—one writer found that it was “so full of self-laudation that a body of men with any intelligence or spirit should have scorned to present...[such an] egotistical and inflated address.” Certainly, the writer’s hostility may have been politically motivated due to the fact that the Executive would not permit the Opposition to join in the address, but members of the royal party also expressed their frustration with the monotonous flood of addresses. After a time, the Duke of Newcastle, who had to pen the Prince’s reply to each address, bewailed to the Queen the strain on his “powers of originality” and Dr. Acland found that the “no end” of addresses was “to us a cause of considerable inconvenience.”⁵²

Unfortunately for the royal party, once a municipal body had presented its address upon the Prince’s arrival they could expect further address recitations at a local levee from religious bodies, volunteer societies, and the towns and counties not along the royal route. The presentation of addresses, however, comprised only a small part of a levee. The main function of a levee, or Drawing Room in the case of women, was to permit certain select male members of society to pay their respects to the monarch at Court. The ceremony, as held in Britain, was

⁵¹Fifth Duke of Newcastle, Henry Pelham Fiennes Pelham Clinton, ed., *Addresses Presented to H.R.H. The Prince of Wales During His State Visit to British North America, with the Replies Thereto, July, August, September 1860* (London, 1860).

⁵²*Acadian Recorder*, 4 August 1860; Huskins, “Public Celebrations in Victorian Saint John and Halifax,” 91-94; Newcastle Papers, reel A-1610, Duke of Newcastle to Edmund Head, 13 June 1860; Sidney Lee, *King Edward VII: A Biography*, vol. 1 (London, 1925), 88-89; Acland Papers, letter 11, 11 September 1860.

limited to members of the aristocracy, the upper ranks of the church, military, and navy, diplomats, ministers of the Crown, chief civil servants, ambassadorial officials, and sometimes distinguished men from the medical and legal professions and the arts. The presentations were brief but formal and entailed the reading out of each person's name by an aide-de-camp, at which time the said person would come forward and pay his respects to the Queen by kissing her hand and passing on. No exchange would take place between the Queen and the person, but, more significantly in terms of social recognition, the person would find his name published in the press the next day as having been presented to the Queen. By displaying the status of its participants to the populace, the levee became an event at which the élite confirmed their position in the social scale.⁵³

Upon learning of the possibility of the Prince holding levees during his tour, complete with court etiquette, the *Globe* argued that there should be no "enforcement of formalities" which would restrict intercourse between the Prince and Canadians because such formalities were "not understood in this country and [are] contrary to prevailing sentiment."⁵⁴ To a certain extent, the levees were to be less formal than in the Mother Country. Queen Victoria directed that there should be no kissing of hands so that the ceremony should be more like those held by the Prince Consort on which occasions the men only passed by and bowed.⁵⁵ Also, admission was not to be restricted to persons of a certain social standing or occupation. Provided that a

⁵³Michael MacDonagh, *The English King: A Study of the Monarchy and the Royal Family, Historical, Constitutional and Social* (New York, 1929), 262-263; Leonore Davidoff, *The Best Circles: Society, Etiquette and the Season* (London, 1973), 25, 32.

⁵⁴*Globe*, 5 June, 26 May 1860.

⁵⁵Newcastle Papers, reel A-1610, Duke of Newcastle to Edmund Head, 17 April 1860.

person submitted his name and address at least one day before the levee and brought with him two cards "distinctly written" containing his name and office or military rank, one of which would be used to verify his name on the list of names previously submitted and the other to be read by the aide-de-camp or equerry at the time of presentation, he would be accepted upon passing two other significant conditions. First, all people were to appear in full dress which meant full uniform for military and militia officers and for the male public a suit of black with a dress coat. Considering that many people could not afford a dress coat with tails, the dress regulations in essence barred the lower middle and working classes from the levees, a point not lost on the *Montreal Witness* which argued that more sensible clothes, such as a frock coat, be adopted. Like the *Globe*, the editors of the *Witness* also found it "somewhat ill-judged to require a rigorous adherence to old-world etiquette in this free and easy country."⁵⁶ Secondly, and less contentious for the press, the regulations specified that only "gentlemen" would be fit to be presented to the Prince. Though permitted to be presented in Britain during Drawing Rooms, women were not allowed to participate in the levees held in British North America. The reason provided, and a likely one considering her attitude towards her son and directions given to General Bruce, was that the Queen had given orders that no ladies should be presented to the Prince so long as he was under age.⁵⁷

Though regarded by the *Times* correspondent as "dull" and "routine," the levees were well-attended by persons seeking to be recognised as "gentlemen" and as the "élite" of society. With an attendance of about two thousand gentlemen, the Montreal levee was considered by the

⁵⁶Canada, *Canada Gazette*, 4 August 1860; *Montreal Witness*, 11 August 1860.

⁵⁷*Canada Gazette*, 4 August 1860; *Globe*, 9 August 1860.

Montreal Transcript as “the most important public event of the visit.” “A personal introduction to the heir of England’s throne,” the writer exclaimed, “is an honour not lightly to be prized, nor within the grasp of every one.” Accordingly, newspapers in every community where a levee was held published the names of every “gentleman” presented to His Royal Highness. Even the *Canada Gazette* published their names, an action which drew the ire of the *Globe*’s editors who complained that it was unnecessary, especially at “four pence per line.”⁵⁸ As in the case of receptions and address presentations, the *Globe* felt that the levees catered to self-seeking upstarts who, in trying to play the part of social leaders, had actually exposed themselves as frauds from their lack of etiquette and decorum. Indeed, as one writer jibed in the case of the levee in Toronto, “The courtly gentlemen did not [even] know where to put their hats.”⁵⁹

Militia Reviews

Besides putting themselves forward as social leaders at address presentations and levees, some members of the upper class also sought to increase their status in the community by taking on commissions in the militia and participating in the Prince’s reviews of local companies or, better yet, acting as the Prince’s guard of honour. Militia commissions, according to J.K. Johnson, were “an almost indispensable mark of local status and were eagerly sought” by members of the upper class. Although the duties were more ceremonial than labourious, an appointment as a militia officer lent a person local prestige and prominence from military service,

⁵⁸Woods, *The Prince of Wales in Canada and the United States*, 209; *Montreal Transcript*, 28 August 1860; *Montreal Gazette*, 28 August 1860; *Globe*, 31 August 1860.

⁵⁹*Globe*, 10 September 1860.

a duty British North Americans "expected their prospective leaders to assume."⁶⁰ After a spate of military enthusiasm during the Crimean War, economic depression and the expiration of the Militia Act in 1858 had dampened militia service; it was, therefore, rejuvenated by the announcement of the Prince's tour. "A chance to parade before Queen Victoria's son," Desmond Morton writes, "and especially the opportunity to meet him, spurred prosperous Nova Scotians and New Brunswickers as well as Canadians to launch their own volunteer units." Excited by the prospect of being able to assert their status as officers leading companies either reviewed by or guarding the heir to the throne prompted members of the upper class in Halifax, Montreal, and Toronto to form what are now some of the oldest regiments of the Canadian Armed Forces. While Torontonians formed the Queen's Own Rifles in the spring of 1860, in Halifax the Scottish Rifles, Chebucto Greys, and several other rifles companies came together in the Halifax Volunteer Battalion which, like the Queen's Own Rifles, would be reviewed by the Prince and also serve as his Guard of Honour in their city. Similarly, the Canadian Grenadier Guards of Montreal traced one of its regiments to the Royal Tour. Commanding officer Lt. Col. Thomas Wiley, who handled much of the Tour's administrative work for John Rose, used his influence to have the 1st Battalion of Volunteer Militia Rifles of Canada renamed as the Prince of Wales *Regiment* of Volunteer Rifles, a regiment designation no other infantry unit would receive until 1900.⁶¹

⁶⁰Johnson, *Becoming Prominent*, 71-79.

⁶¹Desmond Morton, *A Military History of Canada*, 3d ed. (Toronto, 1992), 86-87; W.T. Barnard, *The Queen's Own Rifles of Canada, 1860-1960* (Don Mills, ON, 1960); Thomas J. Egan, *History of the Halifax Volunteer Battalion and Volunteer Companies, 1859-1887* (Halifax, 1888), 1-4; A. Fortesque Duguid, *History of the Canadian Grenadier Guards, 1760-1964* (Montreal, 1965), 31.

Militia reviews and Guards of Honour afforded their participants an opportunity to gain, or enhance, their status in the community. In order to further increase their prestige in the eyes of the public and, moreover, to ensure that only people of similar social distinction joined their companies, several militias adopted elaborate uniforms too expensive for members of the working class to afford. The high cost was not regarded as a financial burden by the mostly wealthy members of the militias: it was a "privilege" to be able to pay for their clothing and accoutrements as this allowed them "full liberty to select such styles and colours as the fancy of the members or their financial resources would allow." The result was a "great want of uniformity" on the part of some regiments in terms of colour and style of facings, but all remained uniformly expensive. The uniforms did more than keep working people from their ranks and cater to vanity. Worn not only during reviews, but also at levees and balls, they

served to distinguish members of the...élite from the rest of the population, while at the same time underlining their wearers' patriotic function. Uniforms were the embodiment of authority, but they also denoted service to the nation. This was why so much time and creativity were devoted to the business of designing and multiplying uniforms....⁶²

The uniforms—much less the position of the upper class at reviews and as Guards of Honour—did not impress everyone during the Royal Tour. Considering the motivations of the volunteer captains, colonels, and majors in gaining commissions and in forming companies specially for the Royal Visit, the middle class press, predictably, critiqued them as frauds who knew little about military performance, but much about fancy dress and ceremonies. After the Toronto levee, and the sizeable attendance of militia officers, the *Globe* felt that the Prince of

⁶²Morton, *A Military History of Canada*, 87; Egan, *History of the Halifax Volunteer Battalion and Volunteer Companies*, 3; Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837* (New Haven, 1992), 186-187.

Wales "should be told that these are not real soldiers, but only shams; that the great part of them are merely officers of Sedentary Militia; 'sedentary' meaning in this case 'nowhere.'" At the dedication of the Brock Monument, the paper's writers again critiqued the "new spick and span regiments" on their lack of military training, especially targeting the officers who, they joked, did not yet understand "the difference between 'right-shoulders forward,' and 'stand at ease.'" That shortcoming, however, did not prevent there being "more officers on board than men. That is a matter of course. If the privates had taken the command of the officers, then affairs would have looked about right."⁶³

Notwithstanding the self-seeking associated with it, the British government was pleased to witness the rise of militia companies which the Prince's tour had engendered. In fact, the Duke of Newcastle had stressed to the Governor General and Lieutenant Governors that "advantage should be taken of this visit to encourage the Militia and Volunteers as much as possible." Well aware that the Canadian militia suffered from a lack of training, staff organisation, and an officer corps whose only qualification was local prominence, the Duke advised Sir Edmund Head that "Any occasion on which The Prince could see them should be attended to" and that "any compliment which can give an impetus to the spirit of self-protection would be well placed." Similarly, (as the Prince of Wales told his mother) the Duke of Cambridge, the Commander-in-Chief of the British Army and youngest son of George III, had told the Prince of Wales that "I should see the Volunteers on every occasion so as to give them as much encouragement as possible, because he says that it is important that the inhabitants of the Colonies should understand that they must have some troops for their own defence which

⁶³*Globe*, 10 September, 19 September 1860.

hitherto they have been very slow in comprehending...."⁶⁴ Though newly recruited volunteers were motivated more by individual status than by concerns over colonial defence, the Prince's presence had, nevertheless, resulted in a significant growth in the size of local militias. Unfortunately, according to the historian of the Halifax volunteer battalion, after the initial excitement had passed some "found that drill and military training was not so simple a matter" and after the Prince's visit had come to an end "some little weeding out took place...."⁶⁵

Manliness and the Royal Ball

Militia reviews were notable not only for the attention they gave to the state of the volunteer companies and to the status of its men, but also for the opportunity they gave the public to (re)view the Prince of Wales. At the time, little was known about the eighteen-year old heir to the throne, either in Britain or British North America, since he had not yet been permitted to talk to reporters and his actions were usually monitored by his guardians. Consequently, when discussing the Prince's character journalists were unable to refer to any of his favourite activities, friends, or interests and, as a result, they had to examine and interrogate even his smallest actions during the Tour in order to get even an inkling of his personality. Only in this way could they present a picture of the future king.⁶⁶ Not uncoincidentally, the image the middle class press presented of the Prince was that of a respectable gentleman. Gleaned from such small indicators

⁶⁴Newcastle Papers, reel A-1610, Duke of Newcastle to Edmund Head, 17 June 1860, Duke of Newcastle to George Dundas, 30 June 1860; Stephen J. Harris, *Canadian Brass: The Making of a Professional Army, 1860-1939* (Toronto, 1988), 12-13; Albert Edward quoted in Lee, *King Edward VII*, 90.

⁶⁵Egan, *History of the Halifax Volunteer Battalion and Volunteer Companies*, 3.

⁶⁶Roby, *The King, the Press and the People*, 69.

as his countenance, bearing, and tone of voice, the press accorded the Prince the qualities of the ideal middle class gentleman—self-control, confidence, courtesy, honesty, and naturalness. By portraying the Prince of Wales as an exemplar of masculinity, the middle class sought to further legitimise their own claim to social authority on the basis of sharing the same respectable manly behaviour as the heir to the throne.

Commenting on his reception in Montreal, for example, the *Montreal Gazette* was able to ascertain from his brief walkabout that he exuded an “air of calm,” modesty, and even a “sweet dignity.” Furthermore, his “eloquent” reply to the address of loyalty exhibited cordiality, tact, and grace even though, unbeknownst to the press, it was penned by the Duke of Newcastle. Reports in other cities credited the Prince with courtesy, cordiality, affability, a “gentlemanly bearing,” and, from his participation in reviews, fearless horsemanship.⁶⁷ The press were also quick to point out his unostentatious behaviour, a faculty, it was explained, which belonged “only to the true gentleman” in order that he be able to set “at ease those who may be in his presence.” “There is about him no affectation,” the report continued, “no look or movement which can be pointed to as an assertion of superiority.” In fact, at times it seemed that his modesty and unassuming nature were so pronounced that some people were disappointed: as one elderly lady exclaimed “Why he’s only like other boys, after all.”⁶⁸ More pervasive, however, were the reports of the way in which his “dignified manner and bearing seem to have touched all hearts for there is scarcely a man or woman who can speak of him without tears.” Indeed, according

⁶⁷*Montreal Gazette*, 27 August 1860; *Globe*, 26 July, 17 August, 18 August, 10 August 1860; Morgan, *The Tour of H.R.H. the Prince of Wales*, ix, 23.

⁶⁸*Globe*, 17 August 1860; Cellem, *Visit of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales*, 100, 211-212.

to a member of the royal party, throughout his tour of British North America Albert Edward found himself "generally pronounced 'the most perfect production of nature.'"⁶⁹

While the Prince's participation in reviews, receptions, and levees had contributed to this interpretation of his personality, his attendance at royal balls offered the most influence and opportunity in defining his character. As an entertainment, the balls permitted a more relaxed image of the Prince to emerge than did formal ceremonies. Moreover, as the one activity at which the Prince was able to entertain women, the ball permitted him to exhibit one of the most important qualities of a gentleman—heterosexuality. Although not a term used until later in the century, "heterosexual" attitudes, contained in the concept of virility, became an important component of middle class respectability in the mid-nineteenth century since it supported family life and the moral order. Denoting not merely the participation of men and women in reproductive sex, but "a 'necessary' and 'essential' erotic orientation to the 'opposite' gender," virility/heterosexuality was distinguished by a public interest in women, the display of confidence in their company, a directness of approach, and, at the same time, a controlled manner. In contrast with the "indulgent" upper class and the "perverse" lower orders, the middle class male was able to control his male impulses and direct them in a manner compatible with the code of chivalry.⁷⁰ From the 1870s until his death in 1910 there could be little denying that Albert Edward demonstrated the characteristic of having a pronounced "erotic orientation" towards

⁶⁹Quoted in Martin, *The Life of His Royal Highness the Prince Consort*, 148-149, 191.

⁷⁰Gary Kinsman, *The Regulation of Desire: Homo and Hetero Sexualities*, 2d ed. (Montreal, 1996), 12, 55; Jonathan Ned Katz, *The Invention of Heterosexuality* (New York, 1995), 40-55; George L. Mosse, *Nationalism and Sexuality: Respectability and Abnormal Sexuality in Modern Europe* (New York, 1985), 1-2, 10; Jeffrey Weeks, *Sex, Politics and Society: The Regulation of Sexuality Since 1800* 2d ed. (London, 1989), 39, 42.

women, an obsession which led him into several extramarital affairs. In his youth, however, it seemed that his attitude was very much different. The young Prince's slight build, soft complexion, and seeming physical delicacy, features which were depicted in a lithograph widely published just before and during the Tour [Figure 2.2], lent themselves to rumours that he was a frail, effeminate lad uninterested in women or, as the *Illustrated London News* delicately put it, "less active in his habits and tastes than is usually found in young men of his age...."⁷¹ The Prince's attendance at balls and attention to the ladies, however, dispelled these rumours thanks largely to the press coverage which emphasised his interest in women, confidence, charm, and courtesy, and, in doing so, presented him as the perfect gentleman.

At each ball the Prince attended in St. John's, Halifax, Fredericton, Quebec, Montreal, Cobourg, Toronto, London, and Hamilton, the press reported that "His Royal Highness displayed no little devotion to the fair sex" and, it was said, preferred their company to that of gentlemen. At almost every ball he would arrive at 10:00 and usually did not leave until around 4:00 in the morning, unless the following day was a Sunday, in which case he departed just before midnight. Nearly every dance was danced. At the first ball he attended in St. John's he demonstrated to everyone his passion for dancing which he performed gracefully and with such skill that he "managed his spurs so well that no crinoline was torn."⁷² In fact, his waltzing was

⁷¹Stanley Weintraub, *Edward the Caresser: The Playboy Prince who Became Edward VII* (New York, 2001), 22, 30, 63; Joseph Pope, *Public Servant: The Memoirs of Sir Joseph Pope*, ed. Maurice Pope (Toronto, 1960), 15; Anne MacDermaid, "The Visit of the Prince of Wales to Kingston in 1860," *Historic Kingston*, no. 21 (1973): 54; *Illustrated London News*, 25 August 1860; Roby, *The King, the Press and the People*, 69.

⁷²Cellem, *Visit of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales*, 100-101, 268-269, 44. The Prince regularly wore a colonels uniform to the balls. Incidentally, he did not manage "his spurs so well" in Quebec where he caught them on a ladies dress and took a tumble. True to form, however, "He was

so adept that people were fully satisfied "that this was by no means the first occasion which he had placed his arm around a lady's waist!"⁷³ As for his dancing partners, the *Montreal Transcript* sympathised with the Prince who "must certainly have been troubled with 'un embarras de choix' amongst the bevy of fair damsels that surrounded him" at the Montreal Citizen's Ball. Such a problem, however, rarely prevented him from demonstrating his "good taste" by selecting "some of the prettiest young ladies in the room" for his partners.⁷⁴ While his vigour for the gallop and passion for the waltz entertained his partners, his charm was also credited for "the pleasant smiles which lit up the features of one and all [of those partners], [and] told plainly that he was making himself excessively agreeable." So agreeable that the *Illustrated London News* felt that after reading about his exploits on the dance floor "no one is likely to question his manliness...."⁷⁵

It seems the women in attendance at the balls required little convincing as to the Prince's manliness, according to male commentators. In fact, women were represented as in a constant "flutter" on account of the Prince's presence. Such a portrayal of women was consistent with the ideology of patriarchy which claimed that women were inherently emotional while men remained rational. Consequently, as Jane Connors argues, male and female royalism has been depicted differently. Men have been represented as interested solely in the institution of

⁷³Cellem, *Visit of His Royal Highness the prince of Wales*, 45.

⁷⁴*Montreal Transcript*, 28 August 1860; Woods, *The Prince of Wales in Canada and the United States*, 55; Cellem, *Visit of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales*, 62, 101.

⁷⁵Cellem, *Visit of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales*, 100; *Illustrated London News*, 25 August 1860.

monarchy while women have been transfixed with the Royal Family and its personalities.⁷⁶ During the Royal Tour of 1860, descriptions of the behaviour of men and women conformed to these stereotypes: middle class men were presented—not least by themselves—as restrained and respectful and women as emotional and unmannered. While middle class men were presented as watching the activities of the Prince out of loyalty, women were said to be in attendance solely “for the exhibition of their charms.” Endeavouring to attract the attention of the Prince—“that great object of feminine ambition”—ladies put on their best gowns and raised their skirts “by the crinoline a sufficient height from the ground to show the prettiest of ancles [*sic*].” Young ladies also tried “to make themselves as conspicuous as possible,” in the case of Bradford, by throwing “bouquets into the royal car.” Even more conspicuous, and revealing of the “female obsession” with the Prince, were the incidents of “Lady relic hunters” who, in Quebec, had removed the hair scrapings from his brushes and combs and, at the Crystal Palace Ball in Toronto, had “succeeded in abstracting the feather from the Prince’s cocked hat, which they entirely denuded of its plumes.” Curiously, though, the male relic hunting that took place as the bedroom furniture, dinner sets, and glassware specifically purchased and designed for the Prince’s use during the Tour were auctioned off did not attract the same sort of attention from the press.⁷⁷

⁷⁶Although touched on here, the complicity of women in the formation of middle class identity and their role in the production and dissemination of royal representations will be examined in-depth in Chapter III below. Connell, *Masculinities*, 164; Jane Connors, “Betty Windsor and the Egg of Dukemburg: Men, Women, and the Monarchy in 1954,” *Journal of Australian Studies*, no. 47 (1996): 67, 74.

⁷⁷Cellem, *The Visit of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales*, 33; Kinahan Cornwallis, *Royalty in the New World; or, the Prince of Wales in America* (London, 1860), 242, 129; *Globe*, 31 August 1860; Wiley Papers, “A Reminiscence of the Visit of the Prince of Wales to Canada in 1860,” 210, 230, 239-240.

It was behaviour at the balls, however, which garnered the greatest commentary on the part of those observing “female obsession” with the Prince. Decked out in their newly procured ball dresses, ladies stretched their necks and strained their eyes in order to get a glimpse of the Prince and “to admire his round face and graceful figure.” Regarded as “a great favourite of the ladies every where,” the Prince was most cherished as a dancing partner. “All crinolinedom was in a flutter,” the *Montreal Gazette* reported, at the prospect of dancing with the Prince. “Gentlemen tried in vain to procure partners” as they were refused by women wanting to leave every opportunity for a Princely invitation. Though a dance with the Prince was remote for women unconnected with the staff or governments, his bearing, handsome face, and royal stature have “made the ladies more loyal to the throne than ever, if that is possible.”⁷⁸

The balls were not meant for all women, or men, to attend since they were regarded as events organised for the entertainment of mainly the upper class. “The Ball of last evening,” the *Montreal Transcript* explained of its Citizen’s Ball, “was looked to by our *elite*—of the fair sex especially—with even greater interest than any other of the concomitants of the Prince’s visit.” In order to ensure the attendance of the right class of person—and to prevent working people from attending—steep ticket prices were instituted and a rigid fashion code was demanded at each ball. Despite the prevalence of a discourse affirming the unity of all subjects, the persistence of protocol, the demands on appropriate dress at certain functions, and the cost of admission to others supported social boundaries. At a cost of \$10 for a ticket admitting one gentleman and two ladies to the Toronto Crystal Palace Ball, \$20 for a ticket to two different events in the

⁷⁸Cellem, *The Visit of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales*, 100-101, 268-269; *Montreal Gazette*, 12 September 1860; *Globe*, 10 August 1860.

Montreal programme including the Citizen's Ball, and \$10 for a single ticket to the ball in Halifax, these events were—purposely—well beyond the reach of working people and led to what the *Halifax Evening Express* considered “a rather more aristocratic affair than it otherwise would have been.” The Halifax organising committee, however, had permitted the royal suite, military and naval officers, and “persons of distinction” to free admission, an offer which produced a mild contretemps since several people felt that they were of “distinction” and demanded free entry upon arrival.⁷⁹ Generally precautions were taken to ensure limited entry. In Montreal each ticket was numbered to place a “moral check” on “any ill-advised subscriber” who thought of transferring his or her tickets to “improper persons.” More common was the establishment of a dress code which specified that “no gentleman will be admitted to the Ball except in *full dress*,” which meant a black dress coat, black trousers, black or white waistcoat, white cravat, and white kid gloves. There were no published regulations as to appropriate attire for ladies though it was assumed that their dresses should match their male counterparts in their respectableness.⁸⁰

These regulations led to complaints that the balls, like other events connected with the Visit, “savour too much of aristocracy.” In defence of the Montreal organising committee, the *Montreal Transcript* unapologetically explained that their “labours are mainly directed to the

⁷⁹*Montreal Transcript*, 4 August, 28 August 1860; *Globe*, 16 August 1860; Woods, *The Prince of Wales in Canada and the United States*, 30-31; Raymond Montpetit, “Fêtes et société au Québec: la visite du Prince de Galles et la construction du Crystal Palace à Montréal, en 1860,” in *Travaux et Conférences, 1975-1979* (Montréal, 1979): 271; Huskins, “Public Celebrations in Victorian Saint John and Halifax,” 103.

⁸⁰*Montreal Transcript*, 4 August 1860; *Montreal Gazette*, 2 August 1860; *Acadian Recorder*, 14 July 1860.

getting up of entertainments on a magnificent scale; and attendance on them can only be procured on terms not accessible to many except the highest classes." The elevation of entertainments from "lower, coarse, vulgar" enjoyments implied the superiority of the upper class while legitimising social differences and justifying the expenditure of public appropriations on their own exclusive balls and dinners. Over half of the Nova Scotian appropriation for the Royal Tour went towards funding the Halifax ball and banquet which only the élite could afford to attend. In addition, much to the chagrin of the *Acadian Recorder*, the organising committee, composed of those "few individuals—the *rich* men of the community and those who pretend to belong to that class," had devoted part of the public appropriation "to cheapening Ball tickets for those who are able enough to pay for themselves...." Working people, meanwhile, were not even permitted to view the apartments holding the ball until after it was held and only then upon paying an admission charge of one shilling and three pence.⁸¹

By all accounts the most lavish ball occurred in Montreal where a specially constructed building was erected to hold an estimated five thousand dancers for the Citizen's Ball. Forming the ballroom in an immense circle with an orchestra in the centre surrounded by an outer circle for promenading, adjoining dressing and refreshment rooms with champagne fountains and lemonade taps, and an above gallery for easy viewing, the building cost \$47,000 for a single night's entertainment [Figure 2.3]. Notwithstanding the raising of two red ropes to limit access to the Prince, most people in attendance were thrilled by the event and felt the expense justified since the ball had "transcended any of the other festivities of the present jubilee, and that never,

⁸¹*Montreal Transcript*, 11 August 1860; Bourdieu, *Distinction*, 7; *Acadian Recorder*, 14 July 1860; Huskins, "Public Celebrations in Victorian Saint John and Halifax," 118-119; *Acadian Recorder*, 4 August 1860.

either on this continent or elsewhere, has there been an affair of the kind at all equalling it in any way."⁸²

In Toronto, the Citizen's Ball held in the Crystal Palace had been a lavish affair too, but, as middle class observers complained, it had been overshadowed by the so-called "reception" held at Osgoode Hall a couple of nights earlier. Merchants, manufacturers, and other professionals had no qualms over the Law Society of Upper Canada's intention to hold an evening reception for the Prince at Osgoode Hall, but when they learnt that the judges and lawyers had decided to introduce dancing into the evening's programme, they charged that the legal professionals, militia officers, and members of the traditional ruling families who would attend, were trying to monopolise the attentions of the Prince for themselves. By transforming the reception into a "genteel" ball, the Osgoode reception would lessen the significance of the "citizen's" ball and cement the claims of the lawyers and their friends as to who formed the city's élite. "As to their motive," the *Globe's* editors argued, "there can be no doubt that it proceeds from the most contemptible pride of class. Our mushroom aristocracy it appears will not condescend to mix with the middle classes even though a Prince is a guest." In a letter to the editor, "A Citizen" reached a similar conclusion and regarded it as

the most offensive case of self-created upper class exclusivism ever heard of in this Province. Do these lawyers fancy that they monopolize all the "gentility" and "respectability" of the city? It would seem so. It looks as if they wished to impress upon the mind of the Prince that Toronto has a circle of fashionable society occupying a sphere very much elevated above that of the merchants and traders, manufacturers and mechanics, whom he will meet at the other ball.

⁸²Wiley Papers, "A Reminiscence of the Visit of the Prince of Wales to Canada in 1860," 214; Woods, *The Prince of Wales in Canada and the United States*, 130-136; Cornwallis, *Royalty in the New World*, 100; *La Minerve*, 31 August 1860; *Montreal Gazette*, 30 August 1860.

Although the Law Society denied that it was going to hold a ball, "As soon as the guests entered it then became evident to them...that the affair had assumed all the features of a regular ball" complete with printed programmes and the performance of no less than sixteen dances. After conducting the Prince on a tour of the library, after whom everyone "scrambled up after him" and "squeezed their way in," the dancing began in earnest with the Prince alternatively taking the hand of the wife or daughter of Henry Boulton, Allan MacNab, John Beverly Robinson, University College president John McCaul, and Chief Justice William Draper. As expected, the rest of the approximately 800 attendees comprised members of the legal profession, officers, their wives and daughters, and, lastly, "a particularly lucky merchant or two thrown in." "It was," the *Montreal Gazette* concluded, "without doubt an exclusive affair, those invited and the parties who invited them forming, in their own estimates, at any rate, the cream of society."⁸³ Though shut out on this occasion and with their access restrained during other ceremonies, members of the middle class nonetheless had their own royal events and activities which they controlled and manipulated to their own benefit. These most important of these were the opening of the Victoria Bridge and the inauguration of Industrial Exhibitions.

The Victoria Bridge Celebration and Industrial Exhibitions

In the mid-nineteenth century, according to A.A. Den Otter, a "technological nationalism" swept British North America as technological innovation became regarded as "the engine of economic and moral growth." Progress became the key to prosperity and, as the industrial leaders supposedly responsible for it, the manufacturers and entrepreneurs of the

⁸³*Globe*, 24 August, 10 September 1860; Cellem, *The Visit of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales*, 234; *Montreal Gazette*, 12 September 1860.

middle class claimed respect and status. With their fortunes crucially tied to the continuation of technological change and industrialisation, the middle class promoted industrial progress and themselves by extension. As John Bodnar explains, the middle class had to instruct the public that change was not only constant, "but desirable and purposeful. Most of what had come before, in other words, had only one aim: to prepare the way for a technologically sophisticated society led by industrialists and entrepreneurs."⁸⁴ Leading the way to industrial society in Canada was the railway or, more specifically, the Grand Trunk Railway.

The Grand Trunk Railway was chartered in 1854 and, when completed in 1860, had lines stretching from Sarnia to the Eastern Townships and from Montreal to Portland, Maine. Benefiting from the influence of George-Étienne Cartier, who acted as the company's director while serving as Canada's Attorney-General, the Railway received government subsidies, loans, guarantees, a monopoly, and became "synonymous with the national interest." Regarded as the harbinger of economic growth, progress, and prosperity, the Grand Trunk had little difficulty in obtaining government support in building a bridge to cross the St. Lawrence River and connect Montreal to the ice-free port of Portland. Constructed by the engineering team of Alexander Ross and Robert Stephenson, the Victoria Bridge would rise at its highest level sixty feet above the water upon twenty-four stone piers which held up the 9,144 foot long tubular construction [Figure 2.4]. Hailed as a victory of man over nature and as a symbol of Canadian technological progress, the completion of the Victoria Bridge demanded a fitting opening and the government

⁸⁴ A. A. Den Otter, *The Philosophy of Railways: The Transcontinental Railway Idea in British North America* (Toronto, 1997); John E. Bodnar, *Remaking America: Public Memory, Commemoration, and Patriotism in the Twentieth Century* (Princeton, 1992), 30-31.

successfully petitioned the Prince of Wales to lay the last stone.⁸⁵

Although “in colonial importance, the chief feature in the royal visit to Montreal,” the formal opening of the Bridge was much like the inauguration of bridges elsewhere. “There was the usual platform covered with scarlet cloth,” the *Times* correspondent observed, “and a little scaffolding, from which hung a ponderous slab of granite, the last stone required to complete the masonry of the marvellous undertaking.” The Prince of Wales arrived in the afternoon in an open railway carriage built for the occasion and, after meeting local politicians and Grand Trunk executives, he patted a bed of mortar with a silver trowel upon which was then placed the last block of limestone. After giving the block a few taps with a mallet, the Prince proceeded to the centre of the Bridge to drive in the last rivet, a ceremony that “is nothing to describe, though it would have made a grand picture.” An exclusive luncheon at a local shop completed, the Prince then returned to Montreal.⁸⁶

Despite its unspectacular presentation, the Prince’s opening of the Victoria Bridge had served the middle class well. The inauguration celebrated progress and technological achievement and, as the paragons of progress and industrial development, manufacturers and entrepreneurs benefited from the attention, and legitimation, the Prince’s attendance granted to

⁸⁵Young, *George-Étienne Cartier*, 111-116; Triggs, *Le Pont Victoria*, 19, 21, 41, 43, 69; Charles Legge, *A Glance at the Victoria Bridge and the Men Who Built It* (Montreal, 1860). Similarly, the Prince was used to promote the European and North American Railway by riding its rails and surveying the Reversing Falls Suspension Bridge in New Brunswick. Bonnie Huskins, “‘A Tale of Two Cities’: Boosterism and the Imagination of Community during the Visit of the Prince of Wales to Saint John and Halifax in 1860,” *Urban History Review* 28, no. 1 (1999): 31-46.

⁸⁶Woods, *The Prince of Wales in Canada and the United States*, 119, 125-128; Cornwallis, *Royalty in the New World*, 94-96; Gloria Lesser, “En 1860, le Prince de Galles inaugure le pont Victoria,” *Vie des Arts*, no. 105 (1981-82): pp. 38-40, 89.

both technological change and themselves. For a class trying to attain hegemony and authority in society, royal blessing was invaluable especially since everyone was not comfortable with the swift and dramatic changes ushered in by industrial development and technological innovation. Representing tradition, stability, and continuity, the monarchy acted as a reassuring presence in a time of change. By opening the Victoria Bridge, and sanctioning progress and technological change, the Prince of Wales reassured an anxious public that the developments posed no threat to society. As in Britain, where Queen Victoria and Prince Albert visited and gave their blessing to a variety of industrial monuments, the Prince had legitimised progress, commercial enterprise, and industrialisation through his inauguration of the Bridge. In addition, as Peter Williams argues, the royal blessing of industrial achievement conferred "the ultimate acknowledgement of middle class worth and of the place of contemporary industrial and commercial progress in the nation's...history."⁸⁷

Not surprisingly, then, the Prince was also invited to open the Exhibitions of industrial progress held in Montreal, Toronto, and Hamilton. On learning that the Prince would visit British North America, the manufacturers of each city immediately planned to hold an Industrial Exhibition for His Royal Highness to visit and to house and display their products in local versions of Joseph Paxton's Crystal Palace. While the Palaces stood as living monuments to the presence of the industrial class, their contents equally promoted the British North American manufacturing industry with displays of raw materials transformed into furniture, clothing,

⁸⁷Bodnar, *Remaking America*, 248; Walden, *Becoming Modern in Toronto*, 15; Michael Billig, *Talking of the Royal Family* (London, 1992); Tom Nairn, *The Enchanted Glass: Britain and its Monarchy* (London, 1988); Asa Briggs, *Victorian Cities* (1963; reprint, London, 1968), 170; Adrienne Munich, *Queen Victoria's Secrets* (New York, 1996), 10-11; Peter R. Williams, "Public Discussion of the British Monarchy, 1837-87" (Ph.D. diss., Cambridge University, 1988), 200-201.

machinery, and a host of other products. The Prince's visits to the Exhibitions were as unspectacular as the opening of the Victoria Bridge, but as in that case the Prince's mere presence sanctioned the industrial progress exhibited therein and, consequently, helped to legitimise the authority of the burgeoning middle class.⁸⁸

Working Class Participation

While the upper and middle classes competed between themselves for the attentions of the Prince, members of the working class had difficulty even seeing Queen Victoria's son. Concerned over growing labour organisation and worker behaviour, the upper and middle classes had limited the access of the working class to the Prince, except when it suited them. Kept off reception committees, unable to attend the levees and balls due to dress regulations and ticket prices, and refused entry to the Industrial Exhibitions until after the Prince had been escorted through, the working class experience of the Royal Tour of 1860 was one of shared exclusion. Barred from inside entertainments, skilled workers in Montreal nonetheless demanded admission to the ballrooms while working people in other towns took to the streets and joined processions to honour the Prince and claim social recognition. In response, the middle class prescribed proper respectable behaviour to working people through their own actions while discrediting the claims of workers by representing them as disorderly spectators.

Working people were permitted to present only one address to the Prince of Wales, that being from the working men and artisans of the Grand Trunk Railway Company on the occasion

⁸⁸Walden, *Becoming Modern in Toronto*; Triggs, *Le Pont Victoria*, 81; E.A. Heaman, *The Inglorious Arts of Peace: Exhibitions in Canadian Society During the Nineteenth Century* (Toronto, 1999), 91-92; Montpetit, "Fêtes et société au Québec," 263-264; *Montreal Gazette*, 3 September 1860; Nairn, *The Enchanted Glass*, 76.

of the opening of the Victoria Bridge. The address expressed the same sentiments of loyalty as any municipal tract and bore little evidence of its class origins, with the exception of a reference to the late deceased Robert Stephenson the Bridge's designer "who rose from our own class." The mobility-affirming thrust of this remark was underscored by the observation that the Grand Trunk Railway treated its workers well and that all labourers could aspire to greatness through honest toil. The Prince's reply played right along: Stephenson's rise from "your class" had demonstrated England's opening "to all her Sons the same prospect of success to genius combined with honest industry. All cannot attain the prize, but all may strive for it; and in this race victory is not to the wealthy or the powerful, but to him to whom God has given intellect, and has implanted in the heart the moral qualities which are requisite to constitute true greatness." The Prince's reply reflected well the attitude of the middle class: one of its organs promptly published the address and response in full.⁸⁹

Though the address suggested the contentment of the mechanics who had worked on the Bridge, members of the local Mechanic's Institute complained openly about their treatment during the Royal Tour to Montreal. Sponsored by the middle class to improve the morality and intellectual refinement of workers, the Mechanic's Institute had instilled the ideal of respectability in its members, but, as ball organisers found out, respectability was "a two-edged sword." While leading workers to denounce drink and to embrace imperial ideology, the Institute's message of respectable behaviour motivated them to take action "to preserve and protect what they saw as the *rights* of respectability." Accordingly, they fought for a greater place in the celebration and,

⁸⁹Newcastle, *Addresses Presented to H.R.H. The Prince of Wales During His State Visit to British North America*, 61-62; *Montreal Gazette*, 27 August 1860.

specifically, the grand ball where they could demonstrate their respectability. Writing to the editor of the *Montreal Transcript*, "A Mechanic" professed that "I really believe the Mechanics are entitled to a good share of the forthcoming celebration." Citing their work on the Victoria Bridge, he explained that "Were it not for the mechanics, we would not have the Prince amongst us...Why, then, should they be excluded from joining in the festivities on that occasion?" Proposing a solution in the *Montreal Gazette*, one worker suggested that a second ball should be held "at a cheap rate where our mechanics would not be obliged to appear in full dress." Instead of \$10 per gentleman and \$6 for each woman, the mechanic suggested prices of 50 and 25 cents respectively.⁹⁰

Perhaps swayed by the pleas of workers, or by more practical considerations such as defraying part of the large deficit incurred from the construction of the ballroom, the Citizen's Committee condescended to let workers hold their own "People's Ball" in the grand ballroom a couple of nights after their own great "Citizen's Ball." Though the tickets cost only a dollar each and there were "no restrictions as to dress," only about 3500 people attended, possibly because a fireworks display competed with the event. The Prince arrived at 10:00, as usual, and entered a box in the upper gallery overlooking the dance floor. He was welcomed by "tremendous cheering," but could not be enticed to descend and join the dancers who, according to the *Times* correspondent, had popularly interpreted the "no restrictions as to dress" policy as "to mean corduroys, brown or gray shooting-jacket, yellow vest, and scarlet necktie, without gloves, or with thick leather ones, as the case might be...." The Prince remained little more than

⁹⁰*Montreal Gazette*, 11 August 1860; *Montreal Transcript*, 16 August 1860; Palmer, *Working-Class Experience*, 57-58; Holman, *A Sense of Their Duty*, 121-126.

an hour, “though he would, most probably, have stayed longer had not people preferred standing round him in a dense crowd to dancing.” Despite the shortness of the Prince’s stay, George-Étienne Cartier’s paper, *La Minerve*, celebrated the ball as an outgrowth of the Citizen’s Committee’s “idée de [faire quelque chose] pour l’avantage des classes moins aisées.” Other Montreal papers, such as the *Gazette*, *Transcript*, and *Witness*, chose to ignore the event—and the class of people in attendance—but *La Minerve* managed to cover the ball in such a way as to legitimise the authority of the Citizen’s Committee while reaffirming the proper place of the working class. “Vraiment,” the report concluded, “le comité des citoyens mérite tous les éloges pour sa libéralité et pour la sollicitude dont il a fait preuve à l’égard de toutes les classes de notre société.” The *Times* reporter agreed and argued that the Prince’s attendance had “a very good effect.” “It made him personally popular,” he thought, “among a class which till then had only seen him at a distance, *en route* to State ceremonies from which they were excluded.”⁹¹

As the *Times* correspondent noted, the working class’ participation in the Tour took place mainly outdoors as its members gathered as spectators along the Prince’s routes. As the Prince travelled from his place of reception to his residence, however, workers were sometimes permitted to join the procession. Processions consisted of an ordered march through the streets by, first, the police and militia followed by civic and provincial dignitaries, members of the organising committees, the royal suite, and then a hodgepodge of national societies, voluntary associations, and labour organisations. As a display of the social order, a way in which “the city represented itself to itself,” Robert Darnton explains that the procession “could not be taken

⁹¹Wiley Papers, “A Reminiscence of the Visit of the Prince of Wales to Canada in 1860,” 214; *La Minerve*, 31 August 1860; Woods, *The Prince of Wales in Canada and the United States*, 143–146.

literally as a model of society, because it exaggerated some elements and neglected others." In the Royal Tour's processions, for example, women and unskilled workers remained excluded and were expected to only act as spectators. For those included, however, the experience could serve as a means to express their common social identity and claim respectability for their organisations and themselves. Skilled workers, for example, used parades and processions to present themselves and their crafts as "contributors to the social good through their practice of a useful, productive skill" while also differentiating themselves from the working poor. As Bonnie Huskins explains, "processions defined the boundaries of respectability through the articulation of a corporate identity between tradesmen. Trades sported special uniforms and banners which identified them as members of a particular group of skilled craftsmen, and as a respectable body distinct from the manual labourers."⁹²

In processions formed during the Royal Tour of 1860, trade societies joined the ranks to claim their place in the social order through their respectability. Carpenters, mechanics, lumbermen, shoemakers, and coopers marched through the streets led by their masters and carrying banners reaffirming the dignity of their labour. However, while their participation in the processions was orderly and received little comment from the press, workers were generally portrayed by the press as a disorderly mass with much to learn about respectable conduct. As the middle and upper classes withdrew from outdoor amusements to their own exclusive

⁹²Huskins, "Public Celebrations in Victorian Saint John and Halifax," 190-193, 207-208; Robert Darnton, "A Bourgeois Puts His World in Order: The City as a Text," in *The Great Cat Massacre and Other Episodes in French Cultural History* (New York, 1985), 116, 120, 123-124; Susan G. Davis, *Parades and Power: Street Theatre in Nineteenth Century Philadelphia* (Philadelphia, 1986), 4, 152-153, 114-128; Mary Ryan, "The American Parade: Representations of the Nineteenth Century Social Order," in *The New Cultural History*, ed. Lynn Hunt (Berkeley, 1989), 133; Palmer, *Working-Class Experience*, 94.

engagements with the Prince, they portrayed the outdoor activities of working people as disorderly and unrespectable. Typical of such descriptions was one of the Prince's departure from Toronto where, it was argued, the mass of people stood up on seated platforms, jostled with one another, struggled with police, and pushed forward to catch a glimpse of the Prince. "The multitude swayed to and fro" upon the railway platform until a number of ladies were knocked down by men "dead to everything in the shape of gallantry." This occurrence aside, the *Globe* reporter argued that "The ladies are the worst...If a man persists in standing in the road, his hat is often summarily knocked over his eyes...." In short, "the softer part of creation...obstruct the view when they like, and leave it open when they please." The Prince's departure from Toronto's Horticultural Gardens received a similar description where a "disorderly crowd" had "gathered round, and stared at and followed him to his carriage, making it a matter of considerable difficulty for him to work his way through, and still worse for his suite behind." Even inside his carriage the Prince was not safe from the crowds: in St. Mary's, Ontario there was "considerable disorder" with "the crowd rushing in on all sides, in the midst of which the royal carriage moved away...At one point the horses drawing the royal carriage were stopped, and several halts occurred through the people blocking up the way."⁹³

Try as they might to claim an equal part in the celebration, and thus society, through holding their own balls, taking part in processions, and gaining visual contact with the Prince, members of the working class still found themselves largely excluded from the Royal Tour of

⁹³Davis, *Parades and Power*, 44-45; Huskins, "Public Celebrations in Victorian Saint John and Halifax," 290-294; *Globe*, 12 September, 13 September 1860; Cornwallis, *Royalty in the New World*, 134, 137; Wiley Papers, "A Reminiscence of the Visit of the Prince of Wales to Canada in 1860," 213, 231-232.

1860. Even in their efforts to be seen during the Tour they found themselves portrayed as uncouth rabble by a middle class bent upon differentiating themselves from the working class and acquiring social authority, a process in which their disorderly representations of the working class served to underscore the basis of their claims that middle class behaviour was superior.

Conclusion

Throughout the Tour of British North America the Duke of Newcastle apprised Lord Palmerston and Queen Victoria of events, paying particular attention to the manner in which colonials had welcomed the Prince of Wales. Each account related the loyalty of colonials and expressed Newcastle's conviction that the Prince's visit "has cemented the North American colonies to the Crown of Great Britain for some time." The Queen was gratified to hear of the loyalty of her subjects—and of the good conduct of her son—and confirmed in her mind "how useful it is to have sent the Prince of Wales" on this "*very important & successful tour*."⁹⁴ There can be little doubt as to the overwhelming expressions of loyalty evinced towards the Prince, the Queen, and the Mother Country by colonials throughout the Tour. The loyalty expressed, however, was not the principled, intellectual kind as posited by David Mills: it was much more emotional, sentimental, and affective. Certainly, there were pledges to the British constitution, but more often were outpourings of "love of Old Britain," respect for the Prince of Wales, and affection for the Queen. As Joseph Pope recalled of the Prince's visit to Charlottetown, the

⁹⁴Newcastle Papers, reel A-307, Duke of Newcastle to Lord Palmerston, 30 September 1860; Duke of Newcastle to Queen Victoria, 7 August 1860, quoted in Martin, *The Life of His Royal Highness the Prince Consort*, 236; Nottingham University Library, Department of Manuscripts, 5th Duke of Newcastle Papers, Queen Victoria to Duke of Newcastle, 4 August, 2 September 1860; Munsell, *The Unfortunate Duke*, 241.

community was "animated by the most loyal and devoted sentiments to the Throne and Person of our beloved Sovereign and of affection for the dear land of England... We were proud of our colonial connection, and asked for nothing more."⁹⁵

The Royal Tour of 1860, however, had been more than just an opportunity for members of the public to express their sense of place in the British Empire. Organisers and participants also took advantage of the celebration to articulate their place within the social order of the British North American community by propagating hegemonic representations of themselves and of each other. At royal ceremonies such as address presentations, levees, militia reviews, balls, and industrial openings, men of the upper and middle classes produced competing images of each other and struggled for privileged access to the Prince in order to establish and assert their social authority. In this struggle, women and the working class found themselves pushed to the periphery of the Royal Tour or, when included in an event, portrayed as persons lacking the respectability, self-control, and dignity of their social superiors—the male middle class. Indeed, the Royal Tour of 1860 was a constitutive experience for members of the male middle class as they defined themselves, and their place, within British North America against the idle and gushing upper class above and the disorderly mob below. Self-portrayed as respectable gentlemen, a stature, they were apt to point out, that they shared with the Prince of Wales, middle class men used the occasion of the Prince's visit to not only express their sense of place within the British Empire, but also to legitimise their power within their community.

⁹⁵David Mills, *The Idea of Loyalty in Upper Canada, 1784-1850* (Kingston and Montreal, 1988); Elwood Jones, "English-Canadian Culture in the Nineteenth Century: Love, History, and Politics," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 25, no. 4 (1990-1991): 163; *Acadian Recorder*, 4 August 1860; *Montreal Gazette*, 27 August 1860; *Globe*, 7 September 1860; Pope, *Public Servant*, 16.

CHAPTER III

Queen Victoria, 1861-1901

In his study of the meaning of monarchy in the 1864 Confederation debates, W.L. Morton concluded that the "monarchical principle" served as the foundation of constitutional negotiations. Where one saw much emotion displayed just four years before during the Royal Tour of 1860, Morton argued that "in the use of the monarchical principle by those who carried Confederation there was little sentiment, and much hard-headed calculation"—calculation over the retention of British parliamentary government and the avoidance of popular, American-style sovereignty and its "unbridled" democracy. According to Frank MacKinnon, the Fathers of Confederation viewed the Crown pragmatically rather than emotionally, while "its representatives were regarded as institutions of government rather than symbols of glory or objects of reverence."¹ The inaugural ceremonies in Ottawa on 1 July 1867 seem to confirm these conclusions as the informal and business-like observances on Parliament Hill possessed none of the emotional loyalty demonstrated during the Royal Tour, but all of the methodical reserve of constitutional practice.²

The lack of pomp and circumstance on the first day of Confederation, however, was due

¹W.L. Morton, "The Meaning of Monarchy in Confederation," *Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, 4th ser., 1 (1963): 271, 282; Idem, *The Canadian Identity*, 2d ed. (Toronto, 1972), 104; Frank MacKinnon, *The Crown in Canada* (Calgary, 1976), 34; Jacques Monet, *The Canadian Crown* (Toronto, 1979), 19-21.

²Elisabeth Batt, *Monck: Governor General, 1861-1868* (Toronto, 1976), 146; Donald Creighton, *John A. Macdonald. Volume One: The Young Politician* (Toronto, 1952), 476-477; National Archives of Canada [hereafter NAC], John A. Macdonald Papers, MG26 A, reel C-1665, vol. 239, p. 106099, G. McMicken to "My Dear Father," 3 July 1867.

more to the casual and low-key manner of Governor General Monck than to the feelings of the Fathers of Confederation. Prime Minister John A. Macdonald, for example, had hoped that Lord Monck would have assumed a more imposing role on this occasion than was his nature and, in fact, had earlier proposed that the Governor General of the new country should be styled as "Viceroy." The title would not only enhance the status of the new creation and increase the standing of monarchical principles in the country, but would also strengthen the ties of sentiment with Britain. To these ends, Macdonald had also proposed that the new country be named the "Kingdom of Canada," a designation he believed would foster the "monarchical idea" in the colonies while bolstering the British tie. Foreign Secretary Lord Derby, however, objected on the grounds that the name "would wound the [democratic] sensibilities of the Yankees" and, thus, according to Macdonald, "a great opportunity was lost...." Balking too at the "Viceroyalty of Canada," the British government finally acceded to the delegates' proposal of the "Dominion of Canada," a name also "intended on their part as a tribute to the monarchical principle which they earnestly desire to uphold." The title "Dominion" may have been regarded by British officials as being "somewhat in opposition to the institutions south of the border," but it was deemed to be "not offensively so."³

³Creighton, *John A. Macdonald*, 475-476, 458-459; C.P. Stacey, "Lord Monck and the Canadian Nation," *Dalhousie Review* 14, no. 2 (1934): 183; John A. Macdonald to 1st Baron Knutsford, 18 July 1889, *Correspondence of Sir John Macdonald*, ed. Joseph Pope (Toronto, 1921), 450-451; NAC, 4th Earl Carnarvon Papers, MG27 I A2, reel B-2582, PRO 30/6/139, Earl Carnarvon to Lord Derby, 6 February 1867 (copy); NAC, Queen Victoria I Papers, MG24 A29, file 2, Earl Carnarvon to Charles Grey, 7 February 1867 (copy); Ged Martin, *Britain and the Origins of Canadian Confederation, 1837-67* (Vancouver, 1995), 282.

George-Étienne Cartier went even further than Macdonald when he proposed that a member of the royal family should be sent to Canada as the head of a Canadian Viceroyalty. Edward Whelan, ed., *The Union of the British Provinces* (1865; reprint, Summerside, P.E.I., 1949), 26; Ged Martin, *Bunyip Aristocracy: The New South Wales Constitution Debate of 1853 and Hereditary Institutions*

While delegates to the Confederation Conferences supported the monarchical principal due to the form of democracy and constitutional liberty it granted them, they also embraced the Crown out of loyalty and affection for the Mother Country. According to Macdonald, the object of the union of the British North American provinces was to found "a great British Monarchy in connection with the British Empire, and under the British Queen." Similarly, George-Étienne Cartier, George Brown, and others backed their pragmatic arguments for colonial union with assertions of "gratitude and affection" towards Queen and Country and declarations that Confederation would not "endanger the connection that has so long and so happily existed," but, instead, would strengthen the bond with Great Britain by guaranteeing the monarchical element in Canadian life. Even if, as Stéphane Kelly has recently argued, the delegates were motivated more by a desire for political, social, and financial aggrandisement than by a genuine affection for the monarchy, the mere fact that they felt compelled to praise the virtues of the royal connection demonstrates that they recognised the enduring attachment held by Canadians towards the Crown and the wisdom of catering to that constituency.⁴

Motivated, then, not only by constitutional pragmatism, but also a wish to ensure Canada's continued bond with the Mother Country, the Fathers of Confederation institutionalised the monarchy in the new Dominion. In doing so, they reconfirmed the central place of the monarchy in the symbolism of Canadian national identity and, thus, ensured the continued significance of royal representations and ceremonies to the definition of the middle

in the British Colonies (Sydney, 1986), 5-6, 168-173, 197.

⁴*Globe*, 21 September 1864; Whelan, *The Union of the British Provinces*, 26, 30, 44-45; Stéphane Kelly, *La petite loterie: Comment la Couronne a obtenu la collaboration du Canada français après 1837* (Montréal, 1997).

class and its hegemony. In fact, several delegates, such as Brown, Cartier, and E.P. Taché, had been instrumental in organising and articulating such representations during the Royal Tour of 1860.⁵ Royal visits, however, were rare occurrences and, until 1901, were only conducted by secondary royals who received attention commensurate with their status. Some post-Confederation Governors General attempted to personify the British monarchy in all its symbolic splendour, but, while they assisted in maintaining the visibility of the Crown in Canada, they lacked the aura of royalty which gave the monarchy its symbolic resonance. Far more popular—and powerful—an image for the Canadian middle class to utilise in the consolidation of its hegemony was that of Queen Victoria. With countless biographies and newspaper stories from the 1860s until the end of her reign, the annual celebration of the Queen's Birthday, and the observances of the Golden Jubilee of her reign in 1887, the Diamond Jubilee of 1897, and her death in January 1901, members of the middle class articulated representations of the Queen which expressed their shared identity and legitimised their hegemony. Moreover, men and women both fashioned conflicting representations of the Queen in order to uphold and resist male dominance respectively. Although Queen Victoria never visited Canada, the Canadian middle class had made her life—or, more accurately, their bourgeois versions of it—as familiar as their own.

Queen Victoria and the Middle Class

Due to her gender, the character of the representations of Queen Victoria differed from

⁵The roles of Cartier and Brown, as the editor of the *Globe*, in the Royal Visit have been discussed in Chapter II above. Taché served as honorary aide-de-camp throughout the Tour of the Canadas.

those occasioned by her son, Albert Edward, during his tour of British North America. Yet, the images continued to reaffirm middle class values, albeit different ones and in different ways. While the Prince of Wales found himself characterised as the ideal middle class male embodying the gentlemanly qualities of courtesy, selflessness, respectability, and duty, Queen Victoria came to represent the ideal woman, wife, and mother and, as such, gave a face to the ideology of domesticity.

In the nineteenth century middle class social order the home came to be regarded as a sanctuary of morality, a place at which a husband could escape from the competition and clamour of the public world to a private and peaceful environment under the care of his wife. Viewed as inherently emotional, natural, maternal, and moral—qualities supposedly “determined” by her reproductive system—women were believed to be ideally suited for this role. Female identity had always centred on the family, but the expansion of commercial and industrial capitalism led to the idealisation of her domestic place. As men increasingly became employed outside of the home-market economy, the division between the domestic world of women and the public world of men became more sharply defined. Also, growing numbers of young women from rural areas sought work off the farm and relocated to the cities to pursue employment in domestic work, manufacturing, and the burgeoning service industry. Between 1891 and 1901, women in the paid labour force increased by 21.4 percent and, by 1911, comprised 14 percent of the paid work force. These census numbers, however, do not take into account women’s paid employment in the home, such as taking in boarders and running a laundry service, and, consequently, significantly underestimated the total number of women engaged in paid employment. Whatever the case, the increasing number of women pursuing paid work fed

societal concerns that women were abandoning their traditional role in favour of working outside of the home. Consequently, mothering and household management became emphasised even more as the “proper sphere” of women, a norm of femininity which legitimised male dominance.⁶

Since the domestic ideal was essentially a middle class concept, it lent further weight to this class’ claim to moral and cultural authority over the working class. Moreover, the projection of family virtues on to members of the monarchy affirmed middle class values and status. The fact that some royals, such as George III and Princess Charlotte, had embraced the domestic life as illustrated by devotion to the institution of marriage and love of children simplified the process.⁷ The sexual immorality of George IV and the advanced age of William IV temporarily reversed this trend, but the reign of Queen Victoria reestablished the monarchy as a pillar of domesticity. A faithful and loving marriage, a household full of children, and a lengthy widowhood devoted to the memory of her husband permitted the middle class to project upon the Queen its family values while her gender allowed that class to uphold her as a paragon of feminine virtue. Under the direction of middle class ideologues, the Queen was portrayed as the perfect wife and mother, not for doing anything exceptional, but simply for being devoted to her

⁶Alison Prentice et al., *Canadian Women: A History*, 2d ed. (Toronto, 1996), 156-159, 118-121, 126-140; Wendy Mitchinson, *The Nature of Their Bodies* (Toronto, 1991), 12-15; Andrew C. Holman, *A Sense of Their Duty: Middle-Class Formation in Victorian Ontario Towns* (Kingston and Montreal, 2000), 150-153; Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall, *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class, 1780-1850* (Chicago, 1987), 30, 73-74; R.W. Connell, *Gender and Power: Society, the Person, and Sexual Politics* (Stanford, 1987), 183-188.

⁷Richard Williams, *The Contentious Crown: Public Discussion of the British Monarchy in the Reign of Queen Victoria* (Aldershot, UK, 1997), 265; Cecilia Morgan, *Public Men and Virtuous Women: Gendered Languages of Religion and Politics in Upper Canada, 1791-1850* (Toronto, 1996), 27-28; Davidoff and Hall, *Family Fortunes*, 152-155; Linda Colley, “The Apotheosis of George III: Loyalty, Royalty and the British Nation, 1760-1820,” *Past and Present*, no. 102 (1984): 124-125.

husband, sympathetic and caring towards her children, and for demonstrating thrift, industry, and duty in the management of her home.

Unlike such figures as Florence Nightingale or Harriet Beecher Stowe who were examples of women's success in the public sphere, Victoria's image asserted the "proper" place of women in the home. Nevertheless, some women exploited the Queen's domestic image in order to press for a more public role for themselves. Turning the ideology of domesticity and notions of femininity on their head, several middle class women argued that their role as guardians of the home and as the moral housekeepers of society demanded that they enter the public sphere to be heard on social issues and to purify the nation. As Queen Victoria had extended her maternal care and compassion beyond her own family to the entire nation, so female reformers expanded their domestic responsibilities into public charitable work. As a symbol of idealised femininity, then, Queen Victoria served to support male dominance while, at the same time, enabling maternal feminists to legitimise an expanded social role. In both cases, however, the status of the middle class was confirmed as the Queen came to represent a distinctly bourgeois version of the nation.

Moreover, it was a version of the nation which was tied tightly to a sense of Britishness. In producing their royal biographies and constructing their celebrations, Canadians drew upon British publications—especially the Queen's own works—and took their cue from royal ceremonies in the Mother Country. The result was a narrative of the Queen which differed little from comparative stories produced in the United Kingdom and which, therefore, emphasised the common heritage and bond between the two countries. Notwithstanding this, as a rule Canadian publications and ceremonies were more emphatic of the imperial significance of the monarchy

and of the celebrations put on in the Queen's name than their British counterparts. Living in the colonies meant that the Empire was more than just an afterthought, it was a lived experience and, thus, a constitutive part of Canadian national identity.

Queen Victoria's Agency

Although Queen Victoria was far removed from the social life of the middle class, she and her husband actively cultivated her domestic image. According to Adrienne Munich, Prince Albert "appreciated that the age's formulation of what it called 'true womanhood' might enhance the monarchy and consolidate its power" and, therefore, encouraged the transmission of his and Victoria's home life to the public. It was not simply a matter of the couple pretending to conform to middle class family values—they were genuinely happy together—but of publicising their domestic simplicity. Dispensing with royal robes in favour of middle class attire and disseminating prints and photographs of the royal family in domestic bliss, they projected this image into the public realm. Curiously, though, it was after the death of Prince Albert in December 1861 that Queen Victoria's image as the ideal wife and mother came into a sharp focus.⁸

Drastically limiting her public appearances after her husband's death, the Queen replaced the public ceremonial forms of self-representation with the "adoption of various substitute forms of royal representation," foremost among these the publication of a series of books. In both *The Early Years of His Royal Highness the Prince Consort* (1867) and *Leaves from the Journal of Our Life in the Highlands* (1868) Queen Victoria described her home life during her marriage

⁸Adrienne Munich, *Queen Victoria's Secrets* (New York, 1996), 9, 2-5; Margaret Homans, "'To the Queen's Private Apartments': Royal Family Portraiture and the Construction of Victoria's Sovereign Obedience," *Victorian Studies* 37, no. 1 (1993): 5; Idem, *Royal Representations: Queen Victoria and British Culture, 1837-1876* (Chicago, 1998), xix-xxi, 59.

with Prince Albert and in *More Leaves from the Journal of Our Life in the Highlands* (1884) she published selected writings from her journal during her widowhood. In each book the public was presented with a picture of a simple and happy family life of love and domestic duty, an image the Queen propagated in the full knowledge of what her subjects desired. On publishing journal extracts on her domestic life in *More Leaves*, for example, Victoria told one of her daughters that "I have always been fully aware of what I was doing—and know perfectly well what my people like and appreciate and that is 'home life' and simplicity."⁹

Indeed, despite the popularity of her books—*Leaves from Our Life in the Highlands* sold out its 20,000 copies within two weeks—Queen Victoria used a variety of other media to disseminate her domestic and maternal image. During her widowhood the Queen continued to utilise photography to convey the picture of a simple and loving family life to her subjects. Figure 3.1 is typical of such photographs featuring, as it does, the Queen dressed in a plain black dress with a white bonnet and looking at a picture of her beloved husband with a forlorn expression. In addition to depicting the Queen's devotion to her late husband, the photograph emphasises her maternal compassion and the close-knit nature of her family as Victoria places her left hand upon her daughter's shoulder, an act which both consoles her daughter while, at the same time, giving strength and comfort to the widow. With the development of new technologies which could cheaply reproduce and distribute photographs, such domestic images of the Queen became "fashioned...into familiarity."¹⁰

⁹Homans, *Royal Representations*, 115, 100-156; Queen Victoria quoted in Roger Fulford, ed., *Beloved Mama: Private Correspondence of Queen Victoria and the German Crown Princess, 1878-1885* (London, 1981), 160.

¹⁰Munich, *Queen Victoria's Secrets*, 7.

Representing Queen Victoria

Queen Victoria, then, influenced the manner in which her image was interpreted by the public. While writers found it difficult to properly describe her home life due to its private nature, the Queen opened the door to her home ever so slightly in order to let the public see what she wanted them—and, above all, what they wanted—to see. As J. Castell Hopkins noted in his biography of Queen Victoria,

Much that has taken place in this domestic circle has never become known, and never will be; but the Queen herself, in published Journals, and through the Memoranda given to the world in connection with her princely Consort, has furnished sufficient hints for us to understand something at least of the beneficent example and bright home surroundings with which her sons and daughters have been blessed....¹¹

Since the Queen's life appeared to correspond with their own domestic values and gender roles, Canadian middle class writers such as Hopkins publicised the Queen's home life and maternal qualities as a "beneficent example" to children and as a way to legitimise their class' moral and cultural authority.¹² In a series of biographies issued from the 1860s until her death and in lengthy newspaper narratives celebrating her birthday, commemorating the Jubilees, and mourning her death, the life of Queen Victoria became a familiar story to Canadians, but it was

¹¹J. Castell Hopkins, *Queen Victoria, Her Life and Reign. A Study of British Monarchical Institutions and the Queen's Personal Career, Foreign Policy, and Imperial Influence* (Toronto, 1896), 168; Richard T. Lancefield, *Victoria, Sixty Years a Queen: A Sketch of Her Life and Times* (Toronto, 1897), 388; Henry Roe, *Sermon Preached at St. George's Church, Lennoxville, Quebec on June 21, 1887, the Day Appointed for the Observance of the Queen's Jubilee* (Sherbrooke, 1887), 6.

¹²Robert Lanning, "Portraits of Progress: Men, Women, and the 'Selective Tradition' in Collective Biography," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 30, no. 3 (1995): 40; Jeffrey L. Lant, *Insubstantial Pageant: Ceremony and Confusion at Queen Victoria's Court* (London, 1979), 169; Tom Nairn, *The Enchanted Glass: Britain and its Monarchy* (London, 1988), 37, 40-41; Walter E. Houghton, *The Victorian Frame of Mind* (New Haven, 1957), 316, 319.

always a middle class tale.

Since the Queen never visited Canada and most Canadians had never visited Britain, biographies of the Queen became one of the main sources of information, according to John George Hodgins, "for the development of that personal love for the Sovereign and loyalty to her throne...." In his capacity as Deputy Superintendent of Schools for the Ontario Department of Education, Hodgins emphasised the importance of familiarising "the youth of the country with the admirable personal qualities of our beloved Sovereign, her late lamented Consort, and other members of the Royal Family," and, to this end, published a series of sketches and anecdotes about Queen Victoria and her family drawing upon the Queen's own writings and British publications for school readings. Upon opening Hodgins' 1868 school reader, pupils would discover a picture of an exemplary female who, from childhood to widowhood, had demonstrated all of those qualities most admired in a woman: "a dutiful daughter; a loving wife; a watchful mother; a kind mistress; a generous benefactor; an exemplary Christian." Beginning with Victoria's childhood, Hodgins credited her upbringing by the Duchess of Kent for cultivating in the future Queen those key middle class female duties of thrift, self-control, and obedience. Citing one story, he recounted how Victoria had scrimped and saved in order to pay off her father's debts after his death, an act which demonstrated her thrift, fortitude, prudence, and "filial devotion."¹³

Other writers repeated this story and added additional examples from the Queen's

¹³John George Hodgins, *Her Majesty the Queen, the Late Prince Consort, and Other Members of the Royal Family: Sketches and Anecdotes, Selected and Arranged Chiefly for Young People* (Montreal, 1868), 3-4, 23-25; Alison Prentice, *The School Promoters: Education and Social Class in Mid-Nineteenth Century Upper Canada* (Toronto, 1977), 22-23, 47, 51.

Highland Journals and British royal biographies of how Victoria's childhood training had instilled in the young princess the importance of domestic economy in the carrying out of her future duty of household management. Castell Hopkins pointed out that by never being permitted to buy anything on credit or to exceed her own allowance, the princess had been taught the virtues of self-control, economy, and modesty. Richard T. Lancefield, head librarian of the Hamilton Public Library, agreed, writing in his biography that as early as the age of eight Victoria had learned to save and spend responsibly—lessons the young princess would follow in the management of her own household. According to biographers, the Queen's simple childhood had laid the foundation to her "love of simplicity and frugality" and, in consequence, led to her own home being "a noble example of Royal economy and business-like management." By refusing to take on any debts, rejecting "the wicked extravagance of the irresponsible rich," and assuming a modest lifestyle, the royal family of Queen Victoria "set a unique example of cheerful and dignified economy." Instead of "the vulgar display and ostentatious extravagance of many of her subjects," writers claimed that "Domestic happiness and the sense of duty have been their cheap luxuries."¹⁴

Biographers also argued that the Queen's humble upbringing influenced her decision to marry Prince Albert. Shunning materialism and diplomatic initiatives, Victoria, "like a true woman," selected her husband out of "true love" alone. "To the Queen," Castell Hopkins wrote, "a union without love and mutual respect was, and is, abhorrent. Her own marriage had been

¹⁴Hopkins, *Queen Victoria, Her Life and Reign*, 47-48, 297; Lancefield, *Victoria, Sixty Years a Queen*, 21-22; Sarah A. Tooley, *The Personal Life of Queen Victoria* (Toronto, [1896?]), 19, 84, 86; Daniel James Fraser, *Victoria, Queen and Woman* (Toronto, 1897), 13; Hodgins, *Her Majesty the Queen*, 121.

so perfectly, ideally, happy that she would have been the last in all her dominions to dream of marrying a child for money, or rank, or power.” Albert and Victoria’s life together seemed to substantiate her decision since their union led to what Richard Lancefield described as “a domestic family life, so perfect in its purity and charm that it might well serve for a bright example to every home in the land.” While Albert’s devotion to his wife and children proved him to be “an example to all husbands,” the domestic sphere was the Queen’s responsibility and, therefore, she was deemed ultimately responsible for the domestic bliss which reigned in their household. With “a heart and life wholly centred in her home, her husband, and her duties,” Victoria demonstrated those “home instincts” which were regarded as “the chief grace of womanhood”—motherhood.¹⁵

The mother of nine children, Queen Victoria seemed to embody maternity. She became “above all things, a mother” who took the “care and education of these happy little ones” very near her heart. Although Lady Lyttleton had been entrusted with much of the care of the royal children, writers emphasised that Victoria “remained herself the chief authority in nursery matters, and supervised every detail of the children’s training.” “The Queen’s own conviction,” Hopkins asserted, “was that daily instruction at a mother’s knee was the best and truest method....” Subscribing to “proper” gender roles, the Prince Consort educated the children in the rational areas of the arts and sciences, while the Queen supervised their education in the emotional spheres of “the homely English pursuits” and religious faith. Providing her daughters

¹⁵Tooley, *The Personal Life of Queen Victoria*, 111, 125; W.T. Herridge, *A Sermon Preached in St. Andrew’s Church on the Occasion of the Queen’s Diamond Jubilee* (Ottawa, 1897), 4; Hopkins, *Queen Victoria, Her Life and Reign*, 31, 169, 98-101; Lancefield, *Victoria, Sixty Years a Queen*, 74.

with domestic training, she taught them sewing, cooking, housekeeping, and nursing. In addition, the Queen taught her children to be modest and hardworking, values she cultivated by bringing them up as simply as possible with a lack of ostentation and only the plainest clothes and food. Teaching them a reverence for God and respect for religion assisted in instilling in them a sense of humility and further demonstrated that the Queen "was as much the mother of her children as any laborer's wife...."¹⁶

Even in widowhood Queen Victoria was said to exhibit the features of the ideal wife and mother, by keeping her family strong in its time of grief and in remaining faithful to the memory of her late husband. When Prince Albert died on 14 December 1861, the laying of the transatlantic cable was still several years away and, therefore, Canadians would not learn of the event until the end of the month. When they did hear the sad news, they inundated the Governor General's Office with messages of sympathy to the Queen and held special services in their churches paying tribute to the Prince as an intelligent advisor to the Sovereign and as a supportive father. It was the Queen, however, who received most of the attention in eulogies as clergymen expressed their sympathy for the grieving widow and reminded their listeners of her devotion to her husband and children. Indeed, these special circumstances created additional reason to revere her. Recognising that her position as Sovereign demanded that she be strong, Francis Fulford told his parishioners in Montreal's Christ Church Cathedral, Victoria pressed back "for the time the feelings of the wife and the woman into the depths of her bereaved heart, called...her children around her at that trying and awful moment and, invoking a blessing on their

¹⁶John Coulter and John A. Cooper, eds., *Queen Victoria: Her Gracious Life and Glorious Reign* (Guelph, 1901), 88, 91; *Halifax Evening Mail*, 19 June 1897; Tooley, *The Personal Life of Queen Victoria*, 148-149; Hopkins, *Queen Victoria, Her Life and Reign*, 159-160, 168.

heads prayed that they might obtain strength and wisdom to assist her in doing her duty to them and the country....” While sympathy later turned to frustration as many people in Britain found the Queen absorbed by the death of her husband to such an extent that she withdrew from most public appearances, excepting the erection of memorials to the Prince Consort, Canadians did not criticise the Queen for her seclusion. Queen Victoria never had, after all, visited Canada—nor would she—so her absence from royal ceremonies in Britain mattered little on the other side of the Atlantic. Canadians had been accustomed to drawing their conclusions from the Queen’s own published works and other popular British biographies of her life. Rather than viewing her absence as examples of neglect of duty or self-absorption, then, Canadians understood her actions within the scope of royal biography. Consequently, they considered her deep mourning as demonstrative of her female propriety and tenderness as a wife since she continued to behave like a married woman, devoting her life to the memory of her husband. Using the Queen’s laying of a hospital foundation stone in memory of her husband as an example, John Hodgins pointed out that “With that touching faithfulness of memory which characterises her widowhood, she expressed her gratification at performing an act by which she was associated with her deceased husband.” Even in widowhood, the Queen showed that a wife’s attention to her spouse should be unceasing.¹⁷

The moral propriety writers assigned to Queen Victoria was argued to have spilled into

¹⁷NAC, Colonial Office, Canada, original correspondence, MG11 CO 42/632, reel B-451; Francis Fulford, *A Sermon Preached on Sunday, January 5, 1862, in Christ Church Cathedral, Montreal, After the Death of H.R.H. the Prince Consort* (Montreal, 1862); Hodgins, *Her Majesty the Queen*, 128-129, 64; Munich, *Queen Victoria’s Secrets*, 100-102; Homans, *Royal Representations*, 59; Walter L. Arnstein, “Queen Victoria and Religion,” in *Religion in the Lives of English Women, 1760-1930*, ed. Gail Malmgreen (London, 1986), 106-107.

her Court and Empire. Prior to her accession, the Royal Court had been regarded by a number of people as an immoral hive of drink, sex, profanity, and Sabbath desecration. Under the purifying guidance of the new Queen, however, the Court was endowed with dignity, grace, manners, and religiosity. Following her example, Sarah Tooley writes in her royal biography, "the Court became as pure as a good woman could make it." In his Golden Jubilee sermon, Presbyterian Rev. George Bruce similarly told his Saint John congregation that under the Queen's direction the Court "has been firmly controlled, and vice in the most exalted station has been condemned...Not splendid vice but purity of life was the guiding principle." With her high moral standard, refined taste, and "graceful propriety of manners," the Queen's was a purifying presence. The Royal Court, however, became only a microcosm of her wider influence—the refinement of "the morals and manners of the nation" no less.¹⁸

In nationalist thought the nation has often been likened to "one great family" in which the members are depicted as brothers and sisters. In a monarchy, the family metaphor becomes stronger with the King or Queen depicted as the father or mother of the nation. There is often, too, a tendency to believe that the strength of the national family depended upon the moral fabric of the people. Accordingly, Queen Victoria's maternal image became extended beyond her own family and Court and into the nation at large. As mother of the nation, she displayed maternal love and sympathy for her subjects, care which was often described as personal. During the Crimean War, for example, Sarah Tooley wrote that the Queen read the news of battles with a

¹⁸Tooley, *The Personal Life of Queen Victoria*, 144; *Souvenir of the Queen's Jubilee: An Account of the Celebration at the City of Saint John, New Brunswick, in Honor of the Jubilee Year of Her Most Gracious Majesty, Queen Victoria* (Saint John, 1887); Hopkins, *Queen Victoria, Her Life and Reign*, 287-292; Hodgins, *Her Majesty the Queen*, 29.

“throbbing heart” and “consuming anxiety” much like any mother would for her own soldier-son. Not satisfied with just watching events unfold, she was said to have spent much of her time knitting and sewing uniforms for the soldiers, preparing bandages, and, with “maternal care,” ensuring that the local military hospitals were well managed. She possessed a “motherly interest” in the fortunes of her people and shared their joy and sorrows.¹⁹ Her chief value as mother of the nation, however, came not from her maternal sympathy but by setting an example of domestic simplicity and purity for her subjects to emulate.

Just as she influenced her own family, members of the middle class claimed that the Queen’s simplicity, morality, and domesticity had a “moulding effect upon the character, manners, and customs of the masses” and, thus, purified the nation. The Queen’s life, moreover, became more than merely a reflection of the domestic ideal: it reinforced conventional ideas of sexual morality as well. With growing concerns over the number of women working outside the home, sexual conduct, and prostitution particularly, middle class moral reformers wove a number of allegories and symbols into their speeches and literature to combat the perceived eroding of social morality.²⁰ Upheld as an emblem of moral purity, the domestic and idealised feminine image of Queen Victoria assisted social purists in arguing their case and, at the same time, strengthening their claims to moral authority. On commemorating the Golden Jubilee, the *Ottawa Citizen* pointed out that Queen Victoria had been partly responsible for the strengthening

¹⁹Anthony D. Smith, *National Identity* (Reno, 1991), 79, 91; Tooley, *The Personal Life of Queen Victoria*, 182-186, 231; Fraser, *Victoria, Queen and Woman*, 11.

²⁰Anna Clark, “Queen Caroline and the Sexual Politics of Popular Culture in London, 1820,” *Representations*, no. 31 (1990): 47-68; Mariana Valverde, *The Age of Light, Soap, and Water: Moral Reform in English Canada, 1885-1925* (Toronto, 1991); Davidoff and Hall, *Family Fortunes*, 149-152.

of the Empire by offering a humble home life as a model to all. "It is by preserving purity of life," the paper stated, "by cultivating the domestic virtues, by keeping intact the family in all its relations, that a people gain strength and lay broad and deep the basis of true national greatness." Rev. Henry Roe similarly asserted in his Golden Jubilee sermon that "The home is the source of all natural life. Where the home-life is morally tainted, the moral life of the nation is sapped at its foundation, and in time moral ruin must ensue. Where the home-life is pure and sound, the people's national life is secure—nothing very seriously calamitous can happen to it." Such was the beneficial effect, the preacher claimed, of Queen Victoria's "pure sweet true English home"—a home so simple, and full of love and humility that even "the humblest" of her subjects "can feel that here is something good and true which even they can copy." The Queen's love of home and purity of life, Castell Hopkins exclaimed, served as proof of "the fact that domestic institutions based upon lofty ideals and a worthy practice are the best and truest basis for national achievement and power." By setting an example to her subjects, Victoria raised the morals of the nation, an effect which contributed to the greatness of the British Empire and an act which legitimised the cultural authority of the middle class.²¹

Queen Victoria and the Question of Female Power

Despite the efforts to present her as, first and foremost, the ideal wife and mother, Victoria remained Queen of the British Empire: a public and political position which seemed to contradict the domestic role she was upheld to exemplify. Aware of the potential threat to the

²¹*Ottawa Citizen*, 20 June 1887; Roe, *Sermon Preached at St. George's Church*, 5-7; Hopkins, *Queen Victoria, Her Life and Reign*, 27, 434; George Parkin, "Victoria and the Victorian Age," *Canadian Magazine* 16, no. 5 (1901): 398.

traditional female role posed by the Queen's political status, in common with people in Britain Canadian men, and several women, attempted to reconcile her constitutional role with her domestic image. This was partly accomplished by emphasising her home life over her public life, but, unable to ignore her political role, they feminised the Crown. As William Kuhn points out, the rights of the nineteenth century constitutional monarchy, as publicised by Walter Bagehot in the terms of "the right to be consulted, the right to encourage, the right to warn," were the rights "not of a sovereign but of a wife." Like a wife, the monarch had little autonomy and had to seem disengaged from executing political action. Instead, she was to passively submit to her ministers' wishes, as she would to her husband, reserving only feminine "influence" in her dealings with them as opposed to direct political power.²²

Despite her behind-the-scenes political manoeuvring, which was little known until after the publication of her journals (1908-33), members of the middle class frequently described Queen Victoria as the perfect constitutional sovereign, making her functions as such a simple extension of her idealised domestic role and womanliness. Emphasising how her womanly gentleness and sympathy affected diplomatic relations, for example, Richard Lancefield detailed how she had "softened" a diplomatic message from the British Prime Minister to the American President during the Trent Affair and sent "a touching letter of sympathy and condolence" to Mrs. Lincoln after her husband's assassination—actions which cultivated "that spirit of amity and friendliness" between the two nations. More often, however, writers would describe her sense of duty towards her ministers whom she steadfastly supported. As a constitutional monarch, the

²²William M. Kuhn, *Democratic Royalism: The Transformation of the British Monarchy, 1861-1914* (New York, 1996), 29; Homans, *Royal Representations*, xx, 2-3.

Globe reported, Queen Victoria was always willing to give the people's representatives "all the assistance and support she could give in carrying out the well-understood wishes of the people." "On all occasions," the official programme of the Hamilton Diamond Jubilee celebration stated, "she has followed the advice of her ministers...." The most ringing endorsement of the Queen's constitutional rule came from Prime Minister Sir Wilfrid Laurier who described at length her feminine influence on politics. As Lancefield had done, Laurier noted how the Queen's "naturalness" and "simplicity" of character had been exhibited in all of her wise actions, but perhaps not more significantly than in providing caution to rash ministers and suggesting to them that they couch their harshly worded despatches in conciliatory terms. It was on her position as "undoubtedly the first constitutional sovereign the world ever saw" that the Canadian Prime Minister heaped the most praise. Describing her actions as passive rather than active, he told the House of Commons that the Queen never interfered nor "gave any information of what her views were upon any...great political issues." "Whenever a new policy was presented to her by her [British] Prime Minister," he continued, "she discussed that policy with him, and sometimes approved or sometimes, perhaps dissented," but, whatever the case, she always remained discreet and unintrusive. She sought to "rule according to the views of the people" and her only reward was their affection. As described by Laurier, the Queen's actions reflected those of not only the perfect constitutional monarch, but also the perfect wife.²³

The Queen's political position, then, became not a threat to the traditional female role,

²³Lancefield, *Victoria, Sixty Years a Queen*, 356; *Globe*, 21 June 1887; *Diamond Jubilee Souvenir and Official Programme, Hamilton* (Hamilton, 1897), 14; Thomas Fowler, *In Memoriam: A Sermon Preached on the Death of Queen Victoria* (Halifax, 1901), 6-7; Coulter and Cooper, *Queen Victoria*, 382; Canada, House of Commons, *Debates*, 8 February 1901, col. 11-16.

but, in the hands of middle class men, a further means of proving that a woman's proper place was in the home. Responding directly to the "bewildering restlessness" of suffragists in the 1890s, Castell Hopkins pointed to the Queen as a "high example of what a womanly woman can be, and do, without infringing upon the duties and work of man...." She acceded to her ministers views and limited her power to "womanly influence," an intangible power which permitted her to mould public sentiment and set the stage for the implementation of "moral legislation." At a time of increasing moral fervour among Protestant middle class social reformers who advocated legislation on temperance, prostitution, sexual hygiene, and a number of other moral issues, the Queen's image bolstered support by portraying her as not only an example of proper morals, but as an advocate of women's duty to *passively* impress them on society. Such influence, as demonstrated by the good Queen's example, illustrated that a woman "has more influence in moulding the destinies of the country than she would have if twenty votes were hers, or her presence a familiar one at all the polling booths and public meetings of a country." So long as women realised they could do more for purifying politics and society by focussing on the well-being of "their various spheres of national life," as the Queen had done, they would give up the foolhardy demand for the female vote in order to strengthen the nation in the home.²⁴

In suggesting that Queen Victoria shared the view that women's proper place was in the home, Hopkins had been correct. The Queen cultivated her domestic image not only because she knew it to be popular with her subjects, but because she herself was convinced that women were inherently maternal and that it went against nature for them to abandon domesticity in favour of the male prerogative of politics. "I am every day more convinced," she wrote to a

²⁴Hopkins, *Queen Victoria, Her Life and Reign*, 299-301.

relative, "that *we women*, if we are to be good women, *feminine* and *amiable* and *domestic*, are *not fitted to reign....*" Accordingly, she was hostile towards what is today termed as feminism, attacking it as a misguided movement of "mad, wicked folly" which was absent of "every sense of womanly feeling and propriety." "It is a subject," she wrote to Sir Theodore Martin, "which makes the Queen so furious that she cannot contain herself. God created men and women different—then let them remain in their own position."²⁵ Ironically, though, "feminists" exploited Victoria's status as Queen in order to justify an increased public role for women. As a symbol, Queen Victoria was open to manipulation (and self-manipulation, a fact made clear by her ability to portray herself as an ideal mother when she disliked several of her children). She was certainly viewed as a kind and sympathetic woman when she might more readily have been described as selfish, insensitive, and obstinate. A bundle of contradictions, the Queen "could not control many of [her] cultural meanings." "Her uniqueness," Adrienne Munich points out, "enabled those of differing interests and needs to create the Victoria of their particular dreams."²⁶ While, in consequence, the male, middle class images gained cultural ascendancy, middle class feminists were able to do much to empower themselves.

In her book *The Personal Life of Queen Victoria* (1896), Sarah Tooley emphasised how the Queen's exercise of "womanly virtues and domestic graces" in national life had legitimised

²⁵Queen Victoria to the King of the Belgians, 17 February 1852, *Letters of Queen Victoria, 1837-1861*, eds. Arthur C. Benson and Viscount Esher, vol. 2 (London, 1908), 366; Dorothy Thompson, *Queen Victoria: The Woman, the Monarchy, and the People* (New York, 1990), 141-142.

²⁶David Cannadine, *The Pleasures of the Past* (London, 1989), 26-27; Homans, *Royal Representations*, xxxiv; Munich, *Queen Victoria's Secrets*, 3, 13; Victoria R. Smith, "Constructing Victoria: The Representation of Queen Victoria in England, India, and Canada, 1897-1914," (Ph.D. diss., Rutgers University, 1998), 115-116.

the public authority of women. The Queen's home life, Tooley argued, has been "an example to the nation, and afforded the best object-lesson ever given as to the possibility of a woman combining public and political work with the duties of a wife and mother." Victoria's days with Albert were described as a perfect balance between both spheres. Beginning with morning services with her household, she would take a walk with her husband and then inspect the nurseries where she watched her children at study. After her daily meeting with the Master of the Household to discuss domestic arrangements, she would reserve her afternoons to matters of state. The remainder of the day would be devoted to homely pursuits and family entertainments. "Wherever she was, each hour of the day was mapped out, and she spent no idle moments...." Her industry and duty were perhaps no better illustrated than by her dedication to her despatch box. Resolved to be "a working Queen rather than a show monarch," Victoria kept in constant contact with her ministers and worked on her correspondence with meticulousness.²⁷ Able to reign and care for her own household at the same time, the Queen's life was a living protest against the idea "that no women of intellectual pursuits could have the time for the humble domestic duties, and that no woman who was a shining light of domesticity must be expected to trouble herself on other matters."²⁸

Sarah Tooley also credited Queen Victoria for spreading philanthropy amongst ladies of the middle class who followed her charitable example. The Queen donated large sums to schools, hospitals, and orphanages, institutions she also visited to show her sympathy and heartfelt support. While her patronage of such feminine causes served to further popularise her

²⁷Tooley, *The Personal Life of Queen Victoria*, 3, 135-136, 92, 86-87.

²⁸Mary Dickens, "Queen Victoria's Home Life," in *Montreal Gazette*, 5 June 1897.

maternal status, it also involved support for the movement of other women out into that part of the public sphere represented by charitable work. From the late nineteenth century, many middle class women accepted the Victorian stereotypes which depicted them as inherently moral, nurturing, and pure and exploited the influence with which these notions provided them. Stressing their role as guardians of the home and as the moral housekeepers of society, these women legitimised their right to enter the public sphere to be heard on social issues. They formed a number of voluntary organisations, such as the National Council of Women and the Imperial Order Daughters of the Empire, to give voice—and action—to their views. In their endeavours, the image of a maternal and philanthropic Queen Victoria provided both an example to emulate and a justification of social activism. The Queen as dispenser of charity and good works demonstrated from the highest position the beneficial influence of womanliness on the life of the nation, the ability of women to balance domestic duties with public work, and the worth of female voluntary work. Consequently, in order to legitimise their expanded social roles, maternal feminists often cited the example of the Queen and, as illustrated by the case of the Victorian Order of Nurses [VON], sought direct royal association.²⁹

Like their fellow subjects overseas, Canadians were eager to permanently mark the celebration of the Queen's Jubilees with the establishment of a monument paying homage to the Queen's virtues. Giving them some direction on the occasion of the Diamond Jubilee, the Prince of Wales announced that his mother wished that each community would commemorate the anniversary of her accession with the establishment of institutions "of mercy among the sick and

²⁹Tooley, *The Personal Life of Queen Victoria*, 262, 246; Frank Prochaska, *Royal Bounty: The Making of a Welfare Monarchy* (New Haven, 1995), 68, 73-80, 87, 102.

suffering, and to anything which may tend to brighten the lives and ameliorate the condition of Her Majesty's poorer subjects." By enlisting people to do charity on her behalf, the declaration bolstered the image of the Queen as a sympathetic mother who gained happiness not from personal aggrandisement but from the alleviation of the suffering of the poor and sick. However, while the available evidence on the Queen's reaction to the Diamond Jubilee's charitable offerings is sketchy, the Queen's published correspondence on the Golden Jubilee monument from the women of Britain suggests that she preferred personal gifts over hospitals and orphanages. The Queen had hoped that her female subjects would give her yet another statue of her beloved Albert as a gift. When she learned that they preferred to open a hospital in her name, she was not pleased. "The Queen is much hurt & annoyed," she wrote, "An institution will not be a personal present to her & they must not pretend it is." A compromise was reached in which a statue would be built and the surplus would go towards the establishment of the British Institute of Queen's Nurses. Towards the latter venture, the Queen demonstrated little interest beyond condemning the female composition of the organising committee on the basis that "A group of women is most useless." Indeed, she showed so little sympathy with the Institute that she had hoped to divert some of the donations to it towards the purchase of yet another jewel for her collection—"She knows many wish this."³⁰

Notwithstanding all this, the public was left with the impression that the Queen endorsed the Institute. This led to the National Council of Women's decision to establish a Canadian order of nurses as a fitting commemoration of the Diamond Jubilee. The need for a nursing order was

³⁰Elizabeth Hammerton and David Cannadine, "Conflict and Consensus on a Ceremonial Occasion: The Diamond Jubilee in Cambridge in 1897," *Historical Journal* 24, no. 1 (1981): 125; Lant, *Insubstantial Pageant*, 137-138, 147-148.

raised at the Annual Meeting of the National Council of Women in May 1896 by the Vancouver chapter, which drew the attention of other local councils to the suffering of women and children in remote areas of Canada. The National Council agreed to consider the matter and, after consultations, the Executive under the leadership of the Governor General's wife, Lady Aberdeen, proposed the establishment of an order of nurses to supply sparsely settled regions with trained nurses, to attend the sick poor in their urban homes, and to provide rooms in cottage-like hospitals. Despite the opposition of doctors who viewed the nurses as a threat to their livelihoods, the Victorian Order of Nurses became Canada's National Memorial to the marking of the sixtieth year of Queen Victoria's reign.³¹

Seeking to relieve the poor and sick with skilled nurses, the VON gave women a respectable outlet into the public sphere, one consistent with—and empowered by—maternal stereotypes. Moreover, by invoking the Order as a Jubilee tribute to the Queen, women were able to further legitimise their actions and gain the financial support of the government and of individual citizens. As the Canadian Fund for the VON reminded all potential donors, donations to the Order would be a way for citizens to express “their loyalty and love to Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen.... The Victorian Order will be associated with her name in providing for the relief in times of sickness of her subjects throughout the length and breadth of Canada.” “It will show,” the appeal for funds continued, “as the personal gift of Canadians to Her Majesty, that

³¹Marquis and Marchioness of Aberdeen and Temair, “*We Twa*”: *Reminiscences of Lord and Lady Aberdeen*, vol. 2 (London, 1925), 114-125; Doris French, *Ishbel and the Empire: A Biography of Lady Aberdeen* (Toronto, 1988), 223-241; N.E.S. Griffiths, *The Splendid Vision: Centennial History of the National Council of Women of Canada, 1893-1993* (Ottawa, 1993), 69; NAC, Wilfrid Laurier Papers, MG26 G, reel C-746, vol. 34, pp. 11306-11307, Lady Aberdeen to Wilfrid Laurier, 22 January 1897.

they admire and appreciate her blameless, beneficent and beautiful life, noble alike in its sympathies and its activities in doing good." It was also believed—contrary to the Queen's privately expressed sentiments—that "For such a Queen it would be a happier plan to have a memorial in the form of gratitude written perennially in the hearts of the mothers of a young nation, than to have it graven in stone or any inert material." With such invocations, the VON gained legitimacy, not only for the organisation, but for the women who emulated the work of the Queen in pursuing social good. The VON became a testament to "the Queen's ready sympathy and maternal interest in her people's sufferings" and the nurses and middle class organisers became the means of handing down "Queen Victoria's own work."³²

Canadian Imperialism and Queen Victoria's Jubilees

Although maternal feminists challenged the private roles they were assigned by the ideology of domesticity, their actions nevertheless sought to uphold the moral authority of the middle class in society. They may have taken their domestic roles and emphasised femininity out of the home, but they still espoused the same morals and values as their middle class husbands. In addition, their representations supported the image of Queen Victoria as the mother of a middle class nation. Caring, sympathetic, and dedicated to her family, the Queen embodied the virtues of the ideal bourgeois woman and impressed them on not only her own domestic family, but on her national family—the British Empire. Canadians, thus, became her children, a role many embraced and expressed in literature, but celebrated more explicitly with the imperial

³²Victorian Order of Nurses, *Canadian Fund for the Commemoration of the Queen's Diamond Jubilee, by Founding the Victorian Order of Nurses in Canada* (Ottawa, 1897), 2, 15, 17; *Vancouver World*, 2 June 1897.

commemoration of the Golden and Diamond Jubilees.

As noted earlier, Confederation had reaffirmed the British connection in Canada not only for pragmatic constitutional reasons, but because the inhabitants of the Dominion continued to have a cultural bond with Britain which they had no desire to break. These sentiments continued well after Confederation. Even after the end of the First World War, a large number of English-speaking Canadians continued to identify themselves as British Canadians. This belief, in conjunction with political and economic developments in Canada, Britain, and the world, ensured that Canada's relationship with the British Empire would endure as a central issue to Canadians and a defining characteristic of the new Dominion. At the centre of all discussions concerning the nature and future of Canada's connection with the Empire stood "Canadian imperialism"—a commitment to the imperial connection which found expression in a number of political programs and cultural activities, one of which was the celebration of Queen Victoria as the Mother of the Empire.

Sparked by the publication of Carl Berger's *The Sense of Power: Studies in the Idea of Canadian Imperialism, 1867-1914* (1970), Canadian historians have held an animated debate over the nature of Canadian imperialism. Examining several prominent Canadian imperialists, Berger analysed the intellectual basis of Canadian imperialism from the point of view of nationalism instead of from the more traditional economic and political perspective. Rejecting previous assertions made by liberal nationalists, such as O.D. Skelton and John W. Dafoe, that Canadian imperialism was "antithetical" to Canadian nationalism, Berger argued that Canadian

imperialism was, in fact, "one variety of Canadian nationalism."³³ While Canadian imperialists may have identified themselves as Britons, Berger contended that they remained just as concerned with Canada's place in the world and the achievement of national self-respect as those who urged complete autonomy. In urging Canada to assist Britain in the maintenance of the Empire, they sought not to reduce Canadian autonomy, but to increase Canada's influence, enlarge its responsibility, and, ultimately, allow it to replace Britain as the central power in the Empire.

Douglas Cole and Terry Cook disputed Berger's argument by contending that instead of representing an early form of Canadian nationalism, Canadian imperialism signified a wider Britannic or pan-Anglo-Saxon nationalism. They emphasised the racial character of imperialist rhetoric which stressed the commonality of Anglo-Saxon descent, language, and traditions among the members of the British settlement colonies of Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. According to Terry Cook, imperialists believed that "Canada was not defined by a set of characteristics which suggested a distinct Canadian nationalism, but rather by those which offered her no more than a local regional individuality within the Britannic whole."³⁴

Historians have been able to arrive at such different conclusions largely because Canadian imperialists comprised a diverse group of individuals. Some, such as George Parkin, stressed

³³Carl Berger, *The Sense of Power: Studies in the Ideas of Canadian Imperialism, 1867-1914* (Toronto, 1970), 8-9. Also see Robert Page, "The Canadian Response to the Imperial Idea During the Boer War Years," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 5, no. 1 (1970): 33-49.

³⁴Terry Cook, "George R. Parkin and the Concept of Britannic Idealism," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 10, no. 3 (1975): 21; Douglas Cole, "Canada's 'Nationalistic' Imperialists," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 5, no. 3 (1970): 44-49; Idem, "The Problem of 'Nationalism' and 'Imperialism' in British Settlement Colonies," *Journal of British Studies* 10, no. 2 (1971): 160-182.

imperial unity largely in racial terms. Others, such as George M. Grant and Stephen Leacock, eschewed Anglo-Saxon racialism and promoted the imperial bond for the prominence it could bestow upon Canada and its peoples. While prepared to defend Britain in a real emergency, as in the First World War, still others did not desire closer political and military ties with the Empire, but merely wanted to maintain existing ties. These "liberal imperialists" believed that the strength of the British Empire lay in its decentralised nature.

Fruitful as the debate over imperialism and nationalism was, its failure to move beyond issues of politics and political association limited it. Analysis of Canadian imperialism should move beyond defining it as merely a form of nationalism to considering it as a cultural expression as well. Imperialists did not value the imperial bond just for the "the sense of power" which came through membership in the Empire and participation in imperial affairs; Canadian imperialism also expressed a *sense of place*—a British cultural identity with a strong attachment to Britain and its art, architecture, history, literature, theatre, sports, customs, and royalty. Certainly, imperialists also identified themselves as members of a Canadian community with conspicuous differences from their fellow Britons on the other side of the Atlantic, but they remained *British* Canadians nonetheless. The encouragement of British culture in Canada not only promoted imperialism, but also expressed a sense of being part of a "Greater Britain," a nation encompassing the British Isles and the self-governing colonies of the Empire. Canadian imperialists may have differed in their vision of Canada's place and responsibilities within the British Empire, but they never wavered on their proud sense of being a part of the Empire.³⁵

³⁵Phillip Buckner, "Whatever Happened to the British Empire?," *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association* 4 (1993): 3-32; Wade A. Henry, "Canadian Imperialism and the British Empire, 1867-1918," in *Canada: Confederation to Present* [CD-ROM], ed. Rod Macleod et al.

While members of the working class also cherished these cultural ties³⁶ and despite the fact that several anti-imperialists were from the middle class, the celebration of the British heritage and involvement in imperial issues became associated with and resounded the most within bourgeois circles. Businessmen and manufacturers eyed the investment opportunities and markets of the Empire, church officials and laity promoted and assisted in the moral crusade to “civilize” the Empire’s indigenous peoples, and military and militia officers enjoyed the status and romance of being part of the expansive Empire. To many, imperial service became a component of middle class gentlemanly stature denoting loyalty and duty to the Queen.³⁷ Furthermore, the discussions and reports of imperial policy, overseas conflicts, and progress contained in the press were written by the middle class for its own consumption. An imperial frame of mind became part of the dominant middle class view and found one of its chief expressions in the representation of Queen Victoria as the Mother of the Empire.

Queen Victoria, herself, assisted in the projection of her image as the Mother of the Empire. While she rarely advocated imperial expansion, she was determined to maintain the unity of the Empire and to pass it on to her successor intact.³⁸ In 1873, she asked for and

(Edmonton, 2001).

³⁶Ross McCormack, “Cloth Caps and Jobs: The Ethnicity of English Immigrants in Canada 1900-1914,” in *Ethnicity, Power, and Politics in Canada*, eds. Jorgen Dahlie and Tissa Fernando (Toronto, 1981): 38-55.

³⁷John M. Mackenzie, *Propaganda and Empire: The Manipulation of British Public Opinion* (Manchester, 1984), 258; Mark Girouard, *The Return to Camelot: Chivalry and the English Gentleman* (New Haven, 1981), 228.

³⁸Frank Hardie, *The Political Influence of Queen Victoria*, 2d ed. (London, 1938), 174; Idem, *The Political Influence of the British Monarchy*, 25-26; Homans, *Royal Representations*, 230; Walter L. Arnstein, “The Warrior Queen: Reflections on Victoria and Her World,” *Albion* 30, no. 1 (1998):

received the title of Empress of India, a designation which tied her more closely to the fate of *her* Indian Empire, a subject she took a keen interest in.³⁹ Alongside her popular domestic photographs, the Queen also disseminated pictures of herself in elaborate garb and jewellery to promote her imperial image [Figure 3.2]. Perhaps more significant, however, was her participation in imperial ceremonies. Although her public appearances were rare events after the death of her husband, she consented to open both the Indian and Colonial Exhibition (1886) and its permanent manifestation as the Imperial Institute (1887) amidst great pomp and attendance from representatives from all parts of the Empire. The Queen's attendance gave both respectability to these newly formed symbols of the unity of the Empire and enhanced her own image as an Imperial Monarch.⁴⁰ Above all, Queen Victoria's participation in her Golden and Diamond Jubilees promoted her image as Mother of the Empire, even though she was a reluctant helper.

Following the precedent set in commemorating the fiftieth anniversary of George III's reign in 1809, the British government proposed to the Queen that a Golden Jubilee be held in the form of a public thanksgiving in order to mark the anniversary of her accession in 1837. She agreed to participate in the event held on June 21, but, regarding the moment more as a private anniversary than as a public celebration, refused to appear in state, preferring instead to wear her

1-28; Queen Victoria to Lord Rosebery, 28 September 1892, *Letters of Queen Victoria, 1886-1901*, ed. George E. Buckle, vol. 2 (London, 1930), 158.

³⁹The granting of the title "Empress of India" is discussed in greater detail in Chapter VII below.

⁴⁰Duke of Argyll, *V.R.I. Her Life and Empire* (London, 1901), 338, 347, 352; Lord Rosebery to Henry Ponsonby, 13 April 1886, *Lord Rosebery*, Marquess of Crewe, vol. 1 (London, 1931), 264-265.

customary mourning clothes.⁴¹ Nevertheless, her mere appearance in and sanctioning of the event permitted its meaning to be framed in many different ways. Many of the images were of the domestic middle class Queen discussed earlier, but as an event celebrated simultaneously around the Empire, the imperial dimensions—and representations—came to the forefront in Canada.

Intent on preventing the rise of regional and urban/rural jealousies in the country, Prime Minister John A. Macdonald decided against holding a large, central celebration in the nation's capital and opposed the federal sponsorship of large militia demonstrations in a few regional centres. He wanted to "get the people generally to join in the celebration" and the withdrawal of a militia corps from some areas to others "would deaden the interest of the people in the rural districts." Therefore, the federal government limited its official involvement to the submission of an address to the Queen and the appointment of the 21st of June as a public holiday.⁴² The cities, towns, and villages of the Dominion, however, more than made up for the government's lack of funding. While the local management of the Jubilee activities resulted in some municipalities holding the ceremonies on June 30, as several local leaders decided to combine the event with their Dominion Day celebrations and, thus, make it a two-day holiday, all held religious observances on the 21st and shared similar forms of celebration on their set days of

⁴¹Malcolm Chase, "From Millennium to Anniversary: The Concept of Jubilee in Late Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century England," *Past and Present*, no. 129 (1990): 132-147; Walter L. Arnstein, "Queen Victoria's Diamond Jubilee," *American Scholar* 66, no. 4 (1997): 591-597; Lant, *Insubstantial Pageant*, 152-154.

⁴²NAC, 5th Marquis of Lansdowne Papers, MG27 I B6, reel A-625, John A. Macdonald to Lansdowne, 16 March 1887; Macdonald Papers, reel C-1517, vol. 87, p. 34002, Lansdowne to Macdonald, 12 March 1887, p. 34039, Lansdowne to Macdonald, 1 April 1887; Canada, House of Commons, *Debates*, 20 April 1887, col. 20.

commemoration. Activities held in each community were those typically observed on other public holidays, such as Dominion Day or Victoria Day, and included a lengthy program of sports, military demonstrations, children's singing, and fireworks.⁴³ On the surface, there was little to distinguish the Jubilee celebrations from any other festive occasion. Speeches, sermons, and the press nonetheless built it into "a tale of devotion" to the monarch, woman, and Empire.⁴⁴

The imperial character of the spectacle permeated the press as editors filled their pages with stories of Jubilee celebrations in all parts of the Empire. Reports on the expressions of loyalty to the Queen through acts of national rejoicing in London, Madras, Sydney, Cape Town, and Hong Kong, alongside of those across Canada, reminded Canadians of their place in a far-flung Empire encircling the Globe and impressed upon their minds the role of the Queen in binding the British colonies together through ties of sentiment. "Wherever the English flag is thrown to the breeze," the *Montreal Gazette* reported, "British subjects of all races and conditions united in paying tribute of respect to the noble lady...." Commenting, too, on how

⁴³*Ottawa Citizen*, 2 July 1887; *Montreal Gazette*, 22 June 1887; *Manitoba Free Press*, 22 June 1887; *Globe*, 22 June 1887; *Toronto Evening News*, 2 July 1887; *Souvenir of the Queen's Jubilee: An Account of the Celebration at the City of Saint John*; *Queen's Jubilee Souvenir and Guide Book, 1837-1887* (Charlottetown, 1887); Conyngham Crawford Taylor, *Toronto "Called Back," from 1888 to 1847 and the Queen's Jubilee...* (Toronto, 1888), 386.

⁴⁴The commemoration of the Queen's birthday on the 24th of May each year was also marked by Canadian expressions of loyalty and love for Queen Victoria "with our innumerable fellow subjects all over the earth, and all over the sea...." Far from the first public expression of Canadian devotion for the monarch and Empire, the Golden Jubilee was simply a larger scale celebration of Victoria Day as put on by Canadians during the 1870s and early 1880s in which they had consistently proclaimed their "loyal acclamations" in common with their brothers and sisters throughout the Empire. *Saint John Daily News*, 24 May 1870, 26 May 1879; *Montreal Gazette*, 25 May 1872, 24 May 1879; *Globe*, 23 May, 25 May 1871, 25 May 1877; Nancy B. Bouchier, "'The 24th of May is the Queen's Birthday': Civic Holidays and the Rise of Amateurism in Nineteenth-Century Canadian Towns," *International Journal of the History of Sport* 10, no. 2 (1993): 159-192.

“people of every race” had joined hand in hand across the Empire, the *Ottawa Citizen* observed that “In no more eloquent way is it possible to prove the unity of the Empire than by the earnestness and sincerity of the joyous acclaims that pass from sea to sea...in honor of a great Queen, a true wife, and a loving mother.” By joining in the worldwide celebrations, Canadians articulated their sense of place within the Empire and demonstrated their personal affection “to her who for fifty long years has faithfully and wisely ruled over the Empire, of which it is the boast of Canadians that their country forms a part.” Even Jubilee sermons of thanksgiving referred to Canada’s place within the Empire. Rev. Henry Roe reminded his Lennoxville parishioners that “We cannot forget that we stand here to-day as members of the greatest Empire of the world—yes, the mightiest Empire the world has ever seen; an Empire which includes in its dominion more than one sixth of the earth’s surface and rules over more than one sixth of the Human Race; an Empire under the shadow of whose benignant protection we dwell in securest peace.” Whether it were speeches on the size, strength, and prosperity of the Empire or stories about the unity of celebrations throughout the colonies, Canadians were reminded of their place within a British Empire held together by a “silken chain” of sentiment towards a motherly Queen.⁴⁵

The imperial festival was repeated in much the same way in 1897 as the British government proposed marking the sixtieth anniversary of the Queen’s reign with a Diamond Jubilee. The colonies, again, turned the event into a global celebration as they demonstrated their loyalty in similar fashion throughout the Empire. Canadians entered as enthusiastically into

⁴⁵*Montreal Gazette*, 22 June 1887; *Ottawa Citizen*, 20 June, 22 June, 2 July 1887; *Manitoba Free Press*, 22 June 1887; *Globe*, 22 June 1887; Roe, *Sermon Preached at St. George’s Church*, 3.

the "national rejoicing" as before, an action which served, as the editor of the *Globe* had hoped, "as a testimony to future generations of the strength of the loyalty that impels Canadians to maintain the Dominion as an integral portion of the British Empire."⁴⁶ Evidence of Canada's place within the Empire, however, came not merely from the celebrations occurring across the country in unison with those around the world, but from the participation of Prime Minister Wilfrid Laurier and a Canadian military contingent in the centre of the Jubilee spectacle: the imperial metropolis of London.

The transformation of the Diamond Jubilee into an imperial extravaganza centred in London can be credited, in large part, to the machinations of Joseph Chamberlain, the Colonial Secretary. An advocate of colonial contributions to imperial defence, the establishment of an Imperial Council, and the formation of a customs union within the Empire, Chamberlain viewed the Jubilee as an opportunity to not only further cultivate, but also to exploit the ties of sentiment existing between the colonies and the Mother Country in order to push for his imperial designs. Proposing the invitation of the Premiers of the self-governing colonies along with military forces as an escort, the Colonial Secretary believed that "the result would be most unique, and would call attention in a way impressive both to Englishmen and to foreigners, to the extent of Her Majesty's Empire and the loyalty of the populations who are Her Majesty's subjects." Also, the presence of the Premiers in London "would afford a most valuable opportunity for the discussion of many subjects of the greatest interest to the Empire, such as Commercial Union, Colonial

⁴⁶Robert R. McLeod, *The National Grandeur of Britain. Lecture Delivered in the Church of the Redeemer, Halifax, N.S., June 20, 1897* (Halifax, 1897), 1; NAC, Louis-Honoré Fréchette Papers, MG29 D40, reel C-13989, vol. 5, pp. 4031-4032, John Willison to Louis-Honoré Fréchette, 18 December 1896.

Defence, Representation of the Colonies...and other similar subjects." Therefore, with the support of his government, Chamberlain invited the Premiers to attend, first, the Jubilee and, then, a Colonial Conference.⁴⁷

Upon their arrival in Britain, the leaders of the self-governing colonies, including Wilfrid Laurier, found themselves treated better than "most members of the British Government," riding in royal carriages, dining with the Queen, sworn in as members of the Privy Council, and placed—or displayed—in the centre of the Jubilee celebrations. As the Chief Clerk of the Colonial Office explained to the Queen's Private Secretary, Chamberlain "attaches the utmost importance to the character of the reception" given to both the Premiers and their colonial troops since "It is most desirable that the Colonies should be encouraged to increase these forces, and to identify them with the general defences of the Empire...."⁴⁸ The intention was not lost upon Laurier as he recalled that "Along with much genuine and spontaneous kindness one felt the incessant and unrelenting organisation of an imperialist campaign. We were looked upon not so much as individual men but abstractly as Colonial statesmen, to be impressed and hobbled... We were dined and wined by royalty and aristocracy and plutocracy and always the talk was Empire,

⁴⁷NAC, Colonial Office, Colonies, original correspondence, MG11 CO 323/421, reel B-2057, no. 2056, Memorandum by Joseph Chamberlain, 27 January 1897; NAC, Records of the Governor General Office [RG7], Despatches from the Colonial Office [G1], reel C-203, no. 28, Joseph Chamberlain to Lord Aberdeen, 28 January 1897.

⁴⁸Lant, *Insubstantial Pageant*, 219-220; John Kendle, *The Colonial and Imperial Conferences, 1887-1911: A Study in Imperial Organization* (London, 1967), 19-21, 25-30; *Proceedings of a Conference Between the Secretary of State for the Colonies and the Premiers of the Self-Governing Colonies, at the Colonial Office, London, June and July, 1897* (London, 1897); J.L. Garvin, *The Life of Joseph Chamberlain. Volume 3: 1895-1900* (London, 1934), 198; Sir William Baillie-Hamilton to Arthur Bigge, 28 May 1897, *Letters of Queen Victoria, 1886-1901*, vol. 3, 166.

Empire, Empire.” Despite Chamberlain’s best efforts, however, Laurier and the other Premiers resisted the social overtures and the proposals put at the Conference for increased imperial defence and commercial union.⁴⁹

Still, the attendance and treatment of Laurier and the Canadian Jubilee contingent in London assisted in the transformation of the Jubilee from a celebration of a Queen to a celebration of an Imperial Mother. With the presence of the colonials paying homage to “Sa Majesté,” the Quebec judge and author Adolphe-Basile Routhier noted that the Queen’s Jubilee in London took on the character of an imperial festival. “Ministres, officiers et soldats coloniaux étaient constamment l’objet de l’attention publique, prenaient part à toutes les grandes manifestations, étaient conviés à toutes sortes de fêtes.” Such prominence, he concluded, demonstrated “l’importance immense des colonies dans l’empire Britannique.” In addition, the coming together of colonials with people in Britain in celebration of the Queen turned “la fête impériale et coloniale” into “une fête de famille”—a fête in which Canada played an integral part thanks to the position of Laurier in the pageant.⁵⁰

After the Queen, Routhier observed, Laurier received the most attention and occupied a place of honour in the proceedings which he accepted with grace and tact and, in doing so, gave “honneur à son race et à son pays.” The Canadian press echoed Routhier as they gave

⁴⁹Laurier quoted in Oscar Douglas Skelton, *The Life and Letters of Sir Wilfrid Laurier*, vol. 2 (Toronto, 1921), 299-300. Laurier took the liberal imperialist position at the Conference and refused to commit Canada to any imperial obligations declaring that while he ardently defended the British connection he also felt satisfied with the existing relationship. To the Canadian Prime Minister, the British connection founded itself upon the freedom and equality granted to the peoples of the Empire and maintained itself through ties of sentiment and culture.

⁵⁰A.B. Routhier, *La Reine Victoria et Son jubilé* (Québec, 1898), 97-99, 80.

Laurier's exploits front page coverage and viewed his participation as evidence of the central place of Canada in the imperial scheme of things. His government's recent announcement that it would institute a preferential tariff, of which Britain would be the main beneficiary, ensured that the Prime Minister would be well received by British statesmen upon his arrival in the Mother Country. The "imperial tariff," the *Globe* predicted, "will unquestionably give Canada and its representative a more than common prominence in the round of pageantry." The *Montreal Gazette* agreed and suggested that Laurier's arrival in company with the tariff would also bring "into prominence the Imperial idea, which is the dominating note of the Queen's gala week." Chamberlain's surprise of knighthoods for the colonial Premiers furthered Laurier's association with the "Imperial idea," even though, in private, he confessed that he did not want it. Opposed to titles for political persons, he accepted it only because to do otherwise would be to ungraciously refuse the Queen's favour on her Jubilee.⁵¹ Mostly, however, it was Canada's status as the first self-governing colony in the Empire which the press credited for the prestigious position accorded the Canadian Prime Minister in the ceremonies.

"The Colonials," Kit Coleman reported for the *Toronto Mail and Empire*, "are really the most important people in town just now, and Canada stands at the head of the Empire." Accordingly, as the "representative of the senior nation," Laurier took precedence over all of the other premiers and was "chosen to do most of the speaking" in receptions. Reviewing the British newspapers, the *Saint John Daily Sun* observed that they devoted "much space to chronicling his words, describing his personal appearance and style of oratory. The prediction that the

⁵¹Ibid., 172-173; Robert Craig Brown and Ramsay Cook, *Canada, 1896-1921: A Nation Transformed* (Toronto, 1974), 20-21; *Globe*, 15 June 1897; *Montreal Gazette*, 14 June 1897; Skelton, *The Life and Letters of Sir Wilfrid Laurier*, vol.2, 69-70, 278-279.

French-Canadian premier would be the colonial lion of the hour has been fulfilled." The greatest testimony to Canada's "foremost place" in the imperial festival was Laurier's position at the head of the colonial Jubilee procession leading the Canadian contingents. Along the route thousands cheered the Canadians and their premier, an enthusiastic reception which prompted the *Daily Sun* to report that it was an "imposing...spectacle of the worldwide empire" to witness "a reception such as no colonial statesmen ever received in London." Kit Coleman concurred, noting that there was "wild clapping and cheering, as our own boys passed. 'Splendid fellows!' 'Rummy beggars, these Canadians!' 'By Jove, those fellows look fit!' [were exclaimed by] the people behind." "But when the royal carriage containing Mr. And Madame Laurier passed," she continued, "the cheers increased a thousand-fold."⁵² It was a sight which reaffirmed the place of Canada within the British Empire, not merely by providing Canadian imperialists with "a sense of power" through involvement in an elaborate military procession featuring soldiers from around the world nor even because of Laurier's privileged position in the imperial metropolis. The reaffirmation came from the sense Canadians had of participating in a Greater Britain, in a family of loyal peoples united by their affection for a motherly Queen. As Kit Coleman noted, the Diamond Jubilee pageant assured Canadians of their place in an imperial family, a family held together not by political arrangements and imperial defence, but by "the extreme personal attachment felt for her Majesty, not only as Queen, but as a most perfect and beautiful example of all womanly virtues, by her subjects from the Colonies."⁵³

⁵²Kit Coleman, *To London for the Jubilee* (Toronto, 1897), 16-18, 51-52; *Saint John Daily Sun*, 5 June, 15 June, 23 June 1897; *Montreal Gazette*, 11 June 1897; *Globe*, 15 June 1897.

⁵³Coleman, *To London for the Jubilee*, 20.

Mourning Queen Victoria

As significant and memorable an occasion as the Diamond Jubilee was for Canadians, it was soon overshadowed by the death of the Queen on 22 January 1901. Sometimes prone to dramatic overstatement, the press did not exaggerate when it exclaimed that the passing away of Queen Victoria was "The greatest event in the memory of this generation, the most stupendous change in existing conditions that could possibly be imagined...." The immensity of her death was not so much in the political or constitutional repercussions, which were minimal, nor in the way people conducted their day-to-day lives, but in the deep sense of loss, shock, and national mourning which brought members of the Empire together in common grief. On a par with the deaths of President Kennedy and Diana, Princess of Wales, the demise of Queen Victoria stunned the world and led to public expressions and gestures of remorse from all around the Globe, but especially in the Empire. The representation of Queen Victoria as the Mother of the Empire was not simply empty rhetoric since many British subjects responded to her death as one would to a member of their family. "When Queen Victoria died," John Diefenbaker recalled, "Father regarded it as one of the most calamitous events of all time. Would the world ever be the same? I can see him now. When he came home to tell us the news, he broke down and cried." Regarded as "the Queen-mother to us all," Victoria's death united Canadians with British subjects overseas in sorrow and, thus, served to reintegrate the nation through collective ritual action much like a family would affirm its togetherness through the observance of mourning practices.⁵⁴

⁵⁴*Manitoba Free Press*, 23 January 1901; John Diefenbaker quoted in Arthur Bousfield and Garry Toffoli, *Royal Observations: Canadians and Royalty* (Toronto, 1991), 21; W.H. Miln, ed., *Eulogies on Queen Victoria, Delivered by the Prominent Ministers of Canada on Her Majesty's*

Even before the announcement of her death, Canadian churches across the Dominion had responded to the reports of her serious condition, issued on the evening of January 19, by holding special services the next day to pray for her recovery. Leading up to the day of her death, large crowds surrounded the bulletin boards of their local newspapers and telegraph offices and held vigil until the fatal announcement.⁵⁵ As soon as it became known, church bells of all denominations tolled, fire alarms rang, courts adjourned, offices closed, public and private buildings were draped in black, and flags were lowered to half-mast. These immediate actions were done spontaneously on local initiative because state officials were largely caught off guard by the Queen's demise and were in confusion as to proper protocol. Since it had been nearly 64 years since the government last had to respond to the death of a monarch, Canadian politicians and civil servants lacked any knowledge of mourning procedures for one. Upon learning of the severity of the Queen's illness, Premier George Ross of Ontario immediately wired the Prime Minister explaining to him that "We are at a loss to know what are the proprieties of such an occasion," and asked for details of the procedures to be followed in Ottawa so that they could follow them "as closely as circumstances will warrant." Laurier, however, confessed that "we are just as much in the dark as you are yourself" and, consequently, had to appeal to the Canadian High Commissioner in London, Lord Strathcona, for advice.⁵⁶

Funeral Day, Feb. 2, 1901 (Toronto, 1901), 4; Smith, "Constructing Victoria," 102-103; Robert Bocock, *Ritual in Industrial Society: A Sociological Analysis of Ritualism in Modern England* (London, 1974), 119.

⁵⁵*Ottawa Citizen*, 21 January 1901; *Globe*, 21 January, 22 January 1901.

⁵⁶*Globe*, 23 January 1901; *Ottawa Citizen*, 23 January 1901; *Manitoba Free Press*, 23 January 1901; *Montreal Gazette*, 23 January 1901; *Vancouver World*, 23 January 1901; Laurier Papers, reel C-782, vol. 185, p. 52729, George Ross to Wilfrid Laurier, 22 January 1901, p. 52731, Laurier to

Unfortunately, British officials were as perplexed as Canadians, leading Viscount Esher, who as Secretary of the Office of Public Works had played a major role in the organisation of the Diamond Jubilee, to exclaim to a colleague: "I cannot describe to you the ignorance, the historical ignorance, of everyone from top to bottom—who should know something of procedure. You would think that the English Monarchy had been buried since the time of Alfred." Considering her advanced age, one would have thought that a plan would have been in place to deal with the inevitable, but clearly few had prepared. "It was taken for granted," the *Montreal Gazette* noted, "that our beloved Queen would attain if not surpass the years of her grandfather." Also, too, as Rev. F.B. Smith observed in his sermon to his Winnipeg congregation,

Ever since we can remember anything at all she has been our Queen...We were above all impressed with the extraordinary stability, the splendid physical vitality of the Queen which bid fair to outlast the greater part of our own allotted span of life...So that when the news of her decease was flashed across the wires, the life of the empire seemed for a moment to stand still; the continuity of over sixty years of history seemed to be roughly shattered; a landmark in our lives was taken away; we have had to adjust and adapt our mental vision to the change of circumstance, and for the first time have had to think of England without Queen Victoria.⁵⁷

Stunned and unprepared like everyone else, the Colonial Office did not issue mourning procedures until the 24th when Joseph Chamberlain informed the Canadian Governor General

Ross, 22 January 1901 (copy); reel C-1171, vol. 752, p. 215276, Laurier to Lord Strathcona, 22 January 1901 (copy).

⁵⁷Viscount Esher to Sir William Harcourt, 22 January 1901, *Journals and Letters of Reginald Viscount Esher*, eds. Maurice V. Brett and Oliver, Viscount Esher, vol. 1 (London, 1934-38), 276; Jerrold M. Packard, *Farewell in Splendour: The Passing of Queen Victoria and Her Age* (New York, 1995), 22; *Montreal Gazette*, 22 January 1901; Provincial Archives of Manitoba, Queen Victoria Memorial Committee, MG10 C21, sermon by F.B. Smith, 27 January 1901.

that court mourning was to be observed until 24 January 1902, which meant that Lord Minto should not hold any balls or receptions at Government House over the next year, and that the public should wear deep mourning dress (black) until March 6 and half mourning (a combination of any two of mauve, lilac, grey, black, or white) until April 17. Mourning etiquette had been followed throughout the eighteenth century, but during the Victorian period in Britain, as Leonore Davidoff points out, it "became much more complicated as it was incorporated into a more formal social code." The length of mourning and the type of clothes to be worn indicated respectability and, thus, moral authority and social status. Of course, the financial ability to follow the strict mourning practices was limited to the upper and middle classes and permitted them to exclude the working class from participation in "respectable" rituals of mourning. In Canada, however, the etiquette of death was much less restrictive. Certainly, the Canadian observance of the Queen's death was marked by reserve, traditional marks of public respect, and the widespread use of black, but after the Queen's Memorial Services held across the country on February 2, Canadians, for the most part, returned to their normal lives. As the Ottawa Society columnist Agnes Scott (Amaryllis) observed in mid-February, many ladies "have commenced giving teas, which they take great care to assure all invited are not 'teas,' others give luncheons which are not 'luncheons,' and I have even heard of a skating party which was not a 'skating party.' It would appear that there is a good deal in a name." Most wore black immediately after the Queen's death and on the day of her Memorial Service, but then reverted to normal dress completely oblivious to the "tradition" of half-mourning. In fact, when preparations were being made later that summer for the royal visit of the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York, during which half-mourning was still to be observed by the court, Canadian

ladies expressed their ignorance of "what constitutes half mourning." The *Ottawa Citizen* explained the more informal Canadian attitude towards mourning dress when the editors argued that "As it does not follow that the wearing of much mourning is indicative of much grief, neither does it follow that the reverse is the case" and advocated the use of simple means of expressing one's respect.⁵⁸

Nonetheless, up to and including the day of the Memorial Services, members of the middle class attired themselves in suitable mourning clothes and attended services to show their respect(ability) and to demonstrate their perceived moral superiority and social status. In addition to proper dress and a sober demeanor, church attendance was a mark of respectability since it suggested the adherence to moral values, probity, duty, and devotion. On the day of the Services, all of these indicators of one's moral sense and station in society were put on display as the middle class attended these special services *en masse*, an act which also articulated their sense of belonging to a respectable group of social leaders and emphasised the extent to which they formed a cohesive hegemonic bloc. The formation of exclusive male processions further expressed their sense of social authority in their communities. Walking together in unison in lengthy, sombre, and imposing thin lines of black suits and top hats along the main streets to the local churches to pay their respects to the Queen, they embodied an unmistakable kind of social and cultural power. As the photograph of one such procession in Greenwood, British Columbia

⁵⁸RG7, Central Registry Files [G21], reel T-830, vol. 86, file 176-1, part 2, Joseph Chamberlain to Lord Minto, 29 January 1901 (copy); Leonore Davidoff, *The Best Circles: Society, Etiquette and the Season* (London, 1973), 54-56; Agnes Scott quoted as "Amaryllis" in Sandra Gwyn, *The Private Capital: Ambition and Love in the Age of Macdonald and Laurier* (Toronto, 1984), 294; RG7, Miscellaneous records relating to royal visits and vice-regal tours [G23], vol. 4, file 5, Memorandum from the Lord Chamberlain's Office, "The Visit of T.R.H. the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York to Canada," n.d.; *Ottawa Citizen*, 28 January 1901.

illustrates, they were the central figures: on the outside looking in were women and the working class [Figure 3.3].⁵⁹

When it was announced that February 2 was to be observed as a day of mourning, the *Globe* noted that "The idea is that people shall devote themselves to religious exercises and in every way conduct themselves as though they were lamenting the demise of a member of their own families." Having imagined the Queen for years as the Mother of the Empire, it was easy for many Canadians to react to her death as though they were grieving the loss of their mother: for the middle class, as its spokespeople were apt to emphasise in their mourning practices, the feeling was even stronger, for she was *their* sort of National Mother. The newspaper reports of her death, the stories reflecting on her life, and the eulogies delivered at her Memorial Services reconfirmed her bourgeois status by recounting her domesticity, maternal values, and imperial motherhood. The press described at length her lingering at death's door surrounded by her children and grandchildren who wept silently as their matriarch peacefully passed away, a scene offered as illustrative of the royal family's love and devotion. When the Prince of Wales announced her death by saying not "the Queen," but "My beloved mother has passed away," it was interpreted as another "glimpse into the character of that home circle of which she was the centre, and the influence of which has done so much to keep up the standard of English family life." Indeed, the late Queen was most exalted as the model wife who was "proud to look up to her husband" and the ideal mother who was neither ashamed nor selfish "to be the mother of many children." Writers and clergymen reminded readers and listeners that her consideration for

⁵⁹The memorial services for Queen Victoria will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter VI below since they raised a number of religious issues in addition to class-based ones.

others, sympathy, and maternal love were attributes not limited to her own family, but to her people for whom she shared their joys and sorrows and felt "real, true, warm love...." Alas, the *Montreal Gazette* posited, it may have been the "overmastering" strength of these affections combined with her sense of public duty which contributed to her death. "The danger lay in the liability to overstrain of a nature so keenly alive to the sufferings and sorrows of others and so full of loving devotion to her children, other kindred and friends." Also, faced with the death of her husband and some of her children, her sense of duty "urged her to repress her [personal] emotions for the sake of Empire and her people."⁶⁰

By providing an example of domesticity, female virtue, and purity of life, Queen Victoria would not be quickly forgotten by middle class Canadians, but would live on in their social memory as the embodiment of their values, morals, and identity. With the unveiling of statues of the Queen and the renaming of parks and sites in her name in the months and years to come, they commemorated the importance of her life to the life of the Canadian nation they imagined. Although few would ever see the Queen in person, members of the middle class wrote and thought of her as though they knew her intimately. Indeed, they did know the person who appeared in their biographies, sermons, and press stories intimately for, in their acts of representation, the Queen had become one of them.

⁶⁰*Globe*, 23 January, 29 January 1901; *Ottawa Citizen*, 23 January 1901; E.A. Welch, *A Mother in Israel: A Sermon Preached in St. James' Cathedral, Toronto in Memory of Queen Victoria, January 27, 1901* (Toronto, 1901), 11; Miln, *Eulogies on Queen Victoria*, 11, 32; Lydia Agnes Edwards, ed., *How Canadians Mourned for Their Queen: Tributes of Loyalty and Love in Memory of Queen Victoria* (Truro, N.S., 1901); *Montreal Gazette*, 22 January 1901.

CHAPTER IV

The Edwardian Era, 1901-11

With Queen Victoria popularly accepted as a tender, loving mother, the few Canadians who advocated the abolition of the monarchy from their system of government found it difficult to manoeuvre around what Goldwin Smith termed the “halo of myth which has gathered, or rather has been manufactured around her head.”¹ Along with some of his fellow advocates of Continental Union and a few supporters of the Knights of Labour, such as the journalists T. Phillips Thompson and E.E. Sheppard, Goldwin Smith argued that monarchy stifled liberty and had no place in the naturally democratic society of the New World. Recognising the deference and feelings of affection for the widowed Queen, Smith steered clear of critiquing her personally and, instead, set his sights on the Governor Generalship, an institution he styled a “mock monarchy” in which, “by the use of all the social influence, flummery, and champagne at his command,” each Governor General had tried “to propagate aristocratic sentiment.” With the transformation of the Queen into “an Imperialist fetish” in her later years, however, the Toronto intellectual was compelled to criticise the “slavish” Diamond Jubilee and the Queen’s “monster funeral” as evidences of imperialists, militarists, and monarchists subjecting the Queen to “extravagant adulation” in order to serve their political interests. Their royal flattery, he wrote, “has exalted the Queen to a place among the ruling spirits and the foremost benefactors of mankind, it has ascribed British progress to her rule, it has given her name to a great era, as though she had been its moulding and informing spirit. This is fiction, got up partly with a

¹*New York Sun*, 28 April 1901.

political purpose, which, in fact, it has powerfully served." "In this respect," he confided to a friend soon after the Queen's death, "the demise of the Crown is a good thing."²

As prepared as he was to ridicule those who "prostrate[d] themselves in feigned ecstasies of adoration before the occupant...of a merely constitutional throne," Smith still refrained from attacking the Queen personally, whom he described as "a good and domestically exemplary, but in no way extraordinary woman."³ Similarly, E.E. Sheppard, who gained a reputation for his outspokenness as editor of the *Toronto News* in the 1880s, held back his republican-charged punches on the occasion of the Queen's Golden Jubilee. While condemning "an insolent and overbearing faction of ultra-loyalists" for turning the celebration into "a demonstration in favor of the principle of monarchy and perpetual British connection," Sheppard, at the same time, emphasised that he and his fellow "Democrats" respected the Queen personally and considered her "worthy of the homage paid throughout the Empire...."⁴

In their criticism of the royal pageants, Sheppard and Smith were in a distinct minority. Despite his reputable status as one of Canada's leading intellectuals, Smith's republican attitudes gained little support in a country where loyalty, nationality, and respectability were equated with

²Wade A. Henry, "Severing the Imperial Tie?: Republicanism and British Identity in English Canada, 1864-1917," in *Imperial Canada, 1867-1917: A Selection of Papers Given at the University of Edinburgh's Centre of Canadian Studies Conference - May 1995*, ed. Colin M. Coates (Edinburgh, 1997), 177-186; *Bystander* 3 (1883): 186-187; *Toronto Weekly Sun*, 27 March 1901; Goldwin Smith, *Reminiscences* (New York, 1910), 47; *New York Sun*, 28 April 1901; National Archives of Canada [hereafter NAC], Goldwin Smith Papers, MG29 D69, reel M-2191, Goldwin Smith to James Bryce, 28 January 1901.

³*Toronto Weekly Sun*, 3 June 1897; *Toronto Mail and Empire*, 24 January 1901; Smith, *Reminiscences*, 47.

⁴*Toronto Evening News*, 22 June 1887.

monarchism. Indeed, it was partly due to his middle class respectability and the paucity of intellectual vigour in late Victorian Toronto which enabled him to maintain his status in society while critiquing the social fount of royalty. Likewise, Sheppard and his colleague Phillips Thompson did not speak for the majority of the working class on the issue of monarchism. During the reign of Queen Victoria there is little evidence of labour republicanism outside of a segment of the Knights of Labour and, while members of the working class were relegated to the position of mere spectators during royal celebrations, they joined in singing the praises of the Queen. As the organ of the Winnipeg Trades and Labour Council put it on the occasion of the Queen's death, the working class shared "the feeling of loss, impoverishment and of deep sympathy" for "a woman who...followed ever an high ideal and noble purpose."⁵

Notwithstanding the working class' consistent personal respect for Queen and King, at the turn of the century growing labour discontent and class consciousness prompted workers to contest bourgeois power in order to have their rights respected, a conflict which brought them into the realm of royal representation. While much of labour's struggles with capital occurred on the shop floor through strikes and other labour actions, workers also resisted middle class hegemony in the social sphere. Since the middle class had built and supported much of its hegemony upon its social and cultural authority, the working class was compelled to challenge it in this area as well and, consequently, into the sphere of royal ceremonial. Maintaining their personal loyalty to the monarchy and its representatives during the Royal Tour of 1901, members of the working class challenged middle class exclusivism, resisted bourgeois claims to cultural authority, and demanded access to the touring Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York. With

⁵*Voice*, 19 June 1897, 25 January 1901.

the ridicule of middle class "flunkeyism," attempts to serve the future George V with addresses expressing their labour grievances and loyalty to the Crown, and protests over the organisation of the Tour, spending priorities, and restrictive dress codes and admission prices to royal events, the working class attempted to subvert middle class hegemony during the Tour and claim a respected place within the Canadian nation.

The middle class, however, responded to working class pressure and changes in the socioeconomic structure by continuing to reaffirm its social and cultural authority in familiar regal situations, though in different ways. As during the Royal Tour of 1860, address presentations, receptions, militia reviews, and the representation of royal figures as class and gender exemplars were utilised during the Tour of 1901 in order to assert and strengthen social status. Unlike in 1860, however, the struggle was no longer so much between the upper and middle classes because, by the turn of the century, they had largely congealed into a hegemonic bloc. While some checks were necessary every now and again to prevent some members of this status group from attempting to rise above the rest and claim a superior social position, most of the "new" bloc's energy was directed towards consolidating its hegemony against growing working class agitation. In addition, changes in the nature of capitalism along with the rise of labourism and the movement for women's rights engendered changes in the nature of middle class manliness and, thus, the representation of male bourgeois status. Further complicating matters, the accession of Edward VII in 1901 joined with the high profile of his male successor in Canada during the Royal Tour of that year brought two royal figures, holding dissimilar values, physiques, and modes of masculinity, onto the scene. Each had to be made compatible with and, moreover, reinforce the new definitions of middle class manhood. Consequently, royal

representations during the Edwardian era, as articulated in the Royal Tour of 1901, the Coronation of Edward VII (1902) and observance of his death (1910), and the Coronation of George V (1911), were refashioned in order to meet new socioeconomic conditions, images of manliness, and the reformulation of hegemony. Remaining the same, however, was the subordinate position of women. Though gaining a modest voice during the Royal Tour, women were still relegated to spectator status. Despite the increasing dissemination of the ideology of Imperial Motherhood first articulated during the later years of Queen Victoria's reign, ideals of middle class femininity continued to be associated with domesticity finding expression in, first, Princess May, Duchess of Cornwall and York (Queen Mary) and, then, Queen Alexandra as these female figures continued the maternal image so popularly identified with Queen Victoria.

Class and Gender during the Edwardian Era

When the Duke of Cornwall and York toured Canada from coast to coast in September and October of 1901, he travelled through a very different country from that which had hosted his father in 1860. Canadian Confederation, the additions of Manitoba, British Columbia, the Yukon, and the Northwest Territories as provinces and territories, the rapid expansion of transportation networks highlighted by the completion of the transcontinental Canadian Pacific Railway in 1885, and the increased circulation of news and information through telegraph and telephone lines had expanded and integrated the country which forty years earlier had consisted of colonies not only separated by political boundaries, but by inadequate transportation networks. In addition, population and economic growth, increased immigration, and accelerating rates of industrialisation and urbanisation had engendered changes in the social structure,

specifically in the growth and visibility of the working class and in the altered composition of the upper and middle classes.

Fuelled by population growth which added to the labour supply, spurred on by the protective tariff of the National Policy, and stimulated by new and improved transportation networks, industrial capitalism and economic output in Canada grew significantly during the Victorian period reaching its apex between 1900 and 1914, a period which witnessed the most rapid economic development since Confederation. Responding to the growth in capital accumulation and in the potential for even further economic expansion, businessmen, financiers, and manufacturers had by the turn of the century reorganised operations by concentrating production through corporate mergers, had instituted "scientific" management principles and standardised labour tasks to increase worker efficiency, and had encouraged the immigration of people from Asia and Eastern Europe in order to depress the wages of workers. These developments not only caused production to soar, particularly in the manufacturing industries of Montreal, Toronto, and Winnipeg, the mining, fishing, and timber industries of British Columbia, and the steel industry in Nova Scotia and Ontario, but they also contributed, by 1901, to the rise of a much larger, more vocal, and organised working class than had existed even a decade earlier. Economic development during the 1880s had contributed to the establishment of a significant labour movement. The Knights of Labour, the Trades and Labour Congress (TLC), and other unions came into being. An economic downturn in the 1890s had, however, weakened the bargaining ability of union members. By the end of the decade, an economic upturn in conjunction with the aforementioned initiatives of the owners of capital sparked another period of labour unrest as workers across the country protested low wages, poor

working conditions, the importation of cheap labour, and the formation of business monopolies by participating in an unprecedented 726 strikes between 1899 and 1903. Occurring primarily in the manufacturing and construction industries, but also taking place amongst miners, track men, and fishermen, several of the strikes were also over union recognition and opposition to new managerial operation systems. As such, the strikes can be viewed as attempts by workers to retain "some hold on a measure of autonomy at the workplace."⁶

In addition to taking action at their work sites, workers also pushed for political redress of their grievances and resisted the business agenda of some politicians by electing labourites to political office. Demanding an eight-hour day, a minimum wage, the elimination of child labour, public ownership of railways and telegraphs, and an end to Asian immigration, the Trades and Labour Congress sponsored candidates in elections and, despite some small victories in federal and provincial elections, achieved its greatest success at the municipal level. Though never controlling city councils, working class aldermen provided an "oppositional minority to Council's business-oriented majority."⁷ The aldermen pursued a progressive, reformist programme which emphasised fairness and equality for (white) workers and the right of workers to share in the economic and social rewards of capitalist production. Consequently, they protested extravagant expenditures by the government which, in their view, were of little benefit to the working class. Despite the fact that the TLC and labourist aldermen sometimes cooperated with middle class

⁶Bryan D. Palmer, *Working-Class Experience: Rethinking the History of Canadian Labour, 1800-1991*, 2d ed. (Toronto, 1992), 117-121, 156-162, 170-171; Robert A.J. McDonald, *Making Vancouver: Class, Status, and Social Boundaries, 1863-1913* (Vancouver, 1996), 100-101; Craig Heron, *Working in Steel: The Early Years in Canada, 1883-1935* (Toronto, 1988).

⁷McDonald, *Making Vancouver*, 183.

leaders during civic activities in order to improve working class participation—and, therefore, status—they expressed an identity of interests separate from the middle class. As clearly in the city council chambers as on the shop floor, working class representatives did their utmost to defend the interests of workers including, for example, protecting the hard-earned taxes of workers from expropriation for bourgeois facilities and entertainments.⁸ It would be erroneous to suggest, however, that the Canadian working class was a united body. With workers facing different grievances from sector to sector and region to region and divided further by skill levels and ideology, “the potential for class solidarity was undercut.”⁹

The upper and middle classes, too, faced problems of cohesiveness by the late nineteenth century as they tried to share social and cultural authority within a hegemony. As the nineteenth century progressed, the traditional upper class élite’s status based upon wealth accumulated from speculation and agricultural holdings, the control of government offices and patronage appointments, Loyalist ancestry, and traditional deference declined as the processes described in Chapter II accelerated and placed the middle class in a stronger economic, political, and social position. With the growth of industrialisation and commercialisation continuing at a rapid pace after Confederation, the middle class’ influence increased exponentially as the power of manufacturers, businessmen, and professionals in the community grew not only in terms of

⁸Palmer, *Working-Class Experience*, 177; McDonald, *Making Vancouver*, 183; Mark Leier, *Red Flags and Red Tape: The Making of a Labour Bureaucracy* (Toronto, 1995), 78, 92-93, 95, 120-121.

⁹The working class was split even further by ethnicity. This aspect, however, will be explored in Chapter VI below as part of a full discussion of ethnicity and royal representation. Palmer, *Working-Class Experience*, 156, 162; McDonald, *Making Vancouver*, 103-104, 106; Leier, *Red Flags and Red Tape*, 126, 133-134.

numbers, but also in accumulated wealth and economic clout. The pervasiveness of industrial and commercial capitalism in Late Victorian and Edwardian Canada was reflected in the state which continued its support of the capitalist system through policies which aimed at strengthening and empowering capitalist enterprise. Not uncoincidentally, the middle class had also wrested control of political offices and patronage appointments from the traditional élite. Indeed, even the militia, that bastion of upper class status and the target of so much ridicule from the middle class during the Royal Tour of 1860, had become, by the time of the Royal Tour of 1901, a bourgeois institution.

The traditional élite had not disappeared, old money and large land owners remained influential; traditional status holders had, however, been reduced in influence by the rise of the middle class and then became absorbed and integrated into its ranks. In fact, part of the middle class assumed the status of an upper class. The industrial magnates, railway tycoons, executive bankers, and other wealthy manufacturers, businessmen, and professionals had risen economically above their fellow entrepreneurs, but, nonetheless, retained the same middle class values, asserted a common sense of respectability, and lived a lifestyle set apart from the working class in familiar ways. This expanded middle class demonstrated its industry, self-sufficiency, prosperity, and superior status by living in respectable neighbourhoods in detached houses and sharing in common recreational pursuits with members from the same social rank.¹⁰ In addition, its members continued to cultivate a gentlemanly public image, but the nature of this respectable image and, in particular, the character of middle class manliness, had been adapted to meet the new socioeconomic conditions of the late nineteenth century. Traditional modes of respectability

¹⁰McDonald, *Making Vancouver*, 23-24, 149-151.

were altered in order to fit a new type of middle class man: the wage-earner.

As small-scale capitalism became replaced by large-scale enterprises and monopolies by the turn of the century, opportunities for middle class men to be self-employed dwindled and the bureaucratisation of the workplace, which expanded the size of the managerial ranks, lessened the chances of promotion to upper management. Whereas the average mid-nineteenth century middle class man had based his identity largely upon independent entrepreneurship, by the end of the Victorian period many had become wage-earners. Nonetheless, the new breed of "gentleman" maintained an occupational distance from the working class thanks to their better education and the privileging of nonmanual over manual work, the prestigiousness of which was reflected in the wage scale.¹¹ Yet, more significantly, the wage-earning middle class was able to define the boundaries of its social constituency and retain its cultural authority by adopting a new form of manly behaviour. In the face of working class challenges in the political arena and on the shop floor and in response to the growing women's movement which challenged the "assumption that education, professional status, and political power required a male body," the middle class male reformulated the ideal of manhood as it had been formulated in the mid-nineteenth century. The former emphasis on independence and the expression of self-restraint and emotional control through formal conduct, sober dress, disciplined behaviour, and dignified poise was qualified in favour of a stress on manhood as a function of home life and leisure.

¹¹Gail Bederman, *Manliness and Civilization: A Cultural History of Gender and Race in the United States, 1880-1917* (Chicago, 1995), 12-14; Andrew C. Holman, *A Sense of Their Duty: Middle-Class Formation in Victorian Ontario Towns* (Kingston and Montreal, 2000), 25-27, 173.

pursuits.¹² The ideal male became a family man who spent much of his time caring for his family. A counterpoise to the “rough” and “crude” conduct of the working class male, the middle class man distinguished himself with his honest work in support of his family and by his attention to his children as a kind and caring father. At the same time, and as a balance to his domestic side, the ideal bourgeois male also participated in activities which explored his “primordial instincts of survival.” Hunting, fishing, camping, boating, and alpine sports became the virile recreational activities of choice and also served to further separate the middle class wage-earner from the working class man who had neither the income, the time, nor the access to the wilderness to participate in these activities. Time for family, confidence in his inner-self, and participation in rational recreation became the mark of the ideal male.¹³

Members of the middle class, then, from the wealthy to the respectable wage-earner, remained a part of the same middle class-oriented hegemony by sharing the same values and ideals. While the wealthy may have lived in larger houses and surrounded themselves with more expensive accoutrements, they retained their middle class respectability, faith in the work ethic, and, at risk of social criticism, accepted the equal place of other middle class persons in the social scale. What sometimes occurred within the middle class, however, and strained its cohesiveness, was the propensity of some bourgeois members to assert a superior cultural status in society. Despite the absorption of the traditional upper class, some members of the wider middle class

¹²Bederman, *Manliness and Civilization*, 11, 13-17; Keith Walden, *Becoming Modern in Toronto: The Industrial Exhibition and the Shaping of a Late Victorian Culture* (Toronto, 1997), 23-24; Holman, *A Sense of Their Duty*, 158-163; John F. Kasson, *Rudeness and Civility: Manners in Nineteenth-Century Urban America* (New York, 1990).

¹³Bederman, *Manliness and Civilization*, 11, 16-17, 22-23, 27.

hegemony, whether from the traditional élite, the very wealthy, or merely the ambitious and vain, sought to put themselves forward as an upper class carrying a superior social and cultural status. Either through the “senseless” display “of wealth...luxury and ostentation” or by pronouncing themselves as the preeminent leaders of society at public ceremonies, such social climbers received a stiff rebuke from their middle class colleagues.¹⁴ Indeed, with the middle class now embracing such a wide constituency, the need to keep some of its members from breaking rank, and, moreover, to prevent the working class from challenging its authority, became a constant preoccupation of the middle class—one which is clearly illustrated by the use of royal ceremonies and representation during the Edwardian period.

Far from being immune to the socioeconomic developments occurring in Canadian society, royal ceremonies and representations reflected these changes; indeed, they provided a means for both the middle and working classes to consolidate, assert, and challenge the hegemonic order. Developed as a nation-building exercise, the Royal Tour of 1901 served as a vehicle for the middle class to reaffirm its social and cultural authority. Through a process of self- and royal representation during the regular round of address presentations, royal receptions, and militia reviews, male members of the middle class not only articulated a sense of themselves as a cohesive group of respectable gentlemen, but also portrayed royalty and defined the nation in their own image. Continued during the extent of Edward VII's reign and into that of his successor, this process of middle class male self-definition, consolidation, and empowerment also acted as a way to check the social ambitions of some of its own members. By defining proper behaviour and ridiculing as social sycophants and snobs those who transcended such respectable

¹⁴*Globe*, 16 September 1901.

conduct, the middle class monitored and protected its boundaries. As it used royal ceremonies and representations to keep some members from rising above them, so the middle class employed these instruments to keep the working class at bay. With its economic and political authority challenged by strikes and protests in municipal councils, the middle class responded, in part, by reasserting its cultural authority in royal celebrations, limiting labour's oppositional voice in the festivities, and portraying the royal ceremonies as examples of the "social harmony"—and support of the status quo—which supposedly reigned in the hearts of Canadians. By the same token, however, the working class resisted being muffled, challenged middle class exclusivism, and dogged celebrations during the Royal Tour with its labour grievances. Yet, due to their loyalty to the monarchy most workers had difficulty in raising their labour grievances when their future sovereign passed through their communities. Instead, they joined in the rejoicing.

Women's place in the Royal Tour, unlike that of the male middle and working classes, had changed little from previous celebrations and representations. Certainly, they were able to present addresses and attend receptions during the Tour, thanks partly to the presence of the Duchess of Cornwall and York, activities they were prohibited from in 1860, but the Tour remained a male affair. Moreover, whereas middle class manliness had been updated and became personified by Edward VII and George V, bourgeois femininity still bore its Victorian characteristics. Though the Queen had passed away, Queen Alexandra and Queen Mary kept the images of middle class domesticity and Imperial Motherhood alive.

The Origins of the Royal Tour of 1901

The Royal Tour of 1901 also continued to propagate Queen Victoria's maternal image

and sense of public duty after her death. Proclaimed as the "Queen's Wish," the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York's tour of Empire was said to have been her last desire; to give thanks to her imperial children who had given their support during the ongoing South African War (1899-1902). Her decision had been a difficult one for her to make since the Tour would mean that her beloved grandson and granddaughter would be away from her side for several months, a situation which would cause the aged Queen great personal sadness. Yet, "in accordance with [her] life-long habit," Sir Donald Mackenzie Wallace wrote in his official account of the Tour, she sacrificed "her personal feelings to the interests of her people." Wallace, the Duke's Assistant Private Secretary during the Tour, added that the Queen had also been distressed on account of the Duke being the only male in direct succession to the throne after the Prince of Wales, a fact which had caused her to reject an earlier proposed visit to the Australian colonies in 1894.¹⁵ Despite her concerns over her health and, thus, her desire to keep her family close by, on 17 September 1900 the Queen nonetheless followed the advice of her ministers and accepted Australia's latest invitation to the Duke and Duchess, this time for the purpose of opening the first session of the newly federated Australian parliament. Since the second object of the Tour was to thank Australians for their assistance in the South African War, the Queen and the Colonial Office faced demands from other colonies who argued that they had been no less loyal and, therefore, also deserved a visit from Their Royal Highnesses. New

¹⁵Donald Mackenzie Wallace, *The Web of Empire: A Diary of the Imperial Tour of Their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York in 1901* (London, 1902), 6; Joseph Pope, *The Tour of Their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York Through the Dominion of Canada in the Year 1901* (Ottawa, 1903), 157; Marquis of Ripon to Queen Victoria, 30 December 1893, Henry Ponsonby to Marquis of Ripon, 1 January 1894 in *The Letters of Queen Victoria, 1886-1901*, ed. George E. Buckle, vol. 2 (London, 1930), 334-335.

Zealand and several colonial territories between Britain and the Antipodes were soon added to the itinerary.¹⁶

Not wanting Canada to be left out of the growing imperial festival, Prime Minister Sir Wilfrid Laurier wrote the Queen directly on October 20 and humbly prayed that she would be so gracious as to "favour" her "loyal subjects in Canada" with a visit by Their Royal Highnesses on their return from Australia. "It is unnecessary to assure Your Majesty," he added, "that they will meet with a loyal and enthusiastic reception, and that their visit will tend to strengthen, if possible, those ties of union that bind a loyal and patriotic people to their much loved Sovereign." Reluctant in the first place to permit them to travel to Australia, the Queen delayed her response to the Canadian Prime Minister, perhaps hoping that her ministers could decline the invitation on her behalf without causing offence. The Duke of Cornwall and York, interested in extending his Imperial Tour across the Dominion, enlisted British Prime Minister Salisbury's help in convincing his grandmother of the necessity of a Canadian visit. "Please ask the Queen," he wrote, "whether we can visit Canada on our way home from Australia. She is averse to it owing to our long absence from England. But we think it would cause great disappointment and perhaps jealousy. Use your influence." Adding to the pressure, in early December Governor General Lord Minto suggested to Laurier that he should draw up a formal petition from Parliament to be delivered to the Queen on the issue. Soon after he sent the petition on behalf of the Canadian government, Minto received word from Joseph Chamberlain, who had also been working on the Queen to accept the invitation, that the Queen had assented to extending the

¹⁶Wallace, *The Web of Empire*, 4, 6.

Tour to Canada in recognition of Canada's loyalty and contributions to the South African War.¹⁷

The death of the Queen in January 1901, however, seemed to threaten the entire Tour. The new King, in view of the fact that the Duke had been too ill to attend the Queen's funeral and that he "had only one son left out of three and he will not have his life unnecessarily endangered for any political purpose," expressed his reluctance to Lord Salisbury in allowing his son to go on the Tour, scheduled to begin in March, so soon after his accession. On behalf of Salisbury, A.J. Balfour wrote a lengthy letter to the King explaining that he "is no longer merely King of Great Britain and Ireland...He is now the greatest constitutional bond uniting together in a single Empire communities of free men separated by half the circumference of the Globe." As such, he had a duty to do everything in his power to "emphasise...his personality to our kinsmen across the seas...." Colonials "know little and care little for British Ministers and British party politics. But they know, and care for, the Empire of which they are members and for the Sovereign who rules it. Surely it is in the highest interests of the State that he should visually...associate his family with the final act which brings the new community [of Australia]

¹⁷NAC, Records of the Secretary of State [RG6], General correspondence [A1], vol. 162, file 1050, Wilfrid Laurier to Queen Victoria, 20 October 1900 (copy); George, Duke of Cornwall and York quoted in Kenneth Rose, *King George V* (New York, 1984), 43; Lord Minto to Wilfrid Laurier, 4 December 1900, Wilfrid Laurier to Lord Minto, 10 December 1900, in *Lord Minto's Canadian Papers: A Selection of the Public and Private Papers of the Fourth Earl of Minto, 1898-1904*, eds. Paul Stevens and John T. Saywell, vol. 1 (Toronto, 1981-1983), 442, 445; NAC, Records of the Governor General Office [RG7], Letterbooks of despatches to the Colonial Office [G12], vol. 94, Lord Minto to Queen Victoria, 11 December 1900, 206-207; RG7, Despatches from the Colonial Office [G1], reel C-208, Joseph Chamberlain to Lord Minto, 22 December 1900; Phillip Buckner, "The Royal Tour of 1901 and the Construction of an Imperial Identity in South Africa," *South African Historical Journal*, no. 41 (1999): 325-329.

into being...."¹⁸

Despite his own travels around the Empire, including to Canada in 1860, and the faith colonials held that his visits would assuredly impress the importance of their respective regions upon him, imperial affairs never really occupied the attention of Edward VII during his reign. There is little disputing that his concern for his sole male heir was genuine, but the ease with which he had dismissed both the disappointment likely to arise in the colonies and the political usefulness, from an imperial standpoint, of the Tour was indicative of his lack of interest in the self-governing colonies. The Duke of Cornwall and York held a much greater appreciation of the colonies, gained during his service as a midshipman with the Royal Navy, when he had visited most of the Empire. Hence, his desire to add Canada to his 1901 Tour itinerary. Balfour shared the Duke's outlook and understood the imperial loyalty felt in the settlement colonies. Fortunately for those colonies, the future Prime Minister was successful in persuading the King to accede to colonial desires and permit his heir to go on his journey. The King, however, added one proviso: his son should retain the title of Duke of Cornwall and York until after the Tour; only after returning would he assume the title of the Prince of Wales. Long identified as *the* Prince of Wales, the King felt that his son should not take over his former title until the public had grown more accustomed to the monarchical change.¹⁹

As with Queen Victoria, Edward's decision was offered as evidence of the King's "resolve to subordinate his personal feelings to the public good." His own comments certainly

¹⁸Edward VII and A.J. Balfour quoted in Harold Nicolson, *King George V: His Life and Reign* (London, 1952), 67-68.

¹⁹*London Times*, 9 February 1901; Joseph Watson, *The Queen's Wish: How it was Fulfilled by the Imperial Tour of T.R.H. the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York* (Toronto, 1902), 6-7.

encouraged that view. In his first Speech from the Throne in February, the King confessed that

A separation from my son, especially at such a moment, cannot be otherwise than deeply painful, but I desire to give effect to Her late Majesty's wishes; and as an evidence of her interest, as well as my own, in all that concerns the welfare of my subjects beyond the seas, I have decided that the visit... shall not be abandoned....

With these few words, the King not only affirmed the monarch's public commitment and appreciation of the colonies, but also demonstrated that he intended to follow the example set by his mother to put the public's interests before personal feelings.²⁰ Perhaps more significantly, the open affection he expressed for his son, and the attention writers would pay to it, signified the beginning of the process of rehabilitating the image of the former Prince of Wales from a fat, gambling womaniser—developed during a scandalous and well-publicised lifestyle after his marriage in 1863—into a loving, doting father fond of hunting and sport. It also foreshadowed the similar treatment the Duke of Cornwall and York would receive during his eight-month tour of the Empire. In short, the process of transforming the King and his heir into the new middle class male ideal had begun.

The Organisation of the Royal Tour of 1901

Shortly after the King had publicly confirmed that the Tour would go ahead, state authorities around the Empire went to work on their local arrangements in earnest. Motivated in large part by his conviction of the importance of the monarchy as a unifying national symbol in Canada, Lord Minto sought to take the lead in the state's preparations. The need for a solid unifying force, he thought, was especially necessary in a colony such as Canada which lacked the

²⁰Pope, *The Tour of Their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York*, 2, 160; Edward VII quoted in Wallace, *The Web of Empire*, 10-11.

national traditions and the sense of a shared history necessary to unite a nation. With strong connections to the royal household through his wife, who was the daughter of one of Queen Victoria's private secretaries (the Queen Victoria herself was godmother to his first child) the Canadian Governor General's personal attachment further influenced his decision to foster royal sentiment in the Dominion.²¹ By promoting the cultural significance of the monarchy through his own office with Viceregal tours and the encouragement of distinctly Canadian expressions of culture and identity, Lord Minto took it upon himself both to bind the Canadian nation together and to tie the more integrated entity that would result to the British Empire through the active use of the Crown's influence.²² His first attempt in utilising a specific royal event to this end having failed earlier in the year,²³ he involved himself directly in the organisation of the Royal Tour and used his influence to the utmost to insist upon the institution of organisational details he felt would maximise royal influence on the nation-building project. The Tour would be celebrated as a grand success in terms of loyalty displayed by the Canadian public towards the Duke and Duchess; Minto's organisation of the event, interpreted as too rigid on questions of

²¹Lord Minto to Joseph Chamberlain, 11 April 1901, in *Lord Minto's Canadian Papers*, eds. Stevens and Saywell, vol. 2, 37; Carman Miller, *The Canadian Career of the Fourth Earl of Minto: The Education of a Viceroy* (Waterloo, 1980), 173, 183-184, 189; Anthony H.M. Kirk-Greene, "The Governors-General of Canada, 1867-1952: A Collective Profile," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 12, no. 4 (1977): 45.

²²For example, in order to encourage the sport of lacrosse Minto donated a championship cup (the Minto Cup) in 1901 with the first cup game played in front of the touring Duke and Duchess (Chapter V below). Also, as detailed in Chapter VII below, the Governor General pressed for a Native demonstration during the Royal Tour.

²³Lord Minto had attempted to transform Queen Victoria's Memorial Service in Ottawa into a State Service, but religious differences prevented the possibility of any State Service being held (see Chapter VI below).

protocol and lacking in sensitivity to regional demands, would, however, receive much criticism.²⁴

By June it had become clear that Minto and Laurier had emerged as the two people who decided the main lines of the Tour with consideration then given to the proposals submitted by provincial committees headed by the Lieutenant Governors. Much of the Prime Minister's and Governor General's duties in this matter, however, especially in matters of correspondence and logistical arrangements, were delegated to Joseph Pope, the Undersecretary of State, and Minto's Military Secretary, Major F.S. Maude. "To tell the truth," Pope later recalled, "I was not particularly keen about tackling this job. I had had no experience with royalty, was naturally timid, and thought more might be expected of me than I should be able to perform." Accordingly, he left much of the planning for the militia reviews, escorts, and regulations to be followed at processions, addresses, and receptions to Major Maude. While Maude possessed a thorough knowledge of protocol and the arrangement of military displays in association with royal celebrations, gained from his work in staging the Diamond Jubilee celebrations in London, he lacked a knowledge of Canada and its inhabitants. His experience in the one area would contribute significantly to the successful arrangement of certain displays; equally, his inexperience in the other would compound Minto's own shortcomings and strengthen the impression that the Governor General's Office willfully ignored the desires of Canadians in favour of pursuing imperial objectives during the Tour.²⁵

²⁴Miller, *The Canadian Career of the Fourth Earl of Minto*, 183-184.

²⁵NAC, Wilfrid Laurier Papers, MG26 G, reel C-784, vol. 192, p. 55038, Lord Minto to Wilfrid Laurier, 4 April 1901; Lord Minto to Joseph Chamberlain, 11 April 1901, Lord Minto to Arthur Elliot, 3 November 1901, in *Lord Minto's Canadian Papers*, eds. Stevens and Saywell, vol.

Although Laurier had ultimate authority in the federal government's organisational structure for the Royal Tour, Minto, with support from Maude, handled most of the operations and planning. Aside from moments when Laurier offered advice and a few directions, his duties as Prime Minister constrained his time and ability to deal with the demands involved in arranging a large-scale state visit. He, therefore, largely limited his role in the affair to consultation about and authorisation of actions taken by the Governor General. In his capacity as Secretary of State, R. W. Scott was dissatisfied with this situation. The Office of Secretary of State had been established at Confederation in order to care for the Sovereign's Seal and the responsibilities associated with it. These included stamping statutes, proclamations, and other items requiring the Governor General's signature, looking after the government's record keeping and correspondence, and, lastly, acting as a channel of communication between the sovereign and the people. Upon learning of the leading role to be played by the Governor General's Office, Scott felt that Minto and Maude had infringed on his prerogative and, therefore, he sought to defend the status of his Office. A political veteran who had grown more and more irascible during his later years—he turned 76 in 1901—Scott's opinion and suspicion of British statesmen added to his distrust of Minto's plans for the Tour. A strong supporter of Catholic rights, Irish Home Rule, Canadian autonomy, and an initial opponent of the South African War (he believed it was an imperial conspiracy), he challenged Minto's control by keeping "all correspondence connected with the reception in his own hands"—a situation not rectified until late June with

2, 37, 85; Joseph Pope, *Public Servant: The Memoirs of Sir Joseph Pope*, ed. Maurice Pope (Toronto, 1960), 132-133; RG7, Miscellaneous records relating to royal visits and vice-regal tours [G23], vol. 5, file 10, F.S. Maude to C. Berkeley Powell, 28 October 1901 (copy); Miller, *The Canadian Career of the Fourth Earl of Minto*, 184-186.

Minto's plea for cooperation and assurance to Scott that "I in no way wished to assume unnecessary responsibility as an Imperial officer" except to "assist the gov^{mt} [with] any information sent me, and by any organisation I may be able to offer...."²⁶

Scott was not the only Cabinet minister who grumbled over Minto and Maude's leadership and the way in which they planned the Tour. His resistance to imperial control reflected the tension within the government over the organisation of the Royal Visit. Far from united in its approach to the Tour, the government was beset by competing interests which struggled to influence the Tour's arrangements and shape the representations which would emanate during the month long celebrations. The amount of posturing, negotiating, and jealousy evident during the organising of the Tour's programme further illustrates the extent of dissension and, moreover, underscores the importance state officials placed upon royal ceremonies and representation.

Early on, Minto had informed Chamberlain that several ministers had taken issue with the thirty-four-day duration of the Canadian visit. Not only was it too short to allow Their Highnesses to see the country in all its vastness, splendour, and potential, but the scheduling of the visit from mid-September to mid-October fell too late into the season for the royal party, and the larger international press core tagging along, to witness the North-west harvest. In addition, Cabinet Ministers, along with individual Members of Parliament and other elected officials, all demanded that the Duke and Duchess visit their local constituencies and exerted whatever

²⁶Leslie A. Pal, *Interests of State: The Politics of Language, Multiculturalism, and Feminism in Canada* (Kingston and Montreal, 1993), 62-63; Brian P. Clarke, "Sir William Richard Scott," *Dictionary of Canadian Biography* 14 (1998): 913-916; Minto, "Notes of a Conversation with Mr. Scott, Re: Royal Visit," in *Lord Minto's Canadian Papers*, eds. Stevens and Saywell, vol. 2, 47-49; NAC, Richard William Scott Papers, MG27 II D14, vol. 4, Lord Minto to R.W. Scott, 1 July 1901.

political influence they had to ensure a royal whistle call. Laurier found himself inundated with requests and questions over the itinerary, partisan queries he was able to dodge by delaying the programme's release and, moreover, pointing to Minto's "control" over it.²⁷ By deflecting questions in this manner, the Prime Minister may have stifled debate in the House of Commons, but, in doing so, contributed to the belief that the imperial authorities really did run the show.²⁸

This was, of course, a partial truth. Lord Minto had been chiefly responsible for much of the Tour's programme by exerting his own pressure on the Prime Minister for the approval of amendments which conformed to his own sense of what should be celebrated as Canadian nationhood. For example, he repeatedly tried to persuade Laurier to have the Duke arrive at Quebec rather than Halifax since, he thought, this would be a far more impressive start to the Tour. Quebec, with its historical surroundings, cultural ambiance, and display of French loyalty to the Crown, would ensure that "the arrival of T.R.H. at Quebec will be far more generally popular in Canada, far more appropriate & more convenient than their arrival at Halifax."²⁹

²⁷Laurier Papers, reel C-785, vol. 197, pp. 56194-56196, J. Hamilton to William Roche, 11 May 1901, William Roche to Wilfrid Laurier, 14 May 1901, Wilfrid Laurier to William Roche, 16 May 1901; Canada, House of Commons, *Debates*, 15 May 1901, col. 5214, 17 May 1901, col. 5325.

²⁸Minto may have appreciated the amount of direction he was able to give to the Tour's organization, but he also found it frustrating that he was, quite erroneously, the sole target of the "disagreeable show of temper occasionally in the Cabinet" and was left to shoulder the blame for unpopular decisions made to the programme." His conflict with Clifford Sifton and his newspaper, the *Manitoba Free Press*, was the most public of these confrontations. NAC, Joseph Chamberlain Papers, MG27 II A2, vol. 1, Lord Minto file, Lord Minto to Joseph Chamberlain, 3 August 1901 (copy); RG7/G23, vol. 8, file 20, R.P. Roblin to Daniel McMillan, 6 September 1901, Daniel McMillan to F.S. Maude, 6 September 1901, F.S. Maude to Daniel McMillan, September 1901 (copy); *Manitoba Free Press*, 22 October 1901; D.J. Hall, *Clifford Sifton. Volume Two: A Lonely Eminence* (Vancouver, 1985), 1-2, 89-90.

²⁹Laurier Papers, reel C-784, vol. 192, p. 55015, Lord Minto to Wilfrid Laurier, 2 April 1901, p. 55038, Lord Minto to Wilfrid Laurier, 3 April 1901; Minto Papers, reel A-131, Letterbooks, vol.

Similarly, he advocated the holding of a large Indian demonstration in the North-west, in direct opposition to the advice of officials from the Indian Department, since he believed that a great Powwow featuring Native chiefs paying homage to the Duke would be both a colourful spectacle and, at the same time, remind Canadians of the heritage of British justice in their Dominion.³⁰ All of Minto's proposals, however, remained only *proposals* without the approval of the Prime Minister. Moreover, adding to the complex of interests competing within the state to control and influence the design of the Tour, the Duke of Cornwall and York and his advisors played a leading role and, in the end, were the most powerful. Every detail of the visit had to be reviewed by the Duke before his arrival and he would not accept anything which he did not authorise. While the Duke would occasionally suggest a few additions to the programme (he had, for example, from the very beginning advocated the distribution of medals to men who served in the South African War) for the most part he demanded reductions. Some were based upon personal preference, such as his distaste for large luncheons, but most were done in order to limit the programme so that he would not "be asked to do too much": a condition which, Minto thought, had "cut things down far below what I think advisable."³¹

2, p. 252, Lord Minto to Francis Knollys, 8 April 1901; NAC, Colonial Office, Canada, original correspondence [MG11 CO42], reel B-800, vol. 882, no. 14174, Lord Minto to Joseph Chamberlain, 12 April 1901.

³⁰See Chapter VII below for a full discussion of the Great Pow-wow of 1901.

³¹Minto Papers, reel A-131, Letterbooks, vol. 2, p. 312, Lord Minto to Wilfrid Laurier, 8 June 1901; Duke of Cornwall and York to Sir Arthur Bigge, 15 November 1900, in *Letters of Queen Victoria, 1886-1901*, ed. Buckle, vol. 3, 620; RG7/G23, vol. 4, file 5, Lord Wenlock to Lord Minto, 24 July 1901 (copy), vol. 5, file 9, Lord Minto to Oliver Mowat, 27 September 1901 (copy); Lord Minto to George Parkin, 23 August 1901, Lord Minto to Wilfrid Laurier, 5 September 1901, Lord Minto to George Parkin, 9 September 1901, in *Lord Minto's Canadian Papers*, eds. Stevens and Saywell, vol. 2, 62, 70-71.

The federal state's organisation of the Royal Tour, then, was not a unified action. Disagreements and negotiations between and among imperial authorities and Canadian officials influenced the state's arrangements and affected the character of the Tour. Municipal authorities would further affect the nature of the ceremonies organised as part of the Visit and would alter some of the national state's directions. Nonetheless, by drawing up, amending, and authorising the Tour's final programme, setting out the rules, procedures, and protocol to be followed in every situation, and in maintaining some direct control over certain key ceremonies and representations either by actually organising the event or by influencing its outcome by the presence of state authorities, the federal state laid out the parameters of the royal celebration. Moreover, by enlisting Joseph Pope to write and publish an "official" record of the Tour, the Canadian government would also influence—and legitimise—its own memory of the event.³² Indeed, as an apparatus composed of and serving the interests of the male middle class, the state—regional and imperial tensions aside—designed and articulated the Tour's representations and memories in order to consolidate the hegemony of its constituency, the integrity of the Canadian nation, and the legitimacy of state power.

Though more reflective of the class divisions in society, civic arrangements for the Tour did serve to entrench the cultural status of the male middle class. The majority of middle class aldermen who controlled city councils, and the civic reception committees for the Royal Tour which devolved from them, advocated expenditures which would fund lavish yet fiscally

³²NAC, Joseph Pope Papers, MG30 E86, vol. 76, file 2, Joseph Pope to Sir Arthur Bigge, 10 September 1902 (copy); Pope, *The Tour of Their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York*; Idem, *Voyage de Leurs Altesses Royales le Duc et la Duchesse de Cornwall et d'York au Canada en 1901* (Ottawa, 1905).

responsible royal ceremonies sufficient to boost and promote the prosperity of their communities while reflecting well upon themselves in the eyes of their fellow respectable gentlemen. Working class aldermen, however, opposed local celebrations from which labourers would gain little but pay much. Further complicating matters, members of self-appointed Citizen's Committees, generally composed of middle class men holding greater social pretensions than other members of their class, sought to increase the funds the municipal bodies were prepared to expend on the celebrations.³³

This dynamic was hardly new to city councils as dissension had arisen over the funding of the Golden and Diamond Jubilee celebrations in a number of cities.³⁴ In these debates, tax-conscious aldermen defended the interests of working class "ratepayers" who, they argued, accrued little benefit from the disbursement of their money on elaborate, short-term displays. Instead, they suggested that the costs of the celebrations should be paid by private subscriptions with minimum public outlays. In Ottawa and Montreal, for example, labourist aldermen opposed attempts by their respective councils to substantially increase the public expenditures for the Duke's reception. Alderman Lewis of Ottawa initiated an unsuccessful civil suit to prevent his city council from overdrawing its accounts in order "to be 'it' when the Duke of Cornwall arrives in this country." Alderman Ouimet condemned the majority of his fellow Montreal councillors

³³Nancy B. Bouchier, "'The 24th of May is the Queen's Birthday': Civic Holidays and the Rise of Amateurism in Nineteenth-Century Canadian Towns," *International Journal of the History of Sport* 10, no. 2 (1993): 160, 166; Bonnie L. Huskins, "Public Celebrations in Victorian Saint John and Halifax," (Ph.D. diss., Dalhousie University, 1991), 34, 57; Provincial Archives of Manitoba, Records of the Royal Visit of 1901, MG14 A6, Minutes of the Reception Committee, 1901.

³⁴*Ottawa Citizen*, 11 June 1887; *Montreal Gazette*, 1 June 1887; *Globe*, 14 April 1887; *Toronto Evening News*, 31 May 1887; *Manitoba Free Press*, 15 June 1897; *Vancouver World*, 13 May, 15 June 1897.

for authorising an additional expense of \$3000 for the royal reception when, he alleged, several workers had already been laid-off on account of the shortage in the treasury resulting from previous royal expenditures.³⁵ The most vigorous debates, however, occurred in Toronto where, in addition to the wrangling within City Council, an élitist Citizen's Committee of private individuals added to what Lieutenant Governor Oliver Mowat complained of as the "bother" over "expenditures in connection with the Royal visit...."³⁶

When the Reception Committee of the Toronto City Council reported in mid-July and requested an appropriation of \$10,000 to fund the local celebrations, a few aldermen, most notably E.E. Sheppard, opposed the expenditure on the grounds of being too large and, accordingly, moved that it be reduced to a more reasonable figure of \$5000. According to Sheppard, there was little need for a large expenditure which would only serve to put the city into further debt. Instead of wasting the taxes of the working poor on elaborate displays for the Duke, "who has, no doubt, seen all the processions and listened to all the addresses that a human being can endure without nausea," Sheppard argued in his paper *Saturday Night* that "An old-fashioned welcome and a quiet time would be welcomed by the Duke...." The motion was defeated by a vote of eighteen to four. By September a few aldermen were pressing for an increased expenditure in the range of a total appropriation of between \$25-30,000. According to Alderman Cox, the citizens of Toronto "would not return to Council any Alderman who voted to keep the expenditure to \$10,000." Sheppard, now in the position of having to defend the

³⁵*Montreal Gazette*, 7 September 1901; *Voice*, 9 August 1901; *La Patrie*, 13 August 1901.

³⁶Laurier Papers, reel C-788, vol. 207, p. 58885, Oliver Mowat to Wilfrid Laurier, 11 September 1901.

\$10,000 amount, countered that \$10,000 was all the citizens wanted to spend. "Patriotism," he declared, "was in the hearts, not in the pockets of the people, and if more than \$10,000 was spent it would be a rankling sore in the pockets of the poor ratepayers of Toronto." After some discussion, it was decided to remain with the original sum. But just before the Duke and Duchess were to arrive in the city, Mayor Oliver Howland urged an additional \$1000 from the Board of Control to pay for a number of searchlights to be set up around City Hall. So convinced was he of the importance of this that he suggested that if his resolution did not pass Toronto would henceforth no longer be known as "Hogtown" but as "Little Pigtown." Apparently Howland's swine symbolism had its desired effect as only Aldermen Lamb and Sheppard dissented.³⁷

While representatives of the working class on Council demonstrated unity in opposition to large expenditures in support of civic boosterism during the Royal Tour, the middle class appeared more fragmented as some supported the larger appropriation of around \$25,000. The middle class seemed even less cohesive when a large number of its members gained the support of Mayor Howland to form a Citizen's Committee of "volunteer representatives" to work alongside City Council in making preparations for the Royal Tour. Constructed along the lines of the Committees developed for the Royal Tour of 1860, this had many of its precursors characteristics; specifically, their élitist bent. Chaired by Castell Hopkins and composed of Senators, Members of Parliament, Members of the Legislative Assembly, former Mayors, military officers, business leaders, and members of the judiciary, the Committee foisted itself

³⁷*Globe*, 26 June, 12 July, 16 July, 16 September, 8 October 1901; City of Toronto Archives, City Council Minutes, 15 July 1901; *Saturday Night*, 3 August 1901.

upon a reluctant City Council and Reception Committee already dealing with dissension from within. In what the *Catholic Register* described as "a series of the most desperate attempts to work out their own prominence," members of the Citizen's Committee requested that they and Council work together on the Tour in order to ensure its success. What they planned was for a more liberal appropriation by Council, say between \$50,000 and 75,000, which would pay for the most elaborate and sumptuous celebration yet seen in Canada, if not the Empire. "Not a few of the Aldermen," the *Globe* reporter noticed, "shifted uneasily in their seats when \$50,000 was mentioned." Indeed, the Council's Reception Committee flat out refused to cooperate with the Citizen's Committee and rejected all of its proposals, including a provision to fund the Committee itself. Not only did the Citizen's Committee not represent the people, as aldermen were elected to do, but, as the *Globe* argued, its members, with their requests for excessive expenditures, would lead to increased class antagonism by advocating "senseless luxury and ostentation." "The possession of wealth," it noted, "brings responsibility as well as power," and responsibility—and respectability—was to be found not in public extravagance, but in restraint and moderation.³⁸

Such moderation, it was argued, should not only hold in terms of public expenditures, but also in public behaviour and deportment as well. There was a need for the point to be made, and it was most often put forward in the address presentations, receptions, and militia reviews in which men and women of the middle and working classes articulated representations of themselves, each other, royalty, and their community which served to assert and challenge the

³⁸*Catholic Register*, 12 September 1901; *Globe*, 22 June, 26 June, 13 July, 16 July, 19 July, 16 September 1901.

hegemony of the dominant culture. Before turning to the staging of the Tour and the nature of the actual representations articulated at each local ceremony, a chronology of the Royal Tour follows in order to set the stage.

A Chronology of the Royal Tour of 1901

As the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York steamed away from Portsmouth aboard the *Ophir* on 16 March 1901, their nearly eight-month tour of the Empire began. The lengthy tour would not be an entirely new experience for the Duke since, from his enlistment as a naval cadet in 1877 until he replaced his elder brother as direct heir to the throne in 1892, he had travelled the Globe as a member of the Royal Navy. Since, however, he had not been raised as the heir apparent, he was ill-prepared for the social and political demands of his new status. He had the limited education of a nineteenth century naval officer and was indifferent to the arts, sciences, and politics. His ability to discuss politics with colonial statesmen during the Royal Tour would be further constrained by the King's decision to keep all correspondence relating to political affairs in his own hands. Lacking political knowledge and having an unpolished social manner from his naval days, he nonetheless possessed a hearty sense of humour and affability, characteristics which, when teamed with his wife's social training and experience, made the royal couple a fine complement to each other. Unlike her husband, Princess May had been primed and trained for the role of Queen from birth and, thus, possessed the social graces he lacked.³⁹

The Duke's affability and the Duchess' grace would serve them well during the Royal Tour, particularly in bearing the strain of the monotonous round of address presentations, militia

³⁹Rose, *King George V*, xiii, 6.

reviews, and other repetitious forms of royal ceremonial they experienced from colony to colony. By the time they arrived back at Portsmouth on November 1 the royal couple had travelled about 45,000 miles (33,000 of which were by sea), laid 21 foundation stones, received 544 addresses, presented 4,329 medals, and shook the hands of 24,855 people at official receptions.⁴⁰ The first stop for the *Ophir* was at Gibraltar on March 20 which was followed by visits to Malta, the Egyptian Khedive, Ceylon, and Singapore. Melbourne, Australia was reached on May 5 [Figure 4.1]. After opening the first Parliament of the Australian Commonwealth four days later, and in so doing fulfilling the central purpose of the Tour, the couple proceeded up the eastern coast of Australia to Sydney and Brisbane before steaming onward to New Zealand. As in Australia, the Duke and Duchess were greeted by thousands of people who displayed their loyalty, prosperity, and affection for the late Queen and the new King through their cheers, decorations, songs, triumphal arches, addresses, and other traditional expressions. It was here in New Zealand that the Duke came to fully appreciate the strain of the daily duties as the touring heir apparent. "It is all very well for you and Papa to say we mustn't do too much," he wrote his mother, "but it is impossible to help it. Our stay at each place is so short that everything has to be crammed into it, otherwise people would be offended and our great object is to please as many people as possible."⁴¹ During his tour of the southern and western outreaches of Australia and then of South Africa, the crammed programmes and seemingly endless onslaught of addresses and receptions only continued to weigh on and weary the royal couple and no doubt contributed to the constant requests to Lord Minto to reduce the Canadian programme.

⁴⁰Nicolson, *King George the Fifth*, 69.

⁴¹Duke of Cornwall and York quoted in Rose, *King George V*, 45.

The long voyage from South Africa to Quebec, free from public demands, provided Their Royal Highnesses with time to refresh themselves for the last leg of their tour. Before landing at King's Wharf on September 16, however, the royal party learned that American President William McKinley had died on the 13th from a fatal shooting a week earlier by an anarchist in Buffalo. The President's assassination would change the complexion of the early stage of the Canadian tour as Laurier felt it was appropriate "to suppress all social functions" until the burial out of respect to their southern neighbours. This proved to be impractical and cancellation of public events in Quebec and Montreal were limited to receptions and concerts as the Duke paid his respects to the late President and expressed his sympathy for the American people. McKinley's untimely death was not the only event which restricted the celebrations in Canada since the period of Court mourning for Queen Victoria had not yet expired. Consequently, no balls or public banquets were to be given, but official dinners, concerts, receptions, reviews, and sporting activities were permitted so long as half mourning dress regulations were followed.⁴²

By all accounts proper dress was observed on King's Wharf as the Duke and Duchess set foot on shore to be greeted by the Governor General, the Prime Minister and members of Cabinet, and military and naval officers. Accompanied by their substantial entourage, including three Ladies-in-Waiting, two Equerries, Sir Arthur Bigge (the Duke's Private Secretary), Lord Wenlock (Head of the Royal Household), and a host of *aide-de-camp*, assistants, and officers, the royal couple entered their carriage and headed for the Legislative Buildings along a widely

⁴²Chamberlain Papers, vol. 1, Wilfrid Laurier file, Wilfrid Laurier to Joseph Chamberlain, 17 September 1901 (copy); Pope, *The Tour of Their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York*, 19-20; Minto Papers, vol. 39, file 12, Francis Knollys to Lord Minto, 26 May 1901; *Globe*, 6 June 1901.

decorated route choked with thousands of cheering spectators. Upon their arrival, the Duke and Duchess were welcomed by two thousand children who sang "God Save the King" and other patriotic airs. Inside they went through the routine they had become all too familiar with during the preceding months as they were presented with provincial, civic, and other addresses, to which the Duke gave his reply (which was more often than not composed or at least authorised by Joseph Pope or Wilfrid Laurier), and then received a number of dignitaries. The Duchess had the added pleasure of accepting a bouquet from the young daughter of the most influential local dignitary who happened to have one (in Quebec it was Mademoiselle Jetté, daughter of the Lieutenant Governor). A luncheon followed which, following the Duke's wishes, was confined to the royal suite and members of the Governor General's entourage. The afternoon was spent visiting Laval University where several references were made to the visit the Duke's father had made to that establishment in 1860. The Duke would grow accustomed to such references since whenever he stopped at a place his father had graced with his presence forty-one years earlier, he—and the Canadian public—would be reminded of Canada's royal heritage and of the central place of the monarchy in its national life.

A militia review on the Plains of Abraham and dinners and illuminations followed on the next day. On September 18, the royal suite boarded the royal train which would take them first to Montreal and then across the continent to Vancouver before returning to the *Ophir* moored at Halifax. After the Mayor and a few other dignitaries greeted the Duke and Duchess as they arrived at the Montreal train station, the main reception occurred across the street in Viger Square where 20,000 people had gathered with more filling up the surrounding streets. When the presentation of addresses was completed, the royal procession headed for Lord Strathcona's

home to end the day with an official dinner. A reception was to be held at City Hall, but owing to the observance of President McKinley's death, it and all public celebrations the following day were cancelled. Nonetheless the Duke and Duchess were still able to visit McGill University, Laval University, the triennial session of the Provincial Synod of the Church of England, and the Convent of Villa Maria. Again, references were made in both address and press to the fact that the Duke was following in the footsteps of his father in visiting some of these establishments. On September 20, the train continued on to Ottawa where the address presentation occurred on Parliament Hill in a grand pavilion which had been erected for the occasion. In keeping with the desire to remind people of Canada's royal heritage, and, thus, continue the process of building the Canadian nation through the agency of the monarchy, the Chairman of the Ottawa Entertainment Committee had been successful in obtaining the seat used by Edward VII when he performed the ceremony of laying the cornerstone of the Parliament Buildings in 1860 and placed it in the Royal Pavilion for his son to use.⁴³ Later on in the day the royal couple attended the first Minto Cup lacrosse match ever to be held and then an official dinner which the leading members of Ottawa's religious, social, and political communities attended. Other notable events in Ottawa included the unveiling of a statue of Queen Victoria, the conferring of medals on South African veterans, a large garden party held at Government House, shooting the timber slides at Chaudière Falls, visiting a lumberman's shanty, and a reception in the Senate Chamber. This reception, and all others to follow, were little different from the levees the Prince of Wales held in 1860, with two exceptions: both men and women could be presented and both the Duke and Duchess shook hands with everyone instead of bowing.

⁴³RG7/G23, vol. 5, file 10, E. Tasse to F.S. Maude, 5 September 1901.

Leaving Ottawa on September 24, the royal train steamed into Winnipeg on the 26th for a day which differed little from any other consisting, as it did, of address presentations, a procession, the conferring of medals, luncheon, a visit to the local university, and then an official dinner. From Winnipeg, the train continued on to Calgary where they witnessed a large Native ceremonial, dubbed the "Great Pow-wow," and then an exhibition of broncho busting and other rodeo fare at the local park. Vancouver was reached a couple of days later, followed by Victoria. The forms of ceremony adopted on the West Coast differed little from those elsewhere. A brief respite, however, occurred on the return trip through the North-west as stops at Banff and Poplar Point allowed the royal suite some relaxation time and, for the male members of the suite, some duck shooting at the latter location.

Leaving Poplar Point on October 8, the train rolled into Toronto on the 10th where the Duke and Duchess found the ceremonies familiar, but staged on a larger scale than anywhere else in the Dominion and perhaps the Empire. From Toronto, they travelled around the Western Peninsula to a number of communities before travelling east to Belleville and Kingston (which were perhaps the only places which had been involved in the Royal Tour of 1860 which would make no references to it).⁴⁴ Stopping at the location of the Victoria Bridge in Montreal on the 16th, the Duke and Duchess were again called upon to participate in an event which celebrated the royal heritage in Canada with the reception of an address and a specially bound history of the old tubular bridge opened by the Prince of Wales in 1860 and the new Victoria Jubilee Bridge which replaced the original in 1897. Stops in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia completed the

⁴⁴As noted in Chapter II above, and discussed in detail in Chapter V below, the Prince of Wales was unable to land at either Kingston or Belleville due to demonstrations by Orangemen.

Canadian journey as the royal couple rejoined the *Ophir* amid the thunder of cannons and the cheers of thousands. Before the ship steamed off in the morning of the 21st to make a short stop at St. John's, Newfoundland on its way home, the Duke of Cornwall and York ensured that a letter he had addressed to all Canadians made it to shore. Expressing "our gratitude for the generous feeling which has prompted all classes to contribute towards that hearty and affectionate welcome which we have everywhere met with," the document continued: "I recognise all this as a proof of the strong personal loyalty to the throne, as well as a declaration of the deep-seated devotion on the part of the people of Canada to that unity of the Empire of which the Crown is the symbol."⁴⁵

The Royal Tour in Imperial Perspective

The Tour thus ended on a note which underscored the imperial purpose of the event. The point hardly had to be restated. From its origins through its execution the Royal Visit celebrated the unity of Empire under the British Crown. The imagery and spectacle of the Tour linked Canada's past and future to the Empire and associated the Dominion's heritage, and continued prosperity, with the benefits derived from British liberty, freedom, and imperial strength, all of this, in turn, being seen as devolving from the institution of the monarchy. Events such as the Queen's Jubilees had given expression to these sentiments. The Royal Tour, however, quite literally brought them home allowing the Canadian sense of belonging to a greater national family—indeed a Greater Britain—headed by the King and Queen to be expressed directly in the royal presence. The fêting of the King's son permitted Canadians to

⁴⁵Duke of Cornwall and York quoted in Pope, *The Tour of Their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York*, 144-145.

connect directly with the heir to the throne through visual and spatial contact. As the *Vancouver Province* put it, "it is often only by personal contact with a sovereign that a people have that feeling of passionate devotion which tends to unite an empire."⁴⁶ Far from a passive exercise, the act of seeing can connect people to one another. "Affected by what we know or what we believe," John Berger argues, our gaze allows us to situate ourselves in relation to a visual object and bring it within reach. It can act as a form of touch and, when reciprocated by a mutual glance, can serve to strengthen a social bond. Although it was an impossibility for the Duke of Cornwall and York to return a direct look to each of the tens of thousands of spectators who witnessed his progress through the Canadian dominion, his "tour of inspection" included surveys of the crowds. Asserting the British monarchy's sovereignty while "touching" the crowd as a unified whole, such surveys strengthened the bonds of community within and between Canada and the Empire. In seeing the future King and Queen, even if it was only a glimpse, and in receiving their royal touch, Canadians were able to connect to the monarchy on a personal level unattainable in their local Jubilee celebrations. Indeed, from this perspective Joseph Pope concluded that "the success of the tour will be directly proportional to the number of people who will be in a position to say hereafter that they had a good look at their future King and Queen."⁴⁷

Invariably, male members of the middle class gained the best visual access to Their Royal

⁴⁶*Vancouver Province*, 30 September 1901.

⁴⁷John Berger, *Ways of Seeing* (London, 1972), 8-9; Deena Weinstein and Michael Weinstein, "On the Visual Constitution of Society: The Contributions of Georg Simmel and Jean-Paul Sartre to a Sociology of the Senses," *History of European Ideas* 5, no. 4 (1984): 351, 361; Clifford Geertz, "Centers, Kings, and Charisma: Reflections on the Symbolics of Power," in *Culture and Its Creators: Essays in Honor of Edward Shils*, eds. Joseph Ben-David and Terry Nichols Clark (Chicago, 1977): 153; Takashi Fujitani, *Splendid Monarchy: Power and Pageantry in Modern Japan* (Berkeley, 1996), 24, 53; RG7/G23, vol. 3, file 4, Joseph Pope to J.S. Willison, 14 August 1901 (copy).

Highnesses and, associating their gentlemanly personae with imperial service and loyalty to the late Queen, became most conspicuous in their expressions of affection for the monarchy and commitment to the Empire during the Tour. Through their arrangement of local celebrations, privileged viewing positions in the front lines of the ceremonies, and press reports produced for their own consumption, they asserted their imperial mentality and personal attachment to the Crown. Union Jacks, triumphal arches, and banners declaring loyal devotion to the monarchy were erected by civic reception committees and were complemented by elaborate decorations adorning most places of business. These decorations, on the one hand, expressed the sense of imperial loyalty shared by middle class civic officials, merchants, and professionals. At the same time, they promoted those persons' cities and businesses. In the commodity culture of turn of the century Canada, a culture much like that of England which, Thomas Richards points out, "consisted almost entirely of the bourgeoisie talking to itself," middle class entrepreneurs and consumers keyed on, produced, and consumed products and services which played upon their attitudes, especially imperial sentiment. Consequently, shops produced impressive window displays wrapped in royal and imperial symbolism to attract customers and increase the respectable profile of their businesses in the community. Likewise, enterprising capitalists advertised and sold all manner of souvenir trinkets celebratory of the Royal Tour and merchants sought to increase their trade and respectability by gaining royal patronage through royal warrants and doing direct service for the Duke and Duchess. The Canadian Pacific Railway (CPR), for example, spared no expense in its design of and services provided to the royal train which featured electricity, telephone service between all the cars (a first), and lavish Louis XV style reception rooms and boudoir. By taking over from the *Ophir* in the transport of the royal

suite across the country, the CPR was able to promote itself as a fast, comfortable, and convenient part of an "All-Red" route stretching from Britain through Canada and across to Australia. Competing with the Suez route the Duke had taken on his way to Australia, the CPR presented itself as "the main tie that bound together the scattered parts of the British Empire." Journalists wrote extensively about the royal train and the princely service they received upon it. CPR magnates Thomas Shaughnessey and Lord Strathcona played significant roles in the Tour. The former was knighted and the latter hosted the royal couple at his Montreal residence. Moreover, the CPR's train stations became the focal point in every town and city as the Duke and Duchess arrived and left via their beautifully decorated platforms [Figure 4.2].⁴⁸

Press reports and commentaries, again largely serving a middle class clientele, further contributed to the imperial character of the Royal Tour by describing the public's cheers as evidence of their imperial patriotism and appreciation of the Duke "as the representation of the Imperial idea." According to the *Calgary Herald*, "Those who doubt the unity and indissolubility of the Empire had but to witness the loyal demonstrations of the thousands of people in this remote, although not insignificant portion of 'Britain overseas' to be convinced of our allegiance to British rule." As the "representatives of Imperial unity," the *Montreal Star* said

⁴⁸*Ottawa Citizen*, 14 August 1901; RG7/G23, vol. 5, file 12, "Report of the [Toronto] Reception Committee on the Royal Tour," 24 September 1901, vol. 4, file 5, Henry Birks and Sons to Lord Minto, 2 July 1901; Heintzman and Company, *Canada's Royal Visitors: A Pictorial Souvenir of the Visit of the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York* (Toronto, 1901); *Globe*, 12 October 1901; Thomas Richards, *The Commodity Culture of Victorian England: Advertising and Spectacle, 1851-1914* (Stanford, 1990), 7-10; Tori Smith, "'Almost Pathetic...But Also Very Glorious': The Consumer Spectacle of the Diamond Jubilee," *Histoire sociale—Social History* 29, no. 58 (1996): 333-356; Pope, *The Tour of Their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York*, 27-28, 317-319; Robert M. Stamp, "Steel of Empire: Royal Tours and the CPR," in *The CPR West: The Iron Road and the Making of a Nation*, ed. Hugh A. Dempsey (Vancouver, 1984): 275, 278-280.

of the Duke and Duchess, they prompted outward “expressions of a firm and abiding loyalty to the Empire and to its Sovereign” amongst the people, actions which tended “to strengthen the bonds of kinship and common citizenship that bind us all together....”⁴⁹ Renewing their pledge of allegiance to the new King through displays of affection for his son, the male middle class reaffirmed its shared status as the preeminent civilian “soldiers” of the King and, as such, further legitimised its cultural hegemony.

Address Presentations

While decorations and press reports gave expression to the male middle class’ imperial loyalty and personal attachment to the Crown, address presentations offered one of the best opportunities to connect with the Duke and Duchess and, moreover, to assert cultural authority. Through the actions of the privileged gaze and the mutual glance at work in these ceremonies, male members of the middle class set themselves apart and above women and the working class as the natural leaders of society. On the one hand asserting a cultural bond between the entire community and the British monarchy, the glance, the look, the glimpse, and the reciprocal royal gaze served on the other to legitimise the social status of those who gained the closest visual, and public, contact with the Duke and Duchess. In addition, these ceremonies provided instances in which they could see and be seen by other people from the community.⁵⁰ As such, the ceremonies became events in which different classes, genders, religions, and ethnic groups

⁴⁹*Globe*, 11 October 1901; *Official Programme and Souvenir of the Royal Tour Showing the Progress of Their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York through Quebec and Ontario* (Toronto, 1901), 8-9; *Calgary Herald*, 30 September 1901; *Montreal Star*, *Royal Visit to Canada, 1901* (Montreal, 1901), 1.

⁵⁰Walden, *Becoming Modern in Toronto*, 153-157.

competed and struggled to see and to be seen.

In this struggle, male members of the middle class were accorded viewing privileges and access to the Duke and Duchess commensurate with their cultural dominance. As its members stood nearby or even shook hands with Their Royal Highnesses, the male, middle class legitimised its status before the gaze of thousands of spectators who witnessed the privileged connection between this group of individuals and the monarchy. Such actions, however, did not go uncontested as workers critiqued the imposition of middle class exclusivism, women pressed for greater access, and the middle class sought to keep itself united against the attempts of a component of "upstarts" to assert itself as an "upper-tenth." Women and the working class would attempt to break, or at least join, the privileged position accorded this dominant social group, and, while sometimes successful, more often than not found their attempts stifled by regulations and security.

Some murmurs of discontent over the imposition of rules and regulations limiting the participation of Canadians in the celebrations were first expressed over the composition of royal processions. Where the Royal Tour of 1860 had allowed processions consisting of members of the public, voluntary societies, municipal corporations, and other groups, this Tour insisted that such processions contain only "Their Royal Highnesses, Their Suite and the mounted Escort" and, if the Governor General was on hand, his suite in a separate procession. While this solved the problem of trying to fit in the multitude of people who wanted to join the procession in an appropriate order of precedence, the main reason for the action was that it followed the form of standard royal processions as held in Britain. Royal and imperial authorities felt that they should conform to precedent as played out in the Mother Country and should not adapt themselves to

colonial desires and expectations. Writing during the Canadian tour, Sir Arthur Bigge noted that “So long as we have a Monarchy surely to goodness we ought to stick to all the *old* customs, observances and ritual... Perhaps the fact of being in these colonies makes one more keenly realise the value of what is ancient, of tradition, and of prestige.” Like Minto, the Duke’s Private Secretary regarded the Empire as “new and lacking in tradition.” By appealing to “the colonial love of what was old,” by adhering to age-old traditions through the observance of precedent that deficiency could be made up and a way found “of further tightening the identification of the empire with the monarchy.”⁵¹

While some groups were upset that they would not be able to march in the procession as on other occasions, the equality of exclusion limited the public criticism of this particular form of ceremonial. Ironically, the first victim of the adherence to “tradition”—and to the restrictions that would be placed upon society in its name—would be one of its greatest advocates: Lord Minto. As the sovereign’s representative in Canada, Minto had precedence over the King’s son in the Dominion, but Edward VII directed that this should not apply. Despite Minto’s insistence that “no departure be made from unbroken tradition under which [the] Governor General has always taken first place in Canada,” he was unable to alter the minds of either Laurier, who felt it would be ungracious of Minto to take precedence over the Duke contrary to the King’s wishes, or the Duke’s officials. Apparently, the need to adhere to precedent and to tradition

⁵¹RG7/G23, vol. 8, file 20, F.S. Maude to Daniel McMillan, September 1901 (copy), vol. 11, file 33, Lord Minto to Wilfrid Laurier, 10 August 1901 (copy); Lord Minto to George Parkin, 23 August 1901, in *Lord Minto’s Canadian Papers*, in Stevens and Saywell, vol. 2, 62; William M. Kuhn, *Democratic Royalism: The Transformation of the British Monarchy, 1861-1914* (New York, 1996), 70.

which Bigge had so strongly advocated was a selective tradition.⁵² Despite his displacement, Lord Minto and his staff implemented protocol procedures conforming to royal "tradition" in their arrangement of other ceremonies, in particular address presentations and receptions. Ceremonial regulations nominally adopted to follow ancient practice thus became the means of enforcing current status hierarchies. Privileged "aristocratic" access to royalty and the exclusion of other groups ensured that the ceremonies would be used during the Royal Tour to assert the cultural superiority of the Canadian male, middle class over women and the working class.

In setting the regulations to be followed at address presentations, Major Maude and Joseph Pope had consulted and followed the procedures laid out by the Duke's officials. Bigge had advised Maude that in each city all of the addresses that were to be presented to the Duke from local towns, societies, and organisations should be presented at the same time so that the Duke would only have to make one general reply. Also, with the exception of the civic welcome, addresses were to be handed in unread by a deputation numbering no more than four to five people. While Australian officials had informed Maude that they had set no limits to societies presenting addresses, provided that they were reviewed prior to submission, Lord Minto was "not quite satisfied" as to the advisability of this procedure. He told Maude that he did "not approve of presentation of Addresses from Societies of any Political character." The Governor General also announced that a draft of every address intended to be presented had to be sent to Government House well in advance of the Duke's arrival "in order that its terms may

⁵²Pope, *Public Servant*, 134-135; Joseph Pope to Arthur Sladen, 29 August 1901, Wilfrid Laurier to Lord Minto, 30 August 1901, Lord Minto to George Parkin, 9 September 1901, Minto to Laurier, 31 August 1901, in *Lord Minto's Canadian Papers*, eds. Stevens and Saywell, vol. 2, 63-65.

be scrutinized and approved.” The early submission of the addresses would also allow Joseph Pope enough time to draft the Duke’s replies and submit them for royal review.⁵³

Seemingly innocuous, the address regulations caused some discomfort among the middle class. A few bourgeois organisations, such as the Montreal Board of Trade, felt that their status warranted their being distinguished “from the crowd of societies and organizations.” They should, they insisted, be allowed to present their addresses separately. Similarly, the selection of a small deputation to present the addresses was the cause of “a great deal of jealousy and hard feeling” as members of the middle class competed with each other for the increased status the privilege would bring to them.⁵⁴ The notice that every address had to be submitted beforehand “for His Excellency’s approval,” however, caused the most consternation among democratically inclined members of the middle class and members of the working class who wished to present their grievances to the Crown. The *Hamilton Spectator*’s editors criticised the address regulations as “red tapeism” which insulted the democratic constitutions of Canadians who believed that “everyone is as good as everyone else.” The address screening procedures threatened this ideology and, moreover, impugned the literary skill of Canadians. The Vancouver Trades and Labour Council also took issue with the address regulations since they restricted “The right of the British subject to petition the sovereign for redress of grievances”

⁵³RG7/G23, vol. 6, file 14, Lord Minto to G.W. Ross, 26 September 1901 (copy), vol. 4, file 7, Sir Arthur Bigge to F.S. Maude, 15 September 1901, vol. 4, file 6, F.S. Maude to Lord Minto, 29 July 1901 (copy), Lord Minto to F.S. Maude, 30 July 1901, vol. 4, file 5, Lord Minto to Lord Wenlock, 6 September 1901 (copy); *Montreal Gazette*, 19 July 1901; Minto Papers, reel A-131, Letterbooks, vol. 2, Lord Minto to Wilfrid Laurier, 19 August 1901; Laurier Papers, reel C-787, vol. 206, pp. 58763-58764, Joseph Pope to Wilfrid Laurier, 7 September 1901.

⁵⁴RG7/G23, vol. 9, file 25, George Hadrill to R.W. Scott, 31 July 1901, vol. 7, file 19, E.R. Ricketts to F.S. Maude, 17 August 1901.

which constituted "a fundamental principle of the British Constitution."⁵⁵

Most of the middle class press defended the restrictions on grounds of royal "tradition." Responding to a request from the Undersecretary of State to set the public straight on the issue, J.S. Willison, the editor of the *Globe*, informed his readers that "if there are ceremonial observances which do not fall in with popular views it is fair to say that they are not mere contrivances of the Governor-General or his Secretary, but are in accordance with ancient usages, which they have no power to vary." Consequently, it was unfair to criticise Major Maude "as if he were a social dictator. He is not making rules, but stating and interpreting them." Such ceremonial regulations, the *Montreal Gazette* noted, were "legitimately" a part of court functions. Similarly, the editor of the *Ottawa Citizen* defended the regulations on the basis that "The public movements of royalty even under our very democratic constitutional sovereignty, are governed by a set of rules as rigid as military regulations." Certainly, most Canadians "don't like fuss and feathers to supervene between themselves and those they delight to honor," but "At the same time it would be unfortunate if the obtrusion of an objectionable amount of red tape should have the effect of driving public opinion too far to the other extreme of the see-us-as-we-are description. A certain amount of preparation and ceremonial is a mark of respect to an honored guest...."⁵⁶ While a segment of the middle class critiqued the address regulations for not permitting it to rise too high above its peers or for insulting the democratic

⁵⁵*Ottawa Citizen*, 15 August 1901; Pope, *The Tour of Their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York*, 9-11; RG7/G23, vol. 3, vol. 4, Joseph Pope to J.S. Willison, 14 August 1901 (copy), vol. 4, file 5, Lord Minto to Lord Wenlock, 6 September 1901 (copy); *Montreal Gazette*, 22 August 1901; *Independent*, 17 August, 5 October 1901.

⁵⁶RG7/G23, vol. 3, file 4, Joseph Pope to J.S. Willison, 14 August 1901 (copy); *Globe*, 17 August 1901; *Montreal Gazette*, 22 August 1901; *Ottawa Citizen*, 12 August, 15 August 1901.

nature of Canada with the imposition of aristocratic vestiges, others supported the restrictions. By limiting the opportunities of those who held upper class pretensions to gain privileged recognition, the "red tape" permitted the middle class to present addresses to the Duke as a cohesive whole. Each middle class organisation, institution, and society presented its address on the same terms as the others. Since "political" labour addresses were excluded through screening procedures, the address presentation became an exclusive middle class occasion.

In addition to the regulations governing addresses, security arrangements further limited the access of the working class to the Duke and Duchess while not infringing too much upon the privileged sight lines of the middle class. Since the working class did not have equal access to receptions and militia reviews, for reasons to be discussed later, its best opportunity to view the Duke and Duchess was during the royal processions and address presentations. Directives to the Commissioner of the Dominion Police, however, were designed "to prevent spectators from following the Royal Procession as soon as it has passed them." "Every effort should be made," Major Maude told the Commissioner, "to dissuade the public from endeavouring to see the Royal Procession more than once on each occasion, and to impress on them that rushes made by crowds are liable to be attended by serious, if not fatal, accidents." Accordingly, militia units were to line the streets as the procession passed. At other outdoor events, such as the Duke's disembarkation at train stations, the crowds were also to be kept well back. Such security precautions, E.E. Sheppard charged, would prevent the majority of rate-paying Canadians from looking upon the future occupant of the throne. "In order to give Prince George a correct impression of the benevolent disposition of the Canadian populace," he wrote, "the streets wherever he goes are to be tightly lined with troops, who will keep the savage denizens of these

wilds from eating the Royal Party..." [Figure 4.3]. With a "social ring fence...erected around His Royal Highness, and all but the elect...shut out from contact with the holy few inside," he predicted that the Royal Tour would be "a grand occasion for the self-projection of official, military and social bounders, while those on foot will be expected to permit themselves to be handled and utilized as stage properties for effect."⁵⁷

Even worse for the poorest spectators, however, was the prospect of being forcibly removed from the streets—and put out of sight—by a police force caught up in an anarchist scare. On the heels of other anarchist assassinations of world leaders, such as President Carnot of France (1894), Empress Elizabeth of Austria (1898), and King Umberto I of Italy (1900), the fatal shooting of American President William McKinley by an anarchist in Buffalo just prior to the Duke's landing at Quebec caused an alarmist reaction throughout the Canadian press. Like other papers, the *Calgary Herald* demanded that "stringent measures" be taken "with regard to Anarchists in this country" and that extra precautions be followed during the Duke's visit. The police needed little encouragement as they had already begun to round up anarchists and other "suspicious" characters even before the incident in Buffalo. As the Commissioner of the Dominion Police informed Lord Minto on the day before the shooting,

While in Montreal yesterday I learned that...an anarchist, of whom there is a small coterie there, had been heard to say that it would please him if something happened to H.R.H. while in Montreal. The words themselves did not imply a threat but there was smething [*sic*] in the way they were said which conveyed to the listeners that there might possibly be some lurking danger. It so happens that about a year ago this man had some connection with a counterfeiting gang and at that time I had a warrant issued for his arrest which however has never been put into execution, but now it will properly fill the gap and I have issued

⁵⁷RG7/G23, vol. 11, file 33, F.S. Maude to Arthur Sherwood, 13 August 1901 (copy); *Saturday Night*, 17 August 1901.

instruction that he be arrested on the 15th instant and kept in gaol, on remand, until after the termination of the Duke's visit to this part of the Country.

The President's assassination made it easier for the police to justify the arrest and detention of people. Seen as agents of disorder and crime in general, the poor and the indigent received all of the police's attentions and the full force of the law. Invoking the Vagrancy Act, the Montreal police force issued nearly seventy warrants for persons "who are known to the police as loose, idle or disorderly characters." If, after being apprehended, they were unable to prove their means of living and their "good faith as residents," they were to be "remanded in jail for a week or ten days, so as to get them out of the way while the Royal party is in Montreal." In addition to procuring specific warrants, Montreal police and, indeed, authorities across the Dominion incarcerated vagrants they encountered on the days leading up to and during the Tour until the royal party had passed through. The scare also tightened the security around the Duke who, upon the insistence of the Department of State, had been surrounded by "a vast body of detectives in all sorts of disguises" and further "kept from contact with the people" by restrictions on approaching him without an invitation. As public ceremonies in open areas, address processions were among the most heavily guarded celebrations.⁵⁸

In tandem with the regulations governing the address presentations, the security arrangements were designed to impose order on the ceremonies. As regulations enforced conformity of presenter and presentation and security kept spectators at bay and in control, the

⁵⁸*Calgary Herald*, 13 September, 14 September 1901; RG7/G23, vol. 11, file 34, Arthur Sherwood to Lord Minto, 5 September 1901; *Montreal Gazette*, 13 September, 14 September 1901; *Toronto Mail and Empire*, 13 September 1901; *Globe*, 17 September 1901; *Vancouver World*, 26 September 1901; *Montreal Witness*, 20 September 1901; Hector Charlesworth, *Candid Chronicles: Leaves from the Note Book of a Canadian Journalist* (Toronto, 1925), 259.

male, middle class gained greater access to the Duke and Duchess than would be the case for women and the working class. As the working class was held back by protocol and militiamen, the middle class enjoyed privileged sight lines to watch a series of representatives of their class parade onto royal pavilions to hand in civic and associational addresses to the heir to the throne. The arrangement of people in "concentric circles of consequence" in relation to the Duke and Duchess displayed for all to see the cultural authority of the middle class.⁵⁹ Typical of such ceremonies was the presentation of addresses on Parliament Hill on September 20 by the civic authorities of Ottawa and other towns, the Board of Trade, National Societies, and other associations.

Although a large and open ceremony, in terms of the number of spectators on hand and the occurrence of the event outdoors on an open stage in a public area, the address presentation in Ottawa, as in other cities, took on the air of a private service for a relatively small group of people. The presentation took place on a pavilion which was difficult to access and even more difficult to see for all but the immediate audience [Figure 4.4]. Few could gain admittance to the area near the dais since, following the recommendations of R. W. Scott, large areas on each side of the platform were roped off for "those persons who would naturally have a right to certain privileges [and] should be able to obtain access to a reserved position." With militiamen keeping the public away from the main walk leading from the street to the pavilion and other authorities verifying special passes issued for the reserved areas, only those with some social status could obtain a good view of the happenings on stage. Of course, to be on stage was to be accorded

⁵⁹Walden, *Becoming Modern in Toronto*, 33-39; Judith Bassett, "'A Thousand Miles of Loyalty': The Royal Tour of 1901," *New Zealand Journal of History* 21, no. 1 (1987): 136-137.

the ultimate social recognition. The Prime Minister, as always, was by the Duke's side and, thus, confirmed his place as the foremost citizen of the nation. Joining Laurier on stage to welcome the royal entourage were Cabinet members, Senators, local Members of Parliament and the Provincial Legislature, judges, senior civil servants, clergy, military officers, the Mayor, and high ranking civic dignitaries. Along with the address presenters, these "guests of influence and dignity" crowded on and around the pavilion and, in doing so, further sheltered the Duke and Duchess from the gaze of the nearly 15,000 spectators on hand. With their backs turned to the crowd and their faces toward the Duke, "Ottawa's four hundred" formed a semicircle around the stage which gave the impression that the ceremony was for their sole satisfaction [Figure 4.5]. Indeed, apart from catching a passing glance at the Duke as he walked to and from the pavilion, what the immense crowd saw was not his royal person, but Ottawa's élite paying privileged homage to him and being brought within the orbit of his royal gaze and touch.⁶⁰

For those who were unable to see the event, the press recaptured it in detail by naming all those in attendance on the pavilion and, moreover, reprinting all of the addresses submitted to the Duke and Duchess. Inaudible to all but those on the pavilion, the civic address from the Corporation of Ottawa was couched in the same language as every other address handed in on this occasion and during the Tour. Expressing the loyal devotion and attachment to Edward VII and his son, a sense of pride in being a part of the British Empire, a firm conviction that it is the Crown which binds Canadians to Britain, and, lastly, confidence that the Royal Tour will bind Canadians even more closely with the Mother Country, the addresses from civic authorities and

⁶⁰RG7/G23, vol. 6, file 14, Joseph Pope to A. Gobeil, 6 September 1901 (copy), R.W. Scott to Joseph Pope, 4 September 1901; *Ottawa Citizen*, 20 September, 21 September 1901; *Montreal Gazette*, 21 September 1901; Pope, *The Royal Tour of Their Royal Highnesses*, 43-47.

the members of the voluntary associations served to reaffirm the status of the middle class as Canada's leading patriots and respectable imperial loyalists. The Duke's reply to the address acknowledged the loyalty to the Crown and attachment to British institutions, touched on the prosperity he had seen in Canada as a result of British citizenship, and mentioned how pleased he was to find how contented and united Canadians were. The "truth" of the original utterances was thus affirmed.⁶¹ The address presentation on Parliament Hill was little different from other presentations held during the Tour. Through regulations, security, and spatial segregation the ceremony placed the middle class in privileged positions adjacent to the pavilion to witness other members of their class present addresses to the Duke and Duchess on their behalf. Through the privileged gaze and royal "touch," the re-presentation of their messages of imperial service by the Duke, and the witnessing of the event by the working class, the middle class asserted its cultural hegemony not only to the subordinate but also to itself.

Middle class women shared in the privileged gaze, but, at the same time, their position in the ceremonies emphasised their deference to male power. Having gained a greater public role through their involvement in the voluntary associations which allowed them to transfer their domestic duties into the public realm in the name of moral reform and Imperial Motherhood, middle class women were able to negotiate a position on the presentation platform next to their husbands. The presence of the Duchess of Cornwall and York and Lady Minto served to indicate the appropriateness of their attendance. On behalf of their wives, members of city councils solicited Major Maude for permission to escort their spouses onto the address platform

⁶¹Pope, *The Royal Tour of Their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York*, 165-313; Bassett, "A Thousand Miles of Loyalty," 135.

to welcome Their Royal Highnesses. While allowing them to be in attendance, Maude made it clear that they "will not be presented to His Royal Highness on the occasion of the Presentation of Addresses." Provided that they accompanied a male dignitary, kept silent, and did not interfere with the ceremony, middle class women could view the proceedings from the rear or side of the stage. While their appearance apart from the crowd and on the stage demonstrated the increased acceptance of a public role for women, their position in the address presentation underscored their continuing subordination to men.⁶²

Some middle class women felt that playing a supporting role was inadequate and sought to present addresses and gifts to Their Royal Highnesses themselves on behalf of their organisations. Despite Joseph Pope's conviction that women should not make speeches but remain "in silence," the Imperial Order Daughters of the Empire [IODE] and the National Council of Women [NCW] successfully petitioned the Governor General's Office to have their addresses presented to the Duke and Duchess. The fact that Lady Minto was the Honorary President of the National Council of Women and a supporter of the IODE may have played a part in gaining the acceptances. The addresses differed little from the ones presented by other groups save for their emphasis on the integral role of women in the nation and Empire. The document presented by the IODE thus affirmed that "the women of Canada are ready always to make any sacrifices when danger threatens the Empire." The NCW's presentation spoke of its

⁶²RG7/G23, vol. 9, file 26, E.B. Worthington to F.S. Maude, 16 September 1901, F.S. Maude to E.B. Worthington, 17 September 1901 (copy), vol. 8, file 20, Daniel McMillan to F.S. Maude, 27 August 1901, F.S. Maude to Daniel McMillan, 2 September 1901 (copy); Bonnie Huskins, "The Ceremonial Space of Women: Public Processions in Victorian Saint John and Halifax," in *Separate Spheres: Women's Worlds in the Nineteenth-Century Maritimes*, eds. Janet Guildford and Suzanne Morton (Fredericton, 1994): 145-159.

members devotion to the ideals of "pure and lofty womanhood" as exemplified by Queen Victoria and Queen Alexandra. Though modest, these presentations to royalty and their acceptance by the Duke and Duchess served to demonstrate to the public that the monarchy took an interest in women's public work and acknowledged their public role.⁶³

The women's presence and actions did not escape criticism. When the ladies of Ottawa proposed the lavish gift of a fur cape to the Duchess, to be paid by their own subscriptions, the press heaped criticism on the proposal from two directions. The middle class press had little problem with the ladies presenting a luxurious gift, but found fault with the type selected. Gifts of fur only served to "accentuate the impression which has prevailed in England for ages that Canada is a land of perpetual winter." While the maple leaf gold clasps were admired, a fur cloak would only propagate the wintry image of Canada recently stirred up by Rudyard Kipling's "Lady of the Snows" and, as a consequence, may reduce the number of immigrants to the country from Britain. The organ of the Winnipeg Trades and Labour Congress, however, drew attention to the class aspect of the gesture. The mink cape, estimated at a cost of \$1000, could not possibly be afforded by working women and, therefore, the "costly" and unnecessary gift would only serve to emphasise the exclusion of poor women at the same time that it celebrated "the exuberant loyalty of the ladies." Indeed, the *Voice* noted, "'Ladies' and 'women' seem to be separate species at the capital." While the wives of the Ottawa Four Hundred were able to contribute generously, "so far none of the workers in the sweat shops have been asked to subscribe." Not that they could since, the paper pointed out, the "women" of Ottawa did not

⁶³Pope, *Public Servant*, 158; Idem, *The Royal Tour of Their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York*, 179, 216-217.

earn more than four dollars per week in the needle trades. Due to labour's criticism of the fur cape, Lord Minto thought that a public presentation of the gift would only aggravate the situation by making "an invidious distinction between those who had subscribed to the gift and those who for various reasons might have found themselves unable to subscribe." Consequently, he suggested that a private presentation be held at Government House, an invitation the ladies readily accepted. The ceremony itself was simple enough as approximately four hundred women were in attendance to witness Lady Laurier presenting the cape to an appreciative Duchess on their behalf.⁶⁴

The exclusion of working class women and men from participating in address and gift presentations, and labour's criticism of the middle class, did not entail criticism of the Duke and Duchess. While mocking the middle class organisers and participants, labour papers and organisations welcomed "the heir to the throne of Britain with heartiness and sincerity." As the *Voice* explained, "so long as monarchy is the accepted form of government, broad based upon the people's will, the representative of the reigning family will always be justly entitled to respect and honor as the representative of supreme authority." The *Independent*, the paper of the Vancouver Trades and Labour Council, similarly celebrated the arrival of the royal couple in their city and welcomed the "hearty and loyal" demonstration given by all Vancouverites to the Duke and Duchess. It saw the loyal welcome as evidence of the strong attachment of Canadians to the Empire irrespective of social position. It also, however, viewed the Duke and Duchess

⁶⁴Pope, *The Tour of Their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York*, 61-62; *Montreal Gazette*, 5 August 1901; *Voice*, 9 August, 23 August 1901; RG7/G23, vol. 4, file 6, F.S. Maude to Mrs. Cotton, 31 August 1901 (copy), Mrs. Cotton to F.S. Maude, 3 September 1901.

as "a modest couple" who "fill the position they are to occupy by accident of birth with much grace." As such, they were unlike the social snobs who toadied to social precedence, but had more in common with the honest working man and woman. By portraying the heir to the throne as a man who enjoyed simple and unmaterialistic pleasures, labour attempted to diffuse the middle class' representations of Prince George as a middle class royal figure. Instead, he was constructed as a man who shared the working class dislike for precedence, royal function, and flattery in favour of fairness, informality, and honesty.⁶⁵

These beliefs motivated some workers, despite all of the barriers put in their way, to present an address to the Duke on behalf of labourers. Invoking the right to petition the Crown as an inherent right of every Briton, workers sought to gain the ear of the Duke on labour grievances while pledging their loyalty and affection to the heir to the throne. As in the case of the female members of the IODE and the NCW, the Duke's willingness to hear their concerns by accepting their address would be interpreted, at least by the working class, as evidence that the Duke sympathised with them and held them in as great esteem as he did any other of his loyal subjects. Royal affirmation of the workers' right to present their grievances to the Crown and recognition of those workers as a part of the community would accord symbolic power to the working class and, thus, assist it in its attempts to diffuse the self-promoting representations of the middle class during the Royal Tour. The presentation of a loyal address would give the working class a greater role in the royal celebration and, with it, a more visible place in the nation.

⁶⁵*Globe*, 27 July 1901; *Voice*, 27 September 1901; *Independent*, 5 October 1901; *Sandon Paystreak* quoted in *Calgary Herald*, 25 September 1901.

Perhaps the most determined worker to present an address to the Duke was a self-taught poet and longtime labour activist from Kamloops by the name of Marie Joussaye. A former servant girl who had organised Toronto's domestic servants into the Working Women's Protective Association in the 1880s, Joussaye had embraced and fused the ideologies of "honest womanhood," the nobility of labour, and imperialism. Defending working women from charges that they threatened morality and social order with their presence in the labour market, she argued in her poetry that there was no shame in being "Only a Working Girl" as long as a woman's wage was earned in honest, respectable employment. She had no doubt that the paragon of female virtue—Queen Victoria—shared this view. Submitting a Diamond Jubilee poem she had penned in tribute to "the kind heart and womanly nature of the Queen," Joussaye trusted that although it was a "humble and unpretentious" tract from only a "working-woman" the Queen would graciously accept it because her "kind and gracious heart...tho' loyal is womanly and tender."⁶⁶ On the occasion of the Royal Tour, Joussaye again composed a poem for royalty and, in doing so, again attempted to legitimise the value of honest work and the nobility of toil through royal association. Her 1901 verse, however, would be not from the vantage point of women workers alone, but of all labourers. Moving to Kamloops in the mid-1890s, she opened, first, a restaurant and, then, a boardinghouse, occupations which brought her into close contact with railway workers on the CPR line. Consequently, when a bitter strike by

⁶⁶Carole Gerson, "Marie Joussaye Fotheringham: Canada's First Woman Labour Poet," *Canadian Notes and Queries*, no. 44 (1991): 21-23; Idem, "Only a Working Girl: The Story of Marie Joussaye Fotheringham," *Northern Review* 19 (1998): 141-160; Linda Kealey, *Enlisting Women for the Cause: Women, Labour, and the Left in Canada, 1890-1920* (Toronto, 1998), 4-5, 16-18; Laurier Papers, reel C-749, vol. 44, pp. 14201-14204, Marie Joussaye to Wilfrid Laurier, 27 April 1897, reel C-750, vol. 51, p. 16363, Marie Joussaye to Wilfrid Laurier, 10 September 1897.

nearly 5000 CPR track men, 700 of them in British Columbia, broke out during the summer of 1901 she sympathised and supported her fellow workers and patrons. Although the ten-week long strike ended a couple of weeks before the Duke and Duchess's landing in Quebec, tempers still ran high among track men and their supporters. Particularly galling to them was the way in which the CPR was showcased during the Royal Tour and its executives accorded prominent places in the Tour's programmes. Reacting in part to the recent treatment of the track men, in part to the privileged status given to CPR magnates, and writing in part out of loyalty to the monarchy, Marie Joussaye picked up her pen and composed "Labour's Greeting."⁶⁷

The poem told of the grievances of the CPR workers during the strike, referring to the "poor pay of the lonely work" of the track men, the honesty of that work, and the alleged breach of law by the company in using "alien" labour to break the strikers. Nevertheless, workers remained "free men" despite the efforts of capital for "the freedom given by God and King shall never be bought or sold." Pledging the loyalty of workers to the monarchy for its protection of their freedom, the poem asserted their right to speak on equal terms with the Duke:

We know that only the statesman, the soldier, the scribe, the priest,
The high and rich and mighty may sit at the royal feast,
But we claim this right for Labor, the right to grasp your hand,
To look in your eyes and speak to you as man should to speak to man;
The right to tell the struggle in the Land of the Northern Zone,
Where honest labor is ground in the dust and greed usurps the throne.

Submitting the poem to Lord Minto in mid-September, Joussaye reiterated to the Governor General that while she was "not one of the snobs who have a longing to push their way among their superiors in society," she remained "a *very patriotic Canadian* and would dearly like to see

⁶⁷*Globe*, 17 June, 18 June 1901; *Independent*, 22 June 1901; RG7/G23, vol. 7, file 19, Marie Joussaye to Lord Minto, 16 September 1901.

my future sovereign face to face and shake hands with him....” Noting that her poem had “met with the approval of various Labor Unions and Trade Councils,” she added that the unions would be honoured if her address would be accepted for presentation to the Duke. The Duke was, after all, “the poor man’s Prince as well as the rich man’s Prince.”⁶⁸

“Poor man’s Prince” or not, “Labour’s Greeting” was not passed on to Vancouver’s Reception Committee for presentation as Joussaye had wished. Falling outside of the traditional address genre with its overtly political style, “Labour’s Greeting” was found to be unacceptable by the Governor General’s Office for presentation. Lacking innocuous loyal homilies and pious platitudes which emphasised the unity of all Canadians, there was little chance that it would be accepted by a Governor General who objected to any address of a political nature. Undeterred, Joussaye travelled to Vancouver to deal directly with the Mayor and Reception Committee, but found them just as “averse to my intentions” as the Governor General’s Office. Increasingly frustrated in her efforts “to vindicate labor’s rights to a hearing from her future King” by “the snob outfit running the royal show,” she became only more determined to subvert the restrictions and present the poem to the Duke. As she explained in the *Vancouver World*, “‘No time,’ was the usual excuse” given not only to rejecting “Labour’s Greeting” but every labour address proposed, “and yet there was time for garden parties and other social functions, time for a lot of pitiful upstarts to sun themselves in the Royal grace, but not five minutes for the great army of wage earners to express their loyalty and esteem, to draw his attention to the wrongs and burdens they endure, or to ask his sympathy for some.” Consequently, on the day of the Duke

⁶⁸*Independent*, 5 October 1901; RG7/G23, vol. 7, file 19, “Labour’s Greeting” by Marie Joussaye (1901), Marie Joussaye to Lord Minto, 16 September 1901.

and Duchess' arrival in Vancouver, Joussaye attempted to break past security and hand the address to them as they entered the local Drill Hall for an exclusive luncheon. Held back by guards, she was able to attract the attention of one of the members of the Reception Committee who said he would pass the address on for her. As she would later find out, but for reasons never explained to her, the address never reached the Duke. Nonetheless, her poem had, to her great satisfaction, received attention among her fellow workers and since "my aim is to please my fellow wage-earners...I have ample proof that I have succeeded in my aims."⁶⁹

Other members of the working class also sought to present an address to the Duke, but, like Joussaye, found their petitions turned away by the Governor General's Office.⁷⁰ Indeed, no address from any working class representative was presented to the Duke during his four-and-a-half week tour of the country. With their references to a "working class" holding interests separate from those of other classes, labour addresses were regarded as "political" and antithetical to the process of nation building. Social criticism, opposition to the status quo, and challenges to the hegemony of the middle class had no place in royal celebrations concerned to portray an image of unity, stability, and order. Anything challenging that image was certain to be excluded—with, ironically, its exclusion calling attention to the social tensions supposedly being masked. Address presentations, thus, became a site upon which legitimization and contestation was played out in public.

⁶⁹Laurier Papers, reel C-787, vol. 205, p. 58479, Marie Jousaye to Wilfrid Laurier, October 1901; *Independent*, 5 October 1901; *Vancouver World*, 8 October 1901.

⁷⁰The rejection of an address from the Victoria Trades and Labour Council is discussed in Chapter VI below since the petition not only reflects class interests, but also race relations between white workers and Asian labour during the Tour.

Receptions

Receptions, occasions at which select members of society could pay their respects to the Duke and Duchess, were much like address presentations in that they allowed members of the middle class to assert their cultural authority through privileged royal contact. While presentation to the Duke and Duchess at a reception indoors did not allow a large audience to witness the privileged handshake between citizen and royalty, the middle class press diligently reported the names of every person who was presented. In addition, each lady presented received extra comment on her attire. Indeed, dress would play an important part in the organisation and description of the receptions. Dress codes of varying levels restricted the access of the working class to the receptions and, even at receptions where the dress standards were more relaxed, they served as a social marker distinguishing between the respectable and the rough. Much as it did in reference to other aspects of the middle class attempt to "co-opt" the Tour, the working class challenged this.

While the Governor General's Office had a role in the screening procedures installed to regulate address presentations, it played a relatively small part in regulating the receptions beyond stipulating that evening dress, or uniforms as the case may be, must be worn by all ladies and gentlemen. The dress regulations were to be enforced by each city's Reception Committee, a situation which led to different interpretations as to what constituted appropriate attire and, thus, the level of exclusiveness at each civic reception. Montreal imposed the strictest regulations by, first, specifying that each person wishing to attend must apply to the Reception Committee for an invitation. In order to keep the reception "as exclusive as possible," applications were screened "very carefully." In addition, Mayor Préfontaine stated in a

proclamation that "It is necessary, of course, that all who propose to attend should comply with the Court restrictions as to dress, etc. and be provided with two visiting cards...." The untimely death of President McKinley, however, prompted the cancellation of the affair much to the dismay of the some 2500 invitees who had scaled the screening procedures.⁷¹

Ottawa society was more fortunate not only because the reception in the Senate Chambers was permitted to go ahead, but because of the chance to mingle with the royal couple at a garden party held at Government House. Each event featured "beauty and fashion" on parade as the respectably attired paid homage to their future King and Queen. With nearly 900 people, consisting primarily of military officers, government officials, the clergy, "leading citizens," and their wives, introduced to the Duke and Duchess in the Senate, the *Ottawa Citizen* observed that "So favorable an opportunity to make a debut before royalty was not neglected and a great many obtained that privilege." The garden party was even more exclusive as five hundred carefully selected "ladies" and "gentlemen" from "Ottawa society" were invited to attend. "'Everybody' was there," or, at least "everybody" who was "anybody."⁷²

The reception held in the Legislative Buildings in Toronto was less exclusive as more than 2000 "distinguished and undistinguished people" were presented. The Premier and the Lieutenant Governor believed that the reception should be open to the public provided that the requirements for evening dress were met. On this matter, the Reception Committee made it clear

⁷¹RG7/G23, vol. 9, file 25, F.S. Maude to George Drummond, 9 September 1901, vol. 9, file 26, Mayoral Proclamation, Montreal, 5 September 1901; *Montreal Gazette*, 13 August, 5 September, 14 September, 17 September 1901.

⁷²RG7/G23, vol. 5, file 12, F.S. Maude to O.A. Howland, 1 October 1901 (copy); *Ottawa Citizen*, 23 September, 24 September 1901; *Montreal Gazette*, 24 September 1901; *Globe*, 23 September 1901.

beforehand that "admission would be strictly refused [to any person]...not properly dressed." This was not a problem for the élite as they were able to easily gain admission and dominated the presentations. As the *Globe* correspondent observed, the reception united "scores of Canada's leading men, from all parts of the country, attracted hither by the opportunity afforded to greet their Prince." For those unable to witness the spectacle of politicians, professionals, military officers, and clergy shaking hands with the Duke and Duchess, the local newspapers listed the names of all of those presented along with the mandatory descriptions of ladies' dresses. Despite the dress code, some members of the middle class were clearly disturbed by the number of people from the lower orders who managed to infiltrate the affair. Unlike the reception in Ottawa where "due precaution was taken to ensure the presentation of everyone in his own order," Joseph Pope regarded the Toronto levee as "defective" on account of the lack of special provision for ladies and gentlemen "of high official rank possessing a constitutional right of access to the throne...." Similarly, *Globe* columnist Mary Agnes Fitzgibbon (pseud. Lally Bernard) believed that some men, due to their "innate qualities," demanded respect and deference and that the Reception Committee should be more discriminatory in order to ensure that only "fitting people" met the Duke. Society reporter Grace Denison (pseud. Lady Gay) concurred as she viewed "the motley throng" of "shop girls, vaudeville actresses, clerks (oh! the evening habiliments of some of those men!)" pile into the reception without any regard for "the commonest civility and respect to better bred and more refined people, whose company they happened for once to have the right to be in." They may have had an equal right as British subjects to pay their respects to the Duke and Duchess, but in the view of the middle class élite the working rabble did not enjoy the same respectable status. Defined by their "refined" appearance, manners, and respect for

social order, the middle class distinguished themselves from the uncouth masses at the receptions and even though they appeared before the Duke and Duchess side by side, it was hardly on equal terms.⁷³

The working class did not passively accept the inferior position accorded them in the receptions. Despite the dress regulations and security guards who eyed them with suspicion, several working class people had applied for and successfully gained admittance to the Toronto reception. In addition, the labour press and sympathisers heaped ridicule upon the middle class organisers and participants in order to portray them as a class of grovelling snobs overcome by "flunkeyism." In contrast, the working class, largely uninvolved in the "fuss and flummery," was the truly respectable entity. Likening some of the middle class participants to "social mosquitos," E.E. Sheppard complained that "the busybodies and gadflies of society, the public nuisances, ear-stormers, and wind-jammers are always in front" endeavouring "to crawl into a sunny spot where the light of the Royal countenance may possibly fall upon [them]...." Meanwhile, "the better class of citizens have no show except as spectators." Perhaps that was best since, according to the *Victoria Times*, the "democratic people" distinguished itself from the "hump-back aristocracy" by not taking part "in the humiliating struggle for admission to the full-dress reception." The *Independent* asserted that "Canadians, at least the working classes of this country, of common sense object to the fuss and flummery to the royal visit...." "We believe that the plain people are quite good enough to receive and entertain royalty in a plain and hospitable fashion, which would

⁷³RG7/G23, vol. 6, file 14, G.W. Ross to Lord Minto, 24 September 1901; *Globe*, 14 September, 21 September, 12 October, 14 October 1901; Pope, *The Tour of Their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York*, 118-119; *Toronto Telegram*, 21 October 1901; *Montreal Gazette*, 22 August 1901; Susan B. Kaiser, *The Social Psychology of Clothing: Symbolic Appearances in Context*, 2d ed. (New York, 1990), 5-12, 412.

be a thousand times more appreciated by the duke and party than the gay fantastics of half-educated silly folks, with swelled heads, offering something 'very select.'" Indeed, as the *Nanaimo Herald* put it, the "plain people" were eager to give the Duke and Duchess a hearty welcome, but due to the "snobs" hogging the reception the public was divided into two classes: "those who may come within speaking distance of the Duke and those who may not, and the line seems to be drawn just beyond the frock coat and silk hat." Nevertheless, "Charlie Churner" satirised in the *Toronto Star*, the masses were still expected to pay for the expenses of the celebrations because, after all, "What are the masses for?"⁷⁴

From the middle class point of view, the working class was to share in the expenses of the Tour, but not in the celebration. Organised by themselves for themselves, the receptions were arranged to highlight their cultural prominence through privileged access to royalty, and with it the royal touch. Even in cases where the lower orders were present, the superior attire and etiquette of the middle class would set it apart. Members of the working class sometimes challenged these restrictions in cases where they could obtain the proper dress, but, aided by the voice of the labour press, more often stood outside the receptions halls to view the exclusive proceedings—and the contemptible toadies engaged therein—with derision.

Militia Reviews

Address presentations and receptions were far from the only events during the Royal Tour which were almost entirely monopolised by the middle class. Banquets, dinners, and concerts too

⁷⁴*Saturday Night*, 27 July, 21 September 1901; *Victoria Times* quoted in *Vancouver World*, 16 August 1901; *Independent*, 31 August 1901; *Voice*, 13 September 1901; *Nanaimo Herald* quoted in *Vancouver World*, 17 August 1901; *Toronto Star* quoted in *Ottawa Citizen*, 2 September 1901.

were held for the pleasure of the Duke and Duchess, and the fortunate few in attendance. Militia reviews, however, were more effective in asserting the cultural authority of the middle class than such intimate events mainly due to their much larger scale, public audience, extensive press coverage, and the importance accorded to them by imperial authorities. Concerned over the continued commitment of the colonies in supporting the South African War, imperial authorities such as Joseph Chamberlain and Lord Minto had advocated a royal tour of the Empire in order to stimulate patriotism and imperial unity. By enlisting the Duke to pay special tribute to each colony's militia through his presentation of South African War medals and reviews of the troops, they believed that his tour would strengthen the colonial commitment to the war. As Sir Donald Mackenzie Wallace noted, the Duke's presentation of medals to the officers and men of the South African contingents "reminded the people of the assistance rendered to the Mother Country and the brilliant services of the troops in the field." Consequently, as Phillip Buckner points out, "the military ceremonies surrounding the Tour assumed unusual importance in Australia, New Zealand and Canada."⁷⁵

In addition to medal presentation ceremonies across the country, the Canadian visit included three large militia reviews held in Quebec, Toronto, and Halifax. Featuring thousands of men under arms marching and drilling to the tune of martial music before the heir to the throne, the militia review was an "imposing spectacle" which brought home to Canadians that "the Dominion lacked neither the capacity nor means of doing her share in the defence of the Empire." Enlivened by "all the magnificence of war"—the gleam of steel, the flash of medals, the clattering

⁷⁵Wallace, *Web of Empire*, 198; Buckner, "The Royal Tour of 1901 and the Construction of an Imperial Identity in South Africa," 328-330.

of swords, the galloping of cavalry, and the sound of the bugle and the drum—and, most importantly, featuring the Duke's inspection of the troops, the military manoeuvres became popular features of the Royal Tour among both the participants and the public alike.⁷⁶ As such, like their antecedents in 1860, the reviews offered opportunities for members of the dominant culture to consolidate and assert their hegemony before a large audience. Participation in the review as an officer offered one way in which to reaffirm a person's social status in the community. Where, however, the 1860 tour had involved an upper class marching before and saluting the heir apparent, the current ceremonies were dominated by the middle class.

Critics forty years ago, the middle class had assumed the social status of the upper class and, with it, that class' previous roles in a variety of political and social offices, including those associated with the militia. Under its leaders the image of the militia officer was reformulated to conform to its notions of respectability and manliness. No longer portrayed as sedentary figures who displayed an interest only in fancy dress and ceremonies, militia officers were now represented as dutiful soldiers characterised by moral restraint, self-control, courtesy, and physical strength. They were also exclusively middle class men. While members of the working class also joined the militia due to British ties, a sense of male comradeship, and wish to participate in civic life, they lacked the social influence and etiquette to be promoted, the income to afford the expensive uniforms, and, in the case of cavalry, the ability to provide horses for their own training. Furthermore, since the militia increasingly was called out to deal with labour disputes, officers not only discountenanced working class inclusion in their ranks but also felt that it was

⁷⁶*Montreal Gazette*, 21 October 1901; Pope, *The Tour of Their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall of York*, 21-23.

best not to have too many working class men in the lower ranks as well.⁷⁷

Organised labour also discouraged its members from joining the militia. Because the militia had been recently called out to "aid the monopolist against the working classes," the Dominion Trades and Labour Council asked their members in September 1901 to no longer enlist. The militia, it argued, was not a democratic organisation, but a tool of the middle class to put down labour disputes.⁷⁸ Moreover, the TLC contended that it was a self-indulgent social club in which its bourgeois members monopolised its ceremonial and social activities to the exclusion of the working class. The preparations for the Royal Tour's militia review in Toronto only confirmed this conviction in the minds of labourites. The main bone of contention was the institution of a fifty to twenty-five-cent fee to sit in the 15,000 seat grandstand. While the militia argued that the monies collected would be put to good use by sponsoring the sport of rifle shooting in Ontario, working class representatives charged that the fee would bar many of the poorer classes from attending the spectacle and, thus, would symbolically confirm the inequality of the working class in society. In the militia's defence, the *Globe* pointed out that the fee would limit the predicted large size of the crowd to a more manageable level. Without a fee, "the stand would be filled by those who had the largest equipment of thews and sinews, and women would be apt to fare ill in such a contest." The Toronto Trades and Labour Council was less than satisfied with the explanations provided by the militia and its middle class supporters. During a meeting in which the preparations "were discussed in a somewhat cynical spirit" and demands

⁷⁷Mike O'Brien, "Manhood and the Militia Myth: Masculinity, Class and Militarism in Ontario, 1902-1914," *Labour/Le Travail* 42 (1998): 115-141; Desmond Morton, *A Military History of Canada*, 3d ed. (Toronto, 1992), 96.

⁷⁸*Globe*, 20 September 1901.

made that "workingmen should protest against their earnings being spent in the entertainment," the Council motioned that the grandstand should be reserved for ladies and children at no cost. *Saturday Night* agreed, arguing that the institution of an admission charge would, in effect, turn the Duke and Duchess into a "peep-show" for those who could afford it while pushing the poor man "into the background by the dollars of his rich neighbors...." "It is not the wealthy leader of society," the *Vancouver World* observed on the question, "who alone should be able to come into touch with the Duke and Duchess, the heart which is covered by the blue blouse of the Canadian workingman beats just as loyally and lovingly for them." Such a viewpoint, however, seemed to be lost upon the militia. Indeed, said the *Woodstock Sentinel-Review*, it seemed all too apparent from the exclusion of the working class from the review that "military life [was] apt to breed an arrogance and a supercilious contempt for the public...." Just as the middle class had assumed the privileged positions previously accorded to the upper class militia officers during the Tour of 1860, so it inherited the scorn of the lower classes.⁷⁹

The criticism advanced by the working class little dampened the middle class' enjoyment of the Toronto review as staged on October 11. With nearly 12,000 veterans and active militia on parade it was the largest mobilisation of Canadian troops to have taken place since Confederation. With the presence of the Duke of Cornwall and York in the uniform of Colonel-in-Chief of the Royal Fusiliers, the excitement of the estimated 30-50,000 spectators was further enhanced. The review was simple enough featuring an inspection by the Duke followed by

⁷⁹*Globe*, 6 September, 10 September, 11 September, 13 September 1901; *Saturday Night*, 14 September 1901; *Vancouver World*, 20 September 1901; *Woodstock Sentinel-Review* quoted in *Toronto Weekly Sun*, 23 October 1901; *Catholic Register*, 17 October 1901; *Independent*, 5 October 1901.

military manoeuvres, the presentation of South African War medals, and a final march past, but the press pronounced the event "a stirring spectacle." It was a feast for the senses as the sound of martial music, the smell of the horses, the sight of the uniforms, and the touch of the royal presence treated the spectators to "a graphic demonstration of the solidarity of the Empire, of the closeness of the connection that exists between the colonies and the Mother Country." Particularly well-treated were the grandstand ticket holders who consisted almost entirely of "prominent people," such as judges, politicians, military men, lawyers, and other professionals. Meanwhile, either because they could not afford the admission fee or because they were following the suggestion of their trade unions to boycott the grandstand, the general public preferred to stand rather than pay for a seat. The result was a grandstand which "looked bare and bleak" with no more than 3,000 people occupying its 15,000 seats.⁸⁰

The lack of working people in the stands little disturbed the "prominent people" in attendance. The militia review, like other ceremonies during the Royal Tour, was designed first and foremost for their pleasure and, as planned, it provided them with privileged sight lines from which they could witness members of their own class demonstrate their loyalty to the heir to the throne through military service. As on other occasions, the working class contested the restrictions imposed by middle class organisers through a running critique during the planning stage followed by physical reaction during the performance. The efforts put forward by each party in this struggle suggest that they recognised that the Royal Tour was far from just an occasion to express one's loyalty: it was also a site at which cultural hegemony was at stake.

⁸⁰Pope, *The Tour of Their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York*, 116; *Toronto World*, 12 October 1901; *Montreal Gazette*, 12 October 1901; *Globe*, 12 October 1901.

Representing the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York

The cultural hegemony of the middle class also found expression in the images presented of the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York in the press. Portrayed after the image of the middle class, Prince George and Princess May were represented as exemplars of bourgeois manliness and femininity. This served to legitimise the cultural authority of the middle class while, at the same time, reminding women of their proper roles in society. With increasing numbers of women entering the public sphere and members of the upper working class adopting traditional modes of male respectability, the male middle class reformulated ideas of manliness and reasserted the ideology of separate spheres in order to maintain its hegemony. As the example of royal imagery attests, cultural representation played a significant role in this process.

While maintaining his moral restraint, self-control, and public image, the ideal late Victorian and Edwardian bourgeois male had become more family-oriented and husbandly. A devoted husband and a supportive father, he was a family man who attended to his household and lived the simple, homely life. Prince George adhered to this image, developed more fully during his reign, but also evident during his time as heir apparent. The Canadian press emphasised the loving marriage between the Duke and Duchess and dwelt upon small public interactions between them which were offered as evidence of their devotion to one another. Whether it was the rumour that the Duke insisted that the Tour be shortened in order to relax the burden on his wife, the Duchess' straightening out of the Duke's clothes, or the shared pain they felt from being so long separated from their children, the press offered proof of their domestic bliss. Despite his royal position, the Duke was said to live a "modest" life characterised by "unostentatious simplicity," a condition attested to by his easy demeanour and "unaffected friendliness." He was

most happy, it was said, "when in the society of his wife and frolicking with his children...." Though he was popularly known as the "Sailor Prince" from his time in the Royal Navy, he was also, as *Le Soleil* pointed out, "un modèle de vertus domestiques et un mari et un père exemplaires." He was caring without being emotional, friendly as opposed to gushing, and home-loving rather than domesticated. It was a fine balancing act for the turn of the century male to adopt a domestic image without being regarded as feminine, but, as the image of Prince George developed it was one which could reflect a masculinity confident in its family-orientation.⁸¹

If there was any doubt over home-centred masculinity, it was dispelled by the middle class male's active participation in rational recreation. Prince George epitomised the sporting gentleman as illustrated by his keen interest in the lacrosse match played in Ottawa and, in even greater degree, by his own participation in the "élite ritual" of hunting. Hunting returned man to his primordial instincts and allowed him to utilise and demonstrate his endurance, patience, sharp eye, and natural skills. Moreover, shooting involved a "sporting code" of hunting etiquette which distinguished it from mass slaughter and made it the mark of "the imperial gentleman." The Duke was an avid hunter and when the Royal Tour stopped at Poplar Point, Manitoba on its way back from British Columbia for some duck hunting, he lost no time in exhibiting his fine shot. In the morning alone, the *Globe* reported, "His Royal Highness proved himself an excellent shot, bagging 52 birds, and of the adventurous ducks coming within range of his unerring aim few indeed escaped." By the end of the two-day outing into the local marshes a total of 600 ducks had been bagged by the party, eighty-two of which were from the Duke's gun, the most of any

⁸¹*Globe*, 6 September, 23 September, 9 October, 11 October, 21 October 1901, 23 June 1911; *Montreal Gazette*, 17 September 1901; *Vancouver World*, 30 September 1901; J. Wentworth Day, *King George V as a Sportsman* (London, 1935), 15; *Le Soleil*, 10 May 1910.

hunter. Even though it was customary for royals to bag the greatest number of game in a hunting expedition in order to assert their status through their prowess, the *Manitoba Free Press* nonetheless declared that the Duke's number proved that he "is a keen sportsman in every sense of the word," a fact substantiated not only by his fine shot, but by his respect for his prey. Despite his taste for shooting large numbers of fowl without a second thought, the Duke distinguished himself from the rest of the bloodthirsty by serving as the President of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals.⁸²

The Duke was full of ironies, perhaps not the least of which was that while the press reported on his "friendliness," "modesty," and "sympathy," those who came within closest contact with him held a far from favourable opinion of the man. Joseph Pope, who travelled across the continent with him, regarded the Duke as "somewhat slow of thought, destitute of wit, humour or sarcasm, blunt to rudeness, says just what he thinks without much regard for anyone's feelings—in short, he is a spoiled boy." The Duchess, on the other hand, lived up to her image. Pope considered her clever, charming, sympathetic, and gracious, characteristics which were widely reported in the press. With her "friendly manner and sweet appearance" she won all hearts even though she never spoke a word in public. Her position was by her husband's side. She gave him silent support, straightened his clothing, and carried herself as a simple, loving wife and, above all, a devoted mother. She was, Castell Hopkins noted, "devoted to her home, its duties

⁸²Hector Charlesworth, "King George the Fifth," *Canadian Magazine* 35 (1910): 253; John M. MacKenzie, "The Imperial Pioneer and Hunter and the British Masculine Stereotype in Late Victorian and Edwardian Times," in *Manliness and Morality: Middle-Class Masculinity in Britain and America, 1800-1940*, eds. J.A. Mangan and James Walvin (Manchester, 1987): 183-187; Wentworth Day, *King George V as a Sportsman*, 24; *Globe*, 8 October 1901; *Manitoba Free Press*, 8 October, 9 October 1901; Pope, *The Tour of Their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York*, 105.

and its responsibilities, and believ[ed] her children to be the first object and aim of a woman's study and attention...." As a substitute for her own children, she reportedly indulged the children she met along the Tour. A number of orphans in Montreal were, for example, touched not only with her tender hand but with tears of sympathy. The young girls who presented her with bouquets across the country met with a similar reception as the Duchess' "beaming face" proclaimed "the mother's love of children."⁸³ Princess May did not need to speak to display a maternal nature and a wifely devotion. Indeed, her passive, seen-but-not-heard role in the ceremonies conformed to the male middle class image of woman's place in society.

Offering representations of the male middle class in relation to royalty, and having those representations confirmed by the behaviour of the Duke and Duchess, the Royal Tour of 1901 provided that class with a means of articulating its shared identity and defining the Canadian nation in its image. Through royal association, attention, and emulation, it legitimised its cultural authority while entrenching the inferior position of women and the working class in the social order. Women and the working class contested their subordinate status in the celebrations, but with uneven results. The Royal Tour of 1901 proved to be yet another hegemonic site in which men and women and middle and working classes struggled for power as symbolised in the royal sign.

⁸³Pope Papers, vol. 48, Diary of the Royal Tour, 21 October 1901; *Ottawa Citizen*, 21 September 1901; *Globe*, 21 September, 11 October, 14 October 1901; *Official Programme and Souvenir of the Royal Tour*, 9-10; J. Castell Hopkins, *The Life of King Edward VII, with a Sketch of the Career of King George V* (N.p., 1910), 466; *La Patrie*, 19 September 1901; *Toronto World*, 12 October 1901; Pope, *The Tour of Their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York*, 44, 55.

The Cultural Representations of Edward VII

Until 1901 royal symbolism had been centred largely upon a single person—Queen Victoria. Upon her death, other royal figures stepped into the fray to accept, willingly or otherwise, the symbolic connotations of monarchy. Due to their lengthy tour of the Empire, Prince George and Princess May immediately replaced the Queen in the colonies. Others followed. Indeed, very soon after his accession Edward VII supplanted the late Queen as the central unifying symbol of the Empire. His Coronation in 1902 was designed as an imperial festival to rival the pageantry of the Diamond Jubilee and his death in 1910 was marked by shared mourning around the Empire. These royal ceremonies, like the Royal Tour of 1901 and Queen Victoria's Jubilees and Memorial Services, articulated the imperial mentality of the middle class and at the same time, upheld the monarch as a symbol of national identity. Since the King was also portrayed as the epitome of middle class manliness, his personal identity ultimately became intertwined with that of the nation. Symbols contain multiple meanings and identities and Edward VII as Father of the Empire could not be separated from Edward the sportsman, the respectable gentleman, the devoted husband, and the loving father. Projecting their values upon Edward VII, the male middle class articulated a view of the Canadian nation and of its place within it. As Queen Victoria had served as a class-based and gendered symbol of national-imperial identity, so King Edward assumed the role of Father of the Empire and with it the connotations of middle class manliness with which the position was imbued.

Despite his tour of British North America and other colonies during his lengthy tenure as Prince of Wales, Edward VII would show little interest in colonial affairs during his reign, preferring instead diplomatic relations with foreign powers. On receiving a private audience with

the King in January 1902, the Commander of the Canadian Militia, for example, discovered, much to his dismay, "how little he really knew of our great self-governing Colonies."⁸⁴ Nevertheless, Joseph Chamberlain quickly went to work in building an imperial image of the new King to match that of the old Queen. "I am very anxious," he told Lord Minto a few days after Victoria's death, "that the separate and greatly increased importance of the Colonies should if possible be recognised" by taking appropriate advantage of the change in rulers. To this end, he suggested an addition to the King's formal title which would be amended to read "King of Great Britain and Ireland *and of Greater Britain Beyond the Seas*, Defender of the Faith, Emperor of India." Laurier did not see any need to change the title, but, not wanting to seem ungracious, accepted a change to the style. Lord Minto, though, recommended "and of the British Dominions beyond the Seas" instead of "Greater Britain." The latter term, he insisted, might be "colloquially convenient, [but] is perhaps hardly definite or intelligible enough for such a formal purpose." Receiving the approval of the other Dominions, Lord Salisbury as British prime minister, and the King, Minto's suggestion was effected in November. It was a move, some Canadians commented, which recognised the importance of the Dominions in the Empire and one which would only serve to increase Canada's international stature.⁸⁵

The Coronation of Edward VII, slated for 26 June 1902, was similarly constructed.

⁸⁴Edward Hutton to Lord Minto, 10 January 1902, in *Lord Minto's Canadian Papers*, eds. Stevens and Saywell, vol. 2, 113.

⁸⁵Laurier Papers, reel C-1171, vol. 753, pt. 1, p. 215324, Joseph Chamberlain to Lord Minto, 29 January 1901 (copy), p. 215326, Lord Minto to Joseph Chamberlain, 4 February 1901 (copy); Wilfrid Laurier to Lord Minto, 5 February 1901, in *Lord Minto's Canadian Papers*, vol. 2, 21; RG7, Administrative and Housekeeping Records [G25], vol. 39, "Correspondence Relating to the Proposed Alteration in the Royal Style and Titles of the Crown" (1901); Hopkins, *The Life of King Edward VII*, 293-295; *Globe*, 27 July 1901.

Intended to outshine every previous royal ceremony ever held in the Empire, the imperial character of the celebration, and of the King, was to be emphasised. Accordingly, invitations were issued to the Colonial Premiers and contingents of their soldiers to attend the pageant in London. Arrangements were then made to hold a Colonial Conference and a number of dinners, receptions, concerts, and parties in which the overseas visitors would be the guests of the King. In addition, as a ceremony "symbolizing and expressing a solemn compact between the Sovereign and his subjects," the Coronation was regarded as an occasion at which the bond between the King and his people was to be reaffirmed by "a thousand years' traditions." Consequently, the presence and prominence of the colonial representatives, including Sir Wilfrid Laurier and most of the provincial premiers, gave a new significance to the event. The people of the "British Dominions Beyond the Seas" would be accorded an equal place in the covenant between Crown and people. Insisting on the importance of this, Canadian newspapers printed detailed stories on the history of the Coronation, incidents associated with it, and the nature of its rituals. Municipal committees were also organised in order to prepare local celebrations which would include Canadians more directly in the act of reaffirming the compact. The King's sudden illness just prior to the event, though, dampened the imperial efflorescence expected on Coronation Day as the ceremony had to be postponed until Edward recovered from his appendectomy. By the time the Coronation did take place on August 9, it was rather anticlimactic. Thousands of people who had travelled to the imperial metropolis for the originally scheduled occasion had returned home, including the Canadian troops, and the local celebrations were not entered into as enthusiastically as expected. As Lord Minto had predicted, "as a matter of fact things cannot boil up to the same

pitch a second time, and must be more or less flat."⁸⁶

Not all was lost. The initial enthusiasm had led to a good deal of work integrating Edward VII into national symbolism. In fact, by the time of his death, the King's association with national identity would reach almost as high a level as had that of his peerless mother. More than this, the King and his wife, Queen Alexandra, would be turned into paragons of middle class manliness and femininity which would in turn be transposed upon the nation. The transformation, however, was not an easy one. The new King was no longer the youthful, sweet, and reserved gentleman he had been seen as during his visit to British North America in 1860. By 1901 he had in fact become known as a fat, old, gambling womaniser who seemed the reverse of the image of masculine perfection that would be associated with him.

Edward was, in fact, rotund and 59 years old when he finally ascended to the throne. He also had a well-founded reputation as a philanderer, though little public discussion of the matter had occurred since the 1870s. Of more recent date was the attention his penchant for gambling received. Although he had committed no crime, his involvement in a private baccarat game which had led to accusations of cheating and slander had placed him in the witness box at a sensational trial in 1891. Indeed, he seemed the one on trial as the press and public pronounced his gambling as conduct unbecoming of his position. As one satiric verse in the Toronto paper *Grip* joked:

When he isn't hiding aces in his boot...
Or of buxom Yankee females in pursuit...
It's just awful to observe his goings-on.

⁸⁶Hopkins, *The Life of King Edward VII*, 368, 391-409; Sidney Lee, *King Edward VII: A Biography*, vol. 2 (London, 1927), 106-110; W.J. Thorold, "The Significance of the Colonies," *Canadian Magazine* 19 (1902): 389-393; *Montreal Gazette*, 7 June, 20 June, 8 August, 9 August, 11 August 1902; *Globe*, 21 June, 8 August 1902; *Manitoba Free Press*, 11 August 1902; Scott Papers, vol. 4, Lord Minto to R.W. Scott, 29 July 1902.

Particularly vexed were Presbyterians and Methodists who, Canadian Governor General Lord Stanley reported, "have been grievously exercised over the doings of the Queen's immediate descendants."⁸⁷ By the time of his accession, some Canadians were not ready to forgive the former Prince of Wales for his previous indiscretions and vices and, bucking the trend to embrace the new King, voiced their concerns. One female teacher in Toronto, for example, found herself in a storm of controversy over "some very unpatriotic references" she made of the new sovereign. She reportedly told her students that she "deplored" Edward's accession to the throne "because he has been a patron of the turf, and mingled with the Monte Carlo type of men." Her statements were viewed by many as "treasonable," and she was fortunate not to have been arrested and fined, as happened to a young man in Montreal who made "highly profane and insulting language to the sovereign" in a local music hall. He found himself under arrest "for insulting the name of the King" and was later fined \$10.⁸⁸

Despite its occasional use, coercion, however, was a little employed means of eliciting, or enforcing, loyalty among Canadians. Their commitment to the monarchy continued unabated regardless of the person wearing the crown. Edward was, nonetheless, in need of rehabilitation, especially if he was to serve as a symbol of national identity. Steps in that direction accordingly began in 1901 and continued until his death in 1910. In conformity with the middle class idea, he would be represented as a dutiful, tactful, and wise constitutional monarch, a sporting gentleman, a devoted father, and a moral, loving husband. Castell Hopkins foreshadowed the

⁸⁷Giles St. Aubyn, *Edward VII: Prince and King* (New York, 1979), 163-172; *Grip*, 28 March 1891; NAC, Lord Stanley of Preston Papers, MG27 I B7, reel A-446, Lord Stanley to Lord Salisbury, 11 October 1891.

⁸⁸*Montreal Gazette*, 29 January, 31 January 1901.

treatment the new King would receive in his 1896 biography of Queen Victoria. Devoting a chapter to the character of Albert Edward as Prince of Wales, Hopkins described him as having been raised amid "the domestic life of a home which has ever since been a pattern to the people." Given that, it was only natural that the Prince would be devoted to his own wife, family, and home. He shared his parents' fondness of a "simple country life" and loved nothing more than "family excursions and picnics" and acting as "a host in the midst of his family." Yet, possessing a "heartly and really English" enjoyment of life, Albert Edward also embraced the whole range of cultural activities available to the "average English gentleman" whether it was attending the opera or the Derby, playing cards, or going shooting. Certainly, he had received his fair share of criticism for his past actions, but, Hopkins argued, "to please everyone he would have to be at once the chief of saints and the prince of sinners." For example, in regards to the baccarat case, "those who believe all card-playing to be vicious, and any game of chance in which money is involved to be gambling, will hardly be persuaded that the now historic game of baccarat was anything but wicked...." Those, however, who believed that a Prince must have some amusement, who thought that a private game in a private house is not gambling of the "Monte Carlo" type, and who appreciated "the very English quality of standing by a friend" as it was said the Prince had done, "will find plenty of room for defence of the Prince and even for considerable admiration of his manly course throughout the entire affair." Far from living a scandalous life, Albert Edward had in fact combined "with rare skill the dignity of a Prince, and the jovial manner of a popular English gentleman."⁸⁹

⁸⁹J. Castell Hopkins, *Queen Victoria, Her Life and Reign. A Study of British Monarchical Institutions and the Queen's Personal Career, Foreign Policy, and Imperial Influence* (Toronto, 1896), 269-281.

The press and clergy similarly described the new King as, in the words of Rev. William Clark, "a dutiful and affectionate son...a loving and tender husband, and a wise and devoted father." Special efforts were made to dispel the notion that Edward's life as the Prince of Wales was one of constant leisure and self-indulgence. According to the editor of the *Globe*, "It may perhaps be the general idea that the Prince's life is a round of pleasure, but the caution that things are not always what they seem may be necessary here. What look like occasions for enjoyment may, when they become more routine duties, afford anything but enjoyment to him who takes part in them so frequently that they would be an infliction if they were not a duty." Revealed as bearing the burdens of public duty and as adhering to the love of simple home life and family devotion instilled in him by his mother, Albert Edward, Prince of Wales, was slowly transformed into Edward VII the perfect "English gentleman."⁹⁰

By the time of the King's death on 6 May 1910, he had been rehabilitated to such an extent by press coverage and biographical sketches that the *Globe* could declare that "In the long list of Kings of England, Scotland, and Great Britain there is no name more illustrious than that of him who passed away last night." He had earned this accolade not through any specific action on his part, but by coming to embody the homely and recreational characteristics of the ideal middle class gentleman. His home life was described as one of "honest domestic happiness and unity" defined by husbandly care and fatherly devotion. In making his home life a domestic idyll, he was assisted by his wife who, in the end, was chiefly responsible for the care of the family. While the middle class male was more domestic in habit than had been the case in mid-century,

⁹⁰*Globe*, 11 August 1902, 23 January 1901, 9 August 1902; *Montreal Gazette*, 23 January 1901; *Ottawa Citizen*, 23 January 1901; Bliss Carman, *Ode on the Coronation of King Edward VII* (Boston, 1902).

his wife remained the primary agent of a properly ordered home life. Queen Alexandra found herself portrayed as the “perfect wife and mother” who complemented Edward’s own “natural strength of character” to build a perfect home. There was no more ringing endorsement of Alexandra’s domesticity than that which came from Queen Victoria who, Sarah Tooley noted, “could not have chosen so exactly with her domestic ideal as that of her son’s chosen bride.” Indeed, writers bestowed all of the maternal, feminine qualities previously credited to Queen Victoria on her daughter-in-law as she became portrayed as “an ideal of womanliness.” Sympathetic, unselfish, devoted to her husband, and family-centred, she became such an ideal female role model that in 1908 the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan introduced the *Alexandra Readers* in their schools, a series of school books which offered a world in which men were protectors and providers and women, like their eponymous model, were faithful wives and passive mothers. Teamed with his wife, then, Edward VII provided an “object lesson to the nation” on the ideal relationship of husband and wife in the household.⁹¹

More, of course, was involved in living a life of middle class propriety than what one did—or was thought to do—in the home. “Almost every Englishman is in some sense a sportsman,” W.J. Jackman wrote in his biography of Edward VII, “and in his fondness for outdoor sports Edward was typically English.” As the *Ottawa Citizen* told its readers, “in nothing

⁹¹*Globe*, 7 May 1910; W.T. Herridge, *A Sermon Preached in St. Andrew’s Church, Ottawa on Sunday Morning, May 15th, 1910, to Commemorate the Death of His Most Gracious Majesty, King Edward VII* (Ottawa, 1910); Hopkins, *The Life of King Edward VII*, 191, 79-80; Montreal Star, *Royal Visit to Canada, 1901*, 15; Georgina Battiscombe, *Queen Alexandra* (Boston, 1969), 216; Sarah Tooley, “King Edward VII and His Consort,” *Canadian Magazine* 19 (1902): 106-116; W.J. Jackman, *The Illustrious Life and Reign of King Edward VII* ([Guelph?], 1910), 183-184; Robert M. Stamp, *Kings, Queens, and Canadians: A Celebration of Canada’s Infatuation with the British Royal Family* (Markham, Ont., 1987), 175-178.

did he find such relaxation from the duties of state as in his devotion to outdoor activities.” Writers told of his love of “all manly games” such as tennis, golf, cricket, croquet, and riding in his younger days and, more recently, of his continuing activity in shooting, deer stalking, yachting, and horse racing. Rather than a sin, his penchant for betting was reinterpreted as reflective of his sportsmanship. “These wagers,” Jackman explained, “were made, not from love of gain as in the case of the gambler who seeks to win because of the pecuniary profit which money brings him, but solely to give zest to some sporting event.” Besides, the amounts he wagered were minor in relation to his wealth. While “the pursuit of pleasure has been the ruin of many a man,” the *Vancouver Province* stated, “it was the making of the King—pleasure, not in the grossest, but in the most innocent sense of the term.”⁹²

Owing to his participation in rational recreation, his renewed commitment to his wife, and his long devotion to his children, it was argued that Edward VII had “lived down a rather unenviable reputation through long years of more careful conduct, and succeeded in winning the confidence of all the people as almost no other sovereign of Great Britain except his mother, Queen Victoria, had done.”⁹³ Like his mother, though, Edward achieved his popularity not only through his seeming adoption and idealisation of middle class life, but through his gendered constitutional rule. As noted in Chapter III, Queen Victoria’s role as monarch was reconciled to her domestic image through a process of feminising the Crown. The constitutional role of the monarch was no longer one of leadership and action, but of respect and support for ministers, the

⁹²Jackman, *The Illustrious Life and Reign of King Edward VII*, 108; *Ottawa Citizen*, 7 May, 9 May 1910; Hopkins, *The Life of King Edward VII*, 221-222; *Vancouver Province*, 7 May 1910.

⁹³*Ottawa Citizen*, 7 May 1910.

encouragement of their actions, and the exercise of passive influence. Though more actively involved in the political process than the press was able to see, the Queen had nonetheless become the perfect constitutional monarch largely through an identification of her domesticity and womanliness with her role as queen. The accession of Edward thus placed a man in a now largely feminised office. Consequently, a process of readjustment occurred as Edward's manly image had to be accommodated within a now well-defined, and feminine, constitutional role.

Although less interested in domestic issues than Victoria and less able, due to his lack of experience, age, and personality, to cope with the complexity and volume of government papers, Edward maintained an interest throughout his reign in the army, navy, and foreign affairs. Denied access to state papers by his mother until he was into his 50s—she felt he lacked the discretion to keep them secret—he had as Prince of Wales been permitted to entertain visiting heads of state, conduct levees, and tour foreign capitals. The Queen had considered such activities nonpolitical, but they had cultivated Edward's interest in foreign affairs and had helped him to learn the diplomatic process and how to best use his social skills to diplomatic effect.⁹⁴ Over the course of his reign, he would pursue his interest in foreign diplomacy with visits to France, Italy, and other European nations in which he met with a number of leaders, most notably the German Kaiser Wilhelm II. Coming as it did at the same time that tensions between Britain and Germany were increasing and as the British government pursued rapprochement with a number of European powers, Edward's interaction with world leaders and the foreign public would be credited with the prevention of war with Germany and for the maintenance of peace in Europe.

⁹⁴Frank Hardie, *The Political Influence of the British Monarchy, 1868-1952* (London, 1970), 87-93; Simon Heffer, *Power and Place: The Political Consequences of King Edward VII* (London, 1998), 2-3, 6-7, 11, 19, 88, 94.

Dubbing him "Edward the Peacemaker," the press and biographers argued that the King's gentlemanly qualities of tact, charm, patience, courtesy, and "savoir faire," that is, "the faculty of knowing what to do and what to say on all occasions," had soothed relations between Britain and the nations of Europe at a time of increased international tension. His friendliness, it was said, had calmed the "hot-headed" Kaiser and eased relations between Britain and Germany even as they proceeded to build up their armaments. Likewise, his goodwill visit to France in 1903 was held to have ameliorated ill-feelings between Britain and her southern neighbour to such an extent that the way was open to the *Entente Cordiale*. His trip to Italy in the same year, his encouragement of alliance with Japan, and even his acceptance of Americans into British society were cited as further examples of how he had earned the titled of "Peacemaker" through his affability, diplomatic acumen, and skilful use of social prestige. He was, the *Globe* declared, "by far the most successful diplomat of modern times."⁹⁵

Through a combination of tact, shrewdness, and gentlemanly conduct, Edward was said to have left a legacy of international friendliness and understanding. He had accomplished this, the *Ottawa Citizen* noted, "not so much [by] his actual efforts to prevent disputes between nations as [by] his diplomacy in keeping the European people on good terms with each other through a better knowledge of the merits of each." The representation of Edward as a "Peacemaker," then,

⁹⁵*Vancouver Province*, 7 May 1910; Herridge, *A Sermon Preached in St. Andrew's Church, Ottawa on Sunday Morning, May 15th, 1910*, 9; Hopkins, *The Life of King Edward VII*, 433-437; Jackman, *The Illustrious Life and Reign of King Edward VII*, 70, 161-162; *Ottawa Citizen*, 7 May 1910; *Globe*, 20 April 1903, 7 May 1910; Kinley E. Roby, *The King, the Press and the People: A Study of Edward VII* (London, 1975), 298. On imperial and international events during his reign, see Ronald Hyam, "The British Empire in the Edwardian Era," in *Oxford History of the British Empire. Volume IV: The Twentieth Century*, edited by Judith M. Brown and Wm. Roger Louis (Oxford, 1999): 47-63.

balanced his male identity with a feminised constitutional role. While the press argued that "his influence with his ministers in an advisory capacity was much more pronounced than was that of Queen Victoria," they also maintained that his exercise of influence was motivated by concern to achieve international peace—an ultimately nonpartisan and, therefore, uncontroversial project. Moreover, his use of influence was not interpreted as something done in the passive female way, as had been the case with his mother, but as an extremely active phenomenon. Carefully staying within the constitutional limits of "the right to be consulted, the right to encourage, and the right to warn," Edward used his social influence and diplomatic acumen to not only encourage peace, but to be a "Peacemaker." While his mother had been regarded as the perfect constitutional sovereign because of her extension of wifely duties into the public realm, King Edward's success as a constitutional sovereign came from "his attributes as a man." Just as a woman could best serve as a constitutional monarch by retaining her passive qualities as a wife, so a man could rule within these same constitutional constraints without being emasculated. The image of "Edward the Peacemaker" gave Edward VII an active public function without requiring that he interfere in politics. It was a role which both drew upon and confirmed his gentlemanly character.⁹⁶

Upon his death on 6 May 1910, the quality most Canadians said stood foremost in their minds on remembering the late King was a "Peacemaker." The press, pulpit, and public also remembered him as a sportsman, gentleman, family man, and ultimately, as the Father of the Empire. These characteristics would be recounted over and over again before, and on the day of, the Memorial Services held across the Dominion. It was, the *Vancouver Province* observed,

⁹⁶*Ottawa Citizen*, 7 May 1910; Jackman, *The Illustrious Life and Reign of King Edward VII*, 70; Herridge, *A Sermon Preached in St. Andrew's Church, Ottawa on Sunday Morning, May 15th, 1910*, 10.

a moment in the annals of the Empire in which "a unanimity of purpose...made the scattered units one."⁹⁷ And although one focus of national identity had passed away, the immediate accession of George V followed by his Coronation in June 1911 would renew the process of identity formation in association with royal representation. Greatly aided by his willingness to embrace his role as "his Imperial Majesty" with unprecedented vigour and by his acceptance of bourgeois modes of masculinity, George V easily conformed to the dominant culture's interpretation of Canadian national identity with all that that implied in terms of class and gender.⁹⁸ World war, increased Americanisation, female suffrage, labour unrest, and other social, economic, and political changes would prompt changes in the way all this worked out over the course of the new King's twenty-six-year reign. Indeed, during the Edwardian era itself frequent changes were made to the image of the monarchy as the changing nature of class and gender relations, the composition of the middle class, and the redefinition of masculinity, prompted the dominant culture to reformulate the principles upon which its hegemony rested. Change, too, was made necessary by the need to accommodate the different personalities, interests, and genders of Victoria, Edward, and George. The male middle class addressed all of this through a constant process of redefinition, assertion, and legitimisation. Through royal ceremonies and with the use of royal representations it acted to legitimise its cultural authority in the face of challenges from

⁹⁷*Montreal Gazette*, 7 May, 11 May, 21 May 1910; *Manitoba Free Press*, 23 June 1911; *Globe*, 20 May 1910; J. Castell Hopkins, ed., *Canadian Annual Review of Public Affairs* (Toronto, 1910), 25-26; *Vancouver Province*, 21 May 1910; *Ottawa Citizen*, 7 May, 21 May 1910.

⁹⁸Journal of Viscount Esher, 25 August 1910, in *Journals and Letters of Reginald Viscount Esher*, eds. Maurice V. Brett and Oliver, Viscount Esher, vol. 3 (London, 1934-1938), 17; Marjory MacMurchy, *The King's Crowning* (Toronto, 1911), 10; *Manitoba Free Press*, 22 June, 23 June 1911; *Ottawa Citizen*, 22 June 1911; *Globe*, 23 June 1911.

the working class, women, and even dissidents in its own ranks. Perhaps even more troubling, though, would be the manner in which issues of race and religion impinged upon class and gender identities, complicated the construction of royal representations, and made the image of the Canadian nation even more difficult to frame. So vexed did these matters make the interaction between royal imagery and national identity that the attainment of cultural hegemony became even more difficult than it already was.

PART TWO: RELIGION, ETHNICITY, AND NATIONAL IDENTITY**CHAPTER V****Protestantism, Irish Catholicism, and
French Culture, 1860-1901**

Despite the abolition of slavery throughout the British Empire in the 1830s, the treatment of black colonists in mid-nineteenth century British North America continued to be marked by racism and discrimination. Viewed as indigent, depraved, and inferior, fugitive American slaves gained little acceptance from a predominately white British North American community intent on keeping nonwhites on the margins of colonial society. The extension of legal rights to colonists of African descent had granted them liberty, but equality and fair treatment remained elusive. Nonetheless, many continued to hope and believe that the system of British justice which had granted them legal freedom would also lead to full equality and integration into the white community. In order to fight for the respect of their rights and for an equal place in the community, blacks responded to racial discrimination and isolation by becoming exemplars of British justice and liberty and, thus, strong advocates of loyalty to the British constitution and its linchpin: the monarchy. Associating their liberty with the monarchy, upwardly mobile blacks professed their attachment to Queen Victoria and expressed their faith in her continued protection of their rights as British subjects. Replicating the respectable behaviour of the white middle class, they cheered the Queen on her birthday, volunteered in the militia to defend her Empire, and sought admission to processions and parades celebrating her reign. Thus, when it was announced that her son, Albert Edward the Prince of Wales, would be touring British North America in 1860, blacks throughout the colonies organised in order to pay tribute to Queen

Victoria through her son. In doing so, they hoped to gain public recognition of their rights as citizens and equality as loyal subjects.¹

In Nova Scotia, where a significant black population had settled during the Loyalists' migration, members of the black community had gained admission to the royal procession in Halifax and marched behind a banner of their own declaring "Liberty to the Captive." Members of the city's black volunteer company also did duty alongside their white companions. Although some members of the crowd sneered and jeered as they passed by and some press reports remarked that their participation was "like a laughable farce to the excellent performance of a drama," the black community of Nova Scotia had successfully asserted its right to participate in public celebrations and, moreover, had projected an image of itself as made up of loyal citizens.²

Black people in the Canadas, however, would be less successful in demonstrating their loyalty and in negotiating a more visible and equal place in the community of British North America. As British subjects, the "Coloured Inhabitants" of London, Montreal, Sandwich, Toronto, and Windsor claimed the right to present addresses to the Prince of Wales expressive

¹Jason H. Silverman, *Unwelcome Guests: Canada West's Response to American Fugitive Slaves, 1800-1865* (Millwood, NY, 1985), 34-35, 62, 72-73, 109, 152, 161; Cecilia Morgan, *Public Men and Virtuous Women: Gendered Languages of Religion and Politics in Upper Canada, 1791-1850* (Toronto, 1996), 224-226; Robin W. Winks, *The Blacks in Canada: A History* (Kingston and Montreal, 1971), 149-153; Judith Fingard, "Race and Respectability in Victorian Halifax," *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 20, no. 2 (1992): 169, 172, 188-190; David A. Sutherland, "Race Relations in Halifax, Nova Scotia, During the Mid-Victorian Quest for Reform," *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association* 7 (1996): 41, 44, 46, 50.

²Pierre-Joseph-Oliver Chauvéau, *The Visit of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales to America: Reprinted from the Lower Canada Journal of Education, with an Appendix Containing Poems, Addresses, Letters, Etc.* (Montreal, 1860), 13; *Montreal Gazette*, 8 August 1860; *Globe*, 10 August 1860; Bonnie L. Huskins, "Public Celebrations in Victorian Saint John and Halifax" (Ph.D. diss., Dalhousie University, 1991), 196-197.

of their people's loyalty to the Crown. "As freemen," one former slave declared at a Toronto meeting, "we are willing to show all classes in this noble Province, that we will not be behind them in coming forward to show our Queen's Representative, the Prince of Wales, all the loyalty we can possibly bestow." Accordingly, members of the black community drew up addresses on behalf of all of the "subjects of African descent" resident in their respective towns and cities and, following published regulations, submitted them to the Governor General for approval. Each address reaffirmed the "devoted Loyalty and attachment to the throne" of the black community and expressed "admiration of the Christian and social virtues which so eminently adorn the personal character of our beloved Sovereign." What is more, each thanked the Queen for the protection she afforded fugitive slaves and for "the firm guarantee of Her Majesty's Government of liberty to all loyal subjects...." The address from the "colored Inhabitants of Lower Canada" went even further and proclaimed that "We have found Canada a Country before whose impartial laws we are raised from the almost brutal subjugation of beasts to the equal condition of human beings...for in this land, all are entitled alike to similar and equal protection from the law, which visits with no penalties the differences of race or color among men...." Indeed, under Her Majesty's beneficent rule "all colored men have rights which all white men are bound to respect equally with their own, for their rights are the same."³

³*Globe*, 11 August 1860; National Archives of Canada [hereafter NAC], Records of the Governor General Office [RG7], Miscellaneous records relating to royal visits and vice-regal tours [G23], vol. 1, file 1, H.J. Jones to R.J. Pennefather, 24 August 1860, Address to the Prince of Wales from the "Coloured Inhabitants" of Toronto (1860), Address to the Prince of Wales from the "subjects of African descent residing in the Western portion of Canada" (1860), Address to the Prince of Wales from the "colored subjects of the towns of Windsor and Sandwich" (1860), Address to the Prince of Wales from the "colored Inhabitants of Lower Canada" (1860).

The addresses asserted the loyalty of African Canadians, but also made it clear that it was a condition which was based upon the monarchy's protection of their civil rights through its upholding of the tenets of British justice and liberty. Presentation of an address to the Prince of Wales, therefore, could serve to remind whites that British liberty meant the equality of all citizens irrespective of ethnic background. It would also place the Prince in a position in which he would have to confirm not only the verity of the proposition, but the right of blacks to an equal place in the nation as well. As Mikhail Bakhtin explains, the "word in living conversation is directly, blatantly, oriented toward a future answer-word: it provokes an answer, anticipates it and structures itself in the answer's direction." The "answer-word," then, is framed by the original utterance and, while it is injected by the addressee's own meanings, it still must incorporate and respond to the original speaker's dialogue within the constraints of the "speech genre" being employed. Specifically, the speech genre of the royal address and reply consists of espousals of loyalty and observations from a segment of the public which are accepted, acknowledged, and reverbalised by the royal figure: a process which both enhances the community status of the presenters and legitimises their claims through the sanctioning of the "royal touch." To the members of a minority group, then, the presentation of an address to the Prince of Wales could prove to be a powerful symbolic tool in support of their claims for greater equality and national inclusion by fashioning the monarchy into a supporter and defender of their liberty.⁴

⁴Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M.M. Bakhtin*, ed. Michael Holquist, trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin, 1981), 280; Idem, *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*, ed. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, trans. Vern W. McGee (Austin, 1986), 69-99; David K. Danow, *The Thought of Mikhail Bakhtin: From Word to Culture* (New York, 1991), 13-17, 28-30; John E. Bodnar, *Remaking America: Public Memory*,

The African Canadian community, however, was denied the opportunity to present an address to the Prince of Wales since the Governor General's Office repeatedly rejected all of their requests. Considering their presence to be detrimental to the colony's progress, Sir Edmund Head had never supported the settlement of black people in Canada and, in fact, had advocated their large-scale migration to the West Indies. "Any diminution of their numbers here," he advised the Colonial Office in the late 1850s, "would be most beneficial to Canada." In excusing the rejection of their royal addresses, though, Sir Edmund Head's Secretary noted not the undesirability of blacks in settling in Canada, but, instead, pointed out that the Prince was "desirous to recognize no distinction of race among H.M. subjects residing in Canada" and wished "to view all British subjects residing in Canada in but one light—owing equal allegiance to the British Crown, and enjoying equally the privileges arising from such allegiance." Consequently, the Prince was advised "to decline to accept any address" which would present any race in "a separate and distinct light from the rest of the population."⁵ Yet, at the same time it was turning down addresses from the black community, the Governor General's Office was also accepting addresses from a number of other "separate and distinct" national societies, such as the St. George's Society, the St. Andrew's Society, and the St. Jean-Baptiste Society.

Commemoration, and Patriotism in the Twentieth Century (Princeton, 1992), 27, 35; Victoria R. Smith, "Constructing Victoria: The Representation of Queen Victoria in England, India, and Canada, 1897-1914" (Ph.D. diss., Rutgers University, 1998), 267-268, 290, 294.

⁵Fingard, "Race and Respectability in Victorian Halifax," 188-190; Ged Martin, "British Officials and their Attitudes to the Negro Community in Canada, 1833-1861," *Ontario History* 66, no. 2 (1974): 86-87; RG7/G23, vol. 1, file 1, R.J. Pennefather to A.R. Green, 8 September 1860 (copy), R.J. Pennefather to Saul Gale, 27 August 1860 (copy); RG7, Civil Secretary's Letterbooks [G17c], reel H-1205, vol. 17, R.J. Pennefather to H.J. Jones, 1 September 1860, R.J. Pennefather to William Butler, 5 September 1860, R.J. Pennefather to H.J. Jones, 8 September 1860.

Indeed, the Governor General's Secretary went so far as to assure the St. George's Society that "His Excellency will not fail" to ensure that its members would have an opportunity to present their address personally to the heir to the throne.⁶ It would seem, then, that the Governor General's Office was less interested in suppressing expressions of "separate and distinct" ethnic identities than in denying a visible role to ethnic groups which did not conform to the popularly accepted image of the nation. Despite the assurances of loyalty, emphasis on the equality of all British subjects, and, in a couple of cases, the exact same tone and content as that used in the addresses of some white associations, African Canadian addresses were excluded from the Tour's itinerary because the presenters were an unwelcome part of the overwhelmingly white colony. Lacking economic and political clout, a large population, and a long history of agitation in the colony (as was the case for Nova Scotian blacks) and disparaged by racial attitudes in the white community, African Canadians were dismissed and treated with contempt in mid-nineteenth century Canada. They were a visible Other who, whites believed, could not and should not be incorporated into the nation.⁷

Besides being demarcated in terms of class and gender, a cultural hegemony may also be delineated by ethnicity. A hegemonic bloc may include a single ethnic group, an alliance of several, or may be fragmented and challenged by competing ethnic identities. The dominant male middle class culture of nineteenth century Canada reflected these complexities as it maintained its hegemony over an uneasy alliance between distinct ethnic, and religious, groups. Composed

⁶RG7/G17c, reel H-1205, vol. 16, R.J. Pennefather to G. Cary, 30 July 1860, vol. 17, R.J. Pennefather to P. Bardy, 9 August 1860.

⁷Unlike the First Nations who, for reasons to be explained in Chapter VII, were permitted to meet the Prince during the Tour.

of several ethnic groups and further divided by religious affiliations, Canada could remain a cohesive unit only through the cooperation and integration of the main ethnic groups and religious sects. Even with the integration of English, Scottish, and Irish descendants into its ranks, English-speaking rule proved to be impossible without sharing power with the French middle class. Moreover, the Catholicism of French Canada and a significant segment of the Irish population, as well as the division of British Protestantism into Anglican, Methodist, Presbyterian, and Baptist denominations, necessitated the delicate balance and integration of religious interests into the maintenance of a male middle class hegemonic order. Hence, male middle class Canadians of British, Irish, and French descent and of Protestant and Catholic faith cooperated and collaborated in order to form and maintain an hegemony.⁸

Although diminished by class and gender interests, a common white skin colour, British, Irish, and French descent, and respectable Christianity, ethnic and religious tensions from both within and outside the hegemony nonetheless remained a constant threat to its survival. The assertion of ethnic and religious identities as against middle class interests, the challenge of "extremist" ethnic and religious bodies seeking cultural homogeneity and power, and the resistance of marginal groups: all of these pressures required constant negotiation and management in order to maintain a situation of ethnic and religious harmony. Social stability, the status quo, and, ultimately, the bloc's hegemony were based upon the image of unity in diversity, an image which found expression in the monarchy. The Crown provided a focal point for diverse ethnic and religious groups to come together in a common loyalty to an institution

⁸The term "British" is used here to denote people of English, Scottish, and Irish Protestant ancestry while, unless otherwise specified, "Irish" refers to Irish Catholics.

which, it was claimed, had permitted Catholics to have the same rights as Protestants and had protected the French language while maintaining the centrality of English. The representation of ethnic and religious unity around the figure of the monarch, then, comprised an important component in the process of achieving and maintaining social harmony, resisting homogenising interests, and asserting the cultural authority of the dominant ethnic and religious groups.

Thus, addresses were accepted during the Royal Tour of 1860 from moderate English, Scottish, Irish, and French societies, but not from subordinate ethnic groups such as African Canadians. Nor, as we shall see, were presentations accepted from "extremist" ethno-religious bodies like the Orange Order since recognition of their associations could offend one segment of the bloc and, thus, threaten the racial and religious harmony upon which the equilibrium of hegemony was maintained. The Royal Tour of 1860 and other royal celebrations during Queen Victoria's reign were designed to affirm and consolidate the hegemony of the dominant culture. This process necessitated both the exclusion of the subordinate, which by reason of racism, intolerance, and Otherness had no place in the image of the nation, and the delicate balance of ethnic and religious interests. The imagined Canadian nation was one where, under the influence of the monarchy, the Protestant, the Catholic, the English, and the French existed in a state of harmony—and dominance.

Ethnicity and Religion in Nineteenth Century Canada

Considered in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries as an inherited and fixed category, "race" was associated not only with differences in skin colour, but also with those characteristics which are today encompassed in the term ethnicity. Now regarded as a social

construct, an ethnic group is a cultural collectivity which emphasises shared historical memories, a myth of common ancestry (a sense of "whence we came" to define "who we are"), an association with a specific "homeland," and one or more differentiating elements of a common culture such as a shared language, religion, customs, and/or institutions. Produced in historical contexts of experience, these shared attributes provide a sense of solidarity for a segment of the population which identifies itself as a distinctive ethnic community. Even though a dominant ethnic community frequently shapes the character of a nation, most states are multiethnic which often requires the incorporation—sometimes by coercion, sometimes by negotiation—of other ethnic groups into the state and nation.⁹ Consisting of several large and distinct ethnic communities, Canada reflected this situation. Although the 1871 census classified 61% of Canadians as being of "British" origin, this figure included people of Irish descent of whom many (33.6% of the Irish population in Ontario) were Catholic. Indeed, 41.5% of the Canadian population was Catholic in 1871 (only marginally decreasing to 39% by 1911) with French Canadians forming nearly 31% of the total population (28.5% by 1911). Irish, English, and Scottish Protestants together may have totalled a greater proportion of the population than French Canadians and Catholics, but they, too, were further divided by different faiths, most significantly Methodism, Presbyterianism, Anglicanism, and Baptism.¹⁰ Hegemonic control by a single ethnic and/or religious group, then, proved to be impossible in nineteenth century

⁹Werner Sollors, *The Invention of Ethnicity* (New York, 1989), xiii-xv, 4; Anthony D. Smith, *National Identity* (Reno, 1991), 20-42; Idem, *The Ethnic Origins of Nations* (Oxford, 1986).

¹⁰Canada, *Census of Canada*, 1871, 1911; Donald Harman Akenson, *The Irish in Ontario: A Study in Rural History* (Kingston and Montreal, 1984), 43.

Canada. Alliances had to be made and, moreover, shared national symbols formed to bridge the ethnic and religious divide.

The lack of cultural uniformity underscored the need for consensus in the Canadian national state if it was to maintain its legitimacy and social cohesion. Unable to forge cultural homogeneity, emphasis instead came to be laid upon the concept of unity in diversity. A consensus would not be established through cultural conformity, but through liberty and religious freedom granted by the unifying force and symbolism of the monarchy. The Canadian nation-state became defined as a union between two distinct peoples—French and English—who were bound together by a common loyalty to the monarchy. Reconciling ethnic and religious diversity within a multiethnic state, the monarchy served as a common national symbol which, it was argued, could transcend the divisions of race and religion between French and English Canadians and between Catholics and Protestants.¹¹ Yet, while the monarchy would be a common point of agreement among the majority of the French, English, Catholic, and Protestant élite, the manner in which they interpreted their—and each other's—loyalty to the monarch differed significantly.

The loyalty of British Canadian Protestants—the majority of the upper and middle classes outside of Quebec—to the Crown has been amply described in the preceding chapters. English, Scottish, and Irish Protestants maintained a faith in the primacy of British institutions in Canada and an abiding loyalty to the Mother Country and the Empire. In part a class and gender

¹¹ Allan Smith, *Canada—An American Nation?: Essays on Continentalism, Identity, and the Canadian Frame of Mind* (Kingston and Montreal, 1994), 129-154; John S. Ellis, "Reconciling the Celt: British National Identity, Empire, and the 1911 Investiture of the Prince of Wales," *Journal of British Studies* 37, no. 4 (1998): 391-418.

expression and an assertion of continuing ethnic ties with Britain, the Protestant character of the monarchy also bolstered the royalism of Canadian Protestants. Serving both as the Head of the Church of England and the "Defender of the Faith," the British monarch came to be viewed and portrayed by many as an exemplar of Protestantism. As demonstrated in Part One, middle class values and goals were based upon contemporary definitions of Protestant morality. Much as professionals and businessmen had done, Protestant clergy and laity had upheld the King and Queen as paragons of Christian morality and probity in sermons, lectures, and articles commemorating royal events. Faith in God and regular church attendance, for example, were offered as the reasons for the strength of Queen Victoria's virtues. "Wherein lay the secret of the success which has been so steadily maintained in that long and noble life?" queried Rev. W.H. Wade of the Church of the Ascension, Hamilton. "It lay in the fact that she was trained from her earliest days to acknowledge and serve Almighty God, by whom kings reign and princes decree justice. And so, for sixty-three years her name has stood as a standard for all that means the giving and upholding of liberty to mankind, the maintenance of peace and happiness, truth and justice, religion and piety." Likewise, the Baptist Rev. J.L. Gilmour concluded that "out of this faith [for the Lord Jesus Christ] grew that sanctified affection, that amiability, and that humility that are said to have characterized her." Indeed, the largest Protestant denominations in nineteenth century Canada developed "an informal Protestant alliance" central to which was a shared common outlook on basic social issues and an abiding loyalty to the monarchy upon which they transfixed their morality.¹² Anglican, Presbyterian, Methodist, and Baptist

¹²W.H. Miln, ed., *Eulogies on Queen Victoria, Delivered by the Prominent Ministers of Canada on Her Majesty's Funeral Day, Feb. 2, 1901* (Toronto, 1901); Henry Roe, *Sermon Preached at St. George's Church, Lennoxville, Quebec on June 21, 1887, the Day Appointed*

representations of the monarchy differed little from one another and only when challenged by issues of precedence during royal ceremonies. For example, as some members of the middle class had attempted to assert a superior social status above their bourgeois colleagues, so too had the Anglican clergy tried to exploit the Royal Tour of 1860 in order to establish their Church as the preeminent religious organisation in British North America. As we shall see, however, Anglican leaders would receive a stiff rebuke from the other Protestant denominations as Presbyterians, Methodists, and Baptists sought to protect the equality between, and thus the shared hegemony of, the members of the "Protestant alliance."

More divisive among British Canadian Protestants, and a more serious threat to the preservation of national unity, was the presence of a large French and Irish Catholic population. Although liberal members of the French and Irish Catholic bourgeoisie held a class- and gender-based world view similar to that of the British Protestant middle class, French language rights and full religious equality remained points of contention between and among Francophones, Anglophones, Catholics, and Protestants. Fear of French domination and anti-Catholic sentiments were commonly expressed feelings in Victorian Canada and led many British Protestants to distrust and, in some cases, to vilify their fellow colonists of French ancestry and Catholic faith. The Act of Union (1840-1) which had united the less populated, predominately English-speaking and Protestant Upper Canadian province with the mostly French and Catholic

for the Observance of the Queen's Jubilee (Sherbrooke, 1887); *Ottawa Citizen*, 22 June 1887; Church of England, *Diamond Jubilee Thanksgiving Service, June 20, 1897* (Toronto, 1897); John Coulter and John A. Cooper, eds., *Queen Victoria: Her Gracious Life and Glorious Reign* (Guelph, 1901), 69-70; William Westfall, *Two Worlds: The Protestant Culture of Nineteenth Century Ontario* (Kingston and Montreal, 1989), 11, 83, 128; John Webster Grant, *A Profusion of Spires: Religion in Nineteenth Century Ontario* (Toronto, 1988).

colony of Lower Canada had, despite an equal division of seats in the colonial legislature, increased concerns among British Protestants of being subsumed by a population whose loyalty to the Crown seemed dubious at best in the aftermath of the 1837 Rebellion. The Rebellion Losses Bill (1849) which provided compensation for Lower Canadians, including rebels, whose property had been damaged during the Rebellion, state funding of Catholic separate schools, and official recognition of the French language convinced many of the reality, or at least the threat, of French and Catholic domination. The massive influx of immigrants into Canada West during the 1840s and 1850s which increased its population over that of Canada East only served to accentuate and further politicise the situation as, by mid-century, the anti-Catholic Loyal Orange Order would attain its largest membership numbers and the Clear Grits would sweep the majority of seats in Canada West on a platform calling for "Rep by Pop" to end French Catholic domination and publicly-funded separate schools.¹³

Political events and demographic factors alone did not account for the animosity felt by British Protestants towards French Canadians and Irish Catholics. The force of their anti-Catholic feelings was based upon theological differences which, while not always necessarily articulated or understood, had nonetheless contributed to the development of popular prejudices. The Catholic Church's veneration of saints and relics, adoration of the Virgin Mary, and belief in transubstantiation were offered as evidence of idolatry in an empirical age; its practices of absolution, penance, and indulgences were regarded as immoral and antisocial; and its history of persecution and central control from Rome under an "infallible" Pope held to demonstrate that

¹³Gordon T. Stewart, *The Origins of Canadian Politics: A Comparative Approach* (Vancouver, 1986), 59-64; J.R. Miller, "Anti-Catholic Thought in Victorian Canada," *Canadian Historical Review* 66, no. 4 (1985): 474-494.

the Church was intolerant, tyrannous, and not to be trusted. As adherents to such flawed doctrines and as supporters of an inherently corrupt institution, Catholics were perceived to be unprogressive, ignorant, immoral, and corrupt in all of their actions.¹⁴ Under such circumstances, many British Protestants believed, they were plainly Other and alliance with them was impossible.

Yet if national stability and unity were to be achieved and a new middle class hegemony asserted and sustained in mid-nineteenth century Canada, the ethnic and religious differences between the French and Irish Catholic elite and the British Protestant middle class would have to be minimised and overcome. Early on in his career, John A. Macdonald recognised this and concluded that "No man in his senses can suppose that this country can for a century to come be governed by a totally unfrenchified government. If a Lower Canadian British [*sic*] desires to conquer he must 'stoop to conquer.' He must make friends with the French, without sacrificing the status of his race or language, he must respect their nationality. Treat them as a nation and they will act as a free people generally do—generously."¹⁵ Macdonald was far from alone in this opinion. In the aftermath of the 1837 Rebellions a number of Governors General had sought to use the Crown's influence to inspire loyalty in French Canadians. With increased honours to French Canadians, granting equality of precedence between the Roman Catholic and Protestant hierarchies, and other gestures, Sir Charles Metcalfe, Sir Charles Bagot, Earl Elgin, and Viscount Monck increased the status of French culture and the Catholic Church in British North America

¹⁴J.R. Miller, "Anti-Catholic Thought in Victorian Canada"; D.G. Paz, *Popular Anti-Catholicism in Mid-Victorian England* (Stanford, 1992).

¹⁵John A. Macdonald quoted in Donald Creighton, *John A. Macdonald. Volume One: The Young Politician* (Toronto, 1952), 227.

and, in doing so, propagated an image of monarchical protection of French and Catholic rights.¹⁶ Also, in order to soothe sectarian feelings among British Protestants, the state emphasised the common unity and equality Catholics and Protestants shared under the beneficent rule of the monarchy. As Viscount Monck told a gathering of Orangemen in Kingston in 1862, "I sincerely trust that no exhibition of party, personal, or sectarian feeling, will be permitted to mar so fair a spectacle as that of a people composed of different races and professing different religions, but bound together by a common sentiment of loyal affection to their Sovereign and attachment to the Institutions of the Empire."¹⁷ Several British Protestant writers, too, attempted to assure their more militant and suspicious members of the loyalty of French Canadians and Irish Catholics to the British monarchy and the Empire. Drawing upon the work of the American historian Francis Parkman, they argued that French Canadians appreciated the freedom and liberty granted to them by the British Sovereign which had been denied to them under French rule. Indeed, it was observed on the occasion of Queen Victoria's death that "Probably in no part of the British Empire was more genuine sorrow manifested at the death of Queen Victoria than in the French Canadian province of Quebec, where the boon of constitutional self-government...was accorded during the early years of the late sovereign's reign."¹⁸ Social stability

¹⁶Jacques Monet, *The Last Canon Shot: A Study of French-Canadian Nationalism, 1837-1850* (Toronto, 1969).

¹⁷NAC, 4th Viscount Monck Papers, MG27 I B1, vol. 3, Reply to the Orangemen of Kingston, 7 October 1862.

¹⁸R.G. Moyles and Doug Owram, *Imperial Dreams and Colonial Realities: British Views of Canada, 1880-1914* (Toronto, 1988), 94-95; Carl Berger, *The Sense of Power: Studies in the Ideas of Canadian Imperialism, 1867-1914* (Toronto, 1970), 137-139; Coulter and Cooper, *Queen Victoria*, 201-202.

and the survival of the Canadian state depended upon the minimisation of ethnic cleavages and religious dissension. To this end, the middle class hegemonic bloc attempted to placate wary British Protestants as the state accommodated the Catholic Church in Canada and it tried to incorporate members from the French and Irish Catholic bourgeoisie.

By the mid-nineteenth century, loyalty to the British Sovereign had already been well-established among the majority of French Catholic clergy. Recognising that their privileges, status, and the survival of their Church depended upon collaboration with the British Crown, the Catholic clergy threw its support behind the new administration soon after the Conquest. In return for the Church's collaboration, British authorities protected, and some argue even elevated, the status of the French Catholic clergy. Yet, the Church's support of the British monarchy was not entirely due to reasons of self-interest; it derived also from ideological considerations. Conservative in outlook, most of the French Catholic clergy believed in respect for the social order which, they argued, had been ordained by God. While God had ultimate authority, He had given divine sanction to the rule of kings and, on the occasion of the Conquest, had ordained the exchange of one monarch for another. Accordingly, any rejection of the British monarchy was equally a rejection of God's will. Explaining the clerical reaction to the 1837-38 Rebellion in Lower Canada, Denis Monière points out that they believed that "a Catholic's duty to the established civil power was a matter of religion and not of politics. Therefore, the Catholic's duty was to obey."¹⁹

¹⁹Denis Monière, *Ideologies in Quebec: The Historical Development*, transl. Richard Howard (Toronto, 1981), 65-66, 108; Séraphin Marion, "L'Episcopat québécois et la Couronne britannique," *Les cahiers des dix* 32 (1967): 37-82; Paul-André Linteau, René Durocher, and Jean-Claude Robert, *Quebec: A History, 1867-1929*, trans. Robert Chodos (Toronto, 1983), 233, 271, 277.

The rise of ultramontanist in the latter half of the nineteenth century only served to reinforce the French Catholic clergy's support of the monarchy. A reaction to secularisation, liberalism, and increased democracy, ultramontanist stressed the importance of social order, tradition, and, most of all, the supremacy of the Pope and the Catholic Church. Unlike most British Protestants who upheld the monarchy as the supreme and central entity, ultramontanists believed that their Church had ultimate authority in all aspects of life and that it was to serve as the main source of social unity. The monarchy, as an institution established by God, received respect and loyalty, but only insofar as it remained respectful of the Church. If the Crown ever infringed upon the authority of the Church, ultramontanists believed that they had not only the right, but the duty to resist. Yet, resistance rarely translated into support for the establishment of an independent Quebec republic. Indeed, the republican example of France was anathema to the Quebec clergy. In its efforts to secularise the state, Republican France had stripped the Catholic Church of many of its responsibilities and privileges and, in doing so, had equated republicanism with secularism in the minds of many Catholics. Meanwhile, the British Crown's protection of the Catholic Church and the precedence accorded to its clergy in Canada had equated the Church's well-being with that of the monarchy. Without the monarchy to protect it, the status of the Roman Catholic Church in Quebec would be endangered and, thus, the French Canadian people themselves threatened without the Church to defend their culture.²⁰

While some members of the French Canadian bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie adopted

²⁰Monière, *Ideologies in Quebec*, 136-143; Susan Mann Trofimenkoff, *The Dream of Nation: A Social and Intellectual History of Quebec* (Toronto, 1983), 116, 120-121, 130; Linteau, Durocher, and Robert, *Quebec: A History, 1867-1929*, 233, 271, 277; H.V. Nelles, *The Art of Nation-Building: Pageantry and Spectacle at Quebec's Tercentenary* (Toronto, 1999), 103-107.

radical liberalism and its anticlericalism, they constituted a minority both within Quebec society and the classes they belonged.²¹ The majority of the bourgeoisie were liberals insofar that they supported responsible government, colonial autonomy in internal affairs, and the principles of economic liberalism, but otherwise they were social and political conservatives who supported both the Catholic Church and the British monarchy. Like the French Catholic clergy, mid-century bourgeois such as George-Étienne Cartier, E.P. Taché, and Étienne Parent believed that the British monarchy was a more effective system than republicanism in protecting the French language, defending the Church, and increasing their wealth and status in society while maintaining social order. In common with the British Protestant middle class, the French élite thought that the monarchical system helped to preserve property and a "proper" gradation of classes and that association with royal persons and the reception of royal honours provided them status and influence. Indeed, Anglophilism became a marker of respectability among the French Canadian bourgeoisie as they sought legitimacy by adopting British values, styles, titles, and loyalty. "Threatened by French, American, and native radicalism," Brian Young argues, "they used 'Britishness' to control their adversaries and to guarantee their social position." By the turn of the century, the character of imperial sentiment among British Protestants, which included support of Canadian involvement in the defence of the Empire, and the growing prevalence of British liberal values among the French Canadian élite had increased their sentiment for complete Canadian autonomy and independence, but, still, they wished to remain a part of the Empire. Wilfrid Laurier, Henri Bourassa, and Albert Sévigny, for example, may have shared different ideas on Canadian independence, but they all remained supportive of Canadian inclusion in the

²¹Monière, *Ideologies in Quebec*, 132-134.

Empire under the British Crown. The monarchy, they believed, provided French Canadians and Catholics with equal rights, justice, liberty, and fairness in a parliamentary system while, at the same time, continuing to protect private property and social order.²²

The monarchy, then, served as a tenuous unifying force between British Protestants and the French Canadian Catholic clergy and bourgeoisie. Irish Catholics, however, were a different case than their French co-religionists. At mid-century, Irish Catholic identity in Canada was a strongly felt sentiment which was forged neither by language nor by a large population in one province, but by the maintenance of strong ties to Ireland by immigrant families, a common sense of alienation arising out of a history of subjugation, impoverishment, and discrimination in Ireland, and growing sectarian conflict in Canada West with Protestant militants who regarded Irish Catholics as "an alien threat" to the vision of a "thoroughly British and Protestant colony." A besieged minority, Irish Catholics in Canada West established a number of benevolent societies and voluntary associations, such as the St. Patrick's Society and the Hibernian Benevolent Society, with which they protected their neighbourhoods from Orange vandals, defended Catholic rights in the province, and protested against the British government's policies in Ireland. Nonetheless, despite their opposition towards British rule in Ireland and hostile reception by

²²Stéphane Kelly, *La petite loterie: Comment la Couronne a obtenu la collaboration du Canada français après 1837* (Montreal, 1997), 16-17, 24, 174-175, 198-208; Linteau, Durocher, and Robert, *Quebec: A History, 1867-1929*, 270, 279; Monière, *Ideologies in Quebec*, 130-134; Bruce W. Hodgins, "The Attitudes of the Canadian Founders toward Britain and the British Connection: A Personal Re-examination," in *Imperial Canada, 1867-1917: A Selection of Papers Given at the University of Edinburgh's Centre of Canadian Studies Conference - May 1995*, ed. Colin M. Coates (Edinburgh, 1997), 26; Brian Young, *George-Étienne Cartier: Montreal Bourgeois* (Kingston and Montreal, 1981), 45-48; Nelles, *The Art of Nation-Building*; Réal Bélanger, "L'élite politique canadienne-française et l'Empire britannique: trois reflets représentatifs des perceptions canadiennes-françaises (1890-1917)," in *Imperial Canada, 1867-1917*, ed. Coates, 122-140.

Protestant extremists in Canada, most Irish Catholics accepted assimilation into English Canadian society. Certainly some supported the Fenian Brotherhood and republicanism, but, as in Australia, the majority of Irish Catholics who had immigrated to Canada sought to improve their social and economic condition and, as such, did not want to jeopardise their opportunity for advancement by seeming disloyal to the Crown. By being loyal to Queen and country, Irish Catholic Canadians felt that they could break the "stigma of disloyalty" and eventually gain acceptance in their new home as Canadians. As bishop (1859-70) and archbishop (1870-88) of Toronto, John Lynch impressed this upon the Irish Catholic community. Although spearheading petitions to Queen Victoria in favour of Home Rule and protesting the British government's Irish policies to such an extent that he refused to allow the ringing of the church bells to mark the Queen's Golden Jubilee, Lynch's vision, Roberto Perin points out, "was predicated on assimilation." For Irish Catholics to be accepted and gain admittance in Canadian society, they must blend into it. Certainly, as the example of John Lynch demonstrates, a distinct ethnic identity was an important part of Irish Catholic life in nineteenth century Canada, but by the First World War the gradual process of assimilation and the birth of the children and grandchildren of Irish immigrants would sharply shift the community's primary focus of loyalty from Ireland to Canada and the Empire.²³

²³Brian P. Clarke, *Piety and Nationalism: Lay Voluntary Associations and the Creation of an Irish-Catholic Community in Toronto, 1850-1895* (Kingston and Montreal, 1993), 42-44, 152, 154, 162, 176-178, 184; Mark McKenna, *The Captive Republic: A History of Republicanism in Australia, 1788-1996* (Cambridge, 1996), 210-212; Mark McGowan, "The De-greening of the Irish: Toronto's Irish-Catholic Press, Imperialism, and the Forging of a New Identity, 1887-1914," *Historical Papers of the Canadian Historical Association* (1989): 118-145; Roberto Perin, *Rome in Canada: The Vatican and Canadian Affairs in the Late Victorian Age* (Toronto, 1990), 19-22.

Accordingly to Raymond Breton, "Individuals expect to recognize themselves in public institutions. They expect a certain degree of consistency between their private identities and the symbolic contents upheld by public authorities, which are embedded in the societal institutions and celebrated in public events." If social groups, however, feel that they are inadequately recognised within the symbolic system, it may become a source of alienation and, thus, a motivation for them to undermine the legitimacy of state institutions.²⁴ The reconciliation of social groups other than the largest and most powerful with the state's national symbols, then, is a requisite for state survival and the maintenance of a cultural hegemony in a multiethnic and religiously diverse state. Although primarily settled by British Protestants, nineteenth century Canada included large French and Irish Catholic communities holding distinct identities and cultural concerns which were often in conflict with the beliefs and desires of the dominant culture. Nonetheless, actual and symbolic inclusion of the large minorities into the state and cross-cultural collaboration in a middle class hegemony was attempted by both the state and the dominant culture to defuse ethnic and religious tensions. In this process, the monarchy was offered as the basis for cross-cultural unity as the Sovereign was presented as a symbol of Canadian unity in diversity. During the Royal Tour of 1860, Queen Victoria's Jubilees, and the Queen's Memorial Services, British Protestants, French Canadians, and Irish Catholics articulated and negotiated representations of themselves, each other, and the monarchy in order to claim and reaffirm their status, protect their rights, and maintain a balance of power. As we shall see, conflicts over representations and royal precedence would be common themes in royal

²⁴Raymond Breton, "Multiculturalism and Canadian Nation-Building," in *The Politics of Gender, Ethnicity, and Language in Canada*, eds. Alan Cairns and Cynthia Williams (Toronto, 1986), 31-32.

ceremonies between and among these ethnic and religious groups, but, nevertheless, the image of Canada and the Empire as “a collection of distinct and diverse peoples who were bound together through their loyalty to the Monarch and their service to the empire” remained the linchpin in the multiethnic and religiously diverse state.²⁵

Religious Precedence and the Royal Tour of 1860

The first stage of the Royal Tour of 1860 seemed to support the idea of a culturally diverse British North American community united by royal allegiance. Little evidence of ethnic or religious discord among the major groups could be seen in Newfoundland and the Maritimes and, in fact, the Prince of Wales' visit to Newfoundland was offered as proof of the pervasiveness of racial and religious harmony in the region. According to the Duke of Newcastle's Private Secretary, “the unanimity, spontaneity, and earnestness of the people [in St. John's] were so remarkable, that one was tempted to fancy such a state of things must be perennial, and that rancour and religious animosity and bitter party spirit could scarcely exist in this the oldest of Her Majesty's colonial possessions.” Indeed, the correspondent for the *London Times* observed that “So perfect is this concord [between Protestants and Catholics] that when, after landing, each body presented an address to His Royal Highness, both at once consented to be included in a joint reply—perhaps the first instance of the kind on record.” The suggestion for a joint reply to the Anglican and Catholic clergy came from Newcastle who thought that it would be to “the benefit of religious peace in this place where at one time it was little known though of late improving.” As he told the Queen, “The Roman Catholics form a considerable

²⁵Ellis, “Reconciling the Celt,” 406.

majority of the population of St. John's and anything which can indicate the duty of religious peace in their community is very proper and desirable." Hence, in the joint reply penned by Newcastle, the Prince thanked both Anglican and Catholic clergy for their loyal assurances and added that the maintenance of "religious peace and harmony" in the colony "shall be my constant prayer."²⁶ Continuing to cultivate a spirit of religious harmony by equally recognising the status of both Churches, the Prince paid, first, a private visit to the Anglican cathedral and, then, a short inspection of the Roman Catholic cathedral; a visit which, it was said, was taken as "a deep source of pleasure to the Roman Catholics."²⁷

Although a High Church man, the 5th Duke of Newcastle's political career had been marked by strong support for religious liberalism and an equally vigorous condemnation of religious intolerance. Due to his steadfast support of an increase to the Maynooth College Grant in 1845, for example, he incurred the wrath of Orangemen and Dissenting ministers who denounced him on "the pains of Hell" for acting as a "Friend of the Papists." He refused, however, to waver on his principles "in deference to their love of Papist-burning."²⁸ The same firm resolve characterised the Duke's direction of the Royal Tour. As the events in

²⁶Gardner D. Engelheart, *Journal of Progress of H.R.H. The Prince of Wales Through British North America, and His Visit to the United States, July 10 to November 15, 1860* (London, 1860), 9; N.A. Woods, *The Prince of Wales in Canada and the United States* (London, 1861), 9-10; NAC, 5th Duke of Newcastle Papers, MG24 A34, reel A-1610, Journal of the Tour of 1860, 24 July 1860; reel A-307, vol. D, pp. 13-18, Duke of Newcastle to Queen Victoria, 25 July 1860; 5th Duke of Newcastle, ed., *Addresses Presented to H.R.H. The Prince of Wales During His State Visit to British North America, with the Replies Thereto, July, August and September 1860* (London, 1860), 8.

²⁷Woods, *The Prince of Wales in Canada and the United States*, 10.

²⁸F. Darrell Munsell, *The Unfortunate Duke: Henry Pelham, Fifth Duke of Newcastle, 1811-1864* (Columbia, 1985), 285, 51-53, 91-92.

Newfoundland demonstrate, he was sensitive to the history of racial and religious animosity in the British North American colonies and tried to reconcile Protestants with Catholics. The situation in the Canadas, however, proved more problematic. In Canada East, he informed the British Prime Minister, "Contending religions and religious sects have caused many difficulties as to addresses and the answers, and many other objects of strife."²⁹ The problem was not one of disloyalty, but of precedence in a religiously heterogeneous community. Notwithstanding an informal Protestant alliance and attempts by a segment of the bourgeoisie to downplay religious divisions, Anglican clergy tried to assert their cultural ascendancy in the colony by setting themselves apart and above other denominations. Meanwhile, Catholics vied for equal recognition and other Protestant denominations challenged the precedence of both churches. Never absolute, hegemony is a process which involves constant negotiation and, as the circumstances of Royal Tour of 1860 in Canada attest, royal ceremonies comprised a significant site in which Protestants and Catholics asserted and challenged the basis of a cross-cultural hegemony.

Although no denomination had been established as a state church in the colony, some leading members of the Church of England had long maintained a belief in their Church's preeminence in British North America. The 1791 Constitutional Act's provision of land reserves in support of "the Protestant" (Anglican) clergy had lent some credence to their claim, but opposition from other Protestant denominations, eventually leading to the secularisation of the reserves in 1854, and the corresponding growth of these faiths had reduced the authority of the

²⁹Newcastle Papers, reel A-307, vol. C1, pp. 140-145, Duke of Newcastle to Lord Palmerston, 2 September 1860.

Anglican Church by the mid-nineteenth century. Notwithstanding increased agreement amongst Anglican and other Protestant clergy in the aftermath of the clergy reserves controversy, Anglican bishops continued to harbour dreams of cultural ascendancy. For George Mountain, the Bishop of Quebec, the visit of the Prince of Wales conjured up ideas of how to best use the occasion to the benefit of the Church of England in Canada. "It must be desirable," he told John Strachan, the Bishop of Toronto, "that we should [try] to produce the best *effect* & to give the most favorable impression respecting the *status* & the strength of the Church of England in the Province" during the Prince's visit. To this end, Mountain proposed that a joint address from the four provincial dioceses be presented to the Prince of Wales in Montreal instead of separately in each See. The effect of having all of the bishops and a large number of clergy on hand in Montreal would increase the effect of the presentation and, thus, the prominence of the Church in the colony. Both Strachan and the Bishop of Huron agreed that Mountain's plan would be "more imposing" than a presentation "of each Diocese by itself." "An opportunity is now afforded us," the Bishop of Huron commented, "of setting forth our true position as a part of the United Church of England & Ireland and of giving expression to our firm resolve to uphold the Supremacy of the Crown in Canada." In consultation with John Hillyard Cameron, a prominent lay member of the Toronto Synod, Strachan suggested "a slight but nevertheless...important modification" to Mountain's proposal. Since the secularisation of both the clergy reserves and the education system had increased the Church's dependence upon the financial support of the laity and considering that the laity had been recently authorised to serve on the Synod, Strachan and Cameron felt that it would not "be advisable to ignore the Laity" on this occasion. Therefore, they proposed that the joint address be presented by the bishops, clergy, *and* laity of

the four dioceses. The suggestion, however, proved insufficient for the majority of the laity. Reflecting its increased power in the Church of England's affairs in the diocese, the Synod of Toronto rejected any proposal which would seem to diminish its, and its members', influence. Delegates preferred to present their own address, with all of their members present, in their own city with as many local laity on hand as possible. A merged address in Montreal presented by four bishops would not only increase the prominence of the bishops, but also lessen the presence of the laity who would not be able to travel to Montreal in great numbers. Finding the Synod's delegates almost "unanimous" in its position, Strachan was forced to acquiesce.³⁰

The addresses from the bishop, clergy, and laity of each diocese, then, were presented separately in each city, but the bishops were still able to assert both the Church of England's and their own personal prominence in Canada. While the words used in the addresses were not unlike other civic and denominational tracts pledging loyalty, the Anglican bishops were granted precedence before all other denominations in presentation of not only addresses but, at receptions, themselves as well. In setting out the order of precedence, the Duke of Newcastle applied Britain's policy to the colonies. Citing the Queen's Letters Patent, the Colonial Secretary pointed out that the "Prelates of the National Church" should "take precedence of any Episcopate not deriving its rank from any such Letters Patent...." Accordingly, bishops of the Church of England were to take precedence over all prelates of the Roman Catholic Church who

³⁰Archives of Ontario [hereafter AO], John Strachan Papers, MS 35 R7, Bishop of Quebec to John Strachan, 26 May 1860, Bishop of Huron to John Strachan, 4 June 1860, John Strachan to Bishop of Huron, 2 June 1860, J.H. Cameron to John Strachan, 1 June 1860; MS 35 R13, Letterbook 9, p. 332, John Strachan to Bishops of Montreal and Quebec, 18 June 1860; Curtis Fahey, *In His Name: The Anglican Experience in Upper Canada, 1791-1854* (Ottawa, 1991).

were ranked by the Vatican.³¹ As Canada did not have a "National Church," however, the assignment of precedence to Anglican bishops and clergy disturbed the Roman Catholic hierarchy in Quebec where Catholics comprised the overwhelming majority of the population. The Mayor of Quebec also felt as though precedence should be accorded, first, to the Roman Catholic bishop and clergy and, then, to the Church of England and made motions of arranging the reception *cortège* accordingly. Bishop Mountain, however, refused to submit to a position of inferiority especially since Anglican bishops in the other colonies had been given precedence over Catholics. Threatening to boycott the ceremony if the arrangements were not reversed, at length Mountain was placed at the front of the *cortège*, but without his clergy. In yielding his position, the Roman Catholic bishop of Quebec did so on the condition that no Anglican clergy would go with Mountain and before the Catholic clergy. Yet, the ceremony still did not run smoothly: Bishop Mountain was the only Anglican representative on hand during the reception since his clergy preferred to absent themselves rather than accept a place behind their Catholic counterparts.³²

Such problems of precedence between Catholics and Anglicans plagued the Tour throughout the Canadas. In Hamilton, the Roman Catholic bishop and his clergy refused to participate in the procession when no particular position was assigned to them. In Quebec, too, the Catholic bishops declined to attend the state dinner in protest over the Prince's reply to their

³¹RG7, Despatches from the Colonial Office [G1], reel C-15620, vol. 7, Circular from Duke of Newcastle, 3 May 1860; NAC, Colonial Office Records [MG11], New Brunswick, entry books [CO189], reel B-2330, vol. 20, Duke of Newcastle to J.H. Manners-Sutton, 6 July 1860.

³²*Montreal Gazette*, 20 August 1860; Woods, *The Prince of Wales in Canada and the United States*, 90-92.

address the day before. Upon receiving their address at Laval University, the Prince did not address the bishops by any title, such as "My Lords," but commenced at once by saying "I accept with the greatest satisfaction the welcome you offer...." Taking offence at the omission of their "legal title," the hierarchy complained and asked for an explanation to what they would otherwise regard as "an intentional affront." The Duke of Newcastle noted that such a supposition was ridiculous and, pointing out that no titles had been used in replying to the Protestant and Catholic clergy of Newfoundland, he stated that the same rule would be applied in the replies to all addresses from clergy regardless of denomination. As the Duke would not "give a promise" that he would not let any titles be used in future replies to addresses from religious bodies, the hierarchy had to be content with his impartiality. Clearly, as demonstrated by their absence from the state dinner, many were not satisfied and the idea of "'an intentional affront' appeared to rankle in some minds."³³

The disputes over precedence during the Royal Tour reflected and played a part in a wider hegemonic struggle between Anglicans and Catholics in the Canadas. As the prelates of the Church of England attempted to assert their primacy in the religious affairs of the colony through royal recognition, the French Catholic clergy resisted Anglican claims by trying to force their way to the front of the order of precedence in the overwhelmingly Catholic province of Canada East. In addition, the French Catholic clergy did its utmost to demonstrate its loyalty to the monarchy by giving an impressive welcome to the Prince of Wales. In Quebec City, Roman Catholic churches, the bishop's palace, Laval University, and the Convent of the

³³Kinahan Cornwallis, *Royalty in the New World; or, The Prince of Wales in America* (London, 1860), 156, 253; Woods, *The Prince of Wales in Canada and the United States*, 105-106.

Ursulines were all decorated with transparencies, illuminations, and banners containing words of loyal devotion such as "Vive le Prince." Likewise, the Roman Catholic Bishop of Montreal had the local cathedral festooned with decorations and ordered that all of "les cloches de nos diverses Eglises sonneront toutes ensemble, en signe de joie, pour l'heureuse arrivée au milieu de nous de Son Altesse Royale le Prince de Galles." With such acts of "réjouissance publique," the ultramontane paper *L'Ordre* declared, French Canadians wished to honour the eldest son of "notre Reine" and "notre futur Roi" and show him that "tous les bons catholiques sont partout de bons sujets."³⁴

Addresses from the Catholic bishops of Canada, Laval's clerical teachers, and the nuns of the Ursulines further articulated the loyalty of French Catholics to the Crown. Reaffirming the Roman Catholic belief in the ultimate authority of God, each group assured the Prince that it was by His will that French Catholics had been placed under the beneficent rule of the British Sovereign and that, therefore, "entire submission" was due to the "legitimate authority" they had been placed under and to which they had "been committed by Divine Providence." Moreover, making it clear that their loyalty was a condition which was based upon the monarch's protection of their Church, the bishops reminded their fellow Canadians that "We are happy in giving your Royal Highness the assurance that the Catholics of this Colony partake of our sentiments of gratitude to Divine Providence for the many advantages which they possess under the protection of the British Government, especially as regards the free exercise of their religion." Similarly, the members of Laval University noted that their institution had been honoured by the Queen's

³⁴*Montreal Gazette*, 10 August, 21 August 1860; *La Minerve*, 21 August 1860; *L'Ordre*, 20 August 1860.

royal protection and served as a lasting monument “of the desire of Her Majesty to provide for the happiness of all Her subjects....” “We place our trust,” they announced, “in the protection and justice of that August Queen to whom we are indebted for so signal a mark of benevolence.” The Ursulines expressed their appreciation of royal protection by not only saying prayers of blessing on the Prince’s future career, but by extending an invitation to the heir to the throne to enter their convent: a privilege, established under French rule, which was only reserved for the Sovereign and his or her representatives.³⁵

As Anglicans and Catholics vied for the attention of the Prince, and the legitimisation of status that such recognition could bestow, other denominations were largely ignored during the Tour. Methodists, Baptists, Lutherans, Unitarians, Wesleyans, and, occasionally, Presbyterians found themselves placed behind Anglican and Catholic clergy or, worse, denied any place at all in the reception of the Prince. In Newfoundland, only the Anglican and Catholic bishops were invited to participate in the Prince’s reception and in the Maritime colonies all of the Protestant denominations had to follow, first, the Anglican and, then, the Catholic bishop in the order of precedence. In Montreal, Baptists, Lutherans, Methodists, Presbyterians, and other Protestant denominations were so disturbed by their neglect—and the privileged recognition accorded to the Church of England and the Catholic Church—that they withdrew their addresses and petitioned the Governor General and the City Council in protest. Contrary to the spirit of religious equality in Canada, they charged, they had been denied equal status with the Anglican and Catholic clergy. By being placed behind the other clergy and by not being permitted to read

³⁵Newcastle, *Addresses Presented to H.R.H. The Prince of Wales*, 48-50; Woods, *The Prince of Wales in Canada and the United States*, 106-107.

their addresses aloud to the Prince, as the Anglican and Catholic bishops had been allowed to do, they believed that the City Council had “calculated to convey a false impression concerning the actual state of religious opinion in the City of Montreal.” In refusing to present their addresses under such circumstances, they sought to demonstrate to the community that they “will yield to none others in dutiful respect and loyal regard to the person and authority of their gracious and honoured Queen.”³⁶

Indeed, none of the main religions in British North America—Anglican, Roman Catholic, and nonconformist—would “yield to none others” in paying “dutiful respect and loyal regard” to the Prince of Wales. In this religiously heterogeneous community religious equality was a requisite for social harmony and stability. It was also necessary to maintain a cohesive cultural hegemony amongst a religiously diverse middle class. Consequently, when one denomination attempted to claim precedence over the others, the other groups would challenge that attempt and reassert their shared and equal authority in their communities. As an occasion at which questions of precedence were brought to the forefront, the Royal Tour of 1860 served as a site in which the major religions struggled to assert and protect their social prominence. The Anglican hierarchy, still identifying its interests with the traditional upper class, was particularly prominent in attempting to use the occasion as an opportunity to reassert its cultural authority as that class had done. The Duke of Newcastle’s imposition of Britain’s order of precedence to the colonies only furthered its argument for privileged access to the Prince. Defending their status where their faith held the greatest number of followers, members of the Catholic hierarchy

³⁶*Globe*, 17 August, 6 September, 28 September 1860; *Montreal Gazette*, 3 September 1860.

challenged Anglican precedence in Quebec in order to maintain religious equality. Similarly, other Protestant denominations attacked both the precedence accorded to and the actions taken by the Anglican and Catholic clergy. In building a cultural hegemony in mid-nineteenth century British North America, then, incorporating and balancing different religious groups proved to be a difficult process which involved constant mediation.

French Canadian Loyalty and the Royal Tour of 1860

Although the Anglican bishops received some criticism for their attempts to claim religious preeminence,³⁷ most critical attacks were directed towards the French Catholic hierarchy. Leading this attack was the newspaperman and leader of the reformist Clear Grits, George Brown. A well-known opponent of separate schools, an ardent advocate of the separation between church and state, and strongly suspicious of French loyalty to the Empire, Brown charged that the French Canadian expressions of loyalty during the Tour were "insincere" and politically motivated. "If the [Roman Catholic] Hierarchy in Lower Canada approaches the Prince with honied words," Brown argued in his paper the *Globe*, "it is because Roman Catholic institutions are supported at the expense of the Protestant people of Upper Canada; because the Church possesses immense control over the government of the country." The events in Quebec, he continued, only illustrated for all to see the reality of the "hateful domination" of their "Protestant province" by the Papists. Not only had the Prince "been used for a whole day as a means of puffing up the Lower Canadian system of priestly education" by having him visit both

³⁷The *Globe*, for example, characterised the Anglican bishops' practice of greeting the Prince at the door of their cathedrals during private service as "ecclesiastical flunkeyism." *Globe*, 22 August 1860.

Laval and the Ursuline convent, but the shower of attention on Catholic institutions and the accordance of precedence to Roman Catholic clergy in Quebec had placed "the Church of Rome in a position of pre-eminence which she has never occupied in a British province...." "The marked attention bestowed upon the Romish Church and its peculiar institutions" in contrast to the neglect of Protestant institutions in Canada East, such as McGill University, was offered by the Grit leader as evidence of the need for constitutional change in order to end Roman Catholic domination. Only through "Rep by Pop" or a separation of Canada West from East could the situation of "priestly interference" in national affairs cease.³⁸

Clearly, Brown's running critique had a self-serving political motive: to publicise the prudence of his party's platform and to garner the support of the Protestant public. Yet, his questioning of the sincerity of French Catholic loyalty and concern over the Prince's attentions to Catholic institutions also reflected the anti-Catholic sentiments and suspicion of French Canadian loyalty amongst a significant segment of the British Protestant population. Insinuations of French and Catholic disloyalty would cloud the Tour's progress through the Canadas as Orangemen and other ultra-Protestants attempted to claim British Protestant preeminence in the colony by subverting the French Catholic claims of equality which were premised upon fidelity to the monarchy. French Canadians, though, continued to assert their right to equal participation in the celebrations and, moreover, to express their loyalty in their own language, with their own ethnic symbols, and through their own institutions. At stake was the cultural character of the nation: whether it was primarily a British Protestant nation or one in which French Canadians were accorded equality of status. The events surrounding the Royal Tour in French Canada,

³⁸*Globe*, 23 August, 30 August, 12 September, 18 September 1860.

thus, became a discourse on the place of French Canadians in the nation and, ultimately, a struggle over the boundaries of a cross-cultural hegemony between English and French Canadians.

Although occurring a couple of weeks prior to the Prince's arrival in Canada East, debate in Montreal's City Council over the fate of Commissioner's Square foreshadowed, and contributed to, the conflict of emotions that would take place between British Protestants and French Canadians over the nature of French loyalty to the monarchy and the Empire. In a motion made and supported by Anglophone aldermen it was proposed to change the name of Commissioner's Square, so named since 1811, to Victoria Square as an honour to the Queen. Due to its historical associations to the French community, twelve Francophone aldermen voted against the alteration. Councillor Bellemare stressed that their opposition was based upon preventing the erosion of their city's antiquity and was not intended as a slight to the Queen. Nonetheless, aided largely by the less charitable remarks of three aldermen who in their defence of the city's French heritage directed some choice insults at the English members and the British government, the *Montreal Commercial Advertiser* and the *Montreal Herald* interpreted the rejection of the proposal as evidence of French Canadian disloyalty and lack of respect for the Queen. Often at loggerheads, *L'Ordre* and *La Minerve* found common ground in their defence of both the original name of the Square and French Canadian loyalty. The aldermen, they asserted, were merely attempting to conserve the historical (French) character of the city and meant no disrespect to their Queen. In addition, *La Minerve* stated, "Nous condamnons sans restriction la grossièreté du langage et des manières de plusieurs, mais nous pensons sincèrement, nous sommes certains même, qu'aucun Canadien ne nourrit dans son coeur les

sentiments de haine qu'on leur attribue; aucun ne voulait, nous en avons la conviction, faire la moindre injure au nom de notre bien aimée Souveraine." Just as vigorously, George-Étienne Cartier's paper criticised Anglophone extremists who had distorted the facts in order to unfairly portray French Canadians as disloyal. Fortunately, *La Minerve*'s editors concluded, the majority of Anglophones and Francophones were united in ensuring the prosperity of their community under the beneficent rule of a glorious Queen. The *Montreal Gazette* agreed and spoke up for the French population arguing that they "should not be judged by the rubbish spoken by a few third class mob-orators...." For the most part, French Canadians were content and "recognise[d] and appreciate[d] the advantages and benefits of their political alliance with the British race and government."³⁹ As a response to the accusations of French disloyalty and English demagoguery, then, attempts were made by the moderate French and English middle class press to sooth tensions and, thus, maintain the peace between the two ethnic groups in order to preserve the social stability upon which bourgeois hegemony was premised. The French reception of the Prince of Wales two weeks later, however, would again stir up ethnic hostility as French Canadians manifested their loyalty to the Queen's son with actions which many Anglophones regarded as disloyal.

Festooning their streets with the French republic's Tricolour and reading their addresses to the Prince in French, French Canadians reaffirmed their ethnic identity, but, at the same time, professed their attachment to the British monarchy. Indeed, they argued, it was because of the

³⁹ Alan Gordon, "Contested Terrain: The Politics of Public Memory in Montreal, 1891-1930" (Ph.D. diss., Queen's University, 1997), 145-146; Colleen Skidmore, "Concordia Salus: Triumphal Arches at Montréal, 1860," *Journal of Canadian Art History* 19, no. 1 (1998): 95-97; *L'Ordre*, 8 August, 10 August 1860; *La Minerve*, 7 August, 9 August 1860; *Montreal Gazette*, 8 August, 17 September 1860.

Crown's protection that their culture continued to flourish in North America. The fact that French Canadians were able to display their ethnic symbols and express their loyalty in their own tongue was offered as a testament to the glory of British rule. As the *New York Herald* observed, "The brilliant reception given to the Prince of Wales at Montreal has given a thorough refutation to the silly stories...that the French Canadians entertained no feeling of loyalty to the heir of Britain's throne." Attempting to capture the brilliance of the Prince's reception in Quebec and Montreal, the French Canadian press provided exuberant descriptions of the spectacles. In both Quebec and Montreal, journalists wrote, he was met by "l'enthousiasme" of "une foule immense," streets "brillamment tenturées," and "une belle manifestation de [Canadien] loyauté." "Le Prince," *La Minerve* observed,

paraissait jouir beaucoup de toutes ces démonstrations; un air de satisfaction et de bonheur régnait sur sa figure toujours douce, calme et riante. Heureux si le bonheur qu'il éprouve, en voyant tout un peuple dans l'enthousiasme de la loyauté et de l'affection pour sa Souveraine, porte ce Prince à apprécier ce que vaut l'amour d'une nation pour son roi, et soit pour lui un motif puissant de travailler pour la prospérité du royaume qu'il devra gouverner un jour!

Even Cyrille Boucher of *L'Ordre*, a constant critic of the Conservative *La Minerve* and fierce defender of French nationality, initially agreed that the visit of the Prince had calmed the tensions between English and French as both groups welcomed the heir to the throne with the "même esprit" and "un même patriotisme."⁴⁰

The civic addresses to the Prince, and his replies, further emphasised the shared loyalty of French and English. Though Lower Canadians differed in language and religious affiliation,

⁴⁰*New York Herald* quoted in *Illustrated London News*, 15 September 1860; Alphonse Lonclas, *Notice historique sur la famille royale d'Angleterre, le pont Victoria et le palais de l'exposition: Publiée en l'honneur [sic] de la visite de S.A.R. le prince de Galles au Canada* (Montreal, 1860), 8, 14; *L'Ordre*, 20 August, 24 August 1860; *La Minerve*, 28 August 1860.

the Mayor of Quebec told His Royal Highness, "they have but one voice and one heart in expressing loyalty to their Sovereign...." The Mayor and Councillors of Trois Rivières stressed the same theme in their presentation and reminded the Prince that their loyalty was due to "the liberty, the peace, the prosperity, and the happiness" granted to them by the British Constitution and "the liberality of Her Government." The Duke of Newcastle was no less interested in emphasising the peace and harmony in the community and, especially, the role of the Crown in ensuring the equality of all subjects. "In addressing you...as an Englishman," the Prince told the Legislative Assembly of Canada,

I do not forget that some of my fellow subjects here are not of my own blood. To them also an especial acknowledgement is due, and I receive with peculiar gratification the proofs of their attachment to the Crown of England. They are evidence of their satisfaction with the great laws under which they live, and of their just confidence that, whatever be their origin, all Canadians are alike objects of interest to their Sovereign and Her People. Canada may be proud that within her limits two Races of different language and habits are united in the same Legislature by a common loyalty, and are bound to the same Constitution by a common Patriotism.⁴¹

Through state addresses and royal replies, then, French Canadians not only asserted their equal loyalty to the Sovereign in comparison with Anglophones, but had their cultural rights and status within Canada legitimised by royal sanction.

French Canadians demonstrated their pride in their culture and loyalty to the British Crown by raising the Tricolour along the main streets and on public and private buildings. "All the little houses, churches, and villages on the banks of the river," the *Times* correspondent observed as the Prince's ship sailed down the St. Lawrence, "were decked with flags (nearly always the French tricolour)...." More often, the Tricolour and the Union Jack were hung side

⁴¹Newcastle, *Addresses Presented to H.R.H. The Prince of Wales*, 34-36, 40, 52-53.

by side, united, it was said, by feelings of loyalty. In Montreal, *L'Ordre* noted, "de toutes parts flottaient les drapeaux alliés de la France et de l'Angleterre: les deux races, française et saxonne, avaient rivalisé de zèle; chacune voulait montrer à sa manière son enthousiasme et sa fidélité aux institutions libres qui nous régissent." In the aftermath of the Victoria Square controversy, however, *La Minerve* cautioned that French Canadians should demonstrate some tact and reserve in its display of the Tricolour. With their loyalty recently under question by some British Protestants, "il serait d'une extrême inconvenance de donner la prédomination aux couleurs français dans une circonstance comme celle-ci...." The Union Jack should receive at least equal treatment and, therefore, should be hung next to the French flag on all occasions. The *Globe*, though, found that the quantity of French flags on display in Montreal "completely eclipsed the limited number of Union Jacks which were shown. Indeed, judging from appearance, we might well imagine that to France Montreal belongs—that the British flag had been occasionally hung up, out of compliment to our Fatherland, by some few liberal-minded Frenchmen...." The *Acadian Recorder* found the exhibition of the Tricolour to be "a gross insult to the Heir of the British Crown": a sentiment the Duke of Newcastle seemed to share. Although disturbed by the number of French flags he had encountered during the tour through the lower province, he had not commented on them since they seemed to have been raised by private individuals as "ornaments." In Montreal, however, the sight of the Union Jack and the Tricolour hoisted side by side on the two towers of the Roman Catholic Cathedral prompted him to request the Archbishop to lower the Tricolour on the basis that the public should not "be taught to look upon the latter as a national flag." Archbishop Bourget acquiesced to the Duke's request, but

not without receiving criticism from some secular defenders of French culture.⁴²

The editor of *Le Semeur Canadien* regarded Bourget's compliance with Newcastle's request as a "measure of [the Archbishop's] servility towards England and bad feeling towards France." The Tricolour had been adopted by French Canadians as "a characteristic sign of their nationality" and in removing it from Notre Dame Cathedral the Archbishop had "shocked the national sentiment of his fellow-countrymen." French Canadians, he emphasised, were as loyal "as any British Canadian." They were, however, also different. He therefore asked "my English fellow-subjects to be liberal, and allow French Canadians to feel a little differently from them, making allowances for the difference of race and education...." Cyrille Boucher agreed, arguing that "Le drapeau français, qui est le drapeau de la civilisation, ne peut faire honte au Prince Royal d'Angleterre." More than the Tricolour, though, *L'Ordre* defended the use of the French language in addressing the Prince, which usage had come under attack by the *Globe*. "Dans le moment actuel les différentes nationalités célèbrent chacune à leur manière, leur hôte royal: pourquoi les Canadiens seuls seraient-ils obligés d'emprunter une langue qui n'est pas la leur...?" In addition to being loyal British subjects, "nous sommes Canadiens-français, nous sommes catholiques; c'est donc comme tels que nous devons montrer avant tout et partout."⁴³

French Canadians expected to be able to welcome the Prince of Wales in their own language, at their own religious and educational institutions, and with their own symbols of

⁴²Woods, *The Prince of Wales in Canada and the United States*, 88; *L'Ordre*, 24 August, 27 August 1860; *La Minerve*, 28 August, 23 August 1860; Cornwallis, *Royalty in the New World*, 254; *Globe*, 28 August 1860; *Acadian Recorder*, 22 September 1860; Newcastle Papers, reel A-307, vol. C1, Duke of Newcastle to Lord Palmerston, 2 September 1860.

⁴³*Montreal Witness*, 12 September, 19 September, 6 October 1860; *Le Semeur Canadien*, 21 September 1860; *Globe*, 21 August 1860; *L'Ordre*, 22 August, 15 August, 30 August 1860.

ethnic identity. Their ethnic and religious rights, they argued, had been guaranteed by the British Crown. The free expression of their loyalty to the heir to the throne in their own tongue and with symbols of their cultural heritage was therefore meant not as an act of disloyalty, but as a demonstration of their appreciation for the Crown's cultural protection. The articulation of French Catholic identity expressed an image of the Canadian nation in which French and English and Catholic and Protestant were united by a common loyalty to the monarchy and its reciprocal respect for each group's cultural liberty. The state and the British middle class, for the most part, adhered to this image of the nation. Considering that individuals may "become resentful toward the institutions that fail to recognise adequately their identity, societal role, and aspirations," even to the point that they might attempt to undermine the legitimacy of state institutions, the middle class state attempted to accommodate and include French Canadians.⁴⁴ French addresses were accepted, Catholic institutions visited and, although some difference of opinion arose as to its meaning, the Tricolour permitted to hang on most nonpolitical buildings. Symbolic inclusion of French Catholics in the state and nation was thus legitimised during the Tour by royal sanction. Resistance to the image of a bicultural nation, however, arose from ultra-Protestants, mostly belonging to the Orange Order in Canada West, who argued that Canada was, foremost, a British Protestant nation. While French Canadians dispelled such homogenising notions in newspaper editorials, Irish Catholics in Canada West had more difficulty in asserting and defending their ethnic and religious identity. Orange demonstrations in Kingston, Belleville, and Toronto would symbolically challenge the premise of a nation in which Protestant and Catholic shared equal rights in favour of a pure British Protestant hegemony.

⁴⁴Breton, "Multiculturalism and Canadian Nation-Building," 31-32.

Irish Catholicism and Orangeism during the Royal Tour of 1860

Formed in Ulster in the eighteenth century, the Orange Order came to British North America in the early nineteenth century, but did not rise to prominence until after the large scale immigration of Irish Protestants into the colony occurred during the 1840s and 1850s. Organised as the Loyal Orange Association of British America, the Order consisted of scores of local lodges scattered throughout Canada West in which members were united by a common desire to defend the Protestant religion and constitutional monarchy. The figure of King William III, Prince of Orange, was their central symbol and his defeat of the Catholic King James II at the Battle of the Boyne in Ireland on 12 July 1690 their core myth: "the victory of combined Protestantism and constitutional monarchy." Ritual and symbolism played a crucial role in the Order as members swore a sacred oath to be faithful and bear true allegiance to Queen Victoria and her heirs "so long as she or they shall maintain the Protestant Religion and the Laws of this country." The oath continued: "I will, to the utmost of my power, defend them against all traitorous conspiracies and...will steadily maintain the connections between the Colonies of British America and the Mother Country, and be ever ready to resist all attempts to weaken British influence, or dismember the British Empire...." The oath reflected the defensive mind-set of the Order and its suspicion of constituted authority. It affirmed the loyalty of its members to the Crown, but only "so long" as it protected the Protestant religion and the British constitution. Above all, it indicated that Orangemen had not only a right, but an obligation to defend both the "Glorious Constitution" and the Protestant religion from perceived threats to the British nation

of which British North America formed a critical part.⁴⁵

The chief threat to their image of a Protestant nation was Roman Catholicism. Regarding Catholic allegiance to the Pope as in conflict with loyalty to a Protestant Sovereign, dissatisfied with the Act of Union which had given French Canadians too much power and influence over Protestant affairs, concerned over the immigration of Irish Catholic workers who competed for jobs, and alarmed at the rise of a small but noticeable Catholic bourgeoisie which seemed to challenge the ascendancy of the Protestant community, members of the Orange Order put themselves forward as the defenders of the Protestant way of life, the community's prosperity, and the British connection. Anti-Catholic rhetoric, economic discrimination, and the self-promotion of their Order's slogans and symbols in public demonstrations served as their weapons against Catholic intrusions in British North America and in support of a British Protestant hegemony.⁴⁶ It should be no surprise, then, that Orangemen led the criticism of Roman Catholic participation in the Royal Tour of 1860. They denounced the Prince's visits to Catholic institutions and derided the precedence accorded to Romish clergy in Quebec. Such instances were viewed by militant Protestants as examples "of the encroaching arrogance of the Church of Rome" and, as such, demanded a response. A few days before the Prince's landing in Quebec

⁴⁵Cecil J. Houston and William J. Smyth, *The Sash Canada Wore: A Historical Geography of the Orange Order in Canada* (Toronto, 1980), 3-7, 12, 84-86, 96-111; Gregory S. Kealey, *Toronto Workers Respond to Industrial Capitalism, 1867-1892* (Toronto, 1980), 103-114; Loyal Orange Association of British America, *Constitution and Laws of the Loyal Orange Association of British America* (Toronto, 1860), 4, 7.

⁴⁶J.D. Livermore, "The Orange Order and the Election of 1861 in Kingston," in *To Preserve and Defend: Essays on Kingston in the Nineteenth Century*, ed. Gerald Tulchinsky (Montreal, 1976), 248-253; Ian Radforth, "'Called to the attention of the whole civilized world': The Visit of the Prince of Wales to British North America, 1860," *Zeitschrift für Kanada-studien* 20, no. 1 (2000): 200.

the Orange Order in Kingston and Toronto had already planned to assemble as Orangemen in welcoming the Prince to their communities. The events in Quebec strengthened their resolve to put forward a spectacular demonstration of thousands of Orangemen in full regalia waving flags and banners and marching under specially constructed Orange triumphal arches adorned with the emblems and colours of the Order.⁴⁷

When the Irish Catholic inhabitants of these communities learned of the Orange preparations, they immediately called meetings of their own to protest against any Orange demonstration during the Prince's visit. In Kingston more than one thousand people attended a meeting on August 24 in which an unanimous resolution was adopted protesting against "the impolicy of recognising any secret-politico religious association, who may take advantage of the presence of His Royal Highness to make political capital for themselves, by creating a religious feud in the community...." The resolution further proclaimed that all Catholics throughout the province would be encouraged to abstain from joining any procession in which the Orange Order was accorded a place. The Irish Catholic petitioners, though, were prepared to make some concessions to ensure that peace and harmony would reign during the Prince's visit. While asserting that no comparison could be made between the Orange Order and the St. Patrick's Society, the latter being a national and benevolent society rather than a "secret political organization," members of the St. Patrick's Society offered to leave their insignia and banners at home during the visit. Ending with assurances that their actions were motivated by a desire

⁴⁷Woods, *The Prince of Wales in Canada and the United States*, 91-92, 106, 182-183; William Shannon, *Narrative of the Proceedings of the Loyal Orangemen of Kingston and Belleville, on the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth of September, 1860, in Connection with the Visit of H.R.H. the Prince of Wales to Central Canada* (Belleville, 1861), 5-10; Anne MacDermaid, "The Visit of the Prince of Wales to Kingston in 1860," *Historic Kingston*, no. 21 (1973): 55.

for "harmony" and to give the Prince "a loyal and affectionate welcome to this city," the resolutions were dispatched to Governor General Head and the Duke of Newcastle.⁴⁸

Sensitive to the need for ethnic and religious harmony in British North America, Newcastle and Head were alarmed upon learning of the Orangemen's preparations. While still in Montreal, the Duke advised the Governor General that any Orange demonstration would likely "lead to religious feud and breach of the peace; and it is my duty to prevent, as far as I am able, the exposure of the Prince to support participation in a scene so much deprecated and so alien to the spirit in which he visits Canada." Moreover, the Prince could not pass under any Orange arch because to do so would be to officially recognise the status of the Order. This was perceived as another problem since "Orange lodges are not *illegal* in Canada: but they are in Ireland and if the Prince formally & deliberately recognized them *here* it...might have inconvenience at home." Therefore, the Duke resolved that "if any demonstration, or any other demonstration of a party character is persisted in, I shall advise the Prince to abandon his visit to the town altogether."⁴⁹

Head enclosed Newcastle's letter to the Mayors of Kingston and Toronto in order to have them prevent the Orangemen from assembling in their regalia and from hanging party

⁴⁸*British Whig*, 25 August 1860; *Globe*, 29 August 1860; Shannon, *Narrative of the Proceedings of the Loyal Orangemen of Kingston and Belleville*, 12-14; Henry James Morgan, *The Tour of H.R.H. the Prince of Wales Through British America and the United States*, by "A British Canadian" (Montreal, 1860), 147; Woods, *The Prince of Wales in Canada and the United States*, 166-167; MacDermaid, "The Visit of the Prince of Wales to Kingston in 1860," 56; RG7/G23, vol. 1, file 1, J. O'Reilly to O.S. Strange, 1 September 1860 (copy).

⁴⁹City of Toronto Archives, City of Toronto Council Minutes, 1860, App. 141, pp. 244-245, Duke of Newcastle to Edmund Head, 30 August 1860; NAC, Henry Wentworth Acland Papers, MG40 Q40, vol. 1, letter 10, p. 94, 3 September 1860.

emblems on their arches. Emphasising the need for ethnic and religious harmony in the colony, he added that "the exhibition of banners or other badges of distinction which are known to be offensive to any portion of Her Majesty's subjects" would be "viewed with extreme dissatisfaction."⁵⁰ Orlando Strange, the Mayor of Kingston, transmitted the correspondence to Town Council and to members of the Orange Lodge, but both bodies resisted abandoning the Orange demonstration. The Council did not believe that the Duke would carry out his threat and the Orangemen refused "to knock under now" to the directions they believed to be ordered not by the Duke of Newcastle, but by the Irish Catholic community. In fact, the Catholic outcry against their plans only increased the Orange determination not to "surrender to Popish clamor!" "The Romanists," one Kingston Orangeman proclaimed, "have endeavored from the beginning at Quebec to have it all their own way; it is high time such impudence should be chastised." The Kingston Orangemen's decision to take a stand and to reject Romish demands gained the support of the Bishop of Kingston, who encouraged "all Protestants [to] join the Orange Procession, and by so doing manifest the supreme contempt they entertain for the...efforts of a few of the Roman Catholics of this city, who by their impertinent interference have attempted to restrain us of our just rights as faithful...subjects of a good and Liberal Protestant Queen...." Orangemen and other ultra-Protestants, therefore, felt as though they had to march in order to maintain their constitutional rights and to assert Protestant cultural dominance in the community.⁵¹ While, then,

⁵⁰City of Toronto Council Minutes, 1860, App. 141, pp. 245-246, Edmund Head to Adam Wilson, 31 August 1860; RG7/G23, vol. 1, file 1, David Shaw to O.S. Strange, 31 August 1860 (copy).

⁵¹Woods, *The Prince of Wales in Canada and the United States*, 184-185; Shannon, *Narrative of the Proceedings of the Loyal Orangemen of Kingston and Belleville*, 19-25; *Globe*, 29 August 1860; RG7/G23, vol. 1, file 1, John Flanagan to O.S. Strange, 1 September 1860;

it sometimes appeared as a "comic opera,"⁵² the Royal Tour in Kingston, Belleville, and Toronto was in fact a contested terrain in which Orangemen and Catholics asserted and resisted Protestant hegemony in their communities through royal representation and association.

Despite more warnings from Newcastle that he would not permit the Prince to land in Kingston if Orangemen persisted in holding a demonstration, as the Prince's steamship approached the town on September 4 the Duke could see from the deck about one thousand Orangemen assembled wearing their sashes, robes, and insignia, waving flags and banners, and marching to Orange tunes down a street the Prince had to pass. In addition, the Duke informed Lord Palmerston, the Orangemen had erected a triumphal arch "covered all over with devices the most offensive to the Roman Catholic population, and under which the Prince was intended to pass." "No Surrender," "1690," and portraits of William III adorned the arch in defiance of the Duke's demands and Catholic wishes. The Secretary of State for the Colonies, standing firm, notified the Mayor that His Royal Highness would not land "to join any partisan demonstration" and would give the Orangemen until the following morning to remove their symbols. Still, the Orangemen held steadfast and would so remain the next morning. Certainly some dissent entered the ranks—and even more so among the general public—as a few members urged their coreligionists to abandon the procession. They argued that the Orangemen had successfully "vindicated their rights as freemen" and that it was now time to welcome the young Prince.

RG7, Civil Secretary's correspondence [G20], vols. 81-82, item no. 9409 ½, "A Suggestion" by the Bishop of Kingston, 3 September 1860; MacDermaid, "The Visit of the Prince of Wales to Kingston in 1860," 60.

⁵²Donald Swainson, "John Hillyard Cameron," *Dictionary of Canadian Biography* 10 (1972): 119-123.

Most, however, were determined not to compromise. Rev. Andrew Wilson encapsulated the sentiments of his fellow Orangemen in a speech as he

detailed the manner in which the Royal visitor had been taken to convents and nunneries and Popish colleges; the presentation of *all* the Romish Bishops in their robes with their crucifixes; the language which had been put into the Prince's mouth in acknowledgement of Romish addresses; in short, having fully proved that an attempt was being made to fasten upon the mind of the Prince of Wales the delusion that Canada is a country where Popery has the ascendancy, he besought them as men of truth, to stand for truth and freedom, and never surrender.

"There was scarcely a dry eye in all that vast assemblage," the chairman of the Orangemen's Reception Committee observed, "every man felt that he had discharged a solemn duty, that he had done a deed which was of immense importance politically and historically to Canada and the Empire": to protect their constitutional liberty and the Protestant religion in British North America.⁵³

While not violent, the Orangemen's behaviour in Kingston (and later in Belleville and Toronto) can be compared to that of the "religious rioters" and the crowds examined by Natalie Zemon Davis and E.P. Thompson. Like their subjects of study, the Orangemen acted "on the basis of some moral certainty and communal sense of legitimacy" in the defence of their cause, in this case the traditional rights of Britishers to religious liberty and the central place of Protestantism in the British nation. Davis and Thompson note that such demonstrations were likely to occur when it was believed that government authorities had failed to do their job in upholding traditional rights. Similarly, the Orangemen felt that the Duke of Newcastle had

⁵³Woods, *The Prince of Wales in Canada and the United States*, 186-189; Newcastle Papers, reel A-307, vol. C1, pp. 146-151, Duke of Newcastle to Lord Palmerston, 5 September 1860; *Globe*, 6 September 1860; *Montreal Witness*, 8 September, 19 September 1860; Shannon, *Narrative of the Proceedings of the Loyal Orangemen of Kingston and Belleville*, 24-25, 31-32.

ignored their rights while defending the actions of "disloyal" Catholics. The Orangemen, therefore, felt compelled to defend the rights of all British Protestants by demonstrating their "legitimate" right to organise and to welcome the heir to the throne with their symbols of loyalty and Protestant identity. In doing so, they sought to assert a vision of the nation in which British Protestants were culturally ascendant.⁵⁴

In light of the Orange refusal to reconsider to put down their banners, remove their costumes, and take down their insignia, the Corporation of Kingston sent a delegation to the Prince's steamer to ask Newcastle to modify his decision. The delegation impressed upon the Duke that the Orange Order was not outlawed in Canada and that its members had every right to appear in their regalia to welcome the Prince. Newcastle, though, remained as determined as the Orangemen. He explained to the group that the Prince could not condone a demonstration which would "give offense to one class of the community." Attention must be paid to the welfare of "the Empire at large." Thus, twenty-two hours after the Prince's steamer first arrived at Kingston, the Duke sent word ashore that "I now find myself compelled to take the extreme course" of sailing on to Belleville without landing in Kingston. In taking this course, he was of the firm opinion that he had avoided putting the Prince in the "compromising" position of recognising an organisation, though legal in Canada, that had been outlawed by the British

⁵⁴Suzanne Desan, "Crowds, Community, and Ritual in the Work of E.P. Thompson and Natalie Davis," in *The New Cultural History*, ed. Lynn Hunt (Berkeley, 1989), 47-71; Natalie Zemon Davis, *Society and Culture in Early Modern France* (Stanford, 1975), 152-187; E.P. Thompson, "The Moral Economy of the English Crowd in the Eighteenth Century," in *Customs in Common* (New York, 1993), 188.

government and which was "notoriously offensive to the members of another creed...."⁵⁵

Although "their dearest hopes" had been dashed to "do the Prince honour," the Orangemen of Kingston and other lodges which had assembled in the town took pride in their resolve to not "surrender." As one broadside declared shortly after the event,

Go home old Duke and Edmund Head, and tell across the seas,
How Orange banners in the West, are floating in the breeze:
And should the like event again take place, we'll make the same display,
Your [*sic*] welcome still, young Prince of Wales, to Upper Canada.

Should England's throne desert our cause, we still the same shall be,
We'll stand our ground like hearts of Oak, and fight for liberty!
We ever will defend our cause, and for King William cheer,
And send the news across the seas, "there's no surrender here."⁵⁶

The Kingston Orangemen also "sent the news" to nearby Belleville. The Orangemen of Belleville had accepted the pleas of the town's citizens to disband their demonstration in fear that the Prince would also bypass their community, but a large party of Orangemen from Kingston decided to carry on their fight with the Duke by travelling overnight to the town. At first, a government organiser reported to the Prince's ship that all was clear in the town and that no Orange emblems were in sight. Just before the Prince was to come ashore, however, all changed. As the government agent recalled, "I pricked up my ears at the dull booming of a

⁵⁵Creighton, *John A. Macdonald*, 302; Joseph Pope, ed., *Memoirs of the Right Honourable Sir John Alexander Macdonald, First Prime Minister of the Dominion of Canada* vol. 1 (Ottawa, 1894), 225-226; NAC, John A. Macdonald Papers, MG26 A, reel C-1694, vol. 297, pp. 136169-136173, Memorandum on the Orangemen Affair by Alexander Campbell, September 1860; AO, Miscellaneous Collection, MU2113-1860 #5, Duke of Newcastle to O.S. Strange, 5 September 1860 (copy).

⁵⁶Miscellaneous Collection, MU2113-1860 #5, O.S. Strange to Duke of Newcastle, 11 September 1860 (copy); University of Toronto, Thomas Fisher Rare Book Room, Broadside Collection, J. Knowlton, "On the Arrival of His Royal Highness, the Prince of Wales at Kingston, September 4th, 1860."

distant drum. Turning a sharp corner, what should we see but a crowd of men disembarking from a train....” Almost immediately Newcastle ordered the ship on to Cobourg where, upon learning of his latest action, the Orangemen had decided to comply with Newcastle’s request.⁵⁷

More Orange contretemps awaited the Royal Party in Toronto where the Orange-Green controversy had come to be focussed on the Orange arch. Fashioned after the gate in Londonderry, the arch featured the flags and banners of the Order and slogans proclaiming “Freedom” and “Loyal Order Institution.” Most offensive to Irish Catholics, though, was the transparency of William III placed at the top of the structure [Figure 5.1]. At a meeting of approximately one thousand Catholics, speakers declared that the intention behind the arch was to have them bow their heads and “like Roman captives march under the Orangemen’s yoke.” The visit of the Prince of Wales, however, was a time meant for peace, harmony, and unity and not for “raking up from the tomb of the past the ashes of our defeated fathers and flinging those ashes in our face.” Turning the Orange demonstrations on their head, the meeting of Irish Catholics thus charged that the Orangemen were being disloyal in their actions. It was the Orangemen, and not they, who had prevented the Prince’s visit from being a harmonious one and who had trampled on the rights of loyal British citizens wishing to pay peaceful, united tribute to the heir to the throne. For their part, Rev. Walsh proclaimed, “Catholics were loyal by principle and not by caprice; they were loyal because their Church taught loyalty to lawfully

⁵⁷The Kingston Orangemen had also tried to intercept the Prince again by taking a train from Belleville to Cobourg, but by “a curious coincidence” the train carrying them experienced a number of delays and did not reach Cobourg until the Prince had already been received and entertained by the Corporation. Woods, *The Prince of Wales in Canada and the United States*, 192-195; NAC, Thomas Wiley Papers, MG29 E1, “A Reminiscence of the Visit of the Prince of Wales to Canada in 1860,” 223-225; Newcastle Papers, reel A-307, vol. C1, pp. 146-151, Duke of Newcastle to Lord Palmerston, 6 September 1860.

constituted authority.” As their coreligionists in Kingston had done, Toronto Irish Catholics also challenged Orange assertions of Protestant hegemony by questioning their legitimacy and by emphasising the loyalty of Irish Catholics to “Our Beloved Queen” which they attributed to “the freedom they enjoy” under her “mild sway.”⁵⁸

A significant segment of the Protestant middle class also discountenanced the behaviour of the mostly working class Orange Order. Social order, and middle class hegemony, were premised upon harmony between Catholics and Protestants and many middle class men were disturbed by the actions of the Orangemen. Certainly some members of the middle class belonged to the Order and many more who did not support their actions sympathised with them. They could not, however, condone the “ungentlemanly” and “rowdy” behaviour of the Orangemen. “Of the legal right of Orangemen, to behave as they have done,” the *Montreal Gazette* argued, “there can be no question. A man has a right to say what he likes in his own house, but if he knowingly gives offence to the feelings of a guest he has invited to visit him, he violates all rules of courtesy and hospitality.” Further criticising them in terms of their lack of respectability and manliness, the paper pointed out that “True courtesy, like true Christianity, is based upon self-denial. The selfish man is neither a true Christian nor a true gentleman.” Other papers similarly condemned the Orangemen for their lack of gallantry by pointing out how the “ladies” of Belleville had been disappointed. They had worked day and night on decorations, some had trained to welcome the Prince on horseback, and still others had travelled for miles to see the youthful heir, but all for naught due to the less-than-gentlemanly behaviour of the

⁵⁸*Globe*, 30 August, 31 August 1860; Morgan, *The Tour of H.R.H. the Prince of Wales*, 235-236.

Orangemen. Even correspondents for the evangelical *Montreal Witness* and George Brown's *Globe* concluded that the Orangemen were "very indignant" and were anything but "fit company to make part of the escort of a Prince." Although many middle class Protestants may have shared with the Orangemen the conviction that the Catholic Church had received too many courtesies from the Prince of Wales in Quebec, most were not prepared to threaten the community's social stability through undignified public protest.⁵⁹

Despite the opposition to their actions in Kingston and Belleville, the Orangemen were still not prepared to surrender to the incursions of "Popery" demonstrated during the royal tour. After learning about the incidents in Kingston and Belleville the Orangemen of Toronto had been prepared to back down. They had agreed to remove all insignia from the arch and the transparency of William III was to be replaced by one of the Prince; decisions Mayor Adam Wilson transmitted to the Duke of Newcastle. After Wilson had sent the message, though, some Kingston Orangemen had arrived in town and convinced their comrades to keep some Orange symbols on the arch. At sunset on September 7, then, as the Prince landed and proceeded to Government House he passed under the Orange arch with the "objectionable" portrait of William III still atop it. The Royal Party was then surrounded by cries of "No Surrender!" Later admonishing the Mayor, who professed innocence, the Duke demanded a public apology from him, in the absence of which he would advise the Prince to leave the city. Apology received, it was thought that the disturbances would end, but Orange resistance occurred throughout the remainder of the visit to the city and, indeed, through the rest of the tour of Canada West. An

⁵⁹*Montreal Gazette*, 7 September 1860; Robert Cellem, *Visit of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales to the British North American Provinces and the United States in the Year 1860* (Toronto, 1861), 199-200; *Montreal Witness*, 8 September 1860; *Globe*, 6 September 1860.

attempt to fully redecorate the Orange arch, for example, was met with some violence between Orangemen and opponents, the Duke was greeted by hoots in many places, and, in an extraordinary act, the Orangemen of Aurora successfully forced the Prince to pass under their arch by erecting it over the railroad track along which the royal train would travel.⁶⁰

The struggle between Orangemen, Irish Catholics, and the Duke of Newcastle during the Royal Tour of 1860 constituted a struggle between different visions of the British North American community and, ultimately, over power. Orangemen attempted to resist what they perceived as Catholic encroachments on the Protestant character of the nation by asserting the primacy of Protestantism and Britishness in the community and the subservience of Catholicism. Irish Catholics responded by challenging the loyalty of Orangemen and reminding the community of the monarchy's support of religious liberty and tolerance. In this, they gained the support of the Duke of Newcastle who, like a significant element of the Canadian middle class, emphasised the equality of all subjects under Her Majesty in order to maintain social order and harmony in a divided community. Although the young Prince of Wales looked helplessly on at the events swirling around him, he was the central figure in the public struggle as he represented to Catholics and Orangemen alike their conflicting images of the nation and served as the legitimising symbol each sought to claim.

Queen Victoria and Canadian Irish Catholicism

Queen Victoria approved of Newcastle's decisions in dealing with the Orangemen's "ill-

⁶⁰Woods, *The Prince of Wales in Canada and the United States*, 201-219; City of Toronto Council Minutes, 1860, App. 141, pp. 246-251, Adam Wilson to Edmund Head, 4 September 1860, Duke of Newcastle to Adam Wilson, 8 September 1860; Newcastle Papers, reel A-307, vol. C1, p. 152, Duke of Newcastle to Lord Palmerston, 12 September 1860.

judged" demonstrations.⁶¹ She had long deplored the increasing sectarian conflict in her kingdom during the 1840s and 1850s, placing much of the blame for it on the intolerance of ultra-Protestants. On the opposition of some Protestants to a grant to a Catholic clerical college she was particularly upset: "the Protestants behave shockingly, and display a narrow-mindedness and want of sense on the subject of religion which is quite a disgrace to the nation." "I cannot bear to hear the violent abuse of the Catholic religion," she confided at a later time, "which is so painful and cruel towards the many good and innocent Roman Catholics." She was, consequently, disturbed to learn in 1871 that a friend of the Prince of Wales was "infecting him with Orangeism."⁶² The Queen saw herself as "a devout but broadminded" Anglican who felt quite comfortable attending Presbyterian services in Scotland and Lutheran services in Germany. During the 1860s and 1870s, though, she became increasingly critical of Catholicism as the Syllabus of Errors (1864), the Declaration of Papal Infallibility (1869-70), and other measures led her to believe that the Papacy, and even local priests, were attempting to increase their influence and power. She, therefore, came to view the Catholic Church as a threat to her own authority and privately censured the religion as an aggressive, bigoted, and oppressive institution.⁶³

⁶¹Nottingham University Library, Department of Manuscripts, 5th Duke of Newcastle Collection, NeC 12,746, Queen Victoria to Duke of Newcastle, 20 September 1860.

⁶²Queen Victoria to the King of the Belgians, 15 April, 23 April 1845, 22 November 1850, Queen Victoria to Duchess of Gloucester, 12 December 1850, *Letters of Queen Victoria, 1837-1861*, eds. Arthur C. Benson and Viscount Esher, vol. 2 (London, 1908), 36-37, 277, 281; Simon Heffer, *Power and Place: The Political Consequences of King Edward VII* (London, 1998), 22.

⁶³Walter L. Arnstein, "Queen Victoria and Religion," in *Religion in the Lives of English Women, 1760-1930*, ed. Gail Malmgreen (London, 1986), 116-119; Idem, "Queen Victoria and

With a change in popes she would be more kind to the Catholic Church after the 1880s, but not to Irish Catholics. She resented the demonstrations against her beloved Albert following an inappropriate comment he had made concerning Irish discontent during their visit to Ireland four months before he died; even more disturbing was an attempt to blow up a statue of the Prince Consort in 1872. She found the entreaties for an Irish royal residence and reform legislation evidence of “the pretensions of the Irish to have more done for them than the Welsh or English.” Increased Irish agitation during the 1880s in both Ireland itself and in the House of Commons by Charles Stewart Parnell’s Home Rulers further convinced her that “the more one does for the Irish the more unruly and ungrateful they seem to be.” She felt that Irish reforms were unnecessary and opposed the series of land and Home Rule bills introduced by William Gladstone. In fact, her consistent opposition to any sort of action in favour of improving the situation in Ireland, whether by legislative reform or in the guise of a visit by herself to the Emerald Isle, led Gladstone to conclude that she had “a magnificent twist in her mind on the subject of Ireland.”⁶⁴

Most Irish Home Rulers shared a mutual hatred for the “Famine Queen.” On the occasion of the Queen’s Golden Jubilee they voted against supplies and absented themselves

the Challenge of Roman Catholicism,” *Historian* 58, no. 2 (1996): 295-296, 303, 313; Frank Hardie, *The Political Influence of Queen Victoria, 1861-1901*, 2d ed. (London, 1938), 134-136.

⁶⁴Arnstein, “Queen Victoria and Religion,” 119; Philip Magnus, *Gladstone: A Biography* (London, 1954), 209; Henry Ponsonby to Earl Spencer, 13 June 1872, Memorandum by Queen Victoria, 25 June 1871, *Letters of Queen Victoria, 1862-1885*, ed. George E. Buckle, vol. 2 (Toronto, 1926), 7, 136; Queen Victoria to Earl Cowper, 5 December 1880, *Letters of Queen Victoria, 1862-1885*, ed. Buckle, vol. 3, 162; Queen Victoria to Lord Rosebery, 16 June 1893, *Letters of Queen Victoria, 1886-1901*, ed. George E. Buckle, vol. 2 (London, 1930), 262; Gladstone quoted in J.L. Hammond, *Gladstone and the Irish Nation* (London, 1938), 106.

from the London ceremony. Many Irish Catholics in Canada, too, were indifferent to the celebrations. The Jubilee festivities in Canada took on the air of a celebration of Empire and Victorian progress: aspects of Victoria's reign few Irish Catholic Canadians could respond to. Although many had professed their loyalty to the monarchy in 1860, the jingoistic character of the Golden Jubilee prevented many Irish Catholic Canadians from taking part. The plight of "impoverished and abused tenant farmers" in Ireland under the heel of Her Majesty's government was no cause for celebration among those who continued to hold strong ties with their former home. The Irish Catholic community was, therefore, divided as to how to react to the Queen's Jubilee. Some would boycott the festivities altogether in protest against Britain's Irish policies, but a great many others felt that to do so would be to disrespect the Queen of Canada and bring onto themselves the charge of disloyalty which they had worked so hard to dispel. The latter group maintained their sympathies with Ireland, but they also identified themselves as Canadians and, as such, loyal supporters of Canadian institutions including the monarchy.⁶⁵

John Lynch, Archbishop of Toronto, reflected the divisions within the Irish Catholic community over the Golden Jubilee. A native of Ireland and a strong advocate of Home Rule, Lynch was an ardent critic of British coercion in Ireland and focussed much of his attention on Irish affairs. Although looking outward to Ireland and inward to the Irish Catholic community in Canada as a means of insulating Catholics from the Protestant world, he appreciated Canada's respect for freedom of religion and its constitutional self-government. Consequently, he

⁶⁵Conor Cruise O'Brien, *Parnell and His Party* (London, 1957), 9, 150-153; Jeffrey L. Lant, *Insubstantial Pageant: Ceremony and Confusion at Queen Victoria's Court* (London, 1979), 54-55; Mark G. McGowan, *The Waning of the Green: Catholics, the Irish, and Identity in Toronto, 1887-1922* (Kingston and Montreal, 1999), 3-9; Idem, "The De-greening of the Irish," 133; Clarke, *Piety and Nationalism*, 241.

preached loyalty to the Canadian Crown and even went so far as to oppose open criticism of Governor General Lansdowne, a notorious absentee landlord, on the basis that he was “the representative of the Crown and as such deserved respect and loyalty.” Yet, faced with the prospect of celebrating the Queen’s Golden Jubilee, a commemoration which was identified as a celebration of the events of the past fifty years, Lynch, like his community, was torn. As he explained to Cardinal E.A. Tashereau, “I don’t intend to take any notice in the Church of the Queen’s Jubilee...If we ordered people to come to mass, we would have an almost empty church. The brutal acts of her government in her Jubilee year have set Irish hearts from rejoicing.” He would not, however, publicly express his feelings.⁶⁶

The lay Irish Catholic community of Toronto was similarly divided. The *Irish Canadian* was perhaps the strongest opponent of Irish participation in the celebrations, taking the view that the Victorian era was one filled with “wrongs perpetrated with her Majesty’s sanction upon the Irish people....” “This is the year of Queen Victoria’s Jubilee,” the paper noted, “and the Irish people will not forget it. They can never forget the Victorian era, with its famine, its pestilence and death, its coffin-ships, its ocean-graves, and its cemeteries along the St. Lawrence.” The *Catholic Weekly Review* agreed, pointing out that “Ireland cannot Jubilate. The past fifty years have seen...but ‘slaughter.’” Consequently, most (though not all) Irish Catholic organisations declined to participate in the Jubilee procession held on Dominion Day. While professing “loyalty and reverence” to Canada, Daniel P. Cahill of the Irish National Land League felt that “it would be the vilest hypocrisy to pretend to rejoice in the events of the last fifty years—events

⁶⁶McGowan, *Waning of the Green*, 3-5, 57-60, 202; Archives of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Toronto, John Lynch Papers, John Lynch to E.A. Tashereau, 23 April 1887 (copy); Clarke, *Piety and Nationalism*, 243.

which, to [the Irish] race, have been pregnant with the worst evils a nation can suffer."⁶⁷ The *Irish Canadian* also believed that "Canada is indeed a country in which her citizens may well take pride," but "the day made specially sacred to Canada" has been "wrenched from its lofty purpose" by Orangemen and imperialists who turned it into an imperial celebration of the Queen and her reign. Irish Catholics "would gladly join in doing honor to the Queen," but, dominated as the Jubilee was by Orangemen and celebratory of a period which was marked by famine, death, and coercion for the Irish people, they could be sure that many of their fellows would not attend.⁶⁸

By the time of the Queen's Diamond Jubilee, however, the rise of a generation of Canadian-born Irish Catholics had accelerated the process of the Canadianisation of the Irish Catholic community. According to Mark McGowan, the replacement of Catholic bishops who advocated that Catholics keep to themselves by ecclesiastics who encouraged parishioners to work with Protestant Canadians in building a common Canadian nation further contributed to the growing sense among Irish Catholics that Canadian nation-building and good citizenship came before allegiance to Ireland. Moreover, Brian P. Clarke argues, loyalty to Canada and support of Irish Home Rule were reconciled with each other as this new generation of moderates believed that they could "best contribute to Ireland's welfare by being loyal subjects," that is, by contributing to civil society and supporting Canadian self-government, so proving to Englishmen

⁶⁷*Irish Canadian*, 23 June 1887; *Catholic Weekly Review* quoted in Mark McGowan, "We are all Canadians': A Social, Religious, and Cultural Portrait of Toronto's English-speaking Roman Catholics, 1890-1920" (Ph.D. diss., University of Toronto, 1988), 298; *Toronto News*, 28 June 1887; City of Toronto Council Minutes, 1887, 4 July 1887, No. 723.

⁶⁸*Irish Canadian*, 7 July 1887.

that Irishmen were accommodating, responsible, and capable of self-government. At the core of their sense of good Canadian citizenship was loyalty to the established government and, thus, to the Crown.⁶⁹

Irish Catholic Canadians, as evidenced during the Golden Jubilee celebrations, had long had difficulty in distinguishing the Crown from the British government responsible for the oppressive policies followed in Ireland. The Canadianisation of the community, however, included an appreciation that the British monarch was also the Canadian Sovereign under whom their religious liberty and right to self-government had been guaranteed and protected. The *Catholic Weekly Review*'s understanding in 1892 that "The Queen is not English, not even British...she is the lawful Queen" differentiated the monarch from Parliamentary policy and enabled Irish Catholic Canadians to pay due homage to the Sovereign without also sanctioning British government policies. The Irish Catholic commemoration of Queen Victoria's Diamond Jubilee further reflected this shift in thought as the community's press and clergy celebrated the virtues of the Queen and, especially, the liberty her tolerant example had granted them. In Irish Catholic churches across the country, priests thanked the Crown for "the blessing of religious liberty" and the Queen specifically for her spirit of religious tolerance and respect for the rights of conscience. "As Catholics," the Archbishop of Halifax told his flock, "we honor and reverence our queen...because of her personal worth and her governing power." Her character was offered as "the most excellent example" of the feminine virtues, in particular a strong faith in God and respect for the sentiments of others. The granting of Canadian self-government

⁶⁹McGowan, *Waning of the Green*, 4-5, 9-12, 60; Clarke, *Piety and Nationalism*, 224-250.

during the Queen's reign was also offered as a reason why Irish Catholics were prepared to "unite cordially in the intended display of Canadian loyalty to the Queen" during the Diamond Jubilee. As Rev. Ryan told his parishioners, "Canada is loyal because she is free." "There are external questions," the *Catholic Register* acknowledged, "with which Irish Catholics feel that they are concerned; but these questions in no way effect their loyalty either as individuals or as a body of citizens."⁷⁰

Changes in the composition of their clergy and the character of their ethnic identity, then, influenced the Irish Catholic community's attitude towards the monarchy. More indigenous and focussed upon Canadian affairs than was the case a decade earlier, they had by the turn of the century embraced the ideology the French Catholic clergy and laity had long espoused: the identification of their religious rights with constitutional monarchy.

Queen Victoria and French Canadians

From the time of the 1860 Royal Tour until the end of Queen Victoria's reign, the character of the French Canadian élite's attitude towards the monarchy remained consistent. The Roman Catholic hierarchy enjoyed the Crown's recognition of its status in the province of Quebec and, as well, the social stability and conservatism of the institution. The French bourgeoisie also appreciated the social order the system underwrote, and, in common with the clergy, acknowledged the protection it provided to French culture. The freedom to practice the Catholic religion and to converse in French were credited to the Sovereign's sense of justice,

⁷⁰*Catholic Weekly Review* quoted in McGowan, "'We are all Canadians,'" 299; Idem, *Waning of the Green*, 204; *Globe*, 21 June 1897; *Saint John Daily Sun*, 14 June 1897; *Halifax Herald*, 21 June 1897; *Catholic Register*, 3 June, 10 June, 24 June 1897, 24 January, 31 January 1901.

liberty, and fairness, qualities which led her to encourage Canadian self-government and civil liberty in the Dominion. By portraying the Queen and constitutional monarchy in this way, the French Catholic clergy and bourgeoisie were able to support their claims to religious and language equality with English Protestants and, thus, legitimise the maintenance of a cross-cultural class hegemony between the two groups.

Consequently, during the commemoration of Queen Victoria's Golden and Diamond Jubilees the French Canadian élite continued to articulate representations of the Queen which supported their religious and ethnic equality and racial unity. On both occasions, the Archbishops of Montreal and Quebec issued directions to their diocese to hold divine services in thanksgiving for the Queen's reign and, for the Diamond Jubilee, the singing of a *Te Deum* in all of the churches of the Archdiocese of Quebec. In public addresses they also praised the Queen as a "mère de famille modèle," an exemplar of "vertus domestiques," and, above all, as "une protectrice de ses libertés." It was as a supporter of "la liberté de l'Église catholique" and her respect for language rights that she had gained the willing loyalty of all French Canadians. Yet, the Roman Catholic hierarchy was quick to point out that their primary loyalty was to God, for it was He who governed the universe and delegated to mortal kings and queens a part of his power. It was, therefore, by God's will that Queen Victoria ruled over French Canadians and by his blessing that she respected the civil and religious rights of her peoples.⁷¹

Members of the French middle class similarly argued that, thanks to providence, the Queen's rule had been responsible for forging a special relationship between French Canadians

⁷¹Diocèse de Québec, *Mandements des Évêques de Québec*, n.s., vol. 4 (Québec, [1897]), 372; Diocèse de Montréal, *Mandements des Évêques de Montréal*, vol. 12 (Montréal, 1907), 256-257, 352-355, 365-368.

and the Crown, one in which Francophones were granted full religious and civil liberty by a sympathetic and tolerant monarch. "It is under her sceptre," *La Patrie* observed, "that French Canadians have known, loved and practised the regime of political liberty, of democratic sovereignty. It is in the shadow of her throne that our race has developed without restraint. At all our firesides the name of Victoria was the centre for the most profound affection, the most sincere admiration." "Juste et glorieux!" *Le Manitoba* declared of the Queen's reign, "Plus glorieux: que ce soit a Sa Majesté que l'on doive la paix universelle; plus juste; que soit a Sa Majesté que l'on doive la juste complète pour frères d'Ireland, pour le catholicisme dans toutes l'empire et specialement pour les catholiques de Manitoba. God Save the Queen!" Editorials in the other major French dailies, including *La Presse*, *Le Courrier du Canada*, and *La Minerve*, echoed these sentiments. They credited Victoria's respect for religious and language rights for establishing an era of "paix and de développement nationale" in the Empire in which French Canadians were accorded a central place: a position exemplified by Wilfrid Laurier's precedence in the Diamond Jubilee celebrations in the imperial metropole.⁷²

Adding legal and nationalist authority to these assertions, prominent French Canadian lawyers and judges and the *Société Saint Jean-Baptiste* made explicit the relationship between Queen Victoria's rule and the freedom of conscience and equality within Canadian society that Francophones enjoyed. According to Rodolphe Lemieux, professor of law at Laval University, "the name of Victoria will always be dear to the hearts of French Canadians, because it is from

⁷²*La Patrie* quoted in *Globe*, 23 January 1901; *La Patrie*, 24 January 1901; *Le Manitoba* quoted in Thomas W. Dickens, "Winnipeg, Imperialism, and the Queen Victoria Diamond Jubilee Celebration, 1897" (Master's thesis, University of Manitoba, 1982), 196; *Le Courrier du Canada*, 22 June 1887, 19 June 1897; *La Presse*, 19 June, 21 June, 23 June 1897; *La Minerve*, 22 June 1887.

the accession of this illustrious woman to the throne of Great Britain that our constitutional liberties date." Adolphe-Basile Routhier, a judge on the Superior Court of Lower Canada, concurred, arguing that the monarchical system and sentiment for Queen Victoria kept the British Empire together. Although a loose conglomerate of self-governing nations, the Empire's peoples were united by gratitude for their liberty and consequent affection for the Queen. Both the Montreal and Quebec chapters of the *Société Saint-Jean Baptiste*, a national society largely composed of the political and intellectual élite with ultramontane sympathies, represented the relationship between the Queen and French Canadian liberties in similar fashion. Expressing "the love we feel to you as subjects, and the admiration we feel for you as a woman," the addresses and resolutions reaffirmed each chapter's "loyal attachment to Your Majesty and the British Crown" for "the definite consecration of constitutional liberties, the complete enjoyment of their religious and national rights."⁷³

Whether it took it from the clergy or the bourgeoisie, then, the French Canadian élite shared an image of the monarchy in which the Queen was represented as the embodiment of religious tolerance and constitutional liberty. African Canadians during the Royal Tour of 1860 and, to varying degrees, the Irish Catholic community had a similar sense of things. Each of these minority groups had attempted to protect its language rights, defend its religious liberty, and claim civil equality by invoking an image of a sympathetic Sovereign who stood for the

⁷³*Globe*, 2 June 1897; A.B. Routhier, *La Reine Victoria et Son jubilé* (Québec, 1898), 19-26, 171, 183-186; Donald Luc Boivert, "Religion and Nationalism in Quebec: The *Saint-Jean-Baptiste* Celebrations in Sociological Perspective" (Ph.D. diss., University of Ottawa, 1990), 161-167; *Ottawa Citizen*, 9 June 1887; RG7/G20, vol. 186, No. 1827, Address to Queen Victoria from the *Société Saint-Jean-Baptiste de Québec*, 23 June 1897; *La Patrie*, 25 January 1901; *Montreal Gazette*, 25 January 1901.

equality of all subjects irrespective of ethnic background or religious affiliation. In a society in which white, English-speaking Protestants composed the majority of the population, the representation of *their* symbol of national identity as also a symbol of ethnic and religious liberty empowered minority groups permitting them to challenge the dominant culture's hegemony at the level of representation. Some groups, though, were more successful than others. Comprising a significant proportion of the Canadian population, Irish Catholics and French Canadians could not be easily dismissed by British Protestants. In fact, the dominant male, middle class culture of nineteenth century Canada could maintain the social stability its hegemony depended upon only through the incorporation of these large and vocal ethno-religious groups. Consequently, a cross-cultural hegemony composed of male, middle class British Protestants, French Canadians, and Irish Catholics was formed and maintained through the assertion of a common national ideology which diminished ethnic and religious differences by ensuring the equality of each group. The concept of unity in diversity as embodied in the monarchy provided a focal point for these diverse ethnic and religious groups to come together in common loyalty. During the Royal Tour of 1860 and the remainder of Queen Victoria's reign the monarchy was upheld as the guarantor of French language freedom and Catholic religious liberty, but also as a Protestant institution and a continuing link to the British Empire. As demonstrated by the Orange Order's antics, however, not all British Protestants were supportive of the accommodation given to Francophones and Catholics and, as exemplified by African Canadians, not all ethnic groups were included in the dominant culture's image of the nation. Resistance was a constant activity in the maintenance of the cross-cultural hegemony, but so, too, was the process of negotiation, exclusion, and the delegitimisation of counter cultures. More than a

reflection of these social processes, royal representations and ceremonies comprised a hegemonic site in which competing loyalties were challenged, balanced, and integrated. During the Victorian period common agreement and alliances were forged between Protestants, Catholics, English, and French, but old and new challenges during the Edwardian era would continue to strain the tenuous ethnic and religious unity of middle class hegemony.

CHAPTER VI

Religion and Ethnicity During the Edwardian Era, 1901-11

Upon learning of the death of Edward VII on 6 May 1910, British Protestants, French Canadians, and Irish Catholics across Canada united in mourning their loss. No less involved—indeed, particularly conspicuous in the public bereavement—were Jewish Canadians who, the *Globe* headlined, had paid the King a “Fine Tribute” in their memorial services. Edward the Peacemaker was, the *Canadian Jewish Times* proclaimed, “a true friend to our people” and, according to Rabbi Gordon of Toronto’s McCaul Street Synagogue, “nobody sorrowed more sincerely at his death than the Jewish people.” Due to his high profile friendships with such well-known Jews as Leopold de Rothschild and Baron Maurice de Hirsch and his reported use of influence on the Russian Czar to improve the treatment of Jews in that country, he earned the praise of Jewish Canadians as “their great and liberal friend.” “We owe to him in a great measure,” the Hebrew Benefit Association of Montreal memorialised, “the liberty which we now possess and we are also indebted to him for the deep interest he has taken in our Brothers in Europe.” Rabbi Abramowitz echoed these sentiments as he told his Montreal congregation that “In no country in the world did the Jews occupy so satisfactory a political and social position as in England. This was due not only to the King’s friendship for individual Jews, but his attitude towards the Jewish nation.”¹

¹*Canadian Jewish Times*, 13 May 1910; *Globe*, 9 May, 21 May 1910; National Archives of Canada [hereafter NAC], Records of the Governor General Office [RG7], Central Registry Files [G21], reel T-1390, vol. 332, file 2213(2), Simon Glazer to Earl Grey, 8 May 1910 (copy), Hebrew Benefit Association of Montreal to Earl Grey, 9 May 1910 (copy), Young Men’s Hebrew Association of Vancouver to Earl Grey, 9 May 1910 (copy); Philip Magnus, *King Edward the Seventh* (London,

Queen Victoria, too, had been celebrated by Jewish Canadians for evincing "a strong sympathy with the removal of Jewish political disabilities,"² but it was during the reign of Edward VII that their loyalty to the monarchy became most pronounced. In part this was due to the King's more public style and his genuine tolerance for religious diversity, but it was also a matter of the changing character of Canadian society. In 1891 only 6,414 Canadians claimed Jewish ancestry, but by 1911 the number had swelled to 74,564. The larger size of the Jewish population increased the number of synagogues, multiplied Hebrew charitable and educational organisations, and, inevitably, increased the community's visibility in the metropolitan centres of Montreal and Toronto where most had settled. With a larger constituency and more developed social institutions, middle class Jews and rabbis sought to fight antisemitism and gain social acceptance from English and French Christians by adopting a more public and vocal profile. Their public positions, though, were not to protest conditions, but to support the British Empire and proclaim their loyalty to the monarchy. "In view of their minority status," Gerald Tulchinsky explains, "most Jews likely would have been reluctant to utter dissent and thus attract attention (and even antisemitism) on the grounds of disloyalty." Significantly, however, "it was not only fear that inspired their Britishness, it was also pride in Britain's accomplishments, and the borrowed prestige of its imperial status." Indeed, most of the Jewish middle class claimed a common British heritage and celebrated its traditions, the most celebrated of which, in common

1964), 170, 217-218; *Montreal Gazette*, 20 May, 21 May 1910.

²*Montreal Gazette*, 21 June 1897; *Toronto Evening News*, 22 June 1887; Conyngham Crawford Taylor, *Toronto "Called Back," from 1888 to 1847 and the Queen's Jubilee...* (Toronto, 1888), 391; W.H. Miln, ed., *Eulogies on Queen Victoria, Delivered by the Prominent Ministers of Canada on Her Majesty's Funeral Day, Feb. 2, 1901* (Toronto, 1901), 40; *Jewish Times*, 1 February 1901.

with other minority groups, was that of British justice as enshrined in the monarchy. As the symbol of British liberty, the King was praised by Jews for their condition of "perfect freedom and equality" in the Empire. "It is to the example set by England," the *Canadian Jewish Times* announced on the occasion of the Coronation of George V, "that we Jews owe so much for our freedom of conscience and equality after thousands of years of persecution and misery." The Crown's protection of their freedoms permitted them to express their Jewishness openly, an act, they assured Christian Canadians, which was not disloyal to the Empire, but, rather, evidence of their appreciation and loyal devotion to the King.³

Like French Canadians and other minority groups, then, Jewish Canadians had upheld the monarchy as a symbol of their right to civil and religious equality in the Canadian community: an act which both legitimised their claims for equality and served to facilitate their integration into the nation. Despite strong antisemitic sentiments among ultramontanes and other Christians, by the end of the Edwardian era the English middle class press was quick to point to the loyalty of Jews as it reported the ways in which the "Jewish citizens...took advantage of the occasion [of George V's coronation] to give public and religious recognition of their appreciation of the civil and religious liberties they enjoy under the British flag."⁴ In doing so, it sought to reassure the rest of society of the nation's unity during a period of rapid socioeconomic change. Possessing a population of whom 61% claimed British origins in 1871, Canada had by 1911 seen

³Canada, *Census of Canada*, 1891, 1911; Gerald Tulchinsky, *Taking Root: The Origins of the Canadian Jewish Community* (Toronto, 1992), xxii-xxv, 150, 200, 277-228, 232, 256, 277; Stephen A. Speisman, *The Jews of Toronto: A History to 1937* (Toronto, 1979), 62-63, 118-119, 189-190; *Canadian Jewish Times*, 16 June 1911; *Jewish Times*, 13 September 1901.

⁴*Montreal Gazette*, 23 June 1911, 20 May 1910; *Ottawa Citizen*, 23 June 1911; *Manitoba Free Press*, 23 June 1911.

the figure drop to 55% as the number of Jews, Asians, and Eastern Europeans grew dramatically.⁵ The increased ethnic diversity of the Canadian nation seemed to threaten both its social stability and the dominant culture's hegemony as racial tensions rose, white workers protested against the importation of Asian labour by businessmen, and the nontraditional ethnic minorities pushed for equality and social inclusion. The dominant culture attempted to sooth these social tensions by pointing to evidences of loyalty among ethnic minorities in order to convince white Christian Canadians that Jews and Asians were peaceful and respected the socioeconomic order. At the same time, the hegemonic bloc's recognition of the ethnic minorities' loyalty led to their increased status and even inclusion in public celebrations. Significantly, however, it did not fundamentally alter power relations. Although Jews and Asians would find themselves included in royal celebrations as they had never been before, middle class British Protestants, French Canadians, and Irish Catholics continued to legitimise their cultural dominance through ceremonial precedence and royal representations. During the reign of Edward VII Jews, Asians, and other ethnic minorities may have achieved greater public recognition, but they remained in a position of socioeconomic subordination legitimised by public symbolism.

Yet, the alliance between British Protestants, French Canadians, and Irish Catholics also continued to be a tenuous one. Issues of precedence remained problematic during royal ceremonies as the various Protestant denominations and Roman Catholics asserted and resisted the state arrangements proposed for the memorial services of Queen Victoria and Edward VII. The Royal Tour of 1901 was no less compromised by Methodist, Baptist, and Presbyterian

⁵Canada, *Census of Canada*, 1871, 1911.

criticism of the precedence accorded to Anglican and Catholic clergy. Likewise, the Royal Tour replicated the struggle between French and English images of the nation articulated during the 1860 Visit as Francophones again waved the Tricolour and used their own language to express both their sense of ethnic identity and loyalty to the Crown. The opposition to the French practices, however, was more tempered than in 1860, a situation which reflected the greater degree of integration and cooperation between British Protestants and French Catholics by the turn of the century. Indeed, as demonstrated by the Royal Tour's lumberjack display and the decade-long agitation taken to reform the anti-Catholic component of the Accession Oath, British Protestants, French Canadians, and Irish Catholics increasingly expressed a shared sense of Canadian national identity distinctive from the rest of the Empire. Their idealised definition of the Canadian nation included it as a part of the Empire, but it also came to be one in which English, French, Protestant, and Catholic shared equal rights under the freedom of the Crown.

The Memorial Services of Queen Victoria and Edward VII

Despite the unity in lamenting the demise of Queen Victoria and Edward VII among British Protestants, French Canadians, Irish Catholics, and other ethnic and religious minorities, the organisation of the national capital's memorial services for each monarch proved to be contentious issues. As a religious function in a religiously diverse state, a national memorial service posed problems in regards to denominational precedence and the status of each church in the Dominion. As illustrated by the squabbles over religious precedence during the Royal Tour of 1860, these questions were not easily resolved and potentially threatened social unity and the stability of a hegemony. In each memorial service, an imperial vision of Canadian unity

based upon the melding of different religions and ethnicities conflicted with an indigenous image of the Canadian nation based upon unity in diversity—an image which proved stronger and more resilient than the traditional and homogenous imperial interpretation.

Soon after it was announced that the Queen's funeral in London was to take place on February 2, Lord Minto set to work upon arranging a memorial service in Ottawa on the same day. Planning to make it "an impressive ceremony," the Governor General suggested to the Prime Minister that "a ceremony in honour of our Great Queen officially recognized by the Govt of the Dominion would be in full accordance with public sentiment in Canada, & that the natural place to hold such a ceremony would be in the [Anglican] Cathedral Church of the official capital of the Dominion." Minto believed that a gathering of all of the clergy from the various denominations to do honour to the Queen would bring Protestants and Catholics closer together in common affection for the monarchy. Relations between British Protestants and French Catholics had been tense during his term in office as distrust still simmered over the Manitoba Schools Question and at times threatened to boil over as French nationalists opposed Canadian involvement in the ongoing South African War. Rather than uniting both sides under the Crown, though, Minto's decision to hold an official "state" memorial service in the Anglican cathedral (the church to which the Queen was most connected), he later admitted, was the cause of "a great deal of angry feeling" in Ottawa and across the country.⁶ Indeed, upon presenting the proposal to his Cabinet, Laurier found the Methodist, Baptist, and Catholic members firmly

⁶Lord Minto to Charles Tupper, 27 January 1901, Lord Minto to Wilfrid Laurier, in *Lord Minto's Canadian Papers: A Selection of the Public and Private Papers of the Fourth Earl of Minto, 1898-1904*, eds. Paul Stevens and John T. Saywell, vol. 2 (Toronto, 1981-1983), 7-8; NAC, 4th Earl of Minto Papers, MG27 II B1, reel A-131, Letterbooks, vol. 2, pp. 214-219, Lord Minto to Joseph Chamberlain, 15 February 1901.

opposed to the idea. They argued that the service as proposed by Minto would have an appearance of a "state service" in a country lacking a state church. Consequently, to hold it at the Anglican cathedral would be to place the Church of England in the status of a state church—a proposition other denominations could not accept. As Laurier explained to Minto, "I find very strong objection to having a ceremony at the cathedral which would have the appearance of a 'state service.' There will be in Ottawa on Saturday from 15 to 20 different religious ceremonies. We have no state church in this country, & to favor one in so marked a difference, will & already does provoke criticism—a thing above all things to be avoided on such an occasion." Therefore, the government could not participate in the service in any formal capacity. Although Minto could not "conceive that the holding of a state ceremony at the church of any particular denomination could possibly be taken to indicate the acceptance of that church as a 'state' church," he bowed to the "small parochial" wishes of Laurier's Cabinet.⁷

When the press and public found out about the proposal, and the following retreat, they expressed disappointment with the idea and relief with its abandonment. The *Manitoba Free Press* affirmed that the ceremony as planned by Minto could not go ahead since "there is no state church in this Dominion, and there has, therefore, never been, nor can there be, a state church service." Unfortunately, John Dafoe went on to write, "nothing could be more vilely shameful than any attempt to mar the solemn harmony of that anthem of sorrow [surrounding the Queen's

⁷Wilfrid Laurier to Lord Minto, 28 January 1901, Wilfrid Laurier to Lord Minto, 29 January 1901, R.W. Scott to Lord Minto, 31 January 1901, Lord Minto to Wilfrid Laurier, 30 January 1901, Lord Minto to R.W. Scott, 4 February 1901, in *Lord Minto's Canadian Papers*, eds. Stevens and Saywell, vol. 2, 8-9, 12-15, 19-20; Minto Papers, reel A-131, Letterbooks, vol. 2, pp. 214-219, Lord Minto to Joseph Chamberlain, 15 February 1901; Carman Miller, *The Canadian Career of the Fourth Earl of Minto: The Education of a Viceroy* (Waterloo, Ontario, 1980), 187-188.

death] by jarring discords" over religious precedence. The Methodist Rev. Salem Bland agreed that it "would be very unwise in establishing a precedent in favor of any church" and, thus, "if the Government refused to recognize any memorial service as a state service it acted with perfect propriety." Nonetheless, the *Ottawa Citizen* lamented, "the only logical result of the present decision is that there can be no more state funerals in Canada unless the deceased happens to belong to no church whatsoever." The dispersal of the members of Cabinet to the various memorial services held on February 2 testified to the verity of this conclusion. As Minto went to the Anglican Cathedral dressed in uniform and accompanied by Richard Cartwright, F.W. Borden, and William Mulock, Laurier and R.W. Scott went to the Roman Catholic Basilica, Clifford Sifton to the Dominion Methodist Church, and W.S. Fielding to his Baptist congregation.⁸ Although united in sorrow and support for the monarchy, religious diversity prevented Canadians from paying a homogeneous tribute to Queen Victoria. Instead, in lamenting the loss of their Queen with Catholic, Anglican, Baptist, Methodist, and other religious services, Canadians emphasised that their nation was one which respected religious diversity while remaining united in common allegiance to the Crown.

There was, however, some criticism levelled at the lack of memorial services held in Roman Catholic churches. In their defence the *Catholic Register* explained that "however much we may respect Her Gracious Majesty, she was a Protestant and, as such, a heretic. It is not permissible to offer public services in the Church for those outside the pale, and consequently Mass was not offered for the Queen." Instead, each individual Catholic was invited to offer up

⁸*Manitoba Free Press*, 31 January 1901; *Montreal Gazette*, 31 January 1901; *Ottawa Citizen*, 30 January, 4 February 1901.

“private prayers” for the soul of the Queen, an act *La Vérité* claimed would be one of great charity by Catholics for a Protestant person. A *Te Deum* was also sang in many Catholic churches which, *La Presse* pointed out, was the most solemn of ceremonies possible in their church.⁹ The Roman Catholic Church’s attitude towards religious services for Protestants, nonetheless, prevented it from holding a single memorial service with Protestant denominations.

The Catholic Church’s resolve was tested again on the occasion of the death of Edward VII as Governor General Earl Grey revived his predecessor’s idea of a single memorial service involving all of the various religious denominations. Like Minto, Grey had worked throughout his term in office to bring English and French Canadians closer together through the use of royal influence in elaborate ceremonies, most significantly the Quebec Tercentenary of 1908. The death of the King offered another opportunity, albeit an unfortunate one, in which to “produce a great and permanent impression” of the common “National sentiment of mourning” felt by all Catholics and Protestants in the Dominion. The Governor General proposed a “non-sectarian” memorial service on the neutral ground of Parliament Hill which would involve all of the denominations. While the Anglican archbishop would officiate the ceremony, on account of his seniority, Grey assured Wilfrid Laurier that “there will not be a single note in the memorial service which either Roman Catholic or Protestant can take exception. The forms of prayer & the hymns will be non-sectarian & command universal assent.” Paul Bruchési, the Archbishop of Montreal, however, informed Grey that the Catholic Church could not participate in a ceremony which contained hymns and prayers the Governor General may have regarded as “non-

⁹*Catholic Register*, 7 February 1901; *La Vérité*, 2 February 1901; *La Presse*, 4 February 1901.

sectarian," but which were, in fact, Protestant. Catholics would mourn the loss of the King with private prayers in their own churches unless all religious characteristics of the Parliament Hill service were dropped.¹⁰

Undaunted, Earl Grey felt that at the very least the cooperation of all of the Protestant denominations in the memorial service would contribute to his desire for an eventual Protestant Union. Thus, he asked Anglican Archbishop Charles Hamilton to lead a service on Parliament Hill which would remain "a Christian Service in which Roman Catholics as well as Protestants can take part with all their heart, should they desire to do so." Hamilton, however, politely declined Grey's offer. Although flattered that the other denominations had agreed to let him lead the service, he told Grey that "I have no right to assume that their people and all of the other Congregations of the City will acquiesce." In addition, he regarded Baptists, Methodists, and Presbyterians as "schismatics" and, therefore, "he would be dishonouring the Lord and his own convictions if he were to associate himself with them in a common act of worship." For these reasons, Hamilton submitted, it would be "a truer and safer course for all of us to hold our own Memorial Services in our own Churches, on the solemn occasion." At length, then, Earl Grey came to the conclusion that "a Memorial Service, even conducted on the non-sectarian lines that I had suggested, would be likely to do more harm than good."¹¹

¹⁰H.V. Nelles, *The Art of Nation-Building: Pageantry and Spectacle at Quebec's Tercentenary* (Toronto, 1999); Mary Elizabeth Hallett, "The 4th Earl Grey as Governor General of Canada, 1904-1911" (Ph.D. diss., University of London, 1974), 148-178, 298-301; NAC, Wilfrid Laurier Papers, MG26 G, reel C-1163, vol. 735, pp. 206809-206810, Earl Grey to Paul Bruchési, 7 May 1910 (copy), pp. 206832-206833, Earl Grey to Wilfrid Laurier, 11 May 1910, pp. 206811-206812, Paul Bruchési to Earl Grey, 9 May 1910 (copy).

¹¹Laurier Papers, reel C-1163, vol. 735, p. 206833, Earl Grey to Wilfrid Laurier, 11 May 1910, pp. 206834-206835, Earl Grey to Archbishop Charles Hamilton, 11 May 1910 (copy), p.

Despite the attempts of imperial authorities to emphasise a Canadian national identity which downplayed religious differences, Canadians continued to assert the importance of religious identity in their image of the self. This may have prevented religious unity, but the maintenance of equal status between religious denominations permitted the continuance of an informal Protestant alliance and cooperation with Catholics. In memorialising Queen Victoria and Edward VII in denominationally distinct ceremonies they avoided the problems of precedence and conflict over religious dogma while expressing a common sense of unity under the Crown. While Lord Minto and Earl Grey may have regarded religious difference as an impediment to national cohesion, in the Canadian experience unity came from diversity under the Crown.

French Canadians and the Royal Tour of 1901

In organising the Royal Tour of 1901, Lord Minto seemed to have learned from the experience of the Queen's Memorial Service. Controversy over religious precedence or status had to be avoided, and so "H.R.H. had better keep clear of the churches...." Nonetheless, arrangements were made for the Duke to pay a visit to Laval University, a stop Minto confessed he had "been right in approving...though I wish [the Duke] could have escaped it." The fact of the matter, according to F.D. Monk, was that "the institution is the national institution *par excellence*" in Quebec and to omit it from the itinerary "would be taken as a pointed slight." Indeed, Senator George Drummond lamented that "the race question again!!" dictated that both Laval and McGill universities be visited in order to prevent any "ill feeling" arising between

206836, Archbishop Charles Hamilton to Earl Grey, 12 May 1910 (copy), p. 206843, Earl Grey to Wilfrid Laurier, 13 May 1910.

French Canadians and British Protestants during the Duke's visit.¹²

The French Canadian reception of the Duke and Duchess displayed little "ill feeling" during their progress through Quebec. As in previous royal ceremonies, the French Canadian bourgeoisie and Catholic Church celebrated the British Crown and, more specifically, its protection of their language, religious liberty, and social status in society. By proclaiming their loyalty to the King—and the foundations upon which it was based—French Canadians reminded British Protestants of their right to equality in the Canadian community: a status legitimised by the sanction of the heir to the throne. The Roman Catholic hierarchy took the lead in welcoming the royal couple and, according to the ultramontane paper *La Vérité*, demonstrated in so doing that it was the link between the English Crown and the French Canadian people. The Archbishop of Quebec asserted his church's role in this capacity in his address to the Duke as he told him that "the history of our country proves that to the Catholic Church belongs the honour of having forged between the English throne and the French-Canadian people solid bonds...of unswerving loyalty." The loyalty of Catholic clergy to the British monarchy was credited to the Crown's protection of their religious liberty and the privileges accorded to the Romish Church in Quebec. Reaffirming the relationship, the Duke told his audience at Laval University that "if the Crown has faithfully and honourably fulfilled its engagement to protect and respect your faith, the Catholic Church has amply fulfilled its obligation not only to teach reverence for law and order, but to instil a sentiment of loyalty and devotion into the minds of

¹²Minto Papers, reel A-131, Letterbooks, vol. 2, pp. 373-374, Lord Minto to Wilfrid Laurier, 21 August 1901; RG7, Miscellaneous records relating to royal visits and vice-regal tours [G23], vol. 10, file 29, F.D. Monk to Lord Minto, 15 September 1901, Lord Minto to F.D. Monk, 17 September 1901 (copy); vol. 9, file 25, Memorandum by George Drummond, September 1901.

those to whom it ministers."¹³

Representatives of the French bourgeoisie similarly took the opportunity of the Duke's visit to assert their loyalty, reaffirm the Crown's protection of French culture in Canada, and emphasise their equal status with the British middle class. In welcoming the Duke and Duchess to their cities, the Corporations of Quebec and Montreal and the St. Jean-Baptiste Society of Ottawa offered expressions of their "sentiments les plus sincères de loyauté pour le trône" which was "le symbole de la vie nationale d'un grand peuple et de la forme de gouvernement la plus juste et la plus libre...." So long as justice, liberty, and equality were provided to French Canadians by "la constitution généreuse" and the sovereign's benevolent protection, the King could be certain that they would remain loyal and grateful subjects.¹⁴ The bourgeois press and literary scene added to the chorus of French praise for the monarchy as they described it as "le soleil de la liberté" and "le premier gardien de nos droits." Moreover, they pointed out that the shared welcome given to the Duke and Duchess by both French and English Canadians and Their Royal Highnesses' reciprocal recognition of each group had demonstrated that the two races were equal in attachment to the Crown and equal in standing in the community. The Duke underscored this in his national address to Canadians on Parliament Hill. Penned by Joseph Pope and Wilfrid Laurier, the address articulated the state's vision of the nation as one in which French

¹³*La Vérité*, 28 September 1901; Donald Mackenzie Wallace, *The Web of Empire: A Diary of the Imperial Tour of Their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York in 1901* (London, 1902), 364; Joseph Pope, *The Tour of Their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York Through the Dominion of Canada in the Year 1901* (Ottawa, 1901), 171-174, 18-19.

¹⁴Pope, *The Tour of Their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York*, 176-181, 165-166; Wallace, *The Web of Empire*, 375.

and English were united by loyalty to the Crown. In Canada, intoned the Duke, "the two great nations which form its population have been welded into a harmonious people, and...I am confident that the two races will continue, each according to its special genius and opportunity, to aid and cooperate in building up the great edifice of which the foundations have been so well and truly laid."¹⁵ Recognition of equal rights and status between French and English Canadians, then, became a cornerstone not only of French Canadian imagery of the nation, but of the state's representations too. The sharing, assertion, and legitimisation of hegemony between the French and English middle class required cultural cooperation between both parties in order to ensure social stability, order, and the maintenance of the joint power.

Yet, all was not completely harmonious between French and English Canadians during the Royal Tour. French Canadians continued to express their loyalty to the monarchy in their own peculiar way. Along royal routes French Canadians unfurled the Tricolour next to the Union Jack in order to symbolise how their ethnic identity had become entwined with their loyalty to the Crown. The French flag, they assured Anglophones, was meant only "as an emblem of our race" and, thus, the hanging of it next to the Union Jack signified "mixed nationality but not mixed allegiance." The free expression of their ethnic identity served as a testament to the greatness of the British monarchy and of their loyalty to its head. Most Anglophones, however, did not understand this and regarded the act as an insult to the Duke. In the minds of some imperialists, it only confirmed their suspicions over the genuineness of French loyalty. Although French Canadians were willing to defend the British flag and

¹⁵Louis Fréchette, *Bienvenue à Son Altesse Royale le Duc d'York et de Cornwall* (Montreal, 1901); *La Presse*, 19 September 1901; *La Patrie*, 18 September, 19 September 1901.

institutions in their portion of the Empire, most did not support Canada's involvement in imperial wars, such as the South African War, and they fiercely defended Canadian autonomy against imperial encroachments. Notwithstanding their declarations of loyalty, then, their lack of support for imperial adventures and criticism of the ongoing South African War were what most imperialists chose to recall when viewing and hearing about the raising of the Tricolour. Even more insulting from the imperialist perspective, though, was the "untactful" use of the French language to welcome the Duke and Duchess. While the *Hamilton Spectator* was scandalised by the singing of the national anthem "at [the Duke] in French" at Laval, the *Mail and Empire* took offense over the Mayor of Montreal's reading the civic address in French rather than in the "language of Empire." In defence of the use of their tongue to welcome the Duke, *La Presse* noted that French was "dans nos limites, la langue de l'empire." Moreover, the paper argued that "ceux qui nous reprochent d'avoir usé de notre langue oublient que le tribut d'hommages aussi vrais qu'illimités payé à la couronne anglais dans notre idiome national denote mille fois plus sincérité que si nos élans chaleureux avaient passé pas les refroidissements d'une traduction." *La Patrie* concurred. Through the use of the French language and the raising of the Tricolour "pour les fêtes royales... nous avons affirmé notre loyauté et notre civisme comme Canadiens-français."¹⁶

The ultramontane paper *La Vérité* was more strident in defence of the use of the French language during the Tour to the extent of being critical of the lack of French usage by the Duke himself. Notwithstanding Lord Minto's suggestion to Lord Wenlock that the Duke should reply

¹⁶*Globe*, 10 June 1901; Wallace, *The Web of Empire*, 367, 456-458; *Mail and Empire*, 24 September 1901; *La Presse*, 21 September 1901; *La Patrie*, 20 September 1901.

to French addresses in the same language, a gesture which would be “much appreciated” by the residents of Quebec, His Royal Highness chose to speak the language on only two occasions. The first was during his visit to the Ville Marie Convent in Montreal. He had replied to the nuns’ address in English, but then added some remarks in French which were received with great satisfaction by those present including the *La Presse* reporter who observed that the Duke’s French was “sans défaut, presque sans accent.” Despite the royal visitor’s use of French later in an address to some children, *La Vérité* charged that the Duke’s lack of French usage was due to the machinations of “l’école tory-jingo-impérialiste,” i.e. Joseph Chamberlain and Lord Minto, who had intervened to prevent the heir to the throne from speaking in the French language in any official address, thus avoiding any royal recognition of its legitimacy.¹⁷ Some commentators had formed the opinion that the Duke had not spoken French widely during the Tour because he was not familiar enough with the language and did not want to massacre it. *La Vérité*, though, found this explanation—though probably true¹⁸—“ridicule.” French was, after all, “La langue diplomatique du monde civilisé, fait partie de l’éducation des princes et des nobles, et généralement de ceux qui constituent la haute société....” The paper’s founder, Jules-Paul Tardivel, and his son Paul (who took control of the weekly after his father’s death in 1905) believed in preserving the French Catholic character of Quebec and viewed with equal suspicion

¹⁷RG7/G23, vol. 4, file 5, Lord Minto to Lord Wenlock, 6 September 1901 (copy); *Catholic Register*, 26 September 1901; *La Presse*, 20 September 1901; *La Vérité*, 5 October 1901.

¹⁸George had a lifelong inability to speak either French or German with any degree of fluency. In 1913 the British consul-general in Berlin found his French to be simply “atrocious.” Consequently, George tried to avoid speaking the language whenever possible. Kenneth Rose, *King George V* (New York, 1984), 15-16; NAC, 4th Earl Grey Papers, MG27 II B2, reel C-1360, F. Hopwood to Earl Grey, 18 April 1908.

the words and acts of imperialists. Notwithstanding their "nasty remarks about the Duke not having used the French language" in Quebec City and their advocacy of Quebec autonomy leading to eventual independence, they accepted the current constitutional situation, as ordained by God, and, in the face of a "refrain impérialiste" which had been abusive to the French Canadian people during the Royal Tour, they reaffirmed that the French Canadian people were loyal and remained ever prepared to defend the King from an unjust attack. Indeed, on other occasions of royal significance, such as the death of Edward VII and the Coronation of George V, *La Vérité* urged that "Dieu protège...le Roi!" and assured George V that he "peut compter sur l'attachement et la fidélité des catholiques."¹⁹

At the turn of the century, then, English and French middle class Canadians continued to cooperate in order to maintain social stability, order, national unity, and the general hegemony of all the elements involved in this complex. Royal ceremonies and representations provided them with opportunities and methods of affirming, consolidating, and legitimising the uneasy balance of power between the two groups, but, at the same time, also permitted resistance to occur from dissenting parties. Chief among these were the most ardent imperialists who sought cultural and political ascendancy in what they regarded as a fundamentally "British" colony. In turn, French Canadians responded to their imperialist critics by freely expressing their ethnic identity while arguing that the monarchy granted them cultural protection, clear proof of which would be the royal sanction they sought from the Duke of Cornwall and York during his visit

¹⁹*La Vérité*, 5 October, 28 September 1901, 14 May 1910, 24 June 1911; Susan Mann Trofimenkoff, *The Dream of Nation: A Social and Intellectual History of Quebec* (Toronto, 1983), 130, 277, 291; Nelles, *The Art of Nation-Building*, 123-124; NAC, Joseph Pope Papers, MG30 E86, Joseph Pope to Arthur Sladen, 8 November 1901 (copy).

to Quebec. The state ensured that the Duke recognised the equality—and unity—of French, English, Catholic, and Protestant Canadians through selective visits to their institutions and encouraging words from the royal lips. The Royal Tour of 1901, though, also utilised the heir to the throne to encourage another form of representation to consolidate the unity of French and English Canadians: the legitimisation of distinctively *Canadian* symbols.

The Royal Tour of 1901 and Canadian Identity

As early as the 1820s, Upper Canadians had thought of their colony not simply as a clone of British society, but as “potentially a great nation within the empire” with a character of its own. Certainly, the desire of maintaining the British tie constituted an integral part of their imagined community, but so also did the idea of their society as a distinctive community shaped by geography, climate, and a common past in the New World. Literature, historical works, and scientific studies articulated this emerging sense of Canadian identity as state institutions, such as schools, communicated it to a wider audience. New formative symbols were also developed in order to bridge cultural differences and engender social unity around a common image. “Functioning as a tool for the integration of the collective experience,” Allan Smith explains, “the symbol would overcome any tendency towards incoherence and division and obviate the need for an elaborate and detailed description of the national character.”²⁰ The monarchy comprised a major and more complicated symbol, but a myriad of other images came to signify the unity and distinctiveness of Canadians. At mid-century many of these symbols found expression during the Royal Tour of 1860. The Prince of Wales witnessed a game of the developing sport

²⁰Allan Smith, *Canada—An American Nation?: Essays on Continentalism, Identity, and the Canadian Frame of Mind* (Kingston and Montreal, 1994), 253–283.

of lacrosse, commemorated the contributions of the Canadian militia to the War of 1812 (and, in so doing, gave legitimacy to this central nineteenth century Canadian myth), and provided the first real recognition of the efforts of Laura Secord to warn the British of an impending American attack at Queenston Heights. The "formal adoption" of the maple leaf as a Canadian emblem was also attributed to the Royal Tour. In Toronto, native-born Canadians wore silver maple leaves during the royal procession, the Prince's furniture was made of Canadian maple, his plates, glasses, and headboard were all inscribed with scrolls of maple leaves, and he inaugurated Toronto's botanical gardens by planting a Canadian maple tree as a signifier of the monarchy's cultivation of Canadian prosperity, growth, and identity.²¹

Like its predecessor, the Royal Tour of 1901 provided an opportunity to promote distinctive Canadian national symbols in a way which did not threaten the British tie. By having the Duke of Cornwall and York view and embrace such symbols, the proposition that Canadian nationalism and British imperialism were antithetical to each other was shown to be quite false. The Duke's viewing of canoe races, his review of the North-west Mounted Police in Calgary, the involvement of the Peoples of the First Nations in a "Great Pow-wow" for his entertainment,²² and his witnessing of the first lacrosse national championship game for the Minto

²¹Henry James Morgan, *The Tour of H.R.H. the Prince of Wales Through British America and the United States*, by "A British Canadian" (Montreal, 1860), 222; Archives of Ontario, William Hamilton Merritt Papers, MS 74 R2, package 9; Norman Knowles, *Inventing the Loyalists: The Ontario Loyalist Tradition and the Creation of Usable Pasts* (Toronto, 1997); *Globe*, 2 August, 17 August, 18 August, 22 August, 23 August, 24 August 1860; J.H. Morris, "The Origin of Our Maple Leaf Emblem," *Papers and Records of the Ontario Historical Society* 6 (1904): 21-35; Robert Cellem, *Visit of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales to the British North American Provinces and United States in the Year 1860* (Toronto, 1861), 274.

²²See Chapter VII below for a description of the "Great Pow-wow" of 1901.

Cup were designed to show Their Royal Highnesses, and all Canadians, evidences of Canada's unique cultural heritage within the Empire.²³ Above all, however, were acts and images which represented the unity of French and English Canadians. Sometimes, of course, such displays did not work. The raising by French Canadians of both the Union Jack and the Tricolour was a case in point. More successful was the playing of the French Canadian tune "O Canada," until then little known in English Canada, by the bands of the Ontario Militia during the Toronto Militia Review in order to honour the French population. That event was, however, itself eclipsed by an occurrence earlier in the Tour which dramatically symbolised French and English Canadian unity in the mythic Canadian cultural symbol of the lumberman.

In his 1882 volume on Canadian life and culture, George M. Grant observed that "no phase of life in Canada is more characteristically picturesque than that of the lumberman, identified as it is with all that is most peculiar to Canadian scenery, climate and conditions of living." These living conditions included traversing dangerous streams in birchbark canoes, felling tall trees with the skilful use of an axe, and, most of all, the "shanty"—that "peaceful *Commune* of the lumberman's life, with its routine of duty, healthful food and sleep varied by the *chanson de bois* or tale of woodcraft adventure...." The life of the lumbermen was also one of comradeship between honest, hard-working fellows drawn from both French and English backgrounds who worked side by side and lived together in their humble shanties.²⁴ The

²³RG7/G23, vol. 5, file 10, F.S. Maude to C. Berkeley-Powell, 2 September 1901 (copy); *Ottawa Citizen*, 21 September 1901.

²⁴George M. Grant, ed. *Picturesque Canada; The Country as It Was and Is*, vol. 1 (Toronto, 1882), 211-212, 216, 225; Goldwin Smith, *Canada and the Canadian Question* (1891; reprint, Toronto, 1971), 11.

lumberman became a symbol of French and English racial unity in the minds of many and, accordingly, an organised display of lumberman life was considered to be a critical addition to the series of national representations emanating during the Royal Tour of 1901.

The roots of the lumberman's display in Ottawa were actually more opportunist in nature as the prominent lumber baron John R. Booth had called together his Ottawa Valley colleagues to sketch out a programme for the royal visitors which would "convey to the royal visitors some adequate and lasting idea of the lumber industry and the methods of operation incidental to it." To this end they agreed to expend a considerable amount of their own money to fund "the biggest demonstration representative of the lumber industry ever given in Canada." All modern industrial machinery and techniques, however, were to be dispensed with on the occasion in favour of lumbering operations "carried on as they were before lumbering became modernized." Rivermen dressed in the style of the old *voyageurs* and a shanty built in "rustic style" were to add to the character of the display. The lumbermen's display as carried on in this fashion would serve two purposes. First, it would both disguise the substandard labour practices, pay, and living conditions provided for modern bushworkers with romanticism and would deflect recent charges of illegal sawdust dumping practices away from the owners. Secondly, it would put on display a popular image of Canadian identity which symbolised the unity of English and French Canada.²⁵

Indeed, the press—both English and French—had described the Duke and Duchess' visit to the lumbermen's constructed camp at Rockcliffe on September 23 as a "distinctively Canadian

²⁵*Ottawa Citizen*, 2 August 1901; *Montreal Gazette*, 2 August, 5 September, 18 September 1901; *Globe*, 1 August, 2 August, 30 August 1901; Ian Radforth, *Bushworkers and Bosses: Logging in Northern Ontario, 1900-1980* (Toronto, 1987), 4, 25-106.

day” and “une journée vraiment Canadienne.” As his father had in 1860, the Duke first took to the timber slides where the royal party, the Governor General, the Prime Minister, and a large press corps descended the Chaudière Falls aboard square timber cribs. Directed by “voyageurs” dressed in stereotypical red shirts and blue jean pants, the cribs were managed to the tune of traditional French Canadian songs along the route, much to the glee of the Francophone press in attendance. The English press was no less enthralled by the “songs of the paddle” which, the *Manitoba Free Press* correspondent reported, “made the river ring with the beautiful French Canadian songs that only the river men can sing.” Transferred at the end of the rapids to a waiting fleet of birchbark canoes manned by Natives and “halfbreeds,” the royal party was conveyed to Rockcliffe where they were treated to the spectacle of a canoe race and a logrolling contest. They then visited a reproduction of a shanty constructed of pine and with pike poles, axes, saws, and freshly cut logs strewn about the outskirts of the humble lumbermen’s home in order to give the spectators an entertaining representation “of the industry for which the Ottawa Valley is famous the world over.” The red-shirted lumbermen then invited the royal couple into the shanty and banqueted them “in typical lumber style on pork and beans” cooked over a fire and served on tin plates. The lumbermen’s fête then ended with a final demonstration of their prowess, teamwork, and bi-cultural character by the felling, cutting, and skidding of timber “all performed to the accompaniment of shanty songs....” “If there has been any day,” the *Montreal Gazette* concluded, “upon which the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York have enjoyed themselves to the full in Canadian pastime[s] it has been today.”²⁶

²⁶*Globe*, 24 September 1901; *La Presse*, 24 September 1901; *Montreal Gazette*, 24 September 1901; *La Patrie*, 24 September 1901; *Manitoba Free Press*, 24 September 1901; *Saturday Night*, 5 October 1901; *Ottawa Citizen*, 24 September 1901; *Vancouver World*, 24 September 1901.

The characterisation of the Canadian lumbermen as a close-knit group in which English and French cooperated and cohabited with each other symbolised the hegemonic bloc's conception of the Canadian nation. Such images sought to mitigate cultural differences and unite the residents of the state around a common symbolic system. At the centre of the system was the monarchy, a fact which is demonstrated by the way in which its sanction was sought for other symbols. The maple leaf, lacrosse, canoeing, "O Canada," and the lumberman were all presented to heirs to the throne and, in turn, they received, acknowledged, and encouraged each cultural symbol through their participation. The power of symbolism, however, could only go so far. As the reception of the Duke of Cornwall and York in British Columbia would attest, royal symbolism could do little to quell the rise of racial antipathy amongst white workers against Asian labour on the West Coast.

Asian-White Relations and the Royal Tour of 1901

Although the number of Asian people in British Columbia totalled only 19,524 individuals in 1901, or 10.9% of the general population, the Chinese and Japanese communities of Vancouver organised themselves on a grand scale in order to give the touring Duke and Duchess a welcome which would demonstrate their loyalty and attachment to the Empire while, at the same time, asserting their ethnic identity. As white associations were building triumphal arches along the royal routes, the Chinese and Japanese raised "gateways" in their neighbourhoods which, while similar to the other arches, were based upon traditions from their ethnic heritage. The Japanese structure took the form of a *torii* gateway to a Shinto temple, but with the added features of a compilation of Japanese flags and Union Jacks with a written declaration of

"Welcome" to the Duke and Duchess in Japanese characters. The Chinese gateway (*pai-fang*) likewise adhered to a traditional design with its pagoda style and, moreover, was celebrated by its community as following in the tradition of building *pai-fang* in honour of emperors who made local visits. The placement of miniature Union Jacks on the gateway completed the Chinese welcome to the royal couple and, in common with the action of Japanese and French Canadians, emphasised the fusion of their ethnic identity with a national loyalty to the British Empire and monarchy. The existence of Chinese and Japanese communities in Canada, the gateways symbolically proclaimed, was not a threat to the white community as they, too, were loyal and respectable citizens of the British Empire.²⁷

The reaction of white British Columbians to the gateways was mixed. Reflecting the Western conception of Oriental cultures as exotic and colourful, the middle class press detailed the gateways' artistic form and described them as "splendid" structures which added much "colour" and interest to the ceremonies. Other than this ornamental function, Japanese and Chinese Canadians were not assigned any position in the royal ceremonies. Inclusion did not necessarily mean equality; a fact which was underscored by the prominence given to white middle class gentlemen in the ceremonies at the same time that those ceremonies virtually excluded nonwhites. The Asian professions of loyalty, however, were accepted as evidence of the generous paternalism of the British people and the superiority of their system of justice as enshrined in constitutional monarchy. As the *Vancouver Province* noted, "the zeal shown by the

²⁷Canada, *Census of Canada*, 1901; Cheun-Yan David Lai, *Arches in British Columbia* (Victoria, 1982), 22, 103-105; *Vancouver Province*, 24, 25, 30 September 1901; John A. Cherrington, *Vancouver at the Dawn: A Turn-of-the-Century Portrait* (Madeira Park, BC, 1997), 139-140; John E. Bodnar, *Remaking America: Public Memory, Commemoration, and Patriotism in the Twentieth Century* (Princeton, 1992), 65.

Japanese and Chinese portions of the community [in making arrangements for the visit] is a tribute on their part to the justice and honorable dealing which characterizes the British people in their relations with those of other nationalities." Although accorded lower status in the ceremonies and viewed as primarily exotic curiosities, Chinese and Japanese Canadians, then, played an important role in the ceremonies as they served as a living testament to the freedom, justice, and harmony of the British Empire.²⁸

Indeed, it was the message of social harmony which most concerned the middle class. As the number of Asians increased in British Columbia, so did the hostility of white workers towards them. Chinese and Japanese workers were viewed as cheap wage labourers imported by businessmen to undermine the living and working standards of the white working class. White workers, their thinking compounded by racial ideas which assumed that Asians were unassimilable, inferior, and unfairly competitive due to their acceptance of low wages, long work days, and low standards of living, resisted Asian immigration and opposed their employment in areas which directly competed with white labour. At the turn of the century, these sentiments translated into violent conflict in the fishing industry as white workers protested the growing number of fishing licences held by Japanese fishermen. Charging that the canneries were "flooding the river with cheap Japanese labor," in 1900 and 1901 whites from the Fraser River fishing fleet went out on strike to increase the price per catch paid by the canners and to protest the granting of licences to Japanese fishers who, they argued, depressed the price. Dependent upon fishing as their sole means of support, Japanese fishermen crossed the picket lines and faced

²⁸Robert A.J. McDonald, *Making Vancouver: Class, Status, and Social Boundaries, 1863-1913* (Vancouver, 1996), 201; *Vancouver Province*, 30 September 1901.

violent repercussions. Incidents of Japanese fishermen having their boats seized by strikers and then being dumped on remote islands became not infrequent occurrences. Clashes between the middle class militia, which attempted to protect the strikebreakers' boats, and white fishermen similarly added to the social disorder and racial hostility along the Fraser River.²⁹ Coming in the midst of this labour and ethnic unrest, the Royal Tour of 1901 provided the employers of Asian labour with an opportunity to sooth over racial tensions by highlighting the loyalty of Chinese and Japanese residents to the Crown. Though different, and inferior, the Chinese and Japanese were as loyal as any other of His Majesty's subjects as demonstrated by their elaborate gateways erected in honour of the heir to the throne.

White workers, however, were unimpressed by the displays of Asian loyalty. In fact, rumours circulated that white fishermen were planning to burn down the Japanese *torii*, a suggestion the Fishermen's Union vehemently denied.³⁰ The Vancouver and Victoria Trades and Labour Councils, though, were considering exploiting the Duke's visit in order to submit a petition to His Royal Highness protesting Japanese immigration. Confounded by the British government's consistent support of a military alliance with Japan which prevented any Canadian limitation on Japanese immigration, organised labour on the West Coast saw the Duke's visit as an opportune moment to "let Great Britain understand plainly and distinctly that [working men]

²⁹Gillian Creese, "Exclusion or Solidarity?: Vancouver Workers Confront the 'Oriental Problem,'" *BC Studies*, no. 80 (1988-1989): 27-36; W. Peter Ward, *White Canada Forever: Popular Attitudes and Public Policy Towards Orientals in British Columbia*, 2d ed. (Kingston and Montreal, 1990), 103-107, 120-123; Stuart Jamieson and Percy Gladstone, "Unionism in the Fishing Industry of British Columbia," *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science* 16, no. 2 (1950): 155-156; Cherrington, *Vancouver at the Dawn*, 118.

³⁰*Vancouver Province*, 25 September 1901.

will not suffer under the burden of this Oriental plague for the sake of any armed alliance." "The right of British subjects to petition the sovereign for the redress of grievances is a fundamental principle of the British Constitution," the *Independent* argued, and in setting forth the "grievous burden of these [Japanese] people upon the country" the petition "would serve to arouse an interest in the Japanese immigration question where it is most needed." After careful consideration, though, the Trades and Labour Councils of Vancouver and Nanaimo declined to sign an "anti-Mongolian" petition claiming that such a course was "against the dignity of the Labor Council." Not so, apparently, for those belonging to the Victoria Trades and Labour Council. Following proper channels, the president of the Council forwarded a petition signed by more than a thousand people protesting Asian immigration and the resultant cost to white workers in earning a livelihood to the Governor General's Office for approval. Regarding the document not as an address of welcome, but as "a criticism of policy for which H.R.H. was not responsible," Lord Minto promptly rejected the memorial for presentation.³¹

As members of the Victoria Trades and Labour Council were making their vain attempt at a presentation, disgruntled white fishermen in Vancouver decided to take other action. Rather than attempting to present the Duke with an offensive petition, the members of the Fishermen's Union agreed to boycott the demonstrations held in honour of the Duke and Duchess. "The action was taken," the *Vancouver News-Advertiser* reported, "with a view of expressing their disapproval of the policy of the Imperial Government in favoring Japan to the detriment of

³¹*Independent*, 3 August, 17 August 1901; *Vancouver World*, 24 August, 31 August, 20 September 1901; *Voice*, 18 October 1901; RG7/G23, vol. 7, file 19, Joseph Pope to R.W. Scott, 31 August 1901 (copy), R.W. Scott to Joseph Pope, 4 September 1901, Wilfrid Laurier to Joseph Pope, 10 September 1901, F.S. Maude to John Logg, 11 September 1901 (copy).

British Columbia....” Seemingly a nonevent, the fishermen’s refusal to take part in the celebration turned out to cause a significant amount of anxiety on the part of the middle class organisers. Having promised to stage an elaborate fishing boat display in Burrard Inlet for the entertainment of the royal guests, the Reception Committee had counted on white fishermen coming out in force to offer a nightly display of between 1500 and 2000 illuminated boats which would pay “a great compliment to our Sailor Prince....” No longer able to rely upon white fishermen, organisers turned to the Department of Indian Affairs to supply them with Native replacements. Although nearly one thousand Natives were prepared to take part in about 700 boats and canoes, it was a far cry from original expectations. Consequently, a few days before the event was to be staged the Reception Committee hoped to convince some white fishermen to join the planned display by specifying in the press that all “White fishermen are cordially invited to take part....” As the night of illuminations neared ever closer, the Committee’s and the press’ conciliatory overtures to the white fishermen took on the tone of desperate pleas as they first admitted that “the fishermen might have some grounds of complaint in connection with the Japanese question,” then expressed their desire for “all the assistance it can obtain from the white fishermen,” and then indicated that “will appreciate very much any help” they could get from the boycotters. The fishermen, however, stood steadfast to their principles and by all reports not a single white fisherman took part in the boat display.³²

Chinese and Japanese participation in the Royal Tour permitted each group to pledge its

³²*Vancouver News-Advertiser*, 1 September 1901; *Vancouver Province*, 24 September, 28 September 1901; *Vancouver World*, 31 July, 24 September, 27 September, 28 September, 1 October 1901; RG7/G23, vol. 7, file 19, E. Ricketts to Wilfrid Laurier, 26 June 1901; NAC, Records of the Department of Indian Affairs [RG10], Central Registry System, Black (Western) Series, vol. 8582, file 1/1-2-15-6, Frank Devlin to W. Vowell, 11 September 1901.

loyalty to the Crown in its own culturally distinct ways and, thus, assert its right to an equal place in the community. Whites, though, responded in ways primarily based upon class association. The middle class, which both exploited cheap Asian labour and depended upon social order and harmony to maintain the stability of its hegemony, permitted Asians a small, decorative, and subordinate role which would emphasise the loyalty of their foreign employees. White workers, however, rejected these representations and tried to exploit the Royal Tour to press for an end to Asian immigration. More than just a reflection of Asian-white relations in turn of the century British Columbia, the Royal Tour of 1901 constituted a hegemonic site in which Chinese, Japanese, and whites from the middle and upper classes asserted and resisted representations in order to empower themselves.

The Accession Oath and Roman Catholicism

The Coronation and Funeral of Edward VII were other moments which the dominant culture used to demonstrate the religious and ethnic unity felt by "all races, nationalities, and creeds" in the Dominion for the monarchy. Irish Catholics joined in the ceremonies to heap praise upon the King and reaffirm the staunch loyalty of their Church to the British Crown. As Fergus McEvay, the Bishop of Toronto, memorialised, "as Catholic citizens of this prosperous country we will always remember with gratitude the peaceful reign of His Majesty Edward VII who desired that his Catholic subjects should enjoy their full rights as free citizens in Canada."³³

³³*Globe*, 23 June 1911; *Catholic Register*, 14 August 1902; Archives of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Toronto [hereafter ARCAT], Fergus McEvay Papers, Declaration by Fergus McEvay, May 1910, Fergus McEvay to John Gibson, 19 May 1910; Mark McGowan, "The De-greening of the Irish: Toronto's Irish-Catholic Press, Imperialism, and the Forging of a New Identity, 1887-1914," *Historical Papers of the Canadian Historical Association* (1989): 133-134.

This despite Catholic agitation before Edward's Coronation and immediately after his death against the very oath which had confirmed his rule.

The contents of the Accession Oath, Catholics charged, needlessly insulted their religion by scoffing at the act of transubstantiation and terming the worship of the Virgin Mary and the rituals of the Mass as "superstitious and idolatrous." Walking a fine line, Catholics condemned the oath which authorised the King's rule, but maintained their loyalty to the person of Edward VII and to the institution of monarchy. In fact, they argued, it was the spirit of tolerance that characterised British institutions which had prompted them to agitate for the removal of the objectionable tracts from the Oath. The revocation of the Accession Declaration from the Oath would not only symbolically recognise the right of Catholics to full equality, but it would also remove any taint of bigotry from a throne which stood for tolerance. In their agitation, Irish Catholics gained the support of French Canadians and the majority of British Protestants. The fight to reform the Accession Oath, thus, continued the cooperation of these groups in asserting a vision of their nation as one in which English, French, Protestant, and Catholic were united by shared equal rights under the freedom of the Crown.

Written in the context of the Glorious Revolution which had sent the Catholic King James II into exile and enthroned William of Orange, the *Bill of Rights* (1688) was enacted in order to prevent the exiled king, his son, or any other Catholic from ever sitting upon the British throne again. In addition to upholding the rights of Parliament and limiting the Crown's powers, the *Bill of Rights* debarred from the throne all who "shall be reconciled to or shall hold communion with the see or church of Rome or shall professe [*sic*] the papist religion or shall marry a papist...." To ensure this, the Bill specified that the Oath of Accession was to be taken

by each new Sovereign on the first day of the meeting of the first parliament after his or her accession or at his or her Coronation, whichever may come first, and that the Sovereign should repeat the following declaration contained therein:

I A:B doe solemnely [*sic*] and sincerely in the presence of God professe, testifie [*sic*] and declare that I do believe that in the sacrament of the Lords Supper there is not any transubstantiation of the elements of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ at or after the consecration thereof by any person whatsoever; and that the invocation or adoration of the Virgin Mary or any other saint, and the sacrifice of the masses as they are now used in the Church of Rome are superstitious and idolatrous....

Complementing the Oath of Accession, the Coronation Oath, also enshrined in law in 1688, compelled the Sovereign to pledge that he would “maintain the laws of God the true profession of the Gospell [*sic*] and the Protestant reformed religion established by law.”³⁴

By the end of the nineteenth century, most Roman Catholic subjects of Queen Victoria accepted the Protestant succession, but the words contained in the Accession Declaration continued to offend her loyal Catholic subjects both in Canada and other parts of the Empire. Rev. Michael Fallon learned this as his small speech on the subject in an Ottawa parish in December 1898 attracted the attention of the press in the United Kingdom, prompting him “to suggest further organized action.” Further encouraged by the Catholic Truth Society of Ottawa “to make an appeal to the public sense of justice and equality” in order to remove the “unnecessary and offensive” declaration from the Accession Oath, Fallon presented a paper at the University of Ottawa calling for the removal “of this objectionable declaration.” The oaths were offensive, he proclaimed, not because they made the King swear to maintain the Protestant

³⁴*Halsbury's Statutes of England and Wales* 4th ed., vol. 10 (London, 1995), 29-37; Vernon Bogdanor, *The Monarchy and the Constitution* (Oxford, 1995), 43-44; Percy Ernest Schramm, *The History of the English Coronation*, trans. Leopold G. Wickham Legg (Oxford, 1937), 179-227.

religion nor even that he must be a Protestant (with these he had no quarrel), but because of the manner in which they condemned the Catholic religion as "superstitious and idolatrous." "Idolatry," he pointed out, "is the paying of divine homage to false gods: superstition is a belief in which ignorant or abnormal religious feeling is shown." The object was not to abolish the Accession Oath, then, but to request that "Catholic doctrines, held sacred by us, should not be made the object of royal condemnation and shameful insult." The members of the Catholic Truth Society agreed and passed the first of what would be many resolutions issued by Catholic voluntary associations in the years to come expressing regret over the tone of the Oath and a hope that it would soon be amended so as to "enable the Roman Catholics of the empire to enter with more profound feelings of loyal affection into the spirit of a ceremony which should be the occasion of nothing but mutual esteem and good will on the part of both sovereign and subjects." In the first organised agitation, then, the Catholic Truth Society of Ottawa printed Fallon's speech and distributed it to Catholic voluntary associations across the country in hopes of convincing them to pass resolutions of their own to exert pressure on the government "to eradicate from the Imperial Statute Book the last vestige of by-gone outrages to Catholics." The response was immediate and widespread as numerous lodges of the Catholic Mutual Benevolent Association, Catholic Order of Foresters, and Ancient Order of Hibernians passed resolutions of their own echoing the sentiments of the Catholic Truth Society's petition.³⁵ The immediate

³⁵Michael Francis Fallon, *The Declaration Against Catholic Doctrines which Accompanies the Coronation Oath of the British Sovereign* (Ottawa, 1899); Catholic Truth Society of Ottawa, *The Catholic Truth Society: Its Aims and Objects* (Ottawa, [1891?]); NAC, John Costigan Papers, MG27 I D5, reel C-1477, vol. 1, D.F. Ashe to F.J. McDougall, n.d. [1899], Catholic Mutual Benevolent Association petitions from Toronto, Truro, Goderich, Charlottetown, Halifax, Stratford, Glace Bay, Port Lambton, and Fort William (1899), Catholic Order of Foresters petition from Metcalfe, Ontario (1899), Ancient Order of Hibernians petition from St. Thomas, Ontario (1899).

effect of the agitation, though, was negligible. It had stirred Irish Catholic passions, but had led to no public debate outside of their community. Perhaps this was due to the lack of any immediacy to the issue; the last time the Accession Declaration had been read, after all, had been in 1837 and, even though her sixtieth anniversary upon the throne had just passed, few considered that another Coronation would be imminent. Victoria's death in 1901, however, would bring the issue to the forefront as the new king was now placed in the awkward position of having to make the controversial declaration for the first time in nearly sixty-four years.

Although Edward VII regarded the anti-Popery comments contained in the Accession Oath as offensive to his Catholic subjects, the British Prime Minister, Lord Salisbury, told him that he was obliged to read the Declaration at the first opportunity. This he grudgingly did at the opening of Parliament on 14 February 1901, but he told Salisbury afterwards that he was determined to see that it would be "the last time that I, or any of my successors, may have to make such a Declaration in such crude language."³⁶ The King was aided in this project by Catholics around the Empire, including those in Canada. A week before the opening of the British Parliament the *Catholic Register* asked that the "narrow, bigoted and prejudiced article" be abolished and resolved that Canadian Catholics would "agitate, until it shall have been relegated to the distant past, with other such evidences of religious intolerance." The Catholic Truth Society of Ottawa also started up its agitation again by encouraging fellow Catholic associations to submit petitions to Britain requesting the reform of the Oath. In addition, it pressed the Canadian House of Commons to issue a petition of its own. John Costigan, a

³⁶Simon Heffer, *Power and Place: The Political Consequences of King Edward VII* (London, 1998), 108; Sidney Lee, *King Edward VII: A Biography*, vol. 2 (London, 1925-1927), 22-23.

Member of Parliament from New Brunswick and long-time defender of Catholic rights in Canada, proponent of Home Rule for Ireland, and leading member of the Catholic Truth Society, introduced a resolution in the House on February 26 proposing that an address be submitted to Edward VII asking that the Accession Oath be modified so that "the British sovereign [may be] freed forever from the obligation of offending the religious principles of any class of his faithful subjects throughout the British Empire." Introducing his motion for debate on March 1, Costigan explained that the experience of the South African War in which men of different creeds became brothers in arms in defending the Empire and supporting the Crown demonstrated that "we are all British subjects, and that there is no necessity for any cause to divide us...." Adding to his emphasis that the motion was meant as a way to further unite the peoples of the Empire and not as a criticism of the monarchy, he clarified that Catholics were not complaining about the Coronation Oath which provided for the Protestant succession and the maintenance of the Protestant religion, but only a useless declaration whose sole purpose was to wound a portion of the King's most loyal subjects. Therefore, he moved that the House adopt his proposed address to the King asking that "as a token of the civil and religious liberties and of the equality of rights guaranteed to all British subjects in the Canadian confederation, as well as under the British constitution, the British sovereign should not be called to make any declaration offensive to the religious belief of any subject of the British Crown" and, accordingly, the Accession Declaration should be "abolished."³⁷

³⁷*Catholic Register*, 7 February, 14 February 1901; David Shanahan, "John Costigan," *Dictionary of Canadian Biography* 14 (1998): 237-240; Canada, House of Commons, *Debates*, 26 February, 1 March 1901; University of Toronto, Thomas Fisher Rare Book Room, John Charlton Papers, Ms. Coll. 110, vol. 12, Diary, 26 February 1901.

Prime Minister Sir Wilfrid Laurier then rose and said that he personally favoured the motion on the grounds that the Declaration was “repugnant” and “deplorable” and had nothing to do with ensuring the Protestant succession or the supremacy of the Protestant religion in Britain, situations he was “quite content” with as a Catholic. In fact, he proclaimed, all Catholics in Canada would continue to be willing and loyal subjects of Edward VII even if the Declaration was not abolished, but, if it were, their pride and devotion to the Empire “would be enhanced and would be more enthusiastic.” Henri Bourassa concurred with his former leader as he said that the Declaration was not a declaration of Protestantism, but “simply an anti-Catholic declaration....” He, too, had no concern over the maintenance of the Protestant succession: his objection was to “a useless, obsolete, anti-Catholic declaration” which insulted a “free people which is proud to call itself British.” Catholics were not the only Members to support the motion. Robert Borden and John Charlton also made lengthy speeches in support of the motion on the basis that nothing offensive to any of His Majesty’s subjects should be contained in the Accession Oath. An amendment to the resolution specifying that the Declaration should be altered instead of completely abolished, however, was necessary to gain a strong majority in favour of the motion. This it achieved as the amended address passed in a free vote by a count of 125 to 19.³⁸

The House of Commons petition gained almost unanimous support in the press. Even Goldwin Smith, who had been regarded as an opponent to the Roman Catholic Church, urged a revision to the “extremely offensive and insulting” Accession Oath. The submission of a letter

³⁸Charlton Papers, Diary, 27 February 1901; Canada, House of Commons, *Debates*, 1 March 1901; NAC, Colonial Office, Canada, original correspondence, MG11 CO 42/882, reel B-799, no. 11940(81), Petition to Edward VII from the Canadian House of Commons, 1 March 1901.

from the archbishops and bishops of Canada requesting that the King's Oath "respect their most sacred and cherished beliefs" had, according to British Cardinal Herbert Vaughan, also "produced a powerful impression in England." In the end, however, it was the influence of the King and pressure from Irish Nationalist MPs in the British House of Commons, who threatened to force an "unpleasant debate upon the civil list" if amendments were not made to the Oath, which compelled the British government to appoint a Select Committee from the House of Lords to consider the form of the Oath.³⁹ When the Committee reported in July, the revised form it offered pleased neither Catholics nor ultra-Protestants. The Declaration may have eliminated the words "superstitious and idolatrous," but it still contained references to the doctrine of transubstantiation and the invocation of saints which the *Catholic Register* found to be equally insulting. It was, the paper argued, the duty of all "Catholic subjects of the King in every part of the Empire to repeat their emphatic protest against the wording of the revised version." Catholics in Britain also railed against the revised form which, they charged, had merely entrenched Protestant bigotry in the Oath. The King agreed, arguing that all "references to transubstantiation and the Virgin Mary should be omitted." The opposition of ultra-Protestants, though, prevented any such alteration.⁴⁰

As Catholics were pushing for a complete revision of the Oath, if not for its entire abolition, ultra-Protestants resisted any modifications at all to the declaration. Led by the

³⁹*New York Sun*, 17 February 1901; *Catholic Register*, 21 February, 7 March, 14 March, 11 April 1901; ARCAT, Denis O'Connor Papers, Archbishop of Quebec to Denis O'Connor, 17 March 1901, Herbert Vaughan to Denis O'Connor, 15 July 1901.

⁴⁰*Globe*, 15 July 1901; *Montreal Gazette*, 15 July 1901; *Catholic Register*, 18 July 1901; Lee, *King Edward VII*, 23-24; Heffer, *Power and Place*, 109-110.

Orange Order, Canadian ultra-Protestants argued that the people of Britain had decided that the Sovereign should be a Protestant and to that end had "endeavoured to surround that with all the safeguards and provisions that they think necessary." The Declaration, therefore, should be respected as a mechanism devised to ensure the Protestant succession. Members of the Sons of England in Toronto similarly found that the wording of the Declaration was "absolutely necessary to protect the position of the Empire as the greatest protestant nation in the world and its protestant faith." "It is with the greatest fear," they noted in a petition to the British government, "we see in the alteration the first thin line of an attempt to overthrow the bulwarks of the Constitution and the succession to the Throne." The Protestant opposition in the United Kingdom was no less vociferous and, combined with the Catholic rejection of the alterations, the British government found it impossible to continue with the legislation, letting it die after passing through the House of Lords.⁴¹

French Canadians, who to this point had been only passively involved in the agitation, now felt compelled to get more active in order to pressure the British government to amend or abolish the Accession Oath. Thomas Chapais, a Quebec legislator and historian, wrote a pamphlet critiquing the Oath from a French Canadian perspective in which he argued that the "odieuse" Declaration was not necessary to guarantee the Protestant succession since other provisions in the *Bill of Rights* and the *Act of Settlement of 1701* ensured it. If, however, its

⁴¹Canada, House of Commons, *Debates*, 1 March 1901; *Calgary Herald*, 31 July 1901; *Montreal Gazette*, 25 July 1901; Samuel Hume Blake, *Is There Not a Cause? Address at Wycliffe College, and Four Letters on the Coronation Oath* (Toronto, 1901); MG11 CO 42/882, reel B-800, no. 13400(96), "Petition to the Committee of the Imperial Parliament recently appointed to consider the question of the revisions of the King's Coronation Declaration," Sons of England, Middlesex Lodge, March 1901; Heffer, *Power and Place*, 109.

redundance was not viewed as sufficient cause to abolish the Declaration, then respect for the equality of Catholics should be enough to motivate all conscientious persons to remove the humiliating words from an Oath which tainted the British throne. Hence, "pour l'honneur de la Couronne et de la nation britanniques, nous demandons qu'elle soit abrogée, qu'elle soit effacée des statuts de cet empire." As Chapais' pamphlet was being distributed and promoted in such papers as *La Vérité*, a petition, drawn up by anonymous persons, began to circulate among parish clergy throughout Quebec in late August and September calling for Joseph Chamberlain, the Colonial Secretary, to abolish the Accession Declaration. "We regret," it stated,

that notwithstanding the energetic protests of the Catholic subjects of His Majesty you persist in retaining in the formula of the royal oath declarations which are contrary to the Catholic faith, as also to the spirit of justice and liberty which we have a right to expect from the people of England...

In the name of the Catholics of Canada...we declare our protest against the formula of the royal oath, and demand of the government of His Majesty the abolition of this vestige of hate and religious discord.

Although Joseph Pope was a founding member of the Catholic Truth Society of Ottawa and Wilfrid Laurier supported an amendment to the Oath, both were alarmed by the tone of the petition and, even more, by its "inopportune" appearance just before the Royal Tour: a time, Pope observed, "when we should all appear united." Laurier also found that "no more offensive movement could well be undertaken at this moment." Attempting to check its dissemination, the Prime Minister urged Diomedes Falconio, the Apostolic Delegate to Canada, to use his influence to prevent the Quebec clergy from reading the petition from their pulpits and encouraging their parishioners to sign a document which is "harsh, offensive and calculated not to promote the object which the petition has in view, but rather to create such an irritation as to make it impossible to have a calm and dispassionate discussion." The Monsignor was unable to provide

either the source of the petition or able to dissuade its dissemination. Indeed, in the months to come nearly one hundred parishes, voluntary associations, and communities had submitted the petition to the Colonial Office.⁴²

Given the divisions in the British Parliament over the issue, however, the subject of the Accession Oath would not be seriously examined again until the death of Edward VII on 6 May 1910 and the impending Coronation of George V made it a matter of immediate concern. Catholics around the Empire, though, would not offer a substantive opposition to the form of the Oath because the new King had pressured his Prime Minister, Herbert Asquith, into amending the form of the Declaration just a matter of days after his accession. Acquiescing to George V's demand to remove anything that may offend his Roman Catholic subjects from the Declaration, Asquith announced on May 10 that his government would be soon introducing a bill to amend the Declaration. In June he followed up on his promise by tabling the *Accession Declaration Act* which set out the following statement as the new Accession Declaration:

I [A:B] do solemnly and sincerely in the presence of God profess, testify, and declare that I am a faithful Protestant, and that I will, according to the true intent of the enactments which secure the Protestant succession to the Throne of my realm, uphold and maintain the said enactments to the best of my powers according to law.

The change was necessary, Asquith said in the House of Commons, because of the presence of

⁴²Thomas Chapais, *Le serment du roi et les catholiques* (Quebec, 1901); *Ottawa Citizen*, 27 August 1901; Laurier Papers, reel C-787, vol. 206, pp. 58663-58665, Joseph Pope to Wilfrid Laurier, p. 58666, Wilfrid Laurier to Joseph Pope, 6 September 1901 (copy), pp. 58712-58713, Wilfrid Laurier to Diomedes Falconio, 4 September 1901 (copy), p. 58714, Diomedes Falconio to Wilfrid Laurier, 6 September 1901; RG7, Despatches from the Colonial Office [G1], reel C-209, no. 308, Joseph Chamberlain to Lord Minto, 23 October 1901, no. 332, Joseph Chamberlain to Lord Minto, 20 November 1901, no. 367, Joseph Chamberlain to Lord Minto, 13 December 1901; reel C-210, no. 144, Joseph Chamberlain to Lord Minto, 18 April 1902.

twelve million Catholics in the Empire who demanded and deserved to be accorded the same freedoms and respect as their Protestant brethren. The King's Catholic subjects in Canada could not agree more as they gave their full support to Asquith's amendment. "Dans la nouvelle formule," *Le Soleil* pointed out, "il n'y a pas un mot de répudiation, de désobéissance à l'endroit de l'Eglise catholique romaine. Elle affirme simplement que le roi est un fidèle protestant." Both *Le Devoir* and *La Vérité* were overjoyed with the new form of the Declaration with the latter paper making the point that the change would assuredly further strengthen "l'attachement et la fidélité des catholiques" to George V. "L'heureuse réforme," *La Vérité* declared, "qu'il a accomplie en modifiant la formule du serment du couronnement lui ont gagné nos coeurs." Canadian Irish Catholics were similarly pleased with the amended declaration with the *Catholic Register-Extension* observing that "the kindliness and tact of the late King paved the way for the proposed change, and Catholics everywhere throughout the Empire will regard even this partial victory as another step towards the universal liberty of conscience which, under the British Constitution, it denied only to him who sits upon the Throne."⁴³

With the predictable exception of Orangemen and other ultra-Protestants who had forwarded petition after petition to the British government in hopes of defeating the Bill, most Canadian Protestants supported the *Accession Declaration Act* which passed into law by the end of the summer. The main dailies in English Canada were unanimous in congratulating the British Prime Minister for removing the "offensive," "obsolete and intolerable" tracts from the

⁴³Harold Nicolson, *King George the Fifth: His Life and Reign* (London, 1952), 162; *Globe*, 11 May 1910; *Halsbury's Statutes of England and Wales*, 69-70; *Montreal Gazette*, 19 July 1910; *Le Soleil*, 29 June 1910; *Le Devoir*, 28 July 1910; *La Vérité*, 24 June 1911; *Catholic Register-Extension*, 29 June 1910.

Declaration in favour of words which supported the Protestant succession, but without offending "the religious feelings of any of our fellow-citizens." Canadian unity depended upon religious and ethnic tolerance and the voicing of insulting words levelled at nearly half the population would only serve to counteract the efforts of the hegemonic bloc to uphold the monarchy as a symbol of national unity. As Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, the Chief Justice of Canada, explained before the introduction of the Asquith amendment, "No man who has the cause of Imperial Federation really at heart, no man who ever dreams of drawing closer the ties binding the scattered units of the Empire, can possibly wish to hear King George at the beginning of his reign repeat the words of the Royal Declaration."⁴⁴ Unity, hegemony, and national identity were at the root of the debate over the Accession Oath. Canadian Catholics, both Irish and French, imagined their community as one in which they enjoyed the same rights and liberties as Protestants under the Crown, given which understanding they naturally devoted much effort to altering a few phrases which had been uttered only once (1901) since 1837. As a symbol of national identity, the monarchy reflected the values of the Canadian community as a whole and, therefore, could not be used to support Protestant claims of cultural ascendancy. Most Protestants, in this instance as in others, understood the necessity of including French and Irish Catholics in an overarching vision of the Canadian nation and, consequently, joined Catholics in advocating a revision to the Accession Declaration. Anti-Catholic tracts went counter to the idea of a nation united in diversity under the Crown.

During the Edwardian era, then, Catholics and Protestants of the Anglophone and

⁴⁴Castell J. Hopkins, ed., *Canadian Annual Review of Public Affairs* (Toronto, 1910), 28-29; *Globe*, 29 June, 30 June 1910; *Montreal Gazette*, 14 June, 29 June 1910; *Ottawa Citizen*, 12 May, 29 June 1910; *Manitoba Free Press*, 29 June 1910.

Francophone middle class had continued to uphold the reigning British Sovereign as both a symbol of their ethnic and religious identities and of their common identity as Canadians. Minority groups such as French Canadians, Catholics, Jews, and Asians embraced the tradition of British justice enshrined in the monarchy as a means of legitimising their rights to freedom and equality. British Protestants acknowledged the rights of minorities as protected by the Crown. The size of the French Catholic community provided it equal consideration in royal celebrations. Asians and Jews received limited participation in order to reassure the rest of society of the loyalty and unity of all races, classes, and creeds in a rapidly changing country. But while this recognition of the loyalty of Asians and Jews may have contributed to their increased status, their inclusion in public celebrations did not fundamentally alter power relations. Middle class British Protestants, French Canadians, and Irish Catholics continued to legitimise their cultural dominance through ceremonial precedence and royal representations. As demonstrated by the Royal Tour's lumberjack display and the agitation to reform the Accession Oath, British Protestants, French Canadians, and Irish Catholics increasingly expressed a shared sense of Canadian national identity distinctive from the rest of the Empire. Their idealised definition of the Canadian nation included it as a part of the Empire, but it also came to be a community in which English, French, Protestant, and Catholic were united by diversity under the freedom of the Crown.

CHAPTER VII

Aboriginal Tradition and Royal Representation, 1860-1911

In the evening of 28 September 1901, Joseph Pope sat down at his desk and reflected on the day's events, recording the most pertinent in his diary as was his daily habit. This Saturday, however, had been unlike any other he had witnessed. On a wide plateau nestled in the foothills of the Rocky Mountains and overlooking the town of Calgary, more than two thousand people from the Blackfoot, Blood, Cree, Peigan, Sarcee, and Stony First Nations had gathered to honour the Duke of Cornwall and York, the son of the "Great King" and, more significantly, the grandson of their lately deceased "Great White Mother." For weeks the day had been eagerly awaited by organisers, participants, and the general public, all anxious to see, hear, read about, and imagine the "historic" spectacle of the "Great Pow-wow" between the Native tribes of Canada and their future Father-king.¹ While the press had proclaimed the ceremony a fantastic spectacle that was far and above the highlight of the Royal Visit to Canada, Pope had regarded the Pow-wow as rather "tame." Certainly, the gathering had been interesting for its sheer magnitude and novelty, but the Undersecretary of State and co-organiser of the Royal Tour found it a memorable bore. "Of course," he scribbled in his journal, "all depends on the point of view. The Indian agents were bent upon showing how the Indian had responded to civilising

¹Although the proper spelling of the aboriginal ceremony is "Powwow," organisers and the media consistently spelt it "Pow-wow." Since the "Great Pow-wow" differed significantly from a traditional "Powwow" the hyphenated variation will be utilised throughout the chapter when referring specifically to this Native-Royal event. Katherine Pettipas, *Severing the Ties that Bind: Government Repression of Indigenous Ceremonies on the Prairies* (Winnipeg, 1994), 188-189

influences, and had most of the chiefs resplendent in HBC reefers with brass buttons. What we wanted was to see how *uncivilised* they were, and expected to be met with screeching braves riding about firing guns, etc. There was none of this, however, and only a very limited supply of "paint and feathers." Worse still, the address of the chiefs to the future King George V, his reply, and their translations were "interminable" and cramped the performance of a Native "War Dance." Unlike the press and the authors of the leather-bound chronicles of the Royal Tour, Pope had regarded the grand spectacle of the Great Pow-wow as, well, unspectacular.²

While the circumstances surrounding the ceremony and affecting its performance may have led to disappointment for Joseph Pope, they provide the historian with a glimpse into the conflicting attitudes towards Natives between Canadian state and society during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In recent years, historians have paid significant attention to this subject or, more specifically, to the state's attempts to control and assimilate the Peoples of the First Nations through a series of measures including the passage of the Indian Act, the implementation of residential and industrial schools, the introduction of the pass system, and the promotion of farming on reserves.³ In addition, scholars have emphasised that the state

²National Archives of Canada [hereafter NAC], Joseph Pope Papers, MG30 E86, vol. 48, Diary of the Royal Tour, 28 September 1901. Even though Pope found the Pow-wow unspectacular, he recognised its significance and devoted more pages, detail, and description to this ceremony than to any other single event during the Royal Visit to Canada. Joseph Pope, *The Tour of Their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York Through the Dominion of Canada in the Year 1901* (Ottawa, 1903), 78-84.

³Sarah Carter, *Lost Harvests: Prairie Indian Reserve Farmers and Government Policy* (Kingston and Montreal, 1990); Noel Dyck, *What is the Indian "Problem"? Tutelage and Resistance in Canadian Indian Administration* (St. John's, 1991); D.J. Hall, "Clifford Sifton and Canadian Indian Administration, 1896-1905," *Prairie Forum* 2, no. 2 (1977): 127-151; J.R. Miller, *Shingwauk's Vision: A History of Native Residential Schools* (Toronto, 1996); E. Brian Titley, *A Narrow Vision: Duncan Campbell Scott and the Administration of Indian Affairs in*

suppression of Native ceremonies, such as the Potlatch and the Sun Dance, and the discouragement of Native participation in rodeos and fairs comprised a further, important component in the government's Indian policy.⁴ The Department of Indian Affairs believed that in order to assimilate Native peoples, or, as they termed it, "civilise" them, all aspects of aboriginal culture had to be controlled, purged, and then replaced with European traditions. Clearly, Pope believed that the Indian Agents had their way at the Pow-wow. But, had they?

If it was up to them, Indian Administrators would have preferred not to have had any dancing take place at all and would never have condoned such a large gathering of Natives—and especially so close to Calgary—in the first place, a source of constant anxiety to them. Commenting on other, similar events in which the state sanctioned a "traditional" Native presence, such as at exhibitions and the Quebec Tercentenary pageants, some scholars have reasoned that state officials sometimes approved such displays in order to advertise the success of their Indian policy by providing a before-and-after contrast with "civilised" Native children from residential schools.⁵ While there were a number of children from the local residential schools on hand at the Pow-wow, they played a relatively small role in the ceremony. The before-and-after display came lower down the scale in importance to other motives.

The disappointment Joseph Pope felt after the Pow-wow came as a result of an expectation for something more fantastic, colourful, and, above all, "savage." The more

Canada (Vancouver, 1986).

⁴Douglas Cole and Ira Chaikin, *An Iron Hand Upon the People: The Law against the Potlatch on the Northwest Coast* (Vancouver, 1990); Pettipas, *Severing the Ties that Bind*.

⁵Miller, *Shingwauk's Vision*, 194-199; H.V. Nelles, *The Art of Nation-Building: Pageantry and Spectacle at Quebec's Tercentenary* (Toronto, 1999), 172-177.

"uncivilised" the better, or so many of those outside of the Indian Department and the Missions felt. Alongside the civilising attitude of the state was the conflicting view held by Pope, Lord Minto, the press, and many others in the general public that the Natives added colour, danger, laughter, fear, and amazement to spectacles and that their participation in the Royal Tour would add interest and entertainment for not only the Royal entourage, but themselves as well. Historians have pointed out that, in the face of the efforts of the Church and state, the public enjoyed a display of Native "paint and feathers" and *real* "screeching braves" as read about in books and as seen in the popular rodeos and Wild West Shows traversing the country.⁶ What Joseph Pope witnessed on that late August morning, then, appeared to have been a clash between these two diametrically opposed attitudes towards Natives and its negotiated settlement. The state sanctioned Native participation in the Royal Tour, but only if traditional clothes and paint were kept to a minimum and dancing to strict moderation. The addition of a before-and-after display was tacked on in order to assure prospective immigrants that the existence of "barbaric" Natives roaming the prairie was becoming a thing of the past, and to further appease disgruntled missionaries and Indian Agents.

While this interpretation of the Great Pow-wow, gleaned from Pope's observations and thoughts and integrated into the historiography of Native-white relations, provides an illustration of the main attitudes towards Natives at the turn of the century posited by Canadian historians, as an explanation of what happened at the Pow-wow and, crucially, *why* it happened, it only

⁶Robert F. Berkhofer, Jr., *The White Man's Indian: Images of the American Indian from Columbus to the Present* (New York, 1979); Daniel Francis, *The Imaginary Indian: The Image of the Indian in Canadian Culture* (Vancouver, 1992); Keith Regular, "On Public Display," *Alberta History* 34, no. 1 (1986): 1-10; Nelles, *The Art of Nation-Building*, 172-173.

serves as a partial reading. The full reasons behind the state's sanctioning of Native participation, the government's approach to the event, the public's attitudes and expectations, and Native perceptions and agency in the ceremony were far more complicated than either Pope's notes or Canadian historiography allows.

Central to any understanding of the Pow-wow is to appreciate that it was more than just a Native ceremony, but a royal one as well. As such, it must be placed into the context of not only the government's Indian policy, but also the relationship between royal ceremonies, national identity, and power. The Great Pow-wow comprised a small, though significant, part of the Royal Tour of 1901, a visit which represented the monarchy as a symbol of national identity and offered other definitions of identity an opportunity to emerge. Accordingly, part of the impetus to organise a large meeting between Native tribes and their future monarch arose from a desire to contribute and give expression to a sense of Canadian national identity. Despite attempts by Church and state to assimilate them, many Canadians considered Natives part of an imagined Canadian community and, as such, their participation was deemed crucial. As with a lumberjack demonstration in Ottawa a few days earlier and the use of maple leaf badges during the Royal Visit of 1860, Natives were used in the Royal Tour because they were considered distinctively Canadian.⁷ Alongside the appropriation of a variety of Native symbols and activities, such as lacrosse, canoeing, and snowshoeing,⁸ into national symbols and activities during the late

⁷See Chapter VI above for discussions of the introduction of maple leaf badges and the lumberjack display.

⁸Nancy B. Bouchier, "Idealized Middle-Class Sport for a Young Nation: Lacrosse in Nineteenth Century Ontario Towns, 1871-1891," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 29, no. 2 (1994): 89-110; John Jennings, Bruce W. Hodgins, and Doreen Small, eds., *The Canoe in Canadian Cultures* (n.p., 1999); Alan Metcalfe, *Canada Learns to Play: The Emergence of Organized*

nineteenth century, Native peoples themselves became symbols of the Canadian nation and were accordingly treated as any other image—to be symbolically manipulated and controlled. In spite of their social and economic marginalisation, Aboriginal peoples came to be regarded as living examples of the tradition of British justice in Canada which, it was argued, had treated Natives fairly and had cared for and protected them. In this respect, then, Native participation at the Pow-wow permitted an occasion at which white Canadians could also define themselves. Any identity is partly made in juxtaposition to another, especially a visible Other, and whites used Natives as a counterfoil against whom they could define their own identity and imagine their place, and that of Natives, within the nation.⁹

Having an imagined part within the Canadian nation, therefore, did not necessarily translate into political power within the national community. While seemingly investing Natives with symbolic power, royal ceremonies such as the Great Pow-wow also sought to maintain the hegemony of white Canadians, in part by consolidating and defining their culture in opposition to the subordinate Native cultures of their imagined community. At another level, including Natives in royal events was an act of conciliation which served to maintain national unity without restructuring power relations.¹⁰ Aboriginal participation in the ceremony would be framed in such a way as to placate their concerns, supposedly achieved by simply having them present and

Sport, 1807-1914 (Toronto, 1987).

⁹Berkhofer, *The White Man's Indian*, 26-27; Linda Colley, "Britishness and Otherness: An Argument," *Journal of British Studies* 31, no. 4 (1992): 309-329; Francis, *The Imaginary Indian*, 7-8; Nelles, *The Art of Nation-Building*, 168, 173-174.

¹⁰Allan Smith, "National Images and National Maintenance: The Ascendancy of the Ethnic Idea in North America," in *Canada—An American Nation? Essays on Continentalism, Identity and the Canadian Frame of Mind* (Kingston and Montreal), 182.

being heard, while instructing both Natives and whites on the “innate” hierarchies of race through representation. As Chris Tiffin and Alan Lawson argue, “Imperial relations may have been established initially by guns, guile and disease, but they were maintained in their interpellative phase largely by textuality,” that is, by framing texts to indicate who mattered and who was subordinate and compelling colonial subjects to internalise their own subjection.¹¹ Central to this hegemonic process—and to all representations at the Great Pow-wow—was the image of Queen Victoria as the “Great White Mother,” an image which represented, on the one hand, the bodily grounded identity of white Canadians and, on the other, acted as the cultural vehicle with which whites sought to fix, rank, and subdue Native peoples.¹² By the same token, however, it was within textuality, within the representation of the “Great White Mother,” that Natives resisted symbolic control and, indeed, sought to ensure their presence and influence within the Canadian nation. Royal ceremonies, then, served as hegemonic sites in Indian-white relations as both groups structured, manipulated, and imagined representations of themselves, each other, and, above all, the monarchy to maintain and challenge the hegemonic order. Again, as had the other representations of Queen Victoria detailed in earlier chapters, an image of the Queen, this time as the Great White Mother, played a significant role in the process of Canadian nation-building.

The image of Queen Victoria as the Great White Mother, however, was not constructed overnight, but arose out of a long and complex history of Indian-white relations involving French precedents, Native traditions, and British paternalism and colonialism. Before examining the

¹¹Chris Tiffin and Alan Lawson, *De-Scribing Empire: Post-colonialism and Textuality* (London, 1994), 3-4.

¹²Laura Doyle, *Bordering on the Body: The Racial Matrix of Modern Fiction and Culture* (Oxford, 1994), 4.

articulation of royal representation and nation-building at the Great Pow-wow in greater detail, then, the origins and development of the image of the Great Mother during the French regime, British rule, the Royal Tour of 1860, and Canadian treaty-making will be explored.

Indian-White Relations and the Origins of the Great White Mother, 1700s-1815

Long before the accession of Queen Victoria, and, in fact, the British Conquest, the colonial administration of New France had grounded its alliance with the Algonquin Indians upon a paternalistic relationship in which the French Governor came to be represented as a father figure to the Native tribes. In his examination of this alliance, Richard White concludes that though the French and Algonquins had both accepted a patriarchal form of alliance, they differed in their interpretation of familial obligations. The French understanding of patriarchy followed their experience with traditional authority in French society in which the King, as the father of his people, and the male parent of the home had commanded and were obeyed. Yet, the French accepted that the father had to fulfil a set of obligations, foremost among them the duty to protect and provide for his children. The Algonquins, however, viewed the father as a figure who, while commanding respect, did not necessarily receive obedience. Much to the frustration of the French, he was also more generous and protecting than the French had imagined. Nonetheless, the French acquiesced to Native expectations and provided food and clothing in the form of "gifts" in order to ensure the loyalty of Algonquins against the lure of British trade.¹³

Similarly, in establishing and maintaining their alliance with the Iroquois, the British were

¹³Richard White, *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region* (Cambridge, 1991), 84, 112-113, 143, 180-182. Also see Olive P. Dickason, "Louisbourg and the Indians: A Study in Imperial Race Relations, 1713-1760," *History and Archaeology* 6 (1976): 1-206.

compelled to come into an arrangement whereby the King of Britain assumed the role of a father who defended his Native "children" from harm and deprivation. Despite attempts to reduce parental obligations, and thus the expense of gift-giving, British officials actually expanded the practice after the Conquest of New France since the Native tribes who had been allied with the French expected their new father to continue the responsibilities now associated with European monarchs in exchange for their fidelity. Furthermore, following Native uprisings, such as Pontiac's Rebellion in 1763, and the American Revolution the British became more sensitive to the Native definition of the paternal relationship and recognised the necessity of presenting gifts more valuable than they received if they wanted to maintain Native allegiance to the British Great Father.¹⁴ Indeed, by the time Prince William visited Quebec in 1787, on board the *HMS Pegasus*, the British apparently had adjusted their paternalism to such an extent that the Prince could report to his father, George III, that the Natives he had met expressed "sensations...too strong not to be natural" when they were received by the son of "their Great Father in the East."¹⁵ Until 1815 the basis of the paternalistic system headed by the Great Father essentially remained unchanged. The British had incorporated the Native practice of gift-giving into their diplomacy with their Indian allies in order to demonstrate, according to Native custom, their

¹⁴Robert Allen, *His Majesty's Indian Allies: British Indian Policy in the Defence of Canada, 1774-1815* (Toronto, 1993), 13-18; Colin G. Calloway, *Crown and Calumet: British-Indian Relations, 1783-1815* (Norman, OK, 1987); White, *The Middle Ground*, 274-275, 306-310, 403-405. The United States government was also compelled to adopt the paternalist system including the usage of their own version of the "Great Father"—the American president. Francis Paul Prucha, *The Great Father: The United States Government and the American Indians*, vol. 1 (Lincoln, 1984).

¹⁵Prince William to George III, 9 October 1787, quoted in Arthur Bousfield and Garry Toffoli, *Royal Observations: Canadians and Royalty* (Toronto, 1991), 167.

friendship, goodwill, and sincerity. In exchange the British expected, and received, their allegiance and, thus, a measure of security. After the War of 1812 and the establishment of peace between Britain and the United States, the British, and the Americans, felt there was no longer a pressing need to maintain military alliances with the Natives and sought to dispense with the practice of gift-giving. By then, however, the practice had become so entrenched in the lives of many Native groups that they had come to depend on the "King's Bounty" for subsistence. Moreover, as Robert Allen argues, their claim for annual presents appealed to custom and reminded their allies that any detraction from the basis of the alliance would amount to "an impolitic gesture of ingratitude...."¹⁶ While these factors partly influenced the British to continue the practice of gift-giving in a modified form, more important considerations were colonial expansion, the increased necessity of imperial control of Aboriginal peoples, and the growing impoverishment of Native peoples as the nineteenth century wore on. These circumstances compelled the state to take a more interventionist, and commanding, role in its relations with Natives, a position which they attempted to bolster with the imagery of the Great Mother.¹⁷ As well, the emergence of the Canadian nation-state and a sense of Canadian nationality not only ensured that the image of the British monarch as parental figure to his or her Indian "children" would continue, but that the imagery of the Great Mother would be expanded and redefined by colonial administrators and public alike.

¹⁶Allen, *His Majesty's Indian Allies*, 173-174; Calloway, *Crown and Calumet*; Prucha, *The Great Father*, vol. 1, 169-170.

¹⁷Pettipas, *Severing the Ties that Bind*, 37.

The Great Mother on Being the Great Mother

The willingness and cooperation of Queen Victoria in playing the part of the Great Mother also helped in the continuation of the paternal imagery. Ever since her accession in 1837, Queen Victoria had taken a keen interest in the welfare of her Native subjects around the Empire. Writing to the Earl of Carnarvon in 1874, for example, she instructed him to make it clear to all of her colonial governors of "her very strong feeling (and she has few stronger) that the natives and coloured races should be treated with every kindness and affection, as brothers, not—as, alas! Englishmen too often do—as totally different beings to ourselves, fit only to be crushed and shot down!" Once it was known how the Queen felt on the subject, she was confident that "It would shame those disgraceful feelings above alluded to and would encourage those who take the right course, and it would also conciliate the native races themselves."¹⁸ Yet, while her feelings towards her Native subjects were those of genuine concern, she also shared the patronising attitude of many of her colonial administrators that the interests of indigenous peoples could be best served by placing them under British rule. Commenting on the British annexation of New Guinea in 1884, the Queen wrote that "It is no doubt a serious step, but she rejoices at it as it will enable us to protect the poor natives and to advance civilization, which she considers the mission of Great Britain."¹⁹ Like many members of the white community, she believed that the benevolent treatment of Natives, in particular chiefs, headmen, and princes, would not only encourage them to embrace white civilisation, and thus raise them from

¹⁸Queen Victoria to Earl of Carnarvon, 24 December 1878, *Letters of Queen Victoria, 1862-1885*, ed. George E. Buckle, vol. 2 (Toronto, 1926-28), 361.

¹⁹Queen Victoria to Lord Derby, 18 August 1884, *Ibid.*, vol. 3, 525; Frank Hardie, *The Political Influence of Queen Victoria, 1861-1901*, 2d ed. (London, 1938), 174.

“barbarity,” but, also, to accept white hegemony. Discussing the case of India, she told the Marquis of Dalhousie “it strikes the Queen that the more kindly we treat Indian Princes, whom we have *conquered*, and the more consideration we show for their birth and former grandeur, the more we shall attach Indian Princes and Governments to us, and the more ready will they be to come under our rule.”²⁰ Moreover, she agreed with the popular view held by colonial administrators that the key to ensuring the loyalty of Native chiefs and princes was through the promotion of her image amongst them.

Taking the case of India as an example,²¹ on several occasions the Queen sanctioned, altered, and initiated representations of herself to the peoples of India with the deliberate aim of impressing on them her image as an omnipotent and sympathetic monarch. Following the Indian Mutiny (1857) the British government decided to transfer control of the colony from the British East India Company to the Crown to secure British control. A significant part of this process was the desacralising of the Mughal emperor and his replacement with the British monarch in the Government of India Act of 1858. In conjunction with the passage of the Act, the Queen’s Proclamation to Her Indian Subjects—a declaration which the Queen had not only encouraged but had directly influenced the composition—was delivered which declared that Queen Victoria would protect the equality of all her subjects and their freedom of worship.²² The institution of

²⁰Queen Victoria to Marquis of Dalhousie, 2 October 1854, *Letters of Queen Victoria, 1837-1861*, eds. Arthur C. Benson and Viscount Esher, vol. 1 (London, 1908), 47.

²¹No correspondence revealing the Queen’s attitudes towards the Native peoples of Canada has been published to date.

²²Bernard S. Cohn, “Representing Authority in Victorian India” in *The Invention of Tradition*, eds. Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger (Cambridge, 1983): 178; Joanna Trollope, *Britannia’s Daughters: Women of the British Empire* (London, 1983), 16.

the Crown as the supreme authority and protector of Indian subjects sought to achieve Indian subservience by instilling obedience and loyalty to a compelling and benevolent monarchy. The India Act and Proclamation, however, were only the beginning of the construction of Queen Victoria's image in India. Although the Government of India Act established the Crown as the centre of authority in India, Queen Victoria's relationship to the colony was not emphatic. The India Act had not conferred the title of "Empress of India" on the Queen, but efforts were made thereafter to bestow it. The initial move was made by the Queen in 1873 as she inquired why the title of Empress had not been officially adopted, though it had often been used informally.²³ Her motivation came in part from the fact that during the early 1870s both the Emperors of Russia and Prussia claimed precedence, as emperors, over a mere queen and consequently claimed precedence for their children over hers at royal occasions.²⁴ But, her impetus derived largely from her own desire to be more closely associated with *her* Indian Empire. She believed that the Indians were very loyal to the personage of the Queen, but had no affection for British rule. The symbol of the British monarchy, she thought, was the only way "to encourage the good feeling and loyalty of the [Indian] people." Her assumption of the title of Empress of India would thus increase her connection with India by enlarging her image as an Imperial Monarch to the Indians. By January 1876, Disraeli could hardly ignore the fact that "The Empress-Queen

²³Colonel Ponsonby to Earl Granville, 26 January 1873, *Letters of Queen Victoria, 1862-1885*, vol. 2, 238.

²⁴Dorothy Thompson, *Queen Victoria: The Woman, the Monarchy, and the People* (New York, 1990), 130.

demands her Imperial Crown," an object she received the following year.²⁵

Queen Victoria, then, was not just subjected to the construction of her image by politicians and administrators. In fact, as Margaret Homans points out, "she performed certain gestures of self-representation in concert with other representations of her in the media."²⁶ On certain occasions the desired representations of both Queen and promoter could coincide, as it did on the issue of the new title. For the most part, though, the representation of the Queen to Native peoples was initiated by people other than Her Majesty. Queen Victoria's role in her representation as that of a kind, caring mother figure to Natives paralleled that of her political, constitutional position, that is, to consult, to encourage, and to warn. The Queen accepted, even relished, her representation as a benevolent parental figure and encouraged proposals to further disseminate the image amongst her Native subjects.

The Royal Visit of 1860

While there are no published records specifically detailing Queen Victoria's attitude towards the incorporation of North American Indians into royal ceremonies, it is known that she approved of the reception of Native chiefs and princes by touring members of her family and by colonial governors in her name in other parts of the Empire. For example, commenting on Earl

²⁵Queen Victoria to Viscount Canning, 2 December 1858, *Letters of Queen Victoria, 1837-1861*, vol. 3, 304; Memorandum by Queen Victoria, 2 May 1891, *Letters of Queen Victoria, 1886-1901*, ed. George E. Buckle, vol. 2 (London, 1930), 26; Jeffrey L. Lant, *Insubstantial Pageant: Ceremony and Confusion at Queen Victoria's Court* (London, 1979), 178; Benjamin Disraeli to Lord Cairns, 7 January 1876, *Life of Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield*, William F. Monypenny and George E. Buckle, vol. 2 (London, 1929), 797.

²⁶Margaret Homans, "'To the Queen's Private Apartments': Royal Family Portraiture and the Construction of Victoria's Sovereign Obedience," *Victorian Studies* 37, no. 1 (1993): 6.

Canning's progress through India and his reception of Native princes in 1860, she told the Earl that "Such reception and kind considerate treatment of them is, as Lord Canning knows, entirely in unison with the Queen's *own* feelings, and both the Prince [Consort] and herself...feel sure of the good effect it must have on these Princes, and on India in general."²⁷ Meanwhile, on the other side of the Empire, British North Americans were less sure of the benefits that could be gained from involving Native peoples in the welcome they were preparing to give to her son, Albert Edward the Prince of Wales, on his visit to their colonies in the summer of 1860. Unlike what it would do for the Royal Visit of 1901, the state had not organised a large Native demonstration and was indifferent to aboriginal participation. In the context of the mid-nineteenth century, Native peoples were regarded, for the most part, as a dying race doomed to extinction by the forces of progress. With dwindling numbers and increased impoverishment and dependency, the Mi'kmaq in the Maritimes and Native groups in the Canadas were easily shunted aside to the fringes of colonial society. Socially, economically, and geographically marginalised, there was little need to incorporate Natives into the nation or to negotiate with them. As a "dying" and "insignificant" race they were simply ignored and, as some thought, a disgrace best left out of sight. Nevertheless, despite the opposition of some individuals and the indifference of the state, several Natives undertook to make themselves visible and heard not only by the Prince but by the white community as well. Their determination to participate in the reception of the Prince of Wales drew ridicule from opponents, but, also, garnered the support of those who desired to present a British North American nation that was different from the Old Country.

²⁷Queen Victoria to Earl Canning, 2 August 1860, *Letters of Queen Victoria, 1837-1861*, vol. 3, 405.

While certainly not at the level it would be towards the turn of the century, the participation of Natives in the Royal Visit of 1860 generated a struggle over representations in which both whites and Natives imagined themselves, each other, and their place in the community they shared.

The first encounter the Prince would make with North American Indians occurred upon his arrival at Halifax on July 30. As the Royal Squadron approached the harbour, a Royal Salute fired from the Citadel announced the arrival of His Royal Highness to the thousands of Royal watchers congregated at the Nova Scotian capital. Soon, the Royal Fleet was joined and escorted to the harbour by a number of local steamers and yachts all gaily decorated for the occasion. Cheers burst forth from the dockyard where thousands eagerly awaited the landing of the Prince and his reception by the Lieutenant Governor and members of the Legislative Assembly and Local Corporation. After the vessels had come to their moorings a group of between ten and twelve Mi'kmaq canoes swirled around the *HMS Hero*, the Prince's ship, praying to greet His Royal Highness. From his vantage point aboard the *Hero* Dr. Henry Acland, the entourage's physician, observed that "the glassy waters around were thick with the dancing canoes of the Micmac Indians who...came to salute with their cries the son of the Mother Queen."²⁸ But, alas, as one of the midshipmen aboard noted, it was a scene not without its "touch of pathos." Unaware that the Prince had landed ashore just ahead of their arrival, the Indians paddled round the *Hero* two or three times before resorting to deliver their royal address to one of the boat-keepers lying astern. Fortunately, though, the boat-keeper was quick to forward the address ashore allowing the Prince sufficient time to send for and speak to the

²⁸NAC, Henry Wentworth Acland Papers, MG40 Q40, vol. 1, letter 3, 2 August 1860.

Native paddlers.²⁹

Mi'kmaq participation in the royal celebration did not end on the wharf, but continued into the next day with a display of Indian games and ceremonies which, by all reports, "amused him very much, [the Prince] laughing heartily at the ludicrous scene, i.e. the war dance."³⁰ The spectacle of Indians outfitted in their "primitive" costumes performing "savage antics" for their "Great Brother" was not lost on some of the organisers and the public in other parts of the British colonies. Montreal also provided a display of Indian games for the royal visitor which was highlighted by a series of lacrosse matches. The first game featured a team of Algonquins playing against a group of Iroquois which was quickly followed by three matches between an Algonquin squad and a team of Montreal "gentlemen." Although the Algonquins won the first two matches and the whites the third (thanks largely to the white umpire's controversial awarding and disqualification of goals), the press emphasised the skill and fitness of the white players and limited their comments on the victorious Indians. More fitting of comment, however, was the war dance which permitted white commentators to better distinguish the differences between the inferior, yet romantic "sons of the forest" and themselves. The performance featured a number of Indians bedecked in "warlike costumes" and paint and equipped with tomahawks and "scalping knives." Forming a circle with one Indian in the centre beating a drum as he sang, the others, every now and then, "yelled and looked exceedingly fierce" as they brandished their knives and "put their bodies through a series of contortions too

²⁹Thomas Bunbury Gough, *Boyish Reminiscences of His Majesty the King's Visit to Canada in 1860* (Toronto, 1910), 124-125.

³⁰Henry James Morgan, *The Tour of H.R.H. The Prince of Wales Through British America and the United States*, by "A British Canadian" (Montreal, 1860), 30.

horrible to look at." At this point in the performance, the *Montreal Gazette* reported, "the Prince laughed very heartily...."³¹

More mirth awaited the royal entourage in Sarnia where delegations from a number of tribes, including the Delawares, Mississaugas, Oneidas, and Ottawas, met the Prince to pay their respects. Though the young Prince was courteous and graciously received them, observers felt less respect towards the Natives. The *Globe* correspondent was captured by the romance of the situation and expounded on the primitive nature of the Natives describing them as "real red savages, majestic in mien" who "dressed after the most approved fashion of savage finery."³² Reporting on the Prince's reception of two hundred Indians from the Manitoulin Islands, the correspondent for the *New York Herald* noted that all in attendance were "prodigiously amused" by their chief's "harangue" to the son of the Great Mother. In his address, Chief Kanwagashi (the Great Bear) told Albert Edward that it had been preordained that they should meet and that his heart was glad of the event. He said that he hoped the sky would continue to be beautiful for both those of the white skin and the red skin and that the Prince would remember the red men when he came to the throne. The Prince replied that he was grateful for the address and that he also hoped the sky would remain beautiful. He added that he would never forget his "red brethren." Upon the translation of the Prince's speech, the correspondent reported that "yells of delight...issued from the throats of the aborigines" which, in turn, "caused involuntary mirth

³¹Kinahan Cornwallis, *Royalty in the New World; or, The Prince of Wales in America* (London, 1860), 98; *Globe*, 29 August 1860; *Montreal Gazette*, 28 August 1860.

³²*Globe*, 14 September 1860, 17 September 1860.

among the pale-faces.”³³

His Royal Highness then presented commemorative medals to the chiefs and smaller ones to Natives of “lower rank.” The medals featured a bust of Queen Victoria wearing a diadem on the obverse, to the left of which were engraved the Prince of Wales’s plume with the motto “ICH DIEN” and to the right the date 1860. Since the medals were struck from the same dies as ones cast for presentation in Africa, the reverse featured the Royal Arms with the original date of 1840. The simple addition of two extra engravings onto the old dies permitted some cost effective recycling.³⁴ Nonetheless, the *Globe* concluded that the medals “while gratifying the vanity of the recipient, appealed to his untutored mind as an emblem of fealty bestowed upon him by the great Sovereign he revered and served.”³⁵ The Indians completed the ceremony of gift-giving by presenting the Prince with an assortment of tomahawks, wampums, pipes, bows and arrows, and bark work.

As these instances attest, Native participation in the Royal Visit was a contested sphere in which Natives sought a voice and a visible role of their own construction in the face of the contempt of much of the white community. Though ridiculed and exploited for their entertainment value in the ceremonies, Natives refused to stay away from the celebration and participated against this adversity for a number of reasons. In the mid-nineteenth century the Mi’kmaq, as well as the Iroquois and Algonquins, were faced with increased hardship arising out

³³Cornwallis, *Royalty in the New World*, 139-140.

³⁴Melville Allan Jamieson, *Medals Awarded to North American Indian Chiefs, 1714-1922* (1936; reprint, London, 1961), 38-39, 44.

³⁵*Globe*, 17 August 1860.

of the encroachment of white settlers on their lands and the depletion of game which contributed to a state of endemic disease, hunger, and poverty within their communities.³⁶ Many Natives had appealed to the state for assistance only to find their requests ignored. The Royal Visit, however, provided them with an opportunity to voice their concerns in the public spotlight to the son of the Great Mother, a situation which would make it much more difficult for the state to reject Native grievances out of hand. During the Prince's visit to Charlottetown, for example, a delegation of Mi'kmaq approached the royal dignitary at Government House and informed him of their depressed state. With the assistance of Theophilus Stewart, a Prince Edward Island Indian Commissioner sympathetic to their plight, they told the Prince that they did not have any land and of their need for government assistance to become farmers so that they could raise themselves out of poverty. Placing the Prince and the government in an awkward, and unexpected, situation the Prince was advised to donate £50 to the Natives to assist them in their agricultural venture.³⁷

For the most part, the state was able to avoid such embarrassing situations by controlling access to the Prince and by screening all proposed addresses. While the Mi'kmaq of Prince Edward Island were able to penetrate the barriers of privilege and security set up around the Prince, thanks to the assistance of the Indian Commissioner, others were less fortunate. Despite

³⁶L.F.S. Upton, *Micmacs and Colonists: Indian-White Relations in the Maritimes, 1713-1867* (Vancouver, 1979), 127-128; Jennifer Reid, *Myth, Symbol, and Colonial Encounter: British and Mi'kmaq in Acadia, 1700-1867* (Ottawa, 1995), 34-36, 42.

³⁷Upton, *Micmacs and Colonists*, 117-119; Reid, *Myth, Symbol, and Colonial Encounter*, 81, 83. According to Upton, the government, which accepted the donation on behalf of the Mi'kmaq, never handed the money over to the Natives. Instead they used the funds to purchase fifty muskets for the militia.

the significant number of Natives reported to have come out to see the Prince along his route through the provinces, with the exceptions of the instances at Halifax, Charlottetown, and Sarnia, there is no reportage of any discourse having taken place between Native peoples and the Prince of Wales. Addresses, however, were submitted to the Governor General prior to the Prince's arrival by a number of Native groups, following published regulations. Native addresses expressed their "loyal, respect and affection for our Great Mother The Queen."³⁸ Though seemingly innocuous, Native addresses allowed them to remind the Prince, their future Father, and Queen Victoria of the traditional paternal relationship between themselves and the British monarch. Indeed, the episodes at the port of Halifax and at the Sarnia Railway Station were instances in which Natives sought to demonstrate their allegiance to the Crown. That the Prince was supplied with medals for distribution to Natives during a gift-giving ceremony also shows that the state was still aware of the importance of the paternal relationship. Furthermore, following Bakhtin's discussion of the reciprocal nature of language applied in previous chapters, Native addresses, as all addresses, must elicit a response which is structured by and conforms to the original utterance. Even if the reply was as little as an acknowledgement of Native loyalty by the Prince or, as in Sarnia, a promise to remember his "red brethren," the address had served its purpose—to have the Prince of Wales recognise Natives, to endorse their right to exist in the British North American community, and to confirm their special relationship with the Crown. At a time of increased impoverishment and alienation for Native peoples, with many in the white community convinced that they were a dying and "doomed" race, royal recognition was not

³⁸NAC, Records of the Governor General Office [RG7], Miscellaneous records relating to royal visits and vice-regal tours [G23], vol. 1, file 1-Prince of Wales 1860, Address from the Six Nations, Brant and Haldimand Counties, to the Prince of Wales, 1860.

without its importance to the Native community.

Of course, some Natives wanted to go even further and, instead of just engendering a response to their loyalty, sought to present their grievances with the state to His Royal Highness in hopes of obtaining his assistance. Unless smuggled into Government House, however, it was difficult to succeed in this venture since those royal addresses not conforming to the tastes of the state were rejected during the screening phase. Akin to the spurned addresses from the African Canadian community mentioned earlier,³⁹ Native addresses found to be divisive or political in nature were returned. Commenting on an address he had received from the Natives located around St. Regis, Robert Pennefather, the Governor General's Private Secretary, noted "that the proposed address to H.R.H. is not merely one of welcome but touches upon certain matters of business connected with the tribe. H.R.H. has not come to Canada to investigate details of Indian business and I must therefore decline to submit it for his pleasure." Unlike the addresses received from Blacks which were rejected out of hand, Pennefather added that he would be pleased to accept an amended document from the Indians. "I shall be happy however to lay before the Prince an expression of the well known loyalty of the St. Regis Indians and of their welcome of H.R.H. to this Province."⁴⁰

Considering his Office's resistance to entertain any proposals for an address on behalf of the African Canadian community, Pennefather's offer to the St. Regis Indians begs the question why would he not only accept, but encourage an address to the Prince from Native peoples,

³⁹See Chapter V above.

⁴⁰RG7, Civil Secretary's Letterbooks [G17c], reel H-1205, vol. 17, R. Pennefather to J. Colquhoun, 25 August 1860.

another visible minority alienated by the white community? Moreover, Native involvement in the celebration demonstrates the opposition evinced towards them from segments of the population. Whether it was the *Globe* sneering at their participation in the procession in Hamilton, where "They added but little to the dignity of the ceremony" by "whooping" and "leaping" the whole way, or members of the royal party itself regarding Natives as "wild savages—most grotesque in feature," Natives seemed to garner little admiration or support for their presence among whites.⁴¹ Furthermore, British North American newspapers largely ignored their presence and when they were compelled to report on them due to the nature of the event, i.e. Indian games, the comments were often derogatory. Taking the Prince's visit to Halifax as an example of the lack of reportage on Native activities, the leading newspapers of the city, including the *Acadian Recorder*, the *British Colonist*, the *Christian Messenger*, the *Halifax Evening Reporter*, and the *Novascotian*, were all united in printing scarcely a word on Mi'kmaq participation beyond the brief and the banal. British and American correspondents, by comparison, offered their readers full descriptions of the Mi'kmaq welcome and Indian games.⁴² As Jennifer Reid has argued, many members of the white population chose to ignore Natives, and other ethnic minorities such as Blacks, as they imagined their community as a British American

⁴¹*Globe*, 19 September 1860; Gardner D. Engleheart, *Journal of Progress of H.R.H. The Prince of Wales Through British North America, and His Visit to the United States, July 10 to November 15, 1860* (London, 1860), 45, 61. Engleheart served as the Duke of Newcastle's Private Secretary during the tour.

⁴²N.A. Woods, *The Prince of Wales in Canada and the United States* (London, 1861); Cornwallis, *Royalty in the New World*. Woods worked as *The Times*' correspondent during the tour as did Cornwallis for the *New York Herald*.

community which had little place for racial difference and disunity.⁴³ But, as some situations during the Royal Tour illustrate, several whites had included Natives in their definition of the British North American community.

Pennefather's offer to submit an address of loyalty from Native peoples suggests that the state was more willing to accept the visible presence of Natives within the community than Black people. Perhaps the offer was more an acknowledgement of aboriginal tradition in permitting them to pay their respects to the son of the Great Mother or, maybe, it was intended to instill a greater sense of loyalty in them, but, whatever the case, the proposal effectively recognised Native people's place within the community. Likewise, the setting aside of time and space for Indian games and inviting the Prince to attend them demonstrate that not all whites were eager to hide Natives or to ignore their presence. Though marginalised, some whites regarded Native peoples as a distinctive component of their imagined community, a community which was not an identical model of Great Britain, but a community with conspicuous differences from the Mother Country. By far the most prominent distinction raised between Britain and British North America during the Tour was the presence of Native peoples.

On hearing that Halifax was planning to provide a display of Indian canoe races for the Prince, the *Globe* foretold that with these games "His Royal Highness will see something not common in the old country."⁴⁴ In order to ensure the distinctiveness of the event, a committee of volunteers came together to procure subscriptions and manage the participation of Natives in the reception of the Prince of Wales in Halifax. Having been refused public grants to fund the

⁴³Reid, *Myth, Symbol, and Colonial Encounter*.

⁴⁴*Globe*, 21 July 1860.

Indian games, the committee solicited contributions from Nova Scotians to assist them in raising the necessary funds to clothe Mi'kmaq participants in "traditional" garb. In a published "Appeal for the Indians," the committee informed Nova Scotians that "The Indians are entirely destitute of suitable National Costume, and without the means to purchase material to make it...." Thanks to the "liberality of that portion of the community already appealed to," a number of Mi'kmaq had been already "mustered and enrolled, a certain portion of them provided with cloths, beads, &c., and their canoes are being numbered and got in order," but still more charity on the part of the white community was required to effect a memorable display.⁴⁵ Apparently, in the minds of some, such a display was attained with one writer crediting the Mi'kmaq performance as "One of the principal attractions at the festivities in honor of the Prince's arrival at Halifax" and a display worthy of imitation by Canada West. Presaging the gathering at Sarnia, the writer proposed assembling the "remnants" of the "once noble tribes" inhabiting the frontier around Lake Huron and Georgian Bay to pay tribute to the "son of their 'Great Mother.'" Not only would the event please "these ancient lords of the forest," but would be a "novelty" and wrest "the palm from the Lower Province" in impressing the Prince and the international public. "Whilst reviews and illuminations, and yachting, and balls are all very well as amusements," the writer reasoned, "they form—comparatively speaking—but every day scenes in the life of the Prince."⁴⁶ A Native demonstration, on the other hand, would provide the Prince with a distinctive memory of the Upper province and, moreover, a brief respite from the monotonous grind of levees, balls, and dinners he encountered at every turn.

⁴⁵*Christian Messenger*, 25 July 1860.

⁴⁶*Globe*, 4 August 1860.

Certainly the inclusion of Native peoples in the official programme added spectacle and colour to the celebrations, but, if that were the main motive of organisers, the request, nonetheless, permitted Natives to claim their rightful place in the celebration and, thus, the British North American community. In her study of the relations between the Mi'kmaq and whites in nineteenth century Acadia, Jennifer Reid has argued that

the Mi'kmaq perceived the importance of visibility in respect to bringing about a British recognition of the diversity that defined the Acadian community. Thus, they appeared in public celebrations in which...they were appreciated by whites for little more than their entertainment value. Regardless of white motives for seeking their inclusion on these occasions, visibility was still visibility; alienation of the Mi'kmaq was a dismal reality, and the native community consequently exploited all opportunities for potential discourse with the white population.⁴⁷

In the face of white attempts to represent them as an inferior Other, or even at all, Natives persisted in trying to make their presence felt and recognised in British North America through participation in the Royal Tour. In addition, in welcoming the Prince to their community they exercised their traditional rights as the aboriginal children of the Great Mother to reaffirm the paternal bond they held with the monarchy and to approach representatives of the Crown for the redress of grievances. After Confederation, however, and the expansion of the Canadian state, the tradition of government paternalism would take on a more oppressive face, though thinly masked by the benevolence of the Great Mother's maternal image.

Colonialism, Treaty-Making, and the Imagery of the Great Mother

After the acquisition of Rupert's Land in 1870, the intention to develop and settle

⁴⁷Reid, *Myth, Symbol, and Colonial Encounter*, 83-84. H.V. Nelles arrived at a similar conclusion regarding Native participation in the Quebec Tercentenary pageants. Nelles, *The Art of Nation-Building*, 173-181.

Western Canada compelled the state to restrict the movement and control the behaviour of the First Nations populating the Plains and, moreover, to legitimise these actions. The paternal image of the Great Mother provided a convenient mechanism in reaching these ends on the level of representation. The portrayal of Queen Victoria as a mother to Natives, and, by extension, Natives as her children, bolstered the societal view of these people as childlike, simpleminded, and incapable of responsibility. These views arose out of contemporary ideas about progress and civilisation in which progress was understood as a process evolving towards the highest stage of civilisation, supposedly exemplified by Victorian culture. Believing themselves to have reached the apex of human civilisation, Victorians evaluated other societies against their own and, as might be expected, found indigenous cultures bereft of any of the measures of progress. Since they lacked material advancement and development, Natives were regarded as lazy, indolent, backward, and, ultimately, as children who needed to be taken by the hand and led to white civilisation. The categorisation of Natives as helpless children permitted whites to rationalise the placement of Native peoples under government wardship and to justify the state's assimilative policies as benevolent enterprises which endeavoured to care for and protect them.⁴⁸ Consequently, during the negotiation of the treaties with the Natives of the North-west Territories during the 1870s, a process aimed to clear the Plains for white settlement and to place Natives under government wardship, state administrators turned to the tradition of paternalism, heavily infused with the imagery of the Great Mother, to convince the Natives, and perhaps themselves, of the benevolence of the measure.

⁴⁸Pettipas, *Severing the Ties that Bind*, 20-23; Reid, *Myth, Symbol, and Colonial Encounter*, 40-41; Francis, *The Imaginary Indian*, 58-60; Dyck, *What is the Indian "Problem"?*, 56.

In the negotiation of Treaty One in Manitoba in 1871 Lieutenant Governor Adams Archibald set the stage for his successors as he evoked the image of the Queen as a caring mother seeking to do justice for her Native children by showing them the way to "civilisation." After validating his position as the chosen representative of "Your Great Mother," and thus as their surrogate father, Archibald told a large gathering of Natives that "Your Great Mother wishes the good of all races under her sway. She wishes her red children to be happy and contented. She wishes them to live in comfort. She would like them to adopt the habits of the whites, to till land and raise food, and store it up against a time of want."⁴⁹ Similarly, in his negotiation of treaties with the Natives Alexander Morris invoked the names of the Queen and the Great Mother in his speeches "deliberately because in this country it is important that the authority of the Queen should be brought before the peoples."⁵⁰ Accordingly, in his negotiation of Treaty Four in September 1874 he explained to an assemblage of Indian representatives that

The Queen knows that you are poor; the Queen knows that it is hard to find food for yourselves and children; she knows that the winters are cold, and your children are often hungry; she has always cared for her red children as much as for her white. Out of her generous heart and liberal hand she wants to do something for you, so that when the buffalo get scarce, and they are scarce enough now, you may be able to do something for yourselves.

As he had at the negotiation of other treaties, Morris then assured his Native listeners that "she is always just and true...the Queen always keeps her word, always protects her red men." In concluding his address the Lieutenant Governor of the North-west Territories ended with a

⁴⁹Alexander Morris, *The Treaties of Canada with the Indians of Manitoba and the North-West Territories, Including the Negotiations On Which They Were Based, and Other Information Relating Thereto* (1880; reprint, Toronto, 1979), 28.

⁵⁰NAC, John A. Macdonald Papers, MG26 A, reel C-1673, vol. 252, pp. 114092-114093, Alexander Morris to John A. Macdonald, 5 March 1873.

paternalistic flourish—that being the white definition of paternalism—as he told the Native headmen to “look me in the face, eye to eye, and open your hearts to me as children would to a father, as children *ought* to do to a father, and as you *ought* to the servants of the great mother of us all.”⁵¹

From the perspective of government administrators, the representation of Queen Victoria as the “Great Mother” during treaty negotiations expressed a ward-guardian relationship closely approximating that of the mid-Victorian family in which children were kept under close supervision and were expected to obey their parents.⁵² As in other parts of the Empire, such as India, colonial administrators believed that Native peoples closely adhered to their version of the patriarchal family and, therefore, so long as the image of the Great Mother held sway with the Natives “nothing but gross injustice or oppression will induce them to either forget the allegiance which they now claim with pride, or molest the white subjects of the sovereign whom they regard as their Supreme Chief.”⁵³ Nonetheless, the symbols of royalty were invoked in a further, impressive way to ensure Native loyalty to the Great Mother and, so they thought, to the white definition of paternalism.

Through the royal recognition and regal treatment of Native chiefs by the monarch, the

⁵¹Morris, *The Treaties of Canada*, 88-96. The emphasis is mine.

⁵²John L. Tobias, “The Origins of the Treaty Rights Movement in Saskatchewan,” in *1885 and After: Native Society in Transition*, eds. F. Laurie Barron and James B. Waldram (Regina, 1986), 248.

⁵³Morris, *The Treaties of Canada*, 43. The author of the quotation is Wemyss Simpson, the Indian Commissioner during the negotiation of Treaties One and Two. On Queen Victoria as symbolic Mother in India, see Indira Chowdhury-Sengupta, “Mother India and Mother Victoria: Motherhood and Nationalism in Nineteenth Century Bengal,” *South Asia Research* 13, no. 1 (1992): 20-37.

state not only continued a modified tradition of gift-giving, but, in doing so, hoped to enlist the collaboration of Native "leaders" in keeping the Aboriginal population loyal to the Queen and, thus, under control. Again, as in India, Canadian Indian administrators shared the view of their imperial counterparts that "Her Majesty rules the minds and convinced loyalty of the chiefs, and they rule the massed millions of people...."⁵⁴ Although a chief's role was, for the most part, limited to that of a mediator/advisor and to influence his people rather than to dictate to them, the British and Canadian governments, as had the French before them, overestimated his power and continuously cultivated his friendship. In fact, on occasions where there did not seem to be a chief "in charge," government officials would sometimes create one in order to facilitate treaty negotiations and place a headman in a position where he could later influence his tribe in adhering to the treaty's provisions.⁵⁵ Reflecting the state's position, Alexander Morris was convinced that it was of absolute "importance to strengthen the hands of the Chiefs and Councillors by a due recognition of their offices and respect being shewn them. They should be strongly impressed with the belief that they are officers of the Crown, and that it is their duty to see that the Indians of their tribes obey the provisions of the treaties."⁵⁶ Accordingly, the state sought to increase the chiefs' status, and thus the "respect being shewn them," through a number of measures—all associated with royal grace.

⁵⁴J. Castell Hopkins, *Queen Victoria, Her Life and Reign. A Study of British Monarchical Institutions and the Queen's Personal Career, Foreign Policy, and Imperial Influence* (Toronto, 1896), 386.

⁵⁵Peter Carstens, *The Queen's People: A Study of Hegemony, Coercion, and Accommodation among the Okanagan of Canada* (Toronto, 1991), 45-46; Calloway, *Crown and Calumet*, 61; White, *The Middle Ground*, 403-404.

⁵⁶Morris, *The Treaties of Canada*, 286.

On a material level, the Crown directed that any gifts to be given to Native tribes were to be distributed solely by their chiefs. Not only would this action lend a chief economic power within the tribe, but, also, invest him with the prestige of having been recognised by the Queen, under whose directions he had received and distributed the "Queen's Bounty." In this way, the chief would become the visible means through which the Great Mother demonstrated her benevolence.⁵⁷ Moreover, in order to make the chief's privileged relationship with the Queen even more explicit to his tribe, as well as to himself, he was provided with a flag for his lodge and a uniform to wear at times when "it is necessary to show that they are officers of the Queen...."⁵⁸ Above all, medals bearing the image of Queen Victoria were issued to chiefs to cement their loyalty to the Crown and their tribe's recognition of their status.

Again following French precedents, the British adopted the practice of presenting medals to chiefs and other headmen as tokens of friendship, recognition of services rendered during times of war, and as signs of allegiance from those who accepted them. Like gift-giving, the British learned that the presentation of medals was a necessary practice in relations with Natives since chiefs had come to expect them. Usually issued on special occasions, such as treaty signings or royal visits, they became personal marks worn with pride by chiefs as they had come directly from the Queen whose impression appeared on each medal.⁵⁹ Although the government

⁵⁷White, *The Middle Ground*, 496, 502; Calloway, *Crow and Calumet*, 41-43.

⁵⁸Morris, *The Treaties of Canada*, 208.

⁵⁹Dickason, "Louisbourg and the Indians," 111-114; Prucha, *The Great Father*, vol. 1, 173-175; White, *The Middle Ground*, 179; Jamieson, *Medals Awarded to North American Indian Chiefs*; R.W. McLachlan, *Medals Awarded to the Canadian Indians* (Montreal, 1899); Francis Paul Prucha, *Indian Peace Medals in American History* (Madison, 1971).

stressed that the medals did not belong to a chief personally and were to be handed over to his successor in office upon his death or removal, chiefs regarded them as personal gifts and placed much sentimental value on them.⁶⁰ In addition, some had welcomed the official recognition of their status within a tribe which a medal bestowed upon them. Considering the value chiefs placed on these royal favours, then, it should not be surprising that several of them appealed to the government, and in some cases the Crown, to issue medals befitting their—and their Great Mother's—rank.⁶¹

In signing the treaties and accepting medals from the Crown, chiefs and their tribes accepted the paternalism of the Great Mother. Early on in treaty negotiations Wemyss Simpson, the Indian Commissioner during the negotiation of Treaties One and Two, could report to the Secretary of State that “the Indians of both parts have a firm belief in the honor and integrity of Her Majesty’s representatives, and are fully impressed with the idea that the amelioration of their present condition is one of the objects of Her Majesty in making these treaties.”⁶² In taking the Queen’s hand, however, Natives did not believe, nor accept, that they were surrendering their independence by entering into a paternal relationship with the British monarch. On the contrary,

⁶⁰NAC, Records of the Department of Indian Affairs [RG10], Central Registry System, Black (Western) Series, reel C-10141, vol. 3812, file 55,340, J.D. McLean to John Semmens, 23 February 1910.

⁶¹RG10, Central Registry System, Red (Eastern) Series, reel C-9661, vol. 2841, file 172,535, Maurice Ahgnionlen to Lord Aberdeen, 26 March 1896 (transl.), Maurice Ahgnionlen to Lord Aberdeen, 3 July 1896 (transl.); Black Series, reel C-10141, vol. 3812, file 55,340, Wedildahld to the Department of Indian Affairs, 27 April 1911; NAC, 7th Earl and 1st Marquis of Aberdeen Papers, MG27 IB5, vol. 1, file “Sir Mackenzie Bowell,” Mackenzie Bowell to Lord Aberdeen, 27 November 1895; Morris, *Treaties of Canada*, 74.

⁶²Quoted in Morris, *Treaties of Canada*, 42.

according to their understanding of paternalism they believed that they were protecting their autonomy. As noted earlier, Native peoples regarded the child-parent relationship quite differently from Europeans. Following their traditions of familial relations, Natives believed that by accepting the role of "children" to the Great Mother they were exchanging their respect and loyalty to the Crown in return for their freedom and the Queen's parental protection, which included provision in times of need. Instead of entering into a parental relationship of supervision, Natives were convinced that the treaties had guaranteed them a special relationship with the Crown consisting of two equal parties coming together in a mutually beneficial arrangement.⁶³ According to the Native Elders of the Peigans, Stoneys, and Siksikas First Nations, the promises of the Queen to think of them as "my children" and "to look after the well-being of your people" were regarded as significant promises and an important commitment which provided a powerful incentive to their tribes to sign Treaty Seven. Expecting the Queen to respect their autonomy and to protect their welfare, Natives embraced her as their Great Mother and turned to her whenever in need, often over the heads of the Indian Department.⁶⁴

If representation can be used to manipulate and regulate, it can also be resisted. Natives countered white representations with characterisations of their own derived from their interpretation of the Great Mother and the nature of her relationship with Aboriginal peoples.

⁶³Walter Hildebrandt et al., *The True Spirit and Original Intent of Treaty Seven* (Kingston and Montreal, 1996), 302; Jean Friesen, "Magnificent Gifts: The Treaties of Canada with the Indians of the Northwest, 1869-76," *Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, 5th ser., 1 (1986): 47; Blair Stonechild and Bill Waiser, *Loyal till Death: Indians and the North-West Rebellion* (Calgary, 1997), 28-29; Tobais, "The Origins of the Treaty Rights Movement in Saskatchewan," 248.

⁶⁴Hildebrandt et al., *The True Spirit and Original Intent of Treaty Seven*, 82, 115, 118, 122, 290, 320.

After treaty negotiations, Natives from the Great Plains framed their grievances and demands with a rhetorical device James C. Scott has explored elsewhere as the myth of the "Czar-Deliverer." In his examination of peasant resistance in Russia, Scott noted that serfs viewed the czar as a benevolent personage who sought to protect them, but, on occasion, was prevented from doing so by wicked officials who ignored the czar's wishes. Accordingly, the serfs blamed their poor treatment on officials and, thus, implored, first, the officials' superiors to warn them that the czar's traditional benevolence towards the peasantry was being subverted and, then, if necessary, directly petitioned the czar to inform him of the situation. "As a practical matter," Scott adds, "the wishes of the benevolent czar were whatever the pressing interests and tribulations of the peasantry projected onto him; and this, of course, was what made the myth so politically incendiary."⁶⁵ Similarly, in their petitions and oral grievances to the government the First Nations of Canada reminded state officials that the Queen had promised to look after them as her children, an obligation they were charged to fulfill in her name, and if their welfare was neglected government officials were then guilty of ignoring the Queen's wishes.⁶⁶

After the conclusion of Treaties One and Two in the early 1870s several chiefs adopted a similar argument in order to improve the quality of their medals. Offended at the poor calibre of the insignia presented to them in commemoration of the event, a number of chiefs complained of their small size and silver plating to government officials. Invoking the Great Mother to aid

⁶⁵James C. Scott, *Domination and the Arts of Resistance* (New Haven, 1990), 97-98.

⁶⁶Pettipas, *Severing the Ties that Bind*, 129; Reid, *Myth, Symbol, and Colonial Encounter*, 81-86; L. James Dempsey, *Warriors of the King: Prairie Indians in World War I* (Regina, 1999), 7, 83; W.D. Hamilton and W.A. Spray, eds., *Source Materials Relating to the New Brunswick Indian* (Fredericton, 1977), 130.

their demand for quality medals, one chief told Alexander Morris that "I think it would disgrace the Queen, my mother, to wear her image on so base a metal as this....Let the medals you give us be of silver—medals that shall be worthy of the high position our Mother the Queen occupies." In response to these complaints, the government directed that all of the medals struck for the remaining Treaties (Three to Eight) would be three inches in diameter, compared to two inches, and made from solid silver.⁶⁷ More substantial demands for food and clothing, however, were the norm as Natives pressured the government to live up to their treaty promises and provide them with provisions and agricultural training and implements.

The lack of government support was accentuated with the virtual disappearance of the buffalo from the Canadian Prairies by 1879. Destitute and starving, Plains Natives sought government assistance and when it was announced that Lord Lorne, Queen Victoria's son-in-law and the current Governor General, would be touring the Canadian West, they recognised their chance to voice their complaints over the nonfulfillment of treaty promises and prepared to meet with the son of the Great Mother whom they dubbed as their Brother.⁶⁸ Indian administrators knew full well that Natives would take advantage of the vice-regal visit to press for better treaty terms. "This is always the case with Indians," a preparatory memorandum stated, "they will tell His Excellency that the old men made the Treaty, but the young ones had not understood it, they will say they were promised many things at the time of the Treaty which have not been given them." The writer contended that Lord Lorne would have to emphasise that the government

⁶⁷Morris, *Treaties of Canada*, 74; Jamieson, *Medals Awarded to North American Indian Chiefs*, 48-50.

⁶⁸Stonechild and Waiser, *Loyal till Death*, 32, 42; E. Brian Titley, *The Frontier World of Edgar Dewdney* (Vancouver, 1999), 39-47.

would be willing to assist those who cultivate land.⁶⁹ It was not a difficult task to convince the Governor General of the state's position since he shared the same attitude. While sympathetic to requests for food due to the decline of the buffalo, Lord Lorne thought that the Canadian government had treated Indians more fairly than they deserved. Regarding them as "horrible savages" destined to be absorbed by the white race, he had hoped that he would not encounter too many Natives during his Northwestern tour.⁷⁰ Lawrence Vankoughnet, the Deputy Superintendent of Indian Affairs, was also anxious to stifle Native demands and "to prevent any possible imposture being practised by Indians not Chiefs or Headmen." While he suggested designating planned meeting places as a way to limit numbers, the Assistant Indian Commissioner thought that the presence of the local Indian Agent at each meeting place would help in not letting "the visit embarrass the Government in anyway." Whatever the case, he concluded, Native demands "should not be acceded to as the expenditure is large enough as it is now."⁷¹

As Lorne approached the North-west, D.L. Macpherson, the Acting Minister of the Interior, assured His Excellency that everything was being done "to prevent the Indians importuning you" with "new and impossible [treaty] concessions."⁷² In fact, the government had

⁶⁹RG7, G23, vol. 2, file "Lord Lorne, 1881," Anonymous Memorandum, 24 March 1881.

⁷⁰Marquis of Lorne, *Canadian Pictures Drawn with Pen and Pencil* (London, 1885), 164, 172; NAC, 1st Marquis of Lorne Papers, MG27 I B4, reel A-716, Lord Lorne to Archibald Campbell, 28 August 1881 (copy); Macdonald Papers, reel C-1596, vol. 210, p. 89414, Edgar Dewdney to J.A. Macdonald, 23 April 1881.

⁷¹RG7, G23, vol. 2, file "Lord Lorne, 1881," L. Vankoughnet to F. de Winton, 15 July 1881; Macdonald Papers, reel C-1596, vol. 210, p. 89528, E. Galt to L. Vankoughnet, 26 July 1881.

⁷²Lorne Papers, reel A-717, D.L. Macpherson to Lord Lorne, 1 August 1881 (copy).

turned the anxiety concerning the visit on its head and started to look forward to Native attendance. Alarmed at the number of raids on ranches for food and the gathering of up to three thousand Cree and Assiniboine at the government's main supply depot at Fort Walsh demanding rations, state officials grew increasingly concerned over Indian militancy. As the Queen's son-in-law, Lord Lorne seemed to offer the state a way to induce Native compliance by invoking the imagery and traditions of the Great Mother.⁷³ Armed with suits for chiefs and provisions for their tribes, Lorne would present these items as gifts to Native peoples as a sign of the Great Mother's concern. D.L. Macpherson hoped that the gifts "will be satisfactory to the Indians and have a quieting effect." Coming from the Great Mother, he stressed that "The Indians should be made to appreciate these presents more than they would ordinary clothing."⁷⁴ As well, officials thought that when word spread that His Excellency was distributing presents all over the country, it may induce the Natives at Fort Walsh to disperse and meet him at Qu'Appelle and, possibly, with Lord Lorne's influence convince treaty hold out Big Bear to come to terms.⁷⁵

Informing Macpherson about the effect of the visit, the Assistant Indian Commissioner reported that the Natives had come out in large numbers to see their "Brother," but the end result was not an encouraging sign that they were any more prepared to take up farming than before. "His Excellency's trip has much disturbed the minds of the Indians, and I regret to say

⁷³Stonechild and Waiser, *Loyal till Death*, 27; Titley, *Frontier World of Edgar Dewdney*, 39-42, 141.

⁷⁴Glenbow Museum Archives, Edgar Dewdney Papers, vol. 3, pp. 1172-1173, D.L. Macpherson to Edgar Dewdney, 15 July 1881.

⁷⁵Ibid.; Macdonald Papers, reel C-1596, vol. 210, pp. 89531-89532, E. Galt to L. Vankoughnet, 26 July 1881, E. Dewdney to J.A. Macdonald, 23 April 1881. Big Bear was hunting buffalo in Montana during the Governor General's visit.

are neglecting their Fields in consequence.”⁷⁶ If by “disturbed” he meant that they were hopeful that Lord Lorne’s visit would translate into food, clothing, and a sympathetic ear to listen to their grievances, then “disturbed” they were. Edgar Dewdney encountered some of these “disturbed” Natives during a visit to Qu’Appelle to prepare for the vice-regal visit and to advise them upon farming. On learning that Lorne and perhaps the daughter of the Great Mother may pay them a visit in August, one Native replied that “the daughter of the Great Mother would surely not like to see the Great Mother’s children hoeing potatoes in the field naked, and that is what she will see if you don’t send us some clothing.” Even though Princess Louise did not accompany her husband, Dewdney requested more clothing to be issued for the Natives.⁷⁷ Despite their appeals to Lord Lorne that “We are children of the Great Mother, and we wish that through her representative, our brother-in-law, she would listen for a little while to our complaints and sympathize with our sufferings,” the Cree chief Big Child’s request gained little support. Well prepared for the demands for food, and not at all impressed with what he regarded as “nothing but an exclamatory beggar’s oration,” Lorne replied “that the Great Mother had many white children who were very poor.... She would gladly give them all that they needed, but she had so many poor children who needed assistance that she could not always do as much for them as she would wish to.” His Excellency then presented silver medals bearing Princess Louise’s and his impressions to the chiefs.⁷⁸

⁷⁶Macdonald Papers, reel C-1596, vol. 210, pp. 89543-89544, E. Galt to D.L. Macpherson, 18 August 1881.

⁷⁷Ibid., pp. 89479-89481, E. Dewdney to D.L. Macpherson, 4 July 1881.

⁷⁸W.H. Williams, *Manitoba and the North-West* (Toronto, 1882), 85-86; Lorne, *Canadian Pictures Drawn with Pen and Pencil*, 163.

At Indian gatherings at Fort Ellice, Qu'Appelle, Fort Carlton, Battleford, Blackfoot Crossing, and Fort McLeod the speeches repeated themselves along the same lines. Lorne later recalled that, generally, the chief "observes with much unction that the grass is green, the sky blue, and that rivers flow on for ever...There is sometimes a dignified reference to his own stomach and the appetites of his tribe as unsatisfied...." He would then repeat that the government had been generous and had little more to give—except to those who agreed to take up agriculture—and then ended each of the ceremonies with the presentation of medals and some provisions.⁷⁹ Even though most of their demands were ignored by state officials, in part due to economic considerations and oftentimes because the redress of certain grievances would contradict the state's program of Indian assimilation,⁸⁰ Native peoples continued to oppose white representations of the Great Mother, and thus state regulation, by articulating their own interpretation of the Queen. In negotiations and at royal ceremonies Natives claimed their rights to autonomy and provisions by invoking the image of the Great Mother who represented the interests of her Indian children. Though they reminded Indian administrators that as loyal subjects and children of the Queen they expected to be treated fairly, officials often paid little heed to their demands. The state's program of acculturation superceded Native demands and when confronted with Natives charging that they had not lived up to their Great Mother's word

⁷⁹Ninth Duke of Argyll, *Yesterday and Today in Canada* (London, 1910), 100.

⁸⁰Some officials also put little credence in the accuracy of the petitions. In his capacity as the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, Clifford Sifton disregarded Native petitions on the basis that "it is possible for persons to get the Indians to sign almost any kind of statements, if a little excitement and agitation be got up beforehand, and we are unable therefore to rely to any extent upon written statements that come in signed by Indians." NAC, Clifford Sifton Papers, MG27 II D15, vol. 238, pp. 635-636, Clifford Sifton to S.D. Chown, 29 August 1900.

and, in doing so, slighted Her Majesty, officials merely remoulded royal imagery to suit their objectives. Royal representation may have offered Native peoples with both a means and a justification to resist white hegemony, but, as a contested terrain, it was also a potential weapon to be turned against them.

The Great Pow-wow of 1901: Organisation

When the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York toured the Empire during the summer and autumn of 1901, they did so with a retinue of British journalists who zealously informed the British public of the popularity of the monarchy in the colonies.⁸¹ They were equally assiduous in their descriptions of the wealth and character of Britain's colonial possessions, paying especial attention to their most "exotic" features—the indigenous populations. The opportunities for greatest dramatic effect, however, occurred when they were able to thread both of these stories together. Since Queen Victoria had recently passed away in January and her son Albert Edward had ascended the throne as Edward VII, journalists were provided with several instances in which they could capture "pathetic" moments of Native mourning for the "Great White Queen," a scene perhaps only matched by what they described as the overwhelming loyalty of Natives to their new Father. Such an occasion occurred early on in the tour at Rotorua, New Zealand where approximately six thousand Maoris had gathered to meet the Duke and Duchess. Upon listening to the Maori address, Edmund F. Knight of the *Morning Post* reported that "It would be difficult to convey to people at home [Britain] how

⁸¹The British reporters who travelled with T.R.H. around the world were E.F. Knight (*Morning Post*), William Maxwell (*Standard*), A. Pearse (*Sphere*), Joseph Watson (*Reuters*), and J.E. Vincent (*The Times*).

deeply revered and loved was Queen Victoria by these Maori people, and how they grieved at her death. At every ceremony in which they took part the Maoris sang the chant of lamentation for the Great White Queen...."⁸² Likewise, in South Africa foreign correspondents noted the songs of mourning from Native chiefs as they lamented the loss of "our Great, Good, and Wise Queen-Mother" and recorded their cheers as they welcomed Edward VII's son.⁸³

Canada, too, provided the British press with a dramatic Native spectacle embodied in the "Great Pow-wow" Joseph Pope had been so disappointed with. The correspondent for *Reuters*, however, concluded that while the "Pow-wow" was "less imposing than the Maori and Zulu demonstrations, [it] was nevertheless one of the most picturesque and interesting features of the tour, carrying us all back, as it did by its vivid actuality, to the tales of the 'noble Redskin' which we so eagerly devoured in our youth."⁸⁴ While such reportage would, on the one hand, inform the British public that the Canadian North-west was peaceful for settlement, some believed that the "Pow-wow" would have a detrimental effect on British immigration to the area. The *Montreal Star* had hoped that the Royal Visit would dispel many of the myths about Canada, but "Unfortunately, the very picturesqueness of some of the exhibitions arranged for the amusement

⁸²Edmund Frederick Knight, *With the Royal Tour: A Narrative of the Recent Tour of the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York Through Greater Britain* (Toronto, 1902), 196. On the ceremony in Rotorua, see Judith Bassett, "'A Thousand Miles of Loyalty': The Royal Tour of 1901," *New Zealand Journal of History* 21, no. 1 (1987), 125-138.

⁸³Sir Donald Mackenzie Wallace, *The Web of Empire: A Diary of the Imperial Tour of Their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York in 1901* (London, 1902), 347; Joseph Watson, *The Queen's Wish: How it was Fulfilled by the Imperial Tour of T.R.H. the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York* (Toronto, 1902), 322-329; Phillip Buckner, "The Royal Tour of 1901 and the Construction of an Imperial Identity in South Africa," *South African Historical Journal*, no. 41 (1999): 342-343.

⁸⁴Watson, *The Queen's Wish*, 374.

of Their Royal Highnesses—such as decorating Indians in the garb of the dime novel and having a grand parade of them in the North-west—attracted far more attention than the magnificent decorations and electric displays of the great cities.” The *Star* added that since “paint and feathers made better pictures than the great farms and well-filled granaries of the country,” it would be “hard to make the people of England believe that an Indian in fringes and hen feathers...is a sight as strange to the average Canadian as it would be if seen by the Londoner on Trafalgar Square.”⁸⁵ The Great Pow-wow, though, had been staged less to impress the British populace than to address issues at home. Certainly, state officials were influenced by the knowledge that an international audience would be observing the ceremony through the media, but the planning, preparations, and final product arose more out of internal than external exigencies. Prevailing attitudes, policies, and demands towards Natives and royalty by the state and public ensured that the “Great Pow-wow” would be more than just an entertaining spectacle for the Duke, but a hegemonic site in which competing representations of Natives, whites, and royalty converged and articulated an understanding of the nation.

At first, the official response of the Indian Department to the idea of holding a Native demonstration for the Duke and Duchess was a negative one. Responding to a suggestion from a fellow, and unnamed, member of his Department, J.D. McLean, the Secretary of Indian Affairs, drew up an initial memorandum on the subject in May in which he acknowledged that several Indian bands would “take such steps as they consider necessary” to greet His Royal Highness as they had when his father visited the country in 1860. Such demonstrations by Natives would be inevitable, but should the state sponsor them? McLean concluded that “I do not think...that

⁸⁵*Montreal Star*, 21 October 1901.

any concerted action...is either necessary or advisable.”⁸⁶ Although McLean had not provided a reason for discouraging government assistance, his position is not surprising considering his record on Native policies. During his long tenure as Secretary to the Department, from 1901 to 1919, McLean typified the Department’s hardline and unsympathetic approach towards Natives which emphasised assimilation, control, and the suppression of any and all expressions of traditional Native culture. McLean took this position to heart suggesting soon after his appointment, and a few months before penning his memorandum, that Indians who persisted in “giving away” gifts at dance gatherings should be “starved into submission” by withdrawing rations. His superior declined his suggestion on the basis that such action would be too dangerous for the white community since Native hunger may lead them into violence.⁸⁷

After perusing McLean’s memorandum, James Smart, the Deputy Superintendent of Indian Affairs, felt that the subject was of sufficient importance to inform Clifford Sifton and inquire whether the Department should consider assisting Natives in participating in the Duke’s welcome. Like McLean, Smart recommended that “no general participation by the Indians in any welcome should be undertaken....” Much to his dismay, however, Sifton thought that some sort of demonstration would be appropriate and directed his Deputy to see to that effect. The directions Smart had been given, though, were thankfully modest. He requested from the Minister of Finance a “small amount” of the general appropriation to assist some of the Natives in their endeavours and emphasised that “the Department will not undertake any elaborate

⁸⁶RG10, Black Series, vol. 8582, file 1/1-2-15-6, Memorandum by J.D. McLean, 14 May 1901.

⁸⁷Hall, “Clifford Sifton and Canadian Indian Administration,” 127-151; RG10, Black Series, reel C-10144, vol. 3825, file 60511-1.

preparations....” Though a reluctant helper, Smart consoled himself with the belief that “in a few cases it might be well to allow them to express their loyalty and affection to the Crown of Great Britain through Their Royal Highnesses.”⁸⁸

Lord Minto also had the same idea but, as was his nature, with much more ceremony. Since his installation as Canadian Governor General in 1898, Minto had enjoyed visiting reserves and meeting the Natives he romantically viewed as noble savages unsullied by the extravagances of modern civilisation.⁸⁹ Reflecting on the tour’s programme and impressed as he had been on his vice-regal tours to the reserves of the North-west, Minto decided to lobby for “a large gathering” of the Indians from the Blackfoot, Blood, and Sarcee reserves. Writing to A.E. Forget on Dominion Day he reasoned that such a meeting “would be a most acceptable spectacle for His Royal Highnesses to witness.”⁹⁰ A few days later the Governor General, unsure how the Lieutenant Governor of the North-west Territories would respond, decided to spread his net wider and sought the support of Clifford Sifton for his nascent plan. Certain that the Duke “would much like to see something of the Indians in the North West,” Minto asked whether it would be possible to have a “large gathering” of Natives to meet him either at or near Calgary and, if he approved, to inform Forget of his support.⁹¹ Regarding the suggestion “a good one,” Sifton placed upon David Laird the “responsibility of seeing that arrangements are made to carry

⁸⁸RG10, Black Series, vol. 8582, file 1/2-2-15-6, J. Smart to C. Sifton, 20 May 1901 (copy), J. Smart to W.S. Fielding, 3 June 1901 (copy).

⁸⁹Carman Miller, *The Canadian Career of the Fourth Earl of Minto: The Education of a Viceroy* (Waterloo, 1980), 175-176.

⁹⁰RG7, G23, vol. 8, file 23, Lord Minto to A.E. Forget, 1 July 1901 (copy).

⁹¹Ibid., Lord Minto to Sifton, 5 July 1901 (copy).

out His Excellency's suggestion." In giving these instructions to his Indian Commissioner, Sifton added one suggestion—that a contingent of police also attend the Indian gathering.⁹²

When contacted, Commissioner A. Bowen Perry of the North-west Mounted Police (NWMP) was happy to contribute not only men to the celebration, but ideas for the form the exhibition should take as well. He told Minto that between one thousand and fifteen hundred Indians could be assembled at Calgary for the royal visitors and "gymkhana, polo match, cattle roping, broncho riding etc." could be arranged for their entertainment. Then, the Duke could go to the nearby Sarcee reserve where possibly six thousand Natives could be assembled. Minto regarded Perry's suggestion "to hold a gymkhana etc. etc. an excellent one and in this the Indians would take part."⁹³ The Prime Minister, however, was less enthusiastic with the proposal. Reviewing the programme supplied by Lord Minto in late July, Sir Wilfrid Laurier noticed that there had been little provision for Native participation beyond a "Cowboy & Indians" display at Calgary. The Prime Minister felt that, in his judgement, it was inappropriate and limited Native involvement to a mere sideshow act. Writing Lord Minto, he told His Excellency that he advocated a more formal and solemn meeting between the Duke and the Native chiefs where the King-in-waiting could provide the chiefs with "some small but much valued presents." He pointed out that "It has been the constant policy of the British government on this continent to have the sovereign bestow upon the Indian chiefs, marks of individual favour. There are many braves who to this day will wear with pride, silver medals sent to their great great grandfather

⁹²Sifton Papers, reel C-523, vol. 107, Lord Minto file, p. 84461, Clifford Sifton to David Laird, 26 July 1901 (copy).

⁹³RG7, G23, vol. 11, file 34, A.B. Perry to Lord Minto, 9 July 1901, F.S. Maude to A.B. Perry, 20 July 1901.

by George III.” Although he had initially thought Perry’s proposal “an excellent one,” Minto thought better of it and reversed his position to side with the Prime Minister, admitting that he, too, was “rather inclined to think there is too much Cowboy & too little Indian!” in the proposal and that the Indian gathering was in danger of becoming “a ‘circus’ show.”⁹⁴

Now convinced that “any gathering of the tribes should in no way be connected with other arrangements at Calgary, such as Cowboy riding, exhibitions &c.,” Minto began to suggest to Perry, Sifton, and others that the Indian gathering should be held some miles south of the city. By placing the meeting away from the city as a completely separate occasion, Minto thought that its solemnity would be increased to create a “great ceremony in deference to [Native people’s] long connection with the history of the Empire.”⁹⁵ Clifford Sifton, however, had already considered the necessity of holding the gathering away from Calgary because, in keeping with his policy of police control, “It would be impossible to have it *in* the town as we could not control the Indians there.” In a town of about four thousand people the influx of nearly three thousand Natives would make it “difficult to handle a number of Indians in the town itself.”⁹⁶ Fred White, the Comptroller of the NWMP, concurred and felt “relieved that you [Minto] do not wish to have it *at* Calgary—There are lovely spots within a few miles and it will be so much

⁹⁴NAC, 4th Earl of Minto Papers, MG27 II B1, reel C-3113, Wilfrid Laurier to Lord Minto, 27 July 1901 (copy); reel A-131, vol.2, Letterbook, Lord Minto to Wilfrid Laurier, 31 July 1901; RG7, G23, vol. 11, file 34, Lord Minto to Fred White, 7 August 1901.

⁹⁵RG7, G23, vol. 11, file 34, Lord Minto to A.B. Perry, 7 August 1901 (copy), Lord Minto to Clifford Sifton, 10 August 1901 (copy).

⁹⁶Minto Papers, reel C-3114, vol. 10, Clifford Sifton to Lord Minto, [1901] (copy); Sifton Papers, reel C-424, Letterbook, Clifford Sifton to Arthur Sifton, 26 August 1901; NAC, Wilfrid Laurier Papers, MG26 G, reel C-787, vol. 203, p. 57882, Clifford Sifton to Wilfrid Laurier, 3 August 1901.

easier to get the Indians back to their Reserves.”⁹⁷

By the first week of September Laird, Lieutenant Governor A. E. Forget, and Superintendent Saunders of the NWMP had scouted out locations and agreed that Shaganappi Point, about two miles from Calgary, would be the best place for the Pow-wow which would consist of chiefs and members of the Blackfoot, Blood, Cree, Peigan, Sarcee, and Stoney tribes. Believing that it “would make an interesting feature of the display,” Forget recommended the inclusion of Native pupils from the nearby residential schools in the ceremony. Forget, who had served as Indian Commissioner in the 1890s, disapproved just as vehemently of Indian exhibitions as his successor. In his 1896 annual report as Indian Commissioner, for example, he had encouraged any action which would “secure the final abandonment of heathen rites and ceremonies by the Indians.” The promotion of residential schools at the Pow-wow seemed to be one way of facilitating this development. Even though the schools were operated by missionaries to Christianise aboriginal children, the government approved of them on the basis that the schools were an inexpensive method of achieving cultural assimilation and Native economic self-sufficiency. Consequently, the government took every opportunity to show off the success of the schools by showcasing the European dress, grooming, and manners of the Native children to distinguished visitors, a civilised state which could be highlighted by placing them in stark contrast with their “primitive” parents. The Pow-wow offered the Indian Department such an opportunity and Forget’s suggestion was quickly adopted by David Laird. There was a concern that the schools may not have been able to afford the trip to Shaganappi Point, but the government agreed to pay for all transportation costs incurred to bring Indian

⁹⁷RG7, G23, vol. 11, file 34, Fred White to Lord Minto, 9 August 1901.

children from the local industrial schools and orphanages to attend.⁹⁸

More pressing than arranging the attendance of children, though, was the supply of gifts and medals for the occasion. Following Laurier's suggestion that the Native chiefs should be supplied with some "much valued presents," Minto, Perry, and White agreed that every effort should be made to make a "generous expenditure for 'grub' and presents." Considering Native expectations and tradition, medals would have been appropriate, but the lateness in getting the Pow-wow organised made the proposal unfeasible. Instead, Laird and White agreed that at the Pow-wow the Duke should "be asked to promise a medal commemorative of the occasion to the Head Chiefs." As well, in order to exploit the medals to their full potential, the Duke was to emphasise that they were not to be "a personal gift, but to belong to the office, and to be handed to successors." In this way they hoped to further strengthen the political office of chief within each band and its tie to the Crown.⁹⁹ Indeed, when Fred White ordered the medals he had requested a total of 115 silver medals for chiefs and 295 bronze medals for "minor chiefs," headmen, and councillors, so that the medals could be distributed to not only those who attended the Pow-wow, but, under directions from Sifton, to every chief and minor chief in Manitoba and the North-west Territories. Featuring busts of the Duke and Duchess encircled by a scroll

⁹⁸NAC, Records of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police [RG18], Comptroller's Office, NWMP, vol. 216, file 631-1901, part 1, David Laird to Fred White, 3 September 1901 (copy); RG10, Black Series, vol. 8582, file 1/2-2-15-6; RG7, G23, vol. 11, file 34, Memorandum by Fred White, 7 September 1901; Pettipas, *Severing the Ties that Bind*, 140; Miller, *Shingwauk's Vision*, 145, 194-195, 414.

⁹⁹RG7, G23, vol. 11, file 34, Fred White to Lord Minto, 9 August 1901, Lord Minto to Clifford Sifton, 10 August 1901 (copy), A.B. Perry to Lord Minto, 13 August 1901, Memorandum by Fred White, 7 September 1901; RG18, Comptroller's Office, NWMP, vol. 216, file 631-1901, part 1, David Laird to Fred White, 3 September 1901 (copy).

pattern of maple leaves on the obverse and, on the reverse, the Royal Arms with the words "Calgary, Sept. 28th, 1901" and "Presented to Head Chiefs in Commemoration of Assembly of Indian Tribes," the two and a half inch sized medals were distributed to Natives in July 1902.¹⁰⁰

In addition to the promise of medals, the provision of food and tobacco for Natives at the Pow-wow was considered a necessity, again according to tradition, Native expectations, and state control. As with the presentation of medals, Indian administrators knew that Natives would expect to be provided with other gifts from the son of the Great Father which would be distributed to all present by the chiefs. David Laird, however, felt that "presents are not easily arranged without creating jealousy" and, consequently, suggested a "liberal supply of tea, tobacco, flour and beef in which all can share—not only those at the gathering but those who remain on the Reserves...." Such an action, he thought, should keep many Indians on the reserves during the Pow-wow. Furthermore, the rations were to be distributed not by the chiefs, but by the Indian Agents which would lend the Indian Department more control over any potentially damaging repercussions to emanate from the Indian gathering. While the Indian Commissioner recognised that he could not prevent the Pow-wow from happening, he at least hoped to restrain its excesses by placing it under the tight control of his Department.¹⁰¹

Since the Indian Department sought to keep Natives segregated from the white

¹⁰⁰RG10, Black Series, vol. 8582, file 1/1-2-15-6, Department of Indian Affairs Memorandum, 17 December 1902, J.D. McLean to David Laird, 3 May 1902, Eric Acland to G. Flaskerd, 19 August 1959, Fred White to J.E. Ellis Co., 6 November 1901 (copy); RG18 Comptroller's Office, NWMP, vol. 218, file 853-1901, Fred White to James Smart, 20 November 1901 (copy); Jamieson, *Medals Awarded to North American Indian Chiefs, 1714-1922*, 59.

¹⁰¹RG18, Comptroller's Office, NWMP, vol. 216, file 631-1901, part 1, David Laird to Fred White, 3 September 1901 (copy), Memorandum by Fred White, 7 September 1901.

community by keeping them on reserves and sought to instill self-sufficiency and thrift in their communities, Indian administrators were not enamoured with the prospect of having hundreds of Indians venturing off of their reserves to receive free food at the Pow-wow. Holding the ceremony away from Calgary with a contingent of police on hand and directing the issuance of rations were ways in which they attempted to limit the potential threats to their program of Indian assimilation which may arise at the gathering. A greater threat to their Indian policy loomed, however, as they learned that Indian dancing was to take place at the ceremony. Since the 1890s, the Indian Department consistently sought to suppress all Native dancing and ceremonies, such as the potlatch on the West Coast and the sun dance among Plains Indians. Regarding them as vestiges of a barbaric society, officials and the missionaries who operated the residential schools believed that the dances were pagan rituals which kept children from school, interfered with Native farming, and hindered the spread of civilisation and Christianity among Native peoples. State officials recognised that dancing was one way Natives tried to retain their traditional culture and, thus, they frowned on displays of dancing and did their best to prohibit their taking place on reserves. Their performance at public exhibitions, though, was doubly damaging. Not only would the dances perpetuate traditional Native culture, but would convey to the international community the image that Canada was "a place where wild Indians with painted faces still roamed the Plains." Such an image, they believed, did not conform to the picture of a modern, progressive society open to immigration and investment capital which they had hoped to portray.¹⁰² Therefore, when confronted with the possibility of the inclusion of

¹⁰²Titley, *A Narrow Vision*, 162, 172; Cole and Chaikin, *An Iron Hand Upon the People*; Pettipas, *Severing the Ties that Bind*; Francis, *Imaginary Indian*, 98-100; Keith Regular, "On Display," 1-10; RG10, Black Series, C-10144, vol. 3825, file 60511-1.

Indian dancing in the program, missionaries and the Indian Department resisted.

When Reverend H.W. Gibbon Stocken, a missionary to the Blackfoot, first heard that dancing may take place at the Pow-wow, he appealed to Clifford Sifton if "it can be so ordered that the Indians be not asked to give any of their heathen dances?" James Smart, evidently stunned by Gibbon Stocken's information, dashed off a letter to Fred White explaining to him that he thought "it was understood that there were to be no pow-wows or other dances but merely a presentation of the Indians to Their Royal Highnesses." He urged the NWMP's Comptroller "to impress this upon those who have this matter in charge in the West." Smart then told Gibbon Stocken that "it is not intended that the Indians should be asked to give any of their heathen dances" at the Indian gathering. "I may add," he continued, "that the Department would rather discourage than sympathize with any such movement either during this reception or at any other time."¹⁰³ Indeed, Fred White's memorandum on the organisation of the Pow-wow reflected the influence of Laird, Forget, and Smart as he reported that it was their intention that the ceremony "should be as impressive as possible, with a moderate amount of demonstration on the part of the Indians."¹⁰⁴

Lord Minto, on the other hand, could not understand what all the fuss was about. Why, he mused, should the "poor Indian...not enjoy himself as the white man does" at such

¹⁰³RG10, Black Series, vol. 8582, file 1/1-2-15-6, H.W. Gibbon Stocken to Clifford Sifton, 23 August 1901, James Smart to Fred White, 12 September 1901 (copy); RG10, Deputy Superintendent General's Letterbooks, vol. 1125, James Smart to H.W. Gibbon Stocken, 13 September 1901.

¹⁰⁴RG18, Comptroller's Office, vol. 216, file 631-1901, part 1, Memorandum by Fred White, 7 September 1901.

gatherings?¹⁰⁵ He regarded Indian dances and ceremonies as interesting spectacles not “without benefit to our future history to care for the traditions, customs & costumes of the original possessors of the country.”¹⁰⁶ Responding to the intimation that “the noisy demonstration which has usually been considered an essential part of an Indian gathering” may be dispensed with on this occasion, Major Maude informed White that His Excellency “would much regret the elimination of this part of the Programme, which is so picturesque in his opinion.”¹⁰⁷ The Governor General thought that some members of the Indian Department were too reactionary and unnecessarily stigmatised all of the traditions and customs of Native peoples “as heathen & barbaric & therefore to be stamped out without mercy.” Singling out David Laird’s “violent opposition” to Indian dancing, which he blamed for the lack of dancing during his own tour of the North-west in 1902, the Governor General confided in his journal that “The ridiculous wish to cut it down root & branch on the part of narrow minded authorities makes me sick....” Lord Minto attributed “a want...of human sympathy” on the part of the “white administration” to permit Natives to indulge themselves with one of the few amusements they had left.¹⁰⁸

In its planning stages, then, different attitudes and positions were articulated within the

¹⁰⁵Lord Minto’s Journal, 22 September 1900, *Lord Minto’s Canadian Papers: A Selection of the Public and Private Papers of the Fourth Earl of Minto*, vol. 1, eds. Paul Stevens and John T. Saywell (Toronto, 1981-83), 409.

¹⁰⁶Lord Minto to Wilfrid Laurier, 17 February 1903, *Ibid.*, vol. 2, 253-254.

¹⁰⁷RG7, G23, vol. 11, file 34, Fred White to F.S. Maude, 24 August 1901; RG18, Comptroller’s Office, NWMP, vol. 216, file 631-1901, part 1, F.S. Maude to Fred White, 26 August 1901 (copy).

¹⁰⁸Lord Minto to Wilfrid Laurier, 17 February 1903, Lord Minto’s Journal, 30 September 1902, Lord Minto to Wilfrid Laurier, 16 January 1903, *Lord Minto’s Canadian Papers*, vol. 2, 253, 199-200, 244-246.

state which would influence the organisation and staging of the Native gathering to be held in the North-west. While officials from the Department of Indian Affairs resisted any action which could possibly interfere with their programme of Native assimilation, from dancing to the Pow-wow itself, other officials, influenced by popular romantic images of savage Indians, advocated spectacular ceremonies which conformed to their racial stereotypes. Still others, most notably Sir Wilfrid Laurier, pressed for a solemn ceremony which would pay tribute to the loyalty of Native peoples to the Crown, and in doing so, as we shall see later, would remind Canadians of the heritage of British justice in the Dominion. Far from a cohesive, monolithic entity, the state included and attempted to balance differing attitudes towards Native peoples in Canadian society. Thus, when staged, the Pow-wow would reflect these conflicting attitudes and motives as elements of each position would be incorporated in order to reach a negotiated settlement. The meanings articulated at the ceremony, however, were not exclusively state products. Complicating the matter were Native agency and media reception and dissemination. State agents may have done their utmost to frame the meaning of the Indian gathering, but when it was played out Natives and the media had their own contributions to make as to how the Pow-wow would be understood.

The "Great Pow-wow" of 1901: Performance

One week before the Pow-wow was to take place, Commissioner Perry instructed Inspector James Wilson of the NWMP in Regina to proceed to Calgary and report to David Laird in order to render him every assistance in "marshalling" the Indians for the Pow-wow. Shortly after his arrival, Laird consented that Wilson should assume "full charge of the

encampment, with the exception of the rationing of the Indians and the furnishing of the dais.” In front of the dais, Wilson roped off a space for the chiefs and the pupils from the Indian schools. Behind this section the grounds were staked for the placement of the different bands with a separate square flagged at the rear for mounted Indians. On the day of the event, Wilson took all of the mounted Natives, numbering somewhere between four hundred and one thousand, and put them in two lines of about a half mile in length a distance from the dais instructing them to remain silently in place until the Royal Party had passed by and reached the marquee. At this point they were to gallop towards the dais to their respective positions. The pavilion itself was simple enough, consisting of a raised platform over which a large striped awning provided protection from the elements and the Royal Standard and a banner featuring the inscription “Kitaisimatsimpmon,” signifying “We Greet You” in the Blackfoot language, welcomed the Royal visitors. Wilson placed the head chiefs immediately in front of the dais, then the junior chiefs and the pupils. A semicircle of Native women, infants, and elders some ways behind the pupils completed the seating arrangements for the approximately two thousand Natives on hand. All was in place and ready for Their Royal Highnesses’s pleasure.¹⁰⁹

The Duke and Duchess’ day started with their reception at the Calgary train station by Lieutenant Governor Forget, the Mayor, and several other local dignitaries. After a few kind words, the party, which included Lady Minto, Joseph Pope, and Sir Wilfrid Laurier, travelled to see a review of 250 Mounted Police under the command of Commissioner Perry at nearby Victoria Park. The military display would provide Pope and others with a dramatic contrast to

¹⁰⁹RG18, Commissioner’s Office, NWMP, vol. 1489, file 197-1901, James Wilson to A.B. Perry, 29 October 1901 (copy).

the Native demonstration. Pope noted that everyone who viewed the NWMP review “expressed themselves delighted with the unlooked-for brilliancy of the spectacle.” “To the eye of a civilian,” he wrote, “the smart uniforms and fine carriage of the Mounted Police, joined to their mobility and high discipline, indicate a standard of military excellence not elsewhere attained in this country, and not easily surpassed in any other.”¹¹⁰ Following the review and the presentation of South African war medals by the Duke, the royal party then drove across the prairie to Shagannapi Point where the Natives, and in excess of two thousand white spectators, were waiting.

As they approached the pavilion, James Wilson observed that the mounted Indians “carried out my instructions to the letter, and no noise was made while the Royal Procession passed through.”¹¹¹ With the warriors riding into place and the Duke stepping onto the dais, David Laird opened the Great Pow-wow of 1901 by officially receiving Their Royal Highnesses and conducting them to chairs placed at the front of the marquee. As Fred White and Lord Minto had hoped, the Duke appeared in the uniform of Colonel-in-Chief of the Royal Fusiliers which, with its bright red colour, glittering ensemble of medals, and towering busby, made him clearly identifiable to the Natives as a person of great importance [Figure 7.1].¹¹² Once the rest of the party had settled into place on the pavilion, the Indian Commissioner presented the head chiefs to Their Royal Highnesses and instructed their collective address to be read by David Wolf

¹¹⁰Pope, *The Tour of Their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York*, 78.

¹¹¹RG18, Commissioner’s Office, NWMP, vol. 1489, file 197-1901, James Wilson to A.B. Perry, 29 October 1901 (copy).

¹¹²RG7, G23, vol. 4, file 6, Lord Minto to F.S. Maude, 27 September 1901 (copy).

Carrier, a young Sarcee Native.¹¹³ In fact, though, the address and the Duke's reply were penned by Laird and Forget.¹¹⁴ As might be expected, then, the address from the Indian tribes of Southern Alberta reflected more the attitude of the Indian Department than that of the Natives it professed to be from. There was little chance of it being otherwise because, in carrying out its duty to review all addresses submitted for presentation to the Duke, the Governor General's Office had consistently declined all submissions from Natives which seemed political in nature.¹¹⁵ As during the Royal Visit of 1860, the successful submission of an address which touched on aspects other than loyalty and love for the monarchy was remote at best.

Laird and Forget's address on behalf on the Indians more than adequately fit into the accepted structure of royal addresses. Beginning with an outline of how "they," that is, the Indian tribes of Southern Alberta, came to treaty with Queen Victoria, "whose death we deeply lament," the address reminded all present that when "we entered into treaty with our great mother we pledged her our allegiance and loyalty" and, accordingly, refused to bear arms against "our gracious sovereign" during the rebellion of 1885. "On the auspicious occasion of this visit," it continued, "we beg you to convey to your highly exalted father King Edward VII, the same expression of devotion to his person, and loyalty to his Government which we promised to his

¹¹³The head chiefs in attendance were White Pup, Running Rabbit, and Iron Shield of the Blackfoot; Crop Ear Wolf and Day Chief of the Bloods; Running Wolf of the Peigans; Bull's Head of the Sarcees; Jacob Bear's Paw, John Cheneka, and Jonas Big Stony of the Stonies; Joseph Samson and Mister Jim of the Crees.

¹¹⁴Pope Papers, vol. 48, Diary of the Royal Tour, 1901, 28 September 1901.

¹¹⁵RG7, G23, vol. 10, file 29, Address to the Duke of Cornwall and York from the Oka Grand Chief, 9 October 1901; vol. 5, file 11, F.S. Maude to J.S. Hendrie, 14 November 1901 (copy).

Royal mother.” Before ending with a wish that when the Duke accedes to the throne he may reign long over them, Laird and Forget could not resist adding a line which celebrated what they regarded as the prudent and sympathetic policy of the Indian Department. “Under the fostering care of his Majesty’s Department of Indian Affairs,” David Wolf Carrier read, “we are gradually adopting the civilized mode of living, and are acquiring cattle and other means of obtaining ample subsistence and comfortable homes.”¹¹⁶

So far, the Indian Department had been able to turn the Pow-wow from a potential disaster to their advantage. First, by positioning all of the Natives symmetrically in straight lines, balanced groups, and according to hierarchical status the Department, with the assistance of the NWMP, had arranged the Indians so as to give the impression of order and control. The seeming spatial control of the Indians was reinforced by a contingent of NWMP which, though small, still gave the impression that they contained the indigenous peoples and safeguarded the heir apparent by patrolling an imaginary boundary between the Natives and the public, especially around the pavilion. The emphasis on Indian orderliness would also suggest to observers that the state controlled the situation and Native peoples in particular. In addition, their proportional placement, dramatic yet well-timed and conducted entrance on horseback, and lack of “noise” intimated that these “wild savages” of the plains were well on their way to being tamed and civilised. In fact, they had been so quiet and respectful that the Duke’s assistant private secretary thought that “it is against their code of etiquette to show symptoms of excitement or

¹¹⁶Pope, *The Tour of Their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York*, 234-235.

curiosity.”¹¹⁷ The clothing the state and missionaries had outfitted for the chiefs and school children was also intended to suggest that the Natives were adopting a settled and modern lifestyle and that the residential schools were a success. Dressed in dark Hudson’s Bay Company reefing jackets with matching trousers featuring a red stripe down the sides, and topped with a felt hat with a red ribbon, the chiefs exuded the dignity they supposedly lacked in traditional garb [Figure 7.1]. Meanwhile the school children on display were resplendent in uniform clothing and exhibited tidy and trimmed grooming. According to William Maxwell, a journalist for the *Standard*, “They were a clean, healthy, bright, and happy-looking company, a credit to the industrial schools from which they came, and an instructive contrast to the native children who pass their young days in camps.”¹¹⁸ Finally, the address provided a descriptive caption for the audience in order to assist their interpretation of the images of Native progress and contentment presented at the visual affair.

Immediately after the reading of the address, however, the head chiefs were each given an opportunity to speak to the Duke on almost their own terms. Unable to control what the chiefs would say and fearing the worst, the Indian Department hoped to make this part of the programme as brief as possible and, therefore, explained to the chiefs beforehand that the Duke’s visit was necessarily very short and that their speeches must be restricted to “very moderate limits.”¹¹⁹ The chiefs respected the Duke’s pressing schedule and kept their comments brief.

¹¹⁷Wallace, *The Web of Empire*, 390.

¹¹⁸William Maxwell, *With the ‘Ophir’ Round the Empire: An Account of the Tour of the Prince and Princess of Wales, 1901* (Toronto, [1902?]), 279-280.

¹¹⁹Wallace, *The Web of Empire*, 391.

White Pup from the Blackfoot nation first addressed the Duke by presenting the treaty his people had made with the Great Mother twenty-seven years ago and proclaimed that they would always observe it faithfully. The Blood chief Crop Ear Wolf made a similar statement by thanking the late Great Mother for looking after them so well and praying that the Duke would continue the tradition of royal kindness. Running Wolf of the Peigans concurred and added that "We want the Duke to see that we shall be as well treated in the future as we are now. I love cattle, but I want more of them, and I want my body to have more weight, and I want bigger horses." On behalf of the Sarcees Bull's Head continued the requests for food by both reaffirming their allegiance to the Crown and then explaining their lack of food and hunger. "I ask the Duke to take pity on us," he told him,

The Sarcees are very glad that you have come, and have been waiting for you. Take pity on our children, and see that they get a living...I have received this medal (showing it) from Commissioner Laird, and I am not ashamed of it. All our people round you now want to have lots of 'grub' to make them happy before they start for home. The only thing that keeps us alive is having plenty of something to eat.¹²⁰

The effect of the address, according to Maxwell, was disappointing. "It amounted to a demand for 'lots of grub,' and something that sounded like a complaint that he never got enough to eat."¹²¹ Nearly all of the speeches were characterised by the white audience in similar terms, as childlike orations on the importance of land, cattle, and "grub" as the elements of happiness. An official explained to the royal party that "there is nothing that an Indian enjoys so much as speaking by the hour about his grievances, real or imaginary, and it is not surprising that he

¹²⁰Knight, *With the Royal Tour*, 334-335; *Manitoba Free Press*, 30 September 1901.

¹²¹Maxwell, *With the 'Ophir' Round the Empire*, 281.

should be a *laudator temporis acti* and a grumbler with regard to the present.” Those present were unmoved by the pleas for assistance and changed little their opinions that the Indians were fairly treated. If anything, the speeches “only showed that the system which has made the Indian our pensioner has also, unfortunately, but unavoidably, converted him into somewhat of a beggar...[with] an invincible repugnance to work.”¹²²

The lack of eloquence on the part of the chiefs can be attributed to the fact that their words were in fact screened, the filter being the English language. Every speech had to be translated by a Métis interpreter, a process which devalued the orations. According to Wilton Goodstriker, a Blood elder,

Most of the First Nations languages are very descriptive and thorough in composition; consequently, much is lost in attempts to translate them accurately—in this case into English. The First Nations languages are verb-centred, while the English language is noun-centred. This alone would make literal translation extremely difficult.¹²³

Joseph Pope appreciated that “the red man often suffers through the inability of the interpreter adequately to translate his symbolical expressions,” but, nonetheless, he asserted that demands for fatter cattle, larger horses, and more food were the refrain of all. “If this feature was rather less conspicuous on the present occasion,” he concluded, “it was perhaps due to the circumstance that the visible presence of the future King suggested ideas of a loftier nature.”¹²⁴

After the conclusion of each speech the chief advanced and shook hands with the Duke

¹²²Wallace, *The Web of Empire*, 392; Knight, *With the Royal Tour*, 333-334.

¹²³Upton, *Micmacs and Colonists*, 131; Hildebrandt et al., *The True Spirit and Original Intent of Treaty Seven*, 23.

¹²⁴Pope, *The Tour of Their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York*, 80.

and, after a gentle reminder, the Duchess. The Duke then delivered the reply couched in what was regarded as “the figurative style of Indian oratory.” After thanking the Natives for their renewed pledges of loyalty and devotion to the King, he assured his Native listeners that he knew of their attachment to the Crown and, more specifically, to Queen Victoria, “the great mother who loved you so much and whose loss makes your hearts bleed and the tears to fill your eyes.” Commenting on the “steadfast loyalty” of Natives during the 1885 rebellion, he told them that the “Great King” found it a “source of satisfaction” that he could “regard you as faithful children of the grand empire of which you form part.” Stating his satisfaction at finding so much “prosperity that now surrounds the Indian’s teepee,” he reminded them that when they were hungry and wretched “the great mother listened to you and stretched forth her hands to help you, and now those sad days have passed away never to return.” After noting how their requests to have their children to be educated had been “generously” met, the Duke proclaimed that the Great King’s “promises last as long as sun shall shine and waters shall flow, and care will ever be taken that nothing shall come between the love there is between the great King and you his faithful children.” The Duke then concluded the speech by promising that a “suitable silver medal shall be struck” to commemorate the event and indicating that he had arranged to have them supplied with provisions during their stay and until they were home again. The Indians later reciprocated with gifts of stone and bone carvings, a coat, and the headdresses of a medicine man and a brave.¹²⁵

¹²⁵Ibid., 81, 235-237; Imperial Institute, *Catalogue of the Gifts and Addresses Received by Their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York, During their Visit to the King’s Dominions Beyond the Seas, 1901. Exhibited in the North Gallery, May 1902* (London, 1902).

Although he had not penned the reply, the speech's message seemed to conform to Prince George's personal beliefs on the treatment of Natives in the Empire. Believing that Natives should be treated with respect and not pushed asunder, the speech he delivered seemed to endorse these sentiments since it spoke directly to Natives and addressed them not as a neglected minority, but as a loyal people within the Empire who were loved by their "great father" as much as he was loved by "his children of the rising sun." Steeped in paternalism, the address sought to reinforce the allegiance of Natives by reminding them of their past loyalty to the Crown and, more significantly, of the rewards they had received for supporting their Great Mother. So long as they continued their allegiance, and respect for the great King's officers—"those whom he sends to carry out his messages"—he would continue to love and care for his children. The state provided substance to this incentive by handing out provisions for those who had journeyed to pay homage to the King's son. Yet, the speech was directed as much at the public as at the Natives. Natives knew how they were "prospering" under state tutelage and needed little invocation from the Duke to tell them how they really felt. The public, though, was another matter. The address assured everyone that the Indians were treated not only fairly by the state, but generously. Under the state's tutelage Natives were thriving with "beautiful and abundant crops, the herds of cattle and the bands of horses." The residential schools were singled out for particular commendation—and promotion—as they were cited for their important contributions to Indian advancement and happiness. Upon his leaving Canada, the Duke's address to all Canadians underscored these messages as he noted that "I was glad to hear of the progress they [Indians] have made, and the contentment in which they live under the arrangements made for

their benefit by the Dominion Government.”¹²⁶ The remainder of the Pow-wow, however, would suggest otherwise.

After the Duke's speech, the Native children from the local residential schools sang “God Save the King.” Neatly dressed and groomed in western modes and singing the perennial song of British loyalty in “creditable” English, the young pupils became the exemplars of the state's program of Indian advancement. Their progress was further illustrated by the performance of Indian dancing and riding which followed. Featuring between seventy and eighty braves dressed in the “traditional outfit of the warpath” with their faces “hideously daubed” with “war paint,” the demonstration of dancing provided an effective before-and-after contrast, though one Indian official would have preferred to have been able to forgo. The mounted warriors, as well as many elders, were dressed in traditional clothes and, although not enough for Joseph Pope's tastes, some feathers and paint [Figure 7.2]. Onlookers were particularly struck with one Native rider who had smeared his bare body with yellow ochre and looked exceedingly fierce as he and his comrades galloped around the grounds holding their rifles high. They were supposed to have been supplied with blanks to fire, but James Wilson found out that they had never been issued and he could not explain why. Wilson also reported that the display of dancing “was not what it could have been” due to the opposition of the Indian officials. “A small dance was given,” he wrote, “but was not entered into by the Indians with much spirit as they were evidently in fear

¹²⁶Hector Charlesworth, “King George the Fifth,” *Canadian Magazine* 35 (1910): 255; Harold Nicolson, *King George the Fifth: His Life and Reign* (London, 1952), 88; Pope, *The Tour of Their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York*, 236-237, 145.

of their Agents.”¹²⁷ Joseph Pope, however, credited the lengthy process of interpreting the several speeches for wearying the Duke so much “that when the dancing did come on, he would only stay about five minutes to watch it.”¹²⁸ Whatever the case, the display of dancing, no matter how restricted, and amount of Natives who dispensed with modern attire contradicted the messages of Native assimilation that the state was attempting to diffuse. Despite the Indian Department’s ability to influence the movement, words, and actions of Natives at the Pow-wow the moderate demonstration by the Natives still permitted counter-representations within the press.

The Great Pow-wow of 1901: Reception

As soon as the *Calgary Herald* learned of the proposed royal visit to their town, the paper became a strong advocate of Native participation. It expressed its satisfaction with the decision to bring in as many Indians as possible for the Pow-wow, a gathering it trumpeted “will probably be one of the most unique in the history of the Dominion.” The *Herald* was also enthusiastic about the upcoming display of Mounties and broncho riding, but the Indian assemblage received more attention because of its character as “a great historical event” featuring the Native chiefs “swearing of allegiance to the new king through the heir apparent.”

¹²⁷Watson, *The Queen’s Wish*, 374; Pope, *The Tour of Their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York*, 81; RG18, Commissioner’s Office, vol. 1484, file 197-1901, James Wilson to A.B. Perry, 29 October 1901 (copy).

¹²⁸Pope Papers, vol. 48, Diary of the Royal Tour, 1901, 28 September 1901. The *Toronto World*’s report contradicts Pope’s assertion. According to their correspondent, T.R.H. were “greatly interested in the Indians” and spent a further ten minutes after the dancing to walk amongst them shaking hands before returning to Calgary to view the display of broncho busting. *Toronto World*, 30 September 1901.

The event did not disappoint the paper's correspondent as he described the scene as "a most remarkable one" as Indians danced and pranced about in costumes and war paint of "the most fantastic manner." Rather than remarking on the civilised image of the chiefs or evidence of progress the Indian Department had attempted to prop up, the *Herald* indulged not in the neat attire of the pupils from the industrial schools, but in the "barbaric splendour" of their relatives.¹²⁹

The Canadian press across the country described the Pow-wow in similar terms. The following day's newspaper headlines did not refer to the review of the NWMP or the wild west extravaganza that took place later in the day, but, instead, proclaimed "Indians Greet the Duke," "A Great Gathering of Red Men to Meet Royalty," "Loyalty of the Natives Warmly Praised," and "Peaceful Indians in War Paint Entertain Royalty at Calgary." Referring to the Pow-wow as the main event during the royal visit to Calgary, "if not the event of the tour through Canada," the *Manitoba Free Press* described the proceedings as being of a "most unique and interesting character." Similarly, the *Globe* considered that "The lumberman's exhibition at Ottawa and the grand pow-wow of Indians at Calgary will be remembered as the two most distinctive sights which have so far been seen during the Canadian tour." The speeches received considerable credit for the interest in the proceedings, not because they were primitive, as argued by Maxwell and Pope, but due to their symbolic and earnest expressions. The *Free Press*'s correspondent was impressed with the way in which the Native chiefs "gave expression to their feelings by short speeches, some of which were delivered with considerable eloquence and feeling." Despite the truncated nature of the display, the mounted Indians and the "war dance" became the feature stories in the newspapers of the country. The hundreds of mounted braves dressed "in all the

¹²⁹*Calgary Herald*, 28 June, 31 August, 5 September, 12 September, 30 September 1901.

picturesque beauty of varied colored costumes, paint, feathers and beads" presented what one reporter thought was "the most extraordinary spectacle that your correspondent has ever seen." The *Globe* reporter reckoned that a painting by Whistler could only capture "the rainbow glories of the costumes." "And how they sat their horses!" he exclaimed,

Each figure was a figure of untamed barbarism. It would not have been wholly astonishing if at any moment the war whoop had sounded and the bedizened line had descended like a whirlwind of primary colors on the helpless whites huddled about the pavilion.¹³⁰

Rather than describing their equestrian performance as an "aimless" dash about the prairie, as Joseph Pope had done, the *Toronto World* described the scene as "an exhibition of wild and reckless riding."¹³¹ In addition, the "war dance" was regarded as "a wild and fantastic dance" in which most of the braves were "but scantily clothed, paint being considered sufficient covering for their naked bodies." Their gesticulations were equally grotesque as they "danced in savage fashion in a circle waving their arms and shouting weird calls" to the beat of a drum. In toto, then, the *Free Press* reporter concluded that "The scene was one that can never be effaced from the mind while memory lasts."¹³²

The media's description of the Pow-wow differed significantly from the observations of Pope and the impressions the Indian Department endeavoured to instill in the audience. The press focussed on the sensational elements of the Pow-wow describing in detail examples of

¹³⁰*Globe*, 30 September 1901; *Manitoba Free Press*, 30 September 1901; *Ottawa Citizen*, 30 September 1901; *Toronto World*, 30 September 1901.

¹³¹Pope, *The Tour of Their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York*, 81; *Toronto World*, 30 September 1901.

¹³²*Globe*, 30 September 1901; *Manitoba Free Press*, 30 September 1901; *Ottawa Citizen*, 30 September 1901; *Toronto World*, 30 September 1901.

traditional Native culture the Indian Department had attempted to cover up and repress. Influenced by commercial pressures to sell newspapers, the romantic narratives catered to an audience interested in reading about the spectacular over the humdrum. Yet the reports were not simply expressions of sensationalism since they also acknowledged the “historic” significance and distinctiveness of the event—and Natives—in Canadian culture. The press and many organisers recognised that nearly all of the activities they had in store for Their Royal Highnesses during their Canadian tour were repetitive and mimicked royal functions throughout the Empire and in the Mother Country. While the continuity in forms of celebration expressed a shared British heritage, the public and some elements of the state desired something to set Canada apart from the rest of the Empire, as a unique colony, if not a nation. In Ottawa an extravagant lumberman’s display was set up and, in Toronto, the future national anthem of “O Canada” was performed in French for English ears in order to give expression to a Canadian sense of identity.¹³³ Likewise, Natives were regarded as distinctive features of the Canadian nation not to be hidden from view. Accordingly, the Pow-wow garnered great attention during the Royal Visit and the Natives with all of their colour, “stolidness,” “daring,” and “savagery,” found themselves placed on centre stage in the ceremony and in the articulation of the Canadian nation.¹³⁴

The Pow-wow formally recognised Natives as a part of the Canadian nation, but the

¹³³See Chapter VI above.

¹³⁴John Bodnar has noted the tendency of dominant cultures to “nationalize” vernacular, ethnic cultures in order to portray national unity and stress loyalty to the nation-state. John E. Bodnar, *Remaking America: Public Memory, Commemoration, and Patriotism in the Twentieth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), 41-77.

representations articulated at the event did not intend to empower them. Instead, the emphasis on the "historic" aspects of the meeting between Native chiefs and the heir apparent acted to reaffirm the British heritage in Canada. As Laurier had wished, the Pow-wow underscored the traditional British relationship between Natives and the monarchy and, in so doing, promoted the heritage of British justice in Canada. The descriptions of Native prosperity under government wardship and articulation of benevolence and generosity from the Crown, in the form of kind words and gifts, confirmed the popular belief amongst Canadians, imperialists and anti-imperialist alike, that the Native races had always been treated fairly and with humanity by the Canadian government. In contrast to the confrontational and sometimes violent imperialist expansion that took place in the United States, Canadians had regarded their country's expansion westward as an orderly and peaceful process which they attributed to the tradition of British justice purportedly embedded in Canadian politics and society. Richard Lancefield, the Hamilton Public Library's head librarian, for example argued that under Queen Victoria's benevolent guidance the Native populations were "generously treated, and in the course of time transformed into her warmest allies." "Rarely can it be said," he continued, "that in the march of Empire she deprived even the most savage tribe of any right or privilege for which in some form or another she did not afford adequate compensation." With the exchange of gifts, loyal addresses, and decorous Indian performances in honour of the Duke, the ceremonious meeting between Native chiefs and the King's son bolstered such attitudes. Indeed, even Joseph Pope agreed that in this respect the Pow-wow had been "successful," by "demonstrating the beneficent nature of government wardship, and providing the future king with one more practical illustration of the wisdom of that

humane and generous policy which ever characterizes England's treatment of native races."¹³⁵

The Pow-wow gave Natives a place within the nation, but not as equals. Symbolically incorporated into the Canadian nation, Natives became objects to be controlled and manipulated by cultural producers in ways which supported the hegemony of dominant culture.¹³⁶ Natives were regarded as the Other against whom the white community imagined their place, and that of Natives, within the nation. The depiction of Natives as barbaric savages against the discipline and civilised demeanour of the NWMP and Duke of Cornwall and York provided the most obvious example of difference and the "cultural superiority" of the white community at the Pow-wow. Perhaps more crucial to the formation of a Canadian identity among the white community, however, and more widespread than any other representation to emanate in the aboriginal-royal relationship, was the shared whiteness of royalty and the European-Canadian community and the "redness" of the Natives.

As recent studies in post-colonial theory have demonstrated, colonialism operates through more than a simple upholding of imperial dominance through military and political structures; it also constitutes subject positions through the field of representation.¹³⁷ Placed in this context, the image of the British monarch as the Great Mother, or Great Father as the case

¹³⁵Goldwin Smith, *Canada and the Canadian Question* (1891; reprint, Toronto, 1971), 52; Richard T. Lancefield, *Victoria, Sixty Years a Queen: A Sketch of Her Life and Times* (Toronto, 1897), VIII; Pope, *The Tour of Their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York*, 83.

¹³⁶Similarly, Sarah Carter has explored how representations of Natives in captivity narratives were used to regulate race and gender relations. Sarah Carter, *Capturing Women: The Manipulation of Cultural Imagery in Canada's Prairie West* (Kingston and Montreal, 1997).

¹³⁷Tiffin and Lawson, *De-Scribing Empire*.

may be, served to rank and subdue groups through its representation of the place, power, and identity of the white community and of the inferior position accorded to Native peoples within the nation. Indeed, by the late-nineteenth century growing beliefs in racial difference and superiority crept into the imagery of the monarchy as the King and Queen became "White." Throughout the Empire whites added the appellation of "White" to Queen Victoria's aboriginal monikers transforming her from the Great Mother to the Great *White* Mother and, in Africa, the Great *White* Queen. Similarly, by using these names in their description of Natives at the Great Pow-wow the press reconfirmed the images of the "red" Indian as they recounted how the "Great White Mother" had helped her "red children" in past times and how Natives now came to pay their respects to "the son of their great white chief."¹³⁸ By emphasising the racial differences, the royal titles served to rank and subdue groups through its representation of the place, power, and identity of the white community and of the inferior position accorded to Native peoples within the nation.

Recent studies in linguistics, however, have thrown into question whether these pidgin titles had impressed the indigenous peoples of the Empire with a sense of racial hierarchy. In Botswana the closest the Setswana language could come to translating the "Great White Queen" was the far from impressive "Mrs. Little (Old) Lady" (*Mma-Mosadinyana*) while interpreters of the First Nations on the Canadian Plains were limited to the epithets "the woman leader" (*nina'waakii*), "chief woman" (*ninaki*), and "our great big white mother" (*kitoomhk skapiwksistsinon*), none of which quite captured the English nuances in the term "Great White

¹³⁸Manitoba Free Press, 30 September 1901; Toronto World, 30 September 1901; Maxwell, With the 'Ophir' Round the Empire, 285.

Mother.”¹³⁹ It seems, then, that the designation of the King and Queen as “white” had been more focussed and impressive on the white community itself. Laura Doyle explains that in modern fiction and culture a race mother often has been created as a device to access and represent a group history and bodily grounded identity.¹⁴⁰ In contemporary literature and royal ceremonies, such as the Diamond Jubilee of 1897, Queen Victoria fit into this mould as she was selected to play the part of a race mother to the Anglo-Saxon people.¹⁴¹ Similarly, her casting as the Great White Mother assisted the white community in shaping their identities, and power, through the underscoring of racial difference with natives. The Queen’s characterisation as not merely a Great Mother, but a Great *White* Mother signified that while she acted as a parental figure to Native peoples they were not, and could not be, equal participants in the nation since they did not share their Mother’s skin colour. As the Great White Mother, Queen Victoria represented racial hierarchy in the Empire, if not for the colonised, then, at least, for the colonisers.

The Coronation of George V and the Issue of Native Agency

While white Canadians manipulated the representations of royalty and the Native-royal relationship to reinforce their hegemony and their vision of the nation, Natives participated in royal ceremonies and invoked the imagery of the Great Mother in order to demand justice and special recognition. For Indian participants, the display of traditional outfits, crafts, dancing, and

¹³⁹Neil Parsons, *King Khama, Emperor Joe, and the Great White Queen: Victoria Britain through African Eyes* (Chicago, 1998), VII; Hildebrandt et al., *The True Spirit and Original Intent of Treaty Seven*, 24; Dempsey, *Warriors of the King*, 7.

¹⁴⁰Doyle, *Bordering on the Body*, 4-6.

¹⁴¹Edward VII was similarly presented as the father of the nation at his Coronation in 1902. See Chapter IV above.

horsemanship communicated a pride in their culture and their meetings with royal personages served to remind the white community of their special relationship with the monarchy which, they argued, entitled them to certain rights and privileges.¹⁴² Despite facing a number of restrictions at the Great Pow-wow and during the Royal Visit of 1860, Native peoples managed to give expression to their views and their interpretation of the nation by resisting state attempts to control their behaviour. Some Natives, however, recognised that state regulation limited their ability to properly voice their concerns to the monarchy on their own terms. Consequently, they decided to subvert the control of the Canadian state and went directly to London to meet with the King and Queen.

In her examination of the relationship between princes in India and Queen Victoria, Victoria Smith points out that while the government encouraged Native loyalty to the Queen, "they wished to carefully contain that devotion." The loyalty of Native princes contained "the risk that Indians might believe they could go over the head of the government potentially undermining its authority" and, in the worst case scenario, travel to Britain to meet with the Queen.¹⁴³ Likewise, the Canadian government discouraged Natives from travelling to Britain, but recognised that there was little they could do to prevent them. When he was informed that a delegation of chiefs from British Columbia had travelled to London to meet with Edward VII in August 1906, J.D. McLean told the Governor General's Office, which had been alarmed by the lack of "due warning through proper channels," "that it is the policy of the Department to

¹⁴²Pettipas, *Severing the Ties that Bind*, 100; Norman Knowles, *Inventing the Loyalists: The Ontario Loyalist Tradition and the Creation of Usable Pasts* (Toronto, 1997), 86-87, 123.

¹⁴³Victoria R. Smith, "Constructing Victoria: The Representation of Queen Victoria in England, India, and Canada, 1897-1914" (Ph.D. diss., Rutgers University, 1998), 225-226.

discourage as much as possible Indians leaving their reserves," but admitted that "there is no law to prevent their doing so."¹⁴⁴ Similarly, the following year three Natives from the Oak River Sioux Band sailed across the Atlantic to seek the redress of their land grievances from the King in spite of their Indian Agent's attempts to do "all he could to dissuade them from their purpose." In order to induce them to give up the trip, the Agent issued them a pass to Winnipeg to meet with the Assistant Indian Commissioner, but even he "found it quite impossible to change their minds."¹⁴⁵

While it is not known whether the Natives from Oak River had been successful in obtaining an audience with the King, the three chiefs from British Columbia, Joe Capilano of the Squamish, Charlie Tsilpaymilt (a.k.a. Chillihitza, Filpaynem, Tailpaymilt) of the Cowichans (Shuswap/Secwepemc tribal group), and Basil David of the Bonapartes (Okanagan tribal group), were granted permission by Buckingham Palace to meet Edward VII to whom they presented their complaints regarding the intrusion of whites on their lands and on fishing and hunting restrictions. The meeting achieved little in tangible changes to government policy on these issues, but it brought their grievances to public attention, provided their Native communities with hope, and put some pressure on the Canadian government to address their concerns. In fact, it was viewed as so much of a success by British Columbian Natives that another delegation sought to attend the Coronation of Edward VII's son on 22 June 1911 and meet the former Duke of Cornwall and York who had visited their country but ten years earlier. Chief Wedildahld from

¹⁴⁴RG10, Red Series, reel C-11324, vol. 3099, file 301224, J. Hanbury Williams to Frank Oliver, 8 August 1906, J.D. McLean to J. Hanbury Williams, 14 August 1906.

¹⁴⁵RG10, Black Series, reel C-10176, vol. 4035, file 311256, Assistant Indian Commissioner to J.D. McLean, 10 July 1907.

the Kitselas band (Tsimshian tribal group) first reported his intention to go to London with other chiefs from British Columbia to visit George V during the Coronation festivities when he wrote Frank Oliver, the Superintendent of Indian Affairs, to request free pass tickets to and from the imperial metropolis. Responding on behalf of his Minister, McLean explained to Wedildahld that, apart from the fact that the Department had no funds to sponsor the trip, "its policy is not to encourage the taking of trips away from reserves or attending public demonstrations, exhibitions, &c. And the request contained in your communication cannot, therefore, be entertained."¹⁴⁶

Undeterred by McLean's rejection, the Kitselas chief simply ignored him and went above his head writing, first, to Lord Strathcona, the Canadian High Commissioner in London, and, then, to George V himself requesting an audience. Wedildahld's plan of action worked as his letter to the King, intercepted by Lewis Harcourt, made a favourable impression on the British Colonial Secretary. Recalling the similar application made by the three Indian Chiefs in 1906, "when His late Majesty King Edward was graciously pleased to grant them an audience," Harcourt informed Lord Grey that "Unless you and your Ministers see any objection I propose to advise His Majesty to grant a brief interview" to Wedildahld and his companions. Suddenly placed in an awkward predicament, the Department of Indian Affairs reversed its earlier policy and informed the Governor General that they had "no objection to offer to Chief Wedildahld's request for such an audience being granted...."¹⁴⁷ Harcourt's intimation that George V would

¹⁴⁶RG10, Red Series, reel C-11333, vol. 3164, file 378057, Wedildahld to Frank Oliver, 12 January 1911, J.D. McLean to Wedildahld, 11 February 1911 (copy).

¹⁴⁷RG7, Central Registry Files [G21], reel T-1391, vol. 334, file 2213-II, part 6, Wedildahld to George V, 9 April 1911 (copy), Lewis Harcourt to Earl Grey, 10 May 1911,

be pleased to meet with the Natives from British Columbia also compelled the Department to consent to the visit of a delegation of fourteen people from the Six Nations to the Coronation, a proposal McLean had earlier discouraged.¹⁴⁸ The Six Nations, however, had been too late in planning their trip and were unable to field a delegation to represent them at the Coronation. Wedildahld also backed out of the trip at the last minute for unexplained reasons, but three other Natives from British Columbia, interpreter Simon Pierre and two of the visitors from 1906, Joe Capilano and Charlie Tsilpaymilt, were confirmed to go in lieu of the Kitselas chief. Unfortunately, once in London with loyal address in hand the three Natives were told that the King could not fit them into his pressing schedule and, consequently, would be unable to meet them. In his place, though, Lewis Harcourt gladly met with the Native travellers and accepted their address on the King's behalf, assuring them that he would submit the document to His Royal Highness.¹⁴⁹

The trip, then, was a moderate success for the three Natives and the people they represented. While unable to meet George V face to face, they were able to overcome the initial opposition of the Indian Department to attend the Coronation and see that their address of loyalty would be submitted to the King. Moreover, the mere act of travelling across the Atlantic to attend the Coronation on behalf of their fellow Natives and, thus, demonstrating their peoples'

Frank Pedley to D.O. Malcolm, 29 May 1911, C. Murphy to Earl Grey, 30 May 1911.

¹⁴⁸RG10, Red Series, reel C-11333, vol. 3164, file 378057, Six Nations Council Resolution, 19 May 1911, J. Gordon Smith to J.D. McLean, 20 May 1911, J.D. McLean to J. Gordon Smith, 26 May 1911, J. Gordon Smith to J.D. McLean, 29 May 1911, J.D. McLean to J. Gordon Smith, 29 May 1911.

¹⁴⁹Ibid., Frank Pedley to W.L. Griffith, 27 May 1911 (copy), J.D. McLean to Simon Pierre, 25 July 1911.

“unmixed Loyalty” to the King and Queen was satisfaction enough. As Simon Pierre told one of his fellow steamship travellers, none other than Sir Wilfrid Laurier, “The Indians of British Columbia really never forgot The Late King Edward VII and that King George is Now their King They love him as their great White Chief that rules over all. That’s the reason they have appointed us to Journey to London.”¹⁵⁰

Fidelity to the monarchy and faith in the paternal relationship between themselves and their King and Queen became a proud part of the Native heritage from British Columbia to the Maritimes. Believing they had a special relationship with the monarch based upon mutual respect, trust, and sympathy, Natives encouraged the continuation of their royal connections ever reminding new generations of their “historic connection with the British Crown.”¹⁵¹ While the white community manipulated royal imagery in order to consolidate their hegemony and reaffirm the inferior place accorded Natives within their imagined community, Native peoples resisted these impositions with representations of their own designed to empower themselves and claim their rightful place in the nation.

¹⁵⁰Laurier Papers, reel C-905, vol. 685, p. 187328, Simon Pierre to Wilfrid Laurier, July 1911.

¹⁵¹RG10, Red Series, reel C-11310, vol. 3007, file 218222-113, Minutes of the Six Nations Council, 6 May 1909.

CHAPTER VIII

Conclusion

The process of nation-building in nineteenth and early twentieth century Canada involved the production of national symbols which could transcend sub-national loyalties, such as class, gender, ethnic, and religious identities, and unite the residents of the Canadian nation. While the images were many and varied, the monarchy came to be regarded as an essential unifying symbol of the Canadian nation by both state and civil society. Queen Victoria, Edward VII, and George V represented the maintenance of the imperial tie between Canada and the rest of the Empire and stood for the liberty and justice accorded to all Canadians by the Crown under the British constitution, irrespective of ethnic background or religious affiliation. Royal visits, Jubilee celebrations, memorial services, and coronations provided opportunities for the public to express their sense of place in the British Empire and shared loyalty to the monarchy. At the same time, however, these royal ceremonies—and the representations which emanated from them—also served to assert, confirm, and legitimise power relationships within the national community. Despite the claim that national identity superceded other social identities in favour of unity to a common national entity and vision, nationality is not a fixed category. It is a social construct defined by its context and, as such, is open to interpretation, influence, and even manipulation by different class, gender, ethnic, and religious perspectives. Representations of national identity, therefore, draw their meaning from the social relations in which they were created, presented, and received: a process which influenced the nature of royal ceremonies and representations in the building of the Canadian nation.

Infused with the social identities, values, and perspectives of its actors and producers, then, the royal ceremonies and regal representations articulated in Canada between 1860 and 1911 were not just reflections of social relations during this period: they also contributed to the consolidation and legitimisation of a cultural hegemony and to the resistance of subordinate groups to the power of the dominant culture. During the Royal Tour of 1860, the Golden and Diamond Jubilees of Queen Victoria, the Royal Tour of 1901, and a myriad of other royal ceremonies during the reigns of Queen Victoria and Edward VII, the male middle class articulated representations of themselves, women, the upper and lower classes, and the monarchy in order to legitimise their social authority and consolidate themselves as a cultural hegemony in Canada. Accorded precedence at royal ceremonies and privileged access to royal visitors, attaching its definitions of manliness to the Prince of Wales in 1860, the Duke of Cornwall and York in 1901, and Edward VII, and associating its values with royal figures, the male middle class legitimised its cultural authority through royal association and sanction. In presenting an address, participating in a militia review, arranging a form of entertainment for a touring royal, or publishing a story on a facet of the monarch's life, members of the male middle class were not merely pledging their loyalty to the Sovereign and asserting their sense of belonging to a "Greater Britain beyond the Seas," they were also articulating a shared image of themselves as a distinctive, cohesive, and, moreover, hegemonic social formation. By transfixing their class and gender identity onto the national image of the monarchy, the male middle class extended their political and economic power into the cultural sphere in order to consolidate themselves as a cultural hegemony.

Since, however, symbols are open to multiple interpretations and hegemony is a process

of continual renewal, incorporation, and negotiation, subordinate groups were not only able to articulate their own meanings from royal imagery, but also able to resist the male middle class' control of royal ceremonies and its propagation of regal representations at the same cultural level as well. Largely limited to spectator status in royal ceremonial and defined by the ideology of domesticity so successfully associated with Queen Victoria, women pressed for more participation in royal functions and fashioned royal images of their own in order to legitimise a greater female public role. Upholding the example of Queen Victoria in which the mother and sovereign had extended her maternal care and compassion beyond her own family to the entire nation, maternal feminists similarly justified extending their domestic responsibilities into public charitable work. As the Queen had managed so exemplarily, so, too, could all respectable women integrate their domestic prerogative with compatible public duties to the betterment of society.

Since the middle class had built and supported much of its hegemony upon its social and cultural authority, the working class was compelled to carry on its struggle against capital into this area as well and, consequently, into the sphere of royal ceremonial. Finding little in common between themselves and royal figures, though, members of the working class chose a different emphasis in their challenge to middle class hegemony than women had against male dominance. They sought to claim an equal part in the royal celebrations, and thus society. During royal tours members of the working class challenged middle class exclusivism, ridiculed bourgeois "flunkeyism," pressed to participate in royal processions, attempted to serve addresses expressing their labour grievances to royal figures, and protested over the organisation of the tours while, at the same time, maintaining their personal loyalty to the monarchy. Their actions,

however, were muted by the middle class organisers who prevented labourers from coming within close proximity to royalty, censored their addresses, and produced counter representations of workers as uncouth and unruly spectators in stark contrast to themselves and their royal guests.

Other cultural identities beyond class and gender loyalties further altered the nature of royal representations and the formation and negotiation of a cultural hegemony. Ethnic and religious identities complicated the dominant male middle class culture of Victorian and Edwardian Canada as it had to broach and reconcile the divisions between French Canadians, Irish Catholics, and British Protestants in order to maintain national unity. Through a process of cooperation and collaboration in which these tensions were diminished by a common class and gender identity, white skin colour, and respectable Christianity, the middle class crossed ethnic and religious interests, but, still, tensions would continually strain its unity. The assertion of ethnic and religious identities over middle class interests, the challenge of "extremist" ethnic and religious bodies seeking cultural homogeneity and power, and the resistance of marginal groups: all of these pressures required constant negotiation and management in order to maintain a situation of ethnic and religious harmony. Social stability, the status quo, and, ultimately, middle class hegemony were based upon the image of unity in diversity, an image which found expression in the monarchy. The Crown provided a focal point for diverse ethnic and religious groups to come together in a common loyalty to an institution which, it was claimed, had permitted Catholics to have the same rights as Protestants and had protected the French language while maintaining the centrality of English. The representation of ethnic and religious unity around the figure of the monarch, then, comprised an important component in the process of

achieving and maintaining social harmony, resisting homogenising interests, and asserting the cultural authority of the dominant ethnic and religious groups.

Minority groups, however, were also able to invoke the image of the King and Queen as the embodiment of religious tolerance and constitutional liberty. Just as French Canadians and Irish Catholics had done with representations of Queen Victoria and Edward VII as sympathetic monarchs who supported their right to equality and liberty, so, too, had African Canadians, Asians, Jews, and the Peoples of the First Nations expressed their loyalty to the monarchy in a manner which emphasised their right to coexistence in the Canadian nation and cultural protection by the Sovereign. The dominant culture reacted to the resistance of these subordinate groups through a process of negotiation, exclusion, and delegitimation at royal ceremonies which would acknowledge the loyalty of other ethnic and religious groups to the Crown, but without according them a role in the celebrations other than in support of the status quo.

Royal representations and ceremonies, then, comprised hegemonic sites in which competing loyalties were challenged, balanced, and integrated. Canadians of different classes, genders, ethnicities, and religions formed images of the monarchy which articulated their understanding of the Canadian community and their place within it. The royal representation became a sign struggled over as different social formations asserted and resisted regal images which were used to legitimise dominance and subordination. Far from a neutral symbol of Canadian national identity and unity, the monarchy was at the centre of the process of Canadian nation-building between 1860 and 1911: a process which was delineated by power, place, and identity.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

UNPUBLISHED SOURCES

Archives of Ontario

Merritt, William Hamilton.
Miscellaneous Collection.
Strachan, John.

Archives of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Toronto

Lynch, John.
McEvay, Fergus.
O'Connor, Denis.

City of Toronto Archives

Board of Control Minutes, 1901.
Council Minutes, 1860-1911.

Glenbow Museum Archives

Dewdney, Edgar.

National Archives of Canada

Aberdeen, 7th Earl and 1st Marquis. MG27 I B5.
Acland, Henry Wentworth. MG40 Q40.
Carnarvon, 4th Earl. MG27 I A2.
Cartier, George-Étienne. MG27 I D4.
Chamberlain, Joseph. MG27 II A2.
Coleman, Kathleen Blake "Kit." MG29 D112.
Costigan, John. MG27 I D5.
Crewe, 1st Marquis. MG27 II A4.
Denison, George Taylor. MG29 E29.
Fréchette, Louis-Honoré. MG29 D40.
Grey, 4th Earl. MG27 II B2.
Lansdowne, 5th Marquis. MG27 I B6.

Laurier, Wilfrid. MG26 G.
 Lorne, 1st Marquis. MG27 I B4.
 Macdonald, John A. MG26 A.
 Minto, 4th Earl. MG27 II B1.
 Monck, 4th Viscount. MG27 I B1.
 Newcastle, 5th Duke. MG24 A34.
 Parkin, George. MG30 D44.
 Pope, Joseph. MG30 E86.
 Scott, Richard William. MG27 II D14.
 Sifton, Clifford. MG27 II D15.
 Smith, Goldwin. MG29 D69.
 Smith, Sidney. MG24 B63.
 Stanley of Preston, Lord. MG27 I B7.
 Victoria I. MG24 A29.
 Wiley, Thomas. MG29 E1.

MG11, Colonial Office:

CO 42: Canada, original correspondence, 1860-1911.
 CO 189: New Brunswick, entry books, 1860-1867.
 CO 217: Nova Scotia, original correspondence, 1860-1867.
 CO 218: Nova Scotia, entry books, 1860-1867.
 CO 323: Colonies, original correspondence, 1867-1911.
 CO 532: Dominions, original correspondence, 1907-1911.
 CO 537: Supplementary, original correspondence, 1860-1911.

RG6, Records of the Secretary of State:

A1: General correspondence, 1867-1911.
 D2: State protocol and special events, 1901-1911.

RG7, Records of the Governor General Office:

G1: Despatches from the Colonial Office, 1860-1909.
 G12: Letterbooks of despatches to the Colonial Office, 1867-1902.
 G17: Letterbooks, 1860-1910.
 G18: Miscellaneous records, 1860-1911.
 G20: Civil Secretary's correspondence, 1860-1909.
 G21: Central registry files, 1860-1911.
 G23: Miscellaneous records relating to royal visits and vice-regal tours, 1860-1911.
 G25: Administrative and Housekeeping records, 1876-1911.

RG10, Records of the Department of Indian Affairs:

Central Registry System: Red (Eastern) Series, 1872-1911.
 Central Registry System: Black (Western) Series, 1872-1911.
 Deputy Superintendent General's Letterbooks, 1901.

RG18, Records of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police:
 Comptroller's Office, official correspondence, 1901-1911.
 Commissioner's Office, official correspondence, 1901-1911.

Nottingham University Library, Department of Manuscripts

Newcastle, 5th Duke.

Provincial Archives of Manitoba

Queen Victoria Memorial Committee. MG10 C21.
 Royal Visit of 1901. MG14 A6.

University of Toronto, Thomas Fisher Rare Book Room

Broadside Collection.
 Charlton, John. Ms. Coll. 110.

PUBLISHED SOURCES

Newspapers and Periodicals

Acadian Recorder (Halifax), 1860
British Colonist (Halifax), 1860
British Whig (Kingston), 1860
Bystander (Toronto), 1880-1890
Calgary Herald, 1901
Canadian Jewish Times (Toronto), 1910-1911
Canadian Magazine (Toronto), 1901-1902
Catholic Register (Toronto), 1897-1902
Catholic Register and Canadian Extension (Toronto), 1910
Christian Messenger (Halifax), 1860
Frank Leslie's Illustrated Newspaper (New York), 1860
Grip (Toronto), 1891
Halifax Evening Mail, 1897-1901
Halifax Evening Reporter, 1860
Halifax Herald, 1897-1901
Harper's Weekly (New York), 1860
Illustrated London News, 1860
Independent (Vancouver), 1901
Irish Canadian (Toronto), 1887
Jewish Times (Toronto), 1901-1902

Kingston Daily News, 1860
Kingston Daily Standard, 1860
La Minerve (Montreal), 1860-1887
La Patrie (Montreal), 1901-1902
La Presse (Montreal), 1887-1911
La Vérité (Quebec), 1897-1911
Le Courrier du Canada (Quebec), 1860-1901
Le Devoir (Montreal), 1910-1911
Le Pays (Montreal), 1860
Le Semeur Canadien (Montreal), 1860
Le Soleil (Quebec), 1897-1911
L'Ordre (Montreal), 1860
London Times, 1860-1911
Manitoba Free Press (Winnipeg), 1897-1911
Montreal Gazette, 1860-1911
Montreal Star, 1901
Montreal Transcript, 1860
Montreal Witness, 1860-1901
New York Sun, 1901
Novascotian (Halifax), 1860
Ottawa Citizen, 1887-1911
Saint John Daily News, 1870-1879
Saint John Daily Sun, 1897
Saturday Night (Toronto), 1901-1911
Toronto Evening News, 1887
Toronto Globe, 1860-1911
Toronto Mail and Empire, 1901
Toronto Star, 1901
Toronto Telegram, 1901
Toronto Weekly Sun, 1896-1909
Toronto World, 1901
Vancouver New-Advertiser, 1901
Vancouver Province, 1897-1910
Vancouver World, 1901
Voice (Winnipeg), 1897-1911

Books and Pamphlets

Aberdeen and Temair, Marquis, and Marchioness of. *"We Twa": Reminiscences of Lord and Lady Aberdeen*. 2 vols. London: W. Collins, 1925.

Argyll, John Douglas Sutherland Campbell, Ninth Duke of. *Yesterday and Today in Canada*. London: George Allen, 1910.

_____. *V.R.I. Her Life and Empire*. London: Harmsworth, 1901.

Blake, Samuel Hume. *Is There Not a Cause? Address at Wycliffe College, and Four Letters on the Coronation Oath*. Toronto: n.p., 1901.

Carman, Bliss. *Ode on the Coronation of King Edward VII*. Boston: Page, 1902.

Catholic Truth Society of Ottawa. *The Catholic Truth Society: Its Aims and Objects*. Ottawa: Catholic Truth Society of Ottawa, [1891?].

Cellem, Robert. *Visit of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales to the British North American Provinces and United States in the Year 1860*. Toronto: H. Rowsell, 1861.

Chapais, Thomas. *Le serment du roi et les catholiques*. Quebec: n.p., 1901.

Charlesworth, Hector. *Candid Chronicles: Leaves from the Note Book of a Canadian Journalist*. Toronto: Macmillan, 1925.

Chauveau, Pierre-Joseph-Olivier. *The Visit of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales to America: Reprinted from the Lower Canada Journal of Education, with an Appendix Containing Poems, Addresses, Letters, Etc.* Montreal: E. Senecal, 1860.

Church of England. *Diamond Jubilee Thanksgiving Service, June 20, 1897*. Toronto: Church of England Publishing Company, 1897.

_____. Diocese of Huron. *The Service for the Day of the Coronation of His Majesty King George V, June 22, 1911, to be Used in all the Churches of the Diocese*. [London, Ont.?]: Diocese of Huron, 1911.

Coleman, Kit. *To London for the Jubilee*. Toronto: Morang, 1897.

Collins, Joseph Edmund. *Canada Under the Administration of Lord Lorne*. Toronto: Rose, 1884.

Cornwallis, Kinahan. *Royalty in the New World; or, The Prince of Wales in America*. London: Hall and Virtue, 1860.

Coulter, John, and John A. Cooper, eds. *Queen Victoria: Her Gracious Life and Glorious Reign*. Guelph: World Publishing, 1901.

De Cordova, Rafael J. *The Prince's Visit: A Humorous Description of the Tour of His Royal Highness, the Prince of Wales, Through the United States of America in 1860*. New York: B. Frodsham, 1861.

Diamond Jubilee Celebration Programme, 1837-1897, Victoria, British Columbia, June 20, 21, 22, 23. Victoria: n.p., 1897.

Diamond Jubilee Souvenir and Official Programme, Hamilton. Hamilton: n.p., 1897.

Edwards, Lydia Agnes, ed. *How Canadians Mourned for Their Queen: Tributes of Loyalty and Love In Memory of Queen Victoria.* Truro, N.S.: News Publishing, 1901.

Egan, Thomas J. *History of the Halifax Volunteer Battalion and Volunteer Companies, 1859-1887.* Halifax: A. and W. Mackin-lay, 1888.

Engelheart, Gardner D. *Journal of Progress of H.R.H. The Prince of Wales Through British North America, and His Visit to the United States, July 10 to November 15, 1860.* London: privately printed, 1860.

Fallon, Michael Francis. *The Declaration Against Catholic Doctrines which Accompanies the Coronation Oath of the British Sovereign.* Ottawa: St. Joseph's Branch of the Catholic Truth Society, 1899.

Fowler, Thomas. *In Memorium: A Sermon Preached on the Death of Queen Victoria.* Halifax: n.p., 1901.

Fraser, Daniel James. *Victoria, Queen and Woman.* Toronto: Hart and Riddell, 1897.

Fréchette, Louis. *Bienvenue à Son Altesse Royale le Duc d'York et de Cornwall.* Montreal: Granger, 1901.

Fulford, Francis. *A Sermon, Preached on Sunday, January 5, 1862, in Christ Church Cathedral, Montreal, After the Death of H.R.H. the Prince Consort.* Montreal: John Lovell, 1862.

Gough, Thomas Bunbury. *Boyish Reminiscences of His Majesty the King's Visit to Canada in 1860.* Toronto: Musson, 1910.

Grant, George M., ed. *Picturesque Canada; The Country as It Was and Is.* Vol. 1. Toronto: Beldon Bros., 1882.

Hamilton, John R. *Our Royal Guests: A Souvenir of the Visits of the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York and Other Members of the Royal Family to Saint John and the Province of New Brunswick, Canada.* Saint John: n.p., 1902.

Heintzman and Company. *Canada's Royal Visitors: A Pictorial Souvenir of the Visit of the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York.* Toronto: Heintzman and Co., 1901.

Herridge, W.T. *A Sermon Preached in St. Andrew's Church on the Occasion of the Queen's Diamond Jubilee*. Ottawa: Taylor and Gilbert, 1897.

_____. *A Sermon Preached in St. Andrew's Church, Ottawa on Sunday Morning, May 15th, 1910, to Commemorate the Death of His Most Gracious Majesty, King Edward VII*. Ottawa: Men's Association, 1910.

Hodgins, John George. *Her Majesty the Queen, the Late Prince Consort, and Other Members of the Royal Family: Sketches and Anecdotes, Selected and Arranged Chiefly for Young People*. Montreal: John Lovell, 1868.

Hopkins, J. Castell. *Queen Victoria, Her Life and Reign. A Study of British Monarchical Institutions and the Queen's Personal Career, Foreign Policy, and Imperial Influence*. Toronto: Bradley-Garretson, 1896.

_____. *The Life of King Edward VII, with a Sketch of the Career of King George V*. N.p., 1910.

Imperial Institute. *Catalogue of the Gifts and Addresses Received by Their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York, During their Visit to the King's Dominions Beyond the Seas, 1901. Exhibited in the North Gallery, May 1902*. London: William Clowes, 1902.

Jackman, W.J. *The Illustrious Life and Reign of King Edward VII*. [Guelph?]: J.R. Peper, 1910.

Knight, Edmund Frederick. *With the Royal Tour: A Narrative of the Recent Tour of the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York Through Greater Britain*. Toronto: Copp Clark, 1902.

Lancefield, Richard T. *Victoria, Sixty Years a Queen: A Sketch of Her Life and Times*. Toronto: G.M. Rose, 1897.

Legge, Charles. *A Glance at the Victoria Bridge and the Men Who Built It*. Montreal: John Lovell, 1860.

Lonclas, Alphonse. *Notice historique sur la famille royale d'Angleterre, le pont Victoria et le palais de l'exposition: Publiée en l'honneur [sic] de la visite de S.A.R. le prince de Galles au Canada*. Montreal: E. Senecal, 1860.

Lorne, John Douglas Sutherland Campbell, Marquis of. *Canadian Pictures Drawn with Pen and Pencil*. London: Religious Tract Society, 1885.

Loyal Orange Association of British America. *Constitution and Laws of the Loyal Orange*

- Association of British America*. Toronto: A. Jacques, 1860.
- Macdonald, John A. *Address of the Honorable John A. Macdonald to the Electors of the City of Kingston, with Extracts from Mr. Macdonald's Speeches Delivered on Different Occasions in the Years 1860 and 1861*. N.p., [1861].
- MacMurchy, Marjory. *The King's Crowning*. Toronto: William Briggs, 1911.
- Martin, Theodore. *The Life of His Royal Highness the Prince Consort*. 3d ed. Vol 5. London: Smith and Elder, 1880.
- Maxwell, William. *With the 'Ophir' Round the Empire: An Account of the Tour of the Prince and Princess of Wales, 1901*. Toronto: Copp Clark, [1902?].
- McLachlan, R.W. *Medals Awarded to the Canadian Indians*. Montreal: n.p., 1899.
- McLeod, Robert R. *The National Grandeur of Britain. Lecture Delivered in the Church of the Redeemer, Halifax, N.S., June 20, 1897*. Halifax: n.p., 1897.
- Miln, W.H., ed. *Eulogies on Queen Victoria, Delivered by the Prominent Ministers of Canada on Her Majesty's Funeral Day, Feb. 2, 1901*. Toronto: n.p., 1901.
- Montreal Star. *Royal Visit to Canada, 1901*. Montreal: Montreal Star, 1901.
- Morgan, Henry James. *The Tour of H.R.H. the Prince of Wales Through British America and the United States, by "A British Canadian."* Montreal: John Lovell, 1860.
- _____. *The Visit of The Prince of Wales to Canada in 1860: Mr. Morgan's Reply to "Observer" in Full*. [Ottawa?]: n.p., [1888?].
- Morris, Alexander. *The Treaties of Canada with the Indians of Manitoba and the North-West Territories, Including the Negotiations On Which They Were Based, and Other Information Relating Thereto*. 1880. Reprint, Toronto: Coles Publishing, 1979.
- Morris, Charles. *The Life of Queen Victoria and the Story of Her Reign. A Beautiful Tribute to England's Greatest Queen in Her Domestic and Official Life and also the Life of the New King, Edward VII*. N.p., 1901.
- Newcastle, Henry Pelham Fiennes Pelham Clinton, Fifth Duke of, ed. *Addresses Presented to H.R.H. The Prince of Wales During His State Visit to British North America, with the Replies Thereto, July, August and September 1860*. London: privately printed, 1860.
- Norris, John Gustavus. *Mr. J.G. Norris, and the Visit to Canada of H.R.H. the Prince of Wales*.

Ottawa: C.W. Mitchell, 1876.

Official Programme and Souvenir of the Royal Tour Showing the Progress of Their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York through Quebec and Ontario. Toronto: Hunter and Rose, 1901.

Pope, Joseph. *The Tour of Their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York Through the Dominion of Canada in the Year 1901.* Ottawa: S.E. Dawson, 1903.

_____. *Voyage de Leurs Altesses Royales le Duc et la Duchesse de Cornwall et d'York au Canada en 1901.* Ottawa: S.E. Dawson, 1905.

_____. *Public Servant: The Memoirs of Sir Joseph Pope.* Edited and completed by Maurice Pope. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1960.

Proceedings of a Conference Between the Secretary of State for the Colonies and the Premiers of the Self-Governing Colonies, at the Colonial Office, London, June and July, 1897. London: n.p., 1897.

Quebec Jubilee: Souvenir Number. Quebec: Daily Telegraph, [1897].

Queen's Jubilee Souvenir and Guide Book, 1837-1887. Charlottetown: J. Coombs, 1887.

Roe, Henry. *Sermon Preached at St. George's Church, Lennoxville, Quebec on June 21, 1887, the Day Appointed for the Observance of the Queen's Jubilee.* Sherbrooke: G.H. Bradford, 1887.

Routhier, A.B. *La Reine Victoria et Son jubilé.* Québec: C. Darveau, 1898.

Roy, Camille. *Les leçons de notre histoire.* Québec: L'action sociale, 1929.

Shannon, William. *Narrative of the Proceedings of the Loyal Orangemen of Kingston and Belleville, on the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth of September, 1860, in Connection with the Visit of H.R.H. the Prince of Wales to Central Canada.* Belleville: M. Bowell, 1861.

Smith, Goldwin. *Canada and the Canadian Question.* 1891. Reprint, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971.

_____. *Reminiscences.* New York: Macmillan, 1910.

Souvenir of Our Royal Visitors Programme; Vancouver, B.C., September 30, 1901. Vancouver: B.C. Printing and Engraving, 1901.

Souvenir of the Queen's Jubilee: An Account of the Celebration at the City of Saint John, New Brunswick, in Honour of the Jubilee Year of Her Most Gracious Majesty, Queen Victoria. Saint John: J. and A. McMillan, 1887.

Taylor, Conyngham Crawford. *Toronto "Called Back," From 1888 to 1847 and the Queen's Jubilee....* Toronto: William Briggs, 1888.

Tooley, Sarah A. *The Personal Life of Queen Victoria.* Toronto: William Briggs, [1896?].

Victorian Order of Nurses. *Canadian Fund for the Commemoration of the Queen's Diamond Jubilee, by Founding the Victorian Order of Nurses in Canada.* Ottawa: Paynter and Abbott, 1897.

Walker, A.B. *Victoria the Good: The Great and Glorious Mother of Liberty, Justice, Right, Truth and Equity, of Modern Civilization, and the Mightiest Force for Righteousness in the World Since the Time of Jesus.* Saint John: n.p., [1901?].

Wallace, Donald Mackenzie. *The Web of Empire: A Diary of the Imperial Tour of Their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York in 1901.* London: Macmillan, 1902.

Watson, Joseph. *The Queen's Wish: How it was Fulfilled by the Imperial Tour of T.R.H. the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York.* Toronto: William Briggs, 1902.

Welch, E.A. *A Mother in Israel: A Sermon Preached in St. James' Cathedral, Toronto in Memory of Queen Victoria, January 27, 1901.* Toronto: Church of England Publishing, 1901.

Wentworth Day, J. *King George V as a Sportsman.* London: Cassell, 1935.

Williams, W.H. *Manitoba and the North-West: Journal of a Trip from Toronto to the Rocky Mountains....* Toronto: Hunter and Rose, 1882.

Woods, N.A. *The Prince of Wales in Canada and the United States.* London: Bradbury and Evans, 1861.

Printed Collections

Benson, Arthur C., and Viscount Esher, eds. *The Letters of Queen Victoria, 1837-1861.* 3 vols. London: John Murray, 1908.

Brett, Maurice V., and Oliver, Viscount Esher, eds. *Journals and Letters of Reginald Viscount Esher.* 4 vols. London: Ivor Nicholson and Watson, 1934-38.

Buckle, George E., ed. *The Letters of Queen Victoria, 1862-1885*. 3 vols. Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1926-28.

_____, ed. *The Letters of Queen Victoria, 1886-1901*. 3 vols. London: John Murray, 1930.

Diocèse de Montréal. *Mandements des Évêques de Montréal*. Vols. 6-14. Montréal: Diocèse de Montréal, 1887-1912.

Diocèse de Québec. *Mandements des Évêques de Québec*. N.s., vol. 4. Québec: A. Côté, [1897].

Fulford, Roger, ed. *Dearest Child: Letters between Queen Victoria and the Princess Royal, 1858-1861*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.

_____, ed. *Beloved Mama: Private Correspondence of Queen Victoria and the German Crown Princess, 1878-1885*. London: Evans Brothers, 1981.

Guedalla, Philip, ed. *The Queen and Mr. Gladstone*. 2 vols. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1933.

Halsbury's Statutes of England and Wales. 4th ed. Vol. 10. London: Butterworths, 1995.

Hamilton, W.D., and W.A. Spray, eds. *Source Materials Relating to the New Brunswick Indian*. Fredericton: Hamray Books, 1977.

Hopkins, J. Castell, ed. *Canadian Annual Review of Public Affairs*. Toronto: Annual Review Publishing, 1908-1910.

Kennedy, W.P.M., ed. *Statutes, Treaties and Documents of the Canadian Constitution, 1713-1929*. 2d ed. London: Oxford University Press, 1930.

Pope, Joseph, ed. *Memoirs of the Right Honourable Sir John Alexander Macdonald, First Prime Minister of the Dominion of Canada*. 2 vols. Ottawa: J. Durie, 1894.

_____, ed. *Correspondence of Sir John Macdonald*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1921.

St. John-Stevas, Norman, ed. *The Collected Works of Walter Bagehot*. Vol. 5. London: Economist, 1974.

Stevens, Paul, and John T. Saywell, eds. *Lord Minto's Canadian Papers: A Selection of the Public and Private Papers of the Fourth Earl of Minto, 1898-1904*. 2 vols. Toronto:

Champlain Society, 1981-83.

Whelan, Edward, ed. *The Union of the British Provinces*. 1865. Reprint, Summerside, P.E.I.: Pioneer Publishing, 1949.

Government Publications

Canada. *Canada Gazette*, 1860.

_____. *Census of Canada*. 1861, 1871, 1891, 1901, and 1911.

_____. *Censuses of Canada, 1665-1871*. 1876.

_____. House of Commons. *Debates*, 1860-1911.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Articles

Arnstein, Walter L. "Victoria and Religion." In *Religion in the Lives of English Women, 1760-1930*, edited by Gail Malmgreen, 88-128. London: Croom Helm, 1986.

_____. "Queen Victoria Opens Parliament: The Disinvention of Tradition." *Historical Research* 63, no. 151 (1990): 178-194.

_____. "Queen Victoria and the Challenge of Roman Catholicism." *Historian* 58, no. 2 (1996): 295-314.

_____. "Queen Victoria's Diamond Jubilee." *American Scholar* 66, no. 4 (1997): 591-597.

_____. "The Warrior Queen: Reflections on Victoria and Her World." *Albion* 30, no. 1 (1998): 1-28.

Bassett, Judith. "'A Thousand Miles of Loyalty': The Royal Tour of 1901." *New Zealand Journal of History* 21, no. 1 (1987): 125-138.

Beezley, William H., Cheryl English Martin, and William E. French. "Constructing Consent, Inciting Conflict." In *Rituals of Rule, Rituals of Resistance: Public Celebrations and*

- Popular Culture in Mexico*, edited by William H. Beezley, Cheryl English Martin, and William E. French, xiii-xxxii. Wilmington, Del.: Scholarly Resources, 1994.
- Bélanger, Réal. "L'élite politique canadienne-française et l'Empire britannique: trois reflets représentatifs des perceptions canadiennes-françaises (1890-1917)." In *Imperial Canada, 1867-1917: A Selection of Papers Given at the University of Edinburgh's Centre of Canadian Studies Conference - May 1995*, edited by Colin M. Coates, 122-140. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh, Centre of Canadian Studies, 1997.
- Bessant, Bob. "British Imperial Propaganda and the Republic." *Journal of Australian Studies*, no. 42 (1994): 1-4.
- Birnbaum, N. "Monarchs and Sociologists: A Reply to Professor Shils and Mr. Young." *Sociological Review*, n.s., 3, no. 1 (1955): 5-23.
- Bliss, Michael. "Privatizing the Mind: The Sundering of Canadian History, the Sundering of Canada." *Journal of Canadian Studies* 26, no. 4 (1991-2): 5-17.
- Blumer, J.G., J.R. Brown, A.J. Ewbank, and T.J. Nossiter. "Attitudes to the Monarchy: Their Structure and Development During a Ceremonial Occasion." *Political Studies* 19, no. 2 (1971): 149-171.
- Bodnar, John. "Public Memory in an American City: Commemoration in Cleveland." In *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity*, edited by John R. Gillis, 74-89. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.
- Booth, Alison. "Illustrious Company: Victoria Among Other Women in Anglo-American Role Model Anthologies." In *Remaking Queen Victoria*, edited by Margaret Homans and Adrienne Munich, 59-78. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Bouchier, Nancy B. "'The 24th of May is the Queen's Birthday': Civic Holidays and the Rise of Amateurism in Nineteenth-Century Canadian Towns." *International Journal of the History of Sport* 10, no. 2 (1993): 159-192.
- _____. "Idealized Middle-Class Sport for a Young Nation: Lacrosse in Nineteenth Century Ontario Towns, 1871-1891." *Journal of Canadian Studies* 29, no. 2 (1994): 89-110.
- Breton, Raymond. "Multiculturalism and Canadian Nation-Building." In *The Politics of Gender, Ethnicity, and Language in Canada*, edited by Alan Cairns and Cynthia Williams, 27-66. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986.
- Bucholz, R.O. "'Nothing but Ceremony': Queen Anne and the Limitations of Royal Ritual."

Journal of British Studies 30, no. 3 (1991): 288-323.

Buckner, Phillip. "Whatever Happened to the British Empire?" *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association* n.s., 4 (1993): 3-32.

_____. "The Royal Tour of 1901 and the Construction of an Imperial Identity in South Africa." *South African Historical Journal*, no. 41 (1999): 324-348.

Burton, Antoinette. "Making a Spectacle of Empire: Indian Travellers in Fin-de-Siècle London." *History Workshop Journal*, no. 42 (1996): 127-146.

Cannadine, David. "The Context, Performance and Meaning of Ritual: The British Monarchy and the 'Invention of Tradition,' c. 1820-1977." In *The Invention of Tradition*, edited by Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger, 101-164. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Careless, J.M.S. "Limited Identities in Canada." *Canadian Historical Review* 50, no. 1 (1969): 1-10.

Carr, Graham. "Imperialism and Nationalism in Revisionist Historiography: A Critique of Some Recent Trends." *Journal of Canadian Studies* 17, no. 2 (1982): 91-99.

_____. "Harsh Sentences: Appealing the Strange Verdict of *Who Killed Canadian History?*" *American Review of Canadian Studies* (1998): 167-176.

Chaney, David. "A Symbolic Mirror of Ourselves: Civic Ritual in Mass Society." *Media, Culture and Society* 5, no. 2 (1983): 119-135.

Chartier, Roger. "Text, Symbols, and Frenchness." *Journal of Modern History* 57, no. 4 (1985): 682-695.

Chase, Malcolm. "From Millennium to Anniversary: The Concept of Jubilee in Late Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century England." *Past and Present*, no. 129 (1990): 132-147.

Chowdhury-Sengupta, Indira. "Mother India and Mother Victoria: Motherhood and Nationalism in Nineteenth Century Bengal." *South Asia Research* 13, no. 1 (1992): 20-37.

Clark, Anna. "Queen Caroline and the Sexual Politics of Popular Culture in London, 1820." *Representations*, no. 31 (1990): 47-68.

Clarke, Brian P. "Sir Richard William Scott." *Dictionary of Canadian Biography* 14 (1998): 913-916.

- Cohn, Bernard S. "Representing Authority in Victorian India." In *The Invention of Tradition*, edited by Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger, 165-209. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Cole, Douglas. "Canada's 'Nationalistic' Imperialists," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 5, no. 3 (1970): 44-49.
- _____. "The Problem of 'Nationalism' and 'Imperialism' in British Settlement Colonies." *Journal of British Studies* 10, no. 2 (1971): 160-182.
- Colley, Linda. "The Apotheosis of George III: Loyalty, Royalty and the British Nation, 1760-1820." *Past and Present*, no. 102 (1984): 94-129.
- _____. "Whose Nation? Class and National Consciousness in Britain, 1750-1830." *Past and Present*, no. 113 (1986): 97-117.
- _____. "Britishness and Otherness: An Argument." *Journal of British Studies* 31, no. 4 (1992): 309-329.
- Connors, Jane. "The 1954 Royal Tour of Australia." *Australian Historical Studies* 25, no. 100 (1993): 371-382.
- _____. "Betty Windsor and the Egg of Dukemburg: Men, Women, and the Monarchy in 1954." *Journal of Australian Studies*, no. 47 (1996): 67-80.
- Cook, Ramsay. "Identities Are Not Like Hats." *Canadian Historical Review* 81, no. 2 (2000): 260-265.
- Cook, Terry. "George R. Parkin and the Concept of Britannic Idealism." *Journal of Canadian Studies* 10, no. 3 (1975): 15-31.
- Cottrell, Michael. "St. Patrick's Day Parades in Nineteenth-Century Toronto: A Study of Immigrant Adjustment and Elite Control." *Histoire sociale—Social History* 25, no. 49 (1992): 57-73.
- Creese, Gillian. "Exclusion or Solidarity? Vancouver Workers Confront the 'Oriental Problem.'" *BC Studies*, no. 80 (1988-1989): 24-51.
- Cupido, Robert. "Appropriating the Past: Pageants, Politics, and the Diamond Jubilee of Confederation." *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association* n.s. 8 (1998): 155-186.
- Darnton, Robert. "A Bourgeois Puts His World in Order: The City as a Text." In *The Great Cat*

Massacre and Other Episodes in French Cultural History, 107-143. New York: Vintage Books, 1985.

Desan, Suzanne. "Crowds, Community, and Ritual in the Work of E.P. Thompson and Natalie Davis." In *The New Cultural History*, edited by Lynn Hunt, 47-71. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989.

Dickason, Olive P. "Louisbourg and the Indians: A Study in Imperial Race Relations, 1713-1760." *History and Archaeology* 6 (1976): 1-206.

Ellis, John S. "Reconciling the Celt: British National Identity, Empire, and the 1911 Investiture of the Prince of Wales." *Journal of British Studies* 37, no. 4 (1998): 391-418.

Fair, John D. "Walter Bagehot, Royal Mediation, and the Modern British Constitution." *Historian* 43, no. 1 (1980): 36-54.

Farr, David M.L. "Sir John Rose." *Dictionary of Canadian Biography* 11 (1982): 766-772.

Fewster, Kevin. "Politics, Pageantry and Purpose: The 1920 Tour of Australia by the Prince of Wales." *Labour History*, no. 38 (1980): 59-66.

Fingard, Judith. "Race and Respectability in Victorian Halifax." *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 20, no. 2 (1992): 169-195.

Friesen, Jean. "Magnificent Gifts: The Treaties of Canada with the Indians of the Northwest, 1869-76." *Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, 5th ser., 1 (1986): 41-51.

Geertz, Clifford. "Centers, Kings, and Charisma: Reflections on the Symbolics of Power." In *Culture and Its Creators: Essays in Honor of Edward Shils*, edited by Joseph Ben-David and Terry Nichols Clark, 150-171. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977.

Gerson, Carole. "Marie Joussaye Fotheringham: Canada's First Woman Labour Poet." *Canadian Notes and Queries* no. 44 (1991): 21-23.

_____. "Only a Working Girl: The Story of Marie Joussaye Fotheringham." *Northern Review* 19 (1998): 141-160.

Gibson, James A. "The Duke of Newcastle and British North American Affairs, 1859-64." *Canadian Historical Review* 44, no. 2 (1963): 142-156.

_____. "Sir Edmund Walker Head." *Dictionary of Canadian Biography* 9 (1976): 381-386.

- Gillis, John R. "Memory and Identity: The History of a Relationship." In *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity*, edited by John R. Gillis, 3-24. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.
- Gould, Eliga H. "A Virtual Nation: Greater Britain and the Imperial Legacy of the American Revolution." *American Historical Review* 104, no. 2 (1999): 476-489.
- Hall, D.J. "Clifford Sifton and Canadian Indian Administration, 1896-1905." *Prairie Forum* 2, no. 2 (1977): 127-151.
- Hall, Stuart. "Gramsci's Relevance for the Study of Race and Ethnicity." In *Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*, edited by David Morley and Kuan-Hsing Chen, 411-440. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Hammerton, Elizabeth, and David Cannadine. "Conflict and Consensus on a Ceremonial Occasion: The Diamond Jubilee in Cambridge in 1897." *Historical Journal* 24, no. 1 (1981): 111-146.
- Harcourt, Freda. "Gladstone, Monarchism and the 'New' Imperialism, 1868-1874." *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 14, no. 1 (1985): 20-51.
- Heintzman, Ralph. "The Meaning of Monarchy." *Journal of Canadian Studies* 12, no. 4 (1977): 1-2, 115-117.
- Hébert, Yves. "Sir Adolphe-Basile Routhier." *Dictionary of Canadian Biography* 14 (1998): 900-902.
- Henry, Wade A. "Severing the Imperial Tie?: Republicanism and British Identity in English Canada, 1864-1917." In *Imperial Canada, 1867-1917: A Selection of Papers Given at the University of Edinburgh's Centre of Canadian Studies Conference - May 1995*, edited by Colin M. Coates, 177-186. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh, Centre of Canadian Studies, 1997.
- _____. "Canadian Imperialism and the British Empire, 1867-1918." In *Canada: Confederation to Present* [CD-ROM], edited by Rod Macleod et al. Edmonton: Chinook Multimedia, 2001.
- Hobsbawm, Eric. "Introduction: Inventing Traditions." In *The Invention of Tradition*, edited by Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger, 1-14. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- _____. "Mass-Producing Traditions: Europe, 1870-1914." In *The Invention of Tradition*, edited by Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger, 263-307. Cambridge:

Cambridge University Press, 1983.

- Hodgins, Bruce W. "The Attitudes of the Canadian Founders toward Britain and the British Connection: A Personal Re-examination." In *Imperial Canada, 1867-1917: A Selection of Papers Given at the University of Edinburgh's Centre of Canadian Studies Conference - May 1995*, edited by Colin M. Coates, 20-42. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh, Centre of Canadian Studies, 1997.
- Homans, Margaret. "'To the Queen's Private Apartments': Royal Family Portraiture and the Construction of Victoria's Sovereign Obedience." *Victorian Studies* 37, no. 1 (1993): 1-41.
- Hubbard, R.H. "Viceregal Influences on Canadian Society." In *The Shield of Achilles: Aspects of Canada in the Victorian Age*, edited by W.L. Morton, 256-274. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1968.
- Huskins, Bonnie. "The Ceremonial Space of Women: Public Processions in Victorian Saint John and Halifax." In *Separate Spheres: Women's Worlds in the Nineteenth-Century Maritimes*, edited by Janet Guildford and Suzanne Morton, 145-159. Fredericton: Acadiensis, 1994.
- _____. "'A Tale of Two Cities': Boosterism and the Imagination of Community during the Visit of the Prince of Wales to Saint John and Halifax in 1860." *Urban History Review* 28, no. 1 (1999): 31-46.
- Hyam, Ronald. "The British Empire in the Edwardian Era." In *Oxford History of the British Empire. Volume IV: The Twentieth Century*, edited by Judith M. Brown and Wm. Roger Louis, 47-63. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Jamieson, Stuart, and Percy Gladstone. "Unionism in the Fishing Industry of British Columbia." *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science* 16, no. 2 (1950): 146-171.
- Jones, Elwood. "English-Canadian Culture in the Nineteenth Century: Love, History, and Politics." *Journal of Canadian Studies* 25, no. 4 (1990-1991): 162-169.
- Kapferer, Judith L. "The Dream of Community: Folk Festivals and Ideology in Australia." In *The Cultures of Celebrations*, edited by Ray B. Browne and Michael T. Marsden, 57-74. Bowling Green, Ohio: Bowling Green State University Popular Press, 1994.
- Kealey, Gregory S. "Orangemen and the Corporation: The Politics of Class During the Union of the Canadas." In *Forging a Consensus: Historical Essays on Toronto*, edited by Victor L. Russell, 41-86. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984.

- Kelly, Gary. "Class, Race, and Cultural Revolution: Treaties and the Making of Western Canada." *Alberta* 1, no. 2 (1989): 19-40.
- Kirk-Greene, Anthony H.M. "The Governors-General of Canada, 1867-1952: A Collective Profile." *Journal of Canadian Studies* 12, no. 4 (1977): 35-57.
- Lanning, Robert. "Portraits of Progress: Men, Women and the 'Selective Tradition' in Collective Biography." *Journal of Canadian Studies* 30, no. 3 (1995): 38-59.
- Lears, T. Jackson. "The Concept of Cultural Hegemony: Problems and Possibilities." *American Historical Review* 90, no. 3 (1985): 567-593.
- Lesser, Gloria. "En 1860, le Prince de Galles inaugure le pont Victoria." *Vie des Arts*, no. 105 (1981-82): pp. 38-40, 89.
- Lipsitz, George. "The Struggle of Hegemony." *Journal of American History* 75, no. 1 (1988): 146-150.
- Livermore, J.D. "The Orange Order and the Election of 1861 in Kingston." In *To Preserve and Defend: Essays on Kingston in the Nineteenth Century*, edited by Gerald Tulchinsky, 245-259. Montreal and London: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1976.
- Lorenz, Chris. "Comparative Historiography: Problems and Perspectives," *History and Theory* 38, no. 1 (1999): 23-39.
- MacDermaid, Anne. "The Visit of the Prince of Wales to Kingston in 1860." *Historic Kingston*, no. 21 (1973): 50-61.
- MacKenzie, John M. "The Imperial Pioneer and Hunter and the British Masculine Stereotype in Late Victorian and Edwardian Times." In *Manliness and Morality: Middle-Class Masculinity in Britain and America, 1800-1940*, edited by J.A. Mangan and James Walvin, 176-198. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1987.
- Marion, Séraphin. "L'Episcopat québécois et la Couronne britannique." *Les cahiers des dix* 32 (1967): 37-82.
- Martin, Ged. "British Officials and their Attitudes to the Negro Community in Canada, 1833-1861." *Ontario History* 66, no. 2 (1974): 78-88.
- _____. "Queen Victoria and Canada." *American Review of Canadian Studies* 13, no. 3 (1983): 215-234.
- McCann, Phillip. "Culture, State Formation and the Invention of Tradition: Newfoundland,

- 1832-1855." *Journal of Canadian Studies* 23, nos. 1-2 (1988): 86-103.
- McCormack, Ross. "Cloth Caps and Jobs: The Ethnicity of English Immigrants in Canada 1900-1914." In *Ethnicity, Power, and Politics in Canada*, edited by Jorgen Dahlie and Tissa Fernando, 38-55. Toronto: Methuen, 1981.
- McGowan, Mark. "The De-greening of the Irish: Toronto's Irish-Catholic Press, Imperialism, and the Forging of a New Identity, 1887-1914." *Historical Papers of the Canadian Historical Association* (1989): 118-145.
- McKibbin, Ross. "Mass-Observation in the Mall." *London Review of Books* 19, no. 19 (1997): 3, 5-6.
- McKillop, A.B. "Who Killed Canadian History? A View from the Trenches." *Canadian Historical Review* 80, no. 2 (1999): 269-299.
- Miedema, Gary. "For Canada's Sake: The Centennial Celebrations of 1967, State Legitimation, and the Restructuring of Canadian Public Life." *Journal of Canadian Studies* 34, no. 1 (1999): 139-160.
- Miller, J.R. "Anti-Catholic Thought in Victorian Canada." *Canadian Historical Review* 66, no. 4 (1985): 474-494.
- Monet, Jacques. "The Personal and Living Bond, 1839-1849." In *The Shield of Achilles: Aspects of Canada in the Victorian Age*, edited by W.L. Morton, 62-93. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1968.
- _____. "The Canadian Monarchy: 'Everything That Is Best and Most Admired.'" In *The West and the Nation: Essays in Honour of W.L. Morton*, edited by Carl Berger and Ramsay Cook, 321-335. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1976.
- _____. "La Couronne du Canada." *Journal of Canadian Studies* 11, no. 4 (1976): 27-32.
- Montpetit, Raymond. "Fêtes et société au Québec: la visite du Prince de Galles et la construction du Crystal Palace à Montréal, en 1860." In *Travaux et Conférences, 1975-1979*, Groupe de Art Populaire, 258-280. Université de Québec à Montréal: Département Histoire de l'Art, 1979.
- Morris, Ewan. "Forty Years On: Australia and the Queen, 1954." *Journal of Australian Studies*, no. 40 (1994): 1-13.
- Morris, J.H. "The Origin of Our Maple Leaf Emblem." *Papers and Records of the Ontario*

- Historical Society* 5 (1904): 21-35.
- Morton, W.L. "The Meaning of Monarchy in Confederation." *Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, 4th ser., 1 (1963): 271-282.
- O'Brien, Mike. "Manhood and the Militia Myth: Masculinity, Class and Militarism in Ontario, 1902-1914." *Labour/Le Travail* 42 (1998): 115-141.
- Owram, Doug. "Narrow Circles: The Historiography of Recent Canadian Historiography." *National History* 1 (1997): 5-21.
- Page, Robert. "The Canadian Response to the Imperial Idea During the Boer War Years," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 5, no. 1 (1970): 33-49.
- Palmer, Bryan D. "Of Silences and Trenches: A Dissident View of Granatstein's Meaning," *Canadian Historical Review* 80, no. 4 (1999): 676-686.
- Parr, Joy. "Gender History and Historical Practice." *Canadian Historical Review* 76, no. 3 (1995): 354-376.
- Purdy, Sean. "Building Homes, Building Citizens: Housing Reform and Nation Formation in Canada, 1900-20." *Canadian Historical Review* 79, no. 3 (1998): 492-523.
- Radforth, Ian. "'Called to the attention of the whole civilized world': The Visit of the Prince of Wales to British North America, 1860." *Zeitschrift für Kanada-studien* 20, no. 1 (2000): 185-204.
- Ranger, Terence. "The Invention of Tradition in Colonial Africa." In *The Invention of Tradition*, edited by Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger, 211-262. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Redmond, Gerald. "Imperial Viceregal Patronage: The Governors-General of Canada and Sport in the Dominion, 1867-1909." *International Journal of the History of Sport* 6, no. 2 (1989): 193-217.
- Regular, Keith. "On Public Display." *Alberta History* 34, no. 1 (1986): 1-10.
- Robb, Andrew. "David Laird." *Dictionary of Canadian Biography* 14 (1998): 578-581.
- Rutherford, Robert. "Canada's August Festival: Communitas, Liminality, and Social Memory." *Canadian Historical Review* 77, no. 2 (1996): 221-249.
- Ryan, Mary. "The American Parade: Representations of the Nineteenth Century Social Order."

In *The New Cultural History*, edited by Lynn Hunt, 131-153. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989.

Samuel, Raphael. "Reading the Signs." *History Workshop Journal*, no. 32 (1991): 88-109.

_____. "Reading the Signs: II. Fact-grubbers and Mind-readers." *History Workshop Journal*, no. 33 (1992): 220-251.

Shanahan, David. "John Costigan." *Dictionary of Canadian Biography* 14 (1998): 237-240.

Shedel, James. "Emperor, Church, and People: Religion and Dynastic Loyalty During the Golden Jubilee of Franz Joseph." *Catholic Historical Review* 76, no. 1 (1990): 71-92.

Shils, Edward and Michael Young. "The Meaning of the Coronation." *Sociological Review*, n.s., 1, no. 2 (1953): 63-81.

Skidmore, Colleen. "'All That is Interesting in the Canadas': William Notman's Maple Box Portfolio of Stereographic Views, 1860." *Journal of Canadian Studies* 32, no. 4 (1998): 69-90.

_____. "*Concordia Salus*: Triumphal Arches at Montréal, 1860." *Journal of Canadian Art History* 19, no. 1 (1998): 86-109.

Smith, Tori. "'Almost Pathetic...But Also Very Glorious': The Consumer Spectacle of the Diamond Jubilee." *Histoire sociale—Social History* 29, no. 58 (1996): 333-356.

Stacey, C.P. "Lord Monck and the Canadian Nation." *Dalhousie Review* 14, no. 2 (1934): 179-191.

Stamp, Robert M. "Steel of Empire: Royal Tours and the CPR." In *The CPR West: The Iron Road and the Making of a Nation*, edited by Hugh A. Dempsey, 275-290. Vancouver: Douglas and McIntyre, 1984.

Stanworth, Karen. "'God Save the Queen': Narrating Nationalism and Imperialism in Quebec on the Occasion of Queen Victoria's Diamond Jubilee." *RACAR, Revue d'Art Canadienne/Canadian Art Review* 21, no. 1 (1994): 85-99.

Stortz, Gerald J. "An Irish Raical in a Tory Town: William O'Brien in Toronto, 1887." *Éire-Ireland* 19, no. 4 (1984): 35-58.

Sutherland, David A. "Race Relations in Halifax, Nova Scotia, During the Mid-Victorian Quest for Reform." *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association* n.s., 7 (1996): 35-54.

- Swainson, Donald. "John Hillyard Cameron." *Dictionary of Canadian Biography* 10 (1972): 118-124.
- Sylvain, Philippe. "Cyrille Boucher." *Dictionary of Canadian Biography* 9 (1976): 63-66.
- Sylvain, Robert. "La visite du Prince Napoléon au Canada (1861)." *Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, 4th ser., 2 (1964): 105-126.
- Thompson, E.P. "The Moral Economy of the English Crowd in the Eighteenth Century." In *Customs in Common*, 185-258. New York: New Press, 1993.
- Tobias, John L. "The Origins of the Treaty Rights Movement in Saskatchewan." In *1885 and After: Native Society in Transition*, edited by F. Laurie Barron and James B. Waldram, 241-252. Regina: Canadian Plains Research Centre, University of Regina, 1986.
- Tosh, John. "What Should Historians do with Masculinity?: Reflections on Nineteenth Century Britain." *History Workshop*, no. 38 (1994): 179-202.
- Vaughan, Mary Kay. "The Construction of the Patriotic Festival in Tecamachalco, Puebla, 1900-1946." In *Rituals of Rule, Rituals of Resistance: Public Celebrations and Popular Culture in Mexico*, edited by William H. Beezley, Cheryl English Martin, and William E. French, 213-245. Wilmington, Del.: Scholarly Resources, 1994.
- Wahrman, Dror. "'Middle-Class' Domesticity Goes Public: Gender, Class, and Politics from Queen Caroline to Queen Victoria." *Journal of British Studies* 32, no. 4 (1993): 396-432.
- Walden, Keith. "Speaking Modern: Language, Culture, and Hegemony in Grocery Window Displays, 1887-1920." *Canadian Historical Review* 70, no. 3 (1989): 285-310.
- Weeks, Jeffery. "Foucault for Historians." *History Workshop*, no. 14 (1982): 106-119.
- Weinstein, Deena, and Michael Weinstein. "On the Visual Constitution of Society: The Contributions of Georg Simmel and Jean-Paul Sartre to a Sociology of the Senses." *History of European Ideas* 5, no. 4 (1984): 349-362.
- Williams, Raymond. "Base and Superstructure in Marxist Cultural Theory." In *Problems in Materialism and Culture*, 31-49. London: Verso, 1982.

Books

- Adamson, Walter L. *Hegemony and Revolution: A Study of Antonio Gramsci's Political and Cultural Theory*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980.

- Akenson, Donald Harman. *The Irish in Ontario: A Study in Rural History*. Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1984.
- Allen, Robert S. *His Majesty's Indian Allies: British Indian Policy in the Defence of Canada, 1774-1815*. Toronto: Dundurn Press, 1993.
- Amery, Julian. *The Life of Joseph Chamberlain. Volume 4: 1901-1903*. London: Macmillan, 1951.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Rev. ed. London: Verso, 1991.
- Atlay, J.B. *Sir Henry Wentworth Acland, Bart., K.C.B., F.R.S., Regius Professor of Medicine in the University of Oxford: A Memoir*. London: Smith and Elder, 1903.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail M. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M.M. Bakhtin*. Edited by Michael Holquist. Translated by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981.
- . *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Edited by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Translated by Vern W. McGee. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986.
- Barman, Jean. *Growing Up British in British Columbia: Boys in Private School*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1984.
- Barnard, W.T. *The Queen's Own Rifles of Canada, 1860-1960*. Don Mills, ON: Ontario Publishing Company, 1960.
- Batt, Elisabeth. *Monck: Governor General, 1861-1868*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1976.
- Battiscombe, Georgina. *Queen Alexandra*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1969.
- Bederman, Gail. *Manliness and Civilization: A Cultural History of Gender and Race in the United States, 1880-1917*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.
- Beezley, William H., Cheryl English Martin, and William E. French, eds. *Rituals of Rule, Rituals of Resistance: Public Celebrations and Popular Culture in Mexico*. Wilmington, Del.: Scholarly Resources, 1994.
- Berger, Carl. *The Sense of Power: Studies in the Ideas of Canadian Imperialism, 1867-1914*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970.

- _____. *The Writing of Canadian History: Aspects of English-Canadian Historical Writing Since 1900*. 2d ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986.
- Berger, John. *Ways of Seeing*. London: British Broadcasting Corporation and Penguin Books, 1972.
- Berkhofer, Robert F., Jr. *The White Man's Indian: Images of the American Indian from Columbus to the Present*. New York: Vintage Books, 1979.
- Berton, Pierre. *The Royal Family: The Story of the British Monarchy from Victoria to Elizabeth*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1954.
- Best, Geoffrey. *Mid-Victorian Britain, 1851-1875*. London: Fontana Press, 1971.
- Billig, Michael. *Talking of the Royal Family*. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Blumin, Stuart M. *The Emergence of the Middle Class: Social Experience in the American City, 1760-1900*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Bocock, Robert. *Ritual in Industrial Society: A Sociological Analysis of Ritualism in Modern England*. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1974.
- Bodnar, John E. *Remaking America: Public Memory, Commemoration, and Patriotism in the Twentieth Century*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992.
- Bogdanor, Vernon. *The Monarchy and the Constitution*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Translated by Richard Nice. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1984.
- Bousfield, Arthur and Garry Toffoli. *Royal Observations: Canadians and Royalty*. Toronto: Dundurn Press, 1991.
- Bradbury, Bettina. *Working Families: Age, Gender, and Daily Survival in Industrializing Montreal*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1993.
- Brantlinger, Patrick. *Crusoe's Footprints: Cultural Studies in Britain and America*. New York: Routledge, 1990.
- Briggs, Asa. *Victorian Cities*. 1963. Reprint, London: Penguin Books, 1968.
- Brockliss, Laurence, and David Eastwood, eds. *A Union of Multiple Identities: The British*

- Isles, 1750-1850*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997.
- Brown, Robert Craig and Ramsay Cook. *Canada, 1896-1921: A Nation Transformed*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1974.
- Buchan, John. *Memory Hold-the-Door*. Toronto: Musson, 1940.
- Burke, Peter. *The Fabrication of Louis XIV*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.
- Calloway, Colin G. *Crown and Calumet: British-Indian Relations, 1783-1815*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1987.
- Cannadine, David. *The Pleasures of the Past*. London: Collins, 1989.
- . *Aspects of Aristocracy: Grandeur and Decline in Modern Britain*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994.
- Cannadine, David, and Simon Price, eds. *Rituals of Royalty: Power and Ceremonial in Traditional Societies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Careless, J.M.S. *Brown of the Globe. Volume Two: Statesman of Confederation, 1860-1880*. Toronto: Macmillan, 1963.
- Carstens, Peter. *The Queen's People: A Study of Hegemony, Coercion, and Accommodation among the Okanagan of Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991.
- Carter, Sarah. *Lost Harvests: Prairie Indian Reserve Farmers and Government Policy*. Kingston and Montreal: Mc-Gill-Queen's University Press, 1990.
- . *Capturing Women: The Manipulation of Cultural Imagery in Canada's Prairie West*. Kingston and Montreal: Mc-Gill-Queen's University Press, 1997.
- Cherrington, John A. *Vancouver at the Dawn: A Turn-of-the-Century Portrait*. Madeira Park, BC: Harbour Publishing, 1997.
- Clark, Anna. *The Struggle for the Breeches: Gender and the Making of the British Working Class*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.
- Clarke, Brian P. *Piety and Nationalism: Lay Voluntary Associations and the Creation of an Irish-Catholic Community in Toronto, 1850-1895*. Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1993.
- Coates, Colin M., ed. *Imperial Canada, 1867-1917: A Selection of Papers Given at the*

University of Edinburgh's Centre of Canadian Studies Conference – May 1995.
Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh, Centre of Canadian Studies, 1997.

Cole, Douglas, and Ira Chaikin. *An Iron Hand Upon the People: The Law against the Potlatch on the Northwest Coast*. Vancouver: Douglas and McIntyre, 1990.

Colley, Linda. *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.

Connell, R.W. *Gender and Power: Society, the Person, and Sexual Politics*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1987.

_____. *Masculinities*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1995.

Corrigan, Philip, and Derek Sayer. *The Great Arch: English State Formation as Cultural Revolution*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1985.

Creighton, Donald. *John A. Macdonald. Volume One: The Young Politician*. Toronto: Macmillan, 1952.

Crewe, Robert, Marquess of. *Lord Rosebery*. 2 vols. London: John Murray, 1931.

Cunneen, Christopher. *King's Men: Australia's Governors-General from Hopetown to Isaacs*. Sydney: George Allen and Unwin, 1983.

Danow, David K. *The Thought of Mikhail Bakhtin: From Word to Culture*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1991.

Davidoff, Leonore. *The Best Circles: Society, Etiquette and the Season*. London: Croom Helm, 1973.

Davidoff, Leonore, and Catherine Hall. *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class, 1780-1850*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.

Davis, Natalie Zemon. *Society and Culture in Early Modern France*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1975.

Davis, Susan G. *Parades and Power: Street Theatre in Nineteenth Century Philadelphia*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1986.

Dempsey, L. James. *Warriors of the King: Prairie Indians in World War I*. Regina: Canadian Plains Research Centre, 1999.

- Den Otter, A.A. *The Philosophy of Railways: The Transcontinental Railway Idea in British North America*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997.
- Doyle, Laura. *Bordering on the Body: The Racial Matrix of Modern Fiction and Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Duguid, A. Fortesque. *History of the Canadian Grenadier Guards, 1760-1964*. Montreal: Gazette Printing Company, 1965.
- Dunae, Patrick A. *Gentleman Emigrants: From the British Public Schools to the Canadian Frontier*. Vancouver: Douglas and McIntyre, 1981.
- Dyck, Noel. *What is the Indian "Problem"?: Tutelage and Resistance in Canadian Indian Administration*. St. John's: Institute of Social and Economic Research, Memorial University, 1991.
- Eagleton, Terry. *Literary Theory: An Introduction*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1983.
- Errington, Jane. *The Lion, the Eagle, and Upper Canada: A Developing Colonial Ideology*. Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1987.
- Farthing, John. *Freedom Wears a Crown*. Toronto: Kingswood House, 1957.
- Forsey, Eugene A. *Freedom and Order: Collected Essays*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1974.
- Francis, Daniel. *The Imaginary Indian: The Image of the Indian in Canadian Culture*. Vancouver: Arsenal Pulp Press, 1992.
- Francis, Mark. *Governors and Settlers: Images of Authority in the British Colonies*. London: Macmillan, 1992.
- French, Doris. *Ishbel and the Empire: A Biography of Lady Aberdeen*. Toronto: Dundurn Press, 1988.
- Fujitani, Takashi. *Splendid Monarchy: Power and Pageantry in Modern Japan*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996.
- Garvin, J.L. *The Life of Joseph Chamberlain. Volume 3: 1895-1900*. London: Macmillan, 1934.
- Gidney, R.D., and W.P.J. Millar. *Professional Gentlemen: The Professions in Nineteenth-Century Ontario*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994.

- Gillis, John R., ed. *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.
- Girouard, Mark. *The Return to Camelot: Chivalry and the English Gentleman*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981.
- Goheen, Peter G. *Victorian Toronto, 1850 to 1900: Pattern and Process of Growth*. Chicago: Department of Geography, University of Chicago, 1970.
- Gramsci, Antonio. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. Edited and translated by Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Smith. New York: International Publishers, 1971.
- Granatstein, J.L. *Who Killed Canadian History?* Toronto: HarperCollins, 1998.
- Grant, John Webster. *A Profusion of Spires: Religion in Nineteenth Century Ontario*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988.
- Greer, Allan, and Ian Radforth. *Colonial Leviathan: State Formation in Mid-Nineteenth Century Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992.
- Griffiths, N.E.S. *The Splendid Vision: Centennial History of the National Council of Women of Canada, 1893-1993*. Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 1993.
- Gwyn, Sandra. *The Private Capital: Ambition and Love in the Age of Macdonald and Laurier*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1984.
- Hall, D.J. *Clifford Sifton. Volume Two: A Lonely Eminence*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1985.
- Hammond, J.L. *Gladstone and the Irish Question*. London: Longmans, 1938.
- Hardie, Frank. *The Political Influence of Queen Victoria, 1861-1901*. 2d ed. London: Frank Cass, 1938.
- _____. *The Political Influence of the British Monarchy, 1868-1952*. London: Batsford, 1970.
- Harris, Stephen J. *Canadian Brass: The Making of a Professional Army, 1860-1939*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988.
- Hayden, Ilse. *Symbol and Privilege: The Ritual Context of British Royalty*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1987.

- Heaman, E.A. *The Inglorious Arts of Peace: Exhibitions in Canadian Society During the Nineteenth Century*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999.
- Heffer, Simon. *Power and Place: The Political Consequences of King Edward VII*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1998.
- Heron, Craig. *Working in Steel: The Early Years in Canada, 1883-1935*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1988.
- Hildebrandt, Walter, Dorothy First Rider, Sarah Carter, and Treaty Seven Elders and Tribal Council. *The True Spirit and Original Intent of Treaty Seven*. Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1996.
- Hobsbawm, Eric. *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*. 2d ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Hobsbawm, Eric, and Terence Ranger, eds. *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Holman, Andrew C. *A Sense of Their Duty: Middle-Class Formation in Victorian Ontario Towns*. Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2000.
- Homans, Margaret. *Royal Representations: Queen Victoria and British Culture, 1837-1876*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998.
- Homans, Margaret, and Adrienne Munich, eds. *Remaking Queen Victoria*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Houghton, Walter E. *The Victorian Frame of Mind*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957.
- Houston, Cecil J., and William J. Smyth. *The Sash Canada Wore: A Historical Geography of the Orange Order in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1980.
- Houston, Gail Turley. *Royalties: The Queen and Victorian Writers*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1999.
- Hubbard, R.H. *Rideau Hall: An Illustrated History of Government House, Ottawa, from Victorian Times to the Present Day*. Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1977.
- Hunt, Lynn. *Politics, Culture, and Class in the French Revolution*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.

- _____, ed. *The New Cultural History*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989.
- Jamieson, Melvill Allan. *Medals Awarded to North American Indian Chiefs, 1714-1922*. 1936. Reprint, London: Spink and Son, 1961.
- Jennings, John, Bruce W. Hodgins, and Doreen Small, eds. *The Canoe in Canadian Cultures*. N.p.: Natural Heritage/Natural History Inc., 1999.
- Johnson, J.K. *Becoming Prominent: Regional Leadership in Upper Canada, 1791-1841*. Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1989.
- Kaiser, Susan B. *The Social Psychology of Clothing: Symbolic Appearances in Context*. 2d ed. New York: Fairchild Publications, 1990.
- Kantorowicz, Ernst H. *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957.
- Kasson, John F. *Rudeness and Civility: Manners in Nineteenth-Century Urban America*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1990.
- Katz, Jonathan Ned. *The Invention of Heterosexuality*. New York: Dutton, 1995.
- Kealey, Gregory S. *Toronto Workers Respond to Industrial Capitalism, 1867-1892*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1980.
- Kealey, Linda. *Enlisting Women for the Cause: Women, Labour, and the Left in Canada, 1890-1920*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998.
- Kelly, Stéphane. *La petite loterie: Comment la Couronne a obtenu la collaboration du Canada français après 1837*. Montréal: Boréal, 1997.
- Kendle, John. *The Colonial and Imperial Conferences, 1887-1911: A Study in Imperial Organization*. London: Longmans, 1967.
- Kerr, D.G.G. *Sir Edmund Head: A Scholarly Governor*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1954.
- Kinsman, Gary. *The Regulation of Desire: Homo and Hetero Sexualities*. 2d ed. Montreal: Black Rose Books, 1996.
- Knowles, Norman. *Inventing the Loyalists: The Ontario Loyalist Tradition and the Creation of Usable Pasts*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997.

- Kuhn, William M. *Democratic Royalism: The Transformation of the British Monarchy, 1861-1914*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996.
- Lai, Cheun-Yan David. *Arches in British Columbia*. Victoria: Sono Nis, 1982.
- Lang, Marjory. *Women Who Made the News: Female Journalists in Canada, 1880-1945*. Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1999.
- Lant, Jeffrey L. *Insubstantial Pageant: Ceremony and Confusion at Queen Victoria's Court*. London: Hamish Hamilton, 1979.
- Lee, Sidney. *King Edward VII: A Biography*. 2 vols. London: Macmillan, 1925-27.
- Leier, Mark. *Red Flags and Red Tape: The Making of a Labour Bureaucracy*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995.
- Linteau, Paul-André, René Durocher, and Jean-Claude Robert. *Quebec: A History, 1867-1929*. Translated by Robert Chodos. Toronto: James Lorimer, 1983.
- Little, J.I. *State and Society in Transition: The Politics of Institutional Reform in the Eastern Townships, 1838-1852*. Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1997.
- MacDonagh, Michael. *The English King: A Study of the Monarchy and the Royal Family, Historical, Constitutional and Social*. New York: J. Cape, 1929.
- MacDonnell, Tom. *Daylight Upon Magic: The Royal Tour of Canada, 1939*. Toronto: Macmillan, 1989.
- MacKenzie, John M. *Propaganda and Empire: The Manipulation of British Public Opinion*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984.
- _____, ed. *Imperialism and Popular Culture*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1986.
- MacKinnon, Frank. *The Crown in Canada*. Calgary: Glenbow-Alberta Institute and McClelland and Stewart West, 1976.
- Magnus, Philip. *Gladstone: A Biography*. London: John Murray, 1954.
- _____. *King Edward the Seventh*. London: John Murray, 1964.
- Martin, Ged. *Bunyip Aristocracy: The New South Wales Constitution Debate of 1853 and Hereditary Institutions in the British Colonies*. Sydney: Croom Helm, 1986.

- _____. *Britain and the Origins of Canadian Confederation, 1837-67*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1995.
- Martineau, John. *The Life of Henry Pelham, Fifth Duke of Newcastle, 1811-1864*. London: John Murray, 1908.
- Mason, Philip. *The English Gentleman: The Rise and Fall of an Ideal*. London: André Deutsch, 1982.
- McCallum, John. *Unequal Beginnings: Agriculture and Economic Development in Quebec and Ontario Until 1870*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1980.
- McCormack, A. Ross. *Reformers, Rebels, and Revolutionaries: The Western Canadian Radical Movement, 1899-1919*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1977.
- McDonald, Robert A.J. *Making Vancouver: Class, Status, and Social Boundaries, 1863-1913*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1996.
- McGowan, Mark G. *The Waning of the Green: Catholics, the Irish, and Identity in Toronto, 1887-1922*. Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1999.
- McKay, Ian. *The Quest of the Folk: Antimodernism and Cultural Selection in Twentieth Century Nova Scotia*. Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1994.
- McKenna, Mark. *The Captive Republic: A History of Republicanism in Australia, 1788-1996*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- McPhail, Clark. *The Myth of the Madding Crowd*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter, 1991.
- Metcalfe, Alan. *Canada Learns to Play: The Emergence of Organized Sport, 1807-1914*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1987.
- Miller, Carman. *The Canadian Career of the Fourth Earl of Minto: The Education of a Viceroy*. Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1980.
- _____. *Painting the Map Red: Canada and the South African War, 1899-1902*. Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press and the Canadian War Museum, 1993.
- Miller, J.R. *Shingwauk's Vision: A History of Native Residential Schools*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996.
- Mills, David. *The Idea of Loyalty in Upper Canada, 1784-1850*. Kingston and Montreal:

McGill-Queen's University Press, 1988.

Mitchinson, Wendy. *The Nature of Their Bodies: Women and Their Doctors in Victorian Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991.

Monet, Jacques. *The Last Canon Shot: A Study of French-Canadian Nationalism, 1837-1850*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1969.

_____. *The Canadian Crown*. Toronto: Clarke and Irwin, 1979.

Monière, Denis. *Ideologies in Quebec: The Historical Development*. Translated by Richard Howard. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1981.

Monypenny, William F., and George E. Buckle. *The Life of Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield*. 2 vols. London: John Murray, 1929.

Morgan, Cecilia. *Public Men and Virtuous Women: Gendered Languages of Religion and Politics in Upper Canada, 1791-1850*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996.

Morgan, David H.J. *Discovering Men*. London: Routledge, 1992.

Morton, Desmond. *A Military History of Canada*. 3d ed. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1992.

Morton, W.L. *The Critical Years: The Union of British North America, 1857-1873*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1964.

_____. *The Canadian Identity*. 2d ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972.

_____, ed. *The Shield of Achilles: Aspects of Canada in the Victorian Age*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1968.

Mosse, George L. *Nationalism and Sexuality: Respectability and Abnormal Sexuality in Modern Europe*. New York: Howard Fertig, 1985.

Moyles, R.G., and Doug Owram. *Imperial Dreams and Colonial Realities: British Views of Canada, 1880-1914*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988.

Munich, Adrienne. *Queen Victoria's Secrets*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1996.

Munsell, F. Darrell. *The Unfortunate Duke: Henry Pelham, Fifth Duke of Newcastle, 1811-1864*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1985.

- Nairn, Tom. *The Enchanted Glass: Britain and its Monarchy*. London: Picador, 1988.
- Neatby, H. Blair. *Laurier and a Liberal Quebec: A Study in Political Management*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1973.
- Nelles, H.V. *The Art of Nation-Building: Pageantry and Spectacle at Quebec's Tercentenary*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999.
- Neuendorff, Gwendoline. *Studies in the Evolution of Dominion Status: The Governor Generalship of Canada and the Development of Canadian Nationalism*. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1942.
- Nicolson, Harold. *King George the Fifth: His Life and Reign*. London: Constable, 1952.
- Norkunas, Martha K. *The Politics of Public Memory: Tourism, History, and Ethnicity in Monterey, California*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1993.
- O'Brien, Conor Cruise. *Parnell and His Party, 1880-1890*. London: Oxford University Press, 1957.
- Packard, Jerrold M. *Farewell in Splendour: The Passing of Queen Victoria and Her Age*. New York: Dutton, 1995.
- Pal, Leslie A. *Interests of State: The Politics of Language, Multiculturalism, and Feminism in Canada*. Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1993.
- Palmer, Bryan D. *A Culture in Conflict: Skilled Workers and Industrial Capitalism in Hamilton Ontario, 1860-1914*. Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1979.
- _____. *Working-Class Experience: Rethinking the History of Canadian Labour, 1800-1991*. 2d ed. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1992.
- Parr, Joy. *The Gender of Breadwinners: Women, Men, and Change in Two Industrial Towns, 1880-1950*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990.
- Parsons, Neil. *King Khama, Emperor Joe, and the Great White Queen: Victorian Britain through African Eyes*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998.
- Paz, D.G. *Popular Anti-Catholicism in Mid-Victorian England*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1992.
- Penlington, Norman. *Canada and Imperialism*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965.

- Perin, Roberto. *Rome in Canada: The Vatican and Canadian Affairs in the Late Victorian Age*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990.
- Pettipas, Katherine. *Severing the Ties that Bind: Government Repression of Indigenous Religious Ceremonies on the Prairies*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba, 1994.
- Prentice, Alison. *The School Promoters: Education and Social Class in Mid-Nineteenth Century Upper Canada*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1977.
- Prentice, Alison, et al. *Canadian Women: A History*. 2d ed. Toronto: Harcourt Brace, 1996.
- Prochaska, Frank. *Royal Bounty: The Making of a Welfare Monarchy*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.
- Prucha, Francis Paul. *Indian Peace Medals in American History*. Madison: State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1971.
- . *The Great Father: The United States Government and the American Indians*. 2 vols. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1984.
- Qualter, Terence. *Opinion Control in Democracies*. London: Macmillan, 1985.
- Radforth, Ian. *Bushworkers and Bosses: Logging in Northern Ontario, 1900-1980*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987.
- Reid, Jennifer. *Myth, Symbol, and Colonial Encounter: British and Mi'kmaq in Acadia, 1700-1867*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1995.
- Richards, Thomas. *The Commodity Culture of Victorian England: Advertising and Spectacle, 1851-1914*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990.
- Riley, Denise. "Am I That Name?" *Feminism and the Category of "Women" in History*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1988.
- Roby, Kinley E. *The King, the Press and the People: A Study of Edward VII*. London: Barrie and Jenkins, 1975.
- Rose, Kenneth. *King George V*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1984.
- Russell, E.C. *Customs and Traditions of the Canadian Armed Forces*. Ottawa: Deneau Publishers, 1980.
- St. Aubyn, Giles. *Edward VII: Prince and King*. New York: Atheneum, 1979.

- _____. *Queen Victoria: A Portrait*. London: Sinclair-Stevenson, 1991.
- Saywell, John T. *The Office of Lieutenant-Governor: A Study in Canadian Government and Politics*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1957.
- Schramm, Percy Ernst. *The History of the English Coronation*. Translated by Leopold G. Wickham Legg. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1937.
- Scott, James C. *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985.
- _____. *Domination and the Arts of Resistance*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990.
- Scott, Joan Wallach. *Gender and the Politics of History*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1988.
- Silverman, Jason H. *Unwelcome Guests: Canada West's Response to American Fugitive Slaves, 1800-1865*. Millwood, N.Y.: Associated Faculty Press, 1985.
- Sinclair, David. *Two Georges: The Making of the Modern Monarchy*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1988.
- Skelton, Oscar Douglas. *The Life and Letters of Sir Wilfrid Laurier*. 2 vols. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1921.
- Smith, Allan. *Canada—An American Nation? Essays on Continentalism, Identity, and the Canadian Frame of Mind*. Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1994.
- Smith, Anthony D. *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1986.
- _____. *National Identity*. Reno: University of Nevada Press, 1991.
- Smith, David E. *The Invisible Crown: The First Principle of Canadian Government*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995.
- Sollors, Werner. *The Invention of Ethnicity*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Speisman, Stephen A. *The Jews of Toronto: A History to 1937*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1979.
- Stamp, Robert M. *Kings, Queens, and Canadians: A Celebration of Canada's Infatuation with*

- the British Royal Family*. Markham, Ontario: Fitzhenry and Whiteside Limited, 1987.
- Stewart, Gordon T. *The Origins of Canadian Politics: A Comparative Approach*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1986.
- Stonechild, Blair, and Bill Waiser. *Loyal till Death: Indians and the North-West Rebellion*. Calgary: Fifth House, 1997.
- Thompson, Dorothy. *Queen Victoria: The Woman, the Monarchy, and the People*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1990.
- Thompson, E.P. *The Making of the English Working Class*. 1963. Reprint, London: Penguin Books, 1988.
- Tiffin, Chris, and Alan Lawson, eds. *De-Scribing Empire: Post-colonialism and Textuality*. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Titely, E. Brian. *A Narrow Vision: Duncan Campbell Scott and the Administration of Indian Affairs in Canada*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1986.
- _____. *The Frontier World of Edgar Dewdney*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1999.
- Triggs, Stanley, et al. *Le Pont Victoria: Un lien vital/ Victoria Bridge: The Vital Link*. Montreal: McCord Museum of Canadian History, 1992.
- Trofimenkoff, Susan Mann. *The Dream of Nation: A Social and Intellectual History of Quebec*. Toronto: Gage Publishing, 1983.
- Trollope, Joanna. *Britannia's Daughters: Women of the British Empire*. London: Hutchinson and Co., Ltd., 1983.
- Tulchinsky, Gerald. *Taking Root: The Origins of the Canadian Jewish Community*. Toronto: Lester Publishing, 1992.
- Upton, L.F.S. *Micmacs and Colonists: Indian-White Relations in the Maritimes, 1713-1867*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1979.
- Valverde, Mariana. *The Age of Light, Soap, and Water: Moral Reform in English Canada, 1885-1925*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1991.
- Van der Kiste, John, and Bee Jordaan. *Dearest Affie...: Alfred, Duke of Edinburgh, Queen Victoria's Second Son, 1844-1900*. Gloucester: Alan Sutton, 1984.

- Wahrman, Dror. *Imagining the Middle Class: The Political Representation of Class in Britain, 1780-1840*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Walden, Keith. *Visions of Order: The Canadian Mounties in Symbol and Myth*. Toronto: Butterworths, 1982.
- _____. *Becoming Modern in Toronto: The Industrial Exhibition and the Shaping of a Late Victorian Culture*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997.
- Wallace, Elisabeth. *Goldwin Smith: Victorian Liberal*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1957.
- Ward, W. Peter. *White Canada Forever: Popular Attitudes and Public Policy Toward Orientals in British Columbia*. 2d ed. Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1990.
- Warner, Donald F. *The Idea of Continental Union: Agitation for the Annexation of Canada to the United States, 1849-1893*. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1960.
- Weeks, Jeffrey. *Sex, Politics and Society: The Regulation of Sexuality Since 1800*. 2d ed. London: Longmans, 1989.
- Weintraub, Stanley. *Edward the Caresser: The Playboy Prince who Became Edward VII*. New York, 2001.
- Westfall, William. *Two Worlds: The Protestant Culture of Nineteenth Century Ontario*. Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1989.
- White, Richard. *Inventing Australia: Images and Identity, 1688-1980*. Sydney: George Allen and Unwin, 1981.
- White, Richard. *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Widdis, Randy William. *With Scarcely a Ripple: Anglo-Canadian Migration into the United States and Western Canada, 1880-1920*. Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1998.
- Williams, Raymond. *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.
- Williams, Richard. *The Contentious Crown: Public Discussion of the British Monarchy in the Reign of Queen Victoria*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate Publishing, 1997.

- Williamson, Judith. *Consuming Passions: The Dynamics of Popular Culture*. London: Marion Boyars, 1986.
- Winks, Robin W. *The Blacks in Canada: A History*. Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1971.
- Wise, S.F., and Robert Craig Brown. *Canada Views the United States: Nineteenth Century Political Attitudes*. Toronto: Macmillan, 1967.
- Wise, S.F. *God's Peculiar Peoples: Essays on Political Culture in Nineteenth Century Canada*. Edited by A.B. McKillop and Paul Romney. Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 1993.
- Wortman, Richard S. *Scenarios of Power: Myth and Ceremony in Russian Monarchy. Volume One: From Peter the Great to the Death of Nicholas I*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995.
- Young, Brian. *George-Étienne Cartier: Montreal Bourgeois*. Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1981.
- Ziegler, Philip. *Crown and People*. London: Collins, 1978.

Theses

- Anstead, Christopher J. "Fraternalism in Victorian Ontario: Secret Societies and Cultural Hegemony." Ph.D. diss., University of Western Ontario, 1992.
- Boisvert, Donald Luc. "Religion and Nationalism in Quebec: The *Saint-Jean-Baptiste* Celebrations in Sociological Perspective." Ph.D. diss., University of Ottawa, 1990.
- Curcio, Linda Ann. "Saints, Sovereignty, and Spectacle in Colonial Mexico." Ph.D. diss., Tulane University, 1993.
- Dickens, Thomas W. "Winnipeg, Imperialism, and the Queen Victoria Diamond Jubilee Celebration, 1897." Master's thesis, University of Manitoba, 1982.
- Gordon, Alan. "Contested Terrain: The Politics of Public Memory in Montreal, 1891-1930." Ph.D. diss., Queen's University, 1997.
- Hallett, Mary Elizabeth. "The 4th Earl Grey as Governor General of Canada, 1904-1911." Ph.D. diss., University of London, 1974.
- Huskins, Bonnie L. "Public Celebrations in Victorian Saint John and Halifax." Ph.D. diss., Dalhousie University, 1991.

- McGowan, Mark. "'We are all Canadians': A Social, Religious, and Cultural Portrait of Toronto's English-Speaking Roman Catholics, 1890-1920." Ph.D. diss., University of Toronto, 1988.
- Shanahan, David. "The Irish Question in Canada: Ireland, the Irish and Canadian Politics, 1880-1922." Ph.D. diss., Carleton University, 1989.
- Smith, Victoria R. "Constructing Victoria: The Representation of Queen Victoria in England, India, and Canada, 1897-1914." Ph.D. diss., Rutgers University, 1998.
- Williams, Peter R. "Public Discussion of the British Monarchy, 1837-87." Ph.D. diss., Cambridge University, 1988.