

# End of the Great War in 1918 and its Impact on London, Ontario

## *Prelude, Celebrations and Aftermath*



A publication by The London and Middlesex Historical Society in honour of the men and women who served in the Canadian Expeditionary Force from 1914 through 1918.

**Cover:** To help pay for its military expenses, the government launched a series of war bond drives from 1914 through 1918. The cover illustration, from the *London Advertiser* (November 20, 1917), is one example of a war bond advertisement that appeared throughout the 1917 and 1918 Victory Bond campaigns. Other examples appear in the Appendix at the end of the monograph.

# **End of the Great War in 1918 and its Impact on London, Ontario**

*Prelude, Celebrations and Aftermath*

**Marvin L. Simner**

**ISBN 978-0-9866899-8-7**

Copyright©Marvin L. Simner, 2018. All rights reserved.

Published by the London and Middlesex Historical Society

Box 303, Station B, London, Ontario N6A 4W1

Printed by Creative Services, Western University, London, Ontario

# Contents

Abstract .....	1
Prelude .....	1
a) Armistice Delegation .....	4
b) The False Armistice .....	7
c) Cause and Outcome of the False Armistice .....	10
Celebrations during the week of November 11th .....	12
Aftermath .....	13
a) War Debt and Bond Drives .....	13
b) Demobilization .....	23
c) Treatment of Defaulters and Deserters .....	26
d) Continued Publication of Casualty Lists .....	29
e) Caring for the Wounded.....	30
f) Memorials.....	32
Appendix .....	43
End Notes .....	49

# End of the Great War in 1918 and its Impact on London, Ontario

## Prelude, Celebrations and Aftermath

Marvin L. Simner

### Abstract

November 11, 1918, marked the end of hostilities in what was initially called the “Great War” and is now known as World War I. The purpose of this publication is to review the events that took place immediately before, during and after the November 11<sup>th</sup> celebrations in London, Ontario, as recorded largely in the *London Free Press* and the *London Advertiser*. The Prelude focuses on how the approaching armistice was viewed, the nature of the events that unfolded before the armistice document was signed, and the “false armistice celebrations” that took place in London on November 7<sup>th</sup>. In the Aftermath we discuss a number of local issues that arose shortly after November 11<sup>th</sup> that included among others, how to memorialize those who perished during the war, how to repay the voluminous federal war debt, and how to deal with those who evaded conscription as required by the 1917 Military Service Act. Sandwiched between these two sections is an account of the armistice celebrations that occurred during the week of November 11<sup>th</sup>.

### Prelude

The first suspicions that the war might be nearing an end had begun to surface in the London papers in the form of few brief scattered reports from Western Europe in early October, 1918. Under a minor front page headline, “Fritz beaten to a frazzle,” the *London Advertiser* ran the following comment.

American troops are among the wounded who are arriving in large numbers at a southern English port every day. They are flushed with victory and jubilantly declare “the Allies have Fritz beaten to a frazzle.”

Wounded German prisoners, on the other hand, are most despondent. They admit the end is not far off and say it is impossible for Germany to hold out much longer.<sup>1</sup>

Similar thoughts were being expressed by German officials at the highest levels starting with an acknowledgement by Erich Ludendorff, Chief Quartermaster- General, that the war was lost. Of greatest importance, however, a note also was sent by Germany to President Wilson during the night of October 4<sup>th</sup> in the form of a “peace proposal.” The contents of the proposal stemmed from the “Fourteen Points” speech delivered by Wilson to the United States Congress on January 8, 1918, that “called for an equitable peace that would leave the Central Powers (Germany and her allies) with most of their territory intact, (and) obliged (them) to restore (the pre-existing conditions in) all invaded countries but not to suffer financial indemnity or even disarmament.”<sup>2</sup>

Germany’s proposal, however, was viewed with considerable distain in the West as suggested by the following front page headline that appeared in the *London Advertiser* on October 7<sup>th</sup>: “Allies expected to reject enemy’s peace proposal.” The reason for the rejection stemmed from the nature of Germany’s offer which was said to involve little more than terms that involved a negotiated settlement rather than an unconditional surrender which is what the Allies had hoped to achieve. This view was clearly articulated in the American press as summarized in the following examples from a front page article that appeared on October 22<sup>nd</sup> in the *London Free Press*.<sup>3</sup>

*New York Herald:* To-day, as on the heels of the American note of October 8, the demand of the American people will be - no armistice, no negotiations, no discussions, no peace until there is open admission of defeat by whatever government Germany may have, and no thought of peace until the German armies have surrendered unconditionally.

*Chicago Tribune:* There is but one mind in America on this war, that it shall go on to victory, to the utter destruction of Prussian militarism and to the establishment of peace founded on its ashes.

*Boston Post:* What is required from Germany is surrender—unconditional surrender—backed by overwhelming guarantees that leave no loophole for bad faith.

*Philadelphia Inquirer:* Whether the president acted wisely or not in appearing to open the door to discussion, he will not represent the overwhelming sentiment of the nation unless he now closes that door with a bang...In brief, nothing less than unconditional surrender will fill the bill.

General Currie, commander of the Canadian troops in Western Europe, also sent a personal note to the managing editor of the *Free Press* that offered his own evaluation of Germany’s peace proposal. The note, a portion of which is reproduced below, even cautioned against the belief that the war might be over soon.

The casualties have been high, but yet not so when the magnitude of the operations is considered. We have never known the Boche (the German army) to fight harder. He is like a cornered rat, and I believe

will fight most desperately until beaten absolutely and totally. I do not think that he can be finished this year, and I believe that next year he will fight more desperately than ever. The most foolish thing any of our people could do would be to imagine that victory is so close that their efforts might be relaxed.<sup>4</sup>

In keeping with the cautionary message in this note, as late as the morning of November 11<sup>th</sup> the following orders, as reported in the *London Advertiser*, were sent to all division and brigade commanders of the American Forces in France.

You are informed that hostilities will cease along the whole front at 11 o'clock a.m. November 11, 1918, Paris time. All communication with the enemy, both before and after the termination of hostilities is absolutely forbidden. In case of violation of this (order), severe disciplinary measures will be immediately taken. Any officer offending will be sent to headquarters under guard. Every emphasis should be laid on the fact that the arrangement is an armistice only, and not a peace. There must not be the slightest relaxation of vigilance. Troops must be prepared at any moment for further operations. Special steps will be taken by all commanders to insure strictest discipline and that all troops be held in readiness and fully prepared for any eventuality.<sup>5</sup>

Despite these reactions to Germany's proposal, the fact that Germany was even willing to entertain a proposal led to a series of meetings in Paris where the final terms for an armistice were drafted.<sup>6</sup> On November 5, 1918, a note was sent from Washington "notifying the German Government that the armistice terms were ready and in General Foch's hands."<sup>7</sup> Although the terms of the armistice would not be made available to the public "until the Germans have accepted or rejected them,"<sup>8</sup> on November 6<sup>th</sup> the *London Free Press* and the *Daily Advertiser* reported that a German armistice delegation had left Berlin for Spa, the location of the German Headquarters in Belgium. The meeting with General Ferdinand Foch, the Supreme Allied Commander, was scheduled to begin during the morning of November 7<sup>th</sup>. With the exception of the following information received from Germany and reported in the *Free Press*, the location of this meeting was not made public owing to the need for secrecy.

The German Government, having been informed through the President of the United States that Marshal Foch (may) receive accredited representatives of the German Government and communicate to them conditions of an armistice...(the representatives) request that they be informed by wireless of the place where they can meet Marshal Foch. They will proceed by automobile (from Spa) with subordinates of the staff, to the place thus appointed...there will be 10 persons in all...our delegation will be accompanied by a road-mending company to enable automobiles to pass the La Chapelle road, which has been destroyed...by reason of delay the German delegation will not be able to cross the outpost line until between 8 and 10 o'clock today...

In spite of the seriousness of this undertaking, what happened over the next several days in preparation for the signing were a series of misfortunes that, it can only be said, began to resemble scenes from a Charlie Chaplin movie. While most of the following information was reported at the time in the *Free Press* as well as in the *Advertiser*, unless otherwise noted, the

following summary is based on material in Epstein (1959), Rudin (1967), and Weintraub (1985).<sup>10</sup>

## **Armistice Delegation**

The first of many somewhat outlandish episodes started in Berlin with the appointment of the German Armistice Delegation. Matthias Erzberger was asked to head the Delegation although he was neither a high ranking member of the government nor a high ranking member of the active duty German military but, instead, was a civilian Secretary of State in charge of German propaganda in the Foreign Office. The reason Erzberger was chosen stemmed from Germany's difficulty in finding appropriate military personnel who were willing to endorse an armistice agreement, which was considered to be a disgrace, since Germany had waged the war in order to achieve an outright victory.

Erzberger was scheduled to leave Berlin via train at 4:45 p.m. on November 6. When the train reached Spa the delegates were to transfer to automobiles for the final leg of their journey on November 7<sup>th</sup> to an undisclosed Allied meeting place in France. The reason for secrecy was to prevent an attack by German reactionaries who were opposed to an armistice.

At three that afternoon (November 6<sup>th</sup>) Erzberger still had no documents authorizing his mission and even was unsure of the identities of the rest of his party. The Foreign Office was nearly empty, but he was referred to Herr Kriege, the head of the Legal Section. Kriege complained about not having been consulted and said that he was engaged in a dispute with the head of the Political Section about whether a Foreign Office could authorize the signing of a military armistice. "The entire course of world history," he objected, "knew of no precedents for making out the kind of document which was required." At 5:05 the train was getting up steam, but Erzberger refused to board. At 5:10 Count von Oberndorff (the second delegate) appeared and (finally) at 5:15 a messenger arrived with the required papers...

It is important to note that Erzberger not only did not know his final destination, he was also not permitted to sign an armistice agreement on behalf of the German Government. Instead, his role along with the others in the delegation was to negotiate with Foch for the best possible terms in the agreement. In short, he was given "Full power to conduct in the name of the German Government with the plenipotentiaries of the Powers allied against Germany, negotiations for an armistice and to conclude an agreement to that effect, subject to acceptance by the German Government." In the words of Hindenburg, he was told "May God travel with you, and see that you succeed in attaining the best that can still be secured for our Fatherland."

The train from Berlin did not arrive at Spa until the next morning (November 7) which was the day the delegation was to meet with Foch. At Spa the delegation was joined by General Detlev von Winterfeld, a prewar military attaché at Paris, and Captain Vaselow, a naval officer.

The Armistice Commission, composed of Erzberger, Oberndorff, Winterfeldt and Vanselow, left Spa and headed for the front (the Belgium/French border) in several automobiles around noon on November 7. The first car in which Erzberger sat with Oberndorff soon had a serious accident: it failed to make a sharp curve and smashed into a house, whereupon the second car hit the rear end of the first. The street was littered with glass and both automobiles were totally disabled. Erzberger and Oberndorff miraculously escaped injury...The journey continued in the three remaining cars. Progress was slowed since the roads were filled with endless columns of retreating German troops.

By six (that evening) the cars had only reached Chimay, just east of the French frontier, and there the commanding (German) general insisted that they could proceed no farther that night, as trees had been felled across the roads to cover the withdrawal of his men...Erzberger insisted that he must continue his journey and, in the end, succeeded in doing so after telephoning to German commanding officers in the neighboring headquarters at Trelon.

To protect the vehicles throughout their trip, a timed cease-fire was put in place along the road the convoy needed to travel. To make certain that the vehicles were safe,

...three German officers, carrying white flags, had gone ahead to report the coming of the Armistice delegation and to arrange for firing to cease so that the delegates could get through safely. A detachment of pioneers had cleared the (German) road of mines...It was 9:20 in the evening of November 7 when the delegation crossed the German front line. After leaving the German lines...A large white flag had been hoisted on the leading automobile (see the footnote below) and a trumpeter stood on the running board and continually blew short blasts.

Once the German delegation crossed the border and was now on the Allied side, it was courteously receive by the French, who supplied new automobiles for the further journey....Supper was served (on the Allied side) at one in the morning (November 8) at an isolated farmhouse that served as the headquarters for a (French) army command. The Germans were transferred to a railroad car a few hours later which then carried them with (window) blinds turned down to an undisclosed destination...At seven o'clock on the morning of November 8 the train arrived in a forest. About 100 meters away Erzberger saw another similar train. There was no station, no platform or shelter. The two tracks had been constructed for use by heavy railway artillery...The other train was the headquarters of Marshal Foch...At eight o'clock Erzberger was informed that Marshal Foch would receive him at nine (on November 8<sup>th</sup>).

The nature of the ensuing meeting with Marshal Foch, as reported in the *Free Press*, was governed by the following provisions that were established by the Allies during the Paris meetings.

The powers conferred on Marshal Foch only concerned the conclusion of an armistice...The modifications which he is qualified to grant are strictly limited. Any suspension of arms, even if it is asked for on philanthropic grounds, is out of the question. Marshal Foch will do nothing more than communicate to the delegates the already prepared conditions of the armistice.<sup>11</sup>

---

Footnote: Apparently, the flag used by the German Armistice Commission to cross the border on November 7<sup>th</sup>, was considered of sufficient importance to the editor of the *London Free Press* that the following notice appeared in the paper on November 8, 1919: "...this piece of the historic white cloth, a gift from France, is mounted on leather encased in a costly frame and was placed in the Royal Museum in Brussels."



As a result of these provisions, contrary to what the German High Command had anticipated, Germany was only expected to ask for an armistice, and not attempt to negotiate the terms of the armistice. Hence, the nature of the meeting on November 8<sup>th</sup> between the German Armistice Commission and the Allied Armistice Delegation headed by Foch was extremely formal and very brief as described below. According to an eyewitness account, when the Germans entered the room, Marshal Foch asked the Germans the reason for their visit.

ERZBERGER: The delegation has come to receive the proposals of the Allied Powers with a view to reaching an armistice.

FOCH: I haven't any proposal to make, but if the German delegates ask for an armistice, I can make known the conditions under which it can be obtained.

ERZBERGER and OBERNDORFF: The German Government asks for an armistice.

During the reading neither side spoke. Weygand (a member of the Allied delegation) says that tears poured down the cheeks of Captain Vanselow (a member of the German Commission) at the reading of the clauses providing for the occupation of the Rhineland. At the end of the reading Erzberger asked for an immediate suspension of hostilities and cited, in support of his plea, the disorganization of the German Army and the spread of revolution in Germany. ..Foch replied that the fighting would not cease until after the armistice had been signed...the meeting ended near 11:00 a.m. on November 8.

At the conclusion of the meeting, Foch imposed a 72 hour deadline when the signed document needed to be returned. Since the initial meeting with Foch ended at 11:00 a.m. on November 8<sup>th</sup>, this deadline meant that Foch needed to receive the signed document back from Germany no later than 11:00 a.m. on November 11<sup>th</sup>. The document was then sent via courier who traveled by automobile and train to the German High Command in Berlin. In view of the 72 hour deadline, Erzberger estimated the time required to complete the trip and asked Foch for a 24 hour extension. Erzberger's request was denied.<sup>12</sup>

The difficulties that had accompanied the German Commission from Berlin to Spa and then to Foch, now continued with the transmission of the armistice document from Foch to Spa via courier and then on to Berlin. On November 8<sup>th</sup> at 1:00 p.m. the German courier, Captain von Helldorf, left Foch by car with the assurance that his passage through the French/German military border would be arranged by Foch's staff prior to his arrival at the border. The French had calculated that von Helldorf would arrive at the border in about five hours. Contrary to the assurance that von Helldorf had received, however, when he reached the border he was not allowed to pass because the anticipated arrangements had, in fact, not been made. According to Rudin (p. 341) "the German soldiers "fired like the very devil" and for five hours kept their own courier (von Helldorf) from entering their lines despite his signals, his white flags, and his reckless exposure to danger." When night came he still had not been able to cross into German

territory. Upon receiving news of the courier's delay, and since the weather had partially cleared, it was decided to fly another German courier, Captain von Geyer, with another copy of the armistice document directly to Berlin. This second courier, together with a French pilot,

took off from Tergnier in a two-seat Breguet biplane....To the High Command (in Germany) Winterfeld had sent a wireless message which asked for a safe aerial route and altitude and marks of recognition for the airfield....(he also noted that the aircraft) will carry as distinctive marks two white streamers.

Unfortunately, in the message sent by Winterfeld, the second courier, von Geyer, was wrongly identified as von Helldorf, who obviously was the first courier traveling by car and then by train to Berlin. Although it is not known what happened to von Geyer, if the plane had landed as scheduled, it is quite possible that von Geyer would have been considered an illegitimate courier because Berlin was expecting a courier named von Helldorf, and not von Geyer, to be on the plane.

In the meantime, though, von Helldorf had been given clearance to proceed through the border since Major von Bapst arrived at the border with a safe-conduct pass. In view of the lengthy delay that von Helldorf experienced at the border, though, he was not able to enter Germany and arrive in Berlin until November 10<sup>th</sup> which, of course, was extremely close to the end of the 72 hour grace period which was to expire at 11:00 a.m. the next day. To deal with this problem the following actions took place.

At 6:30 p.m. (on November 10<sup>th</sup>), Foch had a message signed by Weygand and delivered to Erzberger, warning of the imminence of the seventy-two-hour deadline...At 2:05 a.m. on the eleventh, less than nine hours before expiration of the time limit, the German delegates (who were meeting with Foch, and not the High Command in Berlin), to no one's surprise, announced their readiness to conclude an agreement...At 5:12 a.m. the discussions were declared concluded, and Foch moved that, for convenience, the effective date be rounded off to five o'clock, so that the armistice could go into effect six hours later, on the hour. At 5:30 (on behalf of the Allies) Foch and Wemyss signed; after them the Germans. "There were tears in the eyes of our two brave officers, General von Winterfeld and Captain Vanselow," Erzberger wrote, "when, under hard compulsion, they took up their pens."..."*Tres bien*," observed Foch. But there would be no handshakes as the two delegations parted, the Marshal waving the Germans to go with "*Eh bien, messieurs, c'est fini, allez.*" After 1,564 days the worst war in history was over (Weintraub, p.153-157).

## The False Armistice

Adding to the blunders that had already occurred during the lead-up to the signing of the armistice on November 11<sup>th</sup>, four days prior to the signing, *The London Evening Free Press* ran the following erroneous banner headline on its November 7<sup>th</sup> front page. This premature headline was based on a cable that the *Free Press* had received from the United Press Service, to which it subscribed.

PARIS CABLE ANNOUNCES THE GREAT WAR IS ENDED! Armistice was signed by Germans at 11 o'clock this morning.

Owing largely to this headline, during the afternoon of November 7<sup>th</sup>, London launched a celebration as joyous and spontaneous as the celebrations that were to be held in the city following the actual signing of the armistice on November 11<sup>th</sup> (see below).

Magical was the change that took place in the staid everyday life of London at 12:00 noon to-day when with papers hot off the press the newsboys of the *Free Press* carried to the citizens the great news of the signing by Germany of the armistice and the definite crawling down of the War God, who for four long years has held sway over the hearts and lives of the world's people...Restaurants were emptied of their customers and men hatless and without overcoats rushed to the streets to buy a copy of the *Free Press*...Staid business men smacked each other on the shoulder and yelled with the abandon of youth like schoolboys...The stock board at Thompson & McKinnon's office, Richmond Street, was marked with the magic words, "War Closed."<sup>13</sup>

The *Free Press* also reported that many similar celebrations had been staged in the surrounding areas. Lambeth, for example, held an automobile parade followed by speeches, Kitchener was said to be "wild with joy" and in Listowel, all of the factories and stores were closed while Galt held "one of the greatest celebrations (it) has ever known."<sup>14</sup> In addition to these local celebrations, and as the result of the same United Press dispatch, similar festivities were held throughout North America as well as in Western Europe (for a full coverage of this material see Weintraub).

In sharp contrast to the headline in the *Free Press*, *The London Advertiser*, which was privy to much of the same information as the *Free Press*, but subscribed instead to the Associated Press telegraphic service, took a very different stand on this matter. In an equally bold front page headline, on November 7<sup>th</sup> the *Advertiser* stated that "GERMANY HAS NOT YET SIGNED THE ARMISTICE" and went on to explain its position in the following manner.

Shortly after noon today The Advertiser received a "flash" from a special news service that the German plenipotentiaries had signed the Allies' armistice terms at 11 o'clock today, and that hostilities were to cease at 2 o'clock. Without delay an extra edition of this paper was prepared, and was ready to go out to the newsboys, when a message came from Washington declaring the "flash" had no authority and could not be accepted as true until verified. Rather than take the chance of arousing the hopes of readers and then possibly having to dash them again, The Advertiser withdrew its special edition and awaited the official news.<sup>15</sup>

The next day the *Advertiser* continued to speak out on this matter.

False reports that Germany had accepted the terms of the armistice (on November 7<sup>th</sup>) and that fighting had ended threw the country into a delirium and turned out to be the greatest hoax of recent years...None of these unfounded rumors, of course, was received or distributed by the Associated Press,

which, on the contrary, was able by investigation carried out through official channels to establish that story was a hoax.<sup>16</sup>

As it is particularly important at this crisis in the war to prevent false and disturbing reports (from) gaining circulation, (the chief press censor was) particularly desirous of obtaining definite information regarding yesterday's fiasco...The censorship rule is that no information except quotations is to pass through tickers. If brought to your district by any news service please state which one carried it.<sup>17</sup>

The immediate question that arises, of course, is whether the *Free Press* and/or the United Press acted in such a way as to deliberately deceive the public. Aside from the obvious error in the *Free Press* headline, what is most surprising is that in a separate column that also appeared on the same November 7<sup>th</sup> front page, the *Free Press* ran the following announcement from Washington that the *Advertiser* had mentioned on its November 7<sup>th</sup> front page (see above), which suggests that the *Free Press* might very well have been aware of the error at the time of its publication.

WASHINGTON, D.C., NOV. 7, - NAVY CABLE CENSORS REPORTED TO-DAY THAT AN UNOFFICIAL MESSAGE HAD COME THROUGH FROM ABROAD ANNOUNCING THAT THE GERMANS HAS SIGNED THE ARMISTICE TERMS DELIVERED BY MARSHAL FOCH. NO AUTHORITY WAS GIVEN FOR THE STATEMENT AND WHILE IT ADDED TO THE AIR OF EXPECTANCY EVERYWHERE, OFFICIALS SAID NOTHING EXCEPT AN OFFICIAL DISPATCH COULD BE BELIEVED.

Needless to say, this announcement in the *Free Press* does raise a serious question, namely, was the material that had appeared in the *Free Press* headline based on an "official dispatch" as requested by the official censors? Apparently in an attempt to address this matter the *Free Press* then printed the following statement, also on November 7<sup>th</sup>, in bold capital letters on its front page.

THE UNITED PRESS BULLETIN (received on November 7<sup>th</sup>), WHICH BROUGHT THE FIRST NEWS TO AMERICA OF THE SIGNING OF THE ARMISTICE WITH GERMANY, WAS SIGNED PERSONALLY BY ROY W. HOWARD, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED PRESS, NOW IN GENERAL CHARGE OF THE UNITED PRESS ORGANIZATIONS IN FRANCE. THE DISPATCH ALSO CARRIED THE SIGNATURE OF WM. PHILLIP SIMMS, CHIEF OF THE PARIS BUREAU.

The following day (November 8<sup>th</sup>) the *Free Press* then attempted to justify its decision by reprinting a message it had also received from the United Press in New York.

Our cablegram received from Paris at noon yesterday signed by Roy W. Howard, president of the United Press, and William Philip Simms, manager of the Paris bureau, reporting the signing by the allies and Germany of an armistice, was written in plain English and not susceptible to any possible misconstruction as received in this office. No censor could have had any doubt as to its plain meaning...we have received no further word whatever from Mr. Howard or Mr. Simms, although messages were dispatched to them as early as 1 p.m. yesterday.<sup>18</sup>

To make matters even worse for itself, rather than apologize and retract the definitive words in its November 7<sup>th</sup> headline, the *Free Press* provided the following editorial comment which expressed little more than a hopeful prophesy in support of its November 7<sup>th</sup> headline.

Germany has determined to accept at once the only course that now or later lies before her. She is well aware of the terms of the armistice, even though the text of these terms may not yet have reached her. She knows the fate of Austria-Hungary, and can be sure that for herself the terms at least will be no better. Hence when she sends a delegation to Foch "to conclude an armistice," it can mean little else than that Germany has recognized defeat and that the war is virtually at an end. This, we say, is not necessarily so, but upon the face of things we are approaching peace at a gallop.

## Cause and Outcome of the False Armistice

Because the *Free Press* report of the signing of the Armistice on November 7<sup>th</sup> was obviously false what was it that led to this report? According to a lengthy analysis of the events that unfolded in Paris on that day (see Morris, 1957<sup>19</sup>) it is now known that Howard, who was the president of the United Press, was informed by Admiral Henry B. Wilson, commanding officer of all United States naval forces in France, that he (Wilson) had received a telegram around 4:00 p.m. (Paris time) on November 7<sup>th</sup> that "The armistice has been signed." Howard then asked,

"Is it official?"

"Official, hell," the admiral said, "I would say it is official, I just received this over my direct wire from the embassy. It's the official announcement."

Howard broke in. "I beg your pardon, Admiral, " he said, "but if this is official and you've announced it to the base and have given it to the local paper for publication, do you have any objection if I file it to the United Press?"

"Hell, no. This is official. It is signed by Captain Jackson, our naval attache' at Paris. Here's a copy. Go to it."

With Wilson's response in mind, Howard then sent a telegram to New York which arrived at 11:20 a.m. on November 7<sup>th</sup>. The news was immediately distributed to all of the papers that subscribed to the United Press (including the *Free Press*). Unfortunately, later that day an orderly arrived with a message for Howard from Admiral Wilson which stated that Wilson had just received a second message which stated that the first dispatch he had given to Howard was "unconfirmable." Although Howard immediately sent another telegram to New York with this second message, unfortunately "it did not reach the United Press office in New York until almost noon the next day, November 8."

In essence it would seem that the *Free Press* was not necessarily at fault in printing the November 7<sup>th</sup> headline because it had relied on the "truthfulness" of the first United Press Dispatch and the United Press was not necessarily at fault because Howard had faith in the

truthfulness of the message that he had received from Wilson. The problem arose, however, because Admiral Wilson had not submitted the report he had received from the naval attaché' to the official censor for confirmation but instead merely believed the authenticity of the report. To this day it is not known who was responsible for the false report that was sent by the attaché'.

On November 9<sup>th</sup> the *Advertiser*, as both a long time subscriber to the Associated Press and not one to permit a victory over a rival newspaper to simply drop, added the following editorial comments to its initial appraisal of both the *Free Press* and the United Press for their roles in the delivery of this false information to the public.

The recent perpetuation of the "greatest hoax of recent years" by the United Press Service and the newspapers gullible or unscrupulous enough to spread the report and persist in its authenticity does nothing if it does not make the old, reliable, world-embracing Associated Press stand out in real strength as the one dependable news service 365 days in the year...when a critical situation must be faced, the practice of anticipating what MAY happen and sending it forth as something that HAS happened, becomes highly dangerous and is indulged in only by the "fakers" of the business...The Associated Press is not playing for profits. It is owned in a mutual way by a chain of newspapers and it employs the highest grade newspapermen who can be secured, but it does not sign their names to dispatches. It is too big to be personal...The Associated Press can be relied upon to characterize its dispatches as official or unofficial. If it sends out something under its own responsibility it quotes its authority or qualifies its statements so that the charge of deliberately falsifying or misleading the public has never been successfully laid against it.<sup>20</sup>

Because of what had happened on November 7<sup>th</sup>, initially many Londoners were skeptical of the true announcement of an armistice on November 11<sup>th</sup>. The *London Advertiser* reported receiving phone calls that morning from a number of readers who felt the need to verify the information that had first appeared in a 3 a.m. edition of the *Free Press*,

"There's a boy away up here in the north end with an extra, saying the war is over. What does your paper say?" "The war is over all right," replied the *Advertiser*. Another man called "What's this about the war being over?" he asked. "It's true," said the *Advertiser* man. "Does your paper say so?" asked the man. "Yes." "All right. Thank you," said the inquirer. These two incidents are significant. It would appear that Londoners know where to inquire when they are anxious for reliable news.<sup>21</sup>

As soon as word of the November 11<sup>th</sup> armistice appeared in the two London newspapers, however, the level of jubilation within the city was not only widespread but overwhelming as summarized in a further edition of the *Free Press* that afternoon.

The news of Germany's capitulation was first given to London in an extra edition (of the *London Free Press*) shortly after 3 o'clock this morning. No other paper carried the information until a considerable time afterwards. The news quickly traveled. The fire department ran an engine out on to King Street, and the siren was left open, the shrill notes reaching nearly all parts of the city. Small Impromptu parades were quickly formed and the business and some of the residential districts of the city traversed. The

newsboys sold extras rapidly to eager buyers. People came out of private residences and apartment houses in numerous cases to learn the news and patriotic fervor and joy were unbounded.<sup>22</sup> (In addition to providing the source for this quotation, see endnote 22 for an evaluation and correction of the word “capitulation” in this paragraph as well as for the significance of the armistice document itself with regard to the end of the war.)

## Celebrations during the week of November 11<sup>th</sup>

When the Armistice was finally confirmed later that day, the mayor issued a proclamation that declared November 11<sup>th</sup> a public holiday. As reported in the *Free Press* the next day, all of London’s citizens were “called upon to unite in celebrating Victory,” and were invited to join a parade that terminated in Victoria Park.<sup>23</sup>

As early as 1 o’clock citizens began to assemble in the park and by 2:45 the members of city church choirs and the Community Chorus had arrived and taken up their stand...The approach of the triumphal procession was heralded long before it came in sight by the arrival at the park of thousands of onlookers from the streets on the route of march. (It was estimated that about 20,000 people had gathered in the park.) They formed a dense throng through which each of the units participating in the parade made its way, forming up in a hollow square around the band stand...The view from this point was an inspiring one. Almost as far as an eye could reach on every side stretched the packed lines of soldiers and citizens. The city’s returned men occupied a position of honour before the stand and other military units were ranged beside them...Led by the massed bands everybody in the park joined in the hymn of praise. It was sung as it had never been sung in London before, for not one of the vast throng failed to realize the debt of gratitude to God for the successful end of the great struggle.<sup>24</sup>

The festivities, however, started long before the parade even began. Shortly after 3 a.m. that morning when the news of the Armistice was first announced, “A bonfire that would have easily consumed the Kaiser and all the German royal family was started at the corner of Dundas and Richmond streets...” The flames were so high, in fact, that the fire department was needed out of fear that the nearby buildings would soon be engulfed. Later that day people “...from far and near... poured into London...on foot, in rigs and in autos till at the lowest estimate at least 50,000 people were gathered...to rejoice with each other at the good news.” That night an even greater bonfire was lit in Victoria Park.<sup>25</sup>

All day long boxes, barrels, posts and other inflammable articles were piled around a green sapling which was erected in an open space from which the sod had been dug. After nightfall the pile was saturated with kerosene, and an effigy of the “Beast of Berlin” was placed upon it...About 8 o’clock the Kaiser’s funeral pile was ignited. In a few moments the flames were leaping high above the tree-tops, and the crowd which had gathered around was driven back by the terrific heat...When everything seemed to be “quieting down,” the Marconi Club Band took up a position in the bandstand and began to play patriotic airs. The crowd, “warmed up” by the fire sang as they never sang before. Although in the years to come, great celebrations may be held, those who took part in the one in Victoria Park last night will never forget it. “London gets more like New York every day,” said one old chap, “and if they only had the signs all lit up you would not know the difference tonight. London sure does know how to celebrate.”

So joyous were the festivities on the 11<sup>th</sup> that one of the headlines in the *Free Press* the next day claimed that London celebrated for nearly 24 hours.<sup>26</sup> The celebrations finally culminated at the end of the week when a Victory Jubilee Carnival was held at the Winter Garden on November 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup>. On both days the Carnival featured the “latest music and newest songs” along with dancing to the strains of the Princess Ten-Piece Orchestra. All participants were urged to attend in costume and on the last day a “rousing grand finale” was held during which \$5 cash prizes were given for the best costumes in the following categories: comic, fancy, character, and historic.

The Winter Garden was thronged on Thursday night (November 14<sup>th</sup>)...The costumes far surpassed anything seen on carnival nights in the Winter Garden previously. The judges at the grand march to-night (November 15<sup>th</sup>) will have a hard task selecting the winners as hundreds were present and many new ones will be on hand when the judging is commended.<sup>27</sup>

In an announcement of the event, the *Free Press* stated that the largest prizes would be awarded to those who wore the most interesting and the most fitting costumes for the occasion. Fifteen dollars would go to the best representation of General Foch, \$10 prizes would be given for the best representation of Lloyd George, General Joffre, General Pershing, King Victor Emanuel and General Haig.<sup>28</sup> To ensure that a large number of Londoner’s would take up this challenge, it was also claimed that “there are men who look enough like one of these great men that only a little make-up would be necessary to win the prize.”

## Aftermath

Although the celebrations in London on November 11<sup>th</sup> were a huge success, a number of uncertainties still remained that needed to be addressed. As mentioned briefly above, these ranged from how to repay Canada’s massive war debt, how demobilization would take place, and how to treat the draft deserters and draft defaulters that resulted from the passage of the Military Service Act of 1917. There were also concerns over whether to continue to print casualty lists in the papers, how to care for the wounded who would be returning home, how best to memorialize those who lost their lives during the war, and finally, how future armistice days should be celebrated. Each of these matters will be discussed separately below.

### War Debt and Bond Drives

The following material is from the official history of the Canadian Army in the first world war by Nicholson (1962, p. 359-361).<sup>29</sup>

When on 1 August 1914 Canada tentatively offered to provide an overseas contingent in the event of war, the Dominion Government had suggested making “all necessary financial provision” for the “equipment, pay and maintenance” of such a force. The British Government agreed to the suggestion...Formal



discussions between the two governments opened in March 1915, with the Canadians insisting that they defray the “entire cost in every particular of their own contingents”...It specified that Canada provide the pay, allowances and pensions of her troops and defray the cost of transporting them and material to the United Kingdom...In addition to paying the actual cost of all supplies and stores issued in Great Britain, Canada would reimburse the British Government for transportation of Canadian troops and material on British railways...At the same time the cost of maintaining Canadian forces in France was considered...The War Office proposed a rate of six shillings per man per day. Of this amount, five shillings was reckoned as the average cost of maintaining a British soldier in the field. It took into account rations, forage, fuel, clothing, and stores of all kinds; all ammunition except artillery; the replacement of small arms, guns, horses, mules, mechanical transport and wagons; and the transportation of troops from England to France and rail transportation on the Continent.

In a very short time the British Government found it necessary to request a revision. On 2 March 1917 the War Office informed the Canadian High Commissioner that the one-shilling rate for artillery ammunition was unrealistic. Consumption by Canadian artillery units had risen from one shilling a day to 6s. 7d. for the three-month period of July to September 1916 (which include the Battle of the Somme with its tremendous artillery programmes). Sir George Perley was told that Australia and New Zealand had agreed to a revised rate of payment, and he asked that Canada should not only increase its capitation rate for artillery ammunition, but that the new rate should be made retroactive to 4 November 1916...There were prolonged negotiations between the two governments before settlement was reached ...on 15 August 1919 the War Office was informed that Canada would accept these accounts as representing her “financial share of the cost of ammunition expended in France from March 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1917, to November 11<sup>th</sup>, 1918. The Canadian refusal to antedate to November 1916 the revision of the capitation rates was a matter of some regret to the War Office...Altogether for the maintenance of her forces overseas (including expenditures for artillery ammunition) Canada (had agreed to pay) the British Government \$252, 567, 942.03.

In addition to the money owed to the British Government, Canada had a large number of other war expenses which was estimated to be around \$1,680,000,000.<sup>30</sup> How did the Dominion expect to raise sufficient funds to repay this debt?

Prior to 1914 the Dominion obtained revenue largely from customs and excise duties. During the war funds were raised through taxes imposed on telegrams, money orders, etc., and staples such as tea and coffee. Then in 1916 all Canadian corporations having \$50,000 or more in capital were required to file a yearly tax return and on September 20, 1917 the government received permission to levy a personal income tax of 4% on all income that exceeded \$1500 in the case of unmarried persons and widows or widowers without dependent children. For all others their income needed to exceed \$3000. These personal income tax amounts are quite interesting because the average salary in Canada in 1917 for supervisory and office employees in manufacturing was \$1,315 and for production workers it was \$760 which meant that very few citizens, other than the wealthy, would have been expected to pay any income tax (see Brown and Cook, 1974, Chapter 12, for a more complete discussion of this matter).<sup>31</sup>

Because the Canadian debt continued to grow, and because these various sources of revenue were insufficient to meet this growing debt, it was necessary to develop other means for raising funds. The method selected was to sell war bonds, an idea which was introduced and promoted in the following way by William Thomas White, the Canadian Minister of Finance.

The statement by the Hon. W. T. White....that Canada is growing richer despite the war should be welcome news to business interests and the public in general. He added that the country would be able to finance the war expenditures and take care of domestic expenditures after the war. For the first time in its history, the exports from Canada surpassed the imports. There should be no pessimism as to business when such a state of affairs is shown to exist, and when the time comes for the floating of a domestic loan (through war bonds) the country should respond with a spirit that will indicate the country's ability to be self-dependent financially, at least to a certain degree.<sup>32</sup>

### The 1915 and 1916 Bond Drives

On November 21, 1915, Canada launched its first war bond drive in the form of an initial issue of \$50,000,000 in \$100, \$500, and \$1000 denominations. The money was to be used by the Canadian government toward the purchase of Canadian goods and supplies to be shipped overseas. The bond sale ended on November 30<sup>th</sup>. To enhance the attractiveness of the issue, the bonds were sold at 2 ½ % below par, paid 5% annual interest, matured on December 1, 1925, and could be redeemed at par if held to maturity. All that was needed to purchase a bond was 10% down with the remainder due in roughly equal amounts through May 1, 1916.

On November 30<sup>th</sup> the Minister of Finance announced that the campaign had been a tremendous success in that sales had exceeded one hundred million dollars, which of course, was \$50 million more than the original issue. In London alone the results showed that the Northern Life Insurance Company purchased \$105,000, Huron and Erie purchased \$150,000, and London Life bought \$100,000 worth of bonds. The *Advertiser* even reported that "A widow of the city has asked for \$25,000, and there are many subscriptions of from \$1,000 to \$5,000."<sup>33</sup>

In view of these results it is not surprising that a similar campaign was launched 1916. This time the bonds, with a maturity date of October 1, 1931 and terms similar to those used in 1915, were on sale from September 11 through September 23. Although the government initially had hoped to sell \$100,000,000 worth of bonds, once again sales exceeded expectations. Two days after the campaign ended, the government reported that sales had reached \$180,000,000.<sup>34</sup>

Why were these campaigns so successful? Although very limited advertising took place during either campaign and neither appealed to patriotic fervor, instead both catered largely to the purchasers' self-interest.

While the Government is aware that Canadian patriotic sentiment alone could be depended upon to insure success, strict regard has been had in fixing the terms of the issue to prevailing financial conditions, with the object of making the offering attractive from a purely financial investment standpoint.<sup>35</sup>

For instance, if an individual with a yearly salary of around \$1,200 had purchased a \$500 bond, the bond would yield an annual return of \$30 which would exceed the person's weekly pay. For the widow who purchased \$25,000 worth of bonds, her yearly income would be \$1,250. In both cases the amounts were guaranteed by the government as long as the owner continued to hold the bond.

But why did the government not also appeal to patriotic fervor? To answer this question it may be helpful to consider the Canadian view of the war through 1916. When the war began in August 1914, it was assumed that it would not last very long and indeed reports in London's papers throughout 1915 and 1916 certainly suggested that despite Germany's best efforts, the Allies were winning and that the war would indeed be over soon. The following two reports appeared in the *Advertiser* in 1916 only three days apart.

The damage to the enemy's moral is probably of greater consequence than the capture of dominant positions and the capture of between 4,000 and 5,000 prisoners. To date, since the 1<sup>st</sup> of July, the British forces alone on the Somme front have met and engaged 35 German divisions, of which 29 have already been defeated and withdrawn exhausted. During the past week in the Belgium area only four aeroplanes have been reported as crossing our lines, while our machines have made between 2,000 and 3,000 flights across the enemy's lines.<sup>36</sup>

Germany will set another peace kite flying about the middle of October, British officialdom both military and civil confidently expects. Recent apparently well-authenticated rumors have reached London that Germany, suffering huge losses because of the recent allied offensive, is endeavoring to suggest an armistice through Spain or the United States.<sup>37</sup>

If the war were to be over soon, an aggressive sales campaign in 1915/1916 might not have been considered necessary. The government could have been sufficiently confident that the funds already available were sufficient to support the fighting in Europe until the end occurred. By 1917, however, the war had now entered its third year and, with the passage of the Military Service Act in August that called for conscription, it had now become abundantly clear that the war was not about to end soon and that the need for money had grown.

### The 1917 Bond Drive

In 1917 the drive was referred to as a Victory Bond Drive with a focus solely on patriotism and with a substantial effort devoted to extremely aggressive advertising and canvassing (the patriotic and emotionally charged nature of this advertising is illustrated in the Appendix). In London the campaign was inaugurated on November 1<sup>st</sup> with the sale of bonds scheduled to begin on November 12<sup>th</sup> and last three weeks. The goal for Canada this time was

\$300,000,000 and London's initial goal was set at \$3,000,000.<sup>38</sup> To achieve success at the local level an organizing meeting was held in London on November 2<sup>nd</sup> during which various committees were established.


The publicity committee will be divided into six parts...There will be a committee appointed to issue statements to the press. Another group will have charge of posters, street car advertising, etc. There will also be a committee to arrange for speakers and meetings in the churches, theatres, or halls...A "local stunt" committee will be formed (to provide) slogans, noise, lights, or anything that will help to bring the Victory Loan before the people...the fifth sub-committee will interview merchants regarding the need for the setting aside of space in their advertisements for Victory Loan matter...The last committee, to look after the schools, is considered a most important one by Major Ingram. It is expected that the children will take an important part in helping to raise London's share of the loan.<sup>39</sup>

What was this loan to be used for? The answer to this question was expressed in the following announcement that appeared in the *Advertiser* well before the bonds even went on sale.

The purpose of Canada's Victory Bond issue is two-fold: First, to maintain and support the Canadian army; second, to enable Great Britain to purchase in Canada those supplies which she must have to carry on the war and to provide food for the civilian population at home. Canada has in both those purposes an irresistibly impelling interest. Canada's patriotism demands that our soldiers lack nothing in food, clothing, guns or service to win the war. And, Canada's own self-interest demands that production shall increase, that commercial activity shall continue, that wages shall be maintained. What is more—Canada's self interest in this case is also patriotic duty—for we must maintain conditions of material well-being in Canada in order to sustain a maximum of war effort. Great Britain's market offers a sure welcome to the products of Canada's fields, mines, fisheries and factories. But Great Britain must have credit to buy these products. So in order to provide the necessary credit the Minister of Finance borrows from the people of Canada, by means of Victory Bonds, the proceeds of which will be used to establish that credit. You, and each of us—up to the greatest sum in our ability to invest; up to the point where it hurts; must all buy Victory Bonds.<sup>40</sup>

In short, although the aim of the 1917 campaign was said to be two fold (to benefit the Canadian troops overseas, and to establish a line of credit for Great Britain), in view of the space allotted to these aims in this announcement, it would seem that the latter was far more important than the former. In this regard, consider the caption and the message by Lloyd George in the ad on the next page that appeared in the *Advertiser*<sup>41</sup> on November 23<sup>rd</sup>, and couple this material with the fact that the United States had not only already established a \$500,000,000 line of credit war bond to enable Britain and France to purchase all of their necessary war supplies from America<sup>42</sup> but also had loaned Great Britain \$1, 860,000,000.<sup>43</sup> Clearly, unless Canada was willing to forego its own prosperity at home and at the same time allow the United States to fully underwrite the Monarchy's overall war expenses, it needed to engage in financial arrangements similar to those that already had been undertaken by the United States.

In early November London's team captains were chosen and instructions were given to the canvassers in preparation for the November 12<sup>th</sup> launch of the bond drive.<sup>44</sup> Even before that date, however, the Huron and Erie Mortgage Corporation and the Canada Trust Company had jointly purchased \$2,000,000 worth of bonds and it was anticipated that an additional \$1,000,000 in sales would be forthcoming from London Life. With these sums in mind, it was estimated that London could very well raise as much as \$6,500,000 by the end of the campaign.<sup>45</sup>



"The next solacing fact is this: That most of this debt will be a debt we owe to ourselves. Great Britain is borrowing in the main from her own children. The debt is in the family . . . and the more we lend the less will Great Britain owe to others. And that is the most important fact in our national security and national wealth."

— Premier Lloyd George  
in Albert Hall, London,  
October 22nd last.

**Happy will be the Nation which  
Owes its War Debts to  
its Own People**

**T**HE interest on Canada's war debt is now about \$25,000,000 a year.

If that interest is paid in Canada to the Canadian people it will go back into circulation in Canada, instead of being sent out to foreign creditors.

Likewise when the principal comes due it will be kept in Canada for re-investment and thus will aid in the development of the nation and its resources.

And that is a most important fact in Canada's national security following the war, just as it is important to Great Britain's National security that her war debt shall be owed to her own children, when the war is over.

So when you buy Victory Bonds you not only directly help Canada to fight the war but you contribute to the national security after the war.

On the launch date the government issued \$150,000,000 worth of bonds in \$50, \$100, \$500, and \$1,000 denominations with a tax free interest rate of 5 ½% and maturity dates of 1922, 1927, and 1937. The *London Advertiser* announced the opening of the London bond drive on the first page of its November 12<sup>th</sup> paper in the following words.

With every noise-making device in the city in full swing the drive on the pocket books of the citizens began sharp at 9 o'clock this morning. The church bells were ringing, whistles blowing, the fire wagons tearing the ozone with fearful sounds from their sirens. In brief, the city was covered with a regular barrage of noise such as possibly has not been heard in recent years.<sup>46</sup>

Although the focus of the campaign was on the establishment of a line of credit for Great Britain, the theme in the ads that appeared almost daily was on personal patriotism and on the need to support the fighting men in Europe.



**This Is YOUR War  
As Well As His**

**N**O "slacker." he—he enlists and gives his life to defend you who cannot go. He fights for you and your family as well as his. He has faith in you. He believes you, as well as your rich neighbor, will at least offer your dollars just as he is offering his life.

The boys on the firing line must have guns and ammunition. They must be fed and clothed. They must have supplies without end—without stint.

It is part of your duty—whether you give assistance in other ways or not—to help in the great task of providing the sinews of war. That can be done only with money—millions and millions of money.

Enlist now in the Army of Bond Buyers and lend your money to the Government at 5½ per cent interest. It's the same as depositing your funds in a savings bank, except that when you buy a Victory Bond you are investing in Canada, and your money works for your country as well as for yourself.

Remember, the man at the front does not offer one-tenth of his life to his country—he offers it all! What percentage of your worldly goods are you going to lend your country?

**Buy a Victory Bond Today**

This space is contributed to  
Canada's Victory Loan by

**SMALLMAN/BERAN**

Because the bonds were sold by application, it was not necessary for individuals to pay the full price at the time of purchase. To illustrate the widespread acceptance of the drive, five days after the campaign began a column appeared in the *Advertiser* with comments received from several of the canvassers.<sup>47</sup>

M.J. Abbot told of one woman with a soft heart. She gave her bond to a friend who was almost down and out, and bought another.

J.A. Croden took nineteen applications in one block on Grand Avenue Friday.

A call came into headquarters Friday night from a C.P.R. man asking that a canvasser be sent to his house as soon as possible to make out a \$500 application.

After making a sale to the lady of the house, the salesman asked to see the maid. "I don't think that she has any money, but you can see," said the lady. The salesman did, and signed the housemaid up for a \$500 bond.

How successful was the campaign? On December 4, 1917, which was several days after the campaign was over, the "Victory Loan headquarters announced that London has gained its (final) objective of \$6,500,000 (and)...The county shot into the two million (dollar) class, justifying the statement often made that Middlesex is the banner county of Ontario..." (The county sold a total of \$2,075,450).<sup>48</sup>

### The 1918 Bond Drive

In 1918 an even more aggressive campaign was implemented. The drive began on October 28<sup>th</sup> and ended on November 18<sup>th</sup> with the government printing 2,500,000 bonds in the same denominations as before and at the same interest rate.<sup>49</sup> The quota for London was now elevated to the purchase of \$7,300,000 worth of bonds.<sup>50</sup>

To ensure success a unique element was built into the 1918 drive. Each municipality that achieved its quota would now be awarded a large Honour Flag to be mounted in a prominent location in front of its municipal office building. If it surpassed its quota by 25% a crown would be added to the flag, and for every additional 25%, a further crown would be added. To capitalize on the competitive nature of the drive a number of firms promoted sales by stressing these goals in their ads. For example, the Fidelity Trust Company of Ontario asked in a local ad that they sponsored, "How many crowns shall we have on our Honour Flag?"<sup>51</sup> and in an ad sponsored by Grafton & Co., Ltd. the firm made the following statement combined with appropriate military terminology.

It is up to each of us individually and to all of us collectively. We have to get that Honour Flag and get it quickly...The Honour Flag will fly with more than two crowns on it if we all do our part and go OVER THE TOP TOGETHER.<sup>52</sup>

In keeping with the competitive nature of the campaign, both newspapers often reported the number of bonds sold throughout Ontario as well as across Canada. Furthermore, The *Free Press* claimed early in the campaign that “London’s Victory Loan organization and bond salesmen will keep right on working up to late tonight, no Saturday half-holiday prevailing for the Victory Loan. Confidence is expressed that the first week of the campaign will close with at least one-half of London’s quota raised.”<sup>53</sup> Special canvassers were recruited to visit firms that were expected to purchase more than \$5,000 worth of bonds and to visit all military personnel stationed at Carling Heights. Enlisted men were expected to purchase \$50 bonds while officers were asked to purchase \$150 worth of bonds. In addition, owners of the various London industries were asked to “encourage their employees by financing their purchases and allowing the money to be paid back (to the firm) in ten installments if necessary.”<sup>54</sup> Even street car conductors were “asked to remind the people that now is the time to buy Victory Bonds when they call out the name of the streets...(and) Guests in hotels who leave calls for an early morning wakeup (were to be) greeted thusly: “Good morning, Mr. Johnston, have you bought your Victory Bonds. It is now 7:15.”<sup>55</sup> Needless to say, messages such as these given throughout the campaign strongly encouraged people to purchase bonds to the limit of their capacity.

What caused this change in focus between 1917 and 1918? Because the war was nearly over by October 28, which was when the 1918 drive began, and sales ended one week after the November 11<sup>th</sup> Armistice was declared, the concluding portion of the 1918 campaign had a decidedly different orientation as outlined in an ad that appeared on November 6<sup>th</sup>.<sup>56</sup>

After fighting ceases it will cost hundreds of millions of dollars to maintain Canada’s soldiers until they can be demobilized.

Canada may have to keep her quota of men in occupied enemy territory.

Canada will have to transport her army home.

All this will have to be financed through the Victory Loan 1918. So whether or not Germany accepts the Allies’ terms, the Victory Loan 1918 must be subscribed—and over-subscribed. Nothing less than this will enable Canada to complete her war effort and to maintain her agricultural and industrial prosperity.

All of these critical factors were succinctly summarized by the *Free Press* in an article published on November 12<sup>th</sup>.<sup>57</sup>

1. To bring the boys home.
2. To maintain them in Europe till peace is firmly established.
3. To maintain our industrial activities and provide new employment for munition workers and soldiers as they return.
4. To continue our loan to Britain for buying Canadian food.
5. To enable Canadian workers to get their rightful share of orders for rebuilding Belgium and France.



In short, in 1918 funds were no longer required to establish a line of credit for Great Britain. Instead, money was now needed to pay for transportation “to bring the boys home,” to pay for the support of the Canadian troops who would be needed to keep the peace in Europe, and finally, to support Canadian industry and to ensure that adequate employment opportunities would exist to meet the needs of those who soon would return from overseas.

To illustrate the level of success associated with this change in emphasis, by mid-November Middlesex County had already exceeded its quota through sales that totaled \$1,300,900 and London itself had sold \$5,915,400 worth of bonds.<sup>58</sup> When the campaign finally closed at midnight on November 18<sup>th</sup>, London’s sales had reached \$9,087,100 and the county had achieved a total of \$2,400,000 in sales.

Hence, in 1918, the overall sales clearly exceeded the sales generated in 1917. In commenting on the outcome of this campaign, it is not surprising that the Campaign Chairman remarked that “This only justifies my faith in the citizens of London (and Middlesex)...I knew that they were as loyal and patriotic as any in Canada, and they have proved this in a greater measure than I believed possible.”<sup>59</sup>

Finally, and to return to the question raised at the beginning of this section, how did the Government expect to honour its overall debt of \$1,680,000,000 and now expect to honour its further annual interest obligations to those who purchased bonds in 1915, 1916, 1917, and 1918? In 1917, for instance, it was estimated that the interest on the bonds was about \$25,000,000 each year and in 1918 the yearly interest was estimated to be more than \$37,000,000.<sup>60</sup> In both cases since many of the bonds could be held for as long as 15 to 20 years, this meant that the total debt, over time, could nearly double in size! The answer to this question was given in a speech to the House of Commons on February 15, 1916 by the Minister of Finance.

We are justified in placing upon posterity the greater portion of the financial burden of this war, waged as it is in the interests of human freedom, and their benefit is equal if not in greater degree than our own...Canada in future years of peace, with the prosperity which will be her heritage from the development of unbounded resources, will be able to meet the interest and sinking fund charges upon such debt as we shall be obligated to incur in defense of our country and its liberties (Brown and Cook, 1974, p. 230).<sup>61</sup>

The Minister’s views were subsequently supported by the *London Advertiser*.

Victory bond financing spreads the repayment of the bonds to the rising generation and the next generation so that this generation which is doing all the fighting, suffering most of the privations caused by the war, will not have to do all the paying. Generations yet unborn will reap the harvest of freedom this generation is fighting for and it is only fair that a portion of the burden of paying the tremendous cost should be borne by the future beneficiaries.<sup>62</sup>

Needless to say, although clearly necessitated by the growing war-time debt, the government may have been forced to take a very different approach than is typically the case today over whether it is appropriate to burden future generations with the current government's financial obligations.

## Demobilization

Shortly after hostilities ended there were three issues associated with demobilization that received considerable attention in the local press. The first had to do with when the troops would be coming home, the second focused on the order in which they would be discharged and the third revolved around how they would be honoured when they arrived. The day after the armistice was declared Ottawa outlined a general demobilization policy with the following provisions. An index system was prepared that contained the name of every man, his marital status, how long he had served in the military and his occupation prior to enlistment. The men were then ranked according to each of these variables. Preference for departure from Europe was given, first, to married men, second to their length of service overseas, and third, "to farmers, railroad men, and others who may be speedily absorbed by the labor demand on their return."<sup>63</sup>

Although the *Free Press* had endorsed the part of this approach that concerned married men,<sup>64</sup> by early December the overall approach had met with considerable criticism by a number of senior military officers who were called together to discuss the government's proposal. News of this meeting was in a letter published by the *Advertiser* from Major-General E. W. Morrison of the Canadian Artillery, who summarized the government's plan in the following way.

They (the married men) were to be segregated in a big camp and divided up according to trade – butchers, bakers, candlestick makers, bartenders, farmers, etc., and then the trades most required were to go home first. After them the bachelors would be dealt with in the same way. In other words, the people of Canada would never see the corps of which they have heard so much. All they would see would be drafts of farmers and bartenders and any other old thing, who would be delivered to Canada at the rate of 2,000 a day, extending over a period of six months...

Instead, according to General Morrison, the proper approach to demobilization would be to enable the men to return home according to seniority of divisions, not by seniority of individuals or trades. In other words, the units should go home under their own officers and "be marched through the cities from which they came, so that the people of Canada may have an opportunity of seeing the men and the regiments and batteries who have fought for them for the last three or four years."<sup>65</sup>

It was Morrison's approach that eventually was accepted by the Government. Beginning in November, 1918, the troops arrived in Canada either according to unit or destination, although destination seems to have taken precedent. On November 30, 1918, of the 115 soldiers who docked in Canada, 33 were destined for London independent of unit<sup>66</sup> and on December 4<sup>th</sup> 38 more arrived at the London C.P.R. terminal also independent of unit.<sup>67</sup> The numbers then began to increase logarithmically. On December 13<sup>th</sup> 647 soldiers landed and 198 were destined for southwestern Ontario and on December 14<sup>th</sup> the White Star liner *Olympia* arrived at Halifax with 5,207 returning soldiers with 433 men destined for the London area.<sup>68</sup>

Because London, like many other cities in Canada, wished to honour its returning veterans, on December 16, 1918, Alderman Frank E. Harley, moved "that a suitable decoration be placed on Richmond Street, facing the G.T.R. and C.P.R depots for the return of our soldiers.."69 It wasn't until April 2<sup>nd</sup>, however, that City Council was asked to consider a motion regarding the nature of the decoration.<sup>70</sup> It was also around this time, at least as far as London was concerned, that the unit became more important than the destination.

On April 12<sup>th</sup> Council received word that the "1<sup>st</sup> Battalion of the famous first division of the Canadian Expeditionary Force will arrive in the City" later that month. Because the 1<sup>st</sup> Battalion was organized in Military District No. 1, which had its headquarters in London and was scheduled to be discharged in London, that plans to honour this unit were developed and submitted to Council. The plans called for a large victory arch.<sup>71</sup> The arch (shown on the next page) was subsequently erected by Smallman and Ingram in a location that, no doubt, was beneficial to their business, i.e., "across Richmond street opposite the Richmond street entrance to the firm's premises."<sup>72</sup>

Council was further informed on April 14<sup>th</sup> that the men from the 1<sup>st</sup> Battalion, transported from Europe to Canada on the troopship *Olympia*, would probably arrive in London on Tuesday the 22<sup>nd</sup> or Wednesday the 23<sup>rd</sup>. On April 22<sup>nd</sup> the *Free Press* listed the names and home addresses of all the men from Branford, Chatham, Galt, Guelph, Ingersoll, Kitchener, London, Sarnia, Stratford, and Windsor who would be on the *Olympia* and who were destined to arrive in London. The London list alone contained 62 names.<sup>73</sup> The *Olympia* landed in Halifax on April 21<sup>st</sup> and the battalion was scheduled to arrive by train in London at the Grand Trunk Railway terminal at 10:00 a.m. on April 24.<sup>74</sup>

Prior to the train's arrival extensive preparations had been made for a welcoming parade and reception, now planned for April 24<sup>th</sup>. The local papers also published a request for volunteers. In particular, people with cars were needed to bring hospitalized soldiers to the parade, to drive the returning local soldiers and their families to their homes and to deliver soldiers who were not from London back to the train station to continue their trip to other locations such as Windsor.

To ensure that an adequate crowd would attend the parade the following announcement together with an outline of the planned celebration appeared on April 22<sup>nd</sup> in the *Free Press*.

Whereas the Council of the City of London has by resolution requested me to issue a proclamation declaring that the day the 1st Battalion returns shall be a Public Holiday for the reception of the battalion. These presents are to make known to the citizens that Thursday, the 24<sup>th</sup> day of April, 1919, is hereby declared a public holiday and I request all persons in the City of London to observe the day as a public holiday, and to give their assistance in extending a welcome to the men returning. Ratepayers along the line of march are particularly requested to decorate their premises. It is (further) requested that citizens will refrain from throwing talcum or other powder during the celebration.



The 1st Battalion, Canadian Expeditionary Force, will arrive in London, via the Grand Trunk Railway at 10 a.m. on Thursday, April 24, and will detrain at the Richmond Street station. The column will march to Carling's Heights via Richmond, Dundas, Adelaide, Rattle, Elizabeth and Oxford streets. The following units will be formed up in line of battalions in mass on York street, facing south between Richmond and Clarence streets, time 10 a.m.; the Great War Veterans on the left, (previously) returned men of the 1<sup>st</sup>

Battalion in the center, and the 1<sup>st</sup> Battalion, Canadian Expeditionary Force on the right. The starting point will be the corner of York and Richmond streets. A small detachment of police, mounted and dismounted, to move at the head of the column.<sup>75</sup>

Around 200 people were present to greet the train as it arrived at the station and all along the parade route were throngs of people waving flags and cheering as the soldiers passed by. Once the military procession neared Dundas, it proceeded through the arch then passed the armouries on Dundas, “where the command ‘eyes right’ rang out as each unit came within 10 paces of the saluting point followed by the command ‘eyes left’ when ten paces past,” it then turned north on Adelaide and proceeded to Carling’s Heights (later known as Wolseley Barracks)<sup>76</sup> The Salvation Army band, the band of the 7<sup>th</sup> Hussars, the juvenile piper band, and the Marconi Club band, accompanied the procession to provide appropriate military decorum.

On the arrival of the column at Carling’s Heights the 1<sup>st</sup> Battalion, Canadian Expeditionary Force, formed up in the enclosure in front of the platform facing east, the (previously) returned men of the same battalion on their left. The Great War Veterans Association then formed up in the rear of the center. At Carling’s Heights brief speeches of welcome were made by the mayor and Rev. H.B. Ashby and Rev. Bryon Snell... (After the speeches) the ropes of the enclosure were cut and the relatives and friends streamed in to see their loved ones... after which the men dined and then passed through the discharge depot...There were many gripping scenes, as mother, father, brother, sister, wife and sweetheart greeted their boys just home from foreign lands, home from the battle-scarred fields of France and Flanders.<sup>77</sup>

## **Treatment of Defaulters and Deserters**

In addition to honouring the returning soldiers, both papers devoted considerable space to a closely related question, namely how to handle the men who had shirked their military obligations during the war. To understand the issues that were of concern here, it is necessary to briefly review the Military Service Act of 1917 and its impact on Canada (for a full discussion of this matter see Nicholson, 1962, pp. 215-222). During the early years of the war voluntary enlistments were sufficient to meet the government’s initial commitment to raise 250,000 men to fight in Europe. By the end of 1915, and in view of the number of casualties that the Canadian Expeditionary Force had experienced, it had become evident that a larger number of troops was required. Hence, on January 1, 1916, Prime Minister Borden increased that goal to 500,000. By December 1916, however, it had also become apparent, at least in some quarters, that this new goal would be difficult to achieve through voluntary enlistments alone and that some form of compulsory enlistment mechanism needed to be implemented. To this end, on June 11, 1917 the Prime Minister introduced the Military Service Bill which called for conscription. Despite considerable opposition, the Bill became an official act on August 29<sup>th</sup> and required all unmarried or widowed men between the ages of 20 and 34 years (designated as Class I men) to register for the draft by November 10<sup>th</sup> (Nicholson, 1962, p. 344). Although at the end of the war the government’s figures showed that approximately 400,000 men had

registered, it was hoped that of this number, at least 100,000 would become available through conscription to top up the number normally gained through voluntary enlistments alone hereby enabling the Government to reach this new goal of 500,000.

One of the major problems in enforcing the Military Service Act was that of dealing with the many defaulters. These included men who failed to register, or who defaulted on a subsequent order to report for medical examination or for military duty, or became deserters. Nearly 28,000 men in Class I were offenders in one of these respects...when hostilities ended there were still some 20,000 Class I men who had neither reported nor had been apprehended (Nicholson, 1962, p. 352).

Because these men had disobeyed the law, shortly after November 11, 1918, there was much discussion in London's papers concerning how best to deal with them. Throughout the later part of December, 1918, and during the early months of 1919 answers gradually became available. Several articles in the *Free Press* suggested that fines in the order of \$500 were being imposed on those who had been identified and arrested as defaulters.<sup>78</sup> The government had also considered taking away their right to vote and even posting their names on public buildings.<sup>79</sup> The deserters, on the other hand, when captured had received jail sentences. The *Advertiser* reported the case of one deserter who received a six month jail term<sup>80</sup> while the *Free Press* reported the case of another deserter who received a two year jail term.<sup>81</sup> Moreover, the acting minister of justice was quite explicit with regard to both of these infractions when he stated that "there is no amnesty in respect of offences committed against the Military Service Act and that the policy of the Government to prosecute these offenders rigorously remains steadfast and in full effect."<sup>82</sup>

Despite such harsh language, the government's overall view on these matters gradually began to change. In April, 1919, General Sam Hughes "expressed the opinion that there should be a uniform system of administering the law with uniform penalties in regard to defaulters and deserters." Because Hughes expressed this view in Parliament, his remark to penalize both provoked an extremely negative response from the Opposition.

The sympathy of the Opposition towards the defaulter (and deserter) was evident and every appeal for mercy and leniency was received with applause from the left of the Speaker. D.D. MacKenzie, Opposition leader, pleaded that Canadians were not used to war. Many young men lacked nerve and fiber to fight. They were thus not criminals in defaulting or deserting. They should not be treated as such. He urged that clemency should be shown.<sup>83</sup>

In keeping with the Opposition's point of view, on December 21, 1919, the Government released the following statement which held that because the war was now over and peace was at hand, both of these offences should be forgiven. As stated in the Government's own words:

...in view of the restoration of peace and for the general purposes of (the) reestablishment (of peace), that amnesty should be graciously extended to all such military offenders so that those now undergoing imprisonment may be discharged; so that pending prosecution of the offenders aforesaid may be

discontinued, and so that all offenders heretofore committed and the penalties incurred and not actually enforced and paid shall be generally pardoned, forgiven and remitted...the greatest relief will be given by the amnesty to offenders against the act who have not been apprehended, but who have been sought for by the authorities.<sup>84</sup>

This statement is extremely interesting since, during the years prior to the implementation of conscription, men who did not voluntarily join the military without a valid excuse were typically viewed as “slackers, or as shirkers and malingerers” and were the target of the “public’s opprobrium” (Dennis, 2017, p. 7).<sup>85</sup> In fact when conscription was introduced the government even provided an opportunity for those who would be conscripted to voluntarily enlist prior to being “forced” to join the military in order to avoid being looked upon as malingerers once they entered the service. As an example of how this attitude was expressed at the local level, E.T. Essery, Chairman of the I.O.D.E made the following remarks during a recruitment drive in 1917 at the Majestic Theatre in London.

What will the man be thought of after the war is over who has never offered to enlist? He will feel like crawling in a hole and well he may feel like that...About half of the young men of this city will not look a recruiting officer in the face. They have the guilty conscience, and they know it...You can enlist either for overseas or home defense, and it is your duty to do one or the other...<sup>86</sup>

Because this negative attitude toward the non-volunteer was so widespread throughout the war, it would seem that as soon as the government announced a general pardon for both defaulters and deserters, there would be widespread public protest. Although this may have been the true elsewhere, such was not the case in London. After the amnesty announcement appeared in the *Advertiser*, every issue of the paper was reviewed throughout the remainder of the month for letters of protest as well as for negative editorial comments. None were found. Equally striking was the absence of any response from the local Great War Veteran’s organization. Perhaps even more striking, however, was the fact that the *Free Press* did not even mention the government’s desire to issue amnesty. Hence it would appear that for Londoners the question of forgiveness in the case of both defaulters and deserters was a non-issue.

While the reason for this lack of interest is not clear, two possible answers come to mind. The first may have had to do with the number of defaulters and deserters who were from the local area. A list of men charged as defaulters under the Military Service Act had been made available to those responsible for handling the affairs of Military District 1. According to the military officer in charge of this district, “there are probably no more than three and at the outside not more than five men belonging to this district (who would) benefit from such an (amnesty) order.”<sup>87</sup> The situation with regard to the deserters was quite similar in that the official figures showed there were only ten deserters from London who were still at large.<sup>88</sup> In essence, since the numbers in both cases were extremely small, the issue of amnesty might not

have been considered sufficiently important for Londoners to bother with. It is also possible that because the amnesty proclamation was issued on December 21<sup>st</sup>, many Londoners might have been reluctant to spoil the Christmas holidays for area families whose relatives had defaulted or deserted and had been pardoned for their actions.

## Continued Publication of Casualty Lists

Nearly 60,000 Canadians had lost their lives during the course of the war and another 173,000 had been wounded. Casualty lists bearing the names of those from the local area frequently appeared throughout the war in London's papers and were especially pronounced after each of the major battles. For example, approximately one month following the battle of Vimy Ridge the *London Advertiser* reported the names of nine men from the surrounding area who had been killed, twelve others who had been wounded, and four more who had died from their wounds.<sup>89</sup>

Even though all fighting was over as of 11 o'clock on November 11, 1918, and many Londoners no doubt had hoped to put the war behind them, the public continued to be reminded of the horrific toll that the war had imposed on the local community through casualty lists that appeared days and even weeks following November 11<sup>th</sup>. On November 15<sup>th</sup> the list contained 34 names, on November 18<sup>th</sup> 12 more were added followed by 11 others on November 19<sup>th</sup>. In fact, even as late as April 7, 1919, the *Free Press* ran a column labeled "Fresh Casualties Issued at Ottawa."<sup>90</sup> What must have been especially troublesome to local readers, however, were words such as "wastage" that sometimes appeared in the press to describe the human carnage that had taken place on the western front.<sup>91</sup>

Although none of these casualties occurred after November 11, 1918, why did the lists still appear in the paper? Several reasons were given by the *London Advertiser*. The first had to do with the fact that because the lists of those killed or wounded were quite large and had to be submitted from overseas by telegraph, there was often a considerable delay in transmission. Indeed, on November 16, 1918, the acting director of the *Advertiser* even stated that the paper expected to receive more names and it was felt that this backlog needed to be disposed of. The headline to the article ("Grief that comes in casualty lists to soon be ended"), however, did express the view that the paper was mindful of the fact that the continuous printing of the lists might have been painful to many of its readers.

With the advent of peace it will relieve the suspense of many people in Canada to know that the casualty lists often weeks behind are tapering off to the end. There are numerous tragic cases, where, since the celebration of peace, news has come of men previously killed in action. We are not exactly certain, but our advices indicate that about five hundred more are to be cabled.<sup>92</sup>



A second, and perhaps an even more telling reason, had to do with the procedure followed by the government when making the names on the casualty lists public. The usual procedure was to notify the next of kin as soon as possible after reports had been received from the field. Once this was accomplished, newspapers were then allowed to print the names.

Unfortunately, this procedure was not always successful. The *London Advertiser* in May, 1917, recounted an instance when “after the next of kin, a father, was notified, his wife, who was away from home (at the time the notice arrived), saw the death of her son reported in the paper before he (the father) could notify her.”<sup>93</sup> Because the wife was extremely upset at receiving the news of her son in this fashion, the father complained to Ottawa.

As the result of his complaint, the practice of publishing local names was discontinued. In commenting on this matter, the *Advertiser* informed its readers that while “casualty lists, embracing the whole of Canada, continues to be received at this office, and while the (local) names cannot be printed, the *Advertiser* preserves the lists for some time, and will be glad to permit anyone to consult the lists.” The *Advertiser* then stated that local names would be printed if the family agreed to their release. With this offer in mind, it could be that many families in the London area, after receiving an official notice from the government, might have wanted distant friends and relatives to be informed of the status of their sons and therefore requested that their names be published.

## Caring for the Wounded

Between August, 1914 and November, 1918, 614,580 men served in the Canadian Expeditionary Force. By the end of the war 59,544 (9.6%) had either been killed or died of illness while 172,950 (28.1%) had been listed as suffering from non-fatal battle casualties, or other injuries (Nicholson, 1962, p. 546 & 548). On November 27, 1918, the *London Advertiser* carried the following message.

Fear is expressed in England that Canada is scarcely ready for the eight thousand Canadians still in hospitals in France, and the forty thousand in hospitals in England. These 48,000 Canadians should be returned to Canada to liberate the hospitals there for the imperial troops wounded in the last stage of the war...The immediate return of wounded soldiers from overseas will find Canada unable to provide accommodations for the men who have so nobly fought in the Empire's cause.<sup>94</sup>

How did London cope with this situation? Throughout much of the war the sick and wounded had been sent to Canada on five hospital ships (MacPhail, 1925, p. 239).<sup>95</sup> The following account of those who arrived in London appeared in the *Advertiser* on May 3, 1919.<sup>96</sup>

Twenty-four wounded and invalided soldiers, several on crutches, other speechless from shell shock, and still another demented as a result of his terrible experiences, returned at 12:45 o'clock this afternoon via C.P.R...The men (transported to the Military Convalescent Hospital) were on the whole the most seriously

wounded lot that has returned to the city since the outbreak of war. Representatives from the Soldiers' Aid Commission and the Returning Soldiers' Club were at the depot to welcome the men.

After the war large numbers continued to arrive. On December 8, 1918, "the hospital ship *Araguaya*, bringing 801 wounded Canadians, (docked in Halifax) after an exceptionally rough trip of 11 days from Liverpool."<sup>97</sup> Upon arrival the wounded traveled by train to various destinations throughout the country. When word was received in London that some of the wounded were from the London region and would arrive at the C.P.R. depot, a request went out in the local papers to Londoners with cars to transport the wounded and their relatives to the nearest hospital.

A special train carrying 162 wounded and invalided soldiers will arrive at 10 o'clock at the C.P.R. depot on Thursday. The party is the largest which has returned to the city at any one time since the outbreak of war...there are 36 London men included...Unless a score or more citizens place their motor cars at the disposal of the Soldiers' Aid Commission this week, officers of that organization expect to experience difficulty in obtaining enough automobiles to meet (the needs of the wounded)...Members of the commission are requesting citizens to place cars at their disposal by telephoning the commission offices. They will then notify the car owner when his automobile will be required...<sup>98</sup>

Where would they be taken? As of April 1, 1918, three military hospitals had opened in London: the Military Convalescent Hospital mentioned above, the Military Station Hospital and the Wolseley Barracks Hospital.<sup>99</sup> Although the location of the latter two is unclear, the Convalescent Hospital was initially located in a building on Ottaway Avenue (now known as South Street)<sup>100</sup> and later became part of the Victoria Hospital complex.<sup>101</sup> The military patients who had resided there were subsequently moved to Westminster Hospital, which was constructed between 1918 and 1920 on farm land that had been purchased by the city for this purpose.<sup>102</sup> A substantial proportion of the cost of construction was undertaken by the Ontario Government.<sup>103</sup>

By October 31, 1918 the total capacity of both hospitals was 634 beds (MacPhail, 1925, p. 331 and 332). In addition, patients could be placed in Victoria Hospital (Ward 7), the Byron Sanatorium, and the Speedwell Military Convalescent Hospital outside Guelph, which received extensive coverage in the *London Advertiser*.<sup>104</sup> As a convalescent hospital, Speedwell opened in October, 1917, and remained in operation until November, 1920.<sup>105</sup> During its three years of operation, Speedwell provided not only medical care but also opportunities for recovering soldiers to acquire marketable skills in areas such as furniture construction, iron work, dairy production and farming that would enable them to enter the labor force. Although Speedwell was a bit of a distance from London, the hospital was considered to be within the London district and was readily accessible from London because "the C.P.R. runs through the grounds and a station has been built within five minutes' walk of the hospital." In short, while other

areas of the country might not have been prepared to handle the numbers of wounded that had been anticipated when the war ended, it would seem that this could not be said of London.

## Memorials

The last issue to received considerable attention in the London papers was the need to memorialize those who had fought and died during the Great War. The earliest mention of this need appeared in the December 3, 1918 issue of the *London Advertiser*.

“We owe a great deal to the heroes of our country who have gone out and defended us,” said Warden D.A. Graham to the members of the (Middlesex) county council at the first meeting of the December session...A memorial for our fallen heroes, for our men who have given their today for our tomorrow, should be erected...The speaker then mentioned the suggestion of President E.E. Braithwaite of the Western University that the various municipalities make grants to be used in the building of a university.<sup>106</sup>

The following year plans were made to implement Braithwaite’s suggestion.

The erection of a fine new science building in connection with the Western University as a war memorial for Middlesex and surrounding counties is the tentative plan that has been proposed...It is anticipated that the grant from this county (Middlesex) alone will be \$100,000. It is quite probable that the university authorities will approach the councils of the 13 counties west of London and including Brant, Norfolk and Gray with a definite proposition at the January meetings. This will enable the councils to include the grant when making up the tax rate for the ensuring year...It is confidently expected that all of the counties will look with favor on the proposition...In this connection it is pointed out that the Western University belongs as much to Middlesex and the surrounding counties as to London. The counties do not hesitate to make appropriations for the local public schools and the high schools and the councilors feel that the grants for the university should be made in the same way. There can be only one university for this section of the province, they say, and that is Western.<sup>107</sup>

Although the funds obtained were not used to erect a science building on Western’s campus, they were employed in 1924 to build the 126 foot high Middlesex Memorial Tower on top of University College, which was completed during the previous year. Today the tower is often referred on Western’s website as “arguably the most recognizable symbol of the university. It is unique to Western and in the world.”

The second memorial structure to be erected in London was the War Memorial Children’s Hospital, located at 392 South Street. The initial proposal for the hospital was made by the London Municipal Chapter of the Imperial Order of the Daughters of the Empire and was accepted by the Victoria Hospital Trust in November, 1919. The hospital was built in 1922.

Not to be outdone by these other structures, it is worth mentioning that city itself also elected to erect a building. According to the London City Council Minutes, on November 17<sup>th</sup>, 1919, (page 235, item 17) Alderman Samuel R. Manness moved “that debentures be issued for

\$100,000 for a Soldiers' Memorial Hall and that a site for same be provided on the Federal Square property (the southeast corner of Dundas and Wellington streets)." On December 6<sup>th</sup> the motion was reframed in the form of a bylaw to be voted on during the next municipal election.<sup>108</sup> Although the bylaw was strongly endorsed by City Council, the London Chamber of Commerce, the *London Advertiser*, and the *Free Press*, unfortunately, it was defeated by a substantial majority (3,185 voted against while 1,913 voted in favor). Although the reason given by the *Free Press* was that the ballot contained not only this bylaw but 12 others most of which also required substantial sums of money.<sup>109</sup> The members of the local Great War Veterans Association were extremely disheartened at the outcome of this vote.

On a pole in front of the clubrooms of the G.W.V.A. on Queens Avenue...the flag was hung at half-mast by the members of the association for the purpose of indicating to the citizens of London their feelings and what they think of the turning down of the proposition for the building of a Memorial Hall. Inside the building gloom seemed to prevail, for the place was unusually quiet this morning. Around a fireplace a silent group of a dozen or so sat and stared moodily into a flickering fire. It was some time after the reporter entered before anyone spoke, and then: "Well, don't you think it was a rotten shame" said J.W. Cunliffe, secretary of the association, "We didn't think the citizens of London would do it (to us)."<sup>110</sup>

On a more positive note, however, in 1925 the Church of the Epiphany in South London erected, as a fitting memorial, the Manor and Highland Park Cenotaph at the corner of Briscoe Street and Holborn Avenue, which, no doubt, would have pleased the members of the Great War Veterans Association because of its very personal nature. The unveiling ceremony, attended by more than 2,000 people, was covered by both the *London Free Press* and the *London Advertiser*. At the end of the ceremony, Mayor George A. Wenige congratulated Manor Park for "having erected a memorial especially when the city has not erected a (similar) memorial since the Boer War." He then went on to suggest that members of Manor Park "should move into the city to show them how it is done."<sup>111</sup> The following words are from the *London Advertiser* written at the time of the memorial's unveiling.

Today there stands at the northeast corner of the Church of the Epiphany in Manor Park, a white marble figure, a soldier in fighting kit, whose quiet eyes scan the nearby homes in the park and far horizon of London. This is the first war memorial figure to be erected in the London district ...There are twelve names on the bronze plaque below the feet of the figure, names of Manor Park men who stayed in France, and for whom the armistice fell on unheeding ears.<sup>112</sup>

Unfortunately, in the years that followed the dedication, the statue was vandalized on a number of occasions. To repair the statue in 1984 a funding drive was launched, and with help from the city to modernize the base, a bronze replica shown on the next page was erected on the same site and rededicated in November, 1985. To avoid interfering with the Armistice Day memorial celebration held at the Cenotaph in Victoria Park, each year a similar celebration is held at the Manor Park Cenotaph about one week prior to November 11<sup>th</sup>.



It is also worth mentioning that on occasion the newspapers would receive information about local residents who had died overseas and had been decorated for bravery. One such letter, received by the *London Advertiser* and written by Sargent Harry Bennett from London, contained the following information.

At least one of the Forest City lads, 823028k Pte Harry Miner, has won the greatest award it is possible for a British soldier to receive, the Victoria Cross. He captured a machine gun after killing the crew, and turned it against another machine gun nest, taking it singlehanded, and falling, mortally wounded, he encouraged those coming behind him to “carry on” to victory. Such are the bare facts of the superhuman feat of the lad who enlisted in London’s Own early in December, 1915.<sup>113</sup>

Along with the Victoria Cross, which was only awarded to 40 Canadians in the Great War,<sup>114</sup> subsequent reports in Miner's file showed that he was also awarded the Croix de Guerre by the French government. In addition to these medals, he was honoured at a Remembrance Day Banquet held at the Clinton Branch of the Royal Canadian Legion in 1968 and was memorialized by having several buildings named for him. The Royal Canadian Legion, Branch 185, in Blenheim is called the Harry Miner Branch and the South Barracks (building M-209) in Land Force Central Area Training Centre in Meaford is known as the Corporal H.G.B. Miner Barracks. He is also listed on an historic roadside plaque in the Municipality of Chatham-Kent. Because Harry Miner was not actually from London but was from a rural area within the larger London Military District, it is unknown if there are any memorials to him in the city.

Although Harry Miner was not from London, a second recipient of the Victoria Cross did reside in London at least for a short period. Pte. Harry Brown lived at 253 Briscoe Street with his sister, Mrs. Charles Egelton, for six months prior to his enlistment in August 1916. While in London he worked as a munitions maker at the National Brass Company. Because he was from Gananoque originally, in August, 2007, his death was commemorated on a cenotaph in Gananoque and his Victoria Cross was placed on display at the Canadian War Museum in Ottawa. The *Advertiser* provided the following account of his award.

(During the battle of Hill 70, on August 17, 1917), the enemy massed in force and counter-attacked. The situation became very critical, all wires being cut. It was of utmost importance to get word back to headquarters. (Brown, along with one other) soldier, was given a message with orders to deliver it at all costs. The other soldier was killed and Brown had his arm shattered, but continued through the intense barrage until he arrived close to the support lines. There he found an officer, but (Brown) was so spent that he fell down the dugout steps and regained consciousness long enough to hand over the message, saying "important message." He then became unconscious and died in a dressing station a few hours later. His devotion to duty was of the highest possible degree imaginable, and the successful delivery of the message undoubtedly saved the loss of the position for the time and prevented many casualties.<sup>115</sup>

Finally, there are, of course, a substantial number of memorial tablets in schools and churches throughout the city with names of former residents who perished during the war. Memorials have also been erected in several of London's cemeteries. Woodlawn Cemetery, for example, has over 50 memorial monuments that were erected to honour soldiers who died during the Great War, most of whom were buried overseas, but whose families elected to provide memorials to them here in London. A self-guided walking tour of 14 of the monuments is available at the Cemetery Office on the cemetery grounds.

### The Armistice Day Memorial

Arguably, one of the most enduring memorials to those who perished in the Great War is the yearly commemoration of Armistice Day, known today as Remembrance Day (see below). The beginning of

Armistice Day, however, was marked by a somewhat checkered history. The first mention of the need for some type of commemoration on November 11<sup>th</sup> appeared in the *London Free Press* on November 7, 1919, in the form of a message sent by 1<sup>st</sup> Viscount Milner, Secretary for the Colonies, to the governor-general. The message began with the following words: "I am commanded by His Majesty the King, to send you for immediate publication the following message, which is addressed to all the peoples of the empire:"

To all my people: Tuesday next, November 11, is the first anniversary of the armistice, which stayed the world-wide carnage of the four preceding years, and marked the victory of right and freedom. I believe that my people in every part of the empire fervently wish to perpetuate the memory of that great deliverance and those who laid down their lives to achieve it.

To afford an opportunity for the universal expression of this feeling it is my desire and hope that at the hour when the armistice came into force, the 11<sup>th</sup> hour of the eleventh day of the eleventh month, there may be for the brief space of two minutes, a complete suspension of all our normal activities. During that time, except in the rare cases where this might be impracticable, all work, all sound and all locomotion should cease, so that in perfect stillness the thoughts of everyone may be concentrated on reverent remembrance of the glorious dead.<sup>116</sup>

To comply with the King's request, on November 8<sup>th</sup> Mayor Charles R. Somerville made the following announcement that also appeared in the *Free Press*.

London will accede to the request of the King that armistice day (November 11) be observed by the cessation of all business for two minutes. The question has not yet been considered in committee, but I will issue a proclamation calling upon the citizens to observe the day in this manner. It is considered that it would not be wise to observe a general holiday in the city. The cessation of business for two minutes will be all that is necessary.<sup>117</sup>

And so it was that the mayor "acceded" to the King's request. On November 10<sup>th</sup> the *Free Press* commented on the rather shallow nature of the mayor's proclamation in the following words.

Two minutes out of 1,440 will be devoted tomorrow to silent memory of the heroic dead...This will be the empire's tribute to the men who had that glorious fortune of giving their lives for a great ideal.<sup>118</sup>

Perhaps also in reaction to this extremely meager memorial service, the next year the mayor received a request from the Central Veterans Council to proclaim a more fitting commemoration of the armistice. The Council proposed a half-day holiday that would entail a "great public celebration" to be held on November 11<sup>th</sup>.<sup>119</sup> Although the London City Council agreed to their request, apparently after giving further thought to this matter, the Veterans Council objected to at least part of their own proposal, namely the need for a half-day holiday. Their objection was based "on the ground that the wage-earning man who is paid by the hour would be the loser and that thousands of needy men would be deprived of money which they might otherwise earn."<sup>120</sup> Clearly, a compromise solution was needed to satisfy both the Veterans Council's initial request and their subsequent objection. Hence, with the approval of

the Veterans Council and the London City Council it was decided to hold a “monster celebration” on November 11<sup>th</sup>, but only during the evening hours so as not to disrupt the working day. The following program of events appeared in the *Free Press* on November 11, 1920, to alert Londoners to the planned celebration that would be held that evening.

As part of the program 4,000 citizens, returned soldiers and others, will parade from the armories at 7:30 and will march down Dundas street to Wellington, hence up to Victoria Park and through the park to Wellington street and, following up to Pall Mall will turn east to Waterloo, then down Waterloo to the armories again. Immediately after this the veterans and the school cadets will return to Victoria Park, where the captured German guns will be placed in position...The fireworks display is to be one of the spectacular features of the evening (\$900 worth of fireworks had been purchased). Rooftops along the route of march will be lined with bright-colored torches, throwing a great flare of light on the parade and crowds on the streets below...After the guns are deposited at Victoria Park there will be an impressive program, consisting of silent prayer, with heads bowed for two minutes, singing of patriotic songs, instrumental selections and a short address by the mayor.<sup>121</sup>

In addition to this announcement, in the same issue of the paper the *Free Press* also claimed that the Mayor

will move a resolution urging the Government to make Armistice Day a permanent holiday by combining Thanksgiving Day with it. It is expected that the (City Council) will unanimously approve of this. This resolution will be forwarded to the proper authorities for consideration.<sup>122</sup>

The next day the *Free Press* characterized the previous night’s celebration as “the biggest parade in years.”

Only the spontaneous outburst of joy on November 11, 1918, surpassed the rejoicing with which London last night marked the second anniversary of the signing of the Armistice. Citizens turned out almost to a man to join in the celebration. The whole downtown section was thronged, and scores of impromptu entertainments were staged, in addition to the main one at the armories. Glamor was added to the gaiety by a pyrotechnical display unrivalled in the city’s history. The bright lights of the downtown district were completely eclipsed by bursting rockets, Roman candles and flambeaux.

Promptly at 7:30 p.m. the fireworks display was started at the armories, heralding the commencement of the march...Although the procession was nearly two miles in length, every section of it found its place without difficulty as a result of the careful planning of those in charge of the celebration.<sup>123</sup>

While it is unknown if the mayor’s resolution was actually forwarded to Parliament, on April 25, 1921 the Honourable H. M. Mowat proposed the following resolution in the House of Commons which, of course, was identical to the resolution suggested by London’s mayor in 1920.

That in the opinion of this House, it is desirable to perpetuate the triumphant conclusion of the Great War by the signing of an armistice on the 11<sup>th</sup> day of November, 1918, and to such end that Monday in the week in which is November 11<sup>th</sup> be called Armistice Day, and that the day for a General Thanksgiving to Almighty God be proclaimed for such a day annually.<sup>124</sup>



Mowat then concluded his remarks by stating that: “The object of this motion was to signify the great deliverance from our enemy by establishing Armistice Day as a legal holiday, and to celebrate Thanksgiving Day, which usually comes about same time, on the same day.” On May 11, 1921, the resolution was introduced to the House, read the second time and was referred to committee on May 23<sup>rd</sup> in the form of Bill 119. What followed in committee was a lengthy and often acrimonious debate that focused not only on the wording of the bill but on other matters such as whether it was to be the day of the week (Monday) or the date of November 11<sup>th</sup> when the event needed to be celebrated. In either case, Armistice Day had now become combined with the Thanksgiving Day celebration. The final version of the bill which was assented to on June 4, 1921, by His Majesty, George V, contained the following provision.

throughout Canada in each and every year (on) the Monday in the week in which the eleventh day of November shall occur (and)... it shall be a legal holiday (and)...the holiday commonly called Thanksgiving Day shall whenever appointed be proclaimed and observed for and on Armistice Day.

Despite the nature of the Kings proclamation, however, in 1921 Armistice Day in London was held not on Monday but instead on Friday, November 11<sup>th</sup>, in keeping with the importance of the date, and again on Sunday, November 13<sup>th</sup> thereby combing the celebration with a normal Thanksgiving Day church service. Hence, in 1921, Armistice Day consisted of a two day holiday.

Friday and Sunday will be Poppy as well as Armistice Day in London. On these two days the third anniversary of the armistice will be celebrated and everyone who was interested in the successful conclusion of the great war is asked to express his sorrow for the dead and his gratitude for peace by wearing the floral emblem of Flanders...Cronyn Memorial has already announced its intention to participate in the Armistice Sunday and is urging its members to wear a poppy that day...it is probable that the majority of pastors in the city will also hold special services...<sup>125</sup>

On Friday “the local hydro station turned out all light switches promptly at 11 a.m. which gave the time signal to the whole city that all Canada was engaged in prayer. The London Street Railway Company cars were halted during the period of silence...That night there was a torch-light procession from the armories down Dundas street, up Richmond to Victoria.” Although the *Free Press* claimed that “throughout Canada the day was observed as a holy day rather than a holiday” whether this was truly the case in London is open to question since the *Free Press* also claimed that “as it is fitting, the day will close in that mardi-gras spirit which characterized the first armistice day.”<sup>126</sup>

This practice of combing Armistice Day with Thanksgiving Day, as a two day celebration at least in London, continued for a number of years. On Saturday, November 8, 1930, the *Free Press* announced that “Solemn services of Thanksgiving tinged with sadness awakened by another Armistice Day will be held in all local churches tomorrow when the attention of the congregations will be directed towards progress made in religion and world peace during the past year.”<sup>127</sup> The significance of the Sunday celebration was also expressed in an editorial that

appeared in the *Free Press* on Monday, November 10<sup>th</sup>: “Time slips by so quickly that it is hard to realize that it is now 16 years since the Great War started and 12 years since Armistice Day...There is every reason on this joint Thanksgiving Day and Armistice Day for us in Canada to give thanks.”<sup>128</sup> As summarized below, the *Free Press* then itemized the events that took place that Sunday (November 9) as well as the events that happened on Tuesday, November 11<sup>th</sup>.

...at *St. Paul's* Cathedral during the morning (of November 9) the annual garrison church parade, in which all military units in the city took part, was held (at the Metropolitan United Church)... trumpeters of the R.C.R. band sounded the Last Post and the Reveille...Following the church service thousands of Londoners who lined the route of the parade witnessed one of the greatest military spectacles seen in London since the war as all of the garrison units and several hundred ex-service men paraded for the march past at the Central Collegiate Institute.<sup>129</sup>

(On November 11<sup>th</sup>) A special ceremony was held at Wolseley Barracks, where the Royal Canadian Regiment paraded in the training square...At 11 o'clock a round of cannon fire announced the two minutes of silence and another cannon shot and reveille marked the terminating of the period of silence...At the city hall the flag was lowered as all employees stood in silent tribute. At the post office and customhouse the Armistice Day was observed when all workers stood at attention.<sup>130</sup>

The 1921 act which served to combine both observances was finally ended by a further act of Parliament in 1931. The reason given for this further act, as stated in the *Free Press*, was the mounting objection to the practice of combining the two since “both were distinctive ways of giving thanks; one for the end of hostilities and the other for bountiful crops and other blessings of Providence.”<sup>131</sup> Thus with this new legislation in mind, Thanksgiving Day in 1931 was celebrated on Sunday, October 12. “The churches were filled with symbols of blessings of the season. Grains, fruits and vegetables, beautiful representations of the bountiful harvest, hung on the walls.”<sup>132</sup> Armistice Day, on the other hand, referred to for the first time as Remembrance Day, was to be celebrated on November 11<sup>th</sup>, which in 1931, fell on a Wednesday.

By legislation of the last session of Parliament, the 11<sup>th</sup> of November was fixed as a public holiday and described as Remembrance Day. There is no difference between holidays as set out in the Interpretation Act. Remembrance Day stands in the same position as the 1<sup>st</sup> of July, Labor Day, Christmas Day or New Year's Day...the day will be observed by parades of war veterans and militia, solemn silence and similar ceremonies and it is the intention that Remembrance Day shall be observed in the same way that Armistice Day has been observed in the past.<sup>133</sup>

### Remembrance Day and the Victoria Park Cenotaph

With the change from Armistice Day to Remembrance Day in 1931 the one-day service to honour London's local veterans began to resemble the service held in London, England. Because the focus of that service was on the cenotaph in Whitehall, a similar though temporary cenotaph was erected here in London. “With the aid of the Public Utilities Commission,

London's war veterans set to work to build their cenotaph. They made it look as nearly as possible like the cenotaph in Old London."<sup>134</sup> Built to scale out of wood and half the size of the Whitehall cenotaph, it was 17 feet high and assembled in the London Armouries.

On November 11, 1931, the wooden cenotaph was placed in the middle of Dundas Street next to the London Street Railway tracks opposite the Victoria Building and the Bell Telephone Building.<sup>135</sup> With space allotted for ex-service men, widows and mothers, invited guests, massed bands, etc. the ceremony on November 11<sup>th</sup> was "witnessed by a crowd estimated at more than 15,000 people."

With the boom of the gun in Victoria Park at 11 o'clock a hush fell over the assembled crowd and men stood with heads bared in reverenced silence remembering their comrades who gave their lives for the sake of peace...No addresses were given, silence and a deep sense of reverence being the tribute paid by the assembled throng...The cenotaph was banked by wreaths placed on behalf of official bodies, various ex-service men's associations and many private individuals...The bugle band of the Fusillers sounded the "Last Post" and "Reveille." Pipers of the Canadian Engineers played the Lament as they circled around in front of the cenotaph.<sup>136</sup>



Following the ceremony the cenotaph was returned to the armouries, stored, and used again in 1932 and 1933. Because the wooden cenotaph was only temporary, in an editorial that

appeared the day after the 1931 ceremony, the *Free Press* called upon the city to consider the need to erect a more permanent memorial.

...this service should impress upon London citizens the necessity of erecting in this city, at an early date, a suitable cenotaph. London, the capital of Western Ontario, the military centre of this peninsula and the place where so many thousands of troops trained for overseas, is almost the only city in Ontario without a suitable memorial.<sup>137</sup>

Indeed, as early as 1928 the local chapter of the Independent Order of Daughters of the Empire initiated a movement to erect a permanent cenotaph in London and over the years had raised more than \$4,000 for such a monument.<sup>138</sup> A site at the south-east corner of Victoria Park was finally selected in 1934 and it was decided that the cenotaph would be built of limestone from the Queenston Quarries in Niagara Falls.<sup>139</sup> “Using workmen employed under the city relief program,”<sup>140</sup> excavation of the site started on September 24<sup>th</sup> with the work to be completed by November 3<sup>rd</sup>. The monument was to be 24 feet high and “modelled along the same lines as the cenotaph at Whitehall” with the overall cost to be around \$8,400.<sup>141</sup>

On November 10, 1934, the completed monument draped on both sides with the Union Jack, was unveiled by Mrs. J.D. Detwiler, regent of the municipal chapter of the IODE.

Thousands were present to witness the brief but impressive ceremony and to again pay their tribute to those whom the new monument is dedicated...This was followed by the brief dedication service and prayer...During the singing of the anthem the foot of the cenotaph was banked by wreaths laid by representatives of the many veterans bodies, other organizations and citizens who wished to add the symbol of the tribute. Col, the Rev. William Beattie then pronounced the benediction and with the singing of “God Save the King” the first service at London’s cenotaph was concluded.<sup>142</sup>

Although it had been rumored that the Anti-War League of London had planned a protest demonstration, the League dismissed the rumor and instead also laid a wreath to honour those who died.<sup>143</sup>

The next day, after a lengthy parade from the armouries that began at 10:00 a.m., the *Free Press* reported that about 2,000 ex-service men gathered at the Victoria Park Cenotaph for the first official November 11<sup>th</sup> service. The following benediction was given by the mayor.

This cenotaph has been dedicated to the memory of those brave men who left all that was dear to them, endured the intense hardships of war and in self-sacrifice died that others might live in freedom. Let their names be not forgotten by all that follow here.<sup>144</sup>

Finally, and in keeping with the theme of the benediction, the *Free Press* published an extremely fitting honour role, reproduced on the following page, with the names of all the men and the four nursing sisters from London who died during the Great War.<sup>145</sup>



# THE GLORIOUS DEAD

## LONDON'S ROLL OF HONOUR

From sources believed to be reliable, The Free Press has compiled this roll of heroic Londoners who died in the service of the Empire, either in action, from wounds, or other causes incidental to the Great War.

"AT THE GOING DOWN OF THE SUN, AND IN THE MORNING WE WILL REMEMBER THEM."

### In Flanders Fields

In Flanders fields the poppies blow  
Between the crosses, row on row,  
That mark our place; and in the sky  
The larks, still bravely singing, fly,  
Scarce heard amidst the guns below.

We're the dead. Short days ago  
We lived, felt dawn, saw sunset glow,  
Loved and were loved, and now we lie  
In Flanders fields.

Take up our quarrel with the foe!  
To you from falling hands we throw  
The torch; be yours to hold it high;  
If ye break faith with us who die,  
We shall not sleep, tho' poppies grow  
In Flanders fields.


By Lt.-Col. John McCrae



- Abbott, W. E.
- Ager, W.
- Adams, J. Douglas
- Aikens, J. Wilson
- Aitken, Arthur B.
- Aitken, Herman A.
- Albright, Selma
- Alderton, A. C.
- Alex, James R.
- Anderson, H.
- Anderson, Harry
- Anderson, James
- Anderson, J. A.
- Anssett, John
- Anzer, Richard H.
- Aspinan, T. H.
- Aspley, W. H.
- Auer, William L.
- Atkinson, Elison P.
- Avey, Howard
- Bailey, Arthur
- Baker, Ernest
- Baker, William
- Balch, W. C.
- Balkwin, Dorothy
- Balkwin, Harry
- Balkwin, William
- Bartley, James
- Bartlett, U. E.
- Bayley, Carl
- Beattie, Frank
- Beattie, William
- Becher, Archie V.
- Becher, H. Campbell
- Belcher, Cecil Russell
- Belcher, R. W.
- Bennett, Francis C.
- Bignar, John
- Billington, S. J.
- Bisbee, Arthur W.
- Boyer, William P.
- Boyd, Henry C.
- Bradbrook, Fred
- Brady, William
- Branton, Secretary
- Briggs, F. W.
- Briggs, L. G.
- Brimley, John H.
- Brooks, C. W.
- Brown, C. S.
- Brown, Arthur K.
- Bryant, Robert I.
- Buckley, Ernest
- Burden, Gordon C.
- Burdett, Henry F.
- Burdett, Thomas
- Burgess, E. F.
- Burnard, Wesley
- Burnett, Harry C.
- Buss, Joseph C.
- Burroughs, Cecil
- Burrows, R. C.
- Burns, Ira
- Burns, Carl A.
- Cadman, Fred
- Calhoun, William
- Callan, Frank
- Campbell, Archie
- Campbell, Roy O.
- Carfax, Fred
- Carfax, Robert
- Carline, James
- Carroll, J. W.
- Carson, A. J.
- Cavehill, Percy C.
- Chadwick, Clifford F.
- Chivas, Edwin J.
- Chivas, W. J.
- Clark, Jack
- Clare, Archie
- Clark, Henry
- Clark, Paul
- Clark, Robert
- Clarkson, Arthur
- Clemence, Cyril L.
- Cogan, A.
- Colman, E.
- Colling, Gladstone
- Collins, George F.
- Collyer, C. H.
- Cook, Donald
- Cook, Ernest
- Cookley, Badger
- Cosier, James R.
- Cottam, Bart
- Courtney, S. H.
- Coward, Alex.
- Crowley, Charles
- Crowley, Robert A. C.
- Curnan, James
- Curtis, Roy B.
- Cushman, Russell
- Daniel, Charles
- Danz, Eym. F. M.
- Darwin, Albert
- Davies, William G.
- Davis, L. C.
- Daw, Claude
- Dawson, W.
- Dean, William
- Deaton, E.
- Dent, Fred
- Dent, Percy
- Diggle, John
- Dixon, Walter
- Doboy, William B.
- Douglass, E. R.
- Dowdell, Albert
- Drake, John H.
- Draper, W.
- Duan, W. J.
- Durlin, Oliver W.
- Dust, A. F.
- Egerton, A. E.
- Eggett, Charles
- Elder, John
- Elliott, Frank
- Ellis, James H.
- Emery, R. F.
- Evans, Jack
- Evans, James
- Fagan, Albert Golden
- Faulkner, John A.
- Faulkner, William H.
- Fench, Archibald
- Fennie, Walter G.
- Fisher, Ella W.
- Fitzgerald, Chester
- Fleming, G. S. R.
- Ford, Edwin
- Foster, Alex.
- Fox, Harold
- Fox, Melfort
- Fraser, Donald
- Fraser, J. Bruce
- Gale, Harry
- Garden, Alex.
- Garratt, A. J.
- Garratt, D. G. K.
- Gates, Alan
- Geary, Oliver B.
- Gibbs, E. A.
- Gibby, H.
- Gleed, Charles E.
- Gleed, George
- Golby, Gordon Earl
- Golcher, Gilbert
- Gullion, Bernard W.
- Gough, W. H.
- Goyer, Francis Joseph
- Graban, Charles P.
- Grant, George
- Gray, D.
- Gray, H. S.
- Gray, James Roy
- Gay, Harold M.
- Goodlow, W. I.
- Gulford, Samuel
- Gulfoyle, T. R.
- Guzan, Arthur
- Hain, James W. W.
- Haldane, Thomas
- Hall, Albert F.
- Haldan, Ernest W.
- Han, Frank E.
- Hardington, Douglas
- Harrison, Douglas
- Hastings, J. H.
- Hastings, William C.
- Hawcock, Harry H.
- Harding, John
- Harris, Nelson
- Harrison, Gustav
- Hastings, Charles
- Hastings, Hugh
- Headley, Mark
- Hedden, William
- Henderson, John R.
- Hicks, Oswald
- Hill, Harry G.
- Hobbs, J. H.
- Hollbrook, Henry L.
- Holland, Mark
- Holman, Joseph
- Howell, Percy V. G.
- Howlett, W. G.
- Hughes, D. W.
- Hunter, Alfred E.
- Hulse, Archibald
- Hunt, Peter
- Huske, William J.
- Hutchison, A. W.
- Hutchins, Archie
- Hingworth, Henry
- Inlay, Gilbert
- Irvine, Lorne A. H.
- Isaac, Harold
- Ivey, Helen
- Jackson, Fred
- Jackie, Reynolds
- Jacobs, Archie L.
- James, Elmer Oler
- Jarvis, L. C.
- Jepkin, John Wesley
- Jenkins, Wesley James
- Jensen, C. A.
- Jepson, Russell W.
- Johnson, Andrew
- Johnson, Chester G.
- Johnson, Samuel Beaty
- Jolly, Albert
- Jones, C. F.
- Jones, William A.
- Kelland, Fred J.
- Kennel, Cyril
- Kennedy, Norman
- Kessey, Fred H.
- Kent, Victor
- Kerry, W. O.
- Kingsmill, Thomas Fraser
- Kirk, Andrew O.
- Kirkpatrick, Johnson D.
- Knight, George E.
- Lacey, W. C.
- Langford, Everett A.
- Langridge, William H.
- Lawson, Wilfrid E.
- Legg, A. I.
- Leicester, J. C.
- Leedson, E. Woodman
- Leeward, Fred W.
- Levie, Richard
- Levie, William Huber
- Liley, Albert E.
- Lisfield, Albert E.
- Lismonne, Philip R.
- Livstone, Fred
- Livington, Spencer
- Loney, Joseph
- Long, Lawrence G.
- Loxton, Gilbert
- Loxon, William E.
- Luff, Thomas
- Lumley, Bart
- McAndrew, Thomas
- McCall, James
- McClelland, Fred
- McCann, Harold Dickson
- McCann, James C.
- McCarthy, Callaghan
- McCurdy, R. J.
- McConnochie, R. J.
- McCreedy, Bernard L.
- McDonald, Katherine
- McEwan, C. F.
- McGeary, Charles
- McIntosh, Gordon Cowan
- McKay, Edward
- McKay, Hugh
- McKeaney, Dan J.
- McLeod, D. G.
- McLennan, Attila A.
- McLennan, William
- McMurphy, Archie
- McMurphy, D.
- McNeil, Donald
- MacArthur, James
- Manston, Leonard F.
- Marston, George
- Martin, George
- Martin, Herbert
- Martin, James
- Martin, Joseph Francis
- Mason, H. E.
- Mason, Martin
- Matheson, Clifford
- Mathews, J. R.
- Max, Percy A.
- Mayer, Harold E.
- Mean, Horace
- Mellet, Henrietta
- Menzel, Verne
- Messner, Robert H.
- Merkley, W. Ernest
- Methson, Arthur P.
- Meyers, Tobias J.
- Milford, Taylor
- Mills, Harry M.
- Mitchell, Walter
- Moak, George
- Moore, E. T. R.
- Moore, William R.
- Moorehead, Edmund C.
- Morgan, Herbert
- Morkin, Gordon
- Morley, E. Lionel
- Morrison, William
- Morse, Edwin H.
- Morton, G.
- Moss, Charles
- Mouat, George Abner
- Mowat, Robert
- Moyer, J. Howard
- Murray, Thomas
- Nanfau, Arthur
- Neash, W. T.
- Neely, W. T.
- Nelson, William
- Newell, Hubert Wesley
- Nickle, Frank
- Noble, George
- Norris, R. W.
- Nurse, William J.
- O'Connell, Charles W.
- O'Hara, Joseph M. G.
- On, Lloyd
- Page, John T.
- Parler, Fred
- Parsons, F. V.
- Parsons, W. A.
- Patterson, Andrew
- Patterson, George B.
- Payne, A. E.
- Payne, Jack
- Peacock, M. A.
- Pennis, Llewellyn M.
- Pennington, George
- Pepper, Fred
- Perkins, A. E.
- Phillips, Allan
- Piper, James W.
- Piper, Thomas J.
- Player, Clifford
- Porter, F. A.
- Prencott, Alfred C.
- Price, James
- Rackham, William
- Raine, A. H.
- Rankin, Donald H.
- Rawlings, Jack
- Raymond, Earl
- Raymond, Frederick C.
- Raymond, George
- Reidley, Arthur
- Reidman, James J.
- Reidman, George
- Reed, Roydon A.
- Reid, Frank Nixon
- Reidman, Alfred
- Reidman, Arthur David
- Reidman, Fred
- Reidman, Fred
- Reidman, Thomas Charles
- Reid, George W.
- Ross, Lorne
- Rutherford, Arwell
- Reyn, John
- Sik, Charles
- Saborn, W. Reginald
- Saat, William
- Savile, John
- Savin, W. T.
- Scatchard, John L.
- Scott, J. Massimo
- Selton, Fred C.
- Show, John
- Shoebak, John
- Shoebak, Thomas M.
- Shoebottom, Richard S.
- Shore, Albert
- Shelley, Lawrence R.
- Skate, B.
- Small, Gordon
- Small, Stanley
- Smith, Clarence H.
- Smith, F. B.
- Smith, Fred
- Smith, Fred A.
- Smith, Herbert H.
- Smith, Russell
- Smith, William H.
- Stallan, Edward
- Stonewell, George
- Stonewell, Kenneth
- Sparks, William
- Spence, William
- Spicknell, Victor E.
- Spies, W. M.
- Spring, Edward
- Sproule, Ernest
- Starr, Gordon
- Stephen, James
- Stophenson, L. L.
- Stewart, L. R.
- Stewart, Peter
- Stratley, George H.
- Stuart, Charles
- Sullivan, Henry
- Sullivan, Thomas
- Sutton, Jas. W.
- Sutton, F. C.
- Swan, James
- Talbot, Frank
- Taylor, Howard
- Taylor, Charles Norman
- Taylor, Gerald I.
- Taylor, Lecky
- Taylor, F. T.
- Telford, Harry
- Temple, R. H.
- Thompson, Richard
- Thorne, Charles W.
- Tidmore, Arthur W.
- Tinney, Wilfrid
- Tinney, William J.
- Tilson, George Edwin
- Tonnett, Percy
- Torrey, Fred
- Tosay, Leonard T.
- Turner, E.
- Turner, Edward
- Underwood, W. G.
- Vickers, Remington G.
- Vann, Victor W.
- Wadje, Ernest
- Walding, C. S.
- Walker, Robert C.
- Walpole, D.
- Wald, Joseph
- Walters, J. J.
- Ward, Charles
- Ward, Henry C.
- Warren, Ian
- Warren, John W.
- Watrick, W. T.
- Webb, Bob
- Whetten, Richard
- Whitely, John
- White, George
- White, Harold
- White, Gordon A.
- White, Clarence
- White, Edwin G.
- Whitton, James
- Woodford, R. G.
- Woodley, Benjamin
- Wray, Wards
- Wright, George Edwin
- Wyldoff, Eric
- Yeo, Lorne
- York, William Henry
- Zigler, Eric

## Appendix

The war bond advertisements shown below are typical of the ones that appeared in both of London's papers to promote sales during the 1917 and 1918 Victory Bond campaigns. Because the campaigns only lasted about three weeks, the messages in the ads were not only patriotic but frequently contained strong emotional, guilt-provoking, overtones designed to convince those who had not already purchased bonds, to do so well before the campaigns ended.



**If this boy were your boy**

If you had a boy in France to-day, you would make your purchase of Victory Bonds large enough to represent a real personal sacrifice.

You would be thinking of that lad—out in the hell on earth that is No Man's Land—cheerfully offering his life for Freedom's cause.

And you would do your best to save that life.

You would help—with all your might—to provide the money that will shorten the war and reduce the cost of Victory, in human lives.

You would buy all the Victory Bonds you could possibly find the money for—and you would find it by stinting yourself down to the barest necessities of life.

Come—share in the glory of those whose lads are in France to-day. Dig deep into your income—as the kin of soldiers dig into theirs—to buy the Victory Bonds that will carry our armies on to Victory, and give us back our boys.

Issued by Canada's Victory Loan Committee  
in co-operation with the Minister of Finance  
of the Dominion of Canada.

London Advertiser, October 31, 1918

**My Dad Has Bought a Bond For Me!**

The little chap won't realize now what the buying of that Victory Bond means to him—to you—to Canada, and to our sons Overseas. But in the years to come—when you may not be here to know it—your boy, grown father to a man, will realize its significance, and he will be glad that you did something in Canada's hour of need, and that you did it for his sake.

**Has Your Dad Bought a Bond For You?**

Issued by Canada's Victory Loan Committee in co-operation with the Minister of Finance of the Dominion of Canada.

113

London Advertiser, November 26, 1917




**SHE'S GIVEN ALL!**  
**YOU ARE ONLY ASKED TO LEND**

**BUY A**  
**VICTORY BOND**

Contributed by The IMPERIAL LIFE  
Assurance Co. of Canada

London Free Press, October 30, 1918





**"For your To-morrow they gave their To-day"**

(Inscribed on a cross in Flanders)

And we who live in tranquillity amid all the comforts of peace and plenty, knowing little of sacrifice, nothing at all of fear of death or violence—are we worthy of the sacrifices those crosses in Flanders mutely remind us of?

Are we doing our duty to our noble dead—those gallant, high-souled boys who interposed their bodies against the assault upon civilization by brutalized might?

Are we living, thinking and acting as people for whom great things are being done, tremendous sacrifices made? Are we accepting in a proper spirit of humility the

bloody sacrifices and the agonies of the battlefields; the sorrows and heart aches of Canadian mothers, wives and sisters whose loved ones lie beneath the poppies in Flanders?

Do we realize that we, each one of us, as individuals have a personal share and interest in the issue for which our boys fight, bleed and die in France.

If we do realize this, then our duty is clear—a duty to ourselves, our country, our glorious fighters, and our heroic dead—to help by every means in our power to bring Victory for our boys in battle.

**Buy Victory Bonds**  
and Help our Soldiers Win the War

Issued by Canada's Victory Loan Committee  
in co-operation with the Minister of Finance  
of the Dominion of Canada

65

London Free Press, November 2, 1918

You have <sup>only</sup> four  
days more to buy  
Victory Bonds.

What are you  
going to do about it?

What excuse will you  
give to yourself next  
week if you don't buy?

Remember :- The boys  
in the trenches did  
not make excuses -  
They went!

Issued by Canada's Victory Loan Committee  
in co-operation with the Minister of Finance  
of the Dominion of Canada.

London Advertiser, November 27, 1917



# 400,000

400,000 fighting men have offered  
their lives for Canada.

400,000 Victory Bond buyers  
should stand behind them.

There should be a bond buyer  
behind every soldier.

Have you taken your place in the  
ranks? If not

**“Fall In!”**

**Only Three Days More**

Issued by Canada's Victory Bond Committee  
in cooperation with the Ministry of Finance  
of the Dominion of Canada

London Advertiser, November 29, 1917

## End Notes

- <sup>1</sup>*The London Advertiser*, October 7, 1918, 1:3.
- <sup>2</sup>David, S. 100 Days to Victory. London, England: Hodder & Stoughton, 2013, p. 396.
- <sup>3</sup>*London Free Press*, October 22, 1918, 1: 7.
- <sup>4</sup> *London Free Press*, November 5, 1918, 7: 4.
- <sup>5</sup>*London Advertiser*, November 12, 1918, 5:5.
- <sup>6</sup>For a full discussion of the meetings and talks that eventually led to the terms of the armistice see Rudin, H.R. Armistice 1918, Yale University Press: Anchor Books, 1967.
- <sup>7</sup> *London Free Press*, November 6, 1918, 11:5.
- <sup>8</sup>*London Free Press*, November 6, 1918, p. 1, headline; *London Advertiser*, November 6, 1918, 1:1-2.
- <sup>9</sup> *London Free Press*, November 8, 1918, 8: 1.
- <sup>10</sup> Epstein, K. Matthias Erzberger and the Dilemma of German Democracy. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1959; Rudin, H.R. Armistice 1918. New Haven, CN: Yale University Press, 1967; Weintraub, S. (1985). A Stillness Heard Round the World. New York, NY: Truman Talley Books, 1985, pp. 45-46.
- <sup>11</sup>*London Free Press*, November 8, 1918, 1:1-2.
- <sup>12</sup>If Foch had agreed to Erzberger's request, the contemporary Armistice Day commemoration would not be held each year at 11 o'clock, on the 11<sup>th</sup> day, of the 11<sup>th</sup> month, which has a poetic ring to it, but instead would occur at 11 o'clock, on the 12<sup>th</sup> day of the 11<sup>th</sup> month, which of course sounds much more prosaic.
- <sup>13</sup>*London Free Press*, November 7, 1918, 11: 3-4.
- <sup>14</sup>*London Free Press*, November 8, 1918, 11: 2.
- <sup>15</sup>*London Advertiser*, November 7, 1918, 1:6.
- <sup>16</sup> *London Advertiser*, November 8, 1918, 13:1.
- <sup>17</sup>*London Advertiser*, November 8, 1918, 1:6.
- <sup>18</sup> *London Free Press*, November 8, 1918, 1: 5.

<sup>19</sup> Morris, J.A. Deadline Every Minute. Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1957.

<sup>20</sup> *London Advertiser*, November 9, 1918, 6:1.

<sup>21</sup> *London Advertiser*, November 11, 1918, 2:5. Note: Use of the word “capitulation” in this article with reference to the armistice document is incorrect because it suggests that with the signing of the document Germany had surrendered on November 11<sup>th</sup>. As mentioned on page 3, this was not the case. Instead, all that happened on November 11<sup>th</sup> was that the fighting had ended. The actual terms of surrender were contained in another document known as the Treaty of Versailles which was not approved by Germany and the Allies until June 28, 1919. Moreover, because there was such opposition in Germany to many of the terms in the treaty, even as late as June, 1919, there was still uncertainty over whether Germany would indeed sign this document and surrender. In her book, Paris 1919 (New York; NY, Random House, 2001), Margaret McMillan claimed that

Reports from Allied agents indicated that it was highly likely that the German government would reject the treaty, although it was not clear if it was prepared to fight...“If Germany refuses,” said Clemenceau, “I favor a vigorous and unremitting military blow that will force the signing.” Wilson and Lloyd George agreed without hesitation (p. 471).

Foch was even prepared to launch a massive drive by forty-two divisions into central Germany if signing did not take place.

Fortunately, Germany did sign on the 28<sup>th</sup> and so the war had now officially ended even through bitterness over the nature of the treaty continued for many years following the surrender as did a profound hatred for those who were instrumental in setting the stage for the surrender. As one of the earliest examples of this hatred, in 1921 Erzberger, who had signed the armistice document on behalf of Germany and who had also supported the Treaty of Versailles, was assassinated by two former German army officers (see MacMillan, p. 478). In fact, shortly after the assassination, the German National People’s Party, an extreme right-wing organization, made the following comment in its newsletter.

Erzberger...has suffered the fate which the vast majority of patriotic Germans have long desired for him. Erzberger, the man who is alone responsible for the humiliating armistice...the man who is responsible for the acceptance of the Versailles “Treaty of Shame” (and) the man whose spirit unhappily still prevails in many of our government offices and laws, has at last secured the punishment suitable for a traitor. Regardless of one’s feeling concerning political murder there can be no doubt that the majority of the German people breathe a sigh of relief at this moment...We must learn to hate our enemies abroad, but we must

also punish the domestic enemies of Germany with our hatred and our contempt (Epstein, 1959, p. 388-389).

<sup>23</sup> *London Free Press*, November 11, 1918, 11:7-8.

<sup>24</sup> *London Free Press*, November 12, 1918, 3:2.

<sup>25</sup> *London Free Press*, November 12, 1918, 5:2; *London Advertiser*, November 12, 1918, 4:3-4.

<sup>26</sup> *London Free Press*, November 12, 1918, 5.

<sup>27</sup> *London Free Press*, November 15, 1918, 3: 4.

<sup>28</sup> *London Free Press*, November 12, 1918, 10: 1-3.

<sup>29</sup> Nicholson, G.W.L. Canadian Expeditionary Force 1914-1919. Ottawa, ON: Queens Printer and Controller of Stationary, 1962.

<sup>30</sup> *London Free Press*, December 9, 1918, 12: 6.

<sup>31</sup> Brown, R.C. and Cook, R. Canada 1896-1921. Toronto, ON: McClelland and Steward, Ltd., 1974.

<sup>32</sup> *London Advertiser*, October 7, 1915, 6:2.

<sup>33</sup> *London Advertiser*, December 1, 1915, 9: 3-4.

<sup>34</sup> *London Advertiser*, September 25, 1916, 9:2-3.

<sup>35</sup> *London Advertiser*, September 12, 1916, 1:4-5.

<sup>36</sup> *London Advertiser*, September 19, 1916, 9:2-3.

<sup>37</sup> *London Advertiser*, September 22, 1916, 4:1-2.

<sup>38</sup> *London Advertiser*, October 29, 1917, 1: 5; *London Advertiser*, November 2, 1917, 13:4-5.

<sup>39</sup> *The London Advertiser*, November 3, 1917, 3:1.

<sup>40</sup> *London Advertiser*, November 8, 1917, 5:5-7.

<sup>41</sup> *London Advertiser*, November 23, 1917, 16:5-7.

<sup>42</sup> *London Advertiser*, September 17, 1915, ? :7.

<sup>43</sup> *London Advertiser*, November 1, 1917, 1:3.

- <sup>44</sup> *London Advertiser*, November 8, 1917, 3:1.
- <sup>45</sup> *London Advertiser*, November 8, 1917, 12:6.
- <sup>46</sup> *London Advertiser*, November 12, 1917, 1:5.
- <sup>47</sup> *London Advertiser*, November 17, 1917, 3:4-5.
- <sup>48</sup> *London Advertiser*, December 4, 1917, 12:3.
- <sup>49</sup> *London Free Press*, November 1, 1918, 8:3.
- <sup>50</sup> *London Free Press*, November 13, 1918, 6:3-8.
- <sup>51</sup> *London Advertiser*, October 29, 1918, 9:1-3.
- <sup>52</sup> *London Free Press*, November 13, 1918, 6:3-8.
- <sup>53</sup> *London Free Press*, November 2, 1918, 5:3.
- <sup>54</sup> *London Advertiser*, October 19, 1918, 9:3.
- <sup>55</sup> *London Advertiser*, October 24, 1918, 2:4.
- <sup>56</sup> *London Advertiser*, November 6, 1918, 3:5-8.
- <sup>57</sup> *London Free Press*, November 12, 1918, 3: 5.
- <sup>58</sup> *London Free Press*, November 12, 1918, 11:4.
- <sup>59</sup> *London Advertiser*, November 18, 1918, 3:6-7.
- <sup>60</sup> *London Advertiser*, November 30, 1918, 2:4.
- <sup>61</sup> Brown, R.C. and Cook, R. Canada 1896-1921. Toronto, ON: McClelland and Steward, Ltd., 1974.
- <sup>62</sup> *London Advertiser*, November 1, 1917, 6: 4-7.
- <sup>63</sup> *London Advertiser*, November 12, 1918, 1:7-8.
- <sup>64</sup> *London Free Press*, November 13, 1918, 4:1.
- <sup>65</sup> *London Advertiser*, November 12, 1918, 1: 7-8.
- <sup>66</sup> *London Advertiser*, November 30, 1918, 2:2.

- <sup>67</sup> *London Advertiser*, December 4, 1918, 4:4.
- <sup>68</sup> *London Free Press*, December 14, 1918, 17:4; 5: 3.
- <sup>69</sup> London City Council Proceedings, December 16, 1918
- <sup>70</sup> *London Free Press*, April 2, 1919, 1:2-3.
- <sup>71</sup> London City Council Proceedings, April 14, 1919, No. 51
- <sup>72</sup> *London Free Press*, April 23, 1919, 1:2-4.
- <sup>73</sup> *London Free Press*, April 22, 1919, 5:3-4.
- <sup>74</sup> *London Free Press*, April 24, 1919, 1:6-8.
- <sup>75</sup> *London Free Press*, April 22, 1919, 13:7.
- <sup>76</sup> *London Free Press*, April 25, 1919, 2:5.
- <sup>77</sup> *London Free Press*, April 25, 1919, 3:1-3.
- <sup>78</sup> *London Free Press*, March 28, 1919, 2: 6; April 8, 1919, 1:6-7.
- <sup>79</sup> *London Advertiser*, November 12, 1918, 1:8.
- <sup>80</sup> *London Advertiser*, November 5, 1918, 5:8.
- <sup>81</sup> *London Free Press*, November 10, 1919, 2:3.
- <sup>82</sup> *London Advertiser*, December 7, 1918, 1:1-2.
- <sup>83</sup> *London Free Press*, April 10, 1919, 12: 3.
- <sup>84</sup> *London Advertiser*, December 22, 1919, 11:3.
- <sup>85</sup> Dennis, P. M. Reluctant Warriors: Canadian Conscripts and the Great War. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press, 2017.
- <sup>86</sup> *London Advertiser*, May 7, 1917, 10:5.
- <sup>87</sup> *London Advertiser*, December 22, 1919, 3:4.
- <sup>88</sup> *London Advertiser*, December 23, 1919, 11:4.
- <sup>89</sup> *London Advertiser*, May 5, 1917, 12:4.



- <sup>90</sup> *London Free Press*, April 7, 1919, 9:7.
- <sup>91</sup> *London Advertiser*, November 29, 1917, 9:2.
- <sup>92</sup> *London Advertiser*, November 16, 1918, 13:2.
- <sup>93</sup> *London Advertiser*, May 8, 1917, 1:4-5.
- <sup>94</sup> *London Advertiser*, November 27, 1918, 9:5-6.
- <sup>95</sup> Macphail, A. The Medical Services: Official History of the Canadian Forces in the Great War 1914-1919. Ottawa, ON: F.A. Acland, 1925.
- <sup>96</sup> *London Advertiser*, May 3, 1917, 3:3.
- <sup>97</sup> *London Free Press*, December 9, 1918, 3:2.
- <sup>98</sup> *London Advertiser*, November 27, 1917, 1:1.
- <sup>99</sup> *London Advertiser*, October 18, 1917, 2:1.
- <sup>100</sup> *London Free Press*, December 11, 1918, 9:5.
- <sup>101</sup> *London Free Press*, November 8, 1919, 9: 4.
- <sup>102</sup> London Scrapbook, Vol. 17, #33. Available in the London Room, London Central Library, London, Ontario.
- <sup>103</sup> *London Advertiser*, November 9, 1917, 2:2-3.
- <sup>104</sup> *London Advertiser*, December 20, 1919, 3: full page.
- <sup>105</sup> *London Free Press*, November 9, 1920, 4:3.
- <sup>106</sup> *London Advertiser*, December 3, 1918, 4: 3.
- <sup>107</sup> *London Free Press*, December 30, 1919, 1:1.
- <sup>108</sup> *London Advertiser*, December 23, 1919, 15: 5.
- <sup>109</sup> *London Free Press*, January 2, 1920, 2:5.
- <sup>110</sup> *London Advertiser*, January 2, 1920, 3:6.
- <sup>111</sup> *London Free Press*, June 1, 1925, 3: 2.
- <sup>112</sup> *London Advertiser*, June 1, 1925, 1:6.

- <sup>113</sup> *London Advertiser*, November 21, 1921, 2:1.
- <sup>114</sup> *London Advertiser*, November 26, 1918, 4:3- 4.
- <sup>115</sup> *London Advertiser*, October 18, 1917, 1:1-2.
- <sup>116</sup> *London Free Press*, November 7, 1919, 10: 6.
- <sup>117</sup> *London Free Press*, November 8, 1919, 3:3.
- <sup>118</sup> *London Free Press*, November 10, 1919, 5:7.
- <sup>119</sup> *London Free Press*, November 1, 1920, 13:5.
- <sup>120</sup> *London Free Press*, November 2, 1920, 3:3.
- <sup>121</sup> *London Free Press*, November 11, 1920, 1:3 and 5:4.
- <sup>122</sup> *London Free Press*, November 11, 1920, 1:3.
- <sup>123</sup> *London Advertiser*, November 12, 1920, 10: 5.
- <sup>124</sup> House of Commons Debate, 13<sup>th</sup> Parliament, 5<sup>th</sup> Session, Volume 3, #2555.
- <sup>125</sup> *London Free Press*, November 10, 1921, 2:5.
- <sup>126</sup> *London Free Press*, November 11, 1921, 1:6.
- <sup>127</sup> *London Free Press*, November 8, 1930, 20:1.
- <sup>128</sup> *London Free Press*, November 10, 1930, 6:1.
- <sup>129</sup> *London Free Press*, November 10, 1930, 3: 1.
- <sup>130</sup> *London Free Press*, November 11, 1930, 1:1.
- <sup>131</sup> *London Free Press*, October 12, 1931, 6:3.
- <sup>132</sup> *London Free Press*, October 12, 1931, 2:3.
- <sup>133</sup> *London Free Press*, November 6, 1931, 26:3.
- <sup>134</sup> *London Free Press*, November 10, 1933, 25:2.
- <sup>135</sup> *London Free Press*, November 10, 1931, 1:2-3.
- <sup>136</sup> *London Free Press*, November 12, 1931, 8:1-3.

<sup>137</sup> *London Free Press*, November 12, 1931, 6:1.

<sup>138</sup> *London Free Press*, November 8, 1956.

<sup>139</sup> *London Free Press*, September 6, 1934, 3:5-6; November 12, 1934, 1:7-8.

<sup>140</sup> *London Free Press*, November 15, 1934, 22.

<sup>141</sup> *London Free Press*, September 25, 1934.

<sup>142</sup> *London Free Press*, November 10, 1934, 1:7-8.

<sup>143</sup> *London Free Press*, November 10, 1934, 2:7.

<sup>144</sup> *The London Free Press*, November 12, 1934, 1:7-8.

<sup>145</sup> *London Free Press*, November 10, 1934, 32.

