ARGONAUTA

Founded 1984 by Kenneth MacKenzie
ISSN No. 2291-5427

Editors

Isabel Campbell and Colleen McKee
Jean Martin ~ French Editor
Winston (Kip) Scoville ~ Production/Distribution Manager

Argonauta Editorial Office

c/o Isabel Campbell
2067 Alta Vista Dr. Ottawa ON K1H 7L4

e-mail submissions to:

scmckee@magma.ca
or
Isabel.Campbell@forces.gc.ca

ARGONAUTA is published four times a year—Winter, Spring, Summer and Autumn

Executive Officers

President: Chris Madsen, North Vancouver, BC
1st Vice President: Roger Sarty, Kitchener, ON
Treasurer: Errolyn Humphreys, Ottawa, ON
Secretary: Michael Moir, Toronto, ON
Membership Secretary: Faye Kert, Ottawa, ON
Councillor: Walter Lewis, Grafton, ON
Councillor: David More, Kingston, ON
Councillor: Winston (Kip) Scoville, Clinton, ON
Councillor: Sam McLean, Mississauga, ON
Past President & Nominating Chair Maurice Smith, Kingston, ON

Membership Business:

200 Fifth Avenue, Ottawa, Ontario, K1S 2N2, Canada
e-mail: fkert@sympatico.ca

Annual Membership including four issues of ARGONAUTA
and four issues of THE NORTHERN MARINER/LE MARIN DU NORD:
Within Canada: Individuals, $70.00; Institutions, $95.00; Students, $25.00
International: Individuals, $80.00; Institutions, $105.00; Students, $35.00

Our Website: http://www.cnrs-scrn.org

Copyright © CNRS/SCRN and all original copyright holders
In this issue of the *Argonauta*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Editorial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President’s Corner</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada’s Office of the Navy Architect, Government Icebreakers and The Russian Icebreaker <em>Yermak</em></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 6: The Canadian Forces Artists Program at the Diefenbunker</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society for Military History Conference</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature Review</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Announcements &amp; Notices</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNRS Nominations</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNRS 2016 Annual Conference &amp; General Meeting</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remembering September 3, 1935</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comic Drawing Contest</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remembering September 3, 1935 Comic Drawing Contest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalists: Recovering “The Losers” of the American Revolution</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Query for Capt. George Allen Ship Information</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Discovery of the lost <em>Ontario</em></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNRS By-laws</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNRS Membership Registration Form</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Editorial
by Isabel Campbell / Colleen McKee

This spring issue brings welcome tidings. Maurice Smith, our Past President, is asking for nominations to the CNRS executive. While only one post is open now, we hope that members will come forward to establish a vital group of individuals willing to serve in future positions on the Executive. We also draw your attention to the current by-laws which appear in this issue. Please also see the President’s report, along with his announcements about the forthcoming CNRS conference in Westminster BC; we encourage members to attend the conference from 18-20 August. More information will appear in the summer issue. The artistic members amongst us are encouraged to enter the comic contest which is part of the program at the annual conference. The Society for Military History conference was held here in Ottawa in mid-April and you can find a few abstracts from the ship-building session in this issue of Argonauta.

We are proud to announce this issue’s articles, beginning with George Bolotenko’s article on icebreakers which addresses the little known Russian influence on Canadian ship design. John MacFarlane describes the “Group 6” Canadian Forces Artist program at the Diefenbunker, including beautiful images, film documentaries, original libretto and music scores, and a prize-winning children’s book on Afghanistan. We welcome the return of Tavis Harris’ literature review to Argo; Tavis keeps us up to date on scholarship described.

It’s been a rough winter in many parts of Canada, especially in the isolated, impoverished areas and we’ve all heard sad news about war-torn parts of the world. We hope that spring and better weather will raise everyone’s spirits and give opportunities for travel, for research and for making connections with fellow scholars and friends.

In closing, we draw your attention in the announcements to a request for assistance from retired USN member John Abbott who is conducting genealogical research about his ancestors in Yarmouth, NS. Argonauta is your quarterly – it’s the place where members can share their ideas, make connections and contribute to scholarship. Please consider sending us your work concerning on-going research, requests for assistance, and also your feedback.

Isabel and Colleen

CNRS Memberships Dues

Now that Argonauta, our newsletter has been sent out, the January issue of The Northern Mariner/Le marin du nord has been published and the April issue is in production, it is time to remind those who have not yet renewed their membership for 2016 to do so.

The Society depends on its members dues to publish the journal, which is the only peer-reviewed maritime research journal in North America, and to host our annual conferences. This year’s conference is in Vancouver in August and next year’s is in Halifax, linking members from coast to coast.

You are welcome to renew by cheque or credit card by mail by downloading the membership form from the CNRS website: http://www.cnrs-scrn.org/membership/index_e.html

or use the on-line form for secure, quick and painless dues payment.

The cost is the same as last year and the value is priceless.
Public marine museums are fast disappearing in Canada. The reasons for this precipitous decline are multifold. The country, perhaps with the exception of the two coasts, is not very sea-minded. Despite the importance of international trade and maritime commerce, the continental relationship with the United States predominates in trade and politics. Talking about ships and maritime things is a hard sell to Canadians at the best of times. Understanding the past on its own terms and explaining to a larger audience in a way that remains interesting and engaging is that much harder. Actually getting paying patrons through the doors to cover costs is another measure. Most marine museums disappoint on this score, as they are small and rely on the generosity of volunteers and donors to operate for the most part. Still, they have continued on from crisis to crisis, through good and bad times. What has really hurt marine museums, however, is waning support at local levels. In many cases, this has meant the difference between staying open and closing. Several marine museums have been left without homes.

Of course, this trend is hardly new. In the year 2000, Toronto’s former Maritime Museum of Upper Canada moved to a new location on the central lakefront but could not attract the numbers that the city deemed necessary rebranded as The Pier. The Maritime Museum of British Columbia was fortunate to find another downtown location when the long-time Bastion Square site was no longer available to it. Plans to develop a shipbuilding-themed museum in North Vancouver on former industrial lands fell through the first time with withdrawal of promised provincial funding and the second time, when volunteer fundraisers and cultural services staff fell short of target goals set by the city council. In Kingston, the federal government recently sold waterfront lands to a developer, and the Marine Museum of the Great Lakes faces an uncertain future as a result. In each of these cases, the stance of municipalities, either for or against, has been crucial for survival.

Marine museums, as many members of this society who have researched or worked in them know, have unique and significant collections of artifacts, books, and primary documents, in many cases to be found nowhere else. What happens to these collections when a marine museum ceases operating? They may go into storage until the museum can open once again. They may get transferred, in whole or in part, to other related institutions, libraries, or archives willing to take them. They may be put up for sale piecemeal or auctioned off in lots. Or, they may simply be thrown out as no longer having any value. Either way, materials important to research in maritime affairs - past, present, and future- become potentially unavailable for a period of time or worse lost forever.
Why should members of the Canadian Nautical Research Society care about the sad state of marine museums? That one word in our name betrays our affections and inherent self-interest. Scholarship is possible because there are those who go do the primary research, chase down the details, write up the results of their findings, and share in common discourse among a community. It makes our life easier and arguably more rewarding to have places where we can find the sources that we need to do our work and pursue our passions. Loss of public marine museums, even just one, inevitably impacts on us all.

There are several ways marine museums need our help. Make a little noise. Write a note or letter in support to civic leaders. Tell developers about the value of maritime heritage. Remind boards and directors of their special responsibilities. Save the records.

As a home for independent researchers, the Canadian Nautical Research Society wholly supports any effort to preserve the material and documentary basis for the maritime narrative in Canada.

Chris Madsen
North Vancouver

Visit the CNRS on Facebook: facebook.com/cnrs.scrn
and Follow us on Twitter twitter.com/CanNautResSoc
The acquisition or building of icebreakers for the Canadian government was, at the turn of the 20th century, a matter of cardinal concern. At a time when waterways moved so many people and goods, there were obvious and necessary political and commercial reasons for the federal government to extend navigation during winter freeze-up, and to maintain communications along the St. Lawrence, keeping routes open among coastal towns of Nova Scotia, Cape Breton and Prince Edward Island, and servicing distant posts and settlements.

This article will look at several developments in the history of Canadian ice-breaking and icebreakers, and at the generally little-known Canadian-Russian connection through the Yermak, a Russian-conceived and -designed icebreaker which set the standard for 20th century vessels of this sort. The Yermak was well known in its time in Canada. Albert Hickman, in his popular 1903 novel, The Sacrifice of the Shannon, names the vessel several times in his work, intimating that it was a supreme engineering marvel.² Yermak was well known in Britain as well, where the vessel had been built in 1897-1898 and re-fitted several times since launch. It assuredly was known to the Canadian government, evidenced by the following notice in The Times of London, published on 19 May 1904: “the [Canadian] government has decided immediately to order an icebreaking vessel, built after the model of the Russian icebreaker Yermak, for use on the St. Lawrence. The employment of such a vessel is expected to make navigation possible for a month longer than at present.”³ Very directly, the Canadian government wanted not any icebreaker, but a vessel of the Yermak type.

It is more than likely that, in connection with this intent to acquire additional and stronger icebreakers to meet her specific needs, Canada established the office of Naval Designer (or Architect) in the Department of Marine and Fisheries.⁴ This paper will show how the above sub-themes came together around 1905 – the search for and appointment of Canada’s first Naval Architect; the Canada-Yermak connection; and the building of two icebreakers for Canada (Earl Grey and J.D. Hazen) under the supervision of that first Naval Architect.⁵

I. Office of Naval Architect /Designer

After Canada’s decision to acquire an icebreaker for the St. Lawrence, on 22 August 1905, the Canadian Minister of Marine, J.R.F. Prefontaine, wrote to Lord Strathcona, Canada’s High Commissioner in the United Kingdom, “w[e] are contemplating the construction of two strong ice-breakers for service between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. What I should like to know is whether you can recommend me a first class naval designer to undertake the work in question.”⁶ Prefontaine further urged that the suggested specialist come out immediately and that
he “get all the information in the possession of the Department regarding the class of vehicle required”, indicating that the Canadian government would pay all expenses. Prefontaine also noted that Vickers, Sons & Maxim, with a representative in Montreal, had done good work in this area, i.e. ice-breaker construction.

Strathcona subsequently put out feelers to Vickers, who responded that they had in their employ just the man to advise the Canadian government on the design of icebreakers, a Mr. Charles Duguid, a “very able and qualified Naval Architect and a most reliable man, prepared to come, and should be paid 500 £/yr. and expenses.” Mr. Dugid had actually worked on the re-design of icebreaker plans recently submitted by the Canadian government to Vickers, further reason for his engagement. With seeming urgency, Prefontaine indicated acceptance of Duguid to Strathcona, and informed him on 25 September 1905 that it was “…important that [Duguid] should leave at once and report to the Department.”

For unspecified reasons, Duguid did not come “at once”, though he may have visited Canada in May or June of 1906. Perhaps Duguid’s posting was held up by the untimely death of Prefontaine on Christmas Day of 1905, or perhaps by the bruited possibility in 1906 of Canada's acquisition of the Yermak (discussed below). Somewhat later, Prefontaine’s successor, L.P. Brodeur, re-commenced the Duguid matter. He wrote to Strathcona on 20 May 1907, requesting clarification of Duguid's qualifications. There was no urgency to the matter, Brodeur indicated; but, he was considering seriously the appointment of a naval architect for the Sorel shipyards (where, he may have thought, icebreakers could be built). Further, Duguid had identified himself to the Department as a “naval designer”— Brodeur requested Strathcona to determine whether or not there was any difference, in British practice, between architect and designer. After inquiry, Strathcona responded that Duguid had, by 1907, acquired 18 years of experience as a naval architect, seven years with Russell & Co in Port Glasgow, and 11 with Vickers, Sons & Maxim at Barrow-in-Furness, London.

Some time after this exchange Duguid finally took up his position as Naval Architect of Canada’s Department of Marine. In early June 1908, however, he left Canada so that he could be in Britain in time for the tendering process for the construction of the Earl Grey, recently ordered by the Canadian government, with instructions that all his communication with the Department was to go strictly through Strathcona.

II. Yermak – Almost Canadian (?)

As noted in the introduction, Yermak, Russia's premier icebreaker, had achieved broad renown. Russia's Admiral S.O. Makarov, obsessed with the call of Arctic exploration, had conceived and designed it after many years of planning and struggling for government funds. To those who had said that arctic ice ridges were impassable, he had responded, “the ice ridges can be overcome. The only thing that cannot be overcome is superstition.” His projected icebreaker would be a “line” icebreaker with strategic and operational value, allowing a naval fleet to work in winter ice. Finally, it would give Russia winter egress out of her northern port of Archangel, as well as encourage commerce and trade out of the estuaries of the great Siberian rivers – again, both strategic and commercial considerations.
Makarov’s dream was finally realized when the Imperial Russian government placed the order for the construction of Yermak, according to Makarov’s plans and designs, with Armstrong, at Newcastle-on-Tyne, in 1897. Russia took delivery of the icebreaker in February 1898.

A brief overview of some of the more revolutionary aspects of Yermak’s design reveals just why it set the gold standard for icebreakers. The bow was an effective mix between ice-cutter and ice-crusher; with the keel line at the forefoot running up at 25 degrees from true horizontal to allow the vessel to mount ice. An elliptical stern reduced settling as the breaker was run up onto ice. The vessel's sides were rounded outwards, to inhibit ice accretion along the waterline. Longitudinal and cross-ship bulkheads, as well as hull sheathing, were significantly reinforced. The vessel was divided into far more individual compartments than usual for that time, to provide more all-around hull strength against ice pressure. Each compartment was fully waterproofed. The main deck was one solid structure, stem to stern. The steel sheets of the bow were double thick, along with an ice-belt the length of the ship. All riveting was ground flush, to reduce wear on the hull. Hot water jets mounted at the bow washed away ice accretion and greased the bow's mounting onto ice. Water ballast tanks fore and aft, and along the ship’s sides, allowed for the distribution of weight as necessary to increase either crushing or rocking pressure upon ice and for more stability in the open sea. The whole length of the boiler section was double-hulled, and the ship was double-keeled. The water pumping system ran on an independent boiler which was fully water-proofed. There were many other innovations, too many to mention here. While not all of these elements were novelties in their own right, when brought together in a vessel of 9,000 tons displacement and with boilers putting out 10,000 horsepower, designed to crush...
rather than smash or cut ice, Yermak truly stood apart from anything that had earlier passed for an icebreaker. Thus came into being the “Russian type icebreaker”, called the “first true icebreaker”, which set the standard for icebreakers for the 20th century and beyond. Hence the wording of the news clipping with which this article opens, indicating the Canadian government’s wish for a Yermak-type icebreaker.

But as Canada was contemplating the building of icebreakers, there came a moment when it seemed possible that, rather than building a copy of Yermak, she might acquire the original! (This possibility, along with the disruption in Marine occasioned by Prefontaine’s death in 1905, might explain his successor’s, Brodeur’s, delay in hiring Duguid). On 20 December 1905 Mr. Joseph A. Pease, a Junior Lord of the Treasury, wrote to Winston Churchill, then working in the Colonial Department, asking him to convey to Lord Elgin, Secretary of State for the Colonies, the following:

The Russian Ice-breaker “Ermack” [Yermak] which was built in my late constituency by Messrs Armstrong, Mitchell and Company at their Walker Shipyard, has been proved to be of very great value by the Russian Government in clearing passages into the Baltic Ports. She is at present in the Tyne and Messrs Armstrong Mitchell and Company have nearly completed certain repairs which were required.

From private information of a reliable character which I believe has not been conveyed to anyone else, I understand that the Russian Government are not in a position to meet Messrs Armstrong’s Bill for the repairs and that the Russian Government at the present moment would probably be disposed to sell the “Ermack” to the British or Canadian Government at a price which would be well worth giving for the use in the St. Lawrence River Mouth Navigation. Pease requested Churchill to pass on the request to Strathcona in absolute confidentiality, since no one, neither Russian diplomatic officials nor Armstrong themselves, knew anything about this proposal to Canada, which was Pease’s own personal undertaking.

Churchill duly forwarded this information on to Strathcona, who sent it on Prefontaine, then in Paris. Perhaps in one of his last acts, Prefontaine telegraphed on the eve of 24 December a return to Strathcona, as follows; “Cannot do anything about ice breaker before I return would thank you for details and report to be sent to Canada Merry Christmas Prefontaine”. Following Prefontaine’s death, E. Marsh, of the Colonial Office, forwarded further particulars regarding a possible sale of Yermak. “The original cost of the Ermack was approximately £ 150,000 and it is understood that the Russian Govt. would readily close at between £80 – 90,000. . . [A]bout £ 10,000 has been spent over the repairs.” On 8 January 1906, this information was telegraphed, in code, to Strathcona, who was then in Montreal.

The Deputy-Minister of Marine responded to Strathcona’s office on 30 January 1906 as follows:

I shall bring the matter to the attention of the new Minister of Marine and Fisheries immediately an appointment is made, but I do not think the
Department is in a position at the present time to purchase the “ERMACK” at
the price mentioned. It appears to me that she would be too expensive for the
work we have in hand, not only in regard to coal consumption, but also in regard
to the large crew she would require. I am also under the impression that she is
too large; however, I will communicate with you again on the subject.²⁰

And there the matter ended. To what degree Russia might have truly entertained
the selling of Yermak is moot. True, the Empire was then in the throes of the Revolution
of 1905, which followed on the heels of Russia's rout in the Russo-Japanese war of
1904. State finances were in disorder, war costs had drained the treasury, and there
may well have been difficulties in finding the funds needed to pay Armstrong's bill for
the icebreaker's repairs and refit. While the source material suggests that Russian
officials did consider the sale of Yermak, the vessel went home to Russia, where the
icebreaker had proven her worth time and again in substantially extending the
navigation season in the Gulf of Finland and in novel Arctic exploratory expeditions
over the five preceding years. With no Yermak Canada, of course, went ahead with
placing orders for new icebreakers.

III. The Building of Earl Grey and J.D. Hazen

The Earl Grey, launched in 1909, and the J.D. Hazen, launched in 1916, were
built on Duguid's watch. Available sources do not tell very much of his contribution to
the icebreakers' designs, but they do hint at his participation.

The Canadian government, when it was considering ordering an icebreaker in
1904, had favoured Vickers, Sons & Maxim as potential builders. By 1905, Vickers had
submitted ice-breaker plans to the Canadian government, which then asked for
modifications, which were effected with the participation of Duguid (as indicated above,
a factor strongly in his favour as candidate for selection as Canada's first Naval
Architect).²¹ Thus it seems safe to say that Duguid was closely connected with the
design, or re-design, of Earl Grey, Canada's most 'elegant' icebreaker. Duguid left
Canada in early June to be in situ for the tendering process for Earl Grey, and to
manage all necessary communications with the Canadian government through
Strathcona.²² And through Strathcona Duguid informed the Department of Marine on 2
July 1908 that the first keel plate of the Earl Grey had been laid down the day before, at
Messieurs Vickers, Sons and Maxim, at Barrow-in-Furness.²³ Available sources are
silent on this point, but in all probability Duguid was present to oversee the construction
of the vessel. He was also a key figure in the construction of another notable Canadian
ice-breaker, the J.D. Hazen.

While Earl Grey was built in the United Kingdom, by the end of the decade
Canada was considering the possibility of building of icebreakers at home. In
December of 1910 Duguid had left for London, and the Deputy Minister of Marine
requested Strathcona to, “as in the past”, put his office at Mr. Duguid's disposal “for the
work he has under consideration”. In all likelihood Duguid was doing preliminary work,
acquiring design and engineering information, on the icebreaker which would be floated
as the J.D. Hazen.²⁴

In 1913 Duguid was back again in London. From there on 28 January he wrote to
V.W. Forneret, Superintending Engineer, River St. Lawrence Ship Channel,
Department of Marine and Transport, that while he was studying dredging (as instructed), “in connection with Ice Breaker Construction, I have received some valuable data which will be of much service should you decide to go on with the large vessel for the St. Lawrence.” The note is irritatingly laconic – what data, from whom? Perhaps Duguid was referring to information gathered on Yermak, which had been back to Armstrongs (its original builders) several times for refit; perhaps Duguid may have received access to icebreaker design work and plans from Armstrong and other yards. They would have proven useful for what was announced towards the end of that year.

On 15 November 1913, the *The Times* published the following announcement:

The Department of Marine and Fisheries within a few days will call for tenders for the strongest and best-equipped ice-breaker ever constructed. It will be used exclusively for the St. Lawrence route, and the contract provides that the vessel shall be built in Canada. Practically all ice-breaking vessels now in the Dominion service were constructed in the Old Country, but this policy will now be reversed by Mr. Borden's Government.

The government's decision to build at home was in all likelihood coloured by the Naval Bill debate which commenced in 1910, and by the decision to develop a Canadian navy and a domestic ability to meet that navy's needs. In this context, the Borden government promised Vickers contracts for the construction of naval vessels if it would establish a subsidiary in Canada. Hence, Vickers, in 1912, towed the Earl of Connaught dry-dock across the Atlantic to Montreal, and set up shop to build to government orders. The naval orders did not come. Under pressure to provide Vickers
with work to justify its massive investment, on 18 March 1913 the government signed a contract with Vickers for the building of an icebreaker. Thus, “the keel of the first Canadian Vickers built ship was laid down. She was the J.D. Hazen, built and fitted for service in the northern waters of her native land. This was a very important job, for the hull was to prove a schoolroom in which would be taught to young Canadians the art of shipbuilding.” However, war orders placed with Vickers delayed the Hazen’s construction; it was finally launched in May 1916, and almost immediately after launch sold to the Russian Imperial Government.

That Duguid was intimately involved in the oversight of the building of Hazen is attested by Duguid’s letter of 21 January 1915 to C. Stanton, Assistant Deputy Minister, Department of Marine and Fisheries, in which he reports: “The ice-breaker, which was progressing most satisfactorily as regards Construction, has been partly dismantled, and the double bottom moved from its berth for a distance of 15 to 20 feet”. It is safe to assume that Duguid monitored the construction of the icebreaker regularly.

IV. The Earl Grey, the J. D. Hazen and Yermak Considered

The Times note of 19 May 1904, with which this article opens, indicates that the Canadian government contemplated the acquisition of an icebreaker of the Yermak type. However, even a cursory glance at the image of Earl Grey (previous page) indicates that it was not at all such a vessel. Rather than an ice-crusher, it was an ice-cutter, with elegant clipper-type lines, and a rakish “Stanley” bow. It had a significant power-to-weight ratio – weighing 4,600 tons, it could produce 7,000 horsepower from its boilers. It needed that power to do its work. Unlike older icebreakers which battered at ice, Earl Grey chose its spots and strove to knife through ice. The vessel did its work well, had an extraordinarily illustrious career, and worked in the Soviet Arctic into the 1950s, being broke up for scrap in the mid-1960s.

But this design gave way in the twentieth century to the Yermak type, and the image of Hazen (next page) demonstrates that it held to this design. The Yermak was not designed specifically for either battering or knifing through ice, although as a much more complete icebreaker than any before it, it could both batter and knife through ice very effectively, as any icebreaker would have to do depending on ice conditions. Yermak’s signal achievement was the power of its ice crushing ability as it rode up on ice. T.E. Appleton suggests that the following criteria are features of a modern icebreaker: good weight and power; the ability to ride up on ice and work free again without losing stability; heeling and trimming tanks to redistribute ballast as needed to roll and expedite the crushing of ice; no vertical or concave surfaces in hull structure; and a well-rounded bottom. One might add that in addition to weight, power also was a significant requirement for crushing ice, and Hazen, displacing approximately 6,000 tons, could produce up to 10,000 indicated horsepower. In all these respects, it was a modern, Yermak-type icebreaker.

I have not yet been able to locate archival sources to explain why the Canadian government, when considering a Yermak type icebreaker in 1904, went with the ice-cutter design of Earl Grey. Perhaps that was a default (more traditional) design to which Vickers' engineers and ships architects in Barrow-on-Furness held. Perhaps
Duguid had some role in this. Duguid visited the United Kingdom often in the execution of his duties, and reported on obtaining “information of interest” for the Canadian government with respect to icebreaker construction, as per his intriguing, though laconic note of 28 January 1913 to Forneret regarding “valuable data” about icebreaker construction, should the government decide to go ahead with “a large vessel for the St. Lawrence”. (This had been on the eve of the Canadian government's decision to proceed with the acquisition of an icebreaker.) One can assume as well that Duguid was speaking about information of value for the construction of Hazen. Overall, on his frequent returns to England from the time of his appointment as Naval Architect, Duguid would have mixed with old acquaintances, visited various shipyards where he had contacts, and would have gathered information on shipbuilding, especially icebreakers. In this connection he would have gathered material on Yermak, built by Armstrong in Newcastle-on-Tyne. It is inconceivable that Duguid's reports back to Ottawa on icebreaker construction would have failed to note that the Yermak type of icebreaker had swept the field. This may very well be why Hazen came out as a “Russian-style” icebreaker.

V. Conclusion

I have already indicated in the introduction the value of icebreakers for the Canadian government as the 20th century opened. This concern was reflected in the decision to create the office of Naval Architect for the Department of Marine, which I have tried to trace despite the paucity of available sources. Whether icebreakers were ordered from abroad, or intended to be built at home, Canada needed someone expert in the design of such vessels to assure that Canada's design needs were properly ascertained, appropriate ship's plans drawn up, and construction quality monitored. Hence the appearance of Douglas Duguid. On his watch, both Earl Grey and Hazen came down the slipways. Moreover, the building of Hazen, more than just the acquisition of an icebreaker, was a notable milepost in the development of Canadian shipbuilding.
With the appearance of Hazen, the Yermak style of icebreaker manifested itself in icebreaker construction in Canada. Here, Duguid's position as a ships' architect with experience in British yards, which had built Yermak and knew it well, was instrumental. He would have incorporated it's leading elements into icebreaker design. That the design was of unmatched excellence was attested by A. Gulston, one of Armstrong's ships' engineers, who sailed on Yermak on its first two forays into the Arctic, after which he declared the vessel to be a “magnificent piece of naval architecture.”

Ultimately both icebreakers built on Duguid's watch distinguished themselves. The ice-cutter Earl Grey / Litke broke port ice, led convoys and undertook research expeditions – though with many refits as the vessel aged -- until 1960. The Yermak-type Hazen / Mikula came home in 1922 from adventures in northern Russian waters, and until 1935 successfully worked the hard ice in the St. Lawrence. But following Earl Grey / Litke, there would be no more dedicated ice-cutters of her type. The Yermak type, as reflected in Hazen / Mikula, would become the archetypal icebreaker which we know today.
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16. For example, Canada's Stanley, the first steel ferry which came into service on the Prince Edward-Nova Scotia run in1888, was an ice crusher. There were other such vessels in Europe. However, none had the armour, the size, as well as many other technical advantages, and especially sheer power, to meet the challenge of Arctic ice as did Yermak.

18. RG 25, Volume 234, File "Me 1/2 – Me 2/1"
20. Ibid
23. Ibid (To buy themselves an extra month for the completion of the project, which was to be done in 10 months, Vickers had the Canadian government accept 11 July as the official start date of the contract.)
25. LAC, RG 12, Vol. 2164, File “9150-3 Canadian Government Ships (Operation). Fleet Data”, 1912-1942
28. Upon taking possession of the icebreaker, the Russian government renamed Hazen as Mikula Selianinovich. On the ship’s return to Canada in 1922, the Canadian government retained the Russian name in shortened form, Mikula.
29. I am immensely grateful to Michael Moir, who kindly provided me with copies of records from the J.D. Hazen fonds which he located at the University of New Brunswick Archives in 2015. The above-cited letter is from Box 22, File 4.

George Bolotenko received his PhD from the University of Toronto in 1979. He worked in Ottawa as an archivist at Library and Archives Canada, 1981-2012. He developed an interest in things maritime, and has done some research in this area, hence this little article.
“Artists have been an integral part of documenting crucial aspects of military history for over a century through various forms of media. I am honoured to see the creativity and talent shine through the pieces that these artists have produced from their privileged experiences alongside the Canadian Armed Forces. This exhibition allows the Canadian public access into the daily lives of our military members and their families.”

-Major-General Derek Joyce, Deputy Commander Military Personnel Command

“Working across a variety of media, these artists bring a unique perspective to the history, contributions and interactions of the men and women in the Canadian Forces in 2012-2013. The art serves to document the work undertaken by the Canadian Forces in Canada and abroad, and to provide a unique perspective from creative and independent viewpoints.”

-Henriette Riegel, Executive Director, Diefenbunker: Canada’s Cold War Museum

From 8 November 2015 to 31 January 2016 the CF Artists Program experimented with its first long-term exhibition. The Diefenbunker, Canada’s Cold War Museum, hosted the event with Megan Lafrenière bringing everything together and all feedback has been exceptionally positive. Jennifer Morse and her team at Legion Magazine provided fantastic graphics for the panels and catalogue. The National Gallery of Canada covered the show in the November issue of their Magazine. Gallery curator Jonathan Shaughnessy noted that the “artists that are involved in the program are in many cases quite prominent. It’s great that they’re choosing to enter into this dialogue with the Canadian Forces, and through their art, document the material, operational and social dynamics of the Canadian military.” Canadian War Art specialist Laura Brandon curated the show. She added that the exhibition provided “a glimpse into a military world filled with tragedy, pride and courage. I have enormous respect for the artists and for the seriousness of their creative endeavours. They profoundly embraced the unique opportunity that the program afforded them.”

The program began in 2001 with the objective of providing professional artists a brief 7-10 day experience of life in the Canadian military. The sixth group of artists, in the program from January 2012 to December 2013, included six individuals and four working in two pairs of two. Two of the artists benefitted from naval hospitality, as have 14 of the 55 artists in the CFAP’s first six groups. After five previous exhibitions had displayed works created by the program for only a few days each time, most often at NDHQ, the new format allowed more people to appreciate the fabulous, thought-provoking art created by CFAP participants. Approximately 8,000 visitors saw in person the works of the artists of Group 6.
The Artists

Joseph Amato and Alicia Payne
Leslie Hossack
Thomas Kneubühler
Leslie Reid

Sophie Dupuis
Mary Kavanagh
Sharon E. McKay
Rhonda Weppler and Trevor Mahovsky

The Navy

Sophie Dupuis, a filmmaker from Val-d'Or, Quebec, visited the frigate HMCS Ottawa for ten-days along the Pacific Coast. From her experiences she created the short National Film Board Documentary “Quiet Forces.” Laura Brandon, described “Quiet Forces” as a “commentary-free non-narrative short documentary.” Dupuis communicates naval experience through “a series of contrasting scenes in quasi film-essay style.” She recorded daily life of the sailors with the marine and mechanical sounds that accompanied them: “sharing meals in the mess hall, navigating the chain of command, and toiling endlessly around a grounded helicopter. Buoyed by a rich soundtrack, her collection of fragmented scenes gradually forms a coherent whole, revealing the sailors’ esprit de corps and sense of shared destiny.”

HMCS Ottawa
Photographer: PO2 Daniel Gelines

HMCS Ottawa JIATF South
2013

Argonauta Spring 2016 ~ www.cnrs-scrn.org
An interesting aspect of the exhibition was a series of six panels prepared using excerpts from Brandon’s interviews with the artists. The quotes reveal, in very succinct form, some of the thoughts of the artists during their experiences with the military.

- “There were lots of people in a very small space.”
- “The hierarchy was very strict.”
- “The people were very interesting and had interesting things to say.”
- “With all the footage I had I could have made 20 films.” - Sophie Dupuis


The North

Leslie Reid of Ottawa, the only painter in Group 6, visited the North in August 2013. In her work *Kaskawulsh III*, 60° 44' N 138° 04' W below she depicts the Kaskawulsh Glacier which extends from the Northeastern slope of the St. Elias Mountains in the Yukon Territory and sends meltwater into the Pacific Ocean and the Alsek and Yukon River system in the North. She flew over much of the area covered by her father’s mapping flights of the 1940s for the RCAF. Laura Brandon describes how "her own military flight resulted in personal photographs whose aerial perspectives seemingly flatten the surrounding mountain ranges so that the dominant features are the glacier and its meltwaters. Based on one of these, she painted layer after layer of barely tinted glaze subtly highlights or shadows particular elements to create a harmonious whole in this painting. The multiplicity of paint layers creates a sense of movement…

- “Standing at the top of the Northwest Passage you know you are at the top of the world.”
- “I felt absolutely like one of them.”
- “It’s very hard to do video from a helicopter.”
- “You can only know a tiny bit of it.” - Leslie Reid
Thomas Kneubühler of Montreal photographed CF Station Alert in Nunavut during his visit there in February 2013. He produced a series of 8 images, “Days in Night.” In one of these, “Antennas,” we see a bright red light in the middle of “a web of blue-lit communication towers and wires. Such is the level of illumination,” in the words of Brandon, “that the stars are hardly visible. This image signifies such a diversity of human activity that it calls into question any description of Alert as isolated.

♦ “The military is a really huge organization.”
♦ “There was no distinction between water and land.”
♦ “How strange that landscape looks in the night.”
♦ “On the very last day I saw the sun.” - Thomas Kneubühler

Daily Life

The ten artists included two pairs. Rhonda Weppler and Trevor Mahovsky, born in Winnipeg and Calgary respectively, explored the Royal Military College (RMC) in photography and sculpture.

♦ “We were interested in the histories that are not apparent in objects but are associated with those objects.” (Rhonda Weppler)
♦ “We wouldn’t do these things if there wasn’t a surprise.” (Trevor Mahovsky)
♦ “There was a connection towards the people who worked there we didn’t think we would have.” (Rhonda Weppler)
♦ “Objects can seem very meaningful and very empty depending on your vantage point.” (Trevor Mahovsky)
Composer Joseph Amato and librettist Alicia Payne, both based in Toronto, created an oratorio (an opera in concert) about military families based on their visits to Military Family Resource Centres (MFRCs) and CF Base Selfkant in Germany.

- “We were welcomed into the community.” (Alicia Payne)
- “The people I met have left lasting impressions.” (Joseph Amato)
- “Every single meeting I had was a surprise and emotional.” (Joseph Amato)
- “Some of the emotion comes from what is left unsaid.” (Alicia Payne)
Mary Kavanagh of Lethbridge Alberta visited several research, training and testing facilities; she is interested in the Cold War and current testing programs of NORAD.

- “To step inside that world is to experience a whole other culture.”
- “I am always surprised by how my biases are challenged.” - Mary Kavanagh

Overseas:

Ottawa’s Leslie Hossack visited Kosovo in 2013 and created a book of her photos, Testament. Interested in memory, the work in the exhibit illustrates how the Kosovo War has been memorialized in the environment.

- “What was initially confusing was the military language surrounding the mission.”
- “I certainly had the sense the camp was a bubble. It is not a natural environment. It’s not their real life.”
- “I’m always examining memory and commemoration and the conjunction between the two.”

- Leslie Hossack

The Expulsion (in white), 2015, Collection of the artist

National Martyrs’ Memorial in Marina, Skenderaj, Kosovo, 2013 Collection of the artist

- “The military has a secret language. They speak in acronyms.”
- “I think this program is one of the most unique in the world.”
- “A good story always revolves around conflict.” — Sharon E. McKay

Footnotes

4. Interviews in full are held at the Canadian War Museum archives. Quotes in this article are from the text used in the exhibition which are also available at the Diefenbunker archives and the Directorate of History and Heritage, DND, archives.
Many CNRS and NASOH members attended the Society for Military History Conference here in Ottawa from 14 to 17 April 2016. Here is a link to the programme: http://www.smh-hq.org/2016/2016annualmeeting.html

First I’d like to draw your attention to the SMH and American Historical Association round-table on the “new military history” which crosses the boundary with the history of environment, gender, and race. This round-table signals changes afoot in the American and Canadian historical communities with greater cooperation among historians who have previously been isolated in academic silos. Michael Grossman, the Executive Director of the American Historical Association, addressed the matter of assumptions scholars make when they approach military historiography. I hope to see more Canadian engagement in breaking down the artificial boundaries which isolate scholars from each other.

Is military history necessarily supportive of a particular political or cultural agenda? Or is it critical and questioning — opening new doors to different views of the world? If the SMH 2016 is any measure, most of the current scholarship fits into the latter category. The Speakers, including members of both societies, presented papers in a variety of panels ranging from the “American Revolutionary War”, Sex and War Art, Cyber warfare, Middle East cultural issues, American-Canadian naval cooperation, Asian naval education, submarine warfare, Afghanistan, the War of 1812, notions of masculinity, and Cold War families, as well as ship-building.

Those of us giving papers and attending the conference had difficulty choosing among the many cutting-edge panels. I did not get the chance to hear the ship-building presentation described in abstracts provided by our President Chris Madsen, because it coincided with my own1 session on Base living during the Cold War. However, the feedback from it and the other sessions was simply outstanding. We look forward to seeing some of this work published in scholarly, peer-reviewed articles in future issues of The Northern Mariner.

Cross-Border Perspectives on Shipbuilding in a Transatlantic War, 1915-1919

Abstract

Military historians are generally familiar with the scale and scope of shipbuilding undertaken in North America during the Second World War, which has attracted much scholarship and popular imagery, whether Henry Kaiser or Rosie the Riveter. By comparison, the equally important shipbuilding effort during the First World War is less known and studied. The security of sea lines of communication and safe passage of war materials from North America to operational theatres in Europe and the Middle East needed ships, both naval and merchant. To meet this requirement, ambitious programs of wartime construction were started in shipyards across North America.

1 This short introduction is by Isabel Campbell, co-editor of Argonauta.
This wartime effort entailed legislative changes, organizational creativity, involvement of government and private industry, marshalling and prioritization of resources, and extensive coordination and collaboration amongst allies. The results were impressive. Thousands of ships were built in a short period of time. Innovative designs, novel techniques of production, and full utilization of available labor on the home front characterized the shipbuilding undertaken during the First World War. This panel examines certain contributions of the United States and Canada, together and cross-border, toward winning the war for the allies. It draws upon the work of knowledgeable and well-researched presenters from the North American Society for Oceanic History and the Canadian Nautical Research Society, the two leading organizations fostering study and publication in maritime history in North America.

Panel Chair: Richard Gimblett, Royal Canadian Navy
Commentator: Stephen Svonavec, Middle Georgia State University

Presenters:

“Admiralty Orders for Canadian Shipyards: Trawlers, Drifters, and the Urgency of Coastal Defence during the Great War”
- Michael Moir (York University) -

The trans-Atlantic movement of munitions, food, and other essential supplies from North America to Britain by merchant vessels was essential to maintain the Allies’ land-based campaigns of the Great War, as well as survival of civilian populations. Disruption of this supply chain was an important objective of the German navy, which attacked Allied and neutral shipping with surface cruisers and submarines. The strategy was initially aimed at shipping lanes close to Britain, but as German submarine design advanced during the war, vessels departing from North America’s eastern seaboard became vulnerable to attack. As the focus of the British Admiralty shifted from hunting enemy warships to defending merchant shipping, the emphasis in naval ship procurement swung from destroyers and cruisers to smaller patrol vessels. Losses to German submarines steadily mounted in 1916, which compelled the Admiralty to build 500 armed vessels to patrol coastlines, sweep for mines, and escort merchant ships. This demand outstripped the capacity of British shipyards, and after turning away Canadian offers to build ships for more than two years, the Admiralty finally agreed in November 1916 to fund the construction of 60 steel trawlers and 100 wooden drifters in Canada for use on both sides of the Atlantic. The initiative was administered by Canada’s Department of Naval Service under the guidance of a Royal Navy officer, but it was carried out by private-sector managers using shipyards on the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River with diverse levels of expertise and facilities, spread out over a distance of more than 1,500 kilometres. This paper will examine Canada’s rapid expansion of shipbuilding capacity in the country’s first large-scale ship procurement program despite challenges posed by geography and sustaining supply lines for material, equipment, and labour that stretched across the country and into the United States – issues that set the stage for the country’s subsequent involvement with the Imperial Munitions Board and the Canadian Government Merchant Marine.
"The Shipping Act of 1916 and Emergency Fleet Corporation: America Builds, Requisitions, and Seizes a Merchant Fleet Second to None"

Salvatore Mercogliano (Campbell University)

The United States Shipping Act, passed on September 7, 1916, provided for the building of an American merchant marine, at the time the US fleet was third in the world, behind Great Britain and Germany - a naval auxiliary, and a naval reserve. The newly created United States Shipping Board (USSB) oversaw the construction, acquisition, and disposition of the vessels provided for by this act and over shipping rates. This marked the first instance where the United States instituted government control over the merchant fleet. With the nations of the world locked in the Great War, the German merchant fleet interned in ports around the world, and the British, French, and Italian vessels diverted to support the war economies, and with losses of over two million tons of shipping, the United States hoped to achieve several objectives via the Shipping Act. First, it hoped to promote and stimulate domestic shipbuilding across the United States. Next, with the withdrawal of European merchant fleets from markets in the America's, an opportunity existed for the United States to exert its economic influence into these areas. Concurrently, the Naval Act of 1916 aimed to construct a battle fleet of ten battleships, six battle cruisers, ten light cruisers, fifty destroyers, and thirty submarines. Between naval expansion and Allied contracts for replacement merchant tonnage, the 234 building ways in the country were occupied and unable to support domestic merchant ship construction. The US declaration of war allowed the USSB to create the Emergency Fleet Corporation and initiate a domestic merchant ship building program that resulted in a fleet of 1,386 ships. With the conclusion of the conflict, the USSB and EFC, along with the U.S. Navy, were poised to challenge British naval superiority.

"Pacific Advantage: Wooden Shipbuilding in British Columbia, Washington State and Oregon during the First World War"

Chris Madsen (Canadian Forces College)

In North America, volume production of merchant and cargo ships for war purposes was first attempted in 1917 under the auspices of the Imperial Munitions Board and the Emergency Fleet Corporation. The decision to build ships out of wood, alongside expanded steel construction, was borne from necessity, not without controversy and criticism. The resulting programs adopted novel standardized designs using shipyards with little direct expertise or managerial experience in shipbuilding and hastily recruited and trained workforces. The Canadian province of British Columbia and the American states of Washington and Oregon received a disproportionate share of wartime contracts due to proximity to ready sources of timber, boat-building traditions serving the lumber trade and government shipping subsidies, business interests and labor clamouring for work as well as available waterfront lands and industrial sites untouched directly by war demands, unlike eastern ports. Shipyards selected for wooden construction, mostly associated with lumber mills or general
construction and engineering firms, were organized by responsible procurement officials such as Robert Butchart in Victoria and John Bain in Seattle for better progress and maximum efficiency. At the local level, results varied from shipyard to shipyard as companies completed individual ships in the face of material shortages, delayed deliveries of key components and major labor strikes. The challenges were shared on both sides of the border, and considerable interaction and coordination from north to south occurred. Scheduling, financial considerations and capacity limitations meant the wooden ships were delivered shortly before and months after the Armistice in November 1918. Most of these ships had short operating lives or were auctioned for scrap value in due course. Though the actual contribution to the war at sea was questionable, the impact of wooden shipbuilding on lives and communities in these regions of the Pacific north-west was telling. The wartime industry was an important sector of employment and business for ordinary people thrust into extraordinary times.
Summer brings with it exciting new times and before I lose many months to living in a tent it is a good opportunity to highlight some recent offerings in the field of maritime history. The first is F.G Hoffman’s “The American Wolfpacks: A Study in Wartime Adaptation.” (Joint Force Quarterly, 1st Quarter 2016: 131-139). Hoffman is a senior research fellow at the Centre for Strategic Research, Institute for Strategic Studies, at the National Defence University and has worked extensively in the defence and security fields. Hoffman’s work seeks to derive historical lessons for the adaptability and doctrinal development of joint-force structures in wartime with a focus on the United States Navy’s (USN’s) creation of “wolfpack” style submarine formations in the Pacific Theatre after witnessing their effectiveness with the Germans employing such a model against Allied shipping in the Atlantic. Hoffman contends that while drills, training, and doctrine serve their purpose, the key to success is adaptability in wartime. The USN’s road towards implementing such a policy is often-neglected but serves to demonstrate how a “learning culture” and willingness to inculcate lessons learned can overcome the limitations imposed by peacetime exercises. Hoffman points out that this willingness is evident in the fact the USN had roundly rejected commerce raiding as a strategic goal in the interwar period yet quickly adopted such measures upon seeing their effect, inflicting significant losses on the Japanese throughout.

Next is Peter M. Solar’s “Late Eighteenth Merchant Ships in War and Peace.” (International Journal of Maritime History. Vol. 28, No 1 (2016): 36-63). Solar is a professor of economics at Vesalius College, Vrije Universiteit Brussel and Université Saint-Louis-Bruxelles, Belgium who has worked in the history of maritime shipping industries. The crux of Solar’s work is emphasising the role Lloyd’s Register can play in systematic historical analysis. Solar contends that while historians have used the Register for studies of individual ships for many years, its role in more expansive research has yet to be fully appreciated. There are several shortcomings in using the Register (as with any source) such as incomplete publication years, noting gaps in the years available, and a time lag in the construction of a given vessel and its first annotation in the source documents, but he assesses the Register as a valuable source. First, Solar conducts a form of meta-analysis to provide an overall view of how the Register fares as a historical source before applying it to two case studies: the presence of privateers during wartime, and the process of doubling and sheathing of ship’s hulls. Finally, Solar examines the listing of vessels by owner and condition. Though larger-scale analyses require some “teasing” of data to fit ongoing or future work, Solar’s work suggests the Registers are a valuable and underutilized resource.

The sinking of the Lusitania represents one of the signal events in America’s decision to enter the Great War in the struggle against the Central Powers. Douglas Peifer’s “The Sinking of the Lusitania, Wilson’s Response, and Paths Not Taken: Historical Revisionism, the Nye Committee, and the Ghost of William Jennings Bryan” (Journal of Military History, 79, (October 2015): 1025-1045) examines the sinking of the Lusitania and how it sharpened debate in Washington over whether the United States should make the defense of neutral rights a casus belli. It further
considers the hard line that President Woodrow Wilson adopted regarding German violations of neutral rights which caused his secretary of state to resign in protest, with the outcome established in 1915 generating a precarious neutrality that lasted less than two years. This article examines the links between Wilson’s wartime policies, the revisionist literature of the interwar period, and the Neutrality Acts of the mid-1930s. Peifer’s main argument centres on the role of “history’s lessons” and that they often mislead rather than inform if separated from their context. This is especially vital for policymakers seeking to draw upon history to validate a decision making process which may draw comparisons between only superficially similar situations. Peifer is chair of the Air War College’s Department of Strategy. He holds a Ph.D. in history from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, with his primary field of concentration modern diplomatic and military history. He has published numerous articles and books on strategy, history, and international politics, with a forthcoming study on naval incidents and the decision for war.

Finally is David Rudd’s “Maritime Non-state Actors: A Challenge for the Royal Canadian Navy?” from The Journal of Military and Strategic Studies (Vol. 16, No 3 2015). Rudd is a defence scientist with the Canadian Department of National Defence with extensive experience in foreign policy and strategic studies. Rudd’s article first seeks to set the strategic environment, underlining the need for states to maintain stable lines of trade and communication to foster global trade. He then defines Maritime Non-State Actors in an expansive sense, including groups ranging from the Sea Shepherd to the Tamil Tigers. Rudd further categorizes the groups by aims and military vs non-military orientations. Policymakers must examine the multifaceted nature of how such groups operate and the type and nature of forces naval forces require to successfully counter such measures.
This year I am serving as the Chair of the CNRS Nominating Committee so I am looking for your help in suggesting names of potential new Council Members. We do not need many this year, in fact just one but having choices contributes to the health of our Society. In addition to Council, some of the nominated names might serve as important regional contacts or be available to serve on Committees. The by-law information pertaining to nominating Officers and Councillors at large is shown below (found in this issue of Argonauta and on the CNRS website).

Annual Conference and General Meeting

18-20 August 2016 - "Where Rivers Meet Oceans" New Westminster, British Columbia. Call for Papers information can be found on page 12, of the Winter 2016 edition of Argonauta. Information about the Annual conference and General Meeting can be seen on page 29 of this issue.

NOMINATING OFFICERS OF THE SOCIETY AND COUNCILLORS AT LARGE

37. There will be a nominating committee. Normally the past president will chair this committee with such other members as may be appointed by council. No officer or councillor or member standing for election or re-election may be a member of this committee. The nominating committee will nominate one candidate for each position to be filled at the next annual general meeting.

38. Members may also propose the names of candidates in writing and with the signatures of three members. All proposals must include a written undertaking by the nominee to accept the position if elected. If such suggestions are not accepted by the nominating committee for incorporation within their report, the nominations not so included must be forwarded by the nominating committee to the annual general meeting in addition to their report, for the purpose of conducting an election for the contested positions. The chair of the nominating committee will close the nominating list, which will include the proposals of the nominating committee and other proposals by members not later than 30 days prior to the annual general meeting.

39. A call for nominations shall be included in the January issue of Argonauta each year. Such notice must include the date on which nominations will close, to whom the nominations must be forwarded, and the date of the annual general meeting at which the nominating committee report will be received, or, if necessary, and election will be held.
40. Nominations from the floor are permitted at the annual general meeting only if there would otherwise be a vacancy for a position.

41. The council may fill any vacancy not filled by election at the annual general meeting in accordance with section 68, (Vacancy in Office).

We survive due to our slowly growing Membership and to the voluntary hard work of two significant teams; *The Northern Mariner* and *Argonauta*. These CNRS publications have a strong national and international audience and they have contributors ready with original editorial content. Everyone works hard including the Members of our Council.

Thank you, Maurice

________________________________________

Please send your nominations to CNRS Nominating Committee

c/o Maurice D Smith

barque2@cogeco.ca
The Canadian Nautical Research Society / Société canadienne pour la recherche nautique

Join us at the

2016 Annual Conference & General Meeting

“Where Rivers Meet Oceans”

18th-20th August 2016

Douglas College
New Westminster, British Columbia

New Westminster is accessible by public transit direct from the Vancouver International Airport, and has affordable accommodation in the city and close-by in the neighbouring municipalities of Burnaby and Coquitlam.

For more information contact:

Chris Madsen
741 East 10th Street
North Vancouver, British Columbia
V7L 2G2
email: CNRS2016@gmail.com
This coming August, the Canadian Nautical Research Society is holding its annual conference and general meeting in New Westminster, British Columbia at Douglas College, Lecture Theatre 2203. As part of the program, the afternoon of Thursday, 18 August 2016 will be a public event devoted to remembering the 1935 waterfront strike in the Port of New Westminster, when police arrested twenty-one striking longshoremen on a single day, September 3, 1935. A number of activities are planned, including an author's reading from Longshoring on the Fraser: Stories and History of ILWU Local 502 published by Granville Island Publishing, a podcast, a guided walking tour of the riverfront, and public art displays. To this end, the Canadian Nautical Research Society is pleased to announce a comic drawing contest in advance of the conference, open to all ages and abilities.

First Prize: $200  Second Prize: $100  Third Prize: $50. Each winner will receive an autographed copy of Longshoring on the Fraser as well.

Using the provided one page template with boxes and text describing the historical event, prospective artists are invited to depict and interpret graphically the waterfront strike in New Westminster, through creativity and their own imagination.

Entries may be hand-drawn or digitally created.

Deadline for submission is **May 31, 2016**. No entries will be accepted after that date.

A selection committee will judge each entry on the following criteria:

- artistic merit and skill
- Interpretation
- historical accuracy
- age and experience level

Entries may be sent by e-mail or post to:

Chris Madsen  
741 East 10th Street  
North Vancouver, British Columbia  
V7L 2G2

email: CNRS2016@gmail.com
By entering the contest, each competitor agrees to their entry being published in the July 2016 Argonauta newsletter, put on public display during the Canadian Nautical Research Society's 2016 annual conference, and used for temporary exhibit in the ILWU Local 502 union hall.

Each entry will be judged on its merit according to the stated criteria, without favour or affection.

See next page for submission form.
The Great Grab at Pacific Coast Terminals
September 3, 1935

Mayor Fred Hume and longshore delegation meet with Shipping Federation the same day as the Battle of Ballantyne Pier.

On principle, longshoremen in New Westminster decline to go back to work.

Early Tuesday, June 25, 1935, scabs go through pickets to work ships on the main riverfront and at Fraser Mills.

Clashes between striking longshoremen and replacement workers occur.


On Tuesday, September 3, 1935, Chief Constable Peter Bruce tells a large group of striking longshoremen to stop picketing and disperse.

Ron Noullet and Joe Breaks inform new inductees into ILWU Local 502 about the struggles of the past and building the union.

The strike ends in police court when charges against two longshoremen are withdrawn by Crown Prosecutor Harry Sullivan. The union loses.

New Westminster longshoremen strike in sympathy with Powell River and Vancouver waterfront workers.

The city forms the Royal City Waterfront Workers Association instead under Arthur Gore and Leonard Bonwick.
Loyalists: Recovering “The Losers” of the American Revolution
by Keith Grant

This week at Borealia -Taylor Stoermer, who teaches Public History at Harvard University, began a series of posts on putting Loyalists (and “pesky” Canadians) back into the story of revolutionary North America. Here’s a taste of his essay:

For me, the overlooked people who are most interesting are the loyalists, and properly defining them, as my work seeks to do, along with that of other historians with similar interests, can reveal a whole new revolutionary history, one that not only breaks down our understanding of the period’s freighted language, like “patriot” and “tory,” but that might make us entirely redefine what we mean when we say “the American Revolution.” By exploring the experience of the loyalists, we can arrive at a clearer understanding of just what they believed, how they shaped the fight for independence, and, more to the point, just what happened to them.


by Stephanie Bangarth

The Mid-Atlantic-New England Council for Canadian Studies (MANECCS) is currently accepting papers from all academic disciplines for the 35th Anniversary Conference to be held at the Portland Regency Hotel and Spa in Portland, Maine between October 20 and 22, 2016. https://maneccs2016.wordpress.com/.

MANECCS is the premier Canadian Studies organization in the region and is affiliated with the Association for Canadian Studies in the United States (ACSUS). Over the past 35 years MANECCS has brought together scholars from across the academic disciplines and from both public and private sectors in education, business, and government. At these conferences scholars explore complex topics relevant to Canada and its position in the world; past, present, and future. We have an exciting biennial conference planned for our 35th anniversary year.

This year will seek to focus specifically on urban and industrial landscapes. We are especially interested in panels that deal with urbanization, sprawl, decline, reattribution, urban and industrial living and working places, urban recreation and social organization, crime and policing, and any other topic related to Canada’s industrialization and urbanization. *Proposals on other topics related to Canadian history and studies are welcome.* Papers from established scholars, emerging scholars, and graduate students are encouraged.

Please submit a 250-word paper proposal or a 500-word panel proposal no later than June 1, 2016 to Brian Payne, Associate Professor History, Bridgewater State University (brian.payne@bridgew.edu). Please keep apprised of all developments at: https://maneccs2016.wordpress.com/
Dear Sir,

I found your organization on the web while researching information on the schooner "Bluenose" that I am constructing as a model of.

Before my father passed in 1993, at the age of 93, he related his family history to my brothers and I. I have in the past sent inquiries to both maritime museums at Yarmouth and Halifax requesting information on a vessel that arrived in Yarmouth approximately 1797. Owner, operator one captain George Allen. He arrived with his wife.

They built a home in Yarmouth within which he raised 12 children. I have a photograph of the captain and his wife. I have seen a photograph of all 14 together. I do not know who has possession of this picture.

One of the children was Samuel George Allen. Samuel took possession of the vessel upon his father’s retirement. It was used in commerce up and down the east coast of Canada and the US. I do not know who Samuel married. There is a daughter whose maiden name was Stella Emma Allen. She is buried in Forest Lawn Illinois. She passed away from ALS.

Stella married one William F. Abbott. They had three children, one was my father Gardner B. Abbott.

There has been a great deal of research done on the 12 children, most of it on the 11 not in my lineage. One thing outstanding in it is the fact that the original home still stands and is listed on the Canadian National Registry.

The information I am seeking is the name of Captain Allen's vessel, her history, disposition and if any photographs exist. The name "Zebulon" is passed around with no real assurance that it is accurate.

I have had a fetish for the sea most of my life. In my 82 years I have owned and sailed extensively 2 star boats. At the age of 82, regretfully it is time to quit sailing.

Any information you may have on this vessel or vessels would be greatly appreciated.

Respectfully yours,

John W. Abbott, USN RET
The Discovery of
THE LOST ONTARIO

On Halloween’s Eve 1780, one hundred and twenty souls boarded the HMS Ontario at Fort Niagara on the western edge of Lake Ontario. The ship carried British soldiers and sailors, Six Nations warriors, women, children, and secretly, 30 American Rebel prisoners of war.

The ship was the most imposing vessel on the Great Lakes, and played a key role in saving thousands of refugees and soldiers at Fort Niagara when first launched. Its primary role was to protect Canada from an attack by American forces to the south.

As the brig’s sails came full, the ship carved a powerful figure as she began her final voyage to cross Lake Ontario. Her mission was to sail across Lake Ontario for a rendezvous with British troops at Oswego. The ship would never arrive at her destination and those on board would never be seen alive again. For over two centuries the ship’s disappearance would become known as “The Legend of the Lake.”

228 years later; two modern-day underwater adventurers would solve her mystery. The ship’s shimmering image would be seen again by explorers, Jim Kennard and Dan Scoville.

After over two centuries of darkness, it’s time to finally bring this story to the surface.

The Mission Media Company is working with the ship’s discovery team, Kennard & Scoville, to undertake an expedition this summer to send an ROV 500 feet down to explore the ship for a feature documentary film on her life, loss, and re-discovery.

Upright and in total darkness, her masts still stand 85 feet high, with guns and bell still in place. HMS Ontario is the oldest intact warship ever found in North America, and one of the oldest intact British warships anywhere in the world. The Legend is now a reality. “The Discovery of the Lost Ontario” will also tell the story of the people who lived in the vast wilderness around Lake Ontario, at the height of the Revolutionary War.
Caught in the conflict of the American Revolution, Lake Ontario was a friction point where Britain, France, Canadien, American and the Six Nations warriors fought ferociously for control of the continent. The result would see the eventual withdrawal of two global empires and the emergence of two new modern nations. It is a founding story of our continent.

In many ways, the time of HMS *Ontario* is the first moment of Canada, 100 years before its Confederation. It is a story many of us have never known, yet it plays a crucial part in the formation of our modern nation; a story that should be shared.

Using tall ships period stand-ins, cinematic period re-enactment, modern-day site exploration and exclusive underwater dive footage, “The Discovery of the Lost *Ontario*” documentary project will take audiences on a journey back to a time when the struggle for a continent raged and one ship was lost in dark mystery - until her amazing re-discovery two centuries later.

We are now raising funds to help underwrite costs for our underwater expedition to shoot the ship in high quality video, as the foundation for our film. The Mission Media Company is inviting the public to support the expedition by participating in their crowd-funding campaign on Kickstarter.com, on until the end of April. Sponsors can help underwrite the costs of equipment to dive on the ship with HD capabilities and the film crew needed to capture the process. The results will be spectacular and provide an exciting foundation for the film.

To support the project, please visit:

You can also share the campaign by following on Facebook & Twitter:
@thelostontario

For more information, email Producer Stuart Clarfield:
discoverthelostontario@gmail.com

The Discovery of the Lost Ontario will be a journey into the deep and a journey back in time.

We invite you to take the journey with us.
NAME

1. The name of the corporation hereinafter called the Society, shall be The Canadian Nautical Research Society.

DEFINITIONS

2. The following definitions apply:

“Act” means the Canada Not-For-Profit Corporations Act S.C. 2009, c. 23 including the Regulations made pursuant to the Act, and any statute or regulations that may be substituted, as amended from time to time;

“articles” means the original or restated articles of incorporation or articles of amendment, amalgamation, continuance, reorganization, arrangement or revival of the Society;

“by-law” means this by-law and any other by-law of the Society as amended and which are, from time to time, in force and effect;

“council” means the board of directors and the members who are the officers of the Society elected by the annual general meeting to their positions and the councillors at large elected by the AGM, all of whom have voice and vote. The past president of the Society is an ex officio member of council and also has voice and vote at meetings of the council. Additionally honorary members of the Society and chairs of committees appointed by the council but who are not otherwise members of council are ex officio members of council, but have voice only.

“meeting of members” includes an annual meeting of members or a special meeting of members;

“special meeting of members” includes a meeting of any class or classes of members and a special meeting of all members entitled to vote at an annual meeting of members;

“Officers of the Society” means a president, a first vice president, a second vice president, a secretary, a treasurer, and a membership secretary.

“ordinary resolution” means a resolution passed by a majority of not less than 50% plus 1 of the votes case on that resolution;

“proposal” means a proposal submitted by a member of the Society that meets the requirements of section 163 (Member Proposals) of the Act;

“Regulations” means the regulations made under the Act, as amended, restated or in effect from time to time;
“special resolution” means a resolution passed by a majority of not less than two-thirds (2/3) of the votes cast on that resolution.

INTERPRETATION

3. In the interpretation of this by-law, words in the singular include the plural and vice-versa, words in one gender include all genders, and “person” includes an individual, body corporate, partnership, trust and unincorporated organization. Other than as specified above, words and expressions defined in the Act have the same meanings when used in these by-laws.

HEAD OFFICE

4. The head office of the Society is at the City of Ottawa in the Province of Ontario. The Society may establish branches elsewhere in Canada by resolution as the council may deem expedient.

CORPORATE SEAL

5. The seal, an impression of which is stamped in the margin of this document, shall be the seal of the corporation. The secretary of the Society shall be the custodian of the corporate seal.

OBJECTS OF THE SOCIETY

6. The purpose of the Society is to promote in Canada the study of ships, shipping affairs, the men and women associated with them, and their relationship and development of societies and maritime environments.

7. To this end the Society shall:

a) Sponsor interdisciplinary nautical research among members by organizing meetings, arranging for the exchange of information, and co-operating with other groups, museums, universities, schools and interested persons;

b) publish a quarterly newsletter reporting developments in the field of nautical research and containing original articles, notes and transcripts of documents;

c) publish a journal of nautical research;

d) offer awards recognizing merit of articles and books published on maritime subjects;

e) offer an award promoting new scholarship; and

f) offer an award for merit in special recognition of excellence in Canadian nautical research applicable to individuals or institutions or for an extraordinary contribution to the Society.
MANAGEMENT OF THE SOCIETY

8. The management of the Society shall be vested in a council composed of between 6 and 10 persons.

9. The council shall meet together for the despatch of business, adjourn and otherwise regulate its meetings as it deems fit.

10. The quorum necessary for the transaction of business by the council is four members.

11. The council may fill any vacancies among the officers or councillors at large. Persons selected under this clause will hold office until the next general meeting of members, at which time vacant offices will be filled by election.

EXECUTION OF DOCUMENTS

12. Contracts, documents or any instruments in writing requiring two signatures of the Society must be signed by the president or the first vice president or the second vice president and the secretary. All contracts documents and instruments in writing so signed are binding upon the Society without any further authorization or formality. The seal of the Society when required may be affixed to contracts, documents and instruments in writing.

FINANCIAL YEAR END

13. The fiscal year and business year of the Society will commence on the first day of January and terminate on the last day of December.

BANKING ARRANGEMENTS

14. The banking business of the Society will be transacted at such bank, trust company or other firm or corporation carrying on a banking business in Canada as the council may designate. The banking business or any part of it shall be transacted by the treasurer. Cheques drawn against an account held by the Society will be signed by the treasurer and one of the president, the first vice president and the second vice president.

BORROWING POWERS

15. Borrowing money is not permitted.

ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

16. Annual financial statements will be presented to the membership at the annual general meeting and then included in the minutes of the meeting as reported in Argonauta, the Society’s newsletter.
MEMBERSHIP

17. Every individual and institution supporting the objects of the Society is eligible to become a member.

18. Either individual or institutional membership may be obtained by application to the Society through the head office and the membership secretary and upon payment of the subscription hereafter mentioned.

19. Every member must abide by and be bound by these by-laws and by other rules of the Society. Acceptance of membership in the Society is deemed to be an undertaking to abide by and be bound by all such by-laws and other rules.

20. The right to vote in the affairs of the Society is limited to members in good standing.

21. On recommendation of the council, members at a general meeting may, as a special mark of recognition for an extraordinary contribution to the Society and/or to the field of nautical research, grant Honorary Membership in the Society to an individual. Such Honorary Membership will be for life unless it is later resigned or terminated as described below. A person so honoured will receive all publications from the Society free of charge, will have voice and vote at all members’ meetings, and voice but not vote at all meetings of council.

22. Pursuant to subsection 197(1) (Fundamental Change) of the Act, a special resolution of the members is required to make any amendments to this section of the by-laws if those amendments affect membership rights and/or conditions described in paragraphs 197(1) (e), (h) (l) or (m).

LIMITATIONS

23. The Society is non-sectarian and non-political and will not have any religious, racial or political affiliation.

NO PECUNIARY GAIN TO MEMBERS

24. The Society is a non-profit organization and will be conducted without the purpose of pecuniary gain for its members, officers or councillors. Any profits or accretions to the Society must be used solely for the support of the objectives of the Society. Officer and councillors may not receive any remuneration for the services.

MEMBERSHIP TRANSFERABILITY

25. Membership is not transferable.

26. Pursuant to Section 197(1) (Fundamental Change) of the Act, a special resolution of the members is required to make any amendment to add, change or delete this section of the by-laws.
NOTICE OF MEMBERS’ MEETINGS

27. Notice of the time and place of a meeting of members shall be given to each member entitled to vote at the meeting by the following means:

a) by mail, courier or personal delivery to each member entitled to vote at the meeting, during a period of 21 to 60 days before the day of the meeting to be held; or

b) by telephonic, electronic or other communication facility to each member entitled to vote at the meeting, during a period of 21 to 35 days before the day on which the meeting is to be held.

28. Notice of the meeting must also include the agenda.

29. Pursuant to subsection 197(1) (Fundamental Change) of the Act, a special resolution of the members is required to make any amendment to the by-laws of the Society to change the manner of giving notice to members entitled to vote at a meeting of members.

MEMBERS CALLING A MEETING

30. The council must call a special meeting of members in accordance with Section 167 of the Act, on written requisition of members carrying not less than 5% of the voting rights. If the council does not call a meeting within twenty-one (21) days of receiving the requisition, any member who signed the requisition may call the meeting.

ABSENTEE VOTING AT MEMBERS’ MEETINGS

31. No form of absentee voting is permitted at members’ meetings.

32. Pursuant to Section 197(1) (Fundamental Change) of the Act, a special resolution of the members is required to make any amendment to the by-laws of the Society to change this.

MEMBERSHIP DUES

33. Each institutional member and each individual member will pay a subscription fee due and payable by 31 March each year. The rates for subscription will be prescribed by the council subject to the approval of the members at the annual general meeting.

TERMINATION OF MEMBERSHIP

34. Membership may be terminated at any time by:

a) the member resigning in writing in which event all payments due to the Society must accompany the resignation; or

b) the member omitting to pay the annual subscription prescribed.
EFFECT OF TERMINATION OF MEMBERSHIP

35. Upon any termination of membership, the rights of the member automatically cease to exist.

DISCIPLINE OF MEMBERS

36. The council may terminate a membership where, in its opinion a member has acted contrary to the interests of the Society, provided that before terminating a membership under this clause, the member has first been given the opportunity to explain his or her position in writing. A member may appeal the council’s ruling to a general meeting of the Society.

NOMINATING OFFICERS OF THE SOCIETY AND COUNCILLORS AT LARGE

37. There will be a nominating committee. Normally the past president will chair this committee with such other members as may be appointed by council. No officer or councillor or member standing for election or re-election may be a member of this committee. The nominating committee will nominate one candidate for each position to be filled at the next annual general meeting.

38. Members may also propose the names of candidates in writing and with the signatures of three members. All proposals must include a written undertaking by the nominee to accept the position if elected. If such suggestions are not accepted by the nominating committee for incorporation within their report, the nominations not so included must be forwarded by the nominating committee to the annual general meeting in addition to their report, for the purpose of conducting an election for the contested positions. The chair of the nominating committee will close the nominating list, which will include the proposals of the nominating committee and other proposals by members not later than 30 days prior to the annual general meeting.

39. A call for nominations shall be included in the January issue of Argonauta each year. Such notice must include the date on which nominations will close, to whom the nominations must be forwarded, and the date of the annual general meeting at which the nominating committee report will be received, or, if necessary, and election will be held.

40. Nominations from the floor are permitted at the annual general meeting only if there would otherwise be a vacancy for a position.

41. The council may fill any vacancy not filled by election at the annual general meeting in accordance with section 68, (Vacancy in Office).

COST OF PUBLISHING PROPOSALS FOR ANNUAL MEMBERS’ MEETINGS

42. Cost of circulating the nominating committee report, other committee reports and other proposals for consideration at the annual general meeting will be borne by the Society. They may be distributed electronically to members.
PLACE OF MEMBERS’ MEETINGS

43. The annual general meeting of the Society will be held at a time and place to be determined by the council. Normally it will be in conjunction with the annual conference, between the end of April and the beginning of September. The annual general meeting may be held outside Canada if the annual conference is held jointly with another Society. Any two consecutive annual general meetings must not be more than fifteen months apart.

44. Special meetings will be held at a time and place determined by the council.

PERSONS ENTITLED TO BE PRESENT AT MEMBERS’ MEETINGS

45. Members, non-members, members of council and the public accountant of the Society are entitled to be present at a meeting of members. However, only those members entitled to vote at the members’ meeting according to the provisions of the Act, articles and by-laws are entitled to cast a vote at the meeting.

CHAIR OF MEMBERS’ MEETINGS

46. Meetings of members will be chaired by one of: the president, the first vice president or the second vice president.

QUORUM AT MEMBERS’ MEETINGS

47. At all members’ meetings ten voting members present shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, but a lesser number may adjourn to a date and place at the call of the president.

VOTES TO GOVERN AT MEMBERS’ MEETINGS

48. At any meeting of members every question shall, unless otherwise provided by the articles or by-laws or by the Act, be determined by a majority of the votes cast on the questions. The chair may only vote in the event of a tie.

PARTICIPATION BY ELECTRONIC MEANS AT MEMBERS’ MEETINGS

49. Participation at meetings of members may not be by telephonic, electronic or other communication facility. However any member at their own expense may use electronic means to monitor a members’ meeting.

MEMBERS’ MEETINGS HELD ENTIRELY BY ELECTRONIC MEANS

50. Members’ meetings may not be held by electronic means or other communication facility.

NUMBER OF COUNCILLORS AT LARGE

51. There will be four councillors at large, elected at the annual general meeting.
TERM OF OFFICE OF OFFICERS AND COUNCILLORS AT LARGE

52. All officers and councillors at large will be elected annually. The president and the vice presidents shall not serve more than three consecutive terms in their respective offices.

CALLING OF MEETINGS OF THE COUNCIL

53. Meetings of the council may be called by the president, or either of the vice presidents. The council will normally meet early in the new calendar year, and again in conjunction with the annual general meeting. Between meetings of the council, electronic means of communication may be used to facilitate business, but any consensus so obtained must be ratified when the council next meets formally.

NOTICE OF MEETINGS OF COUNCIL

54. The president or secretary will give notice of a meeting of council by telephone, electronic, or other means after having ascertained a date that is most convenient for the majority of members of council.

QUORUM FOR MEETINGS OF COUNCIL

55. A quorum for a meeting of council is four members with vote.

PARTICIPATION BY ELECTRONIC MEANS AT MEETINGS OF COUNCIL

56. Participation at meetings of council may be by telephone, electronic or other communication facility at the expense of the member of council. For the duration of such participation, it will count towards quorum.

VOTES TO GOVERN AT MEETINGS OF COUNCIL

57. At all meetings of the board, every question will be decided by a majority of the votes cast on the question. The chair may vote only in the event of a tie.

COMMITTEES OF COUNCIL

58. In addition to a nominating committee, other committees, boards or advisory panels may be appointed by council to act as advisory bodies to the council and to further the objectives of the Society. The council will appoint a chair for each such committee or body as well as the members, and draft or approve the terms of reference.

59. The president is an ex officio member of all committees, boards and advisory panels established by council unless specifically stated otherwise.

APPOINTMENT OF OFFICERS

60. Officers of the Society will be elected by the members present at the annual general meeting.
DESCRIPTION OF OFFICES

61. The president is charged with the general supervision of the business and affairs of the Society. She/he will preside over all meetings of the Society and council, and do, perform and render such acts and services as the council prescribes and require. No person will more serve more than three consecutive annual terms in this office.

62. The first vice president will, in the absence of the president, have all the powers and duties of the president. No person will serve more than three consecutive annual terms in this office.

63. The second vice president will, in the absence of the president and the first vice president, have all the powers and duties of the president. No person will serve more than three consecutive annual terms in this office.

64. The secretary will conduct and act as custodian of correspondence relating to the affairs of the Society, record the meetings of council and of the Society, and perform such other duties as may from time to time be prescribed by the council.

65. The membership secretary will maintain the Society’s master mailing list; keep records on all members, past and present; organize membership recruitment; lead membership retention; report on the status of membership at the first council meeting in each year and at annual general meeting, and perform such other duties as may from time to time be prescribed by the council.

66. The treasurer will keep full and accurate books of account in which are to be recorded all receipts and disbursement of the Society, and under the direction of council will control the deposit of money, the safekeeping of securities, and the disbursement of funds of the Society, and prepare an annual budget. She/he will prepare quarterly reports for the council of the Society’s year to date revenues and expenditures compared against the annual operating budget. She/he will render an account of all his/her transactions as treasurer and of the financial position of the Society at council meetings or whenever required of him/her. She/he will perform such other duties as may from time to time be prescribed by the council.

VACANCY IN OFFICE

67. In the absence of a written agreement to the contrary, the board may remove, whether for cause or without cause, any officer or councillor of the Society. Unless so removed, an officer or councillor shall hold office until the earlier of:

a) the officer’s/councillor’s successor being appointed,

b) the officer’s/councillor’s resignation,

c) such officer or councillor ceasing to be a member of the Society, or

d) such officer’s/councillor’s death.
68. If the office of any officer or councillor of the Society shall be or become vacant, the council may, by resolution, appoint a person to fill such vacancy.

INVALIDITY OF ANY PROVISIONS OF THIS BY-LAW

69. The invalidity or unenforceability of any provision of this by-law shall not affect the validity or enforceability of the remaining provisions of this by-law.

OMISSIONS AND ERRORS

70. The accidental omission to give any notice to any member, director, officer, member of a committee of the board or public accountant, or the non-receipt of any notice by any such person where the Society has provided notice in accordance with the by-laws or any error in any notice not affecting its substance shall not invalidate any action taken at any meeting to which the notice pertained or otherwise founded on such notice.

RULES OF ORDER

71. Roberts Rules of Order will govern proceedings at all members’ and council meetings.

BY-LAWS AND EFFECTIVE DATE

72. Subject to the articles, the council may, by resolution, make, amend or repeal any by-laws that regulate the activities or affairs of the Society. Any such by-law, amendment or repeal shall be effective from the date of the resolution of the council until the next meeting of members where it may be confirmed, rejected or amended by the members by special resolution. Notice of the proposed amendment or repeal must be included in the notice of meeting.

73. If the by-law, amendment or repeal is confirmed or confirmed as amended by the members it remains effective in the form in which it was confirmed. The by-law, amendment or repeal ceases to have effect if it is not submitted to the members at the next meeting of members or if it is rejected by the members at the meeting.

74. This section does not apply to a by-law that requires a special resolution of the members according to subsection 197(1) (fundamental change) of the Act because such by-law amendments or repeals are only effective when confirmed by members.
The Canadian Nautical Research Society
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Membership/Renewal Form

CNRS membership supports the multi-disciplinary study of maritime, marine and naval subjects in and about Canada.

Members receive:

- **The Northern Mariner/Le Marin du nord**, a quarterly refereed journal dedicated to publishing research and writing about all aspects of maritime history of the North Atlantic, Arctic and North Pacific Oceans. It publishes book reviews, articles and research notes on merchant shipping, navies, maritime labour, nautical archaeology and maritime societies.
- **Argonauta**, a quarterly newsletter publishing articles, opinions, news and information about maritime history and fellow members.
- An Annual General Meeting and Conference located in maritime minded locations across Canada such as Halifax, Vancouver, Hamilton, Churchill and Quebec City.
- Affiliation with the International Commission of Maritime History (ICMH).

Membership is by calendar year and is an exceptional value at $70 for individuals, $25 for students, or $95 for institutions. Please add $10 for international postage and handling. Members of the North American Society for Oceanic History (NASOH) may join the CNRS for a reduced rate of $35 per year. Individuals or groups interested in furthering the work of the CNRS may wish to subscribe to one of several other levels of membership, each of which includes all the benefits of belonging to the Society. CNRS is a registered charity and any donation above the cost of basic membership to the Society is automatically acknowledged with a tax-receipt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Canadian</th>
<th>International</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>Benefactor $250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>$95</td>
<td>$105</td>
<td>Corporate $500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>Patron $1000 or above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASOH</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please type in or print clearly and return with payment (all rates in Canadian $).

NB: CNRS does not sell or exchange membership information with other organizations or commercial enterprises. The information provided on this form will only be used for sending you our publications or to correspond with you concerning your membership and the Society’s business.

Should the CNRS publish a members directory for members only access please indicate with a check mark personal contact information you wish to disclose

Name: ____________________________ Email: ____________________________

Address: __________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

Payment by Cheque [ ] Money Order [ ] Visa [ ] Master Card [ ]

Credit Card Number ____________________________ Expiry date ________________

Signature ____________________________ Date ____________________________