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Dedication

To the recipients of the Military Valour Decorations who are the embodiment of the highest military values of gallantry, self-sacrifice and devotion to duty.
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Introduction
Introduction

In all societies and all time periods, gallantry in combat has always been prized as one of the highest achievements and one which should be formally recognized. Canada has a long tradition of valorous soldiers who fought in battles near and far. To recognize them, we used the honours systems available at the time, Indigenous honours, French and later British decorations. It is only recently that Canada created its own form of recognition for valour in combat with the establishment of the Military Valour Decorations (MVDs), taking effect on 1 January 1993. Since then, over a hundred members of Her Majesty’s Canadian Armed Forces (CAF) have been honoured with these decorations, identifying them as the impersonation of the highest of military virtues and highlighting them as examples for soldiers of today and years to come to emulate. Because they recognize gallant action under fire, the prestige of these decorations is unequalled among all Canadian honours, and their rarity, as well as the achievements of those who earned them, only adds to their symbolic value in the eyes of all Canadians.

This publication, produced by the Directorate of Honours and Recognition (DH&R), celebrates the twenty-fifth anniversary of the creation of the Military Valour Decorations by Her Majesty The Queen. This work follows and may be seen as a companion of the publication Pro Valore: Canada’s Victoria Cross created in a cooperation between the Directorate of History and Heritage (DHH) and the Chancellery of Honours at Government House on the occasion of the unveiling of the Canadian Victoria Cross in 2008.1 That original publication focussed on the Canadian recipients of the original Victoria Cross and the manufacture of the modern Canadian Victoria Cross. The present work will provide a brief outline of gallantry recognition in Canada before 1993, a history of the creation of the MVDs, a statistical analysis of the awards made thus far, details on the insignia and, most importantly, a register containing the names, photos and citations of the recipients.

It is sincerely hoped that this modest work will provide a lasting record and tribute to the bravest of the brave.
Chapter One
Gallantry Recognition in Canada
Prior to 1993
Gallantry Recognition in Canada Prior to 1993

Military valour has been admired and recognized throughout history and across all cultures. The reason behind this was best expressed by Sir Winston Churchill when he said that “Courage is rightly esteemed the first of human qualities, because it is the quality which guarantees all others.” The defence and security of the people is the primary task of any government and those who contribute to this mission through gallant, daring and valorous acts have been celebrated by the people who benefited from these actions. It is known that the Greeks and the Romans formally recognized war heroes with a system of wreaths and medallions not dissimilar to modern medals. In the Middle-Ages, the most courageous soldiers were knighted for their valour. More recently, almost every country has created decorations specifically to recognize gallantry in combat.

In what is now Canada, the Indigenous honoured their most courageous warriors, not through the bestowal of medals or insignia, but using their own traditions. The men who had proven themselves in battle could wear distinctive markings, sometimes they were made Chiefs in recognition of their valour, but always homage
was given through the respect that was paid to them in various ways, from the right to speak first to the place of honour given to them in the group, among others. It is worth quoting Samuel Clark at some length as he explain in his book Distributing Status, *The Evolution of State Honours in Western Europe* that ‘The status of an accomplished warrior was often raised by oral praise, ceremonial honours, body painting, decoration of his domicile, special clothing, weapons, and rights to parts of the bodies of the defeated warriors, again typically scalps or heads. Superior warriors were usually allowed to decorate their homes with scalps or heads they had taken. (…) Common on the plains was the adoption of feathers as a body decoration, typically as a headdress. It was meant as a symbol of status and power, but feathers usually had to be earned by means of bravery or accomplishment in battle. In addition, many North American communities signalled accomplishments by decorating their bodies with tattoos. And war shirts were used to raise the status of accomplished warriors. Like Asian robes of honour, these shirts could be ornamentally decorated. The Inuit had few special tangible rewards for outstanding performance. Distinctive facial tattoos represented at least one kind of reward that was symbolic of military feats.’

The French did and continue to use their national orders to recognize acts of gallantry. In the days of New France, the main honour used to recognize such acts, along with other distinguished service, was the *Ordre Royal et Militaire de Saint-Louis* which was created by King Louis XIV in 1693. This Order, also known as the *Croix de Saint-Louis*, had three levels, Grand Cross, Commander and Knight, in descending order. Several Canadians were admitted to the Order, many of them in relation to acts of military valour in battle.

Later, it was the British Honours System which was used to recognize acts of gallantry performed by Canadians. Countless books and articles have been written to record the history and composition of the British Honours System as well as the many Canadians.
who earned British honours for gallantry from the 18th century to the Korean War. Many of these works are listed in the Bibliography at the end of this publication. This history, though rich and fascinating it may be, is beyond the scope of this work; only a brief description of the system and its general structure will be offered here.

Although military valour is the highest quality, worthy of the highest praise, it is interesting to note that, besides the knighthoods of the Middle-Ages, no formal and dedicated honour for gallantry was created in Britain until the middle of the 19th century. While orders had existed from the dark times of the Middle-Ages – the Order of the Garter for example was founded in 1348 – by the Victorian era they had long lost their purpose of recognizing bravery in the field and then served to recognize high-ranking dignitaries and later, public service generally. Campaign medals, in their modern form, appeared with the Waterloo Medal in 1815 while long service medals made their debut in the 1830s. While the Mention in Despatches was often used to recognize gallant acts, it was not accompanied by any insignia until the end of the First World War. Moreover, the Meritorious Service Medal, created in 1845, had also been occasionally used to recognize gallantry but this was not the intended purpose of this honour.5

It was the Crimean War (1854–56) that saw the creation of the first honour specific to gallantry in the form of the Distinguished Conduct Medal (DCM) established by Queen Victoria in 1854. The DCM was an Army award and the Royal Navy followed suit with
its own Conspicuous Gallantry Medal (CGM) in 1855. Both of these were limited to other ranks leaving officers without gallantry recognition. These two first gallantry decorations were quickly followed by the creation of what remains the highest and more prestigious of all gallantry decorations, the Victoria Cross (VC), in 1856. Unlike the DCM and CGM, the new decoration was open to all ranks and both naval and military forces (although there were distinctive ribbons for Navy and Army awards until 1918).

The gallantry recognition framework continued to grow sporadically, pushed by events and needs. The Distinguished Service Order (DSO) was established in 1886 and had a dual purpose of recognizing leadership as well as filling the gap to recognize the gallantry of officers below VC level. The Royal Navy gained its Conspicuous Service Cross (CSC) in 1901 to recognize petty officers and subordinate officers not eligible for the DSO. The First World War saw unprecedented numbers of men in combat, killed and performing gallant deeds. This swiftly prompted the creation of new, more accessible gallantry decorations, creating a third level of gallantry recognition below the VC at Level 1 and the DSO (for officers), CGM and DCM (for other ranks) at Level 2. The Royal Navy’s CSC was renamed the Distinguished Service Cross (DSC) and was joined by the Distinguished Service Medal (DSM) for ratings and the Army

Medals of Brigadier-General Edmond Alfred Blais, CBE, MC. He was wounded and earned the Military Cross during the First World War. He was made a Commander of the Order of the British Empire for his leadership during the Second World War, especially in relation to the organization of the historic Quebec Conference
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created the Military Cross (MC) for junior officers and warrant officers, all this before the end of 1914. Other ranks in the Army had to wait until 1916 to get their Level 3 decoration with the creation of the Military Medal (MM). The creation of the Royal Air Force (RAF) in 1918 by joining the Royal Naval Air Service (RNAS) (which had earned naval decorations) and the Royal Flying Corps (RFC) (which had earned Army decorations) triggered the creation, in that same year, of the Distinguished Flying Cross (DFC) for officers and warrant officer and Distinguished Flying Medal (DFM) for other ranks. It would not be until 1943 that the RAF would gain a Level 2 decoration for other ranks with the Conspicuous Gallantry Medal (Flying), exactly the same as the Royal Navy’s CGM with the white in the ribbon replaced with light blue.

The table below illustrates the gallantry recognition framework as it applied to Canadians in both World Wars and in Korea.
Table 1: British Gallantry Recognition Structure as used by Canada during the two World Wars and Korea

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gallantry Level</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Royal Navy</th>
<th>British Army</th>
<th>Royal Air Force</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 1</strong></td>
<td>All ranks</td>
<td>Victoria Cross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1856</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 2</strong></td>
<td>Officers</td>
<td>Distinguished Service Order</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(when for gallantry*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DSO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other ranks</td>
<td>Conspicuous Gallantry Medal</td>
<td>Distinguished Conduct Medal</td>
<td>Conspicuous Gallantry Medal (Flying)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CGM 1855</td>
<td>DCM 1854</td>
<td>CGM 1943</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 3</strong></td>
<td>Officers</td>
<td>Distinguished Service Cross</td>
<td>Military Cross</td>
<td>Distinguished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DSC 1901, renamed 1914</td>
<td>MC 1914</td>
<td>Flying Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DFC 1918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other ranks</td>
<td>Distinguished Service Medal</td>
<td>Military Medal</td>
<td>Distinguished</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DSM 1914</td>
<td>MM 1916</td>
<td>Flying Medal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DFM 1918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 4</strong></td>
<td>All ranks</td>
<td>Mention in Dispatches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note that while the Distinguished Service Order was primarily used to recognize operational leadership and other military distinguished service in time of war by officers below field rank (limited to service ‘in action’ with the enemy from 1 January 1917), it could also be used to recognize Level 2 gallantry by officers.
It was therefore not only the level of gallantry that determined which decoration one would earn but also the service to which they belonged as well as their rank. The only honours to be entirely rank and service neutral were the two extremes, the Victoria Cross at the top and the Mention in Despatches at the bottom. The DSO was also service neutral but was only open to officers. These are distinctions which were the result of the society that created these honours, one where rank and position held a great importance. When Canada created its own decorations, not only with a more democratic spirit but also admittedly in a different time period entirely, these distinctions would not be recreated and all Canadian decorations are rank and service neutral; the difference in decoration being dictated only by the level of valour demonstrated. The United Kingdom eventually changed its gallantry system in 1993, long after Canada had ceased to use it, where all gallantry decorations became rank neutral, and all, except at Level 3, became service neutral. This was achieved by the abolition of the DSM, MM and DFM and opening the DSC, MC and DFC to all ranks, retaining the service specificity for historical reasons; and abolishing the two CGMs and the DCM and replacing them, as well as the gallantry aspect of the DSO, with a new rank and service neutral decoration at Level 2, namely the Conspicuous Gallantry Cross (CGC).

Interestingly, the VC (since the early 20th century) and the MID were also the only two honours to be available posthumously. For every decoration in between, one had to be alive when the honour was approved to be eligible. This meant that if a MC was approved for an officer but he was killed before the decoration could be presented, the award stood. If however, the officer either died while performing the deserving act or died before the award could be approved, it would, unless it met the very high standard of the VC, be automatically downgraded to a MID. This ‘posthumous gap’ would only be addressed in 1979 when all the Royal Warrants for gallantry decorations were amended to make them available posthumously. Here again, Canada would learn from this experience and all modern Canadian decorations have been available posthumously from their creation.

While the Royal Warrant for the British VC has contained cancellation previsions since its establishment and still does – and they were used eight times between its creation and 1908 – no VC has been rescinded since. King George V held the strong view that the VC should never be forfeited and his feelings were clearly put forth in a 26 July 1920 letter from Lord Stamfordham, his Private Secretary:
‘The King feels so strongly that, no matter the crime committed by anyone on whom the VC has been conferred, the decoration should not be forfeited. Even were a VC to be sentenced to be hanged for murder, he should be allowed to wear his VC on the scaffold.’

This is another significant difference between British antecedents and modern Canadian honours in that all three MVDs, including the VC, can be revoked.

The original VC, along with many gallantry decorations in the British system, carry with their award an annuity, which is a rather modest and symbolic amount. For Canadian recipients, this was paid by the Government of Canada, Veterans Affairs Canada specifically, in accordance with the Gallantry Awards Order and the amount was only $3,000 per year by the time the last Canadian recipient died. One of the basic principles of the modern Canadian honours system is that Canadian honours do not carry titles nor do they confer upon their recipients any privileges, political influence or monetary benefits. Honours only give the recipients the right to wear the appropriate insignia and, in the case of orders and decorations only, the right to use the associated post-nominal letters and display the insignia in the individual’s personal coat of arms. Consequently, there are no annuities associated with any modern Canadian honour, including the VC.

When a whole unit or group acted in brave fashion with the authorities unable to single out any specific individual, representative VC recipients, in small numbers in proportion with the size of the unit involved, could be selected by secret ballot by members of the unit in each rank group. This provision has not been used since the First World War and has not been duplicated for the modern Canadian MVDs.

Canada made substantial use of the British gallantry awards up to and including the Korean War (1950–53). Thereafter, Canada was not involved in combat missions for many decades but rather concentrated on peacekeeping missions. Use was made of the non-combat British gallantry honours such as the George Medal, Air Force Cross, appointment to the Order of the British Empire for gallantry and the various Queen’s Commendations for bravery well into the 1960s before it was discreetly stopped as Canada started to build its own honours system. Some of the last British awards
to Canadians made on the recommendation of Canada were related to the United Nation Organization in Congo (ONUC) mission. Once the Order of Canada had been created in 1967, with its associated Medal of Courage, albeit ineffective, the Prime Minister’s Private Secretary, John Hodgson, recommended to the Prime Minister, then the Right Honourable Lester B. Pearson, that from this point, only Canadian honours should be used and that some should be created to recognize bravery. He went on to say that recommendations for ‘courage awards through British Government sh[ould] be stopped quietly.’ Cabinet subsequently agreed on 17 April 1968 that ‘the practice of recommending the award of British orders, decorations and medals for acts of bravery should be discontinued (…)’. This entire discussion related only to acts of bravery not while in combat with an enemy but it would appear the logic could also apply to combat awards although this specific topic was not raised. Even if it applied to all British honours, this remained a government policy only. No legislation or formal regulation was ever enacted to preclude such recommendations and therefore the possibility existed, should the situation arose, for the Canadian Government to make recommendations for British honours, including the VC.
While the British combat gallantry awards were not used by Canada after the end of the Korean War simply because there was no need for it, there remained the general understanding that they were still available and would be used should the need arise. This theoretical potential existed for many decades into the 1970s and 1980s until Canada finally decided to create its own family of Military Valour Decorations as we will see in the next Chapter.

During their use in Canada, British gallantry decorations came to adorn the chests of the bravest citizens and were well-known and respected by the fellow countrymen, especially in time of war. Unique among those, given its prestige, is the VC. The original British Victoria Cross, created by Queen Victoria on 29 January 1856, was awarded to Canadians during several conflicts between the creation of the decoration and the end of the Second World War.

The original Victoria Cross was awarded to 81 members of Canada’s military forces out of a total of 1,355 crosses and three bars awarded throughout the British Empire and Commonwealth so far. The former number includes only those recipients who earned the VC while serving as a member of the Canadian military forces (including Newfoundland) as opposed to Canadians serving with the British forces (there were 13 awards to such persons) or British recipients who later moved to

---

Major John Keefer Mahony was invested twice by His Majesty King George VI. The first time was on 31 July 1944 in Italy where he was presented with his crimson ribbon in front of several thousand soldiers. He was later invested with his Victoria Cross by the King during a private informal ceremony at Buckingham Palace on 3 December 1944.

Photo: DND
Canada or served in our military. The last VC to be awarded to a Canadian was that to Lieutenant Robert Hampton Gray, VC, a member of the Royal Canadian Naval Volunteer Reserve attached to the Fleet Air Arm, the aerial branch of the Royal Navy, who earned a posthumous VC on 9 August 1945 while leading an attack against a Japanese warship. Canada’s last surviving recipient of the Victoria Cross, Sergeant Ernest Alvia “Smokey” Smith, VC, CM, OBC, CD, (Retired), passed away on 3 August 2005. He was given the rare privilege of lying-in-state in the foyer of the House of Commons in the Centre Block of the Parliament Buildings in Ottawa, and thousands of Canadians came to pay their respects before a large military funeral was held in Vancouver.
Sergeant Ernest Alvia “Smokey” Smith, VC, CM, OBC, CD. Smith was the last Canadian living recipient of the VC, having earned the decoration during an attack at the River Savio in Northern Italy on 21/22 October 1944 during which he disabled a German tank at close range and damaged another, forcing it to retreat, killed four enemy and routed six more, all the while protecting and carrying a wounded comrade, and later joined a counter-attack to disperse the Germans still attacking his previous position.

Photo: Public domain

Private Ernest Alvia “Smokey” Smith, VC
Photo: Public domain

Mourners lining up on Parliament Hill in Ottawa to pay their respects during the lying in state of Ernest “Smokey” Smith, VC, CM, OBC, CD, on 9 August 2005
Photo: Canadian Forces Joint Imagery Centre, Department of National Defence

From left to right, Commissioner Giuliano Zaccardelli, COM, Commissioner of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, General Rick Hillier, CMM, MSC, CD, Chief of the Defence Staff and Chief Warrant Officer Daniel Gilbert, MMM, CD, Canadian Forces Chief Warrant Officer, pay tribute to “Smokey” Smith during the laying-in-state in the foyer of the House of Commons
Photo: DND

Military funeral for Sergeant Ernest Alvia “Smokey” Smith at St. Andrew’s Wesley United Church in Vancouver, British Columbia, 13 August 2005
Photo: DND
The Right Honourable Daniel Roland Michener, PC, CD, QC, Governor General of Canada, with recipients of the Victoria Cross and George Cross at Government House, June 1967

*Front row from left to right:* Frederick Maurice Watson Harvey, VC, MC; Raphael Louis Zengel, VC, MM; George Randolph Pearkes, VC, PC, CB, DSO, MC, CD; the Governor General; Paul Triquet, VC, CD; Ernest Alvia “Smokey” Smith, VC, CD; and Benjamin Handley Geary, VC

*Rear row from left to right:* Ernest Ralph Clyde Frost, GC; David Vivian Currie, VC, CD; Alexander Picton Brereton, VC; Charles Smith Rutherford, VC, MC, MM; Charles Cecil Ingersoll Merritt, VC, ED; John Keefer Mahony, VC; Coulson Norman Mitchell, VC, MC; Frederick Albert Tilston, VC; Arthur Dwight Ross, GC, CBE, CD; Thomas Fasti Dinesen, VC; John Weir Foote, VC, CD; and John MacMillan Stevenson Patton, GC, CBE

Photo Credit: LAC PA-129803
Chapter Two
Creation of the Military Valour Decorations
Creation of The Military Valour Decorations

When Canada established its national honours system on the occasion of the Centennial of Confederation, it included honours to recognize distinguished service and non-combat bravery. The Order of Canada included in its structure a Medal of Service as well as a Medal of Courage when first created in 1967. This single Medal of Courage was intended to cover any and all acts of bravery not performed under enemy fire. To recognize bravery in all its ranges with a single honour immediately proved entirely impractical and the Medal of Courage was never awarded. It was abolished and replaced by a new family of three Canadian Bravery Decorations when the honours system was expanded in 1972. This expansion also involved the restructuring of the Order of Canada in its current three levels and the creation of a new Order of Military Merit, also in three levels. When the new system was implemented in 1972, it did not include the VC or any of the previous British gallantry decorations.
Neither in 1967 nor in 1972 was there any substantial discussion regarding the creation of military valour decorations. Firstly, there was no immediate requirement for combat awards because Canada had, since the Korean War-era, concentrated on peacekeeping missions under the United Nations. Secondly, there remained the vague understanding that if required, Canada could still use British gallantry decorations, including the Victoria Cross. As explained in Chapter One, the VC – the Commonwealth’s highest honour – had been earned by many Canadians between its creation during the Crimean War and the end of the Second World War. Eight-one Canadians earned it while serving under Canadian command with several others while serving under British command. The rich history, symbolism and mystique surrounding what is arguably the most famous and respected gallantry decoration in the world gave it a place of honour and special importance in the hearts of Canadian veterans and their fellow citizens.

Shortly after the new Canadian Bravery Decorations were created in 1972, inquiries were made with regards to the status of the Victoria Cross in the modern Canadian honours system and its potential use for Canadians. The Prime Minister, then the Right Honourable Pierre Elliott Trudeau, only provided vague answers saying that Canadians should receive Canadian decorations but never clearly stated that Canada would not use the VC in the future. In subsequent decades, the Royal Canadian Legion and other veteran associations pressured the government to confirm the VC as Canada’s highest honour for combat gallantry. This position had the support of all political parties in the House of Commons, including the New Democratic Party, which was unanimous in its position.

In 1982, Prime Minister Trudeau approved the Canadian Forces Honours Policy which contained provisions for decorations for ‘bravery (in active combat in the face of an armed enemy)’. While a proposal from Mobile Force Command for the creation of such decorations was discussed at the first meeting of the Canadian Forces Honours Policy Committee (CFHPC) on 9 March 1982, the proposed awards
bore the names of specific individuals, something the Committee rejected. No further action was taken to define the structure or create the decorations at this time since there was no immediate need for such recognition at the time although there was an understanding such decorations would be needed should Canada become engaged in an armed conflict.

In 1986, the Royal Canadian Legion passed a resolution at its annual convention urging the Prime Minister, then the Right Honourable Brian Mulroney, to retain the Victoria Cross as the country’s highest award for gallantry. The topic was also raised by some Parliamentarians and it appears that the Prime Minister was open to the idea. News had reached Canada that Australia was taking steps to ‘Australianize’ the VC (a process that would be completed in January 1991) to make it an Australian decoration granted by The Queen in right of Australia on the recommendation of Australian authorities. The Prime Minister asked officials to examine the possibility of following a same path in Canada.

In 1987, the Prime Minister replied to the Royal Canadian Legion, which published a substantial portion of the Prime Minister’s response in its April edition of the Legion magazine:

‘As you know, Canada has since the mid-1960s been developing its own national system of honours […]. An element in the evolution of our system has been a policy that the government will not recommend Canadians for British honours. This includes the Victoria Cross, which is bestowed by Her Majesty The Queen on the recommendation of the British government.

I do recognize, however, the special place of the Victoria Cross in the history of the Canadian Armed Forces and its pre-eminence as a decoration for combat valour. I have therefore asked officials to review the possibility of ‘Canadianizing’ the Victoria Cross, that is, making it subject to award on the recommendation of the Government of Canada. If this should prove possible, it would reconcile two significant objectives: the continued development of a truly Canadian system of honours and the maintenance of an important link with our military and Commonwealth heritage.’

The Right Honourable Martin Brian Mulroney, PC, CC, GOQ

Photo: Public Domain
What Prime Minister Mulroney may not have known is that by this point work had been initiated at National Defence and the proposal was headed in a completely different direction. Ongoing work at National Defence regarding mobilisation and readiness requirements, and the ever present possibility of armed conflict with little or no notice, made the creation of the decorations in peacetime desirable. In late 1985, staff work was initiated and discussions took place between National Defence’s Directorate of Ceremonial and the Chancellery of Honours at Rideau Hall. The initial idea from DND was that the new decorations should be a variation to the existing Canadian Bravery Decorations either keeping the same insignia and having different ribbons or having slightly amended insignia as well as differentiated ribbons. The Director of Honours at the Chancellery, Roger de C.B. Nantel, while open to these options, was in favour of having one common set of decorations open to both military and civilian recipients, in peacetime and war, to recognize uniformly any specific type of deed. After all, CAF members were eligible for the Canadian Bravery Decorations and the Regulations for those decorations did not limit their use to peacetime actions. If the existing decoration were to be used in combat situations, a simple device could be added to the ribbon to denote the award was earned in ‘circumstances above and beyond the call of duty in active combat in the face of armed opposition in military operations’. This proposed ‘Combat Emblem’, in the form of metallic crossed swords – the traditional symbol for combat awards – would be open to military and civilian recipients who earned their decoration in such a context. The insignia would be silver or gold depending on the medal upon which it was to be worn (a miniature version being worn on the undress ribbon). Its use could also be extended to other honours such as the Meritorious Service Cross. CFHPC first discussed the matter on 21 April 1986 and strongly opposed the

Sketch of the Star of Courage with the proposed Combat Emblem

Photo: DH&R
Emblem idea. The members were unanimous in the fundamental belief that bravery under combat conditions, where courage and personal risk is a requirement of everyone’s duty, was different from bravery in ‘normal’ peacetime conditions and that consequently, separate bravery awards for combat against an armed enemy were needed. The Committee asked for a new proposal with rationale for distinct combat bravery awards and comparing practices of our allies both in terms of structure and numbers. The VC idea however was not dead, even the Chancellery staff seemed divided on the matter. In a 16 April 1987 article in *The Gazette* in Montreal entitled ‘Victoria Cross may come back as Canada’s top military medal’, Bill Fairbairn revealed that the Deputy Director at the Chancellery, David John, had stated the VC could be restored as the top battlefield bravery award and that its elimination from the system in 1972 has been ‘inadvertent’ because of erroneous interpretation of terminology. He asserted that further research had revealed, as will be detailed below, that the current VC Royal Warrant allowed for Commonwealth countries to make direct recommendations to The Queen for the award, without reference to British authorities. One VC holder, John Foote, was quoted in the article as saying ‘I am glad the VC is making a comeback’. Needless to say that Mr. John was reprimanded for his indiscretion and the Chancellery distanced itself from the comments described as ‘personal opinion’.

CFHPC reviewed the matter again on 2 September 1987. While the Director of Honours at the Chancellery remained in favour of using the existing Canadian Bravery Decorations with suitable modifications – a diagonal metallic gold thread across the ribbon was one suggestion – there was agreement at CFHPC on the need for separate decorations for combat bravery and on the general structure for the decorations. It was agreed that there should be four levels of combat bravery awards, as in the previous British structure: three combat bravery decorations and a modern equivalent to the Mention in Despatches. The initial proposal included eligibility for civilians as well as allied military personnel working in conjunction with the CAF, it established that the same allocations as those used during the Second World War and Korea would be retained (one nomination for every 250 persons under command every 6 months), that all awards in the family would be rank and service neutral (unlike most of their British predecessors) and established an immediate awards process similar to that used in past conflicts. At this point, it was also envisaged that in case of war, the existing Bravery Decorations Committee (primarily composed of civilian members who consider the Canadian Bravery Decoration nominations) would be used for the new combat decorations, a strange suggestion which would soon be altered.
The broader definition of ‘enemy’, taken from the *National Defence Act* and the *Queen’s Regulations and Orders* (QR&Os) was also agreed upon for the purpose of the new decorations. Therefore, ‘enemy’ was to include ‘armed mutineers, armed rebels, armed rioters and pirates’.19

Therefore, despite the assurances provided publicly by Prime Minister Mulroney in 1987 regarding the VC, the diverging opinions within the Chancellery on the matter of the VC, and the acknowledged pressure of veteran groups to restore the VC, the proposal under development at National Defence was not altered and continued to call for three purely Canadian decorations, modelled after the existing Canadian Bravery Decorations. This accorded with the government’s policy which had consistently maintained that all future awards will be clearly Canadian and therefore there was no plan to revert to the use of British awards such as the VC to meet national needs. This was also following the precedents set with the creation of other modern Canadian honours which replaced British ones. The closest example was the George Cross and George Medal for non-combat bravery which were initially replaced by the Medal of Courage of the Order of Canada in 1967, and then by the new Canadian Bravery Decorations in 1972, without any significant opposition or concern.

A further briefing note to CFHPC of 17 March 1989 refined the proposal for what were then called the Combat Bravery Decorations. It recommended that all awards be available posthumously. Although it clearly stated the final titles and designs were to be determined by the Honours Policy Committee (HPC, the Government Committee responsible to provide advice to the Prime Minister on honours), the structured proposed was as follows:

- Canadian Combat Cross (CCC)
- Distinguished Conduct Star (DCS)
- Military Bravery Medal (MBM)

The criteria for all three mirrored those of the Canadian Bravery Decorations with the simple addition of ‘in active combat in the face of an armed enemy’.

*The George Cross*
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CFHPC discussed the proposal on 5 April 1989 including delegation of award authority in wartime and allocations for immediate awards but also further discussed the definitions of ‘enemy’ and ‘combat’, specifically avoiding the word ‘war’ to prevent any confusion. The Committee also requested the name for the top level be changed to the Military Cross of Valour. A revised proposal incorporating the changes requested by CFHPC was later circulated secretarily.20

Later that year, HPC agreed to the development of the decorations and their related Regulations.21

The creation of gallantry decorations had not been a high priority given the absence of an immediate need for them and work continued to progress slowly when, on 2 August 1990, Iraq invaded Kuwait. By the end of the month, the Government had committed the CAF to join an international coalition intent on repelling the aggression and defending Kuwait’s neighbours. When Iraq failed to comply with the international ultimatum, backed by United Nations Security Council Resolution 678 of 29 November 1990, to withdraw its forces from Kuwait by 15 January 1991, the coalition, including its Canadian components, went on the offensive against Iraqi forces in what became known as the Gulf War. For the first time since Korea

A destroyed Iraqi tank rests near a series of oil-well fires in northern Kuwait during the Gulf War, 9 March 1991
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forty years earlier, Canada was at war and suddenly, the need for military valour decorations became more pressing.22

By September 1990, the names had evolved to the following:23

- Military Cross of Valour (MCV)
- Distinguished Service Cross (DSC)
- Military Medal of Bravery (MMB)

Discussions proceeded with the Chancellery of Honours and HPC and the draft Regulations continued to evolve. Armed Forces Council had discussed the proposal on 17 October 1990 and made recommendations to the Government. These were considered by HPC, which approved the draft Regulations on 1 November 1990.24

The DND proposal called for a family of Military Valour Decorations to be as follows:

- Cross of Canada (CCC)
- Star of Military Valour (SMV)
- Medal of Military Valour (MMV)

By this time, it had also been determined that a specific military committee, with a representative of the Governor General, would consider the nominations for these decorations and the previous idea of using the existing Committee that considers Canadian Bravery Decorations was dropped. HPC agreed to the proposed structure and criteria but stated that the designs, especially the ribbons, remained to be determined (discussed in Chapter Five).25

While civilians were originally to be eligible, it was later decided, after discussion with Chancellery officials, that only military personnel, Canadian and allied, should be eligible for the decorations.26

On 10 January 1991, in light of the ongoing events in the Gulf, the proposal as it stood, including the proposed names and criteria for all three decorations, were communicated by the Directorate of Ceremonial by message to several CAF commanders for their advance information.27 By 6 February 1991, the Letters Patent and Regulations were at the Privy Council Office (PCO) for approval.28
On 7 February 1991, as Canada was deeply involved in the Gulf War, the front page of *The Globe and Mail* announced that the Government intended to replace the Victoria Cross with a purely Canadian decoration to be called the ‘Cross of Canada’. The reaction among veteran and social groups such as the Monarchist League of Canada was swift and visceral. It forced the Government to reconsider its plans which occasioned a delay in the announcement of the new decorations.

As a result of the public reaction to the news, the Minister of National Defence’s office was briefed on the background of the proposal along three main points:

- The CF has been fully consulted as new decorations are designed for the Canadian honours system.

- The names, designs and regulations for the newly proposed Military Valour Decorations result from in-depth studies by the CF Honours Committee over several years, and have the support of Armed Forces Council.

- The CF did not ask for and do not wish to ‘Canadianize’ the Victoria Cross (VC) (much like Australia has done). Rather, the CF recommends the creation of a new and recognizably Canadian military valour decoration at this highest level. The standards for the recommended award, the Cross of Canada, have been carefully kept comparable with those of the VC.’

This last point was the crux of the matter. There was a feeling in certain circles that a clean break from the British system had to be done, as it had been for the other elements of the honours system, and that the new awards had to be meaningful and motivating for current and future serving members of the CAF as potential recipients. It was believed that these younger Canadians had different outlooks than veterans and that they would prefer something different and entirely Canadian. This view however, was not acknowledging the full force and weight of the historic and symbolic power of the VC for veterans and Canadians at large. The new decorations had to be respected and valued not only by members of the CAF but by all Canadians. Damage control would not suffice to quell the public opinion in this regard, especially in light of the previous statement of the Prime Minister on this matter.
After the leak which lead to the 7 February 1991 front page news, the head of the Chancellery of Honours, then Lieutenant-General François Richard, received a phone call from PCO where he and the Chancellery of Honours were criticised for misjudging the public opinion in the matter and failing to advise PCO and the Prime Minister of the potential reaction to such a decision. From that point on, the Prime Minister’s Office essentially took control and provided the direction to HPC on the matter as we shall see below. This goes to show how important and emotional symbolic issues can be and this hard-learned lesson would guide all those involved in this file in the future.

Initially, National Defence, the Chancellery of Honours, HPC and the central agencies intended to ride the storm and generally maintain the original plan. On 16 April 1991, National Defence submitted further recommendations, including the renaming of the top level to the Canada Cross so the structure now reflected the following:

- Canada Cross (CCC)
- Star of Military Valour (SMV)
- Medal of Military Valour (MMV)

These recommendations were supported by HPC and forwarded to the Prime Minister’s Office. Silence ensued until November 1992 in light of the ongoing public debate on the matter. The Gulf War had by this point ended, no combat award recommendations were forthcoming as a result of that campaign and therefore the lifting of operational pressure along with the public reaction to the government proposal combined to push the issue onto the back burner, at least temporarily.

In the public sphere however, opposition only grew with time. In the days and weeks that followed the leak, letters poured in to the offices of the Governor General, Prime Minister, Ministers and Members of Parliament from Canadians, many of them veterans, mostly opposing the Government’s proposal. In a 19 February 1991 letter to Parliamentarians, the Monarchist League of Canada requested assistance to have the VC maintained as Canada’s top honour. The letter as accompanied with a VC fact sheet that made the point that the VC was no longer a strictly British honour. It explained that changes made by King George VI in 1942 allowed the Dominions like Canada, Australia and New Zealand to make direct recommendation to The King for the VC. This was further expanded in 1961
by The Queen to allow all Commonwealth countries to do so, therefore making ‘the VC a Commonwealth-wide honour’. The League followed up with another letter specifically to Conservative backbenchers on 15 May 1991 in order to exert pressure on the Government and found many supporters on the Government benches.

The National Council of Veteran Association (NCVA) passed a Resolution at its Annual Meeting in Toronto on 31 October 1991 ‘that the Victoria Cross […] should be retained as Canada’s highest decoration for Valour’ and that ‘the responsibility for awarding it should be repatriated from the United Kingdom to Canada’.

Moreover, on 2 October 1991, Douglas Fee, Progressive Conservative Member of Parliament for Red Deer, Alberta, introduced a private member’s bill in the House of Commons, Bill C-305, an Act Respecting the Award of the Victoria Cross, which called for the reinstatement of the decoration in Canada. The intent was not simply to restore the use of the British VC in Canada but rather to make it a Canadian honour just as the Australians had done earlier that same year. As a result of Fee’s intense lobbying, the bill was supported by all parties and no member spoke against it. The bill eventually passed second reading in the House on 10 February 1993 and was moved to a legislative committee but it was overtaken by events as by this point the Government had already taken action, although the announcement would not be made for another two weeks.

Once again, like in 1986, the Royal Canadian Legion passed a similar unanimous resolution at its 1992 convention in Quebec City to uphold the VC as the highest Canadian honour. In March 1992, the Legion magazine also featured an article related to the Canadianization of the VC, along the lines of the recent Australian experience.
By this point, the Chief of the Defence Staff (CDS), General John de Chastelain, had indicated a willingness to consider a Canadianized version of the VC in order to gain approval for the Military Valour Decorations.37

In November 1992, pressured in part by the progress of the private member’s bill on the VC, the Prime Minister instructed HPC to revisit the matter and it was decided, not surprisingly in light of recent events, to restore the VC at the head of the new family of Military Valour Decorations. Like in Australia, this would not merely be the restored use of the British VC in Canada but rather the creation of a new Canadian VC, a distinctly Canadian honour, with its own Regulations, to be awarded on behalf of The Queen as Queen of Canada, on the recommendation of Canadian authorities alone.

The amended Regulations were sent to PCO on 26 November 1992 and a 10 December 1992 Order-in-Council requested that Letters Patent be sent to Her Majesty for approval.38 Last minute changes were made to the Regulations such as the clarification of the Chancellery’s role and amending the proposed motto from VALOR to PRO VALORE (see also Chapter Five). These amendments were submitted to PCO on 17 December 1992, completed by 22 December and sent to the Registrar General’s Office that same day for formatting of the Letters Patent. These documents were sent to the Prime Minister’s Office on 23 December. After a few more corrections made as late as 30 December, the Prime Minister signed the recommendation to Her Majesty on 31 December 1992.39
Finally, The Queen approved the new Military Valour Decorations on 2 February 1993 (with retroactive effect on 1 January 1993) to be composed of the Victoria Cross (VC), Star of Military Valour (SMV) and Medal of Military Valour (MMV). The announcement was made by the Government on 25 February 1993 and, interestingly the Government asked MP Doug Fee, who had tabled the private member’s bill on the topic, to make the announcement on behalf of the Prime Minister. Mr. Fee then dropped his bill given the Government’s announcement had met his intent.
The details of the new decorations were shared within the CAF through a CANFORGEN published the following day. The Letters Patent and Regulations were formally published in the *Canada Gazette* a year later on 26 February 1994.

The criteria for the VC remained the same as its British counterpart and the criteria for the two other decorations are variations on the VC criteria:

- **The Victoria Cross** shall be awarded for the most conspicuous bravery, a daring or pre-eminent act of valour or self-sacrifice or extreme devotion to duty, in the presence of the enemy.

- **The Star of Military Valour** shall be awarded for distinguished and valiant service in the presence of the enemy.

- **The Medal of Military Valour** shall be awarded for an act of valour or devotion to duty in the presence of the enemy.

The three MVDs are complemented at Level 4 by a modern Canadian version of the Mention in Dispatches and by departmental awards at Levels 5 and 6, namely the Chief of the Defence Staff Commendation and the Command Commendation respectively.
As alluded to in Chapter One, the decorations are service and rank neutral, being open to all ranks in all services, only the degree of gallantry displayed determines the level of recognition. The decorations may be awarded posthumously, may be awarded to members of allied forces, may be revoked and carry no monetary benefits.
There has been a persistent misunderstanding that the Victoria Cross and other MVDs may only be awarded in a declared war, something which has not occurred in Canada since the Second World War and is unlikely to occur again. The decorations can be awarded in situations short of war if the troops are in “combat” with an organized, armed “enemy” that is recognized as such by the Canadian people. It must be understood however that “combat” is not merely the presence of fire. Rather, the fire has to be directed at our troops, with the intent of our troops being the destruction of the opposing force as a valid entity. The word “enemy” is defined in the Regulations as a hostile armed force, and includes armed terrorists, armed mutineers, armed rebels, armed rioters and armed pirates.

However, it must be remembered that conflicting parties in a peacekeeping context are not considered ‘enemies’ and although there may be altercations with the CAF in a peacekeeping mission, the use of force by the CAF will generally be limited to self-defence. This is why MVDs are not awarded during peacekeeping operations. However, other honours such as the Canadian Bravery Decorations, Meritorious Service Decorations (Military Division) and the Mention in Dispatches have been used in such contexts.

In order to preserve that rarity and symbolic value of the decorations, there are numerical limits which are identical to the limits used for gallantry decorations in the two World Wars and in Korea. MVD nominations cannot exceed one nomination for every 250 persons under command in an active theatre of operations for a six-month period. This rule ensures the respect and value of these decorations is preserved but often imposes difficult choices to the leaders; only ‘the bravest of the brave’, those who willingly and knowingly sacrifice themselves for others, or set an extreme example of devotion to duty, will be recognized.

Nominations, which must include two sworn witness statements, must be submitted through the chain of command and reach the Directorate of Honours and Recognition (DH&R) within two years of the date of the incident cited. During the Afghanistan campaign, the nominations would be initiated at the unit level in theatre, reviewed by a theatre-level honours and awards committee, supported
by the Task Force Commander, then forwarded to the Canadian Expeditionary Force Command (CEFCOM), later renamed Canadian Joint Operations Command (CJOC), where it would be reviewed by the Command’s honours and awards committee, supported by the Commander of the Command and forwarded to DH&R (until August 2006, this was the Honours & Awards Section of the Directorate of History and Heritage (DHH)). Staff at DH&R would review every file in detail to ensure the criteria for the proposed award was fully met, the award was in line with precedents and that the number of nominations remained within the numerical limits.

The files are then considered by the Canadian Forces Decorations Advisory Committee (CFDAC), which sits as the Military Valour Decorations Advisory Committee when considering MVD files. Besides the CDS, who acts as Chair, membership of CFDAC includes the Vice-Chief of the Defence Staff, the Commanders of the Royal Canadian Navy, Canadian Army and Royal Canadian Air Force as well as a representative of the Governor General who is a senior official from the Chancellery of Honours at Government House. CFDAC generally meets every two months except in summer but more meetings can be held when the number of cases justifies it. For example, the Committee met monthly at the height of the Afghanistan campaign. The CDS then conveys the Committee’s recommendations to the Governor General who approves the awards on behalf of Her Majesty through an Instrument of Award.

The Governor General then invests the recipients with their decoration at formal investitures generally held at Rideau Hall in Ottawa or at La Citadelle in Quebec City.
The Tomb of the Unknown Soldier is to remind all Canadians of the human cost of our country’s commitment to the cause of peace and freedom in the past, in the present, and in the future. This sarcophagus was built at the front of Canada’s National War Memorial in Ottawa to contain the remains of an unknown Canadian soldier who died in France sometime during the First World War (1914-1918). We do not know his age, or the unit he fought with, or the date of his death; no one does. The remains were exhumed from Cabaret-Rouge British Cemetery, Souchez, Plot 8, Row E, Grave 7. A marker, resembling the other Commission headstones in the cemetery, sits on the now empty grave. It is inscribed as follows:

“THE FORMER GRAVE OF AN UNKNOWN CANADIAN SOLDIER OF THE FIRST WORLD WAR. HIS REMAINS WERE REMOVED ON 25 MAY 2000 AND NOW LIE INTERRED AT THE NATIONAL WAR MEMORIAL IN OTTAWA CANADA”

The idea of awarding the VC to the Unknown Soldier, like it has been done (with the VC and other honours) in some other countries, was discussed on a few occasions, especially during the planning phase of the Repatriation of the Unknown Soldier project, which was a Millennium Project. The Project Working Group, which included among many representatives, three voting members from the three main veteran organizations, discussed the matter on 20 January 1999 during their fourth meeting and unanimously agreed that ‘The Victoria Cross or other military honours would not be considered for the Unknown Soldier’. The logic is that the ‘Unknown Soldier should not be elevated in any way above his fallen comrades. Placed in a
simple, sacred Tomb in a sacred location at the War Memorial, he was meant to represent all fallen soldiers regardless of rank or status. The idea resurfaced at the time the VC insignia was produced. When this became public through a *Globe and Mail* article by Murray Campbell on 3 March 2007 among rumours that the VC had now been cast and that The Queen would formally present the decoration intended for the Unknown Soldier during the ceremony marking the 90th anniversary of the Battle of Vimy Ridge in France on 9 April, veteran groups strongly reacted against the idea. John Frost, Dominion President of the Royal Canadian Legion sent a letter to the Governor General on 28 February and had it published in the *Globe and Mail* of 6 March 2007 where the arguments above were reiterated and concluded that ‘the Unknown Soldier needs no other honour to emphasize his status as a hero among heroes’. The National Council of Veteran Associations also voiced its concern in a letter to Governor General Michaëlle Jean on 1 March. The basic argument is that granting an award to the Unknown Soldier would be making a presumption on the bravery of an individual who is meant to remain anonymous and a representative of all those who died in war. When questioned on the matter on 6 March, Prime Minister Stephen Harper conceded that ‘We haven’t made a final decision. We’ve actually had some mixed responses from veterans organizations. Not all opposed but some opposed, some in favour and the government hasn’t taken a final decision on that’. A poll was conducted by the CBC and the results were posted on their *Your View* webpage; 77% of respondents were against the award, 16% were in favour, while 6% were neutral. The opinion letters addressed to the Governor General and Prime Minister reveal similar opinions with 72% opposed, 22% in favour and 6% neutral (based on 54 letters received). In light of the public reaction in March 2007, and further consultation with veteran groups, the suggestion was definitively put to bed through a decision of HPC of 22 January 2008.
Chapter Three
The Afghanistan Campaign 2001–2014
The Afghanistan Campaign 2001–2014

Although created 25 years ago, the MVDs were first used in the context of the campaign against terrorism in Afghanistan which resulted from the terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001 in the United States. All 109 MVDs awarded thus far have been for gallantry in that long and arduous campaign, this first major combat mission the CAF have been involved in since the Korean War.

The following synopsis of the Afghanistan campaign has been written by Dr. Craig Leslie Mantle, primary editor and project lead of In Their Own Words, a compilation of the personal stories of 23 recipients of the SMV and MMV in Afghanistan until 2007.53

On 11 September 2001, the hijacked airliners that crashed into the World Trade Center in New York City, the Pentagon in Arlington, Virginia and a field in Pennsylvania en route to a substantive target claimed close to 3,000 lives, including 24 Canadians.54 In response, members of the CAF deployed to Afghanistan as part of an international coalition to topple the Taliban leadership that had harboured Osama bin Laden’s al-Qaeda, the organization responsible for these horrific and unprecedented attacks against the United States. The Taliban had governed the country according to its own severe brand of Islamic fundamentalism following both the withdrawal of Soviet forces that had occupied Afghanistan from 1979 to 1989 and the ensuing Afghan civil war; it also derived significant monetary resources from the illicit opium trade. Later, concurrent to providing security, the Coalition directed effort toward ensuring that the country would never again become a safe haven for terrorists by facilitating reconstruction and development across many facets of national life. Lasting 13 years, Canada’s mission in Afghanistan had four distinct and separate phases.

From the very beginning, the Canadian military supported its closest and most important ally; invoking Article 5, the collective defence clause of the North Atlantic (or Washington) Treaty, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) called on member nations to come to the United States’ aid. Assisting the U.S. in ousting the Taliban marked the first stage of Canada’s involvement in Afghanistan. On the ground, Joint Task Force 2, the nation’s elite special operations forces, landed in Afghanistan by the end of 2001; later, in March 2002, both it and the 3rd Battalion, Princess Patricia’s Canadian
Light Infantry, which was based in Kandahar, participated in Operation ANACONDA. Aiming to defeat Taliban and al-Qaeda fighters in the Shah-i-Kowt Valley where they had concentrated following their countrywide rout by American special forces and airpower fighting alongside Afghan militias such as the Northern Alliance, ANACONDA lasted for 17 days. Although a victory for the U.S. and its allies, many of the enemy escaped to neighbouring Pakistan through an exceptionally porous border where they regrouped, re-equipped and later re-entered Afghanistan to continue the fight. Notably, for their participation in ANACONDA, a handful of Canadian snipers received the U.S. Bronze Star Medal. Not since the Korean War (1950–1953) had Canadian soldiers engaged in deliberate offensive combat operations against a recognized enemy.
Aiding in initial reconstruction efforts marked the second phase of Canada’s expanding and evolving mission in Afghanistan. With the Taliban’s quick removal from power, attention quickly turned to stabilizing the country and preventing it from continuing as a failed state by increasing security and establishing a new government. The United Nations in December 2001 authorized the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) to tackle these daunting responsibilities in and around Kabul, the country’s capital. NATO assumed responsibility for ISAF in August 2003 and, by stages, subsequently expanded its presence throughout all of Afghanistan. From that date to July 2005, Canada supported ISAF by contributing a rotating battlegroup that ensured freedom of movement within the city, advised on matters of security and defence, and assisted with the reconstruction of Afghan security forces; other Canadians served elsewhere in South-West Asia.

In August 2005, Canada began to gradually take over responsibility for security and redevelopment in Kandahar province, the volatile birthplace and heartland of the Taliban. Despite being removed from power only a few short years ago, it experienced a resurgence and again represented a significant danger in the south, as did the Haqqani network, a Taliban offshoot and al-Qaeda affiliate that likewise opposed Coalition efforts. In the neighbouring provinces of Helmand and Uruzgan, British and Dutch forces, respectively, fought a similarly dangerous campaign against a reinvigorated threat as well. Over multiple rotations, from 2006 to 2011, and through many battles both large and small, Canadian military personnel in Kandahar worked to create a safe and secure environment in which development and reconstruction projects, however construed, could flourish. Resisting any activities that ran counter to their theocratic worldview and receiving considerable support from neighbouring Pakistan and Afghans sympathetic to their cause, whether that sympathy was genuine or coerced, the Taliban frequently attacked the Canadians with deadly effect. This stage of the mission, in which all 109 Military Valour Decorations were earned, was by far the most dangerous, witnessing sustained, high-intensity combat operations that resulted in the death or wounding of many Canadians. For actions performed in Afghanistan in the presence of the enemy, CAF members (including special operations forces and allied personnel working with the CAF) received 20 Stars of Military Valour and 89 Medals of Military Valour.
In the late summer of 2006, with the Taliban having infiltrated back into the Panjwai district, the Canadians mounted Operation MEDUSA in an attempt to reassert Afghan government control over the area. From 2 to 17 September, the Canadian battlegroup based on the 1st Battalion, The Royal Canadian Regiment, with some additional support, conducted a set-piece engagement that inflicted significant Taliban casualties. MEDUSA marked a major turning point. Not only was it NATO’s most significant land battle to date, it also taught the Taliban a valuable, if costly, lesson, that it could not hope to engage conventionally with numerically- and technologically-superior ISAF forces and win. Following MEDUSA, the Taliban quickly shifted tactics and became more asymmetrical, avoiding direct massed contact with ISAF when possible and using suicide bombers and improvised explosive devices (IEDs) to inflict Coalition casualties. It is instructive to note that more Canadians died from IEDs than from any other cause. Considerable effort was therefore directed toward not only locating and destroying IEDs before they harmed Coalition
members and local civilians, but also using forensic analysis to identify the bomb-making cells that had manufactured the devices. Rather than fighting “traditional” battles as had occurred throughout Canada’s wars of the 20th Century, the Canadians and their allies were now compelled to fight a counter-insurgency campaign for “hearts and minds”, attempting to draw the allegiance of the Afghan people away from the Taliban and towards ISAF and, more importantly, the legitimate Government of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan.

After assuming responsibility for the south, Canada quickly established the Kandahar Provincial Reconstruction Team (PRT), a whole-of-government undertaking with civilian public servants from various government departments to oversee both small- and large-scale projects intended to help rebuild Afghanistan. Despite its modest beginnings, the PRT evolved to become a cornerstone of Canadian engagement in the south. While the military provided security by reducing the threat posed by insurgents, state-building activities – holding elections, large-scale development, improving policing and prisons, microfinancing, capacity-building within the Afghan government, and so forth – were undertaken largely, but not exclusively, by other government departments and agencies. By limiting the physical and psychological space in which the Taliban could operate, non-kinetic activities such as these also contributed to the counter-insurgency campaign. Being the largest and most expensive piece of Canada’s engagement in South-West Asia, the military’s contribution has often overshadowed that of others, but Afghanistan was a battle waged on many fronts, not just in dusty fields and villages.

During this phase of the mission, moreover, Canada suffered its first female combat fatality in its history. Captain Nichola Goddard, MSM of the Royal Canadian Horse Artillery was killed on 17 May 2006 while participating in a joint Canadian/Afghan operation to secure the outskirts of Kandahar City. For her “passionate and professional approach to her duties and to those in her charge,” she was posthumously awarded the Meritorious Service Medal later in the year.56
With the end of combat in July 2011, the third chapter in Canada’s Afghan story, the CAF shifted gears yet again, leaving Kandahar and returning to Kabul. For the next three years or so, from mid-2011 until the end of the mission, Canadians provided training and professional development support to Afghan security forces – the army, air force and police – in order to build capacity and capability so that they might secure the country themselves without outside assistance. The last CAF members returned home in March 2014, marking the end of a long, difficult and frequently controversial period in Canada’s military history.

Being a land-locked country, the war in Afghanistan was primarily army-centric. Nevertheless, the navy and air force both played important roles throughout the entire mission. At sea, Her Majesty’s Canadian Ships participated in counter-terrorism operations such as interdicting and searching vessels for weapons, narcotics and wanted terrorists. By contributing to international fleets operating
in the Arabian Sea and Gulf of Oman, Canadian vessels bolstered regional security, thereby supporting inland operations. In the air, various airframes, from helicopters to fixed-wing aircraft to unmanned aerial vehicles, provided reconnaissance, surveillance, casualty evacuation, fire support and airlift capabilities. Significantly, the Joint Task Force – Afghanistan Air Wing, stood up in December 2008 at Kandahar Airfield and consisting of Griffons, Chinooks, Hercules and Herons, enabled critical military operations by providing a full range of air support capabilities. By reducing the need to travel by ground, thereby minimizing exposure to ambushes and IEDs, the Air Wing undoubtedly saved many Canadian, Coalition and Afghan lives while enabling success on the ground. Active in Regional Command (South), one of ISAF’s divisions of Afghanistan, it flew until August 2011, one month after Canadian combat operations ceased in Kandahar.

Overall, the mission was complex and expensive. In total, some 40,000 CAF members served in Afghanistan over these 13 years in a variety of capacities. While some personnel taught Afghan soldiers how to fight through the Operational Mentor and Liaison Teams (a similar initiative existed to train the police), others in the Strategic Advisory Team mentored Afghan government officials in the business of running an effective and efficient bureaucracy; others still ensured the safe transit of supplies and personnel in and out of Afghanistan by way of Camp Mirage in Dubai, United Arab Emirates. More important than the approximately $18 billion dollars spent on Afghanistan in one way or another, some 159 military members lost their lives through various causes, with 635 wounded in action and a further 1,436 suffering injuries not attributable to combat. Afghanistan’s impact continues to be felt today with many veterans of the conflict, both retired and still serving, suffering operational stress injuries like post-traumatic stress disorder. Canada’s military commitment to Afghanistan ended in 2014, although the war has continued. The country’s future remains unsettled and it is perhaps too early to judge the impact of Canada’s (and the international community’s) efforts in South-West Asia.

Craig Leslie Mantle, PhD
Soon after the beginning of the campaign and it light the persistent belief in some circles that the MVDs could only be awarded in declared wars, the Honours and Awards authorities formally requested concurrence from the chain of command to process and consider as such any MVD nominations that might come forward as a result of combat action in Afghanistan. It was clear early on that this mission met the basic criteria for the MVDs inasmuch as Canadian troops were in actual combat with their aim being the destruction of the opposing force as a valid fighting entity; and they faced and armed enemy recognized as such by the Canadian people. It was now a matter of someone performing an act meeting the exacting criteria for one of the decorations.

The first awards of the MVDs were announced on 27 October 2006. This first announcement was for four awards, the SMV to Sergeant Tower and the MMV to Sergeant Denine, Master Corporal Fitzgerald and Corporal Lamont.
The first presentation of MVDs took place in the Ballroom of the Fairmont Chateau Laurier Hotel in Ottawa on 19 February 2007. On that occasion, the Governor General, then the Right Honourable Michaëlle Jean, presented the first two SMVs and the first four MMVs. The recipients included the four mentioned in the previous paragraph as well as the SMV to Major Fletcher and the MMV to Captain Prohar whose awards had been announced on 6 February 2007. Thirty-three Meritorious Service Decorations (six MSCs and 27 MSMs) were also presented on the same occasion. The recipients were also acknowledged in the House of Commons and
had the opportunity to meet with the Prime Minister, then the Right Honourable Stephen Harper, and the Minister of National Defence, then the Honourable Gordon O’Connor. The CDS, then General Rick Hillier, had also presented, the day before, 23 Mention in Dispatches and nine Chief of the Defence Staff Commendation insignia as well as one Canadian Forces Unit Commendation. These awards were among the first of many that would recognize valiant, brave and distinguished service by CAF members during the intense combat operations in Afghanistan.

Master Corporal Collin Fitzgerald, MMV and Sergeant Patrick Tower, SMV, CD, stand to be recognized in the House of Commons on Parliament Hill in Ottawa, 19 February 2007. Fitzgerald was presented with the Medal of Military Valour and Tower with the Star of Military Valour during a ceremony earlier that day.
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The Afghanistan campaign saw the first use of the MVDs and there was a perception, on the part of some military personnel, that the awarding of decorations was more generous towards the end of the Afghanistan mission than in its early stages. Other wondered why no VC had been awarded during that campaign, especially since the United Kingdom, Australia and New Zealand had all awarded VCs for actions in Afghanistan and Iraq. In 2012, in part to address some of those concerns, General Walter Natynczyk, then CDS, ordered a full review of the 20 SMVs awarded to ensure that the award process for these decorations had been efficient, fair and especially consistent across the years and rotations, and to ensure that all awards respected the intent and criteria of the decoration. A Review Committee, chaired by the Assistant Chief Military Personnel, with Commodore/Brigadier-General representatives from the various commands, reviewed the full nomination files for all 20 SMVs and, after deliberations, reported to the CDS that the process had indeed been fair and consistent and that all awards respected the intent and criteria of the decoration; all 20 SMVs were fully warranted, none of the cases being worthy of higher or lower recognition. This does not mean all SMVs are ‘equal’ in the sense that any decoration in the hierarchy does cover a range of actions. The review found that all the SMVs awarded were for actions that were all clearly in the SMV range, no more, no less. The perception that awards may have been increasingly generous over time may have in part stemmed from the fact that the early years of Canada’s participation in the Afghanistan mission consisted mainly in service, including training, in the Northern part of the country. It is only when the CAF moved to Kandahar province in the summer of 2005 that the basic
conditions for the award of the MVDs, ‘in combat’ with an ‘armed enemy’, were fully met. From that point, a substantial number of troops were in regular and prolonged contact with a recognized armed enemy and the potential for eligible gallantry acts existed. With regards to the lack of award of a VC, the review made it clear that it was simply a matter that no nomination for that campaign met the very high standard for this, the nation’s highest honour.

The CDS was satisfied with the conclusions of the review. At the outset of that review, the chain of command and the CDS in particular had made it clear that there was a desire to be fair, but we would not ‘look for one’ (VC) just for the sake of awarding one, which would only dilute the value of the honour and the reputation of our country.

The number of MVDs Canada awarded in that campaign is comparable with historical precedent (Korea in particular, where incidentally no VC was awarded to a Canadian either) and what our close allies have done (such as the U.K., Australia and New Zealand, who have comparable honours systems), considering number of deployed troops and casualties proportionally. Casualties are especially key as they directly relate to the level of risk and the intensity of the combat.

The following tables compare the gallantry awards and non-combat bravery awards granted to Canadians in Korea and Afghanistan:

**Table 3: Number of Canadian personnel who served and casualties for Korea and Afghanistan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campaign</th>
<th>Served</th>
<th>Killed</th>
<th>Wounded in Action</th>
<th>Total Casualties</th>
<th>Ratio Casualties to Served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>26,791</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>1,042</td>
<td>1,558</td>
<td>1:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>1:50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: Number of gallantry awards to Canadians for Korea and Afghanistan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campaign</th>
<th>Level 1 (VC)</th>
<th>Level 2 (DSO, DCM, SMV)</th>
<th>Level 3 (DSC, DSM, MC, MM, DFC, DFM, MMV)</th>
<th>Level 4 (MID)</th>
<th>Civilian bravery (GM, SC, MB)</th>
<th>Awards total</th>
<th>Decorations total (excluding Level 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Ratios of Canadian gallantry awards for number who served and casualties for Korea and Afghanistan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campaign</th>
<th>Ratio Awards to Served</th>
<th>Ratio Decorations (excluding level 4) to Served</th>
<th>Ratio Awards to casualties</th>
<th>Ratio Decorations (excluding Level 4) to Casualties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>1:68</td>
<td>1:231</td>
<td>1:4</td>
<td>1:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>1:91</td>
<td>1:315</td>
<td>1:2</td>
<td>1:6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These numbers clearly illustrate that there was more intense combat and higher casualties in Korea although that mission was shorter and involved fewer troops in total. While the number of gallantry awards for Afghanistan appears more conservative for the total number of troops who served in that theatre, it is much more generous, twice as generous in fact, when compared with casualties.

The following tables compare the gallantry awards and non-combat bravery awards granted by our close Commonwealth allies in Afghanistan:
Table 6: Number of Commonwealth personnel who served and casualties for Afghanistan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Served</th>
<th>Killed</th>
<th>Wounded in Action</th>
<th>Total Casualties</th>
<th>Ratio Casualties to Served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>1:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>150,000 (not including additional tours)</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>1,069</td>
<td>1:140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>33,149</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>1:109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1:136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Number of gallantry awards to Commonwealth personnel for Afghanistan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Civilian bravery</th>
<th>Awards total</th>
<th>Decorations total (excluding Level 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>1,039</td>
<td>497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Ratios of Commonwealth gallantry awards for number who served and casualties for Afghanistan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Ratio Awards to Served</th>
<th>Ratio Decorations (excluding level 4) to Served</th>
<th>Ratio Awards to casualties</th>
<th>Ratio Decorations (excluding Level 4) to Casualties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>1:91</td>
<td>1:315</td>
<td>1:2</td>
<td>1:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>1:144</td>
<td>1:302</td>
<td>1:1</td>
<td>1:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>1:319</td>
<td>1:663</td>
<td>1:3</td>
<td>1:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>1:140</td>
<td>1:292</td>
<td>1:1</td>
<td>1:2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One must be careful when comparing modern SMV citations with those of VCs from long past conflicts like to Anglo-Boer War or the First World War. The way the VC has been awarded has evolved significantly over time. The decoration was then awarded more freely than in the modern period because the concept of war has evolved and also as a result of the creation of a number of intermediate gallantry decorations covering ground which might have earned a VC a century ago. One can get a more accurate representation of a modern VC-worthy action by looking at citations for more recent awards. For example, a review of the British VCs (leaving aside the modern Australian and New Zealand awards for this exercise) awarded since Vietnam and the Falklands (a substantial portion of which are posthumous awards) reveals that most actions, in addition to outstanding gallantry, usually involve the recipient either drawing fire unto himself to relieve others or single-handedly charging the enemy against overwhelming odds. While our SMV recipients’ actions are most brave and impressive, and truly deserving of the SMV they have received, these actions still do not reach that extreme element that makes it a VC action. Citations also can only provide a brief summary of the action and cannot possibly convey all the contextual and detailed information considered by the various levels of expert review that reached the decision, a decision which must be trusted and respected.

In the end, what is important to recognize and celebrate is the tremendous gallantry demonstrated by the 20 SMV and 89 MMV recipients during this long and arduous campaign, individuals who are the embodiment of the highest of military virtues and who are the worthy successors to generations of brave Canadians who have shown their mettle in combat in various conflicts around the world in the past 150 years.
Chapter Four
Statistical Analysis
Statistical Analysis

A statistical analysis of the 109 MVDs awarded from the creation of the decorations in 1993 to their 25th anniversary on 1 January 2018 has been conducted and the findings are discussed below by topic.

Number of Awards

A total of 20 SMVs and 89 MMVs have been awarded since the creation of these decorations in 1993, all of the awards having been made for actions which took place between 2005 and 2011, during the campaign in Afghanistan. The number of awards has varied during those years based on the operational tempo and intensity of the evolving mission in that country. That campaign can be divided in four distinct phases described in Chapter Three. It is during the third phase – that saw the CAF moving from the North around Kabul to operate in the South centered on Kandahar from the summer of 2005 – where Canadian troops were engaged in intense combat regularly and those situations generated the first nominations for MVDs. Two awards are related to incidents which occurred in 2005, the next year saw 24 MVD-earning actions and the high point was reached in 2008 with 30 awards, before the numbers decreased until the end of the combat mission in 2011.

Specific numerical limits have been established for the MVDs in order to preserve the standard and integrity of the decorations. The limit is set at one recommendation for every 250 persons under command in an active theatre of operations for every six-month period. This is precisely the same limit for gallantry decorations under the British system used during the Second World War and in Korea. There is also a requirement to keep an appropriate balance between the MVDs and other honours in an operational context even if some of them, like the Meritorious Service Decorations, do not have numerical limits set by regulations. The proportions were established
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as follows for the various awards during the Afghanistan campaign, which was considered as ‘war’ for the purpose of the application of the Regulations:

Military Valour Decorations: one for every 250 persons or 0.4%
Meritorious Service Decorations: 0.9% divided as follows:
   Meritorious Service Crosses: 0.2%
   Meritorious Service Medals: 0.7%
Mentions in Dispatches: 1%
Chief of the Defence Staff Commendations: 2%
Command Commendations: 3%

Similar proportions exist for the different levels of operations as follows:

Table 9: Number of Honours and Awards per every 100 persons under command in an active theatre of operation for a six month period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Honour/Award</th>
<th>Military Valour Decorations</th>
<th>Meritorious Service Decorations</th>
<th>Mentions in Dispatches</th>
<th>CDS Commendations</th>
<th>Command Commendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>War</td>
<td>0.4:100</td>
<td>MSC: 0.2:100</td>
<td>1:100</td>
<td>2:100</td>
<td>3:100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MSM: 0.7:100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostilities</td>
<td>0.2:100</td>
<td>MSC: 0.1:100</td>
<td>0.5:100</td>
<td>1:100</td>
<td>2:100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MSM: 0.35:100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Operations</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>MSC: 0.05:100</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>0.5:100</td>
<td>1:100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MSM: 0.18:100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peacetime Activity</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>See Note 1</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>See Note 1</td>
<td>See Note 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: Considerably fewer, depending on activity intensity.
### Award Combinations

Several recipients of the MVDs have also received other honours either before or after their gallantry award.

Six have been admitted to the **Order of Military Merit**, all of whom were appointed after having earned their MVD. Three hold the SMV and three hold the MMV, and all six have been appointed as Members of the Order:

- **Warrant Officer J. PINCHIN, MMM, SMV, CD**, appointed on 23 October 2015
- **Master Warrant Officer D.G. SHULTZ, MMM, SMV, CD**, appointed on 10 October 2014
- **Chief Warrant Officer R. STACEY, MMM, SMV, CD**, appointed on 17 October 2012
- **Warrant Officer T.D. BÉRUBÉ, MMM, MMV, CD (Retired)**, appointed on 23 October 2015
- **Chief Warrant Officer R.J. CRANE, MMM, MMV, CD**, appointed on 26 September 2013
- **Master Warrant Officer M.W. JACKSON, MMM, MMV, CD**, appointed on 26 September 2013
Chief Warrant Officer (then Master Warrant Officer) Richard Stacey, MMM, SMV, CD, was awarded the Star of Military Valour in 2011, Mentioned in Dispatches in 2010 and is seen here receiving his insignia of Member of the Order of Military Merit from His Excellency the Right Honourable David Lloyd Johnston, CC, CMM, COM, CD, Governor General and Commander-in-Chief of Canada, Rideau Hall, 5 March 2013  
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Warrant Officer David Timothee Bérubé, MMM, MMV, CD, was awarded the Medal of Military Valour in 2011 and is seen here receiving his insignia of Member of the Order of Military Merit from the Governor General, Rideau Hall, 3 June 2016  
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Master Warrant Officer Robin John Crane, MMM, MMV, CD, was awarded the Medal of Military Valour in 2009 and is seen here receiving his insignia of Member of the Order of Military Merit from the Governor General, Rideau Hall, 26 February 2015  
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Two have also been awarded the Meritorious Service Cross (Military Division), one holding the SMV, the other the MMV, in both cases, unique award combinations:

**Major D.U.M. SUFFOLETTA, SMV, MSC, CD**  
His MSC was awarded to him as a Captain on 22 August 2012. He was presented with both his SMV and MSC at the same investiture. From February to July 2011, Captain Suffoletta served as officer commanding an embedded partnering team with the Provincial Response Team–Kandahar. During this time, he dramatically improved the operational effectiveness of the unit, while simultaneously enhancing both the Afghan rule of law and the overall legitimacy of the Afghan government. Captain Suffoletta’s efforts culminated in the establishment of a credible and capable Afghan unit that gained recognition among the highest levels of the Afghan government and the coalition.

![Image of Major Suffoletta receiving his awards](image)

**Captain (now Major) David Umberto Mario Suffoletta, SMV, MSC, CD, receives his Star of Military Valour and Meritorious Service Cross from the Governor General, Rideau Hall**  
Photo: Cpl Roxanne Shewchuk

**Colonel J.A.D. ABBOUD, MSC, MMV, CD**  
His MSC was awarded to him as a Major on 4 April 2008. He was presented with both the MSC and the MMV at the same investiture on 13 February 2009. Major Abboud was deployed as the commanding officer of B Company, 3rd Battalion, Royal 22e Régiment, in Afghanistan, from July 2007 to March 2008. He displayed leadership and tactical skills during security and humanitarian assistance operations, which greatly contributed to bringing stability and hope to the Afghan people of the Zharey district.

![Image of Colonel Abboud receiving his awards](image)

**Major (now Colonel) Joseph Antoine Dave Abboud, MSC, MMV, CD, wearing his Meritorious Service Cross and Medal of Military Valour on the day he was invested, Rideau Hall, 13 February 2009**  
Photo: Rideau Hall
Three recipients of the MMV have also been awarded the
Meritorious Service Medal (Military Division):

**Colonel M.L. LAPOINTE, MMV, MSM, CD**
His MSM was awarded to him as a Major on 4 April 2008. Major Lapointe was deployed to Afghanistan as a senior mentor with the Operational Mentoring and Liaison Team, in Afghanistan, from August 2007 to February 2008. Initiating a novel and robust training program, he led six police sub-stations into action in a two-week period. His expert management of the police teams resulted in a marked decrease in insurgent activity, which gained the trust of the local population and brought great credibility to this Canadian initiative.

**Lieutenant-Colonel D. PROHAR, MMV, MSM, CD**
His MSM was awarded to him as a Major on 26 April 2011. As Operational Mentoring and Liaison Team operations officer and headquarters company commander in Afghanistan from September 2009 to May 2010, Major Prohar planned and influenced operations, guaranteeing the necessary support to mentor teams operating in isolated and high-threat locations. His coordination with Canadian, American and Afghan units, his detailed knowledge of unit capabilities and his outstanding situational awareness reduced the level of risk and facilitated task force success. Major Prohar’s leadership and professionalism were critical to the success of operations and brought great credit to the Canadian Armed Forces.

**Colonel M.C. WRIGHT, MMV, MSM, CD**
His MSM was awarded to him as a Major on 10 July 2007. Major Wright was deployed as officer commanding Alpha Company, 1st Battalion, The Royal Canadian Regiment Battle Group, in Afghanistan from August 2006 to February 2007. He responded to the leadership challenge of being in constant contact with the enemy, and successfully planned and executed many company and combat team-level operations. Extremely adaptable, he effortlessly changed his warrior role to that of a humanitarian when working with senior Afghan politicians and the Afghan National Army. Major Wright’s professionalism and devotion to duty has significantly contributed to the success of the mission and has left a lasting legacy in Kandahar province.
Two recipients of the MMV have also been **Mentioned in Dispatches**:

**Chief Warrant Officer R.J. CRANE, MMM, MMV, CD**

He was Mentioned in Dispatches as a Warrant Officer on 6 January 2010. On 30 May 2008, an Afghan National Army (ANA) patrol, mentored by Warrant Officer Crane, was attacked while supporting a Battle Group operation in Zhari District, Afghanistan. After being forced to take protection from intense enemy fire, the patrol received Battle Group orders to move forward. Despite daunting risks, he personally led the advance, inspiring the remainder of the patrol to follow. Warrant Officer Crane’s courage and leadership by example enabled ANA support that contributed to the Battle Group’s operational success.

**Captain T.B. MYRONIUK, MMV, CD**

He was Mentioned in Dispatches as a Corporal on 6 January 2010. On 25 March 2008, a joint Canadian-Afghan patrol was returning from operations in Panjwayi District, Afghanistan, when an insurgent ambush pinned down the rear section. Corporal Myroniuk immediately and instinctively moved towards the enemy to provide sustained and accurate suppressive fire from multiple locations to secure the patrol’s flanks. Corporal Myroniuk’s courageous and decisive action enabled the section to effectively break contact without suffering casualties.

**Posthumous Awards**

A posthumous award means that the person was killed while performing the act or service recognized by the award or died as a direct result of it (died of wounds sustained during the act). Like all modern Canadian decorations, the MVDs may be awarded posthumously and this has occurred once with the MMV (0.9% of all awards). Corporal B. Keller lost his life while performing the act which earned him the decoration.

When a person dies after the award-earning act or service, either during another incident or of unrelated cause (like a heart attack), but before the award is approved and announced, the recipients is identified as ‘deceased’. This is the case of Captain J.S. Snyder who was awarded the SMV for an action on 4 June 2008 and died a few days later, on 7 June, when he tragically fell in a 20 meter deep well and drowned.
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The widow of Corporal Bryce Keller, MMV, Officer Cadet (now Captain) Sarah Keller, receives her late husband’s Medal of Military Valour from the Right Honourable Michaëlle Jean, CC, CMM, COM, CD, Governor General and Commander-in-Chief of Canada, Rideau hall, 13 February 2009
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during a joint night patrol with Afghan National Army forces in Zhari District, west of Kandahar. Similarly, Corporal M.R. McLaren earned his MMV on 16 October 2008 and was killed on 5 December when his armoured vehicle hit a roadside bomb during a joint patrol with Afghan National Army soldiers in the Arghandab District.

In addition to the above mentioned cases which are duly annotated (Posthumous) or (Deceased) as the case may be in the Register, it should also be noted that Chief Petty Officer T. Ratzlaff died on 6 August 2011 in Wardak province, Afghanistan, of wounds suffered when the CH-47 Chinook helicopter in which he was riding was shot down. His death came after his SMV had been approved and presented for his actions of 26 November 2008. The award, which was initially secret, was declassified in 2015.

The widow of Captain Jonathan Snyder, SMV, Megan Leigh Stewart, receives her late husband’s Star of Military Valour from the Governor General, Rideau Hall, 13 February 2009
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Secret Awards

As is the case for other honours and awards, there are occasions where, for operational and personnel security reasons, awards of the MVDs are considered secret. While the fact that an award has been made is published, the name and citation are not released. The awards are presented in private by the Governor General in the presence of only a few close family members and representatives of the chain of command. Eleven secret MVDs (six SMVs and five MMVs representing 10.1% of all awards) have been awarded, all to members of the Canadian Special Operations Forces Command (CANSOFCOM) or military personnel working with them. After some time has elapsed and the security concerns are reduced to an acceptable level, the names and citations, sometimes sanitized, can be made public. On the occasion of the unveiling of the commemorative plaque at The Valour Building in Ottawa on 25 May 2015, honouring the twenty recipients of the SMV of the Afghanistan campaign, the previously classified names and citations of three SMV recipients were released, namely Sergeant S. Courville, Chief Petty Officer T. Ratzlaff and Captain D.U.M. Suffoletta. The remaining three secret SMVs and five secret MMVs will be declassified and published in due course.
Type of Gallantry Recognized
The criteria for the MVDs cover gallantry in combat in many forms such as acts of valour, self-sacrifice or devotion to duty under fire. The nuance between these specific concepts is not easily discernable and subject to personal interpretation and judgement but a few categories of awards can be derived from the citations:

- Specific act of valour in combat;
- Act of valour in saving life under fire; or
- Distinguished service or devotion to duty under fire.

Selecting which of these general categories an award falls under based on the citation is, once again, a matter of subjective judgement but for the purpose of this exercise the following statics have been drawn. Nearly half of awards have been for life-saving acts of valour in combat (50 or 45.9%), with specific acts of valour in combat coming close behind with 41.3%. Distinguished service or devotion to duty under fire come as a distant third with 12.8%.

Military Valour Decorations by Type of Gallantry

Uniform, Branch and Unit Representation
Given that the Canadian Army is the largest of the CAF elements and that the Afghanistan campaign was Army-centric, it is not surprising that the vast majority of awards (and all SMVs) to the CAF have been to the Canadian Army with 93.6%, followed far behind by the RCAF with 2.8% and the RCN with 0.9%. The remaining three awards were to American personnel; one SMV to the U.S. Navy and two MMVs to the U.S. Army.
Corporal Brian Bélanger, MMV, receives his Medal of Military Valour from the Governor General, Rideau Hall, 22 June 2012
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Leading Seaman (now Master Seaman) Pier-Vincent Michaud, MMV receives his Medal of Military Valour from the Governor General, Rideau Hall, 10 June 2011
Photo: Rideau Hall

Military Valour Decorations Awarded by Uniform

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uniform</th>
<th>SMV</th>
<th>MMV</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Army</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Canadian Navy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Canadian Air Force</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. NAVY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. ARMY</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL: 20 / 89 / 109

The MVDs being combat awards, the Combat Arms are necessarily the trades where most of these decorations are earned. The Infantry is the most represented branch with 73.4% of the awards, followed equally by Armoured and Medical, both at 8.3%.
Corporal Cary Baker, MMV, receives his Medal of Military Valour from the Governor General, Rideau Hall, 13 February 2009
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### Military Valour Decorations Awarded by Branch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Branch</th>
<th>SMV</th>
<th>MMV</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Operations</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armour</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 / 7 (9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artillery</td>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical and Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infantry</td>
<td>17 / 63 (80)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td></td>
<td>9 (9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications and Electronics</td>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. NAVY</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. ARMY</td>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL: 20 / 89 / 109
For the very same reasons, the awards have concentrated in front line units. The following graph illustrates the awards to those units with regimental affiliations in the Canadian Army, these are from the Infantry and Armoured, both Regular and Reserve Force. The most represented unit is the PPCLI with 32 awards or 29.4%, followed by the RCR with 22 (20.2%) and the R22’R close behind with 21 (19.3%).

### Military Valour Decorations Awarded by Unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit / Ratification</th>
<th>SMV</th>
<th>MMV</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12e Régiment blindé du Canada</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Canadian Scottish Regiment</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor General’s Foot Guards</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Strathcona’s Horse (Royal Canadians)</td>
<td>1 / 2 (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Loyal Edmonton Regiment</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princess Patricia’s Canadian Light Infantry</td>
<td></td>
<td>(32)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Royal Canadian Regiment</td>
<td>7 / 15 (22)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Royal Canadian Dragoons</td>
<td>1 / 3 (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal 22e Régiment</td>
<td>3 / 18 (21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry Highlanders</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL: 19 / 64 / 87
Rank Representation
The MVDs recognize gallant action while in combat with an armed enemy and are therefore exclusively awarded to those in the thick of the action. This means most of the decorations, like the majority of Mentions in Dispatches, are awarded to personnel of junior ranks, both with officers and non-commissioned members. The most represented rank among the recipients is that of Leading Seaman/Corporal with 31 awards (28.4%) followed by Master Seaman/Master Corporal at 20.2% and Petty Officer 2nd Class/Sergeant at 16.5%. These three ranks account for two thirds (65.1%) of the MVDs awarded. When the next most represented rank, that of Ordinary Seaman/Private (9.2%), is added they represent together nearly three quarters of the awards (74.3%). The officer corps account for 17 of the awards, or 15.6%, while the non-commissioned members (including the American recipients) make up 84.4%.

Corporal Tony Rodney Vance Harris, MMV receives his Medal of Military Valour from the Governor General, Rideau Hall, 13 December 2011
Photo: Rideau Hall
Component Representation

The vast majority of the awards (102 or 93.6%) have been made to members of the Regular component of the CAF. This is normal given the Regular Force makes up 62.5% of the CAF and also made up the majority of participants in the Afghanistan mission.

The Primary Reserve component makes up 25.6% of the CAF and many reservists volunteer to deploy with the Regular Force on various operations. During the campaign in Afghanistan, when the Regular Force’s strength was under stress, the Reserve made up close to a third of deployed personnel on some rotations. Four awards (3.7%) have been made to members of the Primary Reserve. The remaining three awards (2.8%) have been to American personnel.
Gender Representation
The proportion of women in the CAF has increased steadily since the creation of the MVDs in 1993 and many more of them now serve in the combat arms. Women currently make up 17% of the CAF strength but still a much lower proportion in the combat arms. Only one woman has been awarded an MVD thus far (0.9% of the awards), this was the MMV awarded to Captain A. Collette.
Linguistic Representation
Unlike the appointments to the Order of Military Merit where efforts can be made to ensure representation of recipients of both official languages, MVDs recognize acts of gallantry and therefore the representation is mostly coincidental. Thirty-one MVDs have been awarded to personnel whose First Official Language is listed as French, this represents 28.4% of all awards.

Awards to Members of Allied Forces
The MVDs have been open to members of allied forces ‘serving with or in conjunction with’ the CAF since their creation. The nomination process for allies is identical to that followed for CAF recipients, and is used when Canada particularly wishes to honour deeds performed by allied soldiers while fighting under Canadian command or in very close cooperation with the CAF. Three such awards have been made thus far (2.8% of all awards), all three to members of the United States Armed Forces: one SMV to a member of the U.S. Navy, Chief Petty Officer T. Ratzlaff in 2010 (5% of all SMVs) and two MMVs to members of the U.S. Army, Specialist D.F. Graves and Staff Sergeant A. Hever, both in 2011 (2.2% of all MMVs). The former was an assault detachment commander of the United States Special Operations Task Force which fought together with Canadian Special Operations Regiment personnel.
during the incident that led to the award while the latter two were serving with the 1st Squadron, 71st Cavalry Regiment which was part of the Canadian-led Task Force Kandahar. Normally, a country wishing to honour a citizen from another nation seeks permission from the recipient’s home country before making such an award as honours are a matter of sovereignty. However, the United States has let it be known that other countries may award decorations to American military personnel as they see fit and that it is the recipient’s responsibility to seek subsequent approval from their chain of command to wear the decoration on their uniform.\textsuperscript{58}

**Military Valour Decorations Awarded to CAF vs Allies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SMV</th>
<th>1 / 19 (20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MMV</td>
<td>2 / 87 (89)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 20 / 89 / 109
Chapter Five
Insignia and Certificates
Design

The design for the family of Military Valour Decorations is a variation of the design for the Canadian Bravery Decorations instituted in 1972, both sets of decorations having been designed by Captain Bruce Wilbur Beatty, CM, SOM, CD (Retired). Beatty was a Second World War RCAF veteran who eventually became a graphic artist for the RCAF before retiring to join the Chancellery of Honours, at Government House, as a designer of insignia and technical advisor for their manufacture and wear. He is responsible for the design of most modern Canadian honours insignia, including the distinctive snowflake-shaped Order of Canada insignia.

The design finally approved for the MVDs however is not what was initially suggested. As was described in Chapter Two, the names of the three decorations evolved and so did the proposed designs. The initial 17 March 1989 proposal called for the following decorations:

- Canadian Combat Cross (CCC);
- Distinguished Conduct Star (DCS); and
- Military Bravery Medal (MBM).

This proposal did not include details of the designs besides the fact that the Cross was to be a gold cross worn at the neck (like the Cross of Valour), that the Star was to be silver and twelve-pointed (therefore quite different than the Star of Courage), and that the Medal was to be a silver circular medal, both the Star and the Medal being breast insignia.
In August 1990, the Directorate of Ceremonial shared a proposed design for the ribbons with the Chancellery of Honours. The sketch clearly indicates the top level to be a neck decoration similar in shape to the CV as discussed above, while the second level is now a four-pointed star and the third level is a circular medal on a ring suspension. What is more striking is the suggested use of diagonal stripes for the ribbons, similar to those used for the British Distinguished Flying Cross and Medal and Air Force Cross and Medal, but rendered in sanguine and white in various proportions showing an increasing proportion of white towards the lower level.59

By 27 September 1990, the proposal for what were referred to as the ‘bravery decorations for armed conflict’ had evolved further to include the following:60

Military Cross of Valour (MCV): a gold cross with blue enamel;

Distinguished Service Cross (DSC): a Sterling Silver cross. Concerns were raised about the proposed name given a similarly named decoration existed in both the U.K. and the U.S., among others. The Military Cross of Bravery was suggested as a possible alternative; and

Military Medal of Bravery (MMB): a Sterling Silver Medal.
Drawings depicting these options were provided to the Chief of the Defence Staff for the deliberation of Armed Forces Council but they have sadly been lost to history.

On 17 October 1990, Armed Forces Council had agreed to recommend the following specific names and designs to the Government:

**Cross of Canada (CCC):** the design was now to be identical to the Cross of Valour neck badge but with the arms in white enamel and with a sanguine enamel background to the central maple leaf, the ribbon was to be solid sanguine (a brownish red);

**Star of Military Valour (SMV):** the obverse design was already as the final one approved, very much in line with the existing Star of Courage, the ribbon was to be sanguine with one central white stripe; and

**Medal of Military Valour (MMV):** the obverse design was already as the final one approved, this one emulating the Medal of Bravery, the ribbon was to be sanguine with two white stripes.

All three insignia were to bear the Crowned Royal Cypher and the Latin word VALOR on the reverse.

From the 1989 proposal, multiple awards were to be denoted by miniature crossed swords on the bail of the Cross, on gold bars for the other two decorations and on undress ribbons.

The Government Honours Policy approved the creation of the decorations at its 1 November 1990 meeting but left the ribbon designs to be determined.

The CDS, then General John de Chastelain, and Lieutenant-General François Richard, Deputy Secretary, Chancellery of Honours, later decided on the following changes to the ribbons and multiple award devices in a private discussion:

- **Cross of Canada (CCC):** sanguine with one central white stripe wide enough not be obscured by the miniature white cross device (a 6 mm white stripe on a 38 mm sanguine ribbon);

- **Star of Military Valour (SMV):** sanguine with two white stripes (two 4 mm white stripes on a 32 mm sanguine ribbon); and

- **Medal of Military Valour (MMV):** sanguine with three white stripes (three 3 mm white stripes on a 32 mm sanguine ribbon).
The miniature crossed swords devices to denote multiple awards were judged too delicate and sharp and replaced by small gold maple leaves.

Therefore, besides the shade of red, the names, insignia and ribbon design (aside from the motto as we will see) for both the SMV and MMV had by then been fixed as they would finally be approved.

The pressure to finalize the designs alongside the Regulations for the proposed MVDs increased exponentially when the offensive part of the Gulf War began. Designer Bruce Beatty was quoted in *MacLean’s* that ‘It became top priority as soon as the shooting started’.62

Of course, the plan for the top level award was changed drastically after the public outcry and the replacement of the proposed Canada Cross (this designation had replaced that of Cross of Canada from March 1991) by the Victoria Cross in November 1992. Initially, the Canadian VC, like the Australian one, was to be identical in design to the original, including its motto FOR VALOUR. However, an officer within the Directorate of Ceremonial quickly raised the argument that if we are to make the VC Canadian, then it could not have a unilingual motto and suggested the Latin word VALOR be substituted, matching the inscription on the SMV and MMV.63 The CDS agreed with the suggestion but before the draft Regulations pending Government approval were amended to reflect the change, Rideau Hall consulted Buckingham Palace to determine if Her Majesty would be agreeable to a different motto on the Canadian VC. The Palace quickly replied that ‘the Queen would have no objection’.64 Further research conducted by the Chancellery of Honours, in consultation with two Latin experts, replaced the proposed VALOR for the more linguistically accurate PRO VALORE in an eleventh hour amendment to the Regulations before the Prime Minister sent his recommendation to Her Majesty.65 This was used not only on the VC but also on the reverse of the SMV and MMV.

The adoption of the VC as the top level of the family also drove the change in the hue of the proposed ribbons for the other two levels from sanguine to crimson to match the ribbon of the VC.
The VC is a bronze straight armed cross pattée, 38 mm across with double raised edges. It displays in the centre a crowned lion guardant standing upon the Royal Crown (the Royal Crest) with a semi-circular scroll below the Crown bearing the motto. Aside from the raised edges, the reverse is plain. The cross is suspended from its crimson ribbon from a straight suspension bar ornamented with laurel leaves. The suspension bar has a ‘V’ lug at the bottom through which passes the link from which the cross itself is hung. The second award bar design is identical to the suspension bar but without the ‘V’ lug.

The VC design painted by Beatty in 1992 for The Queen’s approval is almost identical to the original VC created in 1856. While it has not been possible to ascertain who designed the original VC, it appears that Henry Armstead of the London jewelers firm of Hancocks & Co, the sole manufacturer of the British VC, may be behind the concept. It is also known that both Queen Victoria and Prince Albert took a personal interest in the design and manufacture of the VC. The only difference between the original decoration and the Canadian 1992 design is the change of the motto from the English FOR VALOUR to the language-neutral Latin PRO VALORE.

When time came to manufacture the VC in 2007, more detailed technical drawings were made in order to make the tooling and the occasion was taken to make one small additional change. Cathy Bursey-Sabourin,
Fraser Herald at the Canadian Heraldic Authority, produced those technical drawings and the floral emblems represented at the ends of the scroll bearing the motto were augmented by the addition of the fleur-de-lis of Royal France to the pre-existing rose, thistle and shamrock representing England, Scotland and Ireland respectively, thereby linking the floral emblems on the Canadian VC to those displayed in the Royal Arms in right of Canada. Inasmuch as these details are not described in the Regulations, no amendment was necessary to make the slight addition to the design.

The design for the Star of Military Valour and Medal of Military Valour are essentially those of the Star of Courage and Medal of Bravery, rendered in gold instead of silver.
The SMV is a star of four points, 44 mm from point to point, with maple leaves in the angles. On the obverse, there is a gold maple leaf on a sanguine field in the centre surrounded by a silver wreath of laurel. On the upper part of the reverse appear the Royal Cypher and Crown as well as the motto. Essentially, the Star is the same shape as the SC but in the reverse combination of metals used for the SC. The SMV also has the distinction of having deep red enamel (described as sanguine) over a sunburst pattern behind the central gold maple leaf where the same area is simply a silver sunburst pattern without any enamel on the SC. The reverse also bears the words PRO VALORE instead of the word COURAGE on the SC.

The design for the MMV is even more similar to the MB in that only the metal is changed from silver to gold and the inscription on the reverse is PRO VALORE in place of the words BRAVERY – BRAVOURE separated by laurels leaves tied into a bow. The MMV is a circular gold medal, 36 mm in diameter, bearing on the obverse a large maple leaf surrounded by a wreath of laurel. The reverse bears the Royal Cypher and Crown as well as the motto.
The laurel, which appears on all three MVDs, the three Canadian Bravery Decorations and countless other honours, is a traditional symbol of victory and honour. In ancient Greece and Rome, wreaths of laurel leaves and other types of leaves were awarded to victors, both in athletic competition and military combat.

Like all modern Canadian decorations, the insignia bears the details of the recipient. The VC, following tradition, would have the service number, rank, initials and name of the recipient as well as their unit engraved on two lines on the reverse of the suspension bar while the date of the act of gallantry would be engraved on three lines in the centre of the reverse of the cross itself. The rank, initials and name of the recipient are engraved on the reverse of the SMV or on the edge of the MMV.

The VC ribbon remains the same solid crimson as the British VC while the SMV and MMV use the same colour with the addition of two and three white stripes respectively. The VC was originally presented with the crimson ribbon to Army recipients while a blue ribbon was used for Navy recipients.

The creation of the Royal Air Force on 1 April 1918 led to the abolition of the distinction with all VCs henceforth having the same crimson ribbon, a change officially made by The King on 22 May 1920. The VC ribbon already being in existence, only the ribbons for the SMV and MMV had to be manufactured for the first time. Ribbon weaver Toye, Kenning and Spencer of the United Kingdom was asked to make those ribbons on 15 March 1993. They sent samples on 27 April 1993, which were approved by the Chancellery of Honours and then manufacture could proceed.66

Similarly, as with the original, the VC undress ribbon bears a small device in the form of the VC. Usually, a device worn on a ribbon denotes an additional award of the decoration. This practice was introduced in 1916 for British decorations and the device is usually in the form of a silver heraldic rose for decorations other than the VC.67 This same practice, but using a miniature VC device, was also introduced to denote an additional award of the original VC from 1916 as a result of the first such award of a second VC to the same recipient which had occurred in 1914.68
In 1917, this was changed to authorize the wear of the device by all Army recipients (with the crimson ribbon), and this applied to all recipients the following year when the crimson ribbon became the unified ribbon for the VC.\(^6^9\) The changes to the ribbon and the wear of devices on the VC undress ribbon were made official by the Royal Warrant of 1920.\(^7^0\) It appears the device may have been added to the VC undress ribbon (and later to both the George Cross and Canadian Cross of Valour to emulate the VC practice), even for single awards, because the VC ribbon, when worn alone, could easily be mistaken for the ribbon of other subordinate honours. Indeed, several orders, decorations and medals shared the solid crimson ribbon or a shade that could be mistaken for it. For example, the Order of British India, established in 1837 used a crimson ribbon since 1838 (it was originally sky blue) and the Army Long Service and Good Conduct Medal also used a similar ribbon from its creation in 1830 until white edges were added to the ribbon in 1915.\(^7^1\) The addition of the VC device on the undress ribbon avoided any confusion with other honours. Additional awards are simply denoted by the addition of further devices to the undress ribbon; two devices for a second award, etc. Only three recipients have ever earned the VC twice, none of them Canadian.

A second award of any of the MVDs would be denoted by the wear of a bar on the ribbon of the original decoration itself. As described above, the bar for the VC is similar to the original, in bronze decorated with laurel leaves tied into a bow at the
centre. The bar for the SMV and MMV is the standard second award bar for modern Canadian decorations, plain with a raised central field with a modern maple leaf in the centre, but the whole in gold instead of the usual silver. As noted above, a bar to the VC would be denoted by the wear of a second VC device on the undress ribbon while each bar to either the SM or MM would be denoted by a gold maple leaf on the undress ribbon.

Emulating the other Canadian decorations, lapel badges were created for the MVDs. The lapel badge for the VC, unlike all other Canadian decorations which are in the form of a reduced version of the obverse of the decoration, is much simpler than the VC design. It was designed by the Canadian Heraldic Authority and manufactured by the Royal Canadian Mint at the same time as the VC was manufactured in 2007. It consists of a bronze cross pattée bearing the Royal Crown on a disk in the centre. The lapel badges for the SM and MM are small representations of the obverse of each decoration and were procured from Joe Drouin Enterprises Ltd. in Gatineau in 2007 (initially 5 SMV and 30 MMV badges) with a second order being placed in 2008 (for a further 48 SMV and 100 MMV badges).72

**Manufacture**

After they were created in 1993, the SMV and MMV were manufactured in small quantity by Rideau Ltée of Ville-Saint-Laurent, Quebec, who received an order from Government House for eight insignia of each decoration as well as eight second award bars in March 1994.73 Rideau Ltée provided lead impressions of the newly made dies for the decorations on 5 April 1994 and these were approved immediately. The first samples for both decoration were then provided on 27 May and then Governor General Raymond Hnatyshyn saw and approved them on 30 May 1994.74 Specimens of both decorations were sent to The Queen for the Royal Collection on 20 December 1994.75 Most of those first insignia were intended for display purposes and therefore, after the Afghanistan campaign started and it seemed probable the MVDs would be used, a small stock of both decorations (10 SMVs and 20 MMVs) was procured from the same company in 2002.76
The decorations made by Rideau Ltée bore the Canadian National Mark (a maple leaf within a squared C), the Rideau Ltée snowflake hallmark and the mark ‘STER’ or ‘S/S’ on the reverse of the lower point of the SMV and on the right side of the reverse of the suspender of the MMV. As the Afghanistan campaign progressed and the demand for the decorations increased, additional stock was manufactured by Carat-Médailles Inc. of Châteauguay, Quebec. An order for 25 SMVs, 100 MMVs, 25 second award bars and 125 mounting pins in gold was made in May 2007 and delivered in November that same year. Their mark ‘CARAT STER’ appears on the reverse of the lower point of the SMV and on the right side of the reverse of the suspender of the MMV. There currently remains a stock of 18 SMVs (1 by Rideau and 17 by Carat) and 22 MMVs (5 by Rideau and 17 by Carat) for future awards. Given the subsequent Memorandum of Understanding between Government House and the Royal Canadian Mint, any future stock of these decorations would be manufactured by the Crown Corporation.
Table 10: Summary of the manufacture of the SMV and MMV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Manufacturer</th>
<th>SMVs</th>
<th>MMVs</th>
<th>Bars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Rideau Ltée</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Rideau Ltée</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Carat-Médailles Inc</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>43</strong></td>
<td><strong>128</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usage</th>
<th>SMVs</th>
<th>MMVs</th>
<th>Bars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Displays, awards and engraving errors</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In stock</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As of 1 January 2018</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the two junior decorations in the family of MVDs were struck and stored in the vault of the Chancellery of Honours awaiting their first recipients, the same was not true of the VC. Initial steps regarding manufacture were taken shortly after the creation of the decorations. At this point, the intent was to use the same metal as the original VC and have the insignia made by the same company, using new dies reflecting the different motto on the Canadian design. However, the new Liberal government of the Right Honourable Jean Chrétien, elected in the fall of 1993, intended to restore balanced budgets and the new Finance Minister, the Honourable Paul Martin, imposed significant financial constraints to all departments. The Office of the Secretary to the Governor General was not spared and cost-saving measures had to be found. As there was no immediate need for the decoration in 1993; the Gulf War was over and Canada was back to its traditional peacekeeping role, its production was delayed in light of the fund limitations then in place. The VC, although in legal existence from 1 January 1993, would remain only a paper reality for 14 years. In addition to the lack of funds and of operational demand for the insignia, the manufacture of the VC, given the precedents set by the original, was a matter of particular symbolism that would be scrutinized not only in Canada, where many had strong opinions on the matter as was seen in Chapter Two, but also by the other Commonwealth countries using the VC. Australia and New Zealand also adopted their own version of the VC, approved by The Queen on 15 January 1991 and 20 September 1999 respectively. However, in both cases, they simply retained the original physical decoration under their own national regulations. This means the insignia is identical in design and metallic content as the original and is still manufactured by the same firm that has made the original VC since its inception.
The matter of the manufacture of the VC lingered as other priorities took over but the beginning of the Afghanistan campaign, especially with the move of the Canadian Battle Group to Kandahar Province in the summer of 2005, where Canadian troops found themselves in active combat against a determined enemy, brought up the distinct possibility that the MVDs might be awarded and therefore increased the pressure to ensure all the related insignia, including that of the VC, should all be ready to be presented to any deserving recipient.

Initial discussions started in 2002 and 2003 among staff and in existing committees, such as the Canadian Forces Honours Committee, on the various matters that needed to be addressed. In early 2003, the Chancellery of Honours officially approached National Defence and Veterans Affairs to launch formal discussions which would lead to formal recommendations regarding the main questions related to the manufacture of the Canadian VC.81

The design having been approved by The Queen in 1993, there still needed to be considered three main issues; what would the decoration be made from, how it would be manufactured and where and by whom would it be made.

Further to decisions reached by Armed Forces Council on 15 June 2004, the Department of National Defence submitted its initial recommendations regarding the manufacture of the VC on 29 June 2004.82 In order to consider these important questions, the Victoria Cross Production Planning Group was established in 2005 further to a decision of HPC at its meeting of 25 February 2005. The Group was created under the authority of HPC with representatives of the Office of Secretary to the Governor General, the Department of National Defence, the Department of Canadian Heritage and Veterans Affairs Canada. Representatives of the Royal Canadian Mint and Natural Resources Canada later joined them. This Group initially chaired by Mary de Bellefeuille Percy of the Chancellery of Honours and later by André M. Levesque of National Defence, met for the first time on 31 May 2005 and again on 16 June 2005 to discuss the major issues, several of the representatives having conducted consultations with their own stakeholders beforehand. Their recommendations were communicated to the Government Honours Policy Sub-Committee on 21 June 2005 and were eventually approved by HPC on 15 February 2006.83

The Group then supervised the manufacturing process in accordance with the agreed plan. Given the historical importance and mystique of this, the highest Canadian honour, much thought and research went into the concept finally agreed upon and the agreement came after much deliberations and vigorous discussions about the various options. The agreed concept maintains a tangible link with history, the original VC and its Canadian recipients; it creates a link with the birth of the nation and bridges this history with the present and future.
Metal Content

While the SMV and the MMV are struck in 24K gold-plated Sterling Silver (92.5% silver and 7.5% copper), the metal to be used in the making of Canada’s Victoria Cross was a matter which generated substantial discussion given the importance accorded to the metal used to make the original VC.

Some of the mystique of the original Victoria Cross is linked to the metal used in its fabrication. The British Victoria Cross is reputed to have been manufactured using bronze from Russian cannons captured at Sevastopol (formerly known as Sebastopol) during the Crimean War of 1854–1856. While there is no solid proof of the origin of the metal used at the outset, the story is taken to be true. What is certain, however, is that this original supply was exhausted by the end of 1914, and since then, the majority of Crosses have been made from the cascabels (the bulbous shaped metal protuberance at the breech end of a cannon which is used to secure the recoil cables) of a pair of Chinese muzzle-loading cannon, the origins of which remain uncertain. There was also another source of metal used briefly during the Second World War when the precious metal temporarily went missing as a result of a transfer of storage location due to enemy action. The only remaining cascabel is held by 15 Regiment The Royal Logistics Corps at Donnington, Telford (U.K.) and must be under armed guard, in the presence of an officer, when it is taken out of its vault. The barrels of the Chinese cannon (with their cascabels missing) are located at the Officers’ Mess at the Royal Artillery Barracks at Woolwich (U.K.).

While some initially suggested the Canadian VC be made of purely Canadian metal, in order to preserve the important historical link between the original VC (and its Canadian recipients) and the new Canadian decoration, it was deemed imperative
that the metal used in the manufacture of the original VC be included, but at the same time, there was a strong desire to make this a distinctly Canadian decoration. It was therefore decided to mix metals to achieve a balanced representation between the past, the present and the future.

Several options were considered for what should be included. Early in the process, someone suggested, inspired by the original use of gunmetal, that a gun used during the Battle of Vimy Ridge in 1917 might provide the source of metal. Research indicated however that only one such piece of artillery remained in existence in Canada and cutting parts of it, even for such a high purpose, was not a palatable option. More importantly perhaps, the guns used in the Great War were no longer made of bronze but rather of steel, which is unsuited to strike or cast medals. The same issue arose with the suggestion that a piece of the original rail which made up the transcontinental railway across Canada, completed in 1885, be used for the purpose. Besides the practical unsuitability of the metal, the fact that most of these rails had been manufactured by the German firm of Krupp, which produced armament for the opposing side during the two World Wars in which most Canadians earned the VC, made this proposal entirely unacceptable. While the bronze remnants from a statue of Queen Victoria held by a museum might prove an interesting connection with the founder and namesake of the original decoration, the fact that the statue had been destroyed with explosives by terrorists of the *Front de libération du Québec* on 13 July 1963 in Quebec City ruled out this option. Yet another possibility was using a small portion of the bell of the original clock tower, called the Victoria Tower, of the Centre Block of the Parliament Buildings, which was destroyed by fire on 3 February 1916.
The bell had famously tolled the 12 strikes of midnight before crashing to the ground in the ruins of the tower. Since 2000, the damaged Victoria Tower Bell has been on display behind the reconstructed Centre Block. After much discussion and consideration, it was decided in February 2006 that the three components in the Canadian VC alloy would be as follows:
• Original gunmetal used in the manufacture of the British Victoria Cross. With the approval of Her Majesty The Queen, a slice of the remaining cascabel was kindly provided to Canada by the British Ministry of Defence.\textsuperscript{88} The piece was cut during a private ceremony attended by Ministry of Defence and Canadian Defence Liaison Staff (London) officials and was then hand carried on an Air Canada flight by Captain Claire Bramma on 14 September 2006, who was met at the Ottawa airport by Government House officials who secured the precious cargo;\textsuperscript{89}

• The Confederation Medal is a large commemorative medallion, which was commissioned by the Government of the new Dominion in 1867 to commemorate the creation of modern Canada through Confederation. The medal, which is 76 mm in diameter, was designed by Joseph Shepherd Wyon and struck by his firm, Wyon & Co, in London (U.K.). The medal bears on the obverse the effigy of Queen Victoria (who created the VC in 1856 and made Canada a Dominion in 1867) and an allegorical representation of Confederation on the reverse in the form of four young female figures representing the four new provinces grouped around the mother-like figure of Britannia with the British lion at her feet. One was struck in solid (22K) gold and presented to Queen Victoria; 50 were struck in Sterling Silver and presented to high dignitaries of the Canadian State such as the Governor General, Ministers of the Crown and Lieutenant-Governors, and 500 were struck

The Confederation Medal
Photo: DHR
in bronze (actually copper with a bronze finish) and presented to other officials such as the Fathers of Confederations, Senators and Members of Parliament at the time of Confederation and some institutions. The particular medal in question here was never awarded and had been found a few years previously in a vault of the Department of Canadian Heritage. That department later transferred it to the Chancellery of Honours to be included in the manufacture of the VC. This element represents the birth of Canada as a nation; and

- Metal found naturally or mined in all parts of Canada, including copper, zinc, lead, etc., to bridge the history of the other two components with the Canada of today and tomorrow.

Once the decision was made concerning the make-up of the medal, the expert metallurgists of Natural Resources Canada worked on the formula to be attained following extensive research including testing the Victoria Crosses held by the Canadian War Museum. Once all the required elements were gathered, they were melted together in an induction furnace to create the unique alloy of which the new Canadian Victoria Cross would be made. This was dubbed the Rideau alloy. This operation took place at the Materials Technology Laboratories of Natural Resources Canada, on Booth Street in Ottawa, on 7 December 2006, in the presence of most members of the Planning Group and resulted in seven large ingots of Canadian VC alloy.

The exact metallic content or proportions of the various component parts were not revealed to prevent forgeries.
Manufacturer

The private firm Hancocks & Co Jewelers of London, U.K., has always manufactured the British Victoria Cross and later those for Australia and New Zealand, and it was therefore an option to have the Canadian version made by this firm with its substantial experience and reputation. This option was strongly recommended by the British Ministry of Defence and supported by the Canadian Department of National Defence. The official of the Chancellery of Honours were in agreement and in 1993, shortly after the creation of the VC, Lieutenant-General James C. Gervais of the Chancellery travelled to London, met the experts at Hancocks and an informal agreement was reached. The intent was to produce a small number of insignia, mostly to be used for display purposes, using the traditional VC metal. As we have seen however, the manufacture did not proceed at that time, mostly as a result of lack of funds. The Hancocks option was again at the forefront when the production project was initiated in 2002-2003. However, there was a strong desire on the part of some that the Canadian VC be manufactured in Canada. Other Canadian insignia have been manufactured in the United Kingdom before. From their creation, the insignia related to the Order of Canada, the Order of Military Merit as well as the three Canadian Bravery Decorations were manufactured in the U.K. by firms with considerable experience in the field. The Crown Jewelers, Garrard & Co. made the insignia for the Order of Canada as well as the Cross of Valour while the firm of Spink & Son made the insignia for the Order of Military Merit, the Star of Courage and the Medal of Bravery. In the early 1980s however, as a matter of national pride, then Prime Minister Trudeau requested that the manufacture of all Canadian honours insignia be transferred to Canada. In light of this, it followed that Canada’s highest honour should also be made at home.
One of the reasons why British firms had been used until the 1980s was that there were few if any firms in Canada which had the detailed knowledge, expertise and experience required to undertake the creation of such insignia, especially where it involved vitreous enamel. The experience acquired since the 1980s had provided evidence that there is now a capacity for such manufacture in Canadian industry but still, there was a reluctance to have the nation’s highest honour made by a private firm given the security implications and the resulting publicity. Moreover, the idea of going through a public tender process and selecting the lowest bidder to make Canada’s highest honour was not an enchanting prospect. After much research, consultation and deliberation, it was decided that the Canadian VC would be manufactured by the Government of Canada, mainly as a team effort between the specialists of the Royal Canadian Mint and Natural Resources Canada.

**Production Method**

In 1856, an attempt was made to strike the VC using the method normally utilized to produce medals, decorations as well as coinage. Unfortunately, the hardness and inconsistency of the gun metal used to make the VC did no produce the desired results and it was decided that the only suitable production method for manufacture using this metal was sand-casting, a fairly complex and labour-intensive process. All VCs have since been cast and once again, in order to preserve the heritage of the original VC in the new Canadian decoration, it was decided to use casting, although ceramic moulds would be used instead of the traditional sand ones.

The Engraving Department of the Royal Canadian Mint, under the guidance of Master Engraver Cosme Saffioti, using the detailed technical drawing produced by the Canadian Heraldic Authority, created the pattern which would be used to create the moulds for the casting process. The final patterns created by the Mint were inspected and approved by the VC Production Planning Group on 9 November 2006.
A team from Natural Resources Canada, Ottawa, under the leadership of Dr. John E. Udd and Dr. John E. Dutrizac, both of the Mining and Minerals Sciences Laboratories-CANMET, and Peter Newcombe of the Materials Technology Laboratory-CANMET, cast the rough insignia parts which were then returned to the Mint for hand finishing and assembly. The first casting of VC pieces using the special Canadian VC alloy took place on 26 January 2007. The more detailed manufacturing steps are as follows:

- technical drawings are prepared by the Canadian Heraldic Authority;
- using the technical drawings, the engraving department of the Royal Canadian Mint sculpts the main elements of the design (Crown and lion) in plaster;
- the plasters are then scanned in order to convert the relief images into electronic data;
- using these main elements the engravers complete the sculpting on computers using state of the art sculpting software;
- once sculpting is complete, the data are sent to a computer-controlled engraving machine for production of the steel dies;
- dies, which are negative images, are cut for the obverse and reverse of the Cross as well as for the suspension bar;
- the dies are further hand enhanced, polished, and prepared by the engraver for striking;
- the dies are used to strike a pewter pattern of the insignia (positive image);
- using the pewter pattern, the Materials Technology Laboratories of Natural Resources Canada make rubber molds of the component parts (negative image);
- the rubber molds are used to produce wax patterns which are positive representations of the VC component parts;
- the wax pieces are attached to a wax trunk creating a wax tree;
- the wax tree is immersed in liquid ceramic which is then left to dry;
- the dried ceramic block with its embedded wax tree is heated in a kiln, hardening the ceramic and melting the wax which escapes through the bottom of the ceramic mold thereby creating a void (negative image) in the ceramic in the shape of the VC parts (this is called the lost wax process);
- the molten VC alloy is then poured into the ceramic mold through the trunk of the tree filling the VC shaped cavities;
• after a cooling period, the ceramic mold is broken away, revealing the bronze tree of VC parts (the entire casting process is repeated until a sufficient quantity of good quality pieces are produced);
• the parts are detached from the tree, cut and returned to the Mint to be finely hand worked and chased to highlight the details and correct any minor imperfections;
• holes are pierced at the top of the cross and in the suspension bar;
• the Cross and bar are assembled with a ring fashioned from wire made of the same material as the Cross;
• the assembled Cross is patinated in a traditional dark brown finish and then slightly polished to relieve the patina on the raised parts, highlighting the details;
• a protective coating is then applied to the finished Cross;
• the Cross is then engraved where appropriate (as for the specimens);
• the finished VC is mounted with its distinctive crimson ribbon using a bronze suspension pin; and
• the finished product is placed in the special leather-covered wooden presentation case bearing the inscription ‘V.C.’ and ‘CANADA’ impressed in gold block letters on the lid. Besides the name of the country, these cases are the same as used for the original, Australian and New Zealand VCs and were procured through Hancocks in London.

At the end of the production cycle, 20 genuine crosses as well as six second award bars had been produced and deposited at the Chancellery of Honours, Government House, for safekeeping. The remaining genuine alloy produced according to the original formula is also kept by the Chancellery of Honours in the shape of marked ingots in case future generations need to cast more VCs.

As mentioned earlier, in an effort to prevent any forgeries in the future, the exact metallic content of the Rideau alloy has not been revealed. Moreover, a special metallic tracer has been included in the alloy, which, when tested, would confirm the authenticity of the insignia. In addition to this, small secret markings have been applied to all genuine and specimen insignia and are only known to the Royal Canadian Mint where they were applied, National Defence and Rideau Hall. Only two people know the actual markings and they are recorded in sealed envelopes in secret files held by all three institutions should they be needed to authenticate a VC in the future.
The Military Valour Decorations
The manufacture of the Victoria Cross:

1–4  Technical drawings
5     Die and wax pattern
6     Rubber molds and wax patterns
7     Inspection of wax pattern
8     Wax tree of VC component parts
9     Ceramic blocks in kiln
10, 11 Molten VC alloy being poured into ceramic mold
12    Ceramic mold is broken away
13    Bronze tree of VC component parts
14    Component parts are detached from bronze tree
15    VC component parts before cutting, assembly and finishing
16    Cross and suspension bar are assembled with a ring
17, 18 Finished VC mounted with its ribbon
19    Mounted VC in its presentation case
20    Lid of the VC presentation case
In addition to the genuine VCs, eight specimen VCs have been manufactured using the same tooling and method but made of plain brass finished in the same manner as the genuine VCs. These specimens are clearly marked (the reverse of the suspension is engraved SPECIMEN and the reverse of the cross bears the numbers S-1 to S-8 and the year of manufacture) and are intended for display and historical purposes by specific institutions. They are:

- S-1 and S-2: Royal Collection. These first two specimens were forwarded to Buckingham Palace and presented to Her Majesty on Accession Day 2007, the 55th anniversary of Her Majesty’s Accession to the Throne. The Queen directed that one of the specimens be put on display at Windsor Castle.
- S-3: Rideau Hall
- S-4: National Defence
- S-5: Library and Archives Canada for the National Numismatics Collection
- S-6: Canadian War Museum
- S-7: Royal Canadian Mint
- S-8: Natural Resources Canada

**Announcement of the Manufacture**

On the occasion of the Victoria Day weekend in 2008, it was officially announced that the Canadian version of the Victoria Cross had been manufactured. Her Excellency the Right Honourable MichÈlÈe Jean, Governor General and Commander-in-Chief of Canada officially unveiled the Victoria Cross at Rideau Hall on 16 May 2008 in the presence of the Prime Minister, the Right Honourable Stephen Harper, numerous dignitaries, decorated veterans, current members of the CAF including several recipients of the SMV and MMV, as well as representatives of Canada’s youth.
The Governor General, the Prime Minister and the Vice Chief of the Defence Staff, later to become Chief of the Defence Staff, with several Military Valour Decorations holders on the occasion of the unveiling of the Canadian Victoria Cross, Rideau Hall, 16 May 2008

Front row from left to right: Warrant Officer Patrick Tower, SMV, CD; the Right Honourable Stephen Joseph Harper, PC, MP; Her Excellency the Right Honourable Michâelle Jean, CC, CMM, COM, CD; Lieutenant-General Walter John Natynczyk, CMM, MSC, CD, and Major David Nelson Quick, SMV, CD

Second row from left to right: Sergeant Derek John Scott Fawcett, MMV, CD; Master Corporal Collin Ryan Fitzgerald, MMV; Sergeant Michael Thomas Victor Denine, MMV, CD; Sergeant Gerald Alexander Killam, MMV, CD; Corporal Clinton John Orr, MMV; Captain Derek Prohar, MMV; Master Corporal Sean Hubert Neifer, MMV; and Private Shane Aaron Bradley Dolmovic, MMV

Third row from left to right: Major Michael Charles Wright, MMV, MSM, CD; Captain Michael John Reekie, MMV; Corporal John David Makela, MMV; Corporal Joseph Jason Lee Ruffolo, MMV; Corporal Michael Patrick O Rourke, MMV; and Private Jay James Renaud, MMV
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Certificate

The certificate accompanying the award of the MVDs is similar to those awarded for the other modern Canadian decorations. They are of white card stock, 14 inches wide and 17 inches high depicting the crest of Canada in gold as well as the inscription ‘BE IT KNOWN that, on behalf of Her Majesty The Queen of Canada, the Governor General has awarded THE STAR OF MILITARY VALOUR to’, which is followed by the name of the recipient and the citation. The certificate is signed by the Secretary to the Governor General at the bottom and the Governor General in the top right corner.

Representations and Commemoration

In order to commemorate the manufacture of the Canadian VC, a special medallion was manufactured. Like the VC itself, the tooling was made by the Royal Canadian Mint, the casting was done by Natural Resources Canada using the same technique as for the VC, and the finishing touches and engraving were done at the Mint. The medallion is made of brass, the same material used to make the specimen VCs, and has the same bronze finish as the VC. It is 83 mm in diameter and 14 mm thick. It bears on the obverse a representation of the Canadian VC, without its suspension. The reverse bears the central element of the VC design, the Royal Crest, on either side of which appear
natural maples leaves and the Roman dates MMV and MMVIII reflecting the span of the project from 2005 to 2008, all above a raised space bearing the recipient’s engraved details, the whole surrounded by the inscription THE VICTORIA CROSS – CANADA – LA CROIX DE VICTORIA. The medallion is housed in a burgundy box bearing the Royal Arms of Canada stamped in gold on the lid, with a cream-coloured insert holding the medallion which may be pulled out by a length of miniature VC ribbon. That case was itself in a white cardboard protective box, the lid of which bore a label with the name of the recipient. The medallion was accompanied by a certificate signed by the Governor General. The certificate is printed on cream-coloured card stock and bears the Royal Arms of Canada embossed in gold along with the inscription ‘This certificate of appreciation acknowledges the significant contribution of (name of the recipient) to the historic production of Canada’s highest honour, the Victoria Cross’. The certificate is housed in a burgundy folder with the Royal Arms of Canada stamped in gold on the cover. This is the same certificate stock and folder used for the Mention in Dispatches. Forty-seven medallions were presented to those institutions and individuals involved with the project as well as others for protocol and historical preservation purposes. Many of the medallions were presented by the CDS, then General Walt Natynczyk, at the Army Officers’ Mess in Ottawa on 15 December 2008.

Example of the Victoria Cross Medallion certificate
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Certificate folder
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General Walter John Natynczyk, then Chief of the Defence Staff, presents the Victoria Cross Medallion to Mrs. Juliane Martin for her contribution in the creation of the Canadian Victoria Cross, Army Officers’ Mess, Ottawa, 15 December 2008
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The recipients were as follows, as engraved on the medallion:

**INSTITUTIONS (11)**

RIDEAU HALL
THE ROYAL CANADIAN MINT – LA MONNAIE ROYALE CANADIENNE
MINING AND MINERAL SCIENCES LABORATORIES - CANMET, NATURAL RESOURCES CANADA – LABORATOIRES DES MINES ET DES SCIENCES MINERALES DE CANMET, RESSOURCES NATURELLES CANADA
MATERIALS TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - CANMET, NATURAL RESOURCES CANADA – LABORATOIRE DE LA TECHNOLOGIE DES MATERIAUX DE CANMET, RESSOURCES NATURELLES CANADA
THE DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE – LE MINISTÈRE DE LA DÉFENSE NATIONALE
THE DEPARTMENT OF CANADIAN HERITAGE – LE MINISTÈRE DU PATRIMOINE CANADIEN
VETERANS AFFAIRS CANADA – ANCIENS COMBATTANTS CANADA
LIBRARY AND ARCHIVES CANADA – BIBLIOTHÈQUE ET ARCHIVES CANADA
CANADIAN WAR MUSEUM – MUSÉE CANADIEN DE LA GUERRE
CANADIAN DEFENCE LIAISON STAFF (LONDON) – ÉTAT-MAJOR DE LIAISON DES FORCES CANADIENNES (LONDRES)
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

**INDIVIDUALS (36)**

**Buckingham Palace (3)**
THE QUEEN OF CANADA – LA REINE DU CANADA
THE RIGHT HONOURABLE ROBIN BERRY, BARON JANVRIN, G.C.B., G.C.V.O., Q.S.O.
THE RIGHT HONOURABLE CHRISTOPHER EDWARD WOLLASTON MACKENZIE GEIDT, C.V.O., O.B.E.

**Chancellery of Honours, Government House (11)**
EMMANUELLE SAJOUS
MARY DE BELLEFEUILLE PERCY, L.V.O.
GABRIELLE LAPPA
DANIELLE DOUGALL
DENIS POIRIER
JULIANE MARTIN
SYLVIE BARSALOU
CAPTAIN BRUCE WILBUR BEATTY, C.M., C.D.
CATHY BURSEY-SABOURIN
MARIE-PAULE THORN
CLAUDE GAGNON
In addition to the medallions above, 17 certificates of appreciation were presented to one institution (15 Regiment, The Royal Logistics Corps, Donnington, Telford, United Kingdom) and 16 individuals who had provided assistance with the project.
Many aspects of Canadian history have been depicted and commemorated in the country’s coinage and stamps and the VC is no exception. The original VC and many of its recipients have been honoured in such a way throughout the Commonwealth but the new Canadian VC has also been featured already. In 2006, to commemorate the 150th anniversary of the creation of the original VC, the Royal Canadian Mint issued special coins, in various metals and finishes, depicting the Canadian VC. Two years previously, in 2004, to mark the beginning of eligibility of the original VC (although created in 1856, the VC was made retroactive to 1854 to cover some gallant actions which had occurred earlier during the Crimean War), Canada Post issued stamps depicting both the original VC and the design for the Canadian VC, complete with The Queen’s signature.

To mark the conclusion of the Afghanistan campaign, during the National Day of Honour commemoration on 8 May 2014, the Government announced the renaming of one of its office building, La Promenade Building at 151 Sparks Street in Ottawa, to The Valour Building to honour the 20 recipients of the Star of Military Valour, the highest decoration awarded in that campaign. The plaque was unveiled on 25 May 2015 by the Honourable Jason Kenny, then Minister of National Defence and Warrant Officer Patrick Tower (Retired), the first recipient of the SMV, in the presence of the CDS, then General Tom Lawson, several other SMV recipients and family members of deceased recipients. In all 11 SMV recipients were present or represented at the event.
The Victoria Cross is the Commonwealth’s highest honour and therefore has precedence above all others. This place of pre-eminence was directed by King Edward VII in 1902. It means that the insignia, undress ribbon or miniature of the VC is worn in the most senior position in all occasions and the same applies to the use of the post-nominal letters VC.
The arms granted in 1915, as augmented in 1920, to Major-General Sir Frederick Oscar Warren Loomis, KCB, CMG, DSO, by the College of Arms in London. He commanded the Royal Highlanders of Canada and later the 3rd Canadian Division towards the end of the First World War. He earned his DSO ‘For great gallantry and brilliant leadership during the operations southeast of Amiens, 8th/9th August, 1918, and east of Arras, 2nd September, 1918. He made reconnaissances under heavy fire, personally superintending the disposition of troops, and encouraging all by his coolness and ability. The results achieved by the brigade were of an outstanding nature.’ Below the shield, which is surrounded by the motto circlet of the Most Honourable Order of the Bath, itself surrounded by branches of laurel which denote the Military Division of the Order, are suspended the insignia of the Order of the Bath in the centre (the depiction of the laurel leaves around the circlet and the omission of supporters indicate the grade of Knight Commander), the insignia of Companion of the Order of St. Michael and St. George on the left and the insignia of Companion of the Distinguished Service Order on the right.

Photo: Canadian Heraldic Authority

The arms granted in 1945 to Colonel Harry Tredennick Caldicott Cock, MC, CD, by the College of Arms in London, which include the Military Cross he was awarded in 1917 while serving with the Royal Canadian Regiment during the First World War.
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The arms granted in 2008 to Flight Lieutenant Atholl Sutherland Brown, DFC (Retired), by the Canadian Heraldic Authority, which include the Distinguished Flying Cross he earned while flying Bristol Beaufighter aircraft with 177 Squadron of the Royal Air Force in Burma during the Second World War.
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Recipients of the MVDs may use the post-nominals letters VC, SMV or MMV after their name as appropriate. As mentioned above, the post-nominal VC is the highest of all, outranking those related to appointment to all orders and even membership in The Queen’s Privy Council for Canada.

Holders of the decorations are entitled to have a representation of their insignia suspended from the shield of their personal coat of arms as duly granted by the Canadian Heraldic Authority pursuant to the Royal Prerogative. No recipient has so far petitioned the Chief Herald for a grant. However, many Canadian recipients of the British gallantry decorations used in Canada until Korea have displayed them in their grant of arms received from either the College of Arms in London, United Kingdom, or, since 1988, the Canadian Heraldic Authority.

The VC and George Cross, the two highest honours in the British honours system, are the only two honours for which a representation of the insignia may be engraved on the standard Commonwealth War Graves Commission headstone. The same rules would apply for the modern Canadian VC and the Canadian equivalent of the George Cross, the Cross of Valour, although this privilege has yet to be used.

The gravestone of Captain Gordon Muriel Flowerdew, VC, Namps-au-Val, France
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Conclusion
A quarter of a century is but the blink of an eye in the continuum of human history. Even when compared with the decorations conferred by our allies, the 25 years of the Military Valour Decorations appear a very modest milestone. What does compare with our allies’ decorations and stands out even in this short period of existence is the impressive valour of the recipients. They all faced tremendous odds and, in the face of the inevitable confusion, stress and fear brought on by combat, they proved to themselves, their peers and the world that they are indeed the bravest of the brave. In a society that sometimes has its doubts about the values and abilities of its younger generation, these individuals make it abundantly clear for all to see that the young soldiers of today are as brave, determined and tenacious as the proud veterans that came before them. Canada and its citizens can be comforted by the fact that such extraordinary men and women continue to stand ready to defend their nation, their fellow Canadians and the values their hold dear.

Pro Valore
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Letters Patent
LETTERS PATENT

Creating

Military Valour Decorations to be designated and styled as the Victoria Cross, the Star of Military Valour and the Medal of Military Valour.

DATED 31st December, 1992
RECORDED 31st December, 1992

Film 682
Document 154

D. DEMERS

DEPUTY REGISTRAR GENERAL OF CANADA
ELIZABETH THE SECOND, by the Grace of God of the United Kingdom, Canada and Her other Realms and Territories, QUEEN, Head of the Commonwealth, Defender of the Faith.

TO ALL TO WHOM these Presents shall come or whom the same may in any way concern,

GREETING:

WHEREAS it is desirable and Our Privy Council for Canada has advised that Letters Patent do issue creating in Canada Military Valour Decorations for the purpose of according recognition to members of the Canadian Forces, or members of an allied armed force serving with or in conjunction with the Canadian Forces, for deeds of military valour;

NOW KNOW YOU that We, by and with the advice of Our Privy Council for Canada, do by these Presents create Military Valour Decorations to be designated and styled as the Victoria Cross, the Star of Military Valour and the Medal of Military Valour.

AND WE DO ordain, direct and appoint that those Decorations shall be governed by the annexed Regulations governing the Military Valour Decorations, as those Regulations may from time to time be amended, revoked or revised by Letters Patent issued by Us, Our Heirs and Successors or Our Governor General of Canada on Our behalf.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF We have caused these Letters to be made Patent and We have caused Our Great Seal of Canada to be affixed to these Letters Patent, which We have signed with Our Royal Hand.

GIVEN this thirty-first day of December in the year of Our Lord one thousand nine hundred and ninety-two and in the forty-first year of Our Reign.

BY HER MAJESTY’S COMMAND

BRIAN MULRONEY

PRIME MINISTER OF CANADA
Appendix Two
Regulations Governing the
Military Valour Decorations
Regulations Governing The Military Valour Decorations

SHORT TITLE

1. These Regulations may be cited as the Military Valour Decorations Regulations.

INTERPRETATION

2. In these Regulations:
   “Advisory Committee” means the Military Valour Decorations Advisory Committee established by section 8; (comité consultatif)
   “citation” means a written document attesting a deed of military valour performed by a person referred to in section 7; (citation)
   “Cross” means the Victoria Cross awarded pursuant to subsection 4(1); (Croix)
   “enemy” means a hostile armed force, and includes armed mutineers, armed rebels, armed rioters and armed pirates, (ennemi)
   “Medal” means the Medal of Military Valour awarded pursuant to subsection 6(1); (Médaille)
   “Military Valour Decoration” means the Cross, the Star or the Medal; (décoration de la vaillance militaire)
   “Star” means the Star of Military Valour awarded pursuant to subsection 5(1). (Étoile)

APPLICATION

3. These Regulations apply in respect of the following Military Valour Decorations:
   (a) the Victoria Cross;
   (b) the Star of Military Valour; and
   (c) the Medal of Military Valour.
**VICTORIA CROSS**

4.  (1) The Victoria Cross shall be awarded for the most conspicuous bravery, a daring or pre-eminent act of valour or self-sacrifice or extreme devotion to duty, in the presence of the enemy.

(2) The Cross shall consist of a bronze straight armed cross pattée, 38 mm across with raised edges:

(a) on the obverse, a lion guardant standing upon the Royal Crown, and below the Crown, a scroll bearing the inscription “PRO VALORE”, and

(b) on the reverse, the date of the act for which the decoration is bestowed is engraved in a raised circle;

(3) The Cross is suspended by means of a plain link from a V below a straight bar ornamented with laurel leaves, on the back of which is engraved the rank, name and unit of the recipient.

(4) Each subsequent award of the Cross shall be indicated by a plain bronze bar ornamented with laurel leaves, which bar shall be attached to the centre of the ribbon from which the Cross is suspended, and where two or more bars are attached those bars shall be equally spaced on the ribbon.

**STAR OF MILITARY VALOUR**

5.  (1) The Star of Military Valour shall be awarded for distinguished and valiant service in the presence of the enemy.

(2) The Star shall consist of a gold star with four points with a maple leaf in each of the angles:

(a) on the obverse of which, superimposed in the centre, there shall be a gold maple leaf on a sanguine field surrounded by a silver wreath of laurel; and

(b) on the reverse of which the Royal Cypher and Crown and the inscription “PRO VALORE” shall appear, below which shall be engraved the rank and name of the recipient.

(3) Each subsequent award of the Star shall be indicated by a plain gold bar with a maple leaf in the centre, which bar shall be attached to the centre of the ribbon from which the Star is suspended, and where two or more bars are attached those bars shall be equally spaced on the ribbon.
MEDAL OF MILITARY VALOUR

6. (1) The Medal of Military Valour shall be awarded for an act of valour or devotion to duty in the presence of the enemy.

(2) The Medal shall consist of a circular gold medal:

(a) on the obverse of which there shall be a maple leaf surrounded by a wreath of laurel;

(b) on the reverse of which the Royal Cypher and Crown and the Inscription “PRO VALORE.” shall appear; and

(c) on the edge of which shall be engraved the rank and name of the recipient.

(3) Each subsequent award of the Medal shall be indicated by a plain gold bar with a maple leaf in the centre, which bar shall be attached to the centre of the ribbon from which the Medal is suspended, and where two or more bars are attached those bars shall be equally spaced on the ribbon.

ELIGIBILITY

7. A person is eligible to be awarded a Military Valour Decoration if that person, on or after January 1, 1993, is:

(a) a member of the Canadian Forces; or

(b) a member of an allied armed force that is serving with or in conjunction with the Canadian Forces.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

8. There is hereby established a Military Valour Decorations Advisory Committee comprising:

(a) a person appointed by the Governor General; and

(b) five members of the Canadian Forces who shall be appointed by the Chief of the Defence Staff, one of whom shall be designated by the Chief of the Defence Staff as the chairperson.
NOMINATION PROCEDURE

9. The Chief of the Defence Staff shall ensure that mechanisms are established for the submission to the Advisory Committee of nominations for the award of a Military Valour Decoration.

10. The Advisory Committee shall:
   (a) consider nominations for the award of a Military Valour Decoration;
   (b) determine whether nominees are eligible to be awarded a Military Valour Decoration;
   (c) submit to the Chief of the Defence Staff the names of eligible nominees who, in the opinion of the Advisory Committee, meet the conditions of award of a Military Valour Decoration; and
   (d) advise the Chief of the Defence Staff on such other matters concerning the award of the Military Valour Decorations as may be referred to the Advisory Committee for consideration.

11. On receipt of the names of eligible nominees submitted pursuant to paragraph 10(c), the Chief of the Defence Staff shall recommend to the Governor General the nominees who, in the opinion of the Chief of the Defence Staff, meet the conditions of award of a Military Valour Decoration.

AWARDS

12. (1) Awards of the Military Valour Decorations shall be made by instrument signed by the Governor General.

      (2) The Governor General may, under any circumstances that the Governor General considers appropriate, allocate the Military Valour Decorations to Field Commanders, but the award of any Military Valour Decoration so allocated shall be subject to ratification by the Governor General.

      (3) A Military Valour Decoration may be awarded posthumously.
PRESENTATION

13. The Military Valour Decorations shall be presented by the Governor General at a formal investiture.

14. Notwithstanding section 13, the Governor General may designate an appropriate person to present the Military Valour Decorations.

POST-NOMINAL LETTERS

15. A recipient of a Military Valour Decoration is entitled to use the following post-nominal letters on all occasions when the use of such letters is customary:
   (a) where the recipient has been awarded the Cross, the letters “V.C.”;
   (b) where the recipient has been awarded the Star, the letters “S.M.V.”; and
   (c) where the recipient has been awarded the Medal, the letters “M.M.V.”.

WEARING OF DECORATIONS

16. (1) The Cross shall be worn in the sequence prescribed in the Canadian Orders, Decorations and Medals Directive and in the following manner:
   (a) on the left breast, suspended from a crimson ribbon that is 38 mm in width; and
   (b) where the undress ribbon is worn, each award of the Cross shall be indicated by a small representation of the Cross, and where two or more such representations are worn those representations shall be equally spaced on the ribbon.

(2) The Star shall be worn in the sequence prescribed in the Canadian Orders, Decorations and Medals Directive and in the following manner:
   (a) on the left breast, suspended from a crimson ribbon that is 32 mm in width and has two vertical white stripes 4 mm in width; and
   (b) where the undress ribbon is worn, each award of the Star shall be indicated by a gold maple leaf, and where two or more maple leaves are worn those maple leaves shall be equally spaced on the ribbon.
(3) The Medal shall be worn in the sequence prescribed in the *Canadian Orders, Decorations and Medals Directive* and in the following manner:

(a) on the left breast, suspended from a crimson ribbon that is 32 mm in width and has three vertical white stripes 3 mm in width; and

(b) where the undress ribbon is worn, each award of the Medal shall be indicated by a gold maple leaf, and where two or more maple leaves are worn those maple leaves shall be equally spaced on the ribbon.

17. A person to whom a Military Valour Decoration has been awarded may wear a miniature of the Decoration, to be one-half the size of the Decoration, on all occasions when the wearing of miniature decorations is customary.

**CANCELLATION AND REINSTATEMENT**

18. (1) The Governor General may cancel or annul the award to any person of a Military Valour Decoration, and may restore any Military Valour Decoration the award of which has been so cancelled or annulled.

(2) Where the award of a Military Valour Decoration is cancelled or annulled under subsection (1), the name of the person to whom the Decoration was awarded shall be deleted from the register referred to in paragraph 19(2)(e).

**ADMINISTRATION**

19. (1) The Chief of the Defence Staff shall ensure that a citation in respect of each award of a Military Valour Decoration is provided with the recommendation.

(2) The Director, Honours, Chancellery, Office of the Secretary to the Governor General shall:

(a) prepare the citations received pursuant to subsection (1) for publication;

(b) prepare the Instruments of Award in respect of the Military Valour Decorations for signature by the Governor General;
(c) arrange for the names of the persons receiving the Military Valour Decorations, with the applicable citations, to be published in the Canada Gazette;

(d) acquire the insignia and have the names of the persons honoured engraved on them;

(e) maintain a register containing the name of each person to whom a Military Valour Decoration has been awarded and such records relating to the awards as are deemed necessary;

(f) prepare certificates of award for presentation to the persons honoured;

(g) arrange for investiture ceremonies; and

(h) perform such other functions in respect of the Military Valour Decorations as the Governor General may require.

GENERAL

20. Nothing in these Regulations limits the right of the Governor General to exercise all powers and authorities of Her Majesty in respect of the Military Valour Decorations.
Appendix Three
Administrative Guidelines
Administrative Guidelines

INTRODUCTION

1. The Military Valour Decorations (MVDs) are national honours created on 1 January 1993 to recognize acts of valour, self-sacrifice or devotion to duty in the presence of the enemy. The regulations governing the decorations are reprinted at Appendix Two.

2. MVDs include the following decorations:
   (a) Victoria Cross (VC). Awarded for the most conspicuous bravery, a daring or pre-eminent act of valour or self-sacrifice or extreme devotion to duty, in the presence of the enemy;
   (b) Star of Military Valour (SMV). Awarded for distinguished and valiant service in the presence of the enemy; and
   (c) Medal of Military Valour (MMV). Awarded for an act of valour or devotion to duty in the presence of the enemy.

3. Awards for gallantry in the presence of the enemy recognize active combat with a foe in situations such as war.

4. They can be awarded for lesser hostile situations short of war if the troops are in “combat” with an organized, armed “enemy” that is recognized as such by the people of Canada. It must be understood however that “combat” is not merely the presence of fire. Rather, the fire has to be directed at the troops, with the intent of combat being the destruction of the opposing force as a viable entity. The word “enemy” in this context means a hostile armed force, and includes armed terrorists, armed mutineers, armed rebels, armed rioters and armed pirates.

5. Canadian Bravery Decorations are used in all other circumstances.

6. It should be noted that conflicting parties in a peacekeeping context are not considered enemies and although there may be altercations with the Canadian Forces in a peacekeeping mission, the use of force by the CF will generally be limited to self-defence. This is why MVDs are not generally awarded during peacekeeping operations.
RECOMMENDATIONS

7. Recommendations are processed through the chain of command from the theatre of operations to Canadian Joint Operations Command (Comd CJOC).

8. Recommendations shall be prepared and forwarded to National Defence Headquarters (NDHQ)/Directorate of Honours and Recognition (DH&R), through the senior Canadian officer in an active theatre of operations and Comd CJOC.

9. In order to maintain the established standards and integrity of these decorations, recommendations normally shall not be submitted or accepted if they total more than one nomination for every 250 persons under command in an active theatre of operations for a six-month period. This rule ensures the respect and value of these decorations are preserved but often imposes difficult choices to the leaders; only the bravest of the brave, those who willingly and knowingly sacrifice themselves for others, or set an extreme example of devotion to duty will be recognized.

10. Recommendations shall be supported by statements gathered from a minimum of two witnesses. If practicable, sworn statements should accompany each recommendation. These statements may be sworn before any commissioned officer on full-time service. In exceptional circumstances where there are fewer than two witnesses, a statement from one person may be acceptable. It should be accompanied by an explanation of the exceptional circumstances.

11. The recommendation shall be accompanied by a supporting narrative that fully summarizes the incident. Guidelines for composing such narratives are included below.

TIME LIMITS

12. Recommendations, which must include two witness statements, shall be submitted within two years of the date of the incident.

13. Recommendations should be initiated as soon as possible after the incident, while memories are fresh and witnesses are available. Normally a recommendation, together with witnesses’ statements, must be initiated within one month of the date on which the deed or action occurred. If this time limit is exceeded, reasons for the delay must accompany the recommendation.

14. The circumstances of each case are carefully examined by CFDAC to ensure fair and equal treatment for all.
INVESTIGATIVE ASSISTANCE

15. Commanding officers should use any available investigative resources to help create a complete recommendation, e.g. military police or allied liaison officers.

GENERAL GUIDELINES

16. All who remain steady in their duty in the face of gunfire or other active combat hazards are courageous. MVDs, therefore, recognize those who are the bravest of the brave, who knowingly sacrifice themselves for others, or who set an extreme example of devotion to duty.

17. As a guide, the senior Canadian officer should recommend no more than one third of the potential number of decorations in any six-month period for immediate award. These should be exclusively for those who demonstrate extreme courage or self-sacrifice. The remaining number of potential recommendations should be held as a reserve and submitted at periodic intervals every six months beginning with the deployment of the formation to the active theatre of conflict, or to meet calls from NDHQ for periodic awards. Responses to such calls shall include statistics for total command strength over the relevant period, along with the total number of recommendations made for the same period.

18. Care should be taken to search actively for the most deserving individuals for periodic awards.

19. The commander should balance recommendations among the forces under control to reflect such factors as severity of combat and closeness of contact with the enemy. In general, units and formations that fought hardest and best should receive the preponderance of recognition. “Best” need not be related to victory or success. A well-fought action against overwhelming odds is equally deserving of recognition.

20. The test should always be to protect the prestige and integrity of the honour in the eyes of the troops.
Guidelines for Composing Supporting Narratives

1. The recommendation for Military Valour shall be accompanied by a supporting narrative which summarizes:
   (a) the location, time and date of the incident;
   (b) the relative positions and general actions of participants, vehicles, etc,
       (photographs or sketches are invaluable);
   (c) the full name and surname, rank, service number, trade and unit, of
       participants, witnesses and others involved;
   (d) separate statements from all participants and witnesses, including the
       nominee (the confidentiality must be respected – this is possible by
       requesting statements for general investigation purposes);
   (e) comments which may assist in evaluating the accuracy or credence of
       any statements, e.g. where one suspects bias or where events may be
       distorted due to passage of time; and
   (f) supplementary photographs, plan drawings, sketches, documentary
       evidence, newspaper clippings, etc.

2. Supporting narratives should include comments on the following points where applicable:
   (a) were the nominee’s actions part of the activity needed to accomplish the
       assigned aim of a military mission? If so, did the actions go above and
       beyond the normal demands of duty expected of peers in rank and trade?
   (b) what training or experience did the nominee have with the problems
       involved in the incident? Was the nominee aware of the risks involved?
       Comment on the nominee’s physical condition and any ill effects
       suffered, if applicable.
   (c) what was the nature and extent of the peril? What special problems
       were present? What equipment, if any, was used? Did others at the scene
       help? Were others present who might have helped? and
(d) when applicable, comment on or provide a diagram of the following:
distances from safety; depth of water; current, tide and ice conditions;
weather factors and temperature; fire and smoke location, type and
severity; location and condition of any victims; and means of access
and exit.

3. If more than one individual might be recognized for a single action, the
narrative must make clear the relative contribution of each. This allows
intervening officers and the Committee to judge if any potential recognition
should be granted equally, or if different awards might be justified for
different individuals.
Appendix Four
Register of Recipients

This register of the Military Valour Decorations includes all awards of the decorations between their creation, on 1 January 1993, and their 25th anniversary, on 1 January 2018. The rank, name and post-nominals displayed are those held by the person at the time of the action recognized by the award. The date indicated is the date on which the Governor General signed the Instrument approving the award and consequently the effective date of the award. For operational and personnel security reasons, the names and citations of the remaining eight classified awards are not included herein.
Recipients of the Star of Military Valour

**Corporal James BALL**

26 June 2008

Corporals Baker, Ball and Bancarz, and Captains Peel and Snyder were deployed to Afghanistan to serve as mentors to an Afghan company, when they were ambushed by Taliban insurgents on June 4, 2008. With little chance of survival, they exposed themselves to great peril and retaliated against the enemy while encouraging the Afghan soldiers to do the same. Captain Snyder seized control of the situation and ensured that the Afghan soldiers retrieved their wounded comrades. Corporal Ball led a two-man team across broken terrain to secure an extraction route that allowed for the execution of a fighting withdrawal by Captain Peel and Corporals Bancarz and Baker. Because of their dedication, leadership and valour, many Afghan and Canadian lives were saved.

**Corporal Jean-François Roger**

Donald BELZIL

23 February 2012

On 9 April 2011, upon intercepting enemy radio transmissions, 3 Platoon, A Company, awaited an attack on the security cordon established to the north of Zangabad, Afghanistan. When the first insurgent shot rang out, Corporal Belzil and Corporal Cousineau moved in that direction with their anti-tank gun, coming across a Canadian section and its Afghan counterpart pinned down under enemy fire, as well as a seriously wounded Afghan soldier lying out in the open. Thanks to Corporal Cousineau’s effective covering fire, and despite heavy enemy fire, Corporal Belzil succeeded in destroying the stronghold from which the deadly insurgent shots originated. They both then pulled the wounded soldier to cover and administered first aid. Corporal Belzil and Corporal Cousineau’s composure and disregard for personal danger helped to push back the enemy attack and save the life of an Afghan soldier.
Lieutenant Gabriel CHASSÉ-JEAN 2 February 2011

From June 8 to 29, 2009, Lieutenant Chassé-Jean demonstrated valiant service under fire while leading his platoon to defeat the enemy in Afghanistan. Over an extended period, and amidst the chaos and confusion of combat, his fearless conduct in the engagement of a determined enemy, as well as his ability to keep his soldiers composed, were critical to multiple victories in a difficult theatre of operation. Whether leading a frontal assault, controlling the situation while trapped in dangerous positions or directing supporting gunfire, he showed courage and inspirational leadership, which were key to the success of multiple engagements.

Sergeant Sebastien COURVILLE, CD 15 November 2012

On 7 and 8 May 2011, Sergeant Courville demonstrated exceptional courage and dedication while mentoring an assault element of the Provincial Response Company–Kandahar during a spectacular and prolonged attack in Kandahar City. During a particularly intense exchange of fire, Sergeant Courville pulled to safety one of his Afghan partners who had been seriously wounded. Through his actions, Sergeant Courville saved a life and lent tremendous credibility to the Afghan National Police and to the Canadian Forces.

Major William Hilton FLETCHER, CD 18 December 2006

As officer commanding C Company, Task Force Afghanistan, from January to August 2006, Major Fletcher repeatedly demonstrated extraordinary bravery by exposing himself to intense fire while leading his forces, on foot, to assault heavily defended enemy positions. On two occasions, the soldiers at his side were struck by enemy fire. He immediately rendered first aid and then continued to head the subsequent assaults. On these occasions and in ensuing combat actions, his selfless courage, tactical acumen and effective command were pivotal to the success of his company in defeating a determined opponent.
Private Jess LAROCHELLE 14 March 2007

On 14 October 2006, Private Larochelle of the 1st Royal Canadian Regiment Battle Group was manning an observation post when it was destroyed by an enemy rocket in Pashmul, Afghanistan. Although he was alone, severely injured, and under sustained enemy fire in his exposed position at the ruined observation post, he aggressively provided covering fire over the otherwise undefended flank of his company’s position. While two members of the personnel were killed and three others were wounded in the initial attack, Private Larochelle’s heroic actions permitted the remainder of the company to defend their battle positions and to successfully fend off the sustained attack of more than 20 insurgents. His valiant conduct saved the lives of many members of his company.

Sergeant William Kenneth MacDONALD, CD 4 April 2008

On 3 August 2006, amidst chaos and under sustained and intense enemy fire in Afghanistan, Sergeant MacDonald selflessly and repeatedly exposed himself to great peril in order to assist his wounded comrades. Despite the risk, he ensured that his men held on until reinforcements arrived and that the platoon’s focus remained on holding the ground that they had fought so hard to secure.

Master Corporal Jeremy PINCHIN 19 November 2009

On 16 November 2008, Master Corporal Pinchin’s small sniper detachment was on an isolated rooftop, in Zhari District, Afghanistan, protecting the southern flank of a joint Canadian-Afghan patrol. As they were advancing on an enemy position, they were attacked and outnumbered by a well-coordinated group of insurgents. When a fellow soldier sustained a life-threatening wound, Master Corporal Pinchin immediately administered first aid and shielded him, thus exposing himself to great risk. Fortunately, his protective armour bore the brunt of several enemy strikes as he aided his comrade. Master Corporal Pinchin’s selfless act of heroism saved the life of a fellow soldier.
Major David Nelson QUICK, CD            18 January 2008
Major Quick displayed exceptional courage while commanding
India Company, 2nd Battalion, The Royal Canadian Regiment
Battle Group, Joint Task Force Afghanistan, from January to
August 2007. He led his troops from the front during numerous
intense combat operations throughout the Zharey District. On
22 April 2007, despite injuries incurred by the explosion of a
bomb, Major Quick kept on going, using his tactical skills. His
prowess and selfless dedication, fundamental in defeating a
determined enemy, inspired the Battle Group to victory.

Chief Petty Officer Thomas RATZLAFF,
of the United States of America       15 November 2010
During an operation in Afghanistan on 26 November 2008,
Chief Petty Officer Ratzlaff demonstrated extraordinary
heroism while reinforcing an assault on a fortified enemy
machine gun nest. After multiple attempts to silence the
machine gun, he gained entry through a hail of enemy fire.
Without hesitation, he deliberately placed himself in harm’s
way, neutralizing the nest while facing almost point blank
fire. His heroic actions saved countless lives in the face of a
determined enemy.

Warrant Officer David George SHULTZ, CD  29 May 2009
On 6 May 2008, a Kandahar Provincial Reconstruction Team
patrol was ambushed in the Zhari district of Afghanistan. At
the first sign of contact, Warrant Officer Shultz formulated and
executed a flanking manoeuvre to neutralize the insurgent
position. After securing the area and providing a situational
report, the patrol was attacked again. Regardless of the risks,
Warrant Officer Shultz plunged into intense enemy fire to
assess the situation, direct his soldiers and engage the enemy.
He repeatedly re-entered the danger zone to extract casualties
and execute the patrol’s fighting withdrawal. His leadership and courage inspired his
soldiers and prevented further casualties.
Corporals Baker, Ball and Bancarz, and Captains Peel and Snyder were deployed to Afghanistan to serve as mentors to an Afghan company, when they were ambushed by Taliban insurgents on June 4, 2008. With little chance of survival, they exposed themselves to great peril and retaliated against the enemy while encouraging the Afghan soldiers to do the same. Captain Snyder seized control of the situation and ensured that the Afghan soldiers retrieved their wounded comrades. Corporal Ball led a two-man team across broken terrain to secure an extraction route that allowed for the execution of a fighting withdrawal by Captain Peel and Corporals Bancarz and Baker. Because of their dedication, leadership and valour, many Afghan and Canadian lives were saved.

On 4 August 2009, Master Warrant Officer Stacey’s valour in the face of the enemy enabled his multinational combat team to fight through multiple ambushes by insurgents in Afghanistan. He led the complex recovery of multiple vehicles which had been disabled by improvised explosive devices, while under enemy fire from all sides. He sorted through the chaos and issued clear direction to Canadian, American and Afghan forces. Throughout eight hours of intense combat, his gallantry, perseverance and selfless dedication to his soldiers were critical to defeating a ferocious and determined enemy.

On 19 April 2011, Private St-Hilaire demonstrated exceptional courage during a battle in Afghanistan. While engaging the enemy from his rooftop position, he noticed an Afghan father and son pinned down under enemy fire. On his own initiative, despite enemy aggression from three separate positions, he requested covering fire before going down to the exposed victims to lead them to shelter. Private St-Hilaire’s bravery and selflessness enabled him to save both lives and to quell the attack.
On 7 and 8 May 2011, Captain Suffoletta demonstrated exceptional valour while mentoring an assault element of the Provincial Response Company–Kandahar during a spectacular attack in Kandahar City. Under intense fire and at great personal risk, he led his team through a close-quarter clearance operation of a multi-storied building, valiantly coordinating multiple assaults that successfully neutralized the insurgent threat. Captain Suffoletta demonstrated distinguished leadership, courageous service and self-sacrifice in the presence of an armed enemy.

On 3 September 2006, during Operation MEDUSA, the light utility vehicle driven by Corporal Teal, a member of 7 Platoon, Charles Company, was hit and destroyed by enemy rocket-propelled grenade fire. Despite being wounded, Corporal Teal assessed the situation, and under heavy enemy fire, moved to report the situation and bring assistance. He then returned twice to the vehicle to provide treatment to his severely wounded comrades, including the platoon medic, and to evacuate all personnel injured or killed. His brave and professional actions saved lives and allowed the orderly withdrawal of his platoon under heavy fire.

Sergeant Tower is recognized for valiant actions taken on 3 August 2006, in the Pashmul region of Afghanistan. Following an enemy strike against an outlying friendly position that resulted in numerous casualties, Sergeant Tower assembled the platoon medic and a third soldier and led them across 150 metres of open terrain, under heavy enemy fire, to render assistance. On learning that the acting platoon commander had perished, Sergeant Tower assumed command and led the successful extraction of the force under continuous small arms and rocket-propelled grenade fire. Sergeant Tower’s courage and selfless devotion to duty contributed directly to the survival of the remaining platoon members.

Three members from Canadian Special Operations Forces Command were awarded the Star of Military Valour. For security and operational reasons, the names and citations of the recipients are not released.
Recipients of the Medal of Military Valour

**Major Joseph Antoine Dave ABBOUD, CD**  
4 April 2008
A selfless and devoted commander of B Company, 3rd Battalion, Royal 22e Régiment, Major Abboud led his combat team during an arduous battle in Afghanistan that lasted two days, in August 2007. His courage and leadership inspired his troops and contributed to the success of the mission.

**Corporal Richard ANDERSON**  
19 November 2009
On 31 January 2009, Corporal Anderson came under small arms fire with his joint Canadian-Afghan patrol, in Zhari District, Afghanistan. During the initial stages of the ambush, an Afghan soldier was severely wounded and lay exposed to the relentless attack. As the battle raged around him, Corporal Anderson exposed himself to enemy fire while he and the patrol medic attempted to move the soldier to safety. With no cover, he immediately began to provide first aid despite enemy rounds impacting inches from his position. Corporal Anderson’s selfless disregard for his personal safety saved the wounded soldier’s life.

**Corporal Cary BAKER**  
26 June 2008
Corporals Baker, Ball and Bancarz, and Captains Peel and Snyder were deployed to Afghanistan to serve as mentors to an Afghan company, when they were ambushed by Taliban insurgents on June 4, 2008. With little chance of survival, they exposed themselves to great peril and retaliated against the enemy while encouraging the Afghan soldiers to do the same. Captain Snyder seized control of the situation and ensured that the Afghan soldiers retrieved their wounded comrades. Corporal Ball led a two-man team across broken terrain to secure an extraction route that allowed for the execution of a fighting withdrawal by Captain Peel and Corporals Bancarz and Baker. Because of their dedication, leadership and valour, many Afghan and Canadian lives were saved.
Corporals Baker, Ball and Bancarz, and Captains Peel and Snyder were deployed to Afghanistan to serve as mentors to an Afghan company, when they were ambushed by Taliban insurgents on June 4, 2008. With little chance of survival, they exposed themselves to great peril and retaliated against the enemy while encouraging the Afghan soldiers to do the same. Captain Snyder seized control of the situation and ensured that the Afghan soldiers retrieved their wounded comrades. Corporal Ball led a two-man team across broken terrain to secure an extraction route that allowed for the execution of a fighting withdrawal by Captain Peel and Corporals Bancarz and Baker. Because of their dedication, leadership and valour, many Afghan and Canadian lives were saved.

Corporal Beaulieu was the gunner on board a light armoured vehicle when, on 5 October 2007, during a combat logistic patrol in Afghanistan, the vehicle was severely damaged by an explosive device. Although he was injured and under sustained enemy fire, Corporal Beaulieu dismounted the vehicle and manually engaged the enemy, exposing himself to great peril. His heroic actions contributed to neutralizing the insurgents and saved the lives of many members of his platoon.

On 13 April 2011, Corporal Bélanger’s joint Canadian-Afghan patrol was ambushed in the Panjwayi district, resulting in an Afghan soldier being wounded. Exposing himself to enemy fire, Corporal Bélanger, the patrol’s medical technician, resolutely made his way to the wounded soldier and dragged him to cover. As bullets continued to ricochet around them, he administered first aid. Because of his professionalism and dedication, Corporal Bélanger saved the life of a fellow soldier.
Sergeant Timothee David BÉRUBÉ  2 February 2011
From 29 May to 29 June 2009, Sergeant Bérubé repeatedly placed himself in exposed positions to coordinate fire support for his combat team during operations in Afghanistan. Often isolated and finding himself in dangerous positions, he fearlessly moved forward to gain a clear view of the battlefield and guide artillery and aviation assets onto their targets. His ability to simultaneously and accurately coordinate multiple gun batteries and attack helicopters, while under intense enemy fire, was a decisive factor in the engagements. His courage and outstanding soldiering ability were crucial to the defeat of the enemy.

Captain Joseph Maurice Jocelyn BORDELEAU, CD  4 April 2008
On 25 September 2007, while under enemy fire in Afghanistan, Captain Bordeleau expertly directed the intervention of the Quick Reaction Force while administering first aid to a critically wounded soldier. In addition to demonstrating leadership and control, Captain Bordeleau’s actions saved the life of a fellow soldier.

Master Corporal Michael Charles John BURSEY  29 May 2009
On 3 September 2008, during an insurgent ambush in the Zharey district of Afghanistan, an anti-tank round destroyed a light armoured vehicle, resulting in numerous serious casualties. While exposed to sustained enemy fire, Master Corporal Bursey repeatedly returned to the vehicle, in which ammunition was exploding in the ongoing fire, to help extract and tend to the casualties. Master Corporal Bursey’s composure and decisive actions ensured critical care for the casualties until their evacuation.
Lieutenant Frédéric Guillaume CARON, CD  
24 February 2011
As part of an Operational Mentor and Liaison Team in Afghanistan from April to October 2009, Lieutenant Caron contributed to the battle group’s operational success. While supervising an Afghan National Army company, he distinguished himself during combat operations through his courage on the battlefield, notably when he led the difficult recovery of an Afghan helicopter that had been shot down. Through his leadership, combat skills and tactical acumen, Lieutenant Caron has brought great credit to the Canadian Armed Forces.

Corporal Bradley CASEY  
26 April 2011
On 18 February 2010, Corporal Casey risked his life to provide treatment to a wounded Afghan National Army soldier. With bullets striking around him, he provided critical treatment and transported the casualty to the medical evacuation helicopter. Despite being under constant fire, Corporal Casey never wavered from his task, ensuring the provision of exceptional medical care to a fellow soldier.

Corporal Chad Gerald CHEVREFILS  
14 March 2007
On 19 August 2006, Corporal Chevrefils, a member of Alpha Company, 1st Battalion, The Royal Canadian Regiment Battle Group, was the driver of a light armoured vehicle during an engagement with numerically superior Taliban forces in Ma‘sum Ghar. During the three hour firefight, he successfully manoeuvred the vehicle through difficult terrain with consummate skill, enabling it to remain unscathed by enemy fire. He subsequently dismounted his vehicle under enemy fire to assist in the recovery of another light armoured vehicle. Corporal Chevrefils’ courageous and skillful actions helped to prevent the Taliban forces from outflanking the remainder of the company and undoubtedly saved numerous lives.
Captain Ashley COLLETTE  
30 November 2011

As a platoon commander from May to December 2010, Captain Collette demonstrated front line leadership that was critical to her soldiers’ success during intense combat in Afghanistan. Stationed in volatile Nakhonay, her platoon regularly faced the threat posed by improvised explosive devices, all while repelling numerous attacks on their base. Despite suffering casualties within the group, she kept her soldiers focused and battle-ready; her desire to succeed never wavered. Captain Collette’s fortitude under fire and performance in combat were critical to defeating the enemy and disrupting all insurgent attempts to reoccupy this key village.

Sergeant Martin Joseph Jean CÔTÉ, CD  
29 May 2009

On 2 June 2008, insurgents ambushed a joint Canadian-Afghan patrol in the Zhari district of Afghanistan. As the patrol moved to seek cover, they triggered an improvised explosive device that seriously injured four members. Shaking off the effects of a severe concussion and oblivious to the ongoing attack, Sergeant Côté triaged the casualties, passed vital information to headquarters and began life-saving treatment. With the patrol unable to effectively break contact, he continued to expose himself to intense enemy fire, to treat injuries and encourage wounded personnel during the prolonged fighting withdrawal.

Corporal Marc-André COUSINEAU  
23 February 2012

On 9 April 2011, upon intercepting enemy radio transmissions, 3 Platoon, A Company, awaited an attack on the security cordon established to the north of Zangabad, Afghanistan. When the first insurgent shot rang out, Corporal Belzil and Corporal Cousineau moved in that direction with their anti-tank gun, coming across a Canadian section and its Afghan counterpart pinned down under enemy fire, as well as a seriously wounded Afghan soldier lying out in the open. Thanks to Corporal Cousineau’s effective covering fire, and despite heavy enemy fire, Corporal Belzil succeeded in destroying the stronghold from which the deadly insurgent shots originated. They both then pulled the wounded soldier to cover and administered first aid. Corporal Belzil and Corporal Cousineau’s composure and disregard for personal danger helped to push back the enemy attack and save the life of an Afghan soldier.
Warrant Officer Robin John CRANE, CD  
29 May 2009

On 4 August 2008, insurgent forces surrounded an Afghan National Army company in a complex ambush in the Panjwayi district of Afghanistan. Warrant Officer Crane and Corporal Myroniuk selflessly remained in the danger zone to extract an Afghan casualty and support another Canadian soldier who was caught in the open. Together, they stood against over 30 insurgents using small arms fire and, when their ammunition was depleted, resorted to hand grenades to hold off the enemy. The courage of Warrant Officer Crane and Corporal Myroniuk saved Canadian and Afghan lives and prevented the company from being outflanked.

Sergeant Michael Thomas DENINE, CD  
25 October 2006

Sergeant Denine deployed with 8 Platoon, C Company, 1 PPCLI during Operation ARCHER in Afghanistan. On 17 May 2006, while sustaining concentrated rocket-propelled grenade, machine gun and small arms fire, the main cannon and the machine gun on his light armoured vehicle malfunctioned. Under intense enemy fire, he recognized the immediate need to suppress the enemy fire and exited the air sentry hatch to man the pintle-mounted machine gun. Completely exposed to enemy fire, he laid down a high volume of suppressive fire, forcing the enemy to withdraw. Sergeant Denine’s valiant action ensured mission success and likely saved the lives of his crew.

Corporal Alexandre Benjamin Jonathan DION  
26 June 2008

On 27 September 2007, in the Panjwayi district of Afghanistan, enemy forces ambushed Corporal Dion’s platoon and grievously wounded a fellow soldier. Under direct and sustained enemy fire, he carried the injured soldier over 150 meters of difficult terrain to safety. Corporal Dion’s valiant actions helped to save the life of his comrade and enabled his platoon to safely withdraw from the scene.
Corporal Yannick DODIER 4 April 2008
Corporal Dodier was deployed with B Company, 3rd Battalion, Royal 22nd Regiment, in the volatile district of Zharey, in Afghanistan. On 17 November 2007, during an ongoing combat operation, he selflessly drew enemy fire to his position, allowing the members of his platoon to suppress the enemy, which had surrounded and trapped them for several hours.

Private Shane Aaron Bradley DOLMOVIC 18 January 2008
On 11 April 2007, Private Dolmovic and Corporal Gionet saved the life of a fellow crewmember after his vehicle struck an improvised explosive device in Nalgham, Afghanistan. After freeing the trapped driver, Private Dolmovic and Corporal Gionet performed life-saving first aid, despite imminent risks of fire, explosions and enemy attack.

Master Corporal Érik Martin DUBOIS 4 April 2008
On 27 September 2007, despite being wounded during a combat operation, Master Corporal Dubois carried, on his back, a critically wounded comrade over 150 metres of difficult terrain. In addition to assisting the soldier, his actions also enabled the safe withdrawal of his platoon from an enemy kill zone in Afghanistan.

Corporal Mark Czeslaw Witold EJDRYGIEWICZ 29 May 2009
On 3 September 2008, during an insurgent ambush in the Zharey district of Afghanistan, an anti-tank round destroyed a light armoured vehicle, resulting in numerous serious casualties. While under constant fire from the enemy, Corporal Ejdrygiewicz worked to extract the injured from the vehicle, in which ammunition began exploding, while alternately providing suppressive fire against the insurgents. Corporal Ejdrygiewicz’s selfless courage under fire was pivotal to the protection and treatment of casualties.
Sergeant Derek FAWCETT, CD  
22 May 2007

On 3 September 2006, while serving with Charlie Company, 1st Battalion, The Royal Canadian Regiment Battle Group, in Afghanistan, Sergeant Fawcett demonstrated great valour during an intense firefight in which one Canadian soldier was killed and others were wounded. Continuously exposed to intense enemy fire, Sergeant Fawcett repeatedly crossed open terrain to lead the evacuation of casualties back to the designated collection point. Realizing that much of the company’s senior leaders had been wounded, he took charge of a subsequent mass casualty evacuation. His actions and professionalism in combat saved the lives of his fellow soldiers and inspired those around him.

Captain William Todd FIELDING, CD  
12 August 2011

On 5 August 2010, Captain Fielding’s Chinook helicopter was struck by enemy fire, in Panjwayi, Afghanistan, causing the fuel tank to explode and rendering the aircraft nearly inoperable. With the helicopter in flames and the cockpit rapidly filling with smoke, Captain Fielding made the time-critical decision to land in enemy territory rather than fly to a friendly landing zone. His outstanding courage and devotion to duty allowed him to execute an emergency landing and then lead the evacuation of the burning aircraft. His actions no doubt saved the lives of all crew and passengers that day.

Master Corporal Collin FITZGERALD, MMV  
25 October 2006

Master Corporal Fitzgerald deployed with 5 Platoon, B Company, 1 PPCLI Battle Group in Afghanistan. He is recognized for outstanding selfless and valiant actions carried out on 24 May 2006, during an ongoing enemy ambush involving intense, accurate enemy fire. Master Corporal Fitzgerald repeatedly exposed himself to enemy fire by entering and re-entering a burning platoon vehicle and successfully driving it off the roadway, permitting the remaining vehicles trapped in the enemy zone to break free. Master Corporal Fitzgerald’s courageous and completely selfless actions were instrumental to his platoon’s successful egress and undoubtedly contributed to saving the lives of his fellow platoon members.
Master Corporal Simon FRIGON 2 February 2011
As a section commander in Afghanistan, Master Corporal Frigon distinguished himself during two separate enemy engagements on 7 and 20 May 2009. In both instances his section was trapped and isolated during an ambush. Yet his unwavering composure and willingness to expose himself to enemy fire inspired his soldiers and instilled them with confidence. With little regard for his personal safety, he was able to precisely define the enemy location, defeat the initial attack and lead his section’s fighting withdrawal. Master Corporal Frigon’s courageous front line leadership and tactical acumen were critical to repelling the enemy without taking casualties.

Corporal Jason FUNNELL 14 March 2007
On 3 September 2006, during Operation MEDUSA in Afghanistan, Corporal Funnell of 7 Platoon, Charlie Company, braved intense enemy fire to come to the assistance of his comrades trapped in a disabled vehicle in an enemy kill zone. Ignoring his personal safety by twice crossing ground covered by effective enemy fire, Corporal Funnell successfully assisted in the treatment and evacuation of his injured and killed comrades while returning effective fire. His brave and professional actions saved lives and allowed the orderly withdrawal of his platoon under heavy fire.

Master Corporal Brent GALLANT 29 May 2009
On 2 June 2008, a Canadian soldier was wounded during an insurgent ambush in the Zharey district of Afghanistan. Surrounded on three sides, Master Corporal Gallant made his way through heavy enemy machine-gun fire to the casualty’s location and began treatment while using his body to shield the soldier from ricochets. Master Corporal Gallant’s unwavering devotion, courage and decisive actions were critical in the treatment and evacuation of the casualty, and were an inspiration to fellow soldiers of his platoon.
Corporal Dave GIONET 18 January 2008
On 11 April 2007, Private Dolmovic and Corporal Gionet saved the life of a fellow crewmember after his vehicle struck an improvised explosive device in Nalgham, Afghanistan. After freeing the trapped driver, Private Dolmovic and Corporal Gionet performed life-saving first aid, despite imminent risks of fire, explosions and enemy attack.

Sergeant Stéphane GIRARD, CD 4 April 2008
On 10 October 2007, Sergeant Girard demonstrated leadership and dedication as a mentor to the Afghan National Army. He selflessly exposed himself to enemy fire to better direct the advancing Afghan soldiers, enabling them to take control of a perilous situation and complete their assigned mission.

Warrant Officer Joseph Yves Léon GONNEVILLE, CD 4 April 2008
On 23 October 2007, during a complex combat operation in the district of Zharey, Warrant Officer Gonneville evacuated two wounded soldiers while under intense fire, and helped to successfully repel a determined enemy as a member of the Operational Mentor and Liaison team, in Afghanistan.

Specialist David Fletcher GRAVES, of the United States of America 31 October 2011
On 3 August 2010, Specialist Graves and Staff Sergeant Hever, both of the 1st Squadron, 71st Cavalry Regiment of the United States Army, and part of the Canadian-led Task Force Kandahar, were conducting a training exercise within Kandahar Airfield when insurgents tried to force their way inside the compound. Unarmed and under fire, Specialist Graves and Staff Sergeant Hever secured weapons and moved to a position of cover in order to engage the enemy. Despite intense enemy action, they maintained their position and delivered accurate return fire. Their courage, decisiveness and soldiering ability neutralized the attack and enabled friendly forces to find safety.
Master Corporal Russell GREGOIRE, CD  29 May 2009

On 14 June 2008, Master Corporal Gregoire’s section was ambushed in Zhari District, Afghanistan. What was initially considered light contact quickly became a concentrated amount of small arms and rocket-propelled grenade fire, splitting the section in two. With the lead element taking serious casualties and in danger of being overrun, Master Corporal Gregoire formulated an extraction plan. In spite of the risks, he led the remainder of the section into heavier fire to provide cover for the beleaguered soldiers’ evacuation.

Master Corporal Gregoire’s selfless devotion and courage inspired his platoon throughout the three-hour engagement.

Sergeant Joseph Jacques Stéphane GRENIER, CD  4 April 2008

Sergeant Grenier distinguished himself by his valiant conduct under intense fire, when his section was ambushed, in Afghanistan, on 27 September 2007. He selflessly exposed himself to great peril when he engaged the enemy to rescue and evacuate two wounded soldiers, all the while coordinating the tactical withdrawal of his troops. His immediate actions contributed to saving numerous lives.

Master Corporal Christopher Lorne HARDING, CD  4 April 2008

Master Corporal Harding was deployed with 6 Platoon, B Company, 2nd Battalion, Princess Patricia’s Canadian Light Infantry, in Afghanistan. When his section was attacked on 8 July 2006, he selflessly advanced across open terrain and commanded the battle, while providing first aid to a critically wounded soldier. His courageous actions under intense fire enabled his section to hold its position and to save the life of a comrade.
Private Tony Rodney Vance HARRIS  
26 April 2011

On 23 November 2009, Private Harris was at Forward Operating Base Wilson, in Afghanistan, when insurgents unleashed a mortar attack. Without regard for his own safety, he ran to the scene of the impact and provided first aid to American soldiers. Noticing another soldier trapped inside a burning sea container, Private Harris went to his aid, single-handedly pulled him to safety and rendered life-saving first-aid as rounds continued to fall. Private Harris’ courageous and decisive actions under fire that day saved several lives and brought great credit to Canada.

Staff Sergeant Adam HEVER  
of the United States of America  
31 October 2011

On 3 August 2010, Specialist Graves and Staff Sergeant Hever, both of the 1st Squadron, 71st Cavalry Regiment of the United States Army, and part of the Canadian-led Task Force Kandahar, were conducting a training exercise within Kandahar Airfield when insurgents tried to force their way inside the compound. Unarmed and under fire, Specialist Graves and Staff Sergeant Hever secured weapons and moved to a position of cover in order to engage the enemy. Despite intense enemy action, they maintained their position and delivered accurate return fire. Their courage, decisiveness and soldiering ability neutralized the attack and enabled friendly forces to find safety.

Master Corporal Adam HOLMES  
20 August 2011

From 30 July to 2 August 2010, Master Corporal Holmes displayed tremendous courage and continuous composure while coordinating exceptional fire support during a four-day combat operation. Constantly under fire, he willingly and repeatedly exposed himself to attack while identifying enemy positions and directing fire upon them. In addition, he single-handedly turned back a group of insurgents who had come within 50 metres of a friendly position. Master Corporal Holmes’ valour and determination were critical to the success of the operation.
Warrant Officer Tod Hopkin, CD

4 April 2008

On 22 and 23 August 2007, Warrant Officer Hopkin commanded the lead vehicle of a combat team through sustained enemy attacks, in Afghanistan, exposing himself to great risk in order to recapture a vital position. His composure and leadership were inspirational, and lead to the success of the mission.

Warrant Officer Joseph Mario Sylvain Isabelle, CD

4 April 2008

On 24 September 2007, during a combat operation in Afghanistan, Warrant Officer Isabelle provided life-saving first aid to seriously injured crewmates after their vehicle was destroyed by an enemy strike. Despite being seriously wounded and completely exposed to enemy fire, he led the successful evacuation of his injured platoon members while directing a counterattack against the insurgents.

Warrant Officer Michael William Jackson, CD

15 March 2010

In the midst of a three-hour battle in Afghanistan on 19 August 2006, Warrant Officer Jackson and Master Corporal Munroe’s platoon was forced to conduct a withdrawal while under enemy fire. Fully exposed to the violence of the enemy, these soldiers risked their lives to coordinate the safe movement of personnel and damaged vehicles. Their heroic actions under constant fire enabled the platoon to regroup and continue the fight, while denying the enemy an opportunity to capture and make use of stricken Canadian equipment.
Sergeant Jayson William KAPITANIUK 29 May 2009
On 14 June 2008, during a major battle group operation in the Zharey district of Afghanistan, elements of C Company were ambushed by insurgent forces. In an attempt to support a platoon that was pinned down under heavy fire, Sergeant Kapitaniuk repeatedly exposed himself to intense enemy fire to regroup his own troops and to relay counter-attack directives. His leadership, determination, and courage were vital to the effectiveness of his unit throughout the engagement and fighting withdrawal.

Corporal Bryce Jeffrey KELLER (Posthumous) 4 April 2008
On 3 August 2006, while exposed to intense enemy fire in Afghanistan, Corporal Keller demonstrated courage and leadership in order to allow his comrades to attend to a critically wounded soldier. Sadly, Corporal Keller made the ultimate sacrifice that day, but his selfless actions contributed to saving lives and enabled his platoon to hold vital terrain until reinforcements arrived.

Master Corporal Gerald Alexander KILLAM, CD 18 January 2008
On 16 May 2007, Master Corporal Killam repeatedly exposed himself to lethal enemy fire during an ambush launched by insurgents in Sangsar, Afghanistan. Although separated from his platoon, he identified enemy positions and issued clear orders that enabled his section to engage the enemy. Inspired by his leadership, Master Corporal Killam’s troops fought back a numerically superior enemy with no casualties to his section.
Private Jordan KOCHAN        29 May 2009
On 3 September 2008, during an insurgent ambush in the Zharey district of Afghanistan, an anti-tank round destroyed a light armoured vehicle, creating a deadly mass-casualty situation. Exposed to sustained enemy fire and the exploding ammunition from the burning vehicle, Private Kochan assisted and treated one of the wounded soldiers who had been ejected from the vehicle by the blast. With insurgents targeting the casualty collection points, Private Kochan’s actions were vital to the treatment and evacuation of casualties.

Private Jason Carl Allan LAMONT        25 October 2006
Private Lamont was deployed with the Health Support Services Company, 1 Princess Patricia’s Canadian Light Infantry Battle Group during Operation ARCHER. On 13 July 2006, an element of the reconnaissance platoon came under heavy enemy fire from a compound located in Helmand Province, Afghanistan, and was isolated from the rest of the platoon. During the firefight, another soldier was shot while attempting to withdraw back to the firing line and was unable to continue. Without regard for his personal safety, Private Lamont, under concentrated enemy fire and with no organized suppression by friendly forces, sprinted through open terrain to administer first aid. Private Lamont’s actions demonstrated tremendous courage, selflessness and devotion to duty.

Major Michel Louis LAPOINTE, CD        4 April 2008
On 25 September 2007, Major Lapointe demonstrated remarkable leadership and courage. He inspired his troops, as well as the members of the Afghan National Police under his command, by quickly forming an ad hoc intervention force to counter a well-coordinated ambush by insurgent forces.
**Master Corporal Jeremy LEBLANC**  
15 March 2010

On 14 October 2006, Master Corporal Leblanc’s section was occupying a position in Afghanistan when insurgents unleashed a devastating attack that resulted in several casualties, including the death of his section commander. Seamlessly assuming command, he rallied his section to return fire while personally tending to the wounded. Despite being injured himself and under constant fire, he continued to lead and inspire his section to keep fighting and hold its ground against a determined enemy. His selfless actions no doubt saved the lives of some of his fellow soldiers.

**Captain Michael MacKILLOP, CD**  
26 April 2011

As commander of a reconnaissance platoon from October 2009 to May 2010, Captain MacKillop disrupted insurgent activities in a volatile sector of Afghanistan through his courageous and relentless engagement of the enemy. Often facing fierce resistance and fire from multiple directions, he remained composed during intense battles, calmly providing direction and constantly looking to gain the advantage. Captain MacKillop’s exceptional leadership under fire and his ability to get the most from his soldiers were critical to consistently defeating insurgents in Afghanistan.

**Corporal John MAKELA**  
18 December 2006

On 16 October 2006, Corporal Makela prevented a fatal attack on his combat logistics patrol by a suicide bomber in Afghanistan. As the turret gunner providing overwatch for the convoy, he accurately identified the approaching suspicious vehicle as a suicide bomber car. Despite the likely potential of an explosion, he maintained his exposed position and applied fire, resulting in the premature detonation of the bomber car. The explosion engulfed Corporal Makela’s vehicle and seriously burned him. His valiant and courageous actions inevitably prevented the bomber from reaching his intended target and saved the lives of the other soldiers in the convoy.
Corporal Mark Robert McLaren (Deceased)  
19 November 2009
On 6 November 2008, Corporal McLaren’s joint Canadian-Afghan patrol was ambushed, in Kandahar Province, Afghanistan. The attack seriously injured his team’s Afghan interpreter, paralyzing him and leaving him exposed to further enemy fire. Heedless to the incoming fire, Corporal McLaren crawled 10 metres to his colleague’s position, extracted him to a safe location and administered first aid. Corporal McLaren’s courage and selfless devotion to his team prevented the interpreter’s immediate loss and allowed for his safe evacuation.

Sergeant Joseph Martin Stephane Mercier, CD  
2 February 2011
From 28 April to 15 August 2009, Sergeant Mercier displayed courage in the aftermath of several ambushes and improvised explosive device attacks in Afghanistan. Willing to expose himself to heavy fire, he often moved fearlessly throughout the battlefield to identify enemy locations, provide clear direction to his soldiers and position himself to effectively engage the enemy. Throughout these intense battles, his front line leadership, tactical acumen and unwavering courage inspired confidence in his soldiers, kept them safe and enabled them to repeatedly defeat a determined enemy.

Leading Seaman Pier-Vincent Michaud  
2 February 2011
On 29 May 2009, Leading Seaman Michaud was a member of a joint Canadian-Afghan patrol that was ambushed by the enemy, leaving one Afghan soldier dead and severely wounding two others. Immediately engaged in an intense, close-quarter firefight, Leading Seaman Michaud directed the Afghan soldiers to seek cover and then moved 50 metres to the casualties’ location, which provided a short 60-centimetre wall for cover. As bullets impacted all around his position, he calmly administered first aid to the casualties and personally brought them to the extraction zone, despite the unrelenting enemy attack. His courage and selfless actions undoubtedly saved the lives of the Afghan soldiers.
Master Corporal Gilles-Remi MIKKELSON  
26 April 2011

On 1 November 2009, a member of Master Corporal Mikkelson’s joint Canadian-Afghan foot patrol was severely wounded by an improvised explosive device. During the ensuing ambush, Master Corporal Mikkelson selflessly crossed through intense enemy fire to provide life-saving first aid to the critically wounded Afghan soldier. Despite the danger, his outstanding courage saved a comrade’s life and brought great credit to Canada and the Canadian Armed Forces.

Private Philip MILLAR  
12 August 2011

On 23 November 2009, Private Millar demonstrated great heroism during an insurgent attack on Forward Operating Base Wilson, in Afghanistan. With mortar bombs falling around him, he unhesitatingly ran to the impact area to provide first aid to a seriously wounded American soldier. Despite the danger, he remained with the casualty, fully exposed to the attack. Private Millar’s courageous actions under fire allowed for the best possible treatment to his comrade and brought great credit to the Canadian Armed Forces.

Master Corporal Paul Douglas MITCHELL  
12 August 2011

On 5 June and 18 July 2010, Master Corporal Mitchell’s front line devotion to duty and courageous actions under fire were instrumental in the defeat of two sustained insurgent attacks. While repeatedly exposing himself to enemy fire and fearlessly maintaining his position, he inspired other soldiers and ultimately repelled the enemy attacks. Master Corporal Mitchell’s selfless actions and disregard for his own safety undoubtedly saved the lives of his fellow soldiers.

Corporal Eric MONNIN  
30 November 2011

On 9 July 2010, two of Corporal Monnin’s fellow soldiers were wounded during a combat operation in Afghanistan. Under increasing enemy fire, he requested permission to move forward and then sprinted across the exposed terrain to reach their position. As bullets continued to fly, he rendered first aid, assisted with the wounded soldiers’ extraction, and rejoined his platoon for the remainder of the engagement. Whether rendering first aid under fire or engaging the enemy, Corporal Monnin saved the lives of his comrades through his courageous and selfless actions.
Corporal Edward Roy Gerold MORLEY 4 April 2008
On 24 September 2007, during a combat operation in Afghanistan, Corporal Morley left his own armoured vehicle to provide first aid to a critically wounded soldier until evacuation was possible. Under the threat of the enemy, he reacted courageously to ensure the survival of a comrade.

Master Corporal Paul Alexander MUNROE, CD 15 March 2010
In the midst of a three-hour battle in Afghanistan on 19 August 2006, Warrant Officer Jackson and Master Corporal Munroe’s platoon was forced to conduct a withdrawal while under enemy fire. Fully exposed to the violence of the enemy, these soldiers risked their lives to coordinate the safe movement of personnel and damaged vehicles. Their heroic actions under constant fire enabled the platoon to regroup and continue the fight, while denying the enemy an opportunity to capture and make use of stricken Canadian equipment.

Corporal Tyler Brian MYRONIUK 29 May 2009
On 4 August 2008, insurgent forces surrounded an Afghan National Army company in a complex ambush in the Panjwayi district of Afghanistan. Warrant Officer Crane and Corporal Myroniuk selflessly remained in the danger zone to extract an Afghan casualty and support another Canadian soldier who was caught in the open. Together, they stood against over 30 insurgents using small arms fire and, when their ammunition was depleted, resorted to hand grenades to hold off the enemy. The courage of Warrant Officer Crane and Corporal Myroniuk saved Canadian and Afghan lives and prevented the company from being outflanked.
Private John NELSON 12 August 2011

On 16 June 2010, Private Nelson’s foot patrol came under attack by insurgents on three sides, in Afghanistan. Upon hearing of a casualty, Private Nelson, under his own initiative, rushed headlong into the raging battle to reach his wounded comrade. Bullets rained around them as he administered first aid. While risking his own life, Private Nelson displayed courage, composure and selflessness as he rendered the necessary assistance to save the life of a fellow Canadian soldier.

Master Corporal Sean NIEFER 15 March 2007

Master Corporal Niefer was a member of Charlie Company, 1st Battalion, The Royal Canadian Regiment Battle Group, in Rotation 2 of Operation ARCHER, in Afghanistan. On 3 September 2006, while engaged in combat operations in support of Operation MEDUSA, he selflessly ordered his vehicle into the enemy kill zone to support extraction of wounded comrades trapped by an enemy ambush. He subsequently provided covering fire from a highly exposed position to facilitate their evacuation, and by doing so, saved the lives of numerous fellow soldiers. His outstanding leadership, courage and valiant action brought great credit to the Canadian Armed Forces and to Canada.

Private Michael O’ROURKE 14 March 2007

On 3 September 2006, Private O’Rourke, a member of 7 Platoon Charlie Company participating in Operation MEDUSA, selflessly ignored his personal safety by braving intense enemy fire to assist in the treatment and evacuation of his comrades trapped in a disabled vehicle. Twice crossing through sustained enemy fire, Private O’Rourke returned effective fire and successfully assisted in the evacuation of injured or killed personnel. His brave and professional actions saved lives and allowed the orderly withdrawal of his platoon under heavy fire.
Corporal Clinton ORR 14 March 2007
Corporal Orr was a member of 23 Field Squadron, 1st Battalion, The Royal Canadian Regiment Battle Group, in Rotation 2 of Operation ARCHER, in Afghanistan. On 3 September 2006, he was operating an armoured vehicle attached to 2 Troop during an assault in Pashmul. Amidst intense combat action and under direct enemy fire, he placed himself at great risk by manoeuvering to recover one light armoured vehicle and only ceased his relentless attempts to extract a second one when informed that the vehicle’s crew had withdrawn to safety. His focus on the mission and his courage in the face of danger have brought great credit to the Canadian Armed Forces and to Canada.

Corporal Joshua O’TOOLE 19 November 2009
On 21 October 2008, Corporal O’Toole was manning the defensive tower of a combat outpost, in Afghanistan, when it was attacked by insurgents. As rounds impacted the tower and rocket-propelled grenades sailed over his head, Corporal O’Toole left the security of his location to fire an anti-armour weapon at the attackers’ location. After a successful hit, he remained in a highly vulnerable position, taking up a heavy machine gun to continue returning fire. Corporal O’Toole’s fearless and relentless actions suppressed the enemy, allowing friendly forces to quickly establish defensive positions and defeat the attack.

Captain Robert David PEEL, CD 26 June 2008
Corporals Baker, Ball and Bancarz, and Captains Peel and Snyder were deployed to Afghanistan to serve as mentors to an Afghan company, when they were ambushed by Taliban insurgents on June 4, 2008. With little chance of survival, they exposed themselves to great peril and retaliated against the enemy while encouraging the Afghan soldiers to do the same. Captain Snyder seized control of the situation and ensured that the Afghan soldiers retrieved their wounded comrades. Corporal Ball led a two-man team across broken terrain to secure an extraction route that allowed for the execution of a fighting withdrawal by Captain Peel and Corporals Bancarz and Baker. Because of their dedication, leadership and valour, many Afghan and Canadian lives were saved.
Corporal Erik POELZER  
On 24 September 2007, during a combat operation in Afghanistan, Corporal Poelzer demonstrated courage and exceptional technical skills by coordinating a vehicle recovery effort through hours of sustained enemy attacks. He continuously exposed himself to great risk while preventing a vital piece of equipment from falling into enemy hands.

Sergeant Joseph André Steve POULIN, CD  
Sergeant Poulin distinguished himself through his bravery as a tank commander by ensuring security during a road construction project in Afghanistan. On several occasions, notably 18 December 2010, 17 February 2011, and 23 April 2011, he placed his tank in dangerous positions to protect civilians, coalition colleagues and Afghan security forces. Sergeant Poulin’s courage and professionalism were instrumental in ensuring the success of this operation.

Captain Derek PROHAR  
Assigned as liaison officer with the United States Special Forces in Afghanistan during the battle at Sperwan Ghar, from 5 to 12 September 2006, Captain Prohar operated as the rear machine gunner on the battalion commander’s vehicle. He was wounded by an improvised explosive device during an intense enemy ambush. Despite his injuries, he continued returning fire and assisted the commander with the control of the attack, which resulted in the successful seizing of key terrain. Captain Prohar’s courage and actions earned him the respect of the allied soldiers of the United States Special Forces.

Corporal Paul RACHYNSKI  
On 6 May 2008, a Kandahar Provincial Reconstruction Team patrol was ambushed in the Zharey district of Afghanistan. After neutralizing the initial threat, Corporal Rachynski selflessly led both Canadian and Afghan soldiers through heavy insurgent fire to rejoin his besieged patrol. Corporal Rachynski’s determination and calm under fire allowed his patrol to evacuate the wounded and execute a fighting withdrawal with no further casualties.
Sergeant Joseph Denis François  
**RANGER, CD**  
2 February 2011

On 14 June 2009, Sergeant Ranger was mentoring an Afghan reconnaissance company during an air-mobile operation when they were attacked by insurgents. With the company taking heavy mortar fire and suffering numerous casualties, Sergeant Ranger rallied his soldiers, established a position and returned heavy fire. As mortar bombs continued to fall, and with little regard for his personal safety, he single-handedly secured a casualty evacuation point. His leadership, fearless engagement of the enemy and ability to stay composed were critical to the defeat of the insurgents and the successful evacuation of casualties.

Captain Michael REEKIE  
14 March 2007

On 19 August 2006, while deployed with Alpha Company, 1st Battalion, The Royal Canadian Regiment Battle Group, in Ma’sum Ghar in Afghanistan, Captain Reekie carried out valiant actions during an intense firefight with Taliban insurgents. Displaying superb judgement, he assessed the changing tactical situation and repositioned his vehicle to maximum advantage, enabling the successful interception and defeat of a numerically superior enemy force during the ensuing three-hour firefight. His outstanding initiative prevented the enemy from outflanking the position. Captain Reekie’s selfless courage and exceptional leadership undoubtedly saved the lives of numerous Alpha Company soldiers.

Private Jay RENAUD  
18 January 2008

On 11 April 2007, despite his injuries, Private Renaud provided life-saving first aid to a seriously injured crewmate after his Coyote reconnaissance vehicle was destroyed by an improvised explosive device. At the time of the incident, Private Renaud was deployed as a surveillance operator with Reconnaissance Squadron, 2nd Battalion, The Royal Canadian Regiment Battle Group, Joint Task Force Afghanistan.
Corporal Anthony ROTONDI  
29 May 2009

On 6 May 2008, a Kandahar Provincial Reconstruction Team patrol was ambushed in the Zharey district of Afghanistan. While exposed to intense enemy fire, Corporal Rotondi assisted two seriously injured fellow soldiers and relentlessly returned fire to allow first aid and casualty evacuation. Corporal Rotondi’s bravery and perseverance in the face of a determined enemy were inspirational to those around him and helped save the lives of fellow soldiers.

Sergeant Marc-André ROUSSEAU  
26 April 2011

On 3 August 2010, while Sergeant Rousseau was conducting an exercise with a group of civilians at the Kandahar Airfield, insurgents blew a hole in the fence in an attempt to force their way inside. Despite being under heavy fire, Sergeant Rousseau led two comrades over exposed ground, occupied a nearby vehicle and aggressively engaged the enemy. Without regard for his own safety, Sergeant Rousseau demonstrated outstanding leadership and courage, which proved vital to winning the battle and saving countless lives on the airfield.

Corporal Jason RUFFOLO  
14 March 2007

Corporal Ruffolo was deployed with Charlie Company of the 1st Battalion, The Royal Canadian Regiment Battle Group, in Afghanistan. On 3 September 2006, while engaged in combat operations in the opening phase of Operation MEDUSA, a bulldozer vainly attempted to extract his light armoured vehicle and came under heavy enemy fire. Without regard for his own safety, Corporal Ruffolo placed himself in a very vulnerable position to unhook his vehicle. In a subsequent attack, he again exposed himself to enemy fire to render first aid to a casualty. His courage and professionalism under extreme duress brought great credit to the Armed Forces and to Canada.
Master Corporal Charles ST-PIERRE  18 September 2011
From 30 July to 2 August 2010, Master Corporal St-Pierre displayed courage and composure while providing fire support coordination during a four-day combat operation in the Arghandab Valley of Kandahar, Afghanistan. Constantly under fire, he willingly and repeatedly exposed himself to attacks while identifying enemy positions and directing fire upon them. Despite being struck in the helmet by an enemy bullet, he never wavered from his responsibilities. Master Corporal St-Pierre’s courage and soldiering ability were critical to the success of the operation.

Master Corporal David Richard TEDFORD, CD  19 November 2009
On 8 October 2008, Master Corporal Tedford’s patrol was ambushed in Kandahar Province, Afghanistan. While providing cover for exposed troops, his vehicle’s main cannon jammed. As his gunner attempted to fix the weapon, he rose out of the turret to return fire with the machine gun mounted atop the vehicle. Realizing the cannon could not be repaired from inside, he exited the vehicle amidst a hail of bullets, cleared the jam and began pouring heavy fire upon the enemy. With fearless determination, Master Corporal Tedford’s selfless action in suppressing the enemy throughout the firefight ensured his patrol’s successful fighting withdrawal.

Master Corporal Michael TRAUNER  19 November 2009
On 18 September 2008, Master Corporal Trauner was providing security for military engineers, in Western Kandahar Province, Afghanistan, when his vehicle’s main armament was destroyed by a rocket-propelled grenade strike. With his dismounted colleagues pinned down by the ambush, he immediately emerged from the turret to engage the attackers with the machine gun mounted atop the vehicle. By placing himself in a highly exposed and vulnerable position, he was able to suppress insurgent fire and protect his fellow soldiers. Master Corporal Trauner’s selfless and tenacious actions undoubtedly saved many Canadian and Afghan lives.
Corporal Marco TREMBLAY 23 February 2012

On 18 May 2011, during an enemy ambush in Sperwan Ghar, in Afghanistan, Corporal Tremblay demonstrated courage and determination. When the first enemy shots were fired, a Canadian soldier was hit in the leg and unable to take cover. Keeping calm under continuous fire, Corporal Tremblay reached the soldier, immediately applied a tourniquet to stop the bleeding and, during a lull, dragged the soldier to safety. Corporal Tremblay's bravery enabled him to save the life of a Canadian soldier.

Lieutenant Joseph Hughes
Stéphane TREMBLAY, CD 4 April 2008

Acting as a mentor to the Afghan National Army during his deployment, Lieutenant Tremblay led Afghan soldiers through a combat operation on 8 September 2007, under enemy fire. His leadership and courage inspired his troops to bring the mission to its successful completion.

Sergeant Dale Milton VERGE, CD 29 May 2009

On 30 March 2008, insurgents initiated a fierce and persistent attack on an Afghan police substation in Spin Pir, Afghanistan. Early in the action, Sergeant Verge sustained significant injuries. Oblivious to his wounds, he re-engaged with suppressive fire and directed effective point defence, neutralizing the enemy and repelling the attack. Sergeant Verge's selfless courage, tactical acumen and leadership set an example of resolve and prevented the substation from being overrun.
Sergeant Graham Marc VERRIER, CD  12 August 2011
On 31 July 2010, Sergeant Verrier’s patrol was caught in open terrain by an insurgent ambush, during an operation in Afghanistan. Despite being fully exposed to enemy fire, he immediately initiated a frontal assault on the enemy position. He also inspired his fellow soldiers to follow and relentlessly engaged the insurgents until they broke contact. Sergeant Verrier’s selfless, courageous and decisive actions under fire were critical to protecting the remainder of his platoon and defeating the enemy ambush.

Major Michael Charles WRIGHT, CD  18 December 2006
On the night of 19 August 2006, Major Wright of Alpha Company, Task Force Afghanistan, demonstrated outstanding courage and exceptional leadership in combat. Directed to move to the Panjwayi District Centre to enhance security, his troops were rapidly engaged and encircled by a significantly larger enemy force. Under intense fire from small arms and rocket-propelled grenades coming from all directions, he refused reinforcements for safety reasons and led his embattled force to out manoeuvre the enemy, inflicting serious enemy casualties. His courage and his leadership led to the defeat of a much larger enemy force without a single Canadian Armed Forces casualty.

Five members from the Canadian Special Operations Forces Command were awarded the Medal of Military Valour. For security and operational reasons, the names and citations of the recipients are not released.
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## Glossary of Post-Nominals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFC</td>
<td>Air Force Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFM</td>
<td>Air Force Medal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB</td>
<td>Companion of the Most Honourable Order of the Bath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBE</td>
<td>Commander of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Companion of the Order of Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>Canadian Forces’ Decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGM</td>
<td>Conspicuous Gallantry Medal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH</td>
<td>Member of the Order of the Companions of Honour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>Member of the Order of Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMG</td>
<td>Companion of the Most Distinguished Order of St. Michael and St. George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMM</td>
<td>Commander of the Order of Military Merit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM</td>
<td>Commander of the Order of Merit of the Police Forces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV</td>
<td>Cross of Valour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVO</td>
<td>Commander of the Royal Victorian Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>Distinguished Conduct Medal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFC</td>
<td>Distinguished Flying Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFM</td>
<td>Distinguished Flying Medal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSC</td>
<td>Distinguished Service Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSM</td>
<td>Distinguished Service Medal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSO</td>
<td>Companion of the Distinguished Service Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Efficiency Decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC</td>
<td>George Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCB</td>
<td>Knight Grand Cross of the Most Honourable Order of the Bath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCVO</td>
<td>Knight Grand Cross of the Royal Victorian Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM</td>
<td>George Medal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Full Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOQ</td>
<td>Grand Officer of the <em>Ordre national du Québec</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCB</td>
<td>Knight Commander of the Most Honourable Order of the Bath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVO</td>
<td>Lieutenant of the Royal Victorian Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB</td>
<td>Medal of Bravery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Military Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>Military Medal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMM</td>
<td>Member of the Order of Military Merit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMV</td>
<td>Medal of Military Valour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>Member of Parliament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSC</td>
<td>Meritorious Service Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSM</td>
<td>Meritorious Service Medal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVO</td>
<td>Member of the Royal Victorian Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBC</td>
<td>Member of the Order of British Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBE</td>
<td>Officer of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OM</td>
<td>Member of the Order of Merit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMM</td>
<td>Officer of the Order of Military Merit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Member of The Queen’s Privy Council for Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC</td>
<td>Queen’s Counsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QSO</td>
<td>Queen’s Service Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Star of Courage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMV</td>
<td>Star of Military Valour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOM</td>
<td>Member of the Saskatchewan Order of Merit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC</td>
<td>Victoria Cross</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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