

Ernest J. Dick

From Temperance to Prohibition in 19th Century Nova Scotia¹

Nova Scotians dramatically changed their attitudes towards, and appetites for, intoxicating beverages in the 19th century. Where alcohol was initially considered an essential part of daily life, Nova Scotians came to consider personal temperance desirable and complete abstinence preferable. The prohibition of the manufacture, import, or sale of all liquor came to be promoted as a political solution for the whole of society. The rethinking of the proper place and role of intoxicating beverages literally touched all corners of society. This rethinking signalled in Nova Scotia, as it did elsewhere, the first mass movement in colonial society to control and modify its own behaviour, with little help from the usual elites. It reflected a fundamental shift in the role and responsibility of government for the conduct of its citizenry.

There has been little critical attention paid to the nineteenth-century development of the temperance-prohibition phenomenon in Nova Scotia or in Canada in general though not for lack of documentation chronicling the efforts of the friends of temperance and prohibition.² Admittedly, those not so friendly to the campaign tended to be more reticent and cautious, for their apprehensions seemed to fly directly in the face of good and righteous intentions. The understanding of their case requires a good deal more reading between the lines. As in any situation where one side succeeds in claiming all the morality, those that are more pessimistic have difficulty in speaking their true minds. However, the temperance-prohibition challenge was flung with such vigour at the political, administrative, and religious attitudes and institutions of the day that society had to respond and archives have abundant records of those responses.

Nova Scotia was an early and energetic convert to the cause of temperance. The honour of being the first temperance society in British North America is claimed by both West River in Pictou County (October, 1827) and Beaver River on the Yarmouth-Digby county-line

(April 25, 1828). The exact nature and wording of the pledge taken at West River is not certain but, in the case of Beaver River, we know that eight men pledged themselves "to forever renounce the use of intoxicating liquors, except when prescribed by a physician in the case of sickness."³ These pledges followed very closely the foundation of the first temperance society in the United States, in Boston in February 1826. Within a few years every county in Nova Scotia had active temperance societies. By 1834 the first convention comprising delegates from temperance societies throughout the province was held at Halifax and an address was presented to the Lieutenant Governor claiming to represent fourteen thousand persons.⁴ Temperance organizations including the Sons of Temperance (1847), the Independent Order of Good Templars (1850s), the Royal Templars (1880s), the Canadian Temperance League (1890), the Women's Christian Temperance Union (1870s), and the Dominion Alliance for the Total Suppression of the Liquor Traffic (1878) were all well represented in Nova Scotia. The claim is made that by the 1870's Nova Scotia had twice as many pledged members in temperance organizations, in proportion to her population, as the whole Dominion.⁵ Similarly, when it came to offering an opinion in provincial (1894) and national (1898) plebiscites Nova Scotians overwhelmingly declared themselves for prohibition. Only Prince Edward Island was more enthusiastic.⁶

Changing Appetites

To fully comprehend how dramatic a rethinking Nova Scotia experienced it is necessary to recall how important alcohol was to daily life at the beginning of the century. It was such a normal part of daily routine that anyone who abstained was considered slightly deranged and physically less than robust. Particularly in urban life where the purity of the water was often suspect, rum was a safe beverage. Alcohol was considered essential in a North American climate to ward off extremes of cold. Daily rations were supplied by employers to their workers, and community barn-raising or other joint projects would not even be contemplated without a puncheon of rum. Temperance societies thus had a formidable educational campaign ahead of them and they began their work in appropriately modest fashion:

There was at first no suggestion of abstinence from wine, ale or beer; in fact, the use of these was encouraged, in the supposed interests of true temperance. Those who before long became convinced that the use of light liquor in moderation was a fatal cause of backsliding, met with bitter hostility from the moderates, and were accused of promulgating a dangerous doctrine. There are men living today who can boast of having been refused by insurance companies because as total abstainers they were considered to be abnormal.⁷

These early temperance societies sometimes even served beer and wine at their functions: in Durham, Pictou County, the members were restricted to two glasses of liquor per day.⁸ The temperance conventions in Halifax in 1834, 1835, and 1836 debated the virtues of total abstinence at some length. By 1836 they were prepared to recommend that all temperance societies "agree to abstain from drinking ardent spirits, and all intoxicating liquors (except the use of wine at the Lord's Supper), and to discountenance the causes and practices of intemperance."⁹ In 1847 the Sons of Temperance, founded in New York City five years earlier, moved into New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. They insisted upon a pledge of total abstinence and from that point on the temperance societies never again accepted anything less than total abstinence. They argued that the drinking of milder malt liquors and wine led inevitably to an appetite for stronger alcoholic content. The temperance societies thus early abandoned temperance as a solution to the drink problem and became distinctly intemperate in their promotion of the prohibition cause. Nonetheless, they continued to call themselves temperance societies, thereby effectively undermining the identity of those who were genuine advocates of temperance rather than prohibition.

Although the temperance societies early succeeded in convincing themselves that their belief in absolute prohibition represented all upstanding and right-thinking citizens, Nova Scotians took some time to change their appetites. The *Provincial Wesleyan*, the official newspaper of the Methodist Church, pondered, in 1856, whether it was possible for anyone to get drunk from a beer containing only 5½ per cent alcohol.¹⁰ Similarly, medical doctors, John Hector McKay of Truro and Alexander Reid of the Halifax Hospital for the Insane, argued before the Royal Commission on the Liquor Traffic that wine and light beers should not be placed in the same category as distilled liquor.¹¹ J. R. Lithgow, Treasurer of the Glace Bay Mining Company, invoked a measure of patriotism in his argument in favour of malt liquors:

Can any temperance drinks be substituted which will go as well with Canada's bread and cheese or bacon? What physician or physiologist will take the ground that infusions of tea and coffee are as wholesome drinks as malt liquors?¹²

Lithgow entered into a vigorous debate in the Halifax newspapers preceding the 1894 provincial plebiscite on the futility of prohibition. He suggested that if prohibitionists wished to prevent drunkenness they should prohibit strong liquors such as rum, brandy, and gin and rather advocate the duty-free import of the light wines of Germany and

France which "are no more injurious than sweet cider."¹³ Also, the suggestion that alcohol could be used responsibly and moderately was associated with prominent leaders as diverse as Joseph Howe, and G. M. Grant, Presbyterian minister in Halifax and later to become principal of Queen's University. The Reverend Dyson Hague, rector of the Anglican Church of St. Paul's in Halifax, suggested to the Royal Commission on the Liquor Traffic, upon its visit to Halifax in July 1892, that he could not see the evil of taking liquor in moderation and acknowledged that he knew men of his congregation "of sober judgement and calm reasoning powers" who use alcohol moderately in their homes.¹⁴

Nova Scotia, however, undeniably decreased its consumption of alcohol over the course of the century. It is impossible to demonstrate the precise measure of this changing appetite because statistics for the early part of the century only allow one to calculate the amount of alcoholic drink legally imported, and do not take account of any local manufacture or distillation. The *Report of the Royal Commission on the Liquor Traffic* could only with confidence offer calculations reaching back to 1871, but even those demonstrate temperance trends. Nova Scotia's proportional alcohol consumption per capita in 1871 was substantially less than the Dominion average and even below that of its sister province, New Brunswick. Over the course of the next twenty years, moreover, Nova Scotia's consumption decreased significantly and in proportion to the rest of the country. Perhaps the proportionally low consumption by 1871 was already due to the early success of the 'moral suasion' of the temperance societies.

Religious Rethinking

Nova Scotia was by no means unique or alone in embracing the temperance-prohibition enthusiasm in the nineteenth century. Parallel movements were sweeping popular sentiment in the United States as well as Great Britain.¹⁵ The popular impetus for the temperance sentiment and its conversion into a prohibition movement in Nova Scotia came very directly from New England along the same axis as the earlier religious revivals. Congregationalist Evangelist Lyman Beecher's famous "Six Sermons on the Nature, Occasions, Signs, Evils, and Remedy of Intemperance" were widely circulated and quoted in Nova Scotia after they had been published in 1826 (Halifax edition published in 1830). The temperance-prohibition movement can be understood not merely as another religious revival but as an unusually successful religious crusade. While the impetus for the early movement was clearly religious, the implications reached far wider than the usual religious revival. Over the course of a century the movement succeeded

in convincing the secular world that salvation was necessary, and attainable, through its moral imperative; that is, the prohibition of all manufacture, import, sale, and use of alcohol. That Nova Scotia, and particularly the Annapolis Valley, was ripe for revival had already been demonstrated in the Great Awakening from 1760-1783 and Henry Alline's New Light revivals after 1784. These earlier revivals had reawakened and stressed the importance of man's spiritual relationship to God, rather than stimulating any concern for the social welfare or daily behaviour of one's fellow man. Nonetheless, they had prepared the ground for the social utility of temperance and prohibition. The previous revivals had disrupted traditional ecclesiastical authority and structures and created an appetite for new enthusiasms.¹⁶ Moreover, they had created the Massachusetts-Nova Scotia religious community, which now ensured that Nova Scotia would participate in the enthusiasm for the temperance cause. Thus it was the Baptist preachers of the Annapolis Valley, although initially only the more worldly of them, who avidly read Lyman Beecher's sermons and preached the first temperance sermons. For Baptists to take an interest in the behaviour and welfare of society, rather than concentrating exclusively on individual salvation was initially considered rather heretical and "worldly". Though Baptists had always placed a high value on the moral behaviour of their members, the interest in prohibition signalled a new-found concern for the redemption of the total society. The Baptists founding of Horton Academy in Wolfville (1829) indicated such a widening sense of Christian responsibility. It was no longer sufficient for Christians to devote their energies exclusively to their individual relationships to God. The Reverend E. M. Saunders, the Baptist historian, appropriately links the Baptist interest in higher education with the pursuit of prohibition and suggests that both represented a "higher, intellectual, moral and Christian life".¹⁷ Indeed, once Baptists turned their vigilance for moral behaviour outside of their own communions they did not dally long with mere temperance or personal abstinence. They quickly accepted total prohibition as the only solution. Thus it was often by way of being spokesmen for the prohibition movement that Baptists made their first steps in the nineteenth century to leave behind their sectarian tendencies and participate fully in Nova Scotian society.

Baptist leadership in the early days of the movement in Nova Scotia is everywhere acknowledged, but it was a true crusade in that the temperance societies were never limited to particular denominations. Methodists, particularly, were quick to join the cause, with significant participation from Anglicans, Presbyterians, and even Roman Catholics.¹⁸ The Roman Catholic Temperance interest, led by the Irish priest,

Father Matthew, had a greater impact in New Brunswick than in Nova Scotia. Nonetheless, the St. Mary's total abstinence society was formed with impressive enthusiasm in Halifax on January 24, 1841.¹⁹ Indeed, the vitality and success of the prohibition movement were due to the fact that the enthusiasm crossed all denominations. It was a truly ecumenical movement as all denominations, some more slowly and some very quickly, were anxious to demonstrate that they were contributing to the good cause of curbing the evil of alcoholic drink. Anglicans remained the most suspicious of the wisdom of prohibition. The Right Reverend Frederick Courtney, Bishop of the Church of England in Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, explained to the Royal Commission on the Liquor Traffic in 1892 the three categories of membership of the Church of England Temperance Society: total abstinence, abstinence from certain kinds of liquors, and moderation and restraint in the use of liquor. Courtney acknowledged that it was indeed tempting to hope that prohibition would neatly and simply do away with the evil of excessive drinking:

It is always so much easier to cut a Gordian knot than to untie it, and prohibition cuts it, while self control is the slow-untieing of a very hard and difficult knot. The majority of the people, if a cause is before them for a long time, at last get impatient and say: 'Let us cut it' The cutting does not succeed. It simply makes it appear as if total abstinence were the only way of dealing with the liquor traffic, and then the knot that seemed to be cut as regards this question being settled, reappears and the question is as far as ever from being settled.²⁰

Presbyterians reflected the most divergent views within one denomination. Presbyterians most recently immigrated from Scotland were the least likely to be temperance supporters.²¹ At the same time Presbyterians were also prominent among the early leaders of the movement and as early as 1852 the highest office of the Sons of Temperance (Grand Worthy Patriarch) was held by a Presbyterian minister, George Christie of Yarmouth. The notion of private temperance, perhaps even abstinence, though not necessarily prohibition for all of society, remained a strong sentiment among Presbyterians for a long time in the nineteenth century. This sentiment, while never openly opposing prohibition measures, often cautioned against excessive trust in "human machinery," in "laws enacted at Halifax or at Ottawa," to turn men's hearts toward "temperance, purity, truth and honesty."²² Baptists and Methodists were sometimes inclined to make grand claims for what prohibition would accomplish for society; indeed they were inclined to intemperance on this count. Presbyterians, on the other hand, were more wary and counselled their fellow Christians to be more modest:

We do not imagine for a moment that the most stringent prohibitory law which could be enacted would banish vice and misery from the community, or make us a virtuous and happy people. It would not empty our jails, poor houses or penitentiaries. Still it would be a long stride in the right direction. It would be a step in the moral training of the people. Total abstinence is but one virtue, and that a negative one: but it lies at the foundation of much else.²³

As the prohibition campaign progressed, the Presbyterians also joined the cause unequivocally. In 1888 the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Canada departed from its traditionally moderate stand and enthusiastically urged a Dominion-wide prohibitory law. John Moir, the historian of the Presbyterian church, argues that this marks a turning point in the church's attitude to strong drink: "A consensus had been reached from which the church did not thereafter retreat."²⁴ Thus by the time of the provincial plebiscite in Nova Scotia in 1894 the *Presbyterian Witness* was supporting prohibition without qualification:

Let the country ring from end to end with the subject. Let us have the largest vote by far ever cast in Nova Scotia. Let there be a majority of ten to one in favour of Prohibition.²⁵

Still there must have continued a glimmer of scepticism within the Presbyterian fold and the *Presbyterian Witness* did have the honesty to acknowledge, and not castigate this sentiment:

There are good men who do not see their way clear to support Prohibition: they will neither work nor vote for it. To their own Master they are accountable. It will be unwise and wrong to interfere in any way with the liberty of action or inaction of such men.²⁶

It was a fundamental theological question whether society could and ought to legislate against temptation. The prohibitionists charted new theological ground on this question with great energy and certitude. The conviction that the removal of temptation was a duty of a Christian society was repeated at length throughout the century:

... a cause which aims at the salvation of the poor drunkard by energetic efforts for his reformation, and by removing beyond his reach the accursed bowl, the temptation to which he has not the moral strength to resist, as well as to save from the fascinations of strong drink, by putting that evil entirely out of the way, the many who otherwise be ensnared thereby.²⁷

This reformist affirmation roused theological objections. Principal G. M. Grant of Queens, won himself few friends by opposing prohibition in the 1898 national plebiscite campaign. In letters to the *Toronto Globe* which were reprinted in pamphlet form, Grant argued:

The Christian principle is, 'I will eat no meat rather my weak brother should suffer.' But if the State enacts 'No one shall eat meat lest the weak suffer,' it becomes a despotism. It puts its trust in the policeman or the bayonet, and, instead of making its people free citizens, it makes them moral weaklings and hypocrites.²⁸

A variation on this argument had been heard on the floor of the Assembly in Halifax some years earlier when the Member from Richmond County, Murdoch McRae, in the course of the 1886 debate declared his belief in "moral suasion as the true temperance law". Moreover, he argued

The man who does not know vice deserves no credit for abstaining from it. If the hon. member for Yarmouth could suppress the liquor traffic there would be no credit to the temperance people for keeping sober, because they could not get any liquor.²⁹

The more temperate Christians sometimes suggested that the prohibitionists demeaned their own accomplishments by abandoning temperance. A correspondent to the *Acadian Recorder*, during the provincial plebiscite campaign, chastised his fellow Christians for the 'intemperance' with which they pursued the cause for prohibition:

When ministers of Christ look to legislation and the world to cast out Satan, or to destroy the works of the devil, it looks to me that they have lost faith in the power of the Gospel of Christ and intemperance is unquestionably one of the works of the devil.³⁰

Yet the temperance societies were not content to know that temperance had become socially respectable. They pressed on with their cause and by the end of the century the theological orthodoxy was the 'social gospel' of the prohibitionists. The Christians obligation to eradicate temptation had become accepted, and, as society was assumed to be Christian, governments were expected to undertake the eradication.

Political Rethinking

The Legislative Assembly of Nova Scotia was to hear from the temperance societies virtually as soon as they became organized across the province. Beginning in 1834, and in virtually every year throughout the century, petitions were received urging "legislative enactments in advancement of the cause of Temperance".³¹ In most years committees were established and reports prepared for the legislature. Friends of the temperance societies were invariably appointed to these committees and thus the reports never failed to praise the work of the temperance societies and document the evils resulting from the sale of "ardent spirits." In 1847 such a committee recommended a grant of £100 to promote the work of the temperance societies.³² On occasion such

grants were repeated in subsequent years but, at other times, they were defeated in the Assembly or by the Legislative Council. However, these early committees could not quite bring themselves to recommend prohibitory legislation. A 1839 committee chaired by Gaius Lewis, a Reformer from Cumberland County, was typical. After documenting the evil it concluded:

Your committee therefore reports that there can be little doubt of the justice of any coercive regulation to restrain the traffic in Ardent Spirits, yet they cannot think it would be expedient, in the present state of Society, to go to any decided and prohibitory Penal Laws on this head — men can never be driven contrary to their inclinations without great difficulty — if the minds of persons are convinced and persuaded of the utility and justice of a regulation, the general feeling is in its favour — if then passed into a Law, it will no longer be looked upon as compulsory, but will be obeyed with readiness.³³

This concern that legislative action not be too far in advance of legitimate public opinion persisted for many years. Prohibitionists never admitted to any reticence or caution on this score, however. Their conviction that prohibitory legislation was correct and that it would improve society's behaviour knew no limits and they pressed their cause on the provincial legislature with great energy.

Politically, the New England-Nova Scotia and New Brunswick associations and contacts paralleled religious ones. Thus it was most natural that Maine's passage of prohibitory legislation in 1851 (the first state in the union to do so) was looked at with a great deal of interest and curiosity. Anyone who had visited Maine after 1851 was considered an expert on the efficacy of prohibition and its effect on crime and poverty. Testimony differed widely with some claiming great progress and others citing noticeable degradation, though all admitted that alcoholic drink was still to be had if one was determined to procure it. By 1855, eleven states and two territories had followed Maine's example, and in 1855 the New Brunswick Legislative Assembly passed a prohibitory bill.³⁴

Party alignments on the question of prohibition have always remained very fluid both in Nova Scotia and, after Confederation, in Canada at large. The parties in opposition tended to make the greatest noises in support of prohibition and revelled in castigating governments with the issue. Their commitment soon wavered if successful in gaining power, much to the perpetual chagrin of the temperance societies. Prominent spokesmen for the prohibitionist cause could usually be found in all political parties. Throughout the century this was the case in Nova Scotia, though particular personalities and circumstances tended to find the Reformers and Liberals more wary of

prohibition while the Conservatives were more supportive. The identification of Conservatives with prohibition was facilitated by the fact that the Reformers constituted the government when the issue first came before the legislature. Moreover, the allegiance between the Conservatives and Baptists stimulated the Conservative enthusiasm for prohibition. Johnston, the Conservative leader, was a prominent Baptist of long standing, having founded the Granville Street Baptist Church in Halifax and been on the Board of Governors of Acadia, and he took a personal interest in promoting the prohibition cause. His arch political rival, Joseph Howe, had opposed public funding for Baptist-sponsored Acadia and thus given to the Baptists further reason to support the Conservatives. Howe was well known to be something of a "bon vivant" and not by disposition inclined to piety. In later years the Liberal leader and Premier, W. S. Fielding, also had a strong personal antipathy to prohibitory measures. Nonetheless, neither opposition nor support for prohibition ever became a truly party issue.

The first prohibition bill was introduced to the Legislative Assembly in 1854 by James Johnston, the leader of the Conservative Opposition and the representative of Annapolis County. Indeed, Annapolis County always made a substantial contribution to the prohibition cause, being among the first counties to ban all licensing of liquor sales, and contributing its representatives, Avard Longley (1859-1878) and J. C. Troop (1867-1874), to the leadership of the cause.³⁵ Johnston presented the legislature petitions containing over thirty thousand names in support of prohibition, but did not press the issue in 1854, as he was directing the Opposition wrath towards the government policy on railroads. The bill died without any conclusive votes taken on it, but was revived with renewed energy and interest in the 1855 session.

Joseph Howe had faced the challenge of the prohibitionists some years earlier when his editor, John S. Thompson, proposed that they drop all advertisements for alcoholic beverages from the pages of the *Novascotian*. Thompson proposed to resign rather than be involved with a newspaper that carried such advertisements. Howe argued that Thompson could do the temperance cause more good by continuing to promote the cause through the *Novascotian*, since the high road of non-association with evil addressed only those in no need of reform or advice. Howe discussed the matter at some length but then declared:

For my part I have thought a good deal about it long ago, for there were many engaged in the early Temperance Movements who forced the subject on my attention and I am convinced that the system of open conflict with the world on this subject is not the best way to mend either its manner or its morals.... The *Novascotian* certainly shall not be destroyed for any such object for I am sure the 2,000 persons who take it would drink a great deal more if they had not that to read.³⁶

With the mood of the Legislative Assembly in the 1855 session decidedly swinging towards prohibition, Howe declared himself unalterably opposed to prohibition and responded with a speech considered one of his classics.³⁷ Howe acknowledged the evils flowing from the excessive use of wine but argued that man had to learn to temper his use of all of God's many gifts, citing gunpowder, water (the temperance man's own element), and woman (God's best gift to man) as equally dangerous:

The fascination which she spreads around her — how difficult to resist; the passions she inspires — how intimately interwoven with all that arouses to exertion, and rewards us for our toils. Yet, when even love is indulged in to excess; when reason is overpowered; when passion hurries on to folly....³⁸

From here he went on to chronicle the achievements of civilization which had been accomplished by societies and personalities that indulged in the juice of the grape. And what were the accomplishments that the state of Maine could boast of; the model the prohibitionists were offering:

Has Maine turned us out yet a statue that anybody would look at; a picture that anybody would buy? Look at the deliverers of mankind; the heroic defenders of nations. Was Washington a member of the temperance society?³⁹

Despite these oratorical heights the prohibition bill appeared to have a majority in the Assembly. However, in the dying moments of the debate Johnston amended the wording by dropping the specific mention of cider as one of the beverages to be prohibited. This amendment caused him to lose the support of some of the absolute prohibitionists who would brook no compromises. Moreover, it provided great sport for the government with William Young, the Attorney General, leading the speculation as to when, and how much, cider was intoxicating or not.⁴⁰

The prohibition measure was again revived in the 1856 session but the intervening elections had not been kind to its supporters and no significant legislative action was expected. The question of revenues that would be lost to the province (said to be approximately £25,000 annually in the license fees and duties — one fifth of provincial revenues) was this time brought to the fore. It was suggested that this loss of revenue to the provincial treasury might have serious implications for English capitalists considering purchasing debentures on railway construction in Nova Scotia. This loss of revenues was always implicit in the reluctance of governments to adopt prohibition but rarely was it admitted outright. Prohibitionists thus pounced on this argument in 1856 with a vengeance: for once they could directly refute

the formerly-unspoken basis of legislative reluctance. They replied by demonstrating how many times more revenue was lost to the province, and to society, by the drinking habit. An editorial in the *Yarmouth Herald* declared that the people of Nova Scotia would "cheerfully make up any deficiency arising from the effects of prohibition," and held anyone who doubted this "guilty of a foul libel against them." Furthermore, it claimed that the government had reduced the argument to a banal choice between railroads and the blessings of prohibition:

It comes to this. According to the Attorney General - that Nova Scotia cannot have a railway, unless the country is well flooded with liquor ... that they would rather expose themselves to all the miseries of pauperism and crime - the twin children of intemperance - than contribute a modest amount of their substance towards the accomplishment of a national object... So the Nova Scotia Railway is to be the product of liquor. Now, we are hearty friends to railways, and all other means of facilitating the intercourse of man with man, and thus promoting civilization as well as increasing wealth; but if we are to choose between the two — a railway with rum and its attendant curses — or no railway, and temperance, with its blessings, we shall not hesitate a moment. Stop the works and deliver the land.⁴¹

The *Novascotian*, a paper decidedly more friendly to the government demurred, allowing that "other means" might indeed be found to replenish the treasury, but then prudently reminded its readers that "an opportunity would be soon afforded, in the sister Province, of fairly trying out the experiment".⁴² Similarly, in the Assembly more than one member suggested that Nova Scotia would be wiser to wait and judge the New Brunswick experiment, and thus the measure was dropped.

In the 1858 and 1859 sessions, prohibitory measures were again proposed, this time by a Thomas Morrison, a Reformer from Colchester County. The government was now led by James Johnston and they opposed the identical measure that they had introduced two years ago. The partisan *Novascotian* took particular delight in this change of attitude:

What do our Temperance friends think of Mr. Johnston's sincerity now? What will they say when they find this once great Apostle of Temperance the first to rise in the House and move against a measure which, only two years ago, he declared was paramount to all others?⁴³

Johnston explained how and why his attitude had changed:

I supported the bill as long as I thought there was any chance of making it a measure of real and practical utility. I have learned from experience, however, that it is impracticable... I have satisfied myself that the harmonious concert — the undeviating determination without which

the bill itself would be worse than useless does not exist; and the moment I came to that conclusion I felt that my best course was to abandon all hope of carrying it into effect.⁴⁴

To extricate himself from this rather uncomfortable situation, Johnston's government proposed and passed a bill in the 1859 session to have the prohibition question put directly to the people at the time of the next election. The Legislative Council rejected this measure as "derogatory to the Legislature, an unconstitutional exercise of Legislative functions, and liable to be drawn into dangerous precedent".⁴⁵

The examples in New Brunswick and the United States which had emboldened Nova Scotia prohibitionists had also by this point begun to pale. New Brunswick's experiment had been cut short by the disallowance of the legislation and yet apparently New Brunswick had seen enough not to press on with prohibition for the moment. The historian J. K. Chapman explains that:

Once New Brunswick's prohibitory Act had come into operation and had begun to challenge existing interests and to interfere with long-established habits, resistance to it had strengthened. The failure of attempts to enforce the Act must surely have fostered doubts respecting the efficacy of legislative action among all but the most hardened of prohibitionists, and strengthened the convictions of those who continued to believe in 'moral suasion' as the one answer to intemperance. But what must have weakened the prohibitionists most in their fight to preserve the Act was the fact that no political party was committed to their philosophy.⁴⁶

Similarly, in the United States, by 1860 most of the states that had passed prohibitory legislation had already dramatically softened their legislation. Then the coming of the Civil War took the momentum out of the prohibition campaign, and it was a full ten years before the cause would regroup in the United States.⁴⁷ The early experiments had not delivered all that the prohibitionists had promised. It was not going to be quite as easy as initially assumed to eliminate the vice and poverty that the temperance societies had blamed on alcoholic beverages. The Nova Scotia legislature did not seriously again consider prohibitory legislation in the nineteenth century although they virtually annually changed the regulations governing the sale of alcoholic drink.

Throughout the nineteenth century, however, the temperance societies never relented in pressing the case for prohibitory legislation. The national legislation passed in 1878, known as the Scott Act, was very disappointing to the prohibitionists because it simply institutionalized a system of local option, whereby the local population could decide not to issue licenses for the retail sale of alcohol. Enforcement, however, was similarly left to the local municipal jurisdictions and thus

varied dramatically across the province. The temperance societies grew increasingly frustrated at the failure of any political party to take the matter to heart once they were elected to power. All candidates for federal and provincial elections were canvassed and their stance on prohibition identified and publicized. The prospects of forming a distinct political party were seriously considered and debated and the Nova Scotia Prohibition Party, led by J. T. Bulmer of Halifax, briefly existed in 1889.⁴⁸ Similarly, on the national level attempts were made in the late 1880s to found a prohibition party but too many prohibitionists insisted that they should cross all party lines. Finally, in 1892, in response to mounting pressure, the federal government appointed a Royal Commission on Liquor Traffic in Canada. The choice of Commissioners appointed by the government convinced prohibitionists that the appointment of the Royal Commission was simply a ruse to forestall legislative action. Only the Reverend Joseph McLeod of Fredericton could be counted on to lend a friendly ear to the prohibition cause. The Royal Commission visited Halifax, North Sydney, Truro, and Yarmouth in July and August of 1892 and then travelled west across the rest of Canada. The prohibitionists presented their case and by far the majority of the testimony heard explicitly favoured prohibition. However, their scepticism was well warranted when the report recommended only more thorough licensing, and suggested higher license fees to ensure the "respectability of those engaged in the trade." The temperance societies then turned to the device of the plebiscite to dramatize the popular support for their cause. The taking of plebiscites further removed the question from party politics and the political process. Politicians scrupulously avoided any mention of the issue, and there was little discussion of the coming plebiscites in the secular press. Citizens were urged to vote, and to vote according to their conscience, but there existed a deliberate avoidance of any further commitments. In the case of the provincial plebiscite, James Longley, the Attorney General, explained:

... That in submitting this measure to the legislature, in response to the public demand, and with the purpose of ascertaining the views of the people on this great and important question, so far as he was personally concerned, it was not with the expectation that even an affirmative result would produce any result as far as the legislature of this province was concerned. The better opinion was that the provincial legislature could not carry into effect a measure of such a sweeping character.⁴⁹

It was the first question on which the government of Nova Scotia as of Ontario, Prince Edward Island, and Canada, had been forced directly to ask the population for an opinion.

The response of the federal government proved no more encouraging for prohibitionists. The Dominion Alliance for the Total Suppression of the Liquor Traffic pressed for an answer after the national plebiscite and managed to obtain a hearing with the Prime Minister, Wilfrid Laurier. Finally on March 14, 1899, Laurier replied in a letter to F. S. Spence, secretary for the Dominion Alliance. Laurier explained that since only 23% of the eligible electorate, albeit a majority of those who had voted, had declared themselves for prohibition, that the government would not consider any action:

I venture to submit for your consideration and the consideration of the members of the Dominion Alliance, who believe in prohibition as the most efficient means of suppressing the evils of intemperance, that no good purpose would be served by forcing upon the people a measure which is shown by the vote to have the support of less than twenty-three percent of the electorate.⁵⁰

The role and authority of a legislature changed in nineteenth-century Nova Scotia as provincial government involvement in institutions ranging from the building of railroads to the financing and control of education came to be accepted in the course of the century. The prohibition campaign urged a parallel expansion of legislative authority over the regulation of personal liberty. The prohibitionists had no hesitation in advocating a radical expansion of legislative authority. The following extract from a speech by Thomas Morrison in the 1856 debate was typical and was repeated in virtually every speech by a prohibitionist in the legislature:

I believe the legislator has a right to step in and legislate against any custom, however ancient, or practice, however common, that spends the property, demoralizes the character, and destroys the life of our people. I am for removing the temptation as much and as far as possible from within the reach of our people ... It is time, high time that this House should step in between appetite and reason, and, if possible, by legislative enactment, put a stop to this growing evil.⁵¹

They claimed that wherever men gathered in communities they must give up a portion of their natural freedom, and that the public good to be gained compensated many times for the hampering of personal habits. Joseph Howe based his opposition exactly on the degree of regulation of daily behaviour that prohibition required and concluded his 1855 speech:

My honourable colleague and friend from Cumberland, whose sincerity in this cause I entirely respect, quoted to us last winter the passage from Scripture, 'If eating meat causes my brother to offend then will I eat no more.' But would my honourable friend shut up all the butchers' shops and forbid by law the sale of meat, for fear somebody would eat too

much? Again, he told us 'we have tried moral suasion, and have failed'. If so, who is to blame? If a speaker here fails to convince his audience, do we permit him to coerce them into belief by force of law? I resist this bill because it is a violation of the voluntary principle. Because it is defended by the old arguments by which fanatics and persecutors in all ages have sought to propagate religious opinions. Hoping to save men's souls (more precious than their bodies), Catholics have burnt Protestants, and Protestants Catholics. The right of private judgment was denied. The right of one human being to coerce others into belief, as it is now sought to coerce them into temperance, has been tried a thousand times, and has failed, as this attempt will fail.⁵²

The expansion of legislative authority in nineteenth-century Nova Scotia stopped short of prohibition.

Administrative Rethinking

Although the legislative assembly of Nova Scotia did not accept prohibition in the nineteenth century they changed the administration and regulation of alcoholic consumption dramatically. Indeed, it was often on the administrative and regulatory questions that the issues were joined and prolific debate ensued in the legislature and the press. Rather than addressing the political, philosophical, and moral questions directly, small points of regulatory or administrative procedure were hotly contested.

Virtually every year after 1832, when a comprehensive liquor license bill had been passed, amendments were proposed and often accepted in the Nova Scotia Assembly. These often raised the duties and license fees, supposedly to deter consumption and guarantee a better class of businessman engaged in the trade. Sale to Indians had been forbidden since 1829, and in 1855, the penalties for sales to minors were stiffened. In 1863 a provision whereby a majority of ratepayers in any polling district could petition against the granting of licenses was provided for. If a majority declared themselves opposed, no licenses for the retail sale (that is, any sales of amounts less than ten gallons) would be permitted until the decision was reversed by a majority of ratepayers. In 1869, the requirement was reversed and those wanting liquor licenses for retail sale now had annually to obtain the signatures of two-thirds of the ratepayers in a polling district on petitions collected at their own expense. Complaints were long and loud but prohibition had become legitimate enough that the onus was now on those wanting to prohibit. These provisions did not apply to the county or city of Halifax where the municipal council had the discretion to grant licenses until 1886.⁵³ The provision for local option by obtaining or withholding signatures on petitions was well suited to the temperance societies and they had great success in organizing local pressure. Thus by 1874, 209 out of 264 polling districts in the province refused to grant

any licenses with only 31 licenses granted in all of Nova Scotia outside the county and city of Halifax. However, the grand total of 256 licenses within the county and city of Halifax was a constant reminder to the prohibitionists that their work was incomplete.⁵⁴

The Canada Temperance Act, or Scott Act, became law on May 8, 1878 and provided for a similar type of local option. A petition by 25 percent of the electors in any city or county required the taking of a vote. A majority vote provided for total prohibition for a minimum of three years. Nova Scotia Members of Parliament, James Forbes and Henry Goudge, spoke to the measure in the House of Commons debate and pointed out that it was not as stringent a measure as already existed in Nova Scotia. They lamented that the people of Canada were not as far advanced on the question as was Nova Scotia.⁵⁵ Nonetheless, the temperance organizations again put their energies to work and by 1885 licenses were banned in seventeen counties with only the city and county of Halifax permitting the retail sale of liquor.⁵⁶

The question of constitutional jurisdictions now raised its head to further frustrate the prohibitionists. The constitutionality of the Scott Act was first challenged by a liquor dealer in Fredericton and it was not until June 3, 1882, that a decision in favour of the federal legislation was brought down by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.⁵⁷ However, a federal act of 1883, known as the McCarthy Act, providing for the federal licensing of the liquor traffic was declared to invade provincial jurisdiction, and thus rejected by the courts. The provinces were held to have exclusive rights to control and license the sale of liquor, although the federal Parliament was understood to have control over imports, distillation and manufacture.⁵⁸

Once the constitutional air had been cleared, prohibitionists resumed their initiatives in the Nova Scotia Assembly; this time led by a Liberal from Yarmouth County, Albert Gayton. The bill he proposed in the 1886 session passed with a comfortable majority and was primarily designed to bring Halifax under the same regulations as the rest of the province; that is, a petition of two-thirds of ratepayers required annually to secure the granting of a liquor license. Opposition this time was led by the Liberal Premier, W. S. Fielding, though to little avail. He argued that a simple majority rather than two-thirds should be sufficient as it was the accepted democratic practice in all other matters. Also, he forwarded the arguments of the Halifax City Council that the requirement of gathering annual petitions was a farce and guaranteed nothing but a nuisance for the respectable merchants in the business of selling liquor.⁵⁹

Many raised concerns about the efficacy of the existing and proposed licensing legislation throughout the century. Examples of the

evasion of regulations were plentiful and legitimate doubt was raised whether the banning of licenses had reduced consumption or not. More than one member of the Legislative Assembly suggested that the banning of liquor licenses served only to promote the sale of unsuspected and impure liquor. All saloon licenses were banned in the 1886 bill and more than a few suggested that this would be counterproductive as then men would have to buy greater quantities, as they would not be able to purchase a single glass. In reply, Nathaniel Spence, a Liberal-Conservative from Hants argued that:

There are many men in the city who would be willing to step in and have a glass with a neighbour who will not have the courage to buy a bottle and take it home and set it before their wives and families, and therefore many a man will go home without having had the glass at all, and the benefit will be greater than the injury.⁶⁰

The Scott Act had not proven itself any more encouraging to the prohibitionists. Though its provisions for ensuring a fair and democratic vote had been improved, its already weak provisions for enforcement had been further eroded by its early constitutional uncertainty. The debate in the Legislative Assembly in 1886 frankly acknowledged this difficulty and speaker after speaker warned that ineffective enforcement was not the greatest danger. Similarly, an editorial in the *Presbyterian Witness* observed that when the Scott Act was not "duly enforced" it became a

reproach to the Temperance cause. The act is nullified and then discredited: and the discredit is supposed to reflect upon all restrictive legislation.⁶¹

This anxiety about the possibility of effective enforcement surfaced in all the political debates on prohibition throughout the century. The hundreds of coves and harbours of Nova Scotia's coastline, combining with its proximity by water to a variety of countries, provided for the best smuggling facilities imaginable. The impressive show of banning the granting of licenses was deceiving as prohibitionists and others alike admitted. Everybody knew where liquor could be obtained. Moreover, people could and did get their supplies sent them from dealers in Halifax along with groceries and other provisions, without trespassing any legal injunctions whatsoever. Prohibitionists, of course, argued that this lack of enforcement simply reflected the corruption of the government in power and suspicions of payoffs were undoubtedly well-founded. Thus by 1886 the prohibitionists were insisting that the liquor licensing legislation provide for the hiring only of legitimate members of temperance societies to act as license inspectors. However, the difficulties with enforcement also reflected a lack of

will both within governments, provincial and municipal, as well in the population at large. The *Acadian Recorder* attempted to explain why the enforcement of prohibition provided particular difficulties:

Prohibitionists, when they complain of the non-enforcement of prohibitory legislation as compared with other laws, continually overlook the fundamental distinction. In the case of almost all other laws designed to repress and forbid any particular action, the thing, the doing of which is repressed is productive of a special injury to some one who is tolerably certain to see that the law will be enforced ... But in the case of the act which prohibitory legislation renders illegal, all parties concerned are sure to do all in their power to throw obstacles in the way of the law and its officers. To expect that in such case any official, no matter how vigilant, can enforce a law of which half the population is seeking to prevent the enforcement, is to expect a miracle.⁶²

The same question about what sort of legislation could be enforced was the major preoccupation of the Royal Commission on the Liquor Traffic when they visited Nova Scotia in 1892. Virtually every witness was asked whether in his experience the Scott Act had contributed to more or less drinking, whether selling by the bottle or by the glass, in hotels or in saloons, encouraged drunkenness, and whether prohibition was indeed possible.

The debate about enforcing liquor licensing or prohibition reflected important differences in attitude towards the role of law in society. The prohibitionists constantly pressing for stiffer legislation sometimes did have to acknowledge the flagrant abuse of the present law. They always had suggestions aplenty about how to make the law more effective, but they also insisted that the rightness of a law was not affected by the degree to which it was observed. George Gigault, member of the Royal Commission of 1892 from Québec and the most blatant in his opposition to prohibition, often asked witnesses: "Do you believe the constant violation of a law leads to the perversion of the moral sense of the people?"⁶³ The absolute prohibitionists responded as the Rev. Joseph Coffin, Methodist Minister from Windsor:

I am not prepared to take the ground that the moral effect is as disastrous as some claim. I take the ground that it is better to have a law, even if it is largely violated, than to have no law, inasmuch as I believe to have the law, even with partial enforcement, is one of the best educators along the line that the law is intended to follow.⁶⁴

They looked upon the law as an educator, in advance of public opinion, laying clear what was right and wrong. The *Yarmouth Herald*, already in the context of the mid-1850's debate, had made this clear:

The Law itself will create public opinion in its favour. It will be so manifestly on the side of virtue, and good order — as the Liquor traffic is manifestly in league with every kind of vice — that men who have character will be anxious to keep it, and they will sustain the Law, out of respect for themselves, and desire for the public weal.⁶⁵

Those more wary of prohibition had a fundamentally different concept of the role of law. They believed that law should reflect the tradition-proven conscience of a people and that a legislature should move very slowly in tampering with the law. George Grant in his 1898 campaign against prohibition urged that society “not strain to the breaking point the traditional respect of our own people for the law. That is the result of centuries of training, and once broken it will not be restored in our day”.⁶⁶

In the twentieth century Nova Scotian society would indeed try prohibition once and for all. E. R. Forbes explains this success very astutely but perhaps errs in viewing the nineteenth-century movement as a “narrow” movement “based upon rural values and ideas of personal salvation.”⁶⁷ Prohibition, virtually from its earliest days, presented society with a fundamental reform challenge and it understandably took a good long while to rethink the religious, political, and administrative implications. The early evangelicalism of the prohibition movement was based on the certitude that poverty and crime could be eliminated if liquor was to be prohibited. The Methodist newspaper, the *Provincial Wesleyan*, articulated this motivation in 1854 when it defended the Maine Liquor Law, despite claims that alcohol consumption had not decreased:

The object of the law is not to prevent people from drinking this or that, but to prevent Pauperism and Crime — to protect the public peace. If the statistics of Pauperism and Crime are in favour of the law, let the amount drank be what it will, if drinking is not diminished, then surely nobody's liberty to drink has been much damaged.⁶⁸

Their undeniable fervour was as much a product of their faith in the improvement they held for society as it was a result of the religious context and language from which it stemmed. One can charge that the movement was surely naive and unsophisticated in this faith but one cannot deny the fundamental nature of the challenge that the prohibition movement posed for nineteenth-century Nova Scotia. One might ascribe to the prohibition movement something of a schizophrenic idealism. The number of people who signed petitions and voted in plebiscites for prohibition is most impressive and yet politicians were rarely punished for failing to put it into effect. It is almost as if Nova Scotians were signing pledges and voting in plebiscites to renew their own self-discipline rather than truly asking for prohibition. Similarly,

the lack of enforcement suggests that the many who were eager to ban all retail sale of liquor were not equally forthcoming to help enforce the legislation. They could order their alcoholic supplies to be delivered safely and legally along with other provisions from Halifax while at the same time boasting that there was no retail sale in their county. Perhaps instinctively Nova Scotians understood the fundamental transition that prohibition required of society. They certainly wanted to be on the side of righteousness and yet take their time to rethink all the implications.

NOTES

1. This article was initially prepared for a graduate seminar in Maritime History taught by Professor Del Muise at Carleton University. I have profited from his critical suggestions and encouragement. Also, I want to thank fellow archivist, Pat Birkett, who generously allowed me to see papers she had prepared on this subject.
2. Graham Decarie's Ph.D. Thesis, "The Prohibition Movement in Ontario: 1894-1916," Queen's 1972, and Ernest Forbes' *Acadiensis* article I, (1971), pp. 11-36 both focus on the twentieth century legislative attempts to enact prohibition and do not investigate the roots of the movement. J. K. Chapman's article, "The Mid-Nineteenth Century Temperance Movement in New Brunswick and Maine" in the *Canadian Historical Review*, Vol. 35, (1954), pp. 43-60 is essential but limits itself to the New Brunswick experiment with prohibition in the 1850's. Ruth Spence's survey, *Prohibition in Canada*, was published in 1919 by the Ontario Branch of the Dominion Alliance for the Total Suppression of the Liquor Traffic in Canada and thus views the temperance-prohibition question as a continuing cause that has not yet quite succeeded.
3. Canada. *Report of the Royal Commission on the Liquor Traffic in Canada. 1895*, p. 770.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 771.
5. *Centennial Book of the Order of the Sons of Temperance of Nova Scotia, 1947*, p. 52 claims that 15 percent of total population and 25 percent of the adult population were enrolled in temperance societies.
- 6.

	Provincial Plebiscite 1892-1894		National Plebiscite 29 September 1898	
	For Prohibition	Against	For Prohibition	Against
Ontario	192,489	110,720	154,498	115,284
Quebec			28,436	122,760
Nova Scotia	43,756	12,355	34,678	5,370
New Brunswick			26,919	9,575
Prince Edward Island	10,616	3,390	9,461	1,146
Manitoba	19,637	7,115	12,419	2,978
British Columbia			5,731	4,756
North-West Territory			6,238	2,824
			278,380	264,693

Taken from F. S. Spence, *The Facts of the Case*, p. 304, and Ruth Spence, *Prohibition in Canada*, p. 248.

7. Ruth Spence, *Prohibition in Canada*, The Ontario Branch of the Dominion Alliance, Toronto, 1919, pp. 37-38.
8. *Centennial Book*, p. 16.
9. *Royal Commission on Liquor Traffic*, p. 771.
10. *Provincial Wesleyan*, 6 March 1856.
11. *Minutes of Evidence - Royal Commission on the Liquor Traffic*, 1893, Vol. 1, pp. 106-112, 273-274.
12. *Acadian Recorder*, 13 March 1894.
13. *Ibid.*, 26 February 1894. The energy which Lithgow devoted to opposing prohibition for this and other reasons suggests that he may have had moral or financial support. No accusations of that sort were made, however, by those who replied to him in the columns of the *Acadian Recorder* and a great deal more research in primary sources would be necessary to investigate this possibility.
14. *Evidence*, p. 10.
15. See James H. Timberlake, *Prohibition and the Progressive Movement*, (Harvard University Press, 1963), John Kobler, *Ardent Spirits*, (G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1973), and Andrew Sinclair, *Prohibition: The Era of Excess*, (Faber & Faber, 1962), on development of this theme in the United States and Brian Harrison, *Drink and the Victorians*, (University of Pittsburg Press, 1971), on the United Kingdom.
16. S. D. Clark, *Church and Sect in Canada*, (University of Toronto Press, 1948), pp. 3-89, Chapters "The Great Awakening in Nova Scotia" and "The Great Revival in Nova Scotia."
17. Edward Manning Saunders, *History of The Baptists of the Maritime Provinces*, (Press of John Burgoyne, Halifax, Nova Scotia, 1902), pp. 208-209.
18. William H. Elgee, *The Social Teachings of the Canadian Churches - Protestant. The Early Period, before 1850*, (The Ryerson Press, 1964), pp. 146-147. Elgee demonstrates that in Upper Canada Methodists played a more aggressive role than in the Maritimes, often leading the movement.
19. *Royal Commission on Liquor Traffic*, p. 772. Five hundred pledges signed the first Sunday with membership reaching five thousand with a few years.
20. *Evidence*, p. 104.
21. Elgee, p. 148; John Moir, *Enduring Witness* (The Bryant Press Limited, n.d.), p. 125.
22. *Presbyterian Witness*, 20 April 1878.
23. *Ibid.*
24. Moir, p. 177.
25. *Presbyterian Witness*, 17 February 1894.
26. *Ibid.*, 24 February 1894.
27. *Provincial Wesleyan*, 2 March 1854.
28. "In Opposition to Prohibition and Coercion" (no publisher, no date; held by Public Archives of Canada Library). Also includes essay by Goldwin Smith and 1855 Speech by Joseph Howe on the Maine Liquor Law.
29. *Debates*, House of Assembly, Nova Scotia, 3 March 1886, p. 123.
30. *Acadian Recorder*, 8 March 1894.
31. *Journals*, House of Assembly, Nova Scotia, 1 December 1834.
32. *Ibid.*, 4 March 1847, p. 225.
33. *Ibid.*, Appendix #68.
34. See article by J. K. Chapman, "The Mid-Nineteenth Century Temperance Movement in New Brunswick and Maine," *Canadian Historical Review*, 35 (1954), pp. 15-22, for a full discussion of these developments.
35. Further evidence of the resoluteness of the prohibition sentiment in Annapolis was presented by H. M. Hirsch, a commercial traveller, to the Royal Commission on Liquor Traffic on July 27, 1892. Hirsch testified that he had never experienced difficulty in obtaining a drink anywhere in Nova Scotia, with the single exception of Annapolis Royal. *Evidence*, p. 100.
36. J. Howe to J. S. Thompson, undated, MG 24 C4, Vol. 1, Public Archives of Canada.
37. William Annad, M.P.P., ed. *The Speeches and Public Letters of the Honourable Joseph Howe*, Volume II, (John P. Jewett, 1858), pp. 209-216. This same speech was quoted and debated at length in the 1886 Debates in the Nova Scotia Assembly and was reprinted in the 1898 national plebiscite campaign pamphlet entitled, "In Opposition to Prohibition and Coercion".
38. *Ibid.*, p. 211.
39. *Ibid.*, p. 215.
40. *Novascotian*, 2 April 1855.
41. *Yarmouth Herald*, 24 April 1856.

42. *Novascotian*, 24 March 1856.
43. *Ibid.*, 22 March 1858.
44. *Ibid.*, 15 April 1858.
45. *Ibid.*
46. Chapman, p. 58.
47. Kobler, pp. 88-95.
48. Spence, p. 148.
49. *Debates*, House of Assembly, Nova Scotia, 7 February 1894, p. 209.
50. Spence, pp. 251-252.
51. *Novascotian*, 24 March 1856.
52. Annand, p. 216.
53. *Royal Commission on Liquor Traffic*, p. 766.
54. *Centennial Book*, p. 80.
55. *Debates*, House of Commons, 3 May 1878, pp. 2400 and 2401.
56. *Royal Commission on Liquor Traffic*, p. 661.
57. Spence, pp. 125-126.
58. F. S. Spence, *The Facts of the Case*, (Newton & Treloar, 1896), p. 92.
59. *Debates*, House of Assembly, Nova Scotia, 31 March and 28 April, 1886.
60. *Ibid.*, 1 April 1886, p. 135.
61. *Presbyterian Witness*, 6 March 1886.
62. *Acadian Recorder*, 3 August 1892.
63. *Evidence*, p. 98.
64. *Ibid.*, p. 229.
65. *Yarmouth Herald*, 24 April 1856.
66. Grant, p. 19.
67. Forbes, p. 11.
68. *Provincial Wesleyan*, 5 January 1854.