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Article abstract
Alcohol policy in New Brunswick was contested terrain. Following the political defeat of prohibition, the province introduced government liquor stores in 1927, but refused for more than three decades to license public establishments, although Legions and private clubs enjoyed a quasi-legal status. By the end of the Second World War, the province had one of the lowest liquor consumption rates in Canada, a small but vocal temperance movement, and a fairly dry hospitality sector. During the 1960s and 1970s, access to alcohol was liberalized with the licensing of taverns and dining rooms, the decriminalization of public drunkenness, and the lowering of the drinking age to 19. Meanwhile, the public health, social service, legal and voluntary sectors lobbied for prevention and treatment programs based on the disease concept of alcoholism, rather than the moralistic arguments of the older temperance movement. By 1975, it was clear that New Brunswick’s alcohol control policies mirrored the wider Canadian experience as residents were treated to competing discourses: drinking was a modern, reasonable, and fashionable recreation but alcohol was society’s most widespread and costly addictions problem.
Civilized Drinking: Alcohol and Society in New Brunswick, 1945-1975
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In 1960, four months before New Brunswick went to the polls in one of the most important elections in its history, Alden Nowlan chided the population for its puritanical, hypocritical and anti-modern attitudes towards alcohol:

The sad fact is that the majority of New Brunswickers who drink are convinced that drinking is immoral. Here we come to the crux of the issue, the point that nobody will admit. The statistics, graphs and comparisons that get thrown back and forth in discussions are really irrelevant. In New Brunswick, liquor isn’t really a political matter. It is a matter of morality, pure and simply.1

In 1960 the province had no legal taverns, beverage rooms, cocktail lounges, or even licensed restaurants. The New Brunswick Temperance Federation claimed a membership of forty thousand and had the ear of government. The ruling Conservatives reflected the values of anglophone New Brunswick and in many ridings that meant restricting access to alcohol. The province was barely one generation removed from the failure of prohibition and the substitution of a tough liquor control statute. In government liquor stores, clerks and counters carefully guarded stocks of beer, spirits and wine from customers. Hours of sale were limited and only home consumption was legal. Yet according to Nowlan, alcohol was readily available through a sizeable network of quasi-legal private clubs that sold beer and liquor by the glass. And once the clubs closed for the evening the bootleggers, who resold supplies purchased at the government stores, took over.2

Across Canada during the 1960s, an increasingly interventionist state chose to loosen restrictions on alcohol. But in 1960 Nowlan doubted whether New Brunswickers were prepared to embrace modernity by liberalizing the legal framework for beverage alcohol. The situation was “a mess” because the

---

1 I wish to acknowledge the support of the University of New Brunswick Research Office and the assistance of researcher Hannah McCarthy.

The clubs were quasi legal because they did not operate under statutory licensing provisions but through informal administrative authority.
wets were “ashamed.” The majority of social drinkers, he suggested, would not only oppose any legal changes, but also “probably admit they consider drinking morally wrong.” In other words, New Brunswickers drank their ale and rum but derived little real pleasure or relaxation from the practice. Employing an idea that would reappear in his literary depictions of a traditional and dysfunctional Maritime society, the twenty-seven-year-old poet/journalist placed the blame on nineteenth-century evangelism, which had been nurtured in constituencies that were “basically poor, ignorant and isolated.”

Hypocritical liquor laws made New Brunswick out of step with the North American mainstream.

This paper is a contribution to the historiography of alcohol regulation in twentieth-century Canada. Aside from the work of Robert Campbell, we know little about the transition from prohibition to government control. Campbell argues that moral regulation and public order were dominant concerns in the management of British Columbia government liquor stores and in the licensing and self-policing of Vancouver beer parlours up to the 1950s. Others have suggested that revenue concerns were the dominant motivation for provincial
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regulation of alcohol in the years after prohibition. An examination of alcohol policy in post-1945 New Brunswick suggests that public discourse and public policy turned increasingly on a notion of guiltless, “civilized” drinking as both a symbol of and a mechanism for societal modernization.

The Temperance Hangover: 1945-60

To most outside and many inside observers, New Brunswick in 1960 was a society lacking in progressive attributes. Like its Maritime neighbours, the province’s experience of the post-World War boom had been uneven. Seasonal resource industries alone could not generate income sufficient for New Brunswick to take its place in modern Canada. Few immigrants had arrived and thousands of residents had left the region for work. Although average per capita income did rise in the 1950s, much of this was because of federal-provincial transfer payments. Per capita net value of production was less than half of the Canadian average in 1951. Literacy levels were low, as were expenditures on education and health. The efficient delivery of social and other services was hampered by a decentralized, outmoded form of municipal organization. According to James Kenny, the provincial state in the 1950s was “fairly undeveloped; the bureaucracy was small and had no tradition of planning long-term development.”

Earlier in the century social reformers had invested heavily in prohibition as a force for regeneration and modernization. Temperance literature had long suggested a link between alcohol and crime. Prohibitionists from the 1850s to the 1920s had argued that by banning the bar, the state would be able to save significant sums on police, courts and jails. Advocates of “moderation” and government control made similar arguments. The object of the 1927 Intoxicating Liquor Act, which ended prohibition, was “generally to promote temperance.” In the post-1945 era, alcohol continued to dominate the lower levels of recorded crime, with several thousand New Brunswickers convicted for drunkenness each year between 1949 and 1958. In this, period police

9 New Brunswick Liquor Control Board, Annual Report, 1927 (Fredericton: King’s Printer, 1928), 4-5.
secured nearly thirteen thousand convictions against the Intoxicating Liquor Act (including bootlegging and illegal sale). In 1952 the province had the highest rate of convictions for public drunkenness of any in Canada: 1,245 per 100,000.10

The arrival of Louis J. Robichaud’s Liberal regime in 1960 signalled the beginning of New Brunswick’s “Quiet Revolution,” a decade of governmental activism that would peak with the controversial Equal Opportunity Program. If the analogy to the modernization of Quebec in the 1960s holds, 1950s liquor administration was part of New Brunswick’s “grande noirceur.” Robichaud, the first elected Acadian premier, had strong support in northern and south-eastern New Brunswick and his cabinet included several francophones. Historically the province’s Acadian areas had been cool towards prohibition. Thus, it is possible to see Robichaud’s commitment to liberalization in part as recognition of francophone cultural values.11 But support for more liberal policies was also evident in the anglophone areas and the English press.12

Public consumption of alcohol in New Brunswick in 1945 or 1960 was illegal. The existence of dozens of private clubs, whose membership equalled the number of adherents of the New Brunswick Temperance Federation, was a flexible, low-profile mechanism for attempting to control social drinking without fully legalizing the sale of alcohol by the glass. Clubs such as the Canadian Legion supposedly served members only and did not sell for profit. Politically, it was safer for the Liberal administration of J.B. McNair (1940-1952) and the Tories under Hugh John Flemming (1952-60) to allow liquor privileges for private clubs on a case-by-case basis. The alternative would have been to stir up temperance resistance against a law that formalized the practices that had developed since 1927 or, worse still, allowed taverns and lounges. The clubs also followed the established patterns of the province’s system of clientism, whereby politically connected “patrons” distributed jobs, contracts and services to local clients, usually on the basis of party loyalty.13

10 Canada Year Book 1960 (Ottawa 1960), 360. In 1946 a Conservative MLA claimed that “89 percent of all our law-breaking” was connected with liquor: New Brunswick, Synoptic Reports of the Legislative Assembly of New Brunswick 1946, 229; Manitoba, Report of the Manitoba Liquor Enquiry Commission (Winnipeg 1954), 294-97.
11 Nowlan in 1960 had predicted that as the province became more Acadian, it would be less puritanical. By the early 1960s, roughly 40 percent of the population was of French ancestry and most of that spoke French. Robichaud’s policies on education and social services were particularly popular in Acadian areas which tended to have scattered rural populations and municipal tax bases that were below the provincial average: Della Stanley, “The 1960s: The Illusions and Realities of Progress,” in The Atlantic Provinces in Confederation, eds. E.R. Forbes and D.A. Muise (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993), 437.
12 See for example the King’s County Record, 10 September 1959.
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The Liberal opposition identified provincial liquor administration as a key government soft spot in the late 1950s. Other election issues included a controversial hospital premium tax. The Liberals also benefited from expectations unleashed by the "Atlantic Revolution," a cooperative, elite-led protest movement against Federal economic policies that had gathered steam after 1949 when Newfoundland entered Confederation. Premier Flemming had been a key leader of the movement.

Alcohol had troubled municipal and provincial politicians in New Brunswick for a century or more. In the 1850s, the province had enacted the first prohibition law in British North America. Because of divided public opinion and difficulties in enforcement, the statute had been repealed. Following the introduction of the Canada Temperance Act (Scott Act) in 1878, which allowed municipalities to vote on local prohibition, most of the province went officially dry. When provincial prohibition was legislated for May 1917, 90 percent of New Brunswickers were living in Scott Act municipalities or counties, where it was already illegal to sell or buy alcohol. Provincial prohibition took effect in 1917. The enforcement of prohibition in the 1920s was a contentious issue that convinced moderate drays that government control was the better option.

In 1927 Premier J.B.M. Baxter, without consulting public opinion, had repealed prohibition. Following the lead of six other provinces and one territory, New Brunswick passed the Intoxicating Liquor Act (ILA) which restricted liquor sales to government stores. For provincial officials facing demands for modern roads, hospitals, rural electrification, and mothers and old age pensions, alcohol profits were difficult to pass up. To reassure nervous drays, the government organized a provincial police force to enforce the liquor law and deliver general rural policing services. The bar, an anathema to both the old-time temperance evangelical and the early twentieth-century Social Gospeller, would not return in the government control era. For more than thirty years there would be no provision in law for licensed premises.

The New Brunswick Liquor Control Board (NBLCB) administered the ILA, which focussed on the operation of the liquor stores. The commission had the power to restrict the quantity of liquor which individuals could purchase and to place individuals on a restricted list if they were suspected of bootlegging.

---

17 Davis, "Prohibition in New Brunswick"; S.N. Branch, *Practices and Principles of Liquor Control in Some Canadian Provinces* (Halifax 1959). According to Branch, the NBLCB usually refused to establish a liquor store in a community until the municipal authorities had made a request.
by the RCMP or local police. The commission’s powers also extended into the area of search warrants and early release from custody, in effect interfering with the powers of the courts. In the 1930s liquor revenues fell and consumer spending declined. During the Second World War, as a result of federal government restrictions on supply, and as an attempt to limit resale bootlegging, the NBLCB introduced a quota system that eventually changed into a ration book or permit system. Although taxes and prices were raised (to the highest in Canada), higher levels of employment and larger pay packets meant increased purchases and by 1945 liquor revenues constituted a record one-quarter of New Brunswick’s budget. 18

The retail network began in 1927 with thirty-seven stores and three dispensaries. The NBLCB also maintained three warehouses and a mail order department; the mail order service was later discontinued. 19 Unlike Nova Scotia, which introduced government sale in 1930, New Brunswick made no provision for plebiscites on whether liquor stores should be opened in a given locale. By the late 1950s, the number of “government stores” had climbed to forty, with a staff of more than three hundred. Compared to other jurisdictions, the ratio of population to outlets was high and hours of sale were restricted, making it difficult for many working people to make their purchases. In terms of liquor revenues as a percentage of its budget, 1950s New Brunswick was the fourth most dependent province in Canada. By the early 1950s, provincial alcohol revenues were twelve dollars per capita. 20

The 1940s was an important era for changing drinking habits. Increased consumer spending was probably the most important variable, as well as the fact that the generation born after the end of prohibition was coming of age. A large percentage of New Brunswick men of military age served in the armed forces, where wet canteens and rum rations were commonplace. Soldiers, airmen and sailors also socialized in wet civilian settings overseas. The rate of per capita consumption of alcohol in New Brunswick in the late 1940s and early 1950s, although lower than other parts of Canada, rose to levels to match the early 1870s, prior to the introduction of the Canada Temperance Act. 21 According to the NBLCB, in the late 1950s rum and other spirits represented

18 New Brunswick Liquor Control Board, Annual Report, 1939-45 (Fredericton: King’s Printer, 1940-46; Saint John Evening Times Globe (ETG), 2 February 1965; New Brunswick, Synoptic Reports of the Legislative Assembly of New Brunswick, 1945, 215; 1961-62, 49, 62, 143-44, 221-222. The permit system was discontinued following World War II.

19 Mail orders, from the headquarters in Fredericton, were a tiny fraction of overall sales. The service was ended with the reorganization of the NBLCB into the Liquor Control Commission in 1962: NBLC, Annual Report, 1962, 5-6.

20 Manitoba Liquor Enquiry Commission, 282; 297. In 1952 liquor revenues were 14 percent of the provincial budget. The rate of profit for the NBLCC was 40.9 percent of sales in 1954.

half of the total alcohol purchased by value, with beer and wine 45 percent and 5 percent respectively.\textsuperscript{22}

Even more so than Nova Scotia, which had allowed taverns in 1948, in New Brunswick the issue of “sale by the glass” was political dynamite prior to the 1940s.\textsuperscript{23} The anomaly in the liquor control system was the practice of allowing private clubs such as the Canadian Legion, military canteens and golf and curling clubs to buy spirits, beer and wine from the NBLCB for sale and consumption on premises. Prior to World War II, the number of clubs enjoying this privilege was limited, but the total climbed in the 1940s and 1950s as more veterans’, sporting, social and fraternal organizations applied to sell liquor to members and guests. By the early 1960s, scores of clubs were buying liquor from the NBLCB; total membership was estimated at thirty-five thousand, “of whom many are highly respected and influential citizens in their communities.”\textsuperscript{24} The commission also gave approval for wet special occasions such as dances and receptions.

In practice, private clubs that wished to enjoy quasi-legal status had to apply to the NBLCB commissioner, who would grant administrative approval. The RCMP and municipal police, charged with enforcement of the ILA, accepted the commissioner’s approval as a tacit privilege for specific clubs to sell to members and guests. Increasingly in the 1950s there were concerns that specific clubs were abusing their privileges by operating as profit-making ventures. The manner through which clubs were accorded “privileges” is a classic example of clientism. Although authority seems to have rested with the NBLCB commissioner, the input of the local MLA was important. Press accounts placed the number of private clubs enjoying wet privileges in 1960 in the hundreds; Saint John alone was reputed to have forty.\textsuperscript{25} The RCMP, which in 1932 had taken over provincial policing duties, kept tabs on clubs selling alcohol and noted whether they had received authorization from Fredericton or were “disorderly.” To discipline a club that sold to non-members or sold alcohol after hours, the liquor board could rescind privileges, as happened in the case

\textsuperscript{22} Branch, \textit{Practices and Principles}, Appendix C.
\textsuperscript{23} Moncton Transcript, 16 November 1939; Nova Scotia, \textit{The Nova Scotia Liquor Control Act: Regulations Pertaining to the Licensing of Hotels and Taverns Made by the Nova Scotia Liquor Commission} (Halifax: 1948). This legislation set up a tavern licensing committee consisting of a county court judge, a business representative, a labour representative and a fourth individual.
\textsuperscript{24} Report of the New Brunswick Liquor Inquiry Commission. (Fredericton: Queen’s Printer, 1961), 11. In Nova Scotia, clubs, messes and military canteens were granted permits by the Nova Scotia Liquor Commission.
of the St. Leonard Curling Club in 1952. The next step would be to prosecute under the ILA. This was a politically sensitive area, with Conservatives complaining during life of the Flemming government (1952-60) that Liberal-dominated clubs enjoyed undeserved privileges. Correspondence in the Flemming papers suggests that the NBLCB on occasion did not prosecute illegal clubs without first notifying the premier. Under the ILA, considerable discretion existed as to fines and jail terms; both MLAs and the commissioner interceded to rescind fines under the ILA and to release convicted offenders from jail before the completion of their sentence. The commission also was able to grant RCMP or municipal police “blanket” search warrants for specific suspected premises such as hotels.26

Between 1927 and the major legislative revision of the early 1960s, a number of amendments were made to the ILA and its administration. In the 1936, the three-person commission was reduced to a single commissioner. The NBLCB bottled its own low-priced spirits to compete with moon shiners and bootleggers. Amendments enacted in 1945 gave the commissioner increased control over extracts, toilet lotions, and Sterno, substances thought to be abused by lower-class drinkers. As of the 1950s, brand advertising of alcohol was not legal, but “institutional” advertising was allowed in newspapers, subject to approval of the NBLCB.27

Although the appointment of an administrative board was designed to remove a contentious issue from politics, liquor administration was interwoven into the patronage system. The chair of the Liquor Control Board was an important patronage position and party influence extended to liquor store managers and clerks. The ruling party also appears to have influenced the appointment of liquor company sales representatives. Distillers and brewers, whose products could be sold only through the NBLCB, were solicited for campaign donations. In the mid 1950s the province had two breweries, Red Ball and Moosehead, and private clubs were required by the NBLCB to purchase beer from both. As political scandals revealed in the 1970s, there were also supply and hauling contracts associated with the Liquor Control Board. Successful contractors were expected to donate a percentage of their earnings to the local party orga-


nization. According to popular accounts of 1950s electioneering, party organizations also used gifts of liquor on election day to sway voters.28

A Quiet Revolution in Drinking

The modern discourse on alcohol, as enunciated by Alden Nowlan in 1960, was that the province needed a more rational attitude towards liquor. Under the LCA, the only place in the province that legal drinking could be enjoyed was in private residences. Tourism promoters were banking on the appeal of the region’s natural scenery and historic past. However, the hospitality industry was aware that most of the hundreds of thousands of visitors who arrived in the Maritimes came from states and provinces where they were able to enjoy “a drink in comfortable surroundings.”29 The provincial municipalities association advocated local option to allow community opinion to settle the matter, essentially the tactic of the late nineteenth-century Scott Act. According to the liberal critique, restrictive liquor laws were a sign of backwardness and the result of the power of “relatively small and narrow-minded groups” over timid politicians.30 A provincial newspaper association pressing for the right to run liquor advertisements dismissed opponents as “virtual prohibitionists who object to anything connected with alcohol.”31

Following World War II, alcohol use in New Brunswick, as in other provinces, was redefined. The forces of modernization included economic self-interest, individual rights, class justice and administrative fairness. In the early to mid 1950s, the New Brunswick Hotel Association, the provincial Trades and Labour Council, the provincial Canadian Congress of Labour, the New Brunswick Police Association and the Saint John Barristers Society all went on record as advocating modernization of the liquor law. Their critique was four fold. First, the existence of “unlicensed and illegal clubs” was a legal and administrative anomaly. Second, tourism and hotel operators argued that they required the right to sell alcohol by the glass or open bottle in order to remain competitive. The Saint John Trades and Labour Council suggested that a

28 PANB, RS 415, Joseph P. Hatty to Hugh John Flemming, 6 December 1954; Thorburn, The Politics, 111-112; RS 416, 1960/210, New Brunswick Liquor Control Board; 1965/225, Robichaud to Harry Leblanc, 1 February 1965; Richard Starr, Richard Hatfield: The Seventeen Year Saga (Halifax: Formac, 1987), 70, 72, 100; Michel Cormier and Achille Michaud, Richard Hatfield: Power and Disobedience (Fredericton: Goose Lane, 1992), ch. 4. For the situation in Nova Scotia, see Dalton Camp, Gentlemen, Players and Politicians (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1970), chs. 18-19. The commissioner could be removed only by a two-thirds vote in the Assembly.


31 ETG, 3 February 1965.
strictly regulated system of licensed cocktail lounges and beer parlours would effectively promote temperance and combat illegal sales. The fact that press accounts stressed that members of the province’s elite often belonged to several wet clubs brought up class issues. The wealthy, educated and politically connected, it seemed, could be trusted with alcohol in Saint John’s elite Union Club or Moncton’s City Club, but the “working man” had no access to taverns. Such sentiments were increasingly unpalatable in the more egalitarian political culture of post-1945 Canada. But it was the hospitality and tourism lobby that was most vocal and best organized. In its eyes, the ILA was an embarrassing and costly anachronism; liquor licenses would allow proprietors to upgrade their hotels and restaurants. A committee of the Hotel Association in 1956 asked Premier Flemming: “is New Brunswick right and the rest of the world wrong?”

Following RCMP raids on a Bathurst hotel and a private club in Restigouche in 1960, both the Saint John Board of Trade and the Maritime Province Board of Trade asked for a review of New Brunswick’s liquor administration.

The brewing and distilling interests of Canada also attempted to project a “common sense” or integrationist approach to alcohol regulation. In 1960, the Maritime division of the Dominion Brewers’ Association (DBA) called upon governments to recognize that most adult Canadians enjoyed drinking in moderation. Traditionally, Maritimers spent more on spirits such as rum than on beer and wine, and the brewers hoped to capitalize on a post-war national trend towards beer. In a document prepared for Nova Scotia (where liquor laws were more liberal than in New Brunswick), the DBA noted that although Nova Scotia’s liquor laws were more restrictive than the Canadian average, the province suffered the second highest rate of conviction for drunkenness. Beer, furthermore, was “a light, moderate drink” that was “very much part of the Canadian way of life.”

The industry consistently stressed its positive economic impact. For example, when Oland’s Brewery Limited opened a new plant in Saint John in 1965, the company stressed its contributions to wages and to federal and provincial taxation. Similarly, when Moosehead Breweries opened a new packaging plant in 1971, the press noted its “high standards of production” and contributions to the Maritime economy. Civic and provincial officials were conscious of the fact

32 PANB, RS 415, Thomas D. Owens to Hon. Hugh John Flemming, 12 July 1956; New Brunswick Hotel Association to Hon. Hugh John Flemming, 27 November 1956. In 1956 Flemming wrote both the Hotel Association and a Protestant minister who supported temperance to reassure them that the Conservative government was giving their concerns thoughtful consideration: Flemming to John S. Taylor, 27 November 1956; Flemming to Rev. J.G.E. Ball, 20 July 1956.


34 DBA, A Realistic Approach; ETG, 13 February 1964. See also Gusfield, Contested Meanings, 21-24.
that Moosehead was a locally owned industry in an industrial city, Saint John. The breweries also carefully supported community sports and charities.35 One of Robichaud’s economic development successes for northern New Brunswick was the opening of the Morgan Maritime Rums Limited distillery at Richibucto.36

In the 1950s and early 1960s, an important part of the discourse of modernization was that alcoholism was a disease or medical condition that should not be condemned, but understood and treated. This message was part of the influential 1954 Bracken Report on liquor administration in Manitoba.37 It also influenced the national United Church Board of Evangelism and Social Service to establish a commission on temperance in 1957. Part of the commission’s role was to “outline the Church’s responsibility in regard to the rehabilitation of alcoholics.”38 In the 1950s, the rate of alcohol abuse in the Maritimes, according to the Alcoholism Research Foundation (ARF), was lower than the national average, reflecting the presence of a large minority of abstainers (41 percent of the population in 1954) and lower levels of disposable income. But alcoholism was cause for concern amongst social agencies, voluntary organizations, and government departments.39

The other side of the question came from traditional temperance groups represented by the New Brunswick Temperance Federation (NBTF), which received a small operating grant from the province. The federation, whose leaders were often evangelical clergy, opposed liberalization. Protestant denominations dominated the English-speaking counties, and the Baptists, historically linked with temperance, were usually the most numerous. Kings County aside, the second biggest Protestant group was the United Church, also closely associated with the dry crusades of the past. Historically, the Church of England tended to be more liberal on control issues.40 The United Church Conference Committee on Evangelism and Social Service opposed the quasi-legal clubs, in part because they led to abuses, and more importantly because their existence potentially paved the way for fully licensed, publicly accessible taverns and lounges. Temperance forces expressed disappointment with mayors and city

39 Manitoba Liquor Enquiry Commission, 273, 294. The ARF, founded in 1951 as an agency of the Ontario government, conducted a clinic in Toronto and supported research. In the early 1960s it added “drug addiction” to its title and later was named the Addictions Research Foundation. See: Smart and Ogborne, Northern Spirits.
40 Thorburn, The Politics, 51-58. At mid-century, Protestant areas tended to support the Conservatives. As Thorburn pointed out, Charlotte County, which was strongly Liberal in the 1940s and 1950s, was an exception in that it was 85 percent Protestant. King’s County, a rural area east of Saint John, was part of the province’s “Bible belt.”
officials who advocated increased hours for liquor stores and additional outlets. To temperance advocates, convenience or tourism arguments did not outweigh the moral and public safety risks of increasing public access to alcohol.41

In 1952, Flemming’s Conservatives defeated the ruling Liberals who had been in power since the Depression years. The campaign had been shaped by the introduction of an unpopular 4 percent sales tax, the government’s opposition to public sector unionization, and accusations that efforts directed against polio and tuberculosis had been insufficient. Flemming’s second victory, in 1956, hinged on his policy to develop hydroelectricity. In neither election did liquor administration play a major role.42

In 1960 the Liberals were returned to power under Robichaud, who appointed the “first linguistically balanced cabinet” in the province’s history.43 Despite press criticism of the ILA prior to the election, Flemming had promised no changes in the law, citing the divided nature of public opinion.44 Fulfilling one of his chief election promises, Robichaud appointed an inquiry into liquor administration in late 1960. Its mandate was to examine the operation of the government stores, the provision for club licenses, and the issue of sale by the glass in “public houses,” restaurants and nightclubs. In keeping with progressive attitudes towards alcohol, the commission also was tasked with examining issues such as “alcoholic education” and treatment and rehabilitation of “problem drinkers.”45 The inquiry, chaired by Justice G.F.G. Bridges, was aware of the detailed report of the Bracken commission in Manitoba and similar studies by legislative committees in Alberta and Saskatchewan. The Temperance Federation was concerned not only that the panel contained no temperance, church or medical spokespersons, but also that it included a prominent labour leader who was known to favour taverns. Bridges personally subscribed to the theory that “guilty drinking” was socially undesirable because it promoted immoderate use. The New Brunswick panel also was cognizant of the Nova Scotia commission on alcohol, which was studying the question of liberalized access. The Bridges commission chose to avoid the issues of nightclubs and the social costs of alcohol consumption.46

41 PANB, RS 415, Rev. J.G.E. Ball to Hon. Hugh John Flemming, 17 July 1956. Ball’s comments indicate that certain temperance interests accepted the unlicensed clubs as a necessary evil.
43 Starr, Richard Hatfield, 122.
44 ETG, 2 March 1960.
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Hearings were held in Edmundston, Woodstock, Campbellton, Bathurst, Newcastle, Saint John, St. Stephen, Moncton and Fredericton.47 The committee also met with NBLCB chair C.L. Dougherty, who advised that when appointed in 1956, he had decided not to allow liquor privileges to any new private clubs other than branches of the Royal Canadian Legion. Dougherty opposed taverns but favoured cocktail bars, both for their clientele and their ease of supervision. He also opposed beer sales in grocery stores and evening hours for liquor stores. The customer permit system, used for revenue and control purposes in Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, was impractical in his view.48

Although there was Roman Catholic and francophone interest in temperance, the Acadian areas of the province tended to be more liberal on alcohol regulation. In the 1950s, three northern or eastern counties (Madawaska, Gloucester and Kent) were classified as more than 80 percent ethnically French and Restigouche was more than 60 percent francophone. Culturally, the Acadians were thought to have wetter drinking habits than anglophones and past plebiscites had revealed less support for prohibition in Acadian ridings than in anglophone New Brunswick. However, in 1961, political scientist Hugh Thorburn suggested that people in the north-eastern and south-eastern Acadian areas were more “dour” than the “more light-hearted and gay” region of Madawaska, with its close ties with Quebec.49 The Bridges hearings revealed that temperance and alcoholism awareness were alive and well in francophone areas of the province, with presentations by les Cercles Lacordaire, le chapitre caisses populaires de Kent and similar French Roman Catholic groups that essentially echoed those of the United Baptist Church and the Women’s Missionary Society of the United Church in opposing changes to the ILA. The Conservative government had promised to help fund the Lacordaire groups to provide temperance education along the lines of the Temperance Federation. Social Catholicism retained a moralistic streak that was not inhospitable to total abstinence. More moderate francophone organizations such as La Ligue de Sobriété and Les Ligues du Sacré-Coeur did not oppose sale by hotels and restaurants.50

47 More than two hundred organizations or individuals submitted briefs, which later were destroyed by commission staff.
49 Thorburn, The Politics, 46-47; Davis, “I’ll Drink to That.” Thorburn also asserted that the Acadians of Gloucester and Kent counties were “simple and honest rural people” who lacked their own leaders and who were politically docile, 68.
Among the individuals and organizations who attended the hearings or submitted briefs, three categories dominated: religious and/or temperance organizations, business interests and private clubs. Protestant and Roman Catholic organizations, hotel, motel and restaurant operators, and sporting and fraternal clubs made presentations or submitted documents. Radio stations made a recommendation for legalizing liquor advertisements and labour organizations requested licenses for taverns and expressed opposition to local option provisions along the lines of Nova Scotia's 1948 legislation.\textsuperscript{51} The Maritime division of the Dominion Brewers Association presented the results of a 1960 public opinion survey which suggested majority support for sale of beer by the glass.\textsuperscript{52} At each meeting, the inquiry convened privately with the RCMP, local police, judicial officials and liquor store managers to discuss operation of NBLCB outlets, illegal sale to minors, bootlegging and law enforcement. Although opinions within this group varied, a recurring theme was an expansion of legal access in order to undercut bootlegging. This included licensing of clubs and extended hours for retail outlets. Officials in rural areas and small towns were not always supporters of taverns, but in the cities, opinion was more positive. Major General N.E. Roberts, chair of the Manitoba Liquor Control Board, explained the regulation of licensed restaurants and beer parlours in the West. These in-camera sessions also revealed a degree of sensitivity to new tactics for treating chronic drinkers, such as halfway houses and counselling. Two social scientists and members of Alcoholics Anonymous dismissed the temperance argument that increased numbers of outlets would lead to greater alcohol abuse. In fact, statistics such as the rate of convictions for impaired driving and fatal automobile accidents suggested the opposite.\textsuperscript{53}

The Bridges' report advocated liberalization of the retail system and legal recognition and control of private clubs in order to develop consent for the law. The situation of the clubs was clearly illegal and organizations had grown accustomed to bar revenues which they were using to carry out repairs and improvements to facilities. Restricting sale to purchases by the bottle had encouraged illegal consumption in public places and over-consumption in private. The report's specific recommendations can be summarized as follows: (1) licenses for clubs owned by the Canadian Legion and other non-profit groups; (2) a new class of licenses for sale by the glass, including taverns, dining

\textsuperscript{51} \textit{ETG}, 17 January 1961.

\textsuperscript{52} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{53} Ibid., \textit{Atlantic Advocate} 51/6 (February 1961): 14-15. In the late 1950s, New Brunswick had the second lowest number of liquor outlets in Canada, but relatively high rates, for Canada, in vehicular deaths and convictions for drunken driving. For the Canadian research literature at this time, see Robert Popham and Wolfgang Schmidt, \textit{A Decade of Alcoholism Research: A Review of the Research Activities of the Alcohol and Drug Addiction Research Foundation of Ontario, 1951-1961} (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1961).
rooms, lounges, hunting and fishing lodges and beverage rooms; (3) additional liquor stores with more flexible hours; (4) a province-wide liquor control law (no local option provision); (5) the removal of the NBLCB’s discretionary powers in reference to fines and jail terms; (6) an increased educational effort directed against alcohol abuse; (7) improved treatment programs and facilities for alcoholics; and (8) legalization of media advertisements of liquor.  

In late 1961, the Robichaud government introduced Bill 11, a liquor control statute that incorporated most of the Bridges’ report recommendations. The bill promised to rebuild “respect for the law,” and had been adapted from legislation in Manitoba, Alberta, and other provinces. The proposal set off an extended debate in the Assembly, one that revealed the opposition Conservatives to be split on the issue of liberalization. Temperance forces had been disheartened by the Bridges’ report’s finding against local option, the framework that had kept most of the province officially dry prior to provincial prohibition in 1917, and Robichaud excluded it from the bill. A number of Protestant activists accused the government of reneging on a promise not to introduce taverns. A delegation from the United Baptists had warned the government that increasing hours of sales of liquor stores would promote, not regulate, alcohol. The Conservative old guard, with strong ties to the evangelical churches, voted against the Liquor Control Bill but a number of “progressive” Tories such as Gordon Fairweather, Flemming’s former Attorney General, supported the Liberals. The temperance wing of the party particularly opposed the provision for Sunday sales in restaurants. Conservative MLAs also attacked the bill for its insufficient attention to the problems of alcoholism.

The New Brunswick Liquor Control Act came into force in May of 1962; it established a three-member New Brunswick Liquor Control Commission (NBLCC) to supervise government liquor stores, and a licensing board. The latter had seven members, one of whom was a member of the NBLCC, and its recommendations were subject to commission approval. The board heard all applications for licensed premises. Taverns, which the Bridges committee had recommended with reluctance, could serve beer until 10:45 p.m. six days a week, excluding Sunday. Lounges could serve until slightly later in the evening. Clubs could not serve on Sundays. Licensed restaurants could operate in unincorporated areas, taverns only in towns and cities. In the Assembly, the premier spoke of taverns as serving “the labouring class of people.” In addition

56 ETG, 2 May 1962.
57 Synoptic Reports, 1961-62, 225-33; Starr, Richard Hatfield, 20; Cormier and Michaud, Richard Hatfield, 37.
58 ETG, 28 June 1962.
to a license fee, the NBLCC would receive a percentage of beer, spirits and wine sales. Clubs had to keep detailed records on members and guests, and limits were placed on the number of times an individual could be a guest. Waiters who served alcohol now had to be licensed. The commission set no minimum or maximum prices for drinks by the glass, but the usual restrictions on taverns found in other jurisdictions were in place: patrons could not stand with drinks; taverns could have no bar, booths or stools and there could be no more than four men to a table. The interior had to be clearly visible from the outside. All premises, including private clubs, had to serve food, thought to be associated with “temperate drinking habits.”

As Mariana Valverde notes, the regulation of drinking establishments was based primarily on cleanliness, order and self-policing by tavern and club staff.

A government spokesperson, justifying the first public drinking spots in thirty-five years, explained that “establishments are available to those people who patronize them, while at the same time ensuring that their operation does not prove offensive to the people who are opposed to the selling or use of liquor.” Licensing procedures began in time to meet the 1962 tourism season and a staff of seven inspectors was hired. In its first fiscal year, the NBLCC issued licenses for eight taverns, forty-two dining rooms, fifteen lounges, fifty-four military canteens, and one hundred and nine clubs. Taverns, especially in the early 1960s, were controversial outside of urban, industrial centres. For example, the town council and Chamber of Commerce for Caraquet, an Acadian fishing community, successfully blocked a tavern license bid in 1963 on the grounds of feared social costs.

By the late 1960s, NBLCC stores were described as “one of the major manifestations of the New Brunswick government.” The number of stores rose from forty-one in 1963 to fifty-nine in 1971. Old buildings were repaired and new facilities were built. The profit margin (based on the commission’s mark-up, not provincial and federal taxes) was high. Warehouses in Fredericton, Saint John, Moncton and Newcastle supplied both the stores and licensed premises. Prior to the municipal reorganization, which transformed thousands of municipal employees into provincial public servants, liquor store workers were one of the largest groups of provincial employees. Traditionally, customers at government
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stores had to fill out order slips for beer, spirits and wine that was kept in storage. This procedure reflected the earlier view of liquor not as a consumer product but a dangerous substance. In the 1969-70 fiscal year, the commission, following up on a management consultant’s study, converted fourteen outlets to full self-service and four additional stores to beer self-service.65

Temperance forces were on the defensive: a representative of the New Brunswick Temperance Federation called the right of licensed restaurants to sell liquor with meals on Sunday “misguided,” and predicted that tipping of waiters and entertainment in lounges would increase consumption. One concession to propriety was that restaurant patrons had to ask for beer, liquor and wine lists.66 The Salvation Army and Women’s Christian Temperance Union (WCTU) also opposed Sunday sales. Protestant groups had been active during the Bridges hearings; Baptist churches had distributed thousands of mail-in cards. Beginning in 1962, Protestant clergy appeared before the licensing board to oppose specific bids for tavern and lounge licenses. Ministerial associations and individual churches brought up Social Gospel-era arguments against taverns in their towns or counties, as well as the nuisance arguments mentioned by property owners. The “no taverns” rule favoured by such organizations as the United Church of St. Stephen clashed with the view of civic officials and town planners who approved of such establishments in commercial zones. By the early 1970s, the main concern was that entrepreneurs were attempting to open taverns in shopping centres, which social conservatives regarded as areas of family activity.67

The WCTU expressed disapproval of the Liquor Control Act, urging members to lobby for the limitation of licensed outlets, and vowed to fight alcohol advertisements.68 The WCTU, the Women’s Institute, and other old-line temperance groups attempted to adopt some of the rhetoric of the more secular alcoholism awareness movement, becoming early advocates of breathalyser tests for suspected drivers. But their objectives remained rooted in the moral notions of the past: alcohol was an absolute evil and abstinence was the best policy. The national president of the WCTU approved of the legal framework for alcohol in the Maritimes, where cocktail bars were rare. In 1966, the WCTU still campaigned against drinking, smoking, gambling and crime comics.69
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Partly because of this backlash, Robichaud disappointed magazine and newspaper publishers by keeping a tight lid on liquor advertisements. In a letter to the provincial Weekly Newspapers Association, he argued that his government could not support product advertisements in media printed in the province because the aim of such advertising was to promote increased consumption.70

The Liquor Control Act created a new lobby. Tavern owners and licensed restaurateurs laid claim to strong arguments: the era’s more permissive social climate; property rights; class justice; job creation and tourism.71 In 1964 the provincial tavern owners’ association approved of extended hours for taverns, lounges and clubs. Charles Dougherty, chair of the NBLCC, explained that the new hours were designed to “reconcile the commercial licensee with his substantial investment in suitable premises and equipment.”72 By the end of the decade there were thirty-five taverns, an equal number of lounges and several dozen licensed restaurants. Licensed clubs, military canteens and legions totalled more than two hundred. In 1969 the LCA was amended to allow suppliers to ship stock directly to bars, clubs and restaurants, ending the wholesale monopoly of the commission.73

Until the 1970s, New Brunswick’s taverns were spartan, drab, male-only institutions. The Bridges’ report, after examination of practices in other provinces, had recommended the male-only rule for taverns, without explanation. For both sexes, it had suggested licensed beer parlours or beverage rooms. This idea was too radical for Robichaud’s government, which did not include beer parlours in the licensing provisions. The 1962 law had banned both female patrons and waiters in taverns. Women, furthermore, could not hold liquor licenses until amendments were made in 1968. Politics in New Brunswick was literally an “old boys” club. Although women had enjoyed the right to vote in provincial elections since 1919, they had been allowed to run for political office only since 1934, with the first woman elected as provincial MLA only in 1967 and the first female MPs elected in general elections only in the 1990s. They also were excluded from jury duty until the 1970s. Other than an occasional letter to the press, there was little public debate of the inequities of the regulation of taverns by gender, which was justified on the grounds of combating immorality and prostitution. When criticism did arise, it was couched in class terms: working “girls” and working-class wives were being denied access to low-cost entertainment. Press accounts described women waiting in automobiles while spouses drank bottled and draught beer in taverns. A Presbyterian
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congregation in Campbellton, in a letter to the premier, opposed the sale of beer
to women in taverns as an example of deteriorating moral standards that would
lead to "the further breakdown of home life and the degeneration of woman-
hood." Women were able to attend private clubs and a small number of cocktail
lounges, but many single women did not feel comfortable in the latter. In the
lounges, entertainment was allowed but dancing was prohibited.74

Amendments in 1970 authorized beverage rooms for women in towns and
cities and males-only taverns outside of incorporated villages, towns and cities.
In 1971, the oldest tavern in Saint John (George's) became the first in New
Brunswick to admit women. "Ladies and escorts" were allowed in a separate
section; men who did not accompany women were restricted to the regular tav-
ern section. Press coverage of the opening was positive, and stressed the quaint
decor, the hearty meals, and the social benefits of the tavern for both "working
girls" and married women. There were few public criticisms of the reform from
religious or temperance organizations. Yet most taverns, unlike lounges,
remained off limits to women, prompting allegations of class discrimination.75

Alcoholics, Problem Drinkers, Teenagers and Social Policy

Following World War II, the expansion of the welfare state and the profession-
alization of social work coincided with a recasting of various types of social
deviance. In official discourse and, increasingly, in the media, "drunkards," like
unwed mothers, the mentally ill and many types of criminals, were no longer
regarded as moral or biological failures, but rather as individuals who deserved
medical and psychological treatment and counselling.76 As the Nova Scotia
Alcoholism Research Commission noted in 1961, the disease concept aside,
fever doubted that alcohol had negative public health effects.77

The "discovery" of alcoholism in post-war Canada was a gradual and uneven
process. In the 1940s, the Alcoholics Anonymous movement spread into the
Maritimes, carrying the message of self-help and the theory that alcoholism

74 ETG, 27 September, 1 October, 4 October, 25 October 1965; 23 April 1970; 27 January 1972;
PANB, RS416, 1970/210, Rev. Murray Graham to L.J. Robichaud, 20 April 1970; Synoptic
Reports, 1961-62, 263; 1968, 485-86. See also, Mimi Ajzenstadt, "Cycles of Control: Alcohol
Regulation and the Construction of Gender Role, British Columbia 1870-1925," International
Journal of Canadian Studies 11 (Spring 1995): 101-20; Robert Campbell, "Ladies and Escorts:
Gender Segregation and Public Policy in British Columbia Beer Parlours, 1925-1945," BC
Studies 105-06 (Spring/Summer 1995): 119-38; Campbell, "Managing the Marginal." 
Contemporary research stressed the working-class basis of taverns and beer parlours: Smart
and Ogborne, Northern Spirits, 79.

76 Margaret J.H. Little, "No Car, No Radio, No Liquor Permit": The Moral Regulation of Single
was a condition or disease that could be controlled but never cured. From Quebec came the Domrémy movement, which in the late 1950s founded the Foyer St. Antoine in Moncton, a drop-in centre for alcoholics, and a mutual aid centre in Edmundston in 1964. Al-Anon, a group for the families of alcoholics, became active in the mid 1960s. In 1964, the federal Royal Commission on Health Services warned of the increasing incidence of alcoholism and of the inability of public facilities and programs to respond. The medicalization of alcoholism continued, although in New Brunswick public understanding and sympathy and treatment facilities lagged behind other jurisdictions. Increasingly, however, the public discourse was that alcoholism was "a preventable and treatable illness" that should be met with compassion and up-to-date medical treatment, not apathy or moral condemnation.

In 1962, as part of his alcohol policy, Robichaud had appointed J. Edward Carten as a director of alcohol education and rehabilitation within the Department of Health. Education and awareness materials were distributed to junior high and high schools, and presentations were made to thousands of physical education and health students each year. The department also offered alcohol counselling and attended meetings and workshops. Community groups such as the Greater Saint John Council on Alcoholism, and Drug Addiction and Lacordaire gathered studies, embarked on fact-finding missions to other jurisdictions, lobbied for treatment facilities similar to Toronto's Harbour Light institution, and delivered their own education programs. As the public continued to "discover" the alleged wide extent of alcohol problems, three specific pathological populations were highlighted: skid row "rummies," problem drinkers, and adolescents.

The skid row alcoholic, usually a lower class male known to the police, was an urban type whose presence brought the first detoxification beds to hospital wards. Treatment of the more visible urban manifestations of alcohol
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CIVILIZED DRINKING

abuse overlapped with a campaign by criminal justice reformers to decriminalize the traditional offence of public intoxication. For decades, police departments and magistrates' courts had been arresting, convicting, fining and jailing drunken recidivists. In 1963, for example, three quarters of the prisoners committed to the Saint John county jail were sentenced for liquor violations, principally public intoxication. Under the LCA, the province subsidized the cost of jailing individuals arrested for intoxication, many of whom were charged several times each year.83

The decriminalization of intoxication was an important legal reform of the 1960s and 1970s. Beginning with British Columbia, provinces amended liquor control laws to divert peaceful "drunks" away from court and jail to health and welfare programs. The 1969 report of a federal-provincial committee on New Brunswick corrections recommended giving "drunks" the option of treatment over arrest, jail or a fine. Advocates such as the Canadian Criminology and Corrections Association argued that decriminalization would benefit the courts and jails and taxpayers.84

In 1970, the Robichaud government passed the Intoxicated Persons Detention Act, which gave police greater discretion to release previously intoxicated persons from custody without preferring charges. Generally promoted as a rehabilitative reform similar to probation and parole, the law also allowed the authorities to enforce compulsory treatment for a minority of recidivists who were deemed "a danger to society."85 The short-term results of this policy prompted considerable controversy amongst organizations and individuals working with chronic street alcoholics, especially when several individuals died of exposure after being released by police. The law was interesting from the question of due process, in that it allowed police to take intoxicated persons into temporary detention without charging them. The Salvation Army argued that recidivists, no longer given shelter, rest and food, were now at even greater risk on the street because they were released as soon as they were sober. Opposition MLAs contended that treatment programs should have been developed in advance of the legislation.86 Once the law went into effect there was a noticeable impact on court dockets.87

Throughout the 1960s the alcoholism lobby employed the image of the problem drinker, a man or woman from any occupation, class or ethnic back-
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ground, whose illness exacted a heavy personal, familial, economic and societal toll. North American alcoholism experts warned that the disease affected up to five percent of the labour force, which in New Brunswick would have represented several thousand workers. Based on the rate of deaths due to liver cirrhosis, alcoholism appeared to be on the rise in the 1960s. Although the differences between alcoholics and problem drinkers were unclear, the discourse that described alcohol abuse as classless built greater support for treatment and rehabilitation.88

Experts stressed that most alcoholics were employed, so industrial alcoholism programs made good sense. Medical opinion suggested that problem drinkers could be treated through psychiatric counselling, drug therapy, and involvement in Alcoholics Anonymous and related organizations.89 Organized labour was interested in including treatment provisions in health plans and collective agreements. The New Brunswick Federation of Labour later called for the public sector to pioneer these programs, with the hope that they would spread to private sector employers. Company health promotion programs were considered a positive approach to a problem that traditionally had been associated with individual immorality. For example, a medical officer for a federal Crown corporation told a conference of industrial safety officers that most alcoholics did not have “large, red noses, bloated features and live in Skid Row conditions.”90

In the mid 1960s, the New Brunswick media, the fading temperance lobby, and the new generation of policy entrepreneurs warned of the medical and social costs of illegal drinking by teenagers. Temperance advocates warned that youth were susceptible to lifestyle advertising by the “liquor interests.”91 The LCA included a special deterrent against underage drinking: individuals under twenty-one convicted of possession of liquor could be fined up to fifty dollars when the standard adult fine was ten dollars. Neither temperance education that was part of the high school health studies curriculum nor work by groups such as the NBTF and the WCTU appeared to diminish the importance of alcohol in youth culture. A controversy erupted in Saint John in 1965, for example, when the YMCA attempted to inform the public on the alleged wide extent of illegal drinking by youth. Teenagers testified that despite the legal drinking age of twenty-one, alcohol was easily obtained and taverns were known to serve minors. The spectre of rampant juvenile drinking, like later moral panics over glue sniffing or marijuana, was all the more worrisome because it was not con-
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fined to a single social class.\textsuperscript{92} Arrests and convictions for juvenile delinquency rose during the 1960s and surveys indicated that a high percentage of youth and young adults were drinkers.\textsuperscript{93} The anxieties of adult society over rebellious youth, teen sexuality, and illegal drugs in part explains the outcome of a rare provincial plebiscite that accompanied the 1967 provincial election. As part of his pragmatic reform package, Robichaud had recently appointed a provincial ombudsman. He was now testing the political waters on the issue of the youth franchise. Voters had been asked if they approved of lowering the voting age from twenty-one to eighteen. Roughly seven out of ten voters opposed the measure and in only one riding, Gloucester, did a majority favour a lowered age.\textsuperscript{94}

\textbf{From Alcohol to Drug Abuse}

In the early 1960s, there were no dedicated public hospital or clinic beds for treating alcoholics in New Brunswick. In 1965, the provincial Department of Health opened alcohol rehabilitation clinics in hospitals at Saint John and at Campbellton, the latter to serve northern New Brunswick. The combined capacity was under sixty beds. The fact that these facilities were located in “mental” hospitals served to stigmatize alcoholics and discourage voluntary participation. In 1968, the province bought about 360 hectares of land on the Nerepis River and turned it over to a non-profit organization, Lonewater Foundation Incorporated. The male alcoholics who volunteered to go to Lonewater were not subjected to modern therapeutic methods, but an old-fashioned mixture of fresh air and chores.\textsuperscript{95} One of the new alcoholic units was the old lazaretto of the Tracadie Hospital. By 1967, the province’s nine in-patient facilities had admitted 1,529 individuals, most of them as voluntary patients, for an average stay of ten days. During that year’s provincial election campaign, both parties promised increased resources to assisting alcoholics.\textsuperscript{96}

In contrast to the United States, where the disease concept of alcoholism was institutionalized and endorsed by celebrities, Canadians seemed “less willing to accept simple categorizations and explanations” of alcoholism.\textsuperscript{97} Not all expert opinion embraced the disease concept. The director of mental health for one of New Brunswick’s health regions, for example, argued that alcoholism was not a disease, but an addiction problem. Maritime physicians, although accepting aspects of the disease theory, in the late 1970s were described as “highly
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ambivalent” and pessimistic as to the treatment of alcoholics, who were viewed as individuals who suffered from character defects such as loss of control. Media discussion continued to concentrate on the more visible street alcoholics in urban centres such as Saint John. The Intoxicated Persons Detention Act, the removal of the offence of vagrancy from the Criminal Code effective in 1972, and longer hours for liquor stores seemed to aggravate the problem of the chronic drinker.

By the late 1960s, alcoholism was being crowded out of the headlines and political speeches by the threat of drug use amongst youth. Police officials, judges, educators, clergy, pharmacists, physicians, journalists, academics, service organizations and even the Loyal Orange Lodge weighed in on the issue. In 1970, appearing before the Royal Commission on the Non-Medical Use of Drugs, provincial government officials opposed any liberalization or legalization of the use of marijuana. At the hearings in New Brunswick, officials, organizations and individuals recommended fighting the drug problem with everything from “restoration of the family unit” and less permissiveness, to “transcendental meditation” and a rejection of materialism. A provincial alcoholism field worker advocated an expanded drug and alcoholism awareness campaign and the establishment of an “alcoholism foundation” to co-ordinate treatment and rehabilitation. Addictions experts, such as John Caldwell of the ARF who visited New Brunswick in 1971, warned that alcohol was society’s most damaging drug, but the message often was lost amidst cultural anxieties over narcotics.

In 1970, New Brunswickers spent $44 million on alcohol, giving the NBLCC a profit of roughly $1.2 million each month. Yet the province, according to critics, had not given priority to alcoholism education and treatment. That year’s provincial election in which the Liberals were unseated owed little to the questions of alcohol or drugs. Richard Hatfield’s Conservatives had benefited from concerns over taxation, centralization, the economy, and the politics of language. Hatfield continued the reformist polices of Robichaud, which included further liberalization of liquor controls and increased resources for alcoholism treatment.
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As the provincial government would later admit, the limited prevention and treatment programs of the 1960s were largely failures. The vast majority of alcoholics remained unidentified and beyond counselling and treatment. The public, furthermore, still tended to blame problem drinkers for their own condition. Hospitals often refused to admit alcoholics and when they did, the emphasis was on short-term physiological symptoms. The salience of the drug issue in the late 1960s allowed alcoholism activists and professionals to appeal to a larger “addictions” crisis, all the while concentrating on what they regarded as the more harmful substance: alcohol. Even the Temperance Federation re-tooled, renaming itself the Federation on Alcohol and Drug Problems.

The trend toward liberalization was countered with one important legal restriction in the late 1960s: police use of breathalyser equipment. With a lower drinking age, increased availability of alcohol, more public drinking establishments, and rising automobile ownership, police and medical authorities grew concerned about highway accidents and fatalities linked to liquor. Police and public health officials were more and more vocal on the issue and the media highlighted highway injuries and fatalities involving alcohol. In mid-1960s New Brunswick, the only legal remedy against impaired driving was a suspension of a motor vehicle licence.

Starting with Saskatchewan, provinces gradually implemented compulsory breathalyser tests; Robichaud’s attorney general studied the issue and introduced legislation in late 1965. The Maritime Association of Chiefs of Police, and many lawyers and physicians pushed for the legislation to be proclaimed. Breathalyser evidence was first accepted by a New Brunswick court in 1966, but the first tests produced no convictions. In 1969, the Criminal Code was amended to make police use of breath testing equipment legal across Canada. Tests had to be conducted within two hours of the initial request and a blood-alcohol content level of .08 percent secured a conviction. In 1970 and 1971 the legality of breathalyser testing was challenged by a series of court rulings. Following a reference to the provincial Court of Appeal in 1971 and the development of better testing guidelines, New Brunswick returned to breathalyser enforcement and was part of the national trend that saw charge rates rise throughout the 1970s. Although the chances of impaired drivers being

103 Valverde, Diseases of the Will, 103; ETG, 3 November 1971.
104 Campbell, Demon Rum or Easy Money, 164-65.
105 ETG, 2, 9 October 1963; 9, 12, 19, 23 November 1964; 13 September 1972.
convicted remained low, the state was now using deterrence against the most controversial user of alcohol. This was not the street drunk or the chronic alcoholic, but the drinking driver. Unlike alcoholism, with drunk driving there were few suggestions of illness or sympathy; rather the impaired driver was a "public enemy" guilty of selfish, dangerous and anti-social behaviour.\footnote{Synoptic Reports, 1971, 58-60; ETG, 14 March 1972; Gusfield, Contested Meanings, 38; Valverde, Diseases of the Will, 191; Statistics Canada, "Impaired Driving in Canada," Juristat 17 (1997): 12.}

**The 1970s: The Mixed Messages of Modernization**

Liquor legislation in the 1970s continued the permissive trend of previous decade. In 1971, the Conservative government amended the LCA to legalize the making of wine and beer at home for personal use, to allow "ladies" beverage rooms to sell wine, to change cocktail lounge licenses to cabaret licenses, and to alter the name of "government stores" to "liquor stores." The home production amendment caused the Liberal opposition to warn that the entire Liquor Control Act was in jeopardy. One MLA suggested that the "Hatfield Home Brew Bill" would help bootleggers, hinder the police and threaten the health of New Brunswickers. Hatfield defended the measure with "lifestyle" arguments: many New Brunswickers were making wine and beer as a hobby; attitudes had become more liberal; and European immigrants were appalled to find their customary practices illegal in New Brunswick.\footnote{Synoptic Reports, 1971, 1616-22.}

By order in council, the government also extended the hours of licensed premises and abolished the mandatory supper closing hour (6:30 – 7:30 p.m.) for taverns. The idea behind the original 1962 rule had been that blue-collar patrons could stop at the tavern for an hour after work before heading home for their meals. Earlier the NBLCC had dropped its vetting of live entertainment in lounges, dining rooms and taverns, and allowed hotel room service to serve drinks. Dancing, however, remained limited to lounges. The hospitality sector lobbied for further liberalization. In 1972, Tourism minister J.C. Van Horne, something of a loose cannon in Hatfield’s government, singled out "archaic" liquor laws as the single biggest impediment to provincial tourism.\footnote{ETG, 25 June 1970; 11 August, 25 June 1971. Until 1970, the commission required specific authorization for each live entertainment event.}

Once the provincial government lowered the voting age in the early 1970s, temperance advocates such as the Kings County Ministerial Association feared that the drinking age would be next. In 1972, both the premier and the leader of the opposition indicated that they had no objections to lowering the drinking age from twenty-one to nineteen.\footnote{ETG, 23 February 1972.} The integrationist theory, which held that
children and youth should be taught to respect alcohol and use it in moderation, was finding increasing support in the media and political circles. The brewery sector, which had expanded under liberalization, advocated lowering the drinking age as a social measure. Capitalizing on the "moderation" theory, Philip Oland, chair of the Brewers Association of Canada, even argued that young people might be deterred from drug use if beer were sold on university campuses.112

The Hatfield government committed itself to continuing and expanding the public health reforms initiated by Robichaud. Medicare came to the province in 1971; a few months later Hatfield announced a task force, headed by Tory MLA Dr. Everitt Chalmers of Fredericton, to inquire into alcoholism and treatment. Chalmers described alcoholism as the fourth most serious disease in North America, following heart disease, cancer, and mental illness. Fully embracing the disease model, Chalmers asserted that alcohol abuse affected every age and class, created tremendous social costs, and was a drain on industry productivity. He also estimated the number of alcoholics in New Brunswick to be as high as fifteen thousand and that close to fifty thousand family members were affected by alcohol abuse or dependency.113

The Study Committee on Alcoholism took to the road in late 1971 and held hearings in eleven towns and cities. The committee included only one church official, an officer of the Salvation Army experienced in working with street people. Chalmers was disappointed that the issue of abuse of alcohol, "a national crisis," attracted only three citizens in Richibucto. The meetings drew bigger numbers in other towns. In addition to convening hearings, the committee visited other provinces and accepted briefs. The tone of a number of submissions was alarmist. A hospital in Chatham estimated that 10 percent of the population of the Miramichi area were alcoholics. Public health officials and community groups appearing before the committee repeated the need for detoxification centres and for a provincial alcohol commission.114

The committee report, released in April of 1972, attempted to present "clear evidence that the disease of alcoholism is becoming more prevalent." Unlike the early focus of alcohol experts who emphasized the "deviant tendencies of a small minority of drinkers," the report reflected 1970s public health concerns based on "increasing aggregate levels of consumption."115 This broadening problematization of alcohol went beyond the disease theory and reflected new research and policy concerns. The social and economic indicators
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of alcoholism included lower life expectancy, hospitalization costs, juvenile delinquency, suicide, and increased insurance premiums. Alcohol took its greatest toll on the backbone of the provincial workforce, males aged thirty to fifty-five. The committee attempted to estimate the cost of alcohol abuse in New Brunswick. Including welfare, justice, accidents, and industrial losses, the proposed total was $13 million, two-thirds of the annual profits of the NBLCC.\(^\text{116}\)

The Chalmers’ report advocated an independent commission to coordinate provincial anti-alcoholism efforts, possibly funded through a sales tax on NBLCC products. The commission would contract out services to non-profit organizations and help sensitize doctors, nurses, clergy, police, and educators to alcohol abuse problems. Education and awareness and community-based solutions, such as multipurpose centres and halfway houses, were also emphasized.\(^\text{117}\) The government accepted the principles of the report but was criticized for appointing an interim planning committee pending follow-up legislation. In 1973, responsibility for alcohol health education was removed from the Department of Health to the interim commission.\(^\text{118}\)

By the mid-1970s, New Brunswick’s alcohol treatment network consisted of the two provincial hospital units, where one seventh to one fifth of admissions were for acute alcoholism; Department of Health field representatives operating out of eight regional offices and detoxification/rehab centres in Saint John, Edmundston, Bathurst and Newcastle. Four private detoxification centres were supported by provincial funding and Lonewater Farm continued to operate as a long-term rehabilitation facility. Women, initially thought to constitute one-tenth of the province’s alcoholics, were a particularly difficult group to identify, counsel and treat. By the early 1970s, public health experts estimated that one-quarter of the alcoholic population were women. In 1974 New Brunswick’s first treatment centre for women opened in Saint John.\(^\text{119}\)

The increase in per capita consumption between the 1950s and the 1970s owed more to buying power than any other single factor. Alcohol policy literature from this era stressed the relationship of price to consumption. By the late 1960s, Toronto’s Addiction Research Foundation was advocating increasing taxes and prices as a public health measure.\(^\text{120}\) Throughout the 1970s, consumers complained of the onerous effects of inflation and taxation. A number
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\(^{116}\) Report of the New Brunswick Study Committee on Alcoholism to the Minister of Health, April 1972 (Fredericton 1972), 1-10.

\(^{117}\) Ibid., 11-20; ETG, 19 April 1972.

\(^{118}\) New Brunswick, Department of Health, Annual Report, 1972-73, 17, 23.


\(^{120}\) Single et al., “The Alcohol Policy Debate,” 146-49; Smart and Ogborne, Northern Spirits, 173-74.
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of commentators and studies have noted that throughout the twentieth century the relative price of beverage alcohol has fallen dramatically, making it more accessible to poorer and working class consumers. As a Nova Scotia study indicated, following World War II, disposable income rose at a much higher rate than the price for retail items such as alcohol.\footnote{121 \emph{ETG}, 23 June 1972. Between 1951 and 1978, per capita income in Nova Scotia increased by almost 700 percent, but the average price of a gallon of alcohol only doubled. By 1971, in Nova Scotia, alcohol was less than half the price of 1951, relative to income, and only a third of the 1951 price by the late 1970s. See: NSCDD, “Alcohol and Other Drug Use in Nova Scotia: Social Impact,” 5 November 1980.}

In the postwar era, access was also liberalized by changes to the minimum legal drinking age. In 1972, Hatfield’s government introduced an age of majority bill, which not only lowered the drinking age to nineteen, but also allowed minors to accompany parents or guardians to licensed dining rooms and to consume liquor in their presence. Opposition politicians, temperance advocates and the press expressed concern about the latter provision, which had been introduced in Manitoba in 1970. The drinking age was lowered despite temperance concern and evidence that the change would increase the rate of automobile accidents amongst nineteen- and twenty-year-olds. The amendment added 25,000 potential legal drinkers to the consumer population. But in the context of concerns about marijuana, many parents and other adults were not always worried about alcohol use by the young.\footnote{122 \emph{ETG}, 12 January, 25 February, 6 June, 9 June, 19 June, 23 June 1972; Robichaud papers, RS 416, 1967/221, United Church of Canada Maritime Conference; Canada, \emph{Revised Intercensal Population and Family Estimates}, July 1971-1991 (Ottawa: Statistics Canada, 1991), table 1.6. The interim commission consisted of a psychology professor, a chemist, a Salvation Army official, a nursing instructor, a teacher, and a professional counsellor.}

Despite the proliferation of public drinking spaces and occasions and the warnings of the declining temperance lobby, the bulk of alcohol purchased in the province was consumed at home. In addition to keeping prices relatively low, the NBLCC continued to change its retail stores into self-service outlets and to build new customer-friendly facilities. By the mid-70s, less than a third of the sixty-four stores were conventional. The result was that consumers made increased purchases through impulse buying. Hours of operation also were extended.\footnote{123 New Brunswick Liquor Corporation, \emph{Annual Report}, 1976-77, 5; R.G. Smart, “Comparisons of Purchasing in Self-Service and Clerk Service Liquor Stores,” \emph{Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol} 35 (1974): 1397-1401.} Consumers were interested in innovation: the provincial Federation of Labour called for NBLCC stores to sell cold beer. In response to a \emph{Time Magazine} report that New Brunswick had “the poorest selection of wines in the country,” NBLCC commissioner G.L. LeBlanc in 1972 promised “quite an improvement in the wine listings.”\footnote{124 \emph{ETG}, 3 November 1971, 16 March 1972.}
Conclusion

In 1945 New Brunswick had a large minority of abstainers and no licensed drinking premises, women and youth were less likely to consume alcohol than adult males, and temperance and church organizations exerted an influence on policy beyond their actual numerical strength. Alcoholism in the 1940s or 1950s was viewed as a type of individual moral weakness and health and welfare programs did not recognize the condition. An extensive study of provincial health services in 1951, for example, completely ignored the issue. Two decades later, the provincial government and many of the helping professions considered alcohol to be one of the province's most acute health and social problems. Although the disease theory did not enjoy scientific and professional consensus, it did serve to mobilize public attention and resources. Throughout the 1970s, the helping professions tended to raise their estimates of costs of alcohol's ravages. By 1980, in neighbouring Nova Scotia, the Drug Dependency Commission placed the annual social and economic costs of alcohol abuse at $170 million.¹²⁵ The New Brunswick Alcoholism and Drug Dependency Commission was eventually established in 1974. In keeping with the North American trend, the emphasis was on what caused alcoholism, but on how to treat it.¹²⁶

Despite the recommendations of public health interest groups, government policy in New Brunswick favoured liberalization and revenue maximization, mirroring trends in other jurisdictions. The reforms of 1962 signalled that most New Brunswickers no longer viewed alcohol as a dangerous commodity.¹²⁷ Policy post-1975 continued to emphasize not control but customer service. The government, partly because of the opposition of unionized employees, dared not privatize retail sales, but alcohol, for half a century regarded as a “necessary evil,” was being marketed as a consumer commodity. In the context of licensed premises, alcohol was regarded as an essential aspect of adult leisure.¹²⁸ Two signs of this approach were the appointment of a task force to investigate the issues of cold beer sales in liquor stores and empty bottle returns, and the extension of cabaret serving hours until 2:00 a.m.¹²⁹

¹²⁶ For later activities of the commission, see Alcoholism and Drug Dependency Commission of New Brunswick, Year End Report April 1983-March 1984: Summary of Statistics for Rehabilitation Treatment and Outpatient Services (Fredericton, 1984).
¹²⁹ New Brunswick, Regulations (Fredericton: Queen’s Printer, 1980, 75; Report of the New Brunswick Beer Study Committee (Fredericton 1981). The task force recommended the trial sale of cold beer in government outlets—a controversial issue with neo-temperance opinion—
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By 1975, New Brunswickers encountered two competing discourses: first, that drinking was a modern, reasonable and fashionable recreation, and second, that alcohol was society’s most widespread and costly drug dependency problem. The changes unleashed by the 1960s, the coming of age of the Baby Boom generation, consumerism, and weakening religious authority contributed to the depiction of beverage alcohol as a value-neutral or even positive lifestyle choice. The one exception to liberalization was the attempt to use legal deterrence to combat impaired driving. Following a series of initial legal challenges to breathalyser legislation, police and prosecutors began a twenty-year struggle to change popular attitudes towards drinking and driving. In the 1950s and 1960s the most common alcohol offender was the skid row or lower class “drunk,” arrested under provincial statute and tried summarily. By the 1970s, the impaired driver, who was not necessarily a working-class individual, was the new social enemy and was prosecuted under the Criminal Code. Although both access to and consumption rates of alcohol increased, there were still abstainers and infrequent users of alcohol in the province. Aside from Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick had the lowest per capita alcohol consumption rate in the country, below the national per capita figure of 13 litres of absolute alcohol.130

As in other Canadian jurisdictions, by the 1970s New Brunswick’s alcohol policy was driven by public order and revenue imperatives, not public health concerns. “Archaic” liquor laws had been swept away in the interest of “civilized” drinking. The voluntary and public health sectors were left to deal with the casualties that resulted from modernization of alcohol control. The government had embraced the credo of the alcohol industry that “the man, not the bottle” was the problem.131 Yet alcohol was a problematic commodity that continued to produce ambivalent responses. This ambivalence is highlighted by one further example. Poet Alden Nowlan lived to see the forces of darkness vanquished by a progressively more liberal liquor administration, much of it introduced by his personal friend Richard Hatfield. Nowlan also lived to be charged for impaired driving.132

---

and study of a possible deposit system on beverage containers to encourage recycling and to protect the environment.


131 Valverde, Diseases of the Will, ch. 6; Smart and Ogborne, Northern Spirits, 72.

132 Communication by Patrick Toner to author.