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ABSTRACT

The period from 1874 to 1901 was a time of significant transition in the economic and political life of Newfoundland. Twenty years into responsible government and with Confederation on the backburner, the colony’s politicians turned their attention to economic diversification, landward development and carving out the island’s place in the British Empire. The period saw both economic prosperity and retrenchment; the construction of a trans-insular railway; the adoption of policies to foster agriculture, forestry, manufacturing and mining; and diplomatic efforts to resolve France’s outstanding claims on the northwest coast of the island. At the same time, the government made an attempt to intervene directly in its primary industry, the fisheries. It created a Fisheries Commission in 1889 that recommended conservation measures and artificial propagation as ways to restore the health of some of the island’s fish stocks. They also proposed new methods of curing, packaging and marketing Newfoundland’s cod, as well as a complete overhaul of the truck system. A major player in both the public and private debates surrounding all of these subjects was the Reverend Moses Harvey.

Along with being minister of the Free Church of Scotland in St. John’s, Harvey was one of Newfoundland’s most active promoters in the late nineteenth century. He served as the media mouthpiece for both Prime Minister William Whiteway and Prime Minister Robert Thorburn; editing the Evening Mercury – the official organ of the Liberal Party and then the Reform Party – from 1882 to 1883 and 1885 until 1890. As well, Harvey wrote regular columns on Newfoundland issues for newspapers in London, New York, Boston, Montreal, Toronto, and Halifax. He also produced numerous books,
articles, encyclopedia entries, and travel guides outlining the island’s attractions and its vast economic potential. In short, Harvey made a significant contribution in shaping the way residents and the outside world viewed Newfoundland during this period.

This thesis examines late nineteenth-century Newfoundland through the writing of Moses Harvey. The biographical approach offers a fuller, more nuanced account of some of the major historical themes of the period including the politics of progress, opening up the interior, railway construction and attitudes toward the fisheries. It also provides an insider’s prospective on what led to some of the major political decisions, policy positions or compromises taken by the Whiteway and Thorburn governments. Finally, a more detailed review of Harvey’s work exposes the practical and political differences that he had with people like D.W. Prowse and Bishop Michael Howley. While these so-called “boomers” in Newfoundland’s historiography agreed on broad themes, they parted ways over what should be done with the fisheries and how best to channel the colony’s growing sense of nationalism.
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CHAPTER ONE – INTRODUCTION

When it comes to the history of Newfoundland and Labrador, the politicians and community leaders in the late nineteenth century seemingly have a lot to answer for. Their incessant push for landward industrial development is said to have come at the expense of more practical investments in the colony’s primary resource – the sea.¹ The crushing public debt brought on by an expensive, poorly built, trans-insular railway is often cited as one of the main factors leading to confederation with Canada in 1949². And the political rhetoric of the period, that spoke of a land with infinite economic potential held back by England’s merchant firms and a distracted or disinterested imperial government, has resulted in a nationalist sentiment that is still being felt today.³

Political and economic expectations were very high in the late nineteenth century. A railway from St. John’s to Hall’s Bay in the north and St. George’s on the west coast promised to open the country up to unprecedented development. Vast tracts of fertile agricultural land would be settled; minerals like copper, iron ore and even coal would be mined; timber would be produced; and a home-grown manufacturing industry would spring up to supply an increasingly prosperous workforce. In short, the railway and landward development were meant to transform Newfoundland, from a colony that was

¹ David Alexander, “Newfoundland’s Traditional Economy and Development to 1934” in Newfoundland in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries, ed. James Hiller and Peter Neary (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1980), 18.
³ Sean T. Cadigan, Newfoundland and Labrador: A History (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009), 12.
lagging behind its neighbours and entirely dependent on the fishery, into a modern economy more in keeping with the progress being enjoyed elsewhere around the globe. Obviously, the best laid plans of the late nineteenth century did not come to pass. The railway brought temporary employment, more labour mobility, a stronger sense of national unity and greater access to the interior of the island.⁴ What it did not bring was lasting wealth. The amount of land under cultivation doubled from 1874 to 1901, but that only represented a per capita increase of 0.04 acres. Similarly, the factory output of the industrial sector that was valued at $10 in 1884 grew to only $12 in 1901.⁵ Mining fared better with copper finds in Tilt Cove, Little Bay and Betts Cover making those communities household names in the 1880s but by 1900, those “El Dorados” had pretty well dried up.⁶ The one bright light was the steady growth of a Newfoundland forest industry, though it did not start to show real results on the colony’s balance sheet until the early 1900s. By the end of the 1890s, forestry still only accounted for around two per cent of overall exports.⁷ Given the relative failure of the late nineteenth century’s marquee development policies, it is understandable that Newfoundland historians examining the period would focus on explaining why things turned out the way they did.

In “A History of Newfoundland 1874-1901,” James Hiller gives a detailed chronicling of the politics of the period and concludes that the so-called “policies of

⁵ Alexander, “Newfoundland’s Traditional Economy,” 27.
progress” were too extravagant for the colony to afford and the promised benefits too unrealistic to obtain. According to Hiller, Newfoundland’s size, geographical position, poverty and relatively low ranking on the list of Imperial priorities made success next to impossible.\(^8\) He did agree, however, that the economic advances taking place in Canada and the United States were hard for local politicians to ignore:

> In the context of the later nineteenth century it is difficult to see how the “policy of progress” could have been avoided. Newfoundland was too close to the mainland of North America, where the “march of progress” was so evidently on the move. There were few public men who could admit that the island to which they were so strongly attached could not keep up with its neighbours, and resign themselves to the fact that it was destined to be a backwater.\(^9\)

This idea that Newfoundland had been lured into impractical economic diversification plans by the siren call of material success in the rest of North America was also advanced by Peter Neary in his study of the colony’s French Shore.\(^10\) This change in outlook turned what was an arcane Imperial concern into a highly charged partisan issue on the local political stage. The French Shore, in turn, gave developers an excuse for not delivering on their promises and kept merchants from having to modernize the fishing industry in response to challenges from countries such as Norway.\(^11\)

---


\(^11\) Neary, 118.
For David Alexander, however, the bigger obstacle was economic and not political. For Newfoundland’s economic diversification to succeed the colony needed to export large amounts of new product while at the same time growing a larger domestic market, if it hoped to cover the cost of development.\textsuperscript{12} While exports and the population did grow during the late nineteenth century, the amount of money made and the number of people employed were nowhere near what was required, so the end result was a massive public debt.

Patrick O’Flaherty cited both the French Shore, and the Imperial Government’s willingness to sacrifice Newfoundland interests for broader diplomatic concerns, as a hindrance to the colony’s economic success. While quite critical of the idea that Newfoundland could not build a sustainable economy based primarily on the fisheries like Iceland or Scotland, O’Flaherty believed the Colonial Office in London consistently made unnecessary development policies even worse.\textsuperscript{13} Whether it was their refusal to give loan guarantees early in the construction of the railway; the tying of any financial bail-out after the bank crash to a commission of inquiry; or the not so subtle nudges in the direction of confederation, O’Flaherty viewed Westminster as a major obstacle to Newfoundland’s success.\textsuperscript{14}

Perhaps, the simplest reason for the failure of the “policies of progress” was put forward by Sean Cadigan in his recent history of Newfoundland and Labrador. The

\textsuperscript{12} Alexander, “Newfoundland’s Traditional Economy,” 35.
\textsuperscript{13} Patrick O’Flaherty, \textit{Lost Country: The Rise and Fall of Newfoundland, 1843-1933} (St. John’s: Long Beach Press, 2005), 134-135.
\textsuperscript{14} O’Flaherty, “Lost Country,” 172-175.
island’s ecology – its cold-water environment, poor soil quality and harsh climate – simply could not sustain the industrial modernization that was occurring elsewhere in North America and around the world.\textsuperscript{15} Science could do many things in the late nineteenth century, but it could not (and still cannot) overcome a geography where one third of the land has almost no soil and the remainder had only small pockets of fertile ground suitable for agriculture.\textsuperscript{16}

Whether the causes of the failure in the end were political, diplomatic, economic or ecological, all of the historians cited above would agree that the problems began with sky-high expectations. Apart from the politicians themselves, the individuals who have become most identified with the hope, optimism and, in some cases, the exaggeration of the late nineteenth century are the “boomers”\textsuperscript{17} – The Reverend Charles Pedley, Judge D.W. Prowse, the Reverend Philip Tocque, Bishop J.T. Mullock, Archbishop M.F. Howley, and the Reverend Moses Harvey.

Charles Pedley was the minister of the Congregational church in St. John's from 1857 to 1864. While in Newfoundland, and with the encouragement of the then governor Sir Alexander Bannerman,\textsuperscript{18} Pedley used local records and the Colonial Secretary's Letter

\textsuperscript{15} Cadigan, \textit{Newfoundland and Labrador}, 3-10.
\textsuperscript{16} Cadigan, \textit{Newfoundland and Labrador}, Map 3, ix.
\textsuperscript{17} The term was first coined by Patrick O’Flaherty in \textit{The Rock Observed} (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1979). He took it from D.W. Prowse who saw his role as “booming Newfoundland and making her attractions known.”
\textsuperscript{18} Bannerman was an Aberdeen-born merchant and politician who after a controversial stint as Governor of Prince Edward Island was appointed to the same position in Newfoundland. His time in the colony (1857-1864) was marked by almost continual conflict with its responsible government. See Edward C. Moulton and Ian Ross Robertson, “BANNERMAN, Sir ALEXANDER,” in \textit{Dictionary of Canadian Biography}, vol. 9, University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003--, accessed January 25, 2016, http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/bannerman_alexander_9E.html.
Books to write *The History of Newfoundland* in 1863. Philip Tocque was a clerk and teacher in Carbonear, Newfoundland who, after several years in the U.S., became an Anglican priest in Canada where he served from 1854 until 1877. Before leaving Newfoundland, Tocque wrote the literary works *Wandering Thoughts or Solitary Hours* (1846) and *Ottawah, the Last Chief of the Red Indians* (1847). After his retirement, he wrote more history-based books like *Newfoundland, As It Was and As It Is in 1877* and *Kaleidoscope Echoes* in 1895. Daniel Woodley Prowse was a Newfoundland-born lawyer who was appointed a judge of the circuit court in 1869 after serving as a Member of the Legislative Assembly for two terms as the representative for Burgeo and La Poile. Prowse is, however, best known for his 1895 book *A History of Newfoundland from the English, Colonial, and Foreign Record*. Michael Francis Howley was a Roman Catholic priest who served on the west coast of Newfoundland in the 1880s before becoming the first native-born Bishop and ultimately Archbishop of St. John’s. Along with being a frequent contributor to the public life of the colony, Howley wrote an *Ecclesiastical History of Newfoundland* in 1888. Rounding out the "boomers" was Moses Harvey. Born in County Armagh, Northern Ireland, Harvey was minister of the

---

Free St. Andrew's Presbyterian Church in St. John's from 1852 to 1878. After his retirement from the pulpit, Harvey became a tireless promoter of Newfoundland and wrote countless newspaper columns, magazine articles, pamphlets and books on the subject until his death in 1901.23

Of all the "boomers", the most well-known by far is Judge D.W. Prowse. This is largely due to the continued popularity of his history of Newfoundland. Not only did it receive wide circulation in 1895 when it was first released, but the book has been republished numerous times including most recently in 1972. Jerry Bannister, building on the work of G.M. Story, argues quite convincingly in his Acadiensis article "Whigs and Nationalists" that D.W. Prowse and his history had a profound impact on shaping Newfoundland's culture and the way its inhabitants see themselves. Over the years, Prowse has evolved from an historical figure to a popular myth, nationalist icon and quintessential part of Newfoundland's heritage.24 This in spite of the fact the main thesis of A History of Newfoundland - that settlement on the island in the eighteenth century was systematically discouraged - has been discredited and the book itself no longer viewed as a reliable source.

In 1971, Memorial University's Keith Matthews turned Newfoundland's historiography on its head with his essay "Historical Fence Building" presented to the Canadian Historical Association and later published in the Newfoundland Quarterly.


Matthews took issue with the theory first espoused by Newfoundland's first Chief Justice John Reeves that the island's "retarded colonization" was the result of conflict between various English interest groups. Some, like the boomers, repeated Reeves' views of the sixteenth to eighteenth century question. Later historians like A.H. McClintock, W. L. Morton and Harold Innis developed more complex explanations for Newfoundland's delayed growth but they were all still rooted in conflict theory. Matthews illustrated that conflict theory was based on a set of untested assumptions that did not hold up when placed against the realities of Newfoundland society in the 1600s and 1700s. He blamed the misinterpretation on an over-reliance on constitutional documents, a desire to find an all-encompassing narrative and the fact that few of the historians were either native Newfoundlanders or primarily interested in the island itself.²⁵

Matthews' article was a revelation and sparked a revolution in how Newfoundland’s history was approached from then on. It was especially a boon for the academic study of the island and its peoples between 1610 and 1790. The late nineteenth century boomers, with the possible exception of Prowse, did not fare as well. In The Rock Observed - a survey of Newfoundland's literature over the centuries, published in 1979 - Patrick O'Flaherty used Matthews’ findings to apply a litmus test of roots and research to the work of the boomers to determine their value.

O’Flaherty described D.W. Prowse’s book as a “cloud of misunderstanding” filled with “sentimental editorializing” that offered little new to distinguish it from previous

histories. Prowse was a native Newfoundlander, though, and worked from an impressive array of primary sources so he was given the designation of historian. Charles Pedley was an Englishman from Staffordshire but he too consulted first-hand records and, while influenced by Reeves, did not repeat the myths of illegal settlement. As result, Pedley was deemed a “sound historian.” Philip Tocque’s research was far from original but *Kaleidoscope Echoes* was said to have literary value because it introduced the theme of a Newfoundlander in a strange country longing for home. The boomer who failed both of O’Flaherty’s tests was Moses Harvey. He was not native born and his many books and articles about the island for the most part simply reiterated one main theme – the vast potential of Newfoundland. Despite the awe expressed at his prodigious output and his boundless energy, O’Flaherty referred to Harvey as an “inveterate surmiser” and a “tireless promoter of dubious schemes for the colony’s development.” While other boomers are called historians or writers, Harvey received the dismissive titles of propagandist, publicist and popularizer.²⁶

While fairly harsh in his judgement, O’Flaherty was not wrong in his general assessment. Moses Harvey was a propagandist, a publicist and a popularizer. Every book that he wrote – from *Newfoundland: The Oldest British Colony* that he co-authored with Joseph Hatton in 1883²⁷ to his many handbooks for tourists²⁸ – was designed to dispel the

---

notion that Newfoundland was nothing more than a giant rock in the North Atlantic, suitable only for the drying of fish. His goal was to convince the general public, the financial community and politicians in Newfoundland, Canada and London that the island had great economic potential and – with the right sort of investment – could produce untold wealth. While his work may have limited value to the historiography of Newfoundland as a whole, Moses Harvey provides a unique window into the late nineteenth century itself.

Unlike his fellow boomers, Moses Harvey made Newfoundland his full-time job from his retirement in 1878 until his death in 1901. He also was extremely active in the political life of the colony by serving as the media mouthpiece for both Prime Minister William Whiteway\textsuperscript{29} and Prime Minister Robert Thorburn.\textsuperscript{30} Harvey was editor of the \textit{Evening Mercury} – the official organ of the Liberal Party and then the Reform Party – from 1882 to 1883 and 1885 until 1890. As well as writing for the local newspaper scene, he produced a series of regular columns about Newfoundland issues for newspapers in London, New York, Boston, Montreal, Toronto and Halifax, to name a few.\textsuperscript{31} Harvey’s longest continuous correspondence during the late nineteenth century


\textsuperscript{31} From 2001 to 2004, Elizabeth Browne of the Queen Elizabeth II Library at Memorial University compiled the most comprehensive bibliography to date of the collective works of Moses Harvey. Her list of newspapers that Harvey corresponded with included: \textit{Canadian News}, \textit{Halifax Citizen}, \textit{London Daily News}, \textit{English Presbyterian Messenger}, \textit{New York Evening Post}, \textit{The Express}, \textit{Montreal Gazette}, \textit{Toronto Globe},
was with the *Montreal Gazette*. From December 3, 1875 to August 16, 1901, he produced – by his own estimation – over 600 fortnightly letters that filled more than 900 columns of space and took 112 days in total to pen. The letters themselves touched on a wide range of topics including current events, economic conditions, politics, the fisheries and general life in Newfoundland. Taken together, along with Moses Harvey’s editorship of the *Evening Mercury*, they are a valuable source for examining Newfoundland’s “policies of progress” to see whether academic assumptions about the period hold true.

The fact that Harvey’s twenty-six-year correspondence was with the *Montreal Gazette* is also of interest. The *Gazette* and the *Toronto Mail* were the two main Canadian newspapers for Prime Minister Sir John A. Macdonald’s Conservative Party. Harvey’s regular reports from Newfoundland would likely have influenced prominent government members across Canada, as well as key members of the Montreal business community. Given that he was writing for a foreign audience, the *Gazette* letters – while not free of politics by any means – did not have the same level of partisan nastiness that marked the *Evening Mercury*-*Evening Telegram* exchanges in the late 1880s. The *Gazette* letters also often served as a template for columns that Harvey sent to other newspapers in Canada, Great Britain and the United States.


33 Prime Minister Macdonald arranged for Thomas White to head the *Gazette* in 1870 and the newspaper’s influence on the Conservative Party grew under his editorship until White’s sudden death in 1888. Thomas White was also a prominent member of the Montreal Board of Trade and the Dominion Board of Trade. He was replaced at the *Gazette* by his son, Robert Smeaton White. See P. B. Waite, “WHITE, THOMAS (1830-88),” in *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 11, University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–, accessed January 25, 2016, http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/white_thomas_1830_88_11E.html.

Given the scarcity and spottiness of personal papers or diaries from most of the key players in late nineteenth century Newfoundland, Moses Harvey’s letters provide an opportunity to measure whether attitudes toward development changed over time; identify any long-term trends; and determine whether the views of boomers like Harvey, Prowse and Howley were as monolithic as has been portrayed. Traditionally, books and pamphlets have been used to describe the general enthusiasm for progress in the late 1800s with Moses Harvey’s soaring rhetoric usually front-and-centre. His talk of “smiling cornfields and meadows”, “the Chile of North America” and “Once it (the railway) is built, all things are possible. Hail! to the great Hereafter …”³⁵ are irresistible for the utopian-vision-to-practical-failure narrative that has been at the heart of much of the academic study of late nineteenth century Newfoundland. While it does not change how the story begins or how it ends, Harvey’s newspaper work can help improve the understanding of what went on between the fence posts.

³⁵ Moses Harvey, *Across Newfoundland with the Governor* (St. John’s: Morning Chronicle Print, 1879), 49 and Moses Harvey, “This Newfoundland of Ours”, A Lecture to the St. John’s Athenaeum, 1878.
CHAPTER TWO - FROM PUPIL TO PULPIT (1820 – 1844)

When considering the life and times of any historical figure, it is traditional to start at the beginning. With Moses Harvey, however, it is tempting to start anywhere but. Throughout most of his life, Harvey produced an enormous amount of written material. He wrote countless sermons, public lectures, newspaper columns, magazine articles, academic reports, and popular books. In fact, he wrote so much and distributed it so widely that it is a challenge just to find everything and document it all.¹ Unfortunately, his pen seems to have been largely silent while he was growing up and being educated in Northern Ireland. There is no public record of Harvey publishing any work during this period and no academic papers have survived from his time at university. The only facts known with any degree of certainty are when he was born, who his parents were, where he grew up, where he went to school, and what he studied. It is not a lot to go on, but it is more than enough to draw a convincing picture of who Moses Harvey was and why he came to believe what he did.

Moses Harvey was very much a product of his age. Like most Victorians, he was amazed by the economic growth he saw throughout the British Empire and inspired by technological advances like the railway and the telegraph. To him, they were outward signs of humanity’s continuous march of progress and the practical power that science could have on a society. This utilitarian view of the world was largely shaped by Moses

¹ Elizabeth Browne, “Bibliography of the Works of the Reverend Moses Harvey (1848-1901)”, Queen Elizabeth II Library, Memorial University, http://staff.library.mun.ca/~ebrowne/harvey/introbib.html. Ms. Browne successfully catalogued over 2,000 entries and referred to it as only “a significant start to the recording of Harvey’s work.”
Harvey’s upbringing in County Armagh, his education in Belfast and his Irish Presbyterian theology. These factors also greatly influenced the way he saw Newfoundland’s past and its future when he arrived there in 1852. They explain why he believed the island’s natural progress had been delayed by outside forces. They were also at the root of his optimism in the ability of science and discovery to help Newfoundland develop its economy.

Moses Harvey was born on March 21, 1820 in the tiny community of Redrock, County Armagh, in the north of Ireland. The Redrock of today is not very different from what it was like almost 200 years ago. It is still a sparsely populated rural area located about five miles south-east of Armagh City and four miles west of Markethill. A mix of houses and small farming operations dot the rolling green countryside and what industry there is, remains largely associated with agriculture. In the early 1800s, Redrock was mostly a community of tenant farmers with average holdings of only about eleven acres. They grew mainly potatoes, barley, oats, turnips, peas, and carrots in soil tilled mainly by spade. They also kept some livestock. 

While tenant farmers in County Armagh were marginally better off than their countrymen to the south, thanks to a slightly more favourable land-tenure system, the general poverty in the Redrock area was pervasive and the main preoccupation of most residents was survival. 

---


supplement their meagre farm incomes, many tenants also grew flax to be sold raw or home-spun into yarn. The Redrock area was part of what was known as the "linen triangle" but in the early nineteenth century, the production of linen was fairly limited - especially in comparison to the Clogher Valley in nearby County Tyrone. It was not until the late 1880s that a local merchant D.H. Sinton established a weaving factory in Markethill.4

Moses Harvey’s upbringing would not have been radically different from that of his neighbours – though as a son of the local Presbyterian minister, he had social and economic benefits that were beyond the means of most of the other members of the congregation. The Reverend James Harvey,5 who came to the area in 1799 to be the first minister of Redrock Presbyterian Church, was paid very little. In 1807, for example, his yearly stipend was £1.17s.7½d. based on an average weekly offering of three shillings. While some years were better than others, this amount appears to be a fairly typical representation of his annual salary. In the early 1840s, the weekly offering was still averaging three shillings and dropped to one shilling during the Great Famine.6 While Harvey’s stipend was meager, it was supplemented by the Regium Donum – an annual

5 James Harvey originally went by Hervey which was also the name used by Moses when he enrolled at the Belfast Academical Institute in 1837.
6 Smyth, 13.
grant given to Presbyterian clergy since 1690 in recognition of their ongoing loyalty to
the Crown. The practice was phased out in 1869, but the amount ranged between £50
and £100 depending on the need of the minister.\textsuperscript{7} The \textit{Regium Donum} obviously had a
huge impact on the Harvey family’s quality of life and explains how James Harvey could
afford to educate his children beyond grammar school. The Redrock manse also came
with over 17 acres of land which they could use to grow grains and vegetables, as well as
raise livestock, to see to their basic needs. It is important to note that Harvey did not just
use the \textit{Regium Donum} for the betterment of his family. He used it to cover many of his
ministerial expenses, such as travel and school supplies, as well as seeing to the
immediate needs of the poor and needy in his congregation.\textsuperscript{8}

Since regular church attendance was an ongoing problem, James Harvey's
ministry was a mobile one that involved travelling to many house meetings in the area on
top of his annual visits to members of his congregation. Families would gather at
convenient locations and the minister would then run them through the Catechisms and
test their knowledge of the Bible. With her husband so often away, responsibility for the
manse and any farm duties fell to his wife Jane Holmes, who grew up in the area, and
their children. Moses had lots of help with the daily chores though because he was the
sixth of what would eventually be eight children. He had three older brothers, Thomas,

\textsuperscript{7} Letter to \textit{The Belfast Monthly Magazine}, 6, 32, (March 31, 1811): 179.
\textsuperscript{8} Smyth, 16-17.
John and James, as well as an older sister Elizabeth. He also had three younger siblings, William, Jane and Joseph. The youngest, Joseph, was born in 1827.\(^9\)

Along with the normal struggles of life in rural County Armagh, education was a major focus for Moses Harvey in those early years. Presbyterians in the nineteenth century (and earlier) were committed to the principles of a learned clergy and a literate laity. Every man, woman and child should be able to read the Bible for themselves. The denomination’s founder, John Knox, believed so strongly in the importance of education that he outlined a four-stage strategy in his *Book of Discipline*, written in 1560. Children between the ages of six and eight were to be taught at congregational schools by ministers. Grammar schools, overseen by schoolmasters, were to be created for children to attend until age twelve. Every larger town was then to have a preparatory college or high school where a four-year course would be taught in the liberal arts. Finally, those students who showed promise were meant to attend university for eight years until the age of twenty-four.\(^10\)

Knox’s lofty goal was achieved to a certain degree in Scotland but it was impractical in Ireland given the reality for Presbyterians there. The Church of Ireland dominated the parish system and the educational endowments up until the mid-nineteenth century, so the majority of the advanced Presbyterian schools were established by
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\(^9\) Smyth, 17. Thomas grew up to be a meal-feed agent in Armagh City. Little is known about John other than his birth date in 1809. James was a surgeon with the Honourable East India Company. Jane married John Monroe and had at least two sons, Moses and James, who ended up in Newfoundland. William became a Presbyterian minister and served his entire career at Maryport, England. And Joseph stayed close to home in nearby Drumbeemore and is buried in the Redrock cemetery.

congregations in the larger centres. The remainder, especially in more rural areas, were “hedge schools” where students would pay a small fee to be taught basic reading and writing skills by a minister or a student for the ministry.\textsuperscript{11} Redrock Presbyterian Church, though not a large congregation, had a small schoolhouse on an acre of manse property. Not much is known about how the school operated, but classes were likely run by the Reverend James Harvey and students like Moses were taught with the aid of popular chivalric novels, classical literature, the Bible, and the \textit{Shorter Catechism}. The \textit{Shorter Catechism} was a series of over one-hundred questions and answers, formulated by the Assembly of Divines in Westminster in 1647, that clearly articulated what Presbyterians believed. It outlined the nature of God, the importance of scripture, the roles of ministry, and the Presbyterian form of governance. It also explained the sacraments, the Ten Commandments and the Lord’s Prayer.\textsuperscript{12} The \textit{Shorter Catechism} also formed a central part of Sunday school, family worship and a Presbyterian’s preparation for the Lord’s Supper.

After graduating from the Redrock schoolhouse, Moses Harvey furthered his education in Markethill. His teacher was a Mr. Moore, but there is no indication whether classes took place in an actual school or in private tutoring rooms. There were “high school” options in the area – especially after the introduction of Ireland’s government-funded National System of Education in 1831. Along with his formal schooling, Harvey

\textsuperscript{11} Andrew R. Holmes, \textit{The Shaping of Ulster Presbyterian Belief and Practice, 1770-1840} (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 266-267.
would also have taken advantage of his father’s library and what nearby Armagh and Markethill had to offer.

The City of Armagh is the ancient capital of Ulster and a place steeped in history and folklore. It is said to be where Saint Patrick founded his church and is the site of cathedrals for both the Church of Ireland and the Roman Catholic Church. In the early nineteenth century, Armagh had a population of about 7,000 that was split between Catholics, Anglicans and Presbyterians. It was chiefly a market town with small service industries and little in the way of manufacturing. What it did have was a public library, an observatory and a very active mechanics’ institute. Markethill, while only a fraction of the size, also had readings rooms and public lectures associated with the two Presbyterian meeting houses. Given that he was only five miles from either centre, it is not inconceivable that Harvey would have visited and availed himself of the opportunity to better his education and his understanding of the world around him.

At some point during this time, Moses Harvey decided to follow his father’s footsteps and enter the ministry. While James Harvey had to travel outside of Ireland for his theological training – most likely to the University of Glasgow - Moses had the option to attend the Royal Belfast Academical Institute (Inst), for his. Before examining Harvey’s seven years at Inst, however, it is necessary to give a brief history of Presbyterianism in Ireland and a description of the various traditions within the denomination. This is important because church membership determined the type of

---

education students for the Presbyterian ministry received and it is a useful way to gauge overall theological, social and political views. While most of the splits and schisms mirrored what went on in Scotland, the dynamics and influences within Ulster often resulted in a product that was uniquely Irish.

Though Scots had been migrating to Ireland in small numbers for centuries, Presbyterianism officially came to the north-eastern counties of Ireland in about 1609 with the arrival of about 50,000 Scottish settlers. Known as the Ulster Plantation, they were part of King James VI’s plan to “civilize” that corner of Ireland through the introduction of substantial and defendable communities entirely inhabited by loyal British subjects.\(^\text{14}\) For the remainder of the seventeenth century, Presbyterians focused on putting down religious roots in their new communities by establishing congregations, presbyteries and, in 1690, the General Synod of Ulster.\(^\text{15}\) The relative cohesion of the group was disrupted in the 1720s over a doctrinal disagreement about the *Westminster Confession of Faith*. Ministers and elders who felt strongly about not subscribing to the subordinate standards broke from the Synod of Ulster to form the Presbytery of Antrim. This is not to say, however, that those who remained within the Synod of Ulster were all staunch subscribers. Many held moderate theological views that eventually became known as the New Light movement. This doctrinal laxity in Ulster and Scotland, as well


\(^{15}\) Presbyterianism is organized in a hierarchy of church courts. At the base is the Session made up of the minister and elected lay elders. The Presbytery consists of all ministers and a representative elder from each congregation in a particular region. Finally, the General Synod or Assembly meets once a year and includes all ministers and a representative elder from all congregations under its supervision.
concerns over government authority and the use of patronage to fill ministerial positions, led to a further split with the formation of the Seceders who held theological views similar to the Covenanters.

The Covenanters or Reformed Presbyterians, who were numerically small in Ulster, strictly adhered to the *National Covenant* (1638) and the *Solemn League and Covenant* (1643). The former condemned the attempt of Charles I to force the Scottish Church to conform to English liturgy and governance. The latter was an agreement with Charles I and Charles II that, in exchange for military assistance, the Scottish system of church governance would be established in England, Ireland and Wales. As a result, Covenanters did not recognize the British constitution nor did they accept civil authority in matters such as voting, registering leases or paying taxes. While the Secession Synod was not quite as anti-establishment, they agreed with the Covenanters that not enough emphasis was being given to the principles of Calvinism. They also opposed landowners appointing ministers rather than congregations electing them – though this was not as common a practice in Ireland. The Seceders established their first Irish congregation in 1746 and then promptly split a year later into Burgher and Anti-Burgher synods over whether or not it was appropriate that town leaders take an oath accepting the "true religion presently professed within this realm." Burghers believed this referred to Protestantism in general, while Anti-Burghers felt they would be swearing allegiance to

the Established Church. Redrock Presbyterian Church was a Secession congregation and a Burgher one. Though by the time Moses Harvey was born, the Burghers and the Anti-Burghers had reunited to form the Secession Synod of Ireland.

As a Presbyterian, Harvey believed in the sovereignty of God as the sole power over the Church; the authority of Scripture; the sinful nature of mankind; and the promise of salvation through grace and faith in Christ. As a Seceder, Harvey strongly held to the orthodoxy of the Westminster standards and the moral order inherent in Presbyterian governance. He also believed that the gospel was to be offered freely to all sinners, not just the elect who had spiritually prepared themselves for salvation. The main vehicle for this was preaching. Seceder sermons were biblically based, but everyday language was encouraged as was a sense of passion and theatre. Written and legalistic sermons were often criticized, by church members and ministers alike, as showing little regard for the souls of the congregation. This combination of theological conservatism and populist evangelism was what Moses Harvey brought with him to his studies at the Royal Belfast Academical Institution (Inst).

Inst was founded in 1810 by a group of prominent Belfast businessmen who wanted to address the lack of advanced education in Ulster at both the grammar-school and the university level. Primary students could choose from a number of subject departments or schools that taught Classics, Mathematics, English, Modern Languages,
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19 Holmes, Shaping of Ulster Presbyterian Belief and Practice, 33-35.
20 Ibid., 132-133.
Writing, and Drawing. An annual fee was charged, but the amount depended on the number of schools that a pupil attended and was kept as low as possible in order “to diffuse useful knowledge, particularly among the middling orders of society, as a necessity, not a luxury.”\textsuperscript{21} The money raised by student fees also went entirely to pay the school masters and professors.\textsuperscript{22} The Collegiate department also had a comprehensive curriculum with professors of Mathematics; Natural Philosophy and Chemistry; Rhetoric, Logic and Belles Lettres; Moral Philosophy; Greek and Latin; Hebrew and Oriental Languages; Irish; and Anatomy. While the goal from the beginning was to draw a majority of college-level students from potential candidates for the Presbyterian ministry, the bulk of the education was designed to be secular in nature. Unlike universities at Oxford, Cambridge, Edinburgh or Glasgow, no religious test or subscription was required of either students or professors. Instead, the Royal Belfast Academical Institution invited all denominations to appoint their own independent professors of Divinity. The Church of Ireland and the Roman Catholic Church declined the invitation, but both the General Synod of Ulster and the Seceder Synods agreed. They also decided to recognize the general certificates awarded at Inst as being equivalent to degrees from “foreign universities” and to raise funds to endow their respective chairs.

While the start of Inst’s Collegiate department was promising and its goal of non-denominational education laudable, the school quickly got caught up in the larger

political and social struggles swirling around Ulster in the early to mid-nineteenth century. The first challenge to overcome was the opposition of the British government which did not want to see post-secondary instruction offered at all. Westminster was not enthusiastic about financing the training of Presbyterian ministers who it blamed for the rise in Irish republicanism and the ill-fated Rebellion of 1798. As a result, they tried to starve Inst out by cutting off public funding.\textsuperscript{23} Private donations and financial support from the Synods increased to make up for the loss and by the early 1820s, the British government quietly dropped its opposition to the collegiate program at Inst. Unfortunately, just as the external threat receded, an internal challenge over theological purity was gathering strength in the form of the Reverend Henry Cooke. Cooke was the charismatic leader of the more orthodox wing of the Synod of Ulster and a staunch supporter of both the Tory Party and stronger ties with the British Union.\textsuperscript{24} He saw the political and theological liberalism of his colleagues as part of Ulster's ongoing slide towards republicanism and Catholic domination. Cooke believed that a man's politics could be deduced from his religious opinions and that Arianism was the gateway to radicalism. Arians questioned the validity of the Trinity and the divinity of Jesus Christ - though in Ulster, it was also a term often applied to those who refused to subscribe to the Westminster Confession of Faith. Inst had known Arians serving on its Joint Board and on the teaching staff so in Cooke's mind, they were automatically suspect.


\textsuperscript{24} \textit{Ibid.}, 341.
and likely the source of heretical views with the Synod. As a result, he launched an aggressive campaign against the Collegiate Department's independence and challenged, through the Synod of Ulster, the religious orthodoxy of many of their academic appointments. Cooke's anti-Inst crusade reached its zenith in the early 1840s during Moses Harvey's time at the Royal Belfast Academical Institute. While the teaching atmosphere within the school has been described as "a calm stream between two warring banks", the ongoing controversy must have had some impact on the students.

Moses Harvey arrived in Belfast to take up his studies in 1836 and for a young man from rural Armagh, it would have been quite a change. Belfast, at the time, was just entering its period of maximum economic growth with both population and industrialization on the rise. Linen production had taken over from cotton as one of the city's major employers, the port was bustling, and shipbuilding in the Lough Neagh basin of the Lagan river was rapidly expanding. The other constant was the steady influx of people from the countryside looking for work and accommodation. Belfast began the century with a population of approximately 20,000 and finished it at 350,000 residents. Like most other new arrivals, Harvey's first order of business would be to find a place to stay because the boarding houses at Inst were for schoolboys only. Divinity students either rented rooms from "decent mechanics or upper tradesmen in respectable streets" or from a member of the Inst staff. They were also responsible for their own meals and
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supplies so it is estimated that a year at Inst - including tuition - cost the average ministerial candidate in the late 1830s about £32. While the school strived to keep costs low, this would have been a considerable amount for a student like Harvey who was coming from a manse in a rural Armagh – even with the Regium Donum that his father received annually. To meet their financial obligations, many students for the ministry were encouraged to seek outside work when the college was not in session either with local merchants or nearby Presbyterian churches.

From the late seventeenth century onward, Presbyterian authorities in both Scotland and Ireland adopted fairly rigorous requirements for its ministers. This included a liberal arts education and adequate theological training. Every candidate was required to attend natural and moral philosophy courses as well as to have a sound knowledge of science, ancient languages, logic, metaphysics and church history. At Inst, candidates for the ministry had to study a minimum of seven subjects: Moral Philosophy; Rhetoric, Logic and Belles Lettres (Literature); Hebrew and Oriental Languages; Church History; Natural Philosophy and Chemistry; Mathematics; and, of course, Divinity. Supplementary courses in Elocution were available and students were encouraged to make use of the library and attend the college's public lectures. The Seceding Synod also recommended that its students learn Irish and the Synod of Ulster made it compulsory in 1835.
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century are sparse, it is impossible to be completely accurate about all the courses Harvey would have taken and the materials he would have studied.\textsuperscript{33} There is, however, a complete list of his professors and enough biographical information on many of them to get a pretty good picture of how Harvey's time at the Royal Belfast Academical Institute would have shaped him.\textsuperscript{34}

Regardless of their theological outlook, most of the professors at the Royal Belfast Academical Institute received their liberal arts education from Glasgow University. This meant they were steeped in the teachings of the Scottish Common Sense School that believed humanity perceives the world as it actually is and this intuition is based on certain fundamental principles of morality. In addition to this shared view of moral philosophy, they also believed in natural philosophy - the practical role that science played in industrial progress. Underpinning everything was the inductive method of Francis Bacon. Namely, this is the ability to gradually generalize a finding based on observations and accumulated data, which applied to the physical world and education more broadly.\textsuperscript{35}

\textsuperscript{33} Entry #1313 in the \textit{Register of the Royal Belfast Academical Institute} lists some of the courses that Moses Harvey took – Logic, Mathematics, Moral Philosophy, Natural Philosophy, Oriental Languages, Divinity and Elocution.\textsuperscript{34} From 1837 to 1841, Harvey's professors in the Faculty of Arts were: the Reverend John Ferrie, Moral Philosophy; the Reverend William Cairns, Logic, Rhetoric and Belles Lettres; John Stevelly, Natural Philosophy; John R. Young, Mathematics; the Reverend William Bruce, Greek and Latin; Thomas O'Feenaghty, Irish; and, the Reverend Thomas Dix Hincks, Hebrew and Oriental Languages. During the next three years of his theological training, Harvey took classes from the following professors appointed by the Seceding Synod: the Reverend Dr. John Edgar, Divinity; the Reverend Robert Wilson, Biblical Criticism; and the Reverend William Killen, Ecclesiastical History.\textsuperscript{35} Andrew R. Holmes, "Presbyterians and science in the north of Ireland before 1874," \textit{The British Journal for the History of Science}, 41, 04, (December 2008): 544-547 and Michael Gauvreau, \textit{The Evangelical
These were certainly the views of the Reverend William Cairns. His Logic and Rhetoric classes emphasized the development of a “science of the mind” and fiercely criticized the “fallacies” of scholars like David Hume, John Locke and George Berkeley who believed that passion not reason governed all human behaviour. The Moral Philosophy professor John Ferrie agreed with Cairns, but his orthodoxy was questioned by the Reverend Henry Cooke who felt that he had Arian tendencies, even though he subscribed to the Westminster Confession. The fight with Ferrie was a continuation of an earlier battle against Arianism that he waged against the Reverend William Bruce’s appointment as head of Greek and Latin. While Bruce was a known Arian, Cooke was unable to get Inst to overturn the appointment or convince the Synod of Ulster to take action. Ferrie was not so lucky. After an aggressive campaign that lasted almost five years, Cooke convinced the Synod of Ulster to withdraw its students from Ferrie’s class and send them to his May Street meeting house in Belfast where he and the Reverend Henry Molyneaux would instruct them instead. Non-subscribers and many of the students from the Seceding Synod remained with Ferrie.

Along with his suspected (but unproven) Arian leanings, Ferrie was criticized for giving too much prominence to the teachings of the noted Scottish theologian and churchman Thomas Chalmers. This is more than a little ironic because within ten years of Ferrie’s appointment, Chalmers’ work was being praised by the Synod of Ulster’s
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Orthodox Presbyterian and taught by Molyneaux in his breakaway Moral Philosophy class. Chalmers felt that William Paley’s theory of natural theology only went so far in explaining the meaning of life. While he agreed that the social and physical order of things confirmed the existence of God, there was a difference between what science and religion could answer. While Harvey was certainly exposed to Paley’s theories, he was also thoroughly immersed in Chalmers’ “science of revealed theology” that applied the Baconian method of induction to Scripture.

The Presbyterian commitment to the induction method in the nineteenth century cannot be understated. According to Queen’s University historian Andrew Holmes, it was essential to any form of inquiry. It could be applied universally and it ensured the “inevitable harmony between the two books of God – the book of nature and the book of revelation.” As long as scientists confined their work to the natural world and did not try to answer questions best left to religion, there would be no cause for alarm. In fact, their commitment to induction was so complete that Presbyterians were said to be “very allergic” to any theory – natural or theological - that was not based on hard facts.

Along with the natural philosophy theories of Paley and Chalmers, Harvey’s scientific education included courses in chemistry and applied sciences taught by James Steelly – though not without some difficulty. The laboratory facilities at Inst were limited. Even though it housed a Faculty of Medicine, Steelly was often forced to prepare his experiments in an oven at his home and his scientific apparatus could not be

38 Holmes, “Presbyterians and science in the north of Ireland before 1874,” 552.
39 Ibid., 553-554.
kept in the lecture hall. Despite these obstacles, the material covered was thorough and Stevelly’s classes were well-attended. Rounding out Harvey’s Liberal Arts education were Hebrew and Oriental Language lessons from Thomas Dix Hincks and Mathematics taught by John Young. Most collegiate professors stuck to the textbook which they also wrote, although Young would also have relied heavily on the work of his predecessor James Thomson, who taught at Inst from 1814 until he left for the University of Glasgow in 1832. Thomson wrote a series of practical textbooks on arithmetic, trigonometry and calculus aimed at the merchant classes that were also used in Ireland’s national school system. As well, he was a strong advocate for the teaching of practical science at Inst and established a mathematical library at the school that eventually numbered over 200 volumes. Like Thomson, Hincks was widely viewed as a subject expert who wrote the recognized texts on Greek grammar, Ancient History and Geography.

Another essential tool for Presbyterian ministers in the nineteenth century was, of course, a theological education and these courses at Inst had a great influence on how Moses Harvey viewed his vocation and the world. By the time Harvey finished his four years of Liberal Arts study in 1841, the Synod of Ulster and the Seceding Synod had united to form the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland. This meant that the two main professors of Divinity – the Reverend Dr. Samuel Hanna from the Synod of Ulster and Seceding Synod’s John Edgar – now shared a joint appointment which, in practice, was not as disruptive as it sounds. Hanna joined Inst in 1817 and was
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a colleague of Edgar’s father Samuel who taught Seceder theology there until his death in 1826. Both were strong Calvinists with active involvement in evangelical missions and causes. While they may have disagreed on some of the finer points, they fervently believed in the importance of doctrinal orthodoxy.  

John Edgar continued in that tradition when he assumed his father’s chair. However, rather than focus on the finer points of Calvinist theology, he preferred instead to expound somewhat passionately on its practical applications. As his colleague and biographer W.D. Killen wrote, “In lecturing, as in other matters, he was guided very much by impulse; and he accordingly took up topics in his class, not in the order of their logical arrangement, but as they happened to make an impression on his own ardent mind.” Edgar also involved his students directly in his missionary activities, which were many. He helped establish the Destitute Sick Society of Belfast; managed the Ulster Religious Tract and Book Society; chaired the Committee of the Belfast Anti-Slavery Society; headed up famine relief efforts for the west of Ireland; founded the Establishment for the Deaf, Dumb and Blind; and was the driving force behind the Ulster Female Penitentiary. John Edgar is, however, best known for being the father of the Irish temperance movement.

In August of 1829, Edgar, having been convinced of the case for temperance by a former classmate, now preaching in the United States, issued a public call for the people of Belfast to abstain from “ardent spirits.” Such action, he believed, would promote the
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sanctification of the Sabbath, improve the work ethic of Irish society and cut the truly
intemperate off from the source of incalculable evil. He believed that distillers could not
survive on sales to drunkards alone. His letter went to the two main local newspapers.
The editor of the *Belfast Guardian* refused it because he thought the writer must be
demented. The *Belfast News Letter* somewhat reluctantly agreed to publish it, but when a
second correspondence came from Edgar on the same subject, the editor insisted that it be
divided into two parts with a week in between to minimize any hostile reaction.\(^{45}\) The
*News Letter* need not have worried. The letters struck a chord and were immediately
reproduced across the country, as well as in Scotland and England. In less than six
months, the Ulster Temperance Society had 3,000 members and by 1833, there were 150
societies across the province and the membership had grown to 15,000.\(^{46}\)

The rapid spread of the movement was due, in no small part, to the drive and the
energy of John Edgar. He accepted speaking engagements, largely at his own expense,
across Ireland and Britain; wrote countless articles, pamphlets and lectures on the subject;
and crafted a message that had strong popular appeal. Rather than calling for abstinence
from all alcohol, Edgar only advocated for an end to drinking spirits and was harshly
critical of teetotalers. He believed they discredited the movement, went against Scripture,
and were tools of the devil.\(^{47}\) Edgar’s passion for evangelism and social improvement
was shared, for the most part, by his colleagues and students at Inst. The first ministers to
join the Temperance Society were Thomas Dix Hincks and Robert Wilson. W.D. Killen,

\(^{45}\) Killen, 29-37.
\(^{46}\) Holmes, *Shaping of Ulster Presbyterian Belief and Practice*, 99.
\(^{47}\) Killen, 94-95.
and James Stevelly were also actively involved in the movement, as were Edgar’s Divinity classes. Virtually all of the Seceder candidates for ministry were members, as were many of those from the Synod of Ulster.  

Students of John Edgar, like Moses Harvey, may not have received the same detailed grounding in Calvinism that they would have learned from his father, but they graduated with a strong sense of evangelism and practical experience with missionary activism. As one of Edgar’s students wrote after his death in 1866: “Those who grew up under his influence, bore away possibly from others a larger number of distinct and accurate conceptions, but from none did they receive so deep and lasting a conviction of the lightness, beauty, and nobleness of seeking the good of others, and leaving the world better than they found it.”

Another major influence for ministerial candidates at Inst was their professors of Biblical Criticism: the Seceding Synod’s Robert Wilson and Samuel Davidson from the Synod of Ulster. Both were appointed to their chairs in 1834 and 1835 respectively, almost ten years earlier than similar appointments at Presbyterian colleges in Scotland. It is speculated that one of the reasons for this is the “well-developed siege mentality” of Ulster Presbyterians and the sense that they constantly had to battle against popery and Puseyism to advance what they believed to be the truth of Scripture.  

Biblical criticism in the nineteenth century was divided into two general schools – higher or historical
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criticism and lower or textual criticism. Historical criticism was decidedly secular in its approach. It looked to examine the Bible in its original context and to investigate the true nature of the events, locations and people described in its verses. To these scholars, the Bible could contain errors and was not the literal word of God. Lower criticism, on the other hand, held the exact opposite. The contents of the Bible were divinely inspired and any errors were the result of poor translation or transcribing errors from one generation to the next. Original meaning could best be determined by a systematic comparison of all the various texts. Both Wilson and Davidson were decidedly in the latter camp and while at Inst, ministerial students learned that every single word of Scripture was directly inspired by God and all sixty-six books were equally authoritative. They were also trained to defend this traditional view against the higher criticism being advanced by German scholars who were viewed as a threat to the integrity of the faith and to the authority of Scripture.\(^5\)

At the heart of this approach to Biblical criticism – as with the way science and natural philosophy was taught at Inst – was a deep commitment to Common Sense realism, the inductive method of Francis Bacon and the Westminster Confession. In a book of lectures published in 1839, Samuel Davidson provides an interesting glimpse into what students like Harvey would have learned. Davidson stressed the need for “right motives and moral principles;” sternly cautioning against rash judgment and presumptive interpretation. He called on his students not to “be afraid to go forth and meet the

opponents of revelation.” On this, he had the firm agreement of Edgar, Hanna, Wilson and Killen.

Another area where there was broad agreement from Harvey’s professors was on the dangers of liberal theology – especially Arianism. One of the fiercest critics of the views of the Remonstrant Synod of Ireland was the Reverend William Killen, who taught Harvey Ecclesiastical History. Killen, like the Reverend James Seaton Reid before him, wanted to return the church to a position of religious, social and cultural relevance in Ulster. The only way to do that was to embrace the beliefs and practices of the seventeenth-century Scottish founders of Presbyterianism in Ireland. That meant the church had to be missionary in its outlook, conservative in its theology and faithful in its governance. This was the reoccurring leitmotif in most of Killen’s writings and it was certainly his rallying cry within the Royal Belfast Academical Institution.

Killen strongly opposed the appointments of Henry Montgomery and John Porter as Divinity professors from the Association of Non-Subscribing Presbyterians. He did not view them as having the same authority as other faculty members and felt that the Board of Inst had threatened its non-sectarian principles by hiring them. In this, he was not alone. His colleagues Edgar, Wilson, Davidson, Hanna, Stevelly, Young, and Cairns all

made their opposition known to the administration and to their respective Synods.\textsuperscript{55} The Board disagreed and ruled that the two had the full privileges enjoyed by every other faculty member in the Collegiate Department. The result of this decision was that no further faculty meetings were held after January 1841 and no General Certificates were awarded, since the body responsible for examining graduating students for the ministry no longer existed.\textsuperscript{56} Apart from this practical impact on students, the internal dissention and hostility does not appear to have negatively affected the quality of education they received. While they lacked the official piece of paper, the academic work that graduates had done was still recognized by Presbyterian Synods, churches and other institutes of higher learning in Ireland and across the United Kingdom. What the faculty discord did do, however, was add considerable fuel to Henry Cooke’s campaign at the General Assembly and Westminster for the creation of a truly Presbyterian college in Ireland. Queen’s University Belfast was established in 1849 and the Assembly’s College was added in 1853.

While the vast majority of Harvey’s professors supported Cooke’s evangelical and orthodox theology, they drew a hard line at his politics and his tolerance of the Orange Order. Cooke advocated a united Protestant political front and urged his fellow Presbyterians to unite with the Church of Ireland against growing Roman Catholic nationalism and what he saw as questionable Whig social reforms – especially in the area

\textsuperscript{55} There is a very interesting and surprisingly dispassionate account of the internal disagreement in the May 1841 edition of \textit{The Bible Christian} which was the Remonstrant Synod’s newsletter at the time. It is entitled “Royal Belfast Academical Institution: The Faculty Question,” III, V (1841).

\textsuperscript{56} Jamieson, 55.
of education. Cooke and his support for the Tory government of Sir Robert Peel had its backers, but not many of them could be found among his ministerial colleagues. They felt that Peel could not be trusted to defend Presbyterians and their suspicion was further heightened by the Marriage Controversy and failed attempt to formalize tenant rights in Ulster.

In 1840, an Irish Court in Armagh – made up solely of Episcopal judges – ruled that a marriage conducted by a Presbyterian minister was invalid because he had not been ordained by an Anglican bishop. This judgment was upheld by both the appeals court in Ireland and, ultimately, the House of Lords in London. The General Assembly was rightly furious and aggressively lobbied the Peel government to resolve the situation, recognize Presbyterian marriages and abolish the ecclesiastical court system. The minister leading the charge was the Moderator of the General Assembly at the time, the Reverend John Edgar. In a passionate speech to a special meeting of the General Assembly in March of 1843, Edgar issued what amounted to a call for political action - something Presbyterians had been reluctant to do for most of the early nineteenth century. He asked "whether Presbyterians are prepared still to assert the principles and maintain the liberty which their fathers bequeathed, dyed with their blood, and sanctified by their piety and their prayers." In this heightened atmosphere of indignation directed at the Tory government in Westminster and with the evangelical orthodox nature of the Irish Presbyterian Church, it is not surprising that delegates formally recognized the newly

58 Killen, Memoir of John Edgar, 152-158.
formed Free Church of Scotland. They also passed a resolution calling on Presbyterians in Ireland to elect representatives to Westminster who would truly represent "the principles and interests of Presbyterianism in the British Legislature."

One way that this renewed political interest manifested itself was in the creation of newspapers such as the *Banner of Ulster* in the east and the *Londonderry Standard* in the west. Both were run by prominent Presbyterians - the Reverend William Gibson and James McKnight respectively - and each were supportive of the Liberals and had strong evangelical sympathies. While Presbyterian-run broadsheets were not uncommon in early nineteenth century Ireland, the focus of most of the publications such as *The Orthodox Presbyterian, The Presbyterian Penny Magazine, The Monthly Missionary Herald, The Christian Freeman, The Bible Christian* and *The Covenanter* were entirely theological in nature. The *Banner* and the *Standard*, in contrast, were unabashed in advocating for a distinctive Presbyterian politics and the topic they seized upon in the 1840s was tenant-land rights. There was little love for the landlord in Ireland. The vast majority of the land on the island was owned by English families who were absent and Church of Ireland. Tenants had little in the way of rights, though marginally more in Ulster than in the south, and were forced to pay rent to the landlord and their agent, as
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60 In what became known as the Great Disruption, nearly forty per cent of Presbyterian Ministers in Scotland broke with the Established Church over spiritual independence from both government and landlords to form the Free Church. This led to congregational splits throughout the British world, but not in Ireland. The Presbyterian Church in Ireland did not re-establish formal ties with the Established Church until 1885.

61 Holmes, "Covenanter Politics," 351.

62 Ibid., 352.

well as taxes to the State. What's more, as was seen with the Marriage Controversy, landlords controlled the courts and the political system. The goals of the tenant-rights movement were what became known as the three Fs: freedom of sale (realizing profits for any improvements to the land), fair rents and the fixity of tenure.

Presbyterian ministers were drawn to this cause for a variety of reasons. Most came from farming backgrounds themselves and had personal or family experience with landlords. Many served in rural congregations and saw firsthand the suffering of tenant farmers and their families. But, perhaps most Presbyterian of all, they felt that the land-ownership system in Ireland went against the principles of the Bible. The support for tenants’ rights, the distaste for the Church of Ireland and the distrust of Tories was not universal - as can be seen by Henry Cooke and his supporters. The opponents, however, were in the minority. It would take the rise of Irish nationalism and concerns over Home Rule in the 1880s before Popery would replace Puseyism as the dominant fear in Ulster and its politics became more Conservative. The politics that Moses Harvey was exposed to in Belfast in the early 1840s - and most certainly during his time at Inst - however, were decidedly Whig or Liberal. While partisan politics would not intrude unduly in lecture halls, many of his professors like Edgar and Killen were front-and-centre in the efforts to mobilize the Presbyterian electorate and push their collective rights at Westminster.

64 Holmes, "Covenanter Politics," 356-358.
65 Killen was quoted in an 1868 edition Banner of Ulster as saying "a Tory Presbyterian is a kind of ecclesiastical and political incongruity - something like snow in summer, or rain in harvest. A Scotch Whig used to be just another name for a true-blue Presbyterian." Holmes, "Covenanter Politics," 364.
When Moses Harvey graduated from the Belfast Academical Institution in 1844, he took with him more than just the qualifications to practise ministry in the Presbyterian Church. Harvey took with him a certain view of the world and its progress – elements of which can be seen in much of what he wrote for the next fifty-seven years. He believed that all knowledge was based on principles that were self-evident and that anyone with common sense and the proper moral upbringing - regardless of their level of education - was able to learn from the world around them. Like most Presbyterian ministers in the nineteenth century, Harvey fully embraced the Baconian method of induction which held that accumulated data and observations were the best way to arrive at solutions, rather than relying on theories or past conclusions. Not only was it used to describe the natural world, it also bridged any gap between science and religion. Rather than seeing the study of biology, geology and chemistry as an attack against theology, Presbyterians like Harvey saw science as a way of proving both the existence of God and His divine plan for humanity. While others from the dissenting tradition were strongly rooted in the Common Sense Philosophy and the Baconian Method (Congregationalists and Methodists, for example) the attachment was particularly strong amongst Ulster Presbyterians. They were the first, for example, to establish Biblical Criticism chairs in their seminaries, as well as making the study of science and moral philosophy mandatory for ministry students. They believed fervently that their system of ecclesiastical governance was superior, but wanted to prove that their theological outlook was as well. This was largely due to the fact that Ulster Presbyterians felt under constant threat from the growing nationalism of the Roman Catholic majority to the south and the political power of the Church of Ireland that surrounded them.
In terms of his theological views, Harvey was firmly grounded in the Westminster orthodoxy of the Seceder tradition and greatly influenced by the evangelical movement that was a growing force in Protestant churches at the time. Evangelical renewal in the eighteenth and nineteenth century was based on four fundamental tenets: the ultimate authority of the Bible, the divinity of Christ, social activism, and personal conversion. Where evangelical Presbyterians differed from their non-conformist brothers and sisters was over the understanding of what was meant by personal conversion. While Presbyterian clergy encouraged immediate and personal acceptance of Jesus Christ as Lord and Saviour, the conversion was less about emotions and more about a rational acknowledgment of the facts coupled with a solemn commitment to live a spiritual life. This Calvinist aversion to intense physical conversion experiences softened after what became known as the Great Ulster Revival of 1859, but that was long after Harvey left Ireland. His evangelicalism was more conservative, more mission-based and less influenced by the growing tide of Methodism in Ulster.

The final thing that Moses Harvey took with him as he left the grounds of the Royal Belfast Academical Institution was a deep belief in the importance of an educated public and of Presbyterians playing an active role in the world around them. Founding Inst professors like Samuel Edgar and James Thomson held the view that everyone had a right to a general literary education and that no religion or sect should make specific articles of faith or modes of worship as prerequisites to that. This is why they opposed

---

religious testing of all kinds at Inst and made public lectures an integral part of academic life at the College. While their successors may have wavered slightly on “no religious testing” in the face of a strong anti-Arian push, the commitment to non-denominational education and public lectures remained strong. Professors like John Edgar, W.D. Killen and Samuel Davison all lectured outside the walls of Inst and not just on subjects of religious or academic importance. They spoke out on social and economic issues, such as temperance and tenant rights, as well as their political powerlessness in the fact of Anglican-dominated governments in both Ireland and at Westminster.

Due to the absence of any first-hand accounts from Harvey himself of his time growing up in Armagh and Belfast, it is impossible to say with complete certainty how much of an influence it had on his theology, his politics and his general outlook. If the writings that came after 1844 are any indication though, Harvey’s education and his Ulster roots did serve as a starting point for all his ideas. His views of the world, however, were not set in stone. They did evolve slightly over time based on changing circumstances and new discoveries, but Harvey always remained true to three fundamental principles: the common sense belief that knowledge of God’s creation was self-evident; the Baconian method of induction for answering natural and philosophical questions; and faith in the ability of science and progress to continually improve the human condition.

---
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CHAPTER THREE – FROM NORTHERN ENGLAND TO NEWFOUNDLAND (1844-1852)

Moses Harvey is best known as a newspaper columnist, author and promoter of the great economic potential of Newfoundland, but it was not until the late nineteenth century that most of his work in this area occurred. Harvey was in his mid-fifties by the time he turned to writing full time. While writing always played an important part of his professional life, for the majority of Harvey's career, he was primarily a Presbyterian minister. This vocation not only shaped his view of society, but greatly influenced how Harvey interacted with the communities he ministered to in Northern England and Newfoundland.

The period of Harvey's life between 1844 and 1878 is important because of the ideas, themes and patterns that emerge. Throughout his over thirty years of ministry, Harvey combined an energetic commitment to his pastoral duties with a passion for knowledge and the intellectual betterment of society. He created and administered schools, founded groups dedicated to learning, gave countless public lectures and actively participated in the literary life about him. Many of the topics covered and theories espoused during this period (especially on progress) reappear time and again in Harvey's later writing. To understand his views on Newfoundland, therefore, it is important to consider the various stops on his journey from preacher to promoter.

***

When Moses Harvey graduated from the Belfast Academical Institution in 1844, it was a tumultuous time for the Presbyterian Church in the United Kingdom and around
the world. While Presbyterians as a denomination were generally prone to division, a split occurred in 1843 that was so large and so sweeping that it came with its own moniker – “The Disruption”. On May 18th of that year, nearly 200 ministers and elders – almost a third of the gathering - walked out of a meeting of the General Assembly at St. Andrew’s Church on George Street in Edinburgh and formed the Free Church of Scotland in Tanfield Hall at Canonmills about two-and-a-half miles away. By the time all was said and done, 475 of the 1200 ministers of the Established Church of Scotland left.¹ The split was ten years in the making and, like most of the schisms in Presbyterianism, centred primarily on the spiritual independence of the church.

In 1834, evangelicals were in a majority position within the Church of Scotland and immediately flexed their muscles by giving congregations the right to veto any minister nominated by the Crown. Several churches did just that, which put the Church of Scotland on the road to eventual conflict with the state. The issue came to a head when the supreme civil court of Scotland ruled that the Church overstepped its bounds by infringing on the rights of Parliament.² For supporters of the state’s right to name clergy, the decision was a victory. For evangelicals, it was a direct assault on the sovereignty of the Presbyterian Church and a challenge to the fundamental tenet that Jesus Christ alone was its sole King and Head. After a decade of growing tension, a conflict between the two factions was all but inevitable. What the ten-year fight did do, however, was give dissidents time to plan so when the split did occur, the new Free Church of Scotland hit

² For a fascinating description of church/state conflict that led up to the Disruption in 1843, see Robert Buchanan, *The Ten Years’ Conflict: Being the History of the Disruption of the Church of Scotland* (Glasgow: W.G. Blackie and Co., 1852).
the ground running. Within five short years, members and adherents of the movement built hundreds of new churches across the country, paid the stipends of their ministers and vigorously supported missionary work at home and abroad. All of this activity created a whole new avenue of opportunity for young ministers like Moses Harvey. Congregations and theological colleges, both Free and Established, were suddenly looking for ministers and Scots in missionary fields throughout the British Empire answered the call. Many ministers from British North America, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, India, and England left their charges to fill the empty pulpits and academic chairs. The result was a boon for hiring in the ministerial job market. The one place that did not see as much upheaval from the Disruption was Ireland. Unlike the denomination in other locations, the Presbyterian Church in Ireland did not split. This was largely because: it did not have the same relationship with the Crown as the Church of Scotland; the Synod of Ulster and the Secessionist Synod had just reunited in 1840; and the sympathies of Ulster Presbyterians were almost universally with the Free Church. At its first meeting after the Disruption, the Irish General Assembly voted to recognize the Free Church of Scotland alone and severed its ties with the Established Church for the next forty years.

---

The general stability of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland and the increased job prospects elsewhere was likely why Moses Harvey looked across the Irish Sea for his first congregation following graduation. After supply preaching at several vacancies in Ulster, the congregation of John Street Presbyterian Church at Maryport in Cumberland, England called Harvey as their minister with a service of ordination and induction taking place in December of 1844. Harvey replaced the Reverend William Stirling Blackwood who resigned for the Old Parish Church at Portobello, near Edinburgh. Old Parish remained part of the Established Church of Scotland after the Disruption.7 Not too much is known about the two Presbyterian churches in Maryport during the nineteenth century. Both buildings are long since gone and no congregational histories remain. The official records from the period are also sparse. John Street was the senior Presbyterian congregation in town having been founded in 1773 with the church being built three years later in 1776. The younger congregation was at nearby Crosby Street. They broke from John Street in 1831 and while the precise reason is not clear, the split coincides with the calling of a new minister.8 Documents later referred to Crosby Street as the United Presbyterian Church, which suggests that the break was as much theological as it was
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7 Archives for the Presbyterian Church of England (PCE) are kept in Westminster College at the University of Cambridge. They have a series of biographical files (“Fasti” files) for ministers of the PCE that were compiled by the Presbyterian Historical Society in the first half of the twentieth century. This information was contained in the Fasti File for Moses Harvey.

Congregations that eventually made up the United Presbyterian Church in Scotland and England, aligned themselves with the old Secessionist tradition.

In a lot of ways, Maryport was an easy choice for Harvey. The town is located in the north-west corner of England, near the Scottish border and on the shores of the Irish Sea. It had strong economic ties with Belfast, a sizeable Irish community and historical links to the Presbyterian Church in Ireland. Presbyterians in England relied heavily on their Ulster brethren to provide them ministers for their pulpits and money for their coffers to further their evangelical work in the broader community. Like Irish Presbyterians, the Church in England did not split following the Disruption in 1843. Only three years earlier, it decided to become an independent body after the Church of Scotland rejected their petition for synod status. That decision, plus the evangelical missionary focus of the new Free Church, weakened the relationship between English Presbyterians and the Established Church. Another attraction of England for Harvey was that it offered his brother William an opportunity to do his ministerial training in a place that was still close to family. William Harvey was several years behind his brother at the Belfast Academical Institution and with the instability swirling around the Divinity Department, many potential student ministers in the mid-1840s were looking elsewhere.

---

9 William Russell, “Maryport in 1832,” Public Lecture at the Old Court House, (May 1896), part of the Dr. J.W. Cravens Collection at the Cumbria Archive Centre (Carlisle).
to pursue their calling. In 1846, William Harvey entered into a four-year Presbyterian seminary program at the Theological College in London.\textsuperscript{12}

Maryport itself has an interesting history, especially in the nineteenth century, and living there no doubt had an influence on Moses Harvey’s later vision for how Newfoundland could develop in future.\textsuperscript{13} The area was largely uninhabited until the arrival of the Romans and the construction of a fort called Alauna in AD 122. Alauna prevented invaders and others from avoiding Hadrian’s Wall by traversing the Solway Firth. After the Romans left, around AD 400, the site fell into disuse with the harbour being used mainly by local fishermen and marauding Vikings. It was not until the mid-eighteenth century that Maryport took shape when Humphrey Senhouse received a charter to build an industrial town meant to compete with Whitehaven in the growing coal trade. The population grew quickly from 1,300 inhabitants in 1774 to over 5,300 in 1841.\textsuperscript{14} Maryport also became a major export centre with 200,000 tons of coal and 100,000 tons of iron ore leaving the harbour on an annual basis by 1848.\textsuperscript{15} This amount only increased with the construction of the Maryport & Carlisle Railway which was designed and overseen by the father of British railways, George Stephenson. To accommodate the growth and take the pressure off Campbell’s Dock (1836), Maryport

\textsuperscript{12} The English Presbyterian Messenger, Volume 1, (August 1847): 473.
\textsuperscript{13} There is very little secondary material available on the history of Maryport. The most detailed is a 1969 self-published book by local amateur historians Herbert and Mary Jackson entitled A History of Maryport 78AD-1900.
\textsuperscript{14} Maryport Conservation Area Character Appraisal commissioned by the Allerdale Borough Council in 2005, (\url{http://www.allerdale.gov.uk/downloads/Maryport_Conscription_Area_Appraisal.pdf})
built the Elizabeth Dock (a pier and wet dock) in the 1850s which made it the first floating dock in the country. Along with exports, the area boasted many secondary industries such as shipbuilding, iron forging, flour milling, sail-making, tanning, a rope works, and a brewery. The keys to Maryport’s prosperity in the nineteenth century, apart from location, were an abundance of natural resources, willing markets, technological advances and a railway. This could not have been lost on someone as keen on progress as Moses Harvey.

With the growing prosperity and population of Maryport came an increased number of Scottish and Ulster Presbyterians. It was to this community that Harvey started ministering in December of 1844. The precise details of Harvey’s time at John Street Church do not exist but there are enough references in official Synod documents and in the denomination’s periodical, The English Presbyterian Messenger, to suggest that he approached his vocation with a great deal of passion and energy. The three themes that occur time and time again in the records are missions, education and ministerial support.

While the Nonconformist tradition in England is historically strong, Presbyterianism in the country ebbed and flowed. It nearly disappeared at the end of the seventeenth century with the restoration of King Charles II; revived slightly in the next
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16 Extensive Urban Survey: Archaeological Assessment Report, Maryport commissioned by the Cumbria County Council, (http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/catalogue/adsdata/arch-319-1/dissemination/pdf/Allerdale/Assessment/Maryport_assessment_report.pdf),

17 The Session Minute Book for John Street Presbyterian Church, 1823-1872 at the Cumbria Archive Centre, Carlisle, England has a gap in the proceedings from 1842 until 1856. Personal correspondence with Tom Robson, Senior Archivist, on February 6, 2013.
century after the Act of Union in 1707; and then started to come back into its own during the evangelical Protestant push of the early nineteenth century. One of the main consequences of this fluctuation was a lack of coordination. Unlike their cousins in Scotland and Ireland, presbyteries in England were often left to their own devices when it came to outreach, orthodoxy and church finances. The newly constituted Presbyterian Church in England sought to change this through the creation of a robust committee system.

The Synod encouraged presbyteries to see to it that all the churches within their bounds established congregational associations. The purpose of these associations was to obtain subscriptions and donations from church members for the Synod’s various funds including: home and foreign missions, Sabbath and day schools, the theological college, and administration. Many churches, however, saw associations as a threat to traditional Presbyterian governance where elders looked after spiritual matters and deacons took care of temporal issues. Others viewed congregational associations as a form of creeping secularization that went against their noble calling. The Synod and The English Presbyterian Messenger had little time for such critics. They believed that associations were a good measure of a congregation’s enthusiasm and zeal. A church with a congregational association was a unified church; engaged in its greater mission and spiritually-minded in its actions. John Street was one of only two Presbyterian churches in the Presbytery of Cumberland and 14 nation-wide that jumped immediately on the

---

19 The English Presbyterian Messenger, (September, 1845): 72-73.
20 Ibid., (October, 1845): 92-93.
21 Ibid.
association bandwagon. While their contributions were modest, usually only £1 or £2 a quarter, Maryport supported the Home Mission, the Foreign and Jewish Mission, the Schools Fund, and the Synod Fund.\textsuperscript{22}

Along with forming a congregational association, Moses Harvey heeded the Church’s call to establish both a Sabbath school and a day school so that the youth of Maryport could be educated and the cause of Presbyterianism advanced.\textsuperscript{23} As in Ulster and Scotland, the Presbyterian Church in England thought education was of paramount importance and something that every congregation should be engaged in – especially since only twenty of seventy-five churches had a school associated with it:

\begin{quote}
A Presbyterian Church without schools is an anomaly in Presbyterianism, and a very imperfect exhibition of an ecclesiastical system whose historic honours have been ever associated with the school as well as with the pulpit. And if a Presbyterian Church without its full complement of schools, will never strike its roots deep, or spread its branches wide, on the soil of England, especially in times like the present, when all other religious denominations in this country are so much alive to importance of retaining the young under their educational influence …\textsuperscript{24}
\end{quote}

Church of England hostility to Presbyterian educational efforts in the county made the situation in Cumberland particularly dire. Established clergy undercut the fees charged by Presbyterian teachers; offered endowments to Presbyterian youth; and, when all else

\textsuperscript{22} Ibid., (June, 1846): 237. The Synod Fund helped defray the cost of ministers travelling to meetings or attending to other official church business.

\textsuperscript{23} Actings and Proceedings of the Synod, 152.

\textsuperscript{24} The English Presbyterian Messenger, (August, 1845): 50.
failed, intimidated their parents.\textsuperscript{25} Despite these obstacles, Moses Harvey went ahead with his plans. John Street held a fundraising bazaar in the spring of 1846 and, over a three-day period, realized a profit of £104. That amount, along with other contributions, allowed them to build “a comfortable school-house and to repair the church.”\textsuperscript{26}

The money raised at the John Street Bazaar is even more impressive because the congregation itself was not a wealthy one. While Maryport’s prosperity grew steadily throughout the early nineteenth century, John Street continually struggled to make ends meet. The minimum stipend that a Presbyterian minister in England needed to carry out his duties was £100 per annum, plus a manse.\textsuperscript{27} While the exact amount of Moses Harvey’s annual stipend is not known, it is clear that it often fell below that £100 threshold. Harvey, like many Presbyterian ministers in Northern England, relied on Lady Hewley’s Charities to top-up their remuneration. Lady Sarah Hewley (1627-1710) was a wealthy heiress who left a portion of her estate to benefit “poor and godly preachers for the time being of Christ's holy gospel.”\textsuperscript{28} Since the three trustees were Presbyterian, many of the grant recipients – though not all of them, by any means – came from that denomination and that is where the problem arose. In the eighteenth century, a majority of the Presbyterians receiving grants were decidedly Unitarian in their outlook. By the 1840s, however, Orthodox Presbyterians and their rock-solid belief in the Trinity held sway. The Unitarians (or Independents, as they were known) felt short-changed and took

\textsuperscript{25} Ibid., 49.
\textsuperscript{26} Ibid., (May, 1846): 205.
\textsuperscript{27} Actings and Proceedings of the Synod, 91.
the matter to court, claiming that the Fund had strayed from Lady Hewley’s original intent and her theological leanings.\textsuperscript{29} The case was eventually decided in favour of the Orthodox Presbyterians but in the course of the proceedings, hearings were held around the country and many grant recipients were called on to appear – including Moses Harvey.\textsuperscript{30}

Harvey’s precarious financial situation at Maryport and the hand-to-mouth existence of many of the congregations across the Cumberland Presbytery drove him to advocate for support from the national church headquarters in London. As Presbytery Clerk, Harvey authored a report calling for the creation of a fund to ensure that all ministers within the Presbyterian Church in England received a minimum stipend of £100 as well as a manse for accommodation. His report reflected the views of the ministers in the region and in many other rural areas across England.\textsuperscript{31} The Cumberland Presbytery’s proposal modelled itself on the Sustentation Fund of the Free Church of Scotland created by its first moderator, the Reverend Thomas Chalmers; the idea being that every congregation should contribute to the fund according to their means. The money would then be used to provide struggling ministers with a modest amount of support. The Synod agreed in principle with Harvey’s Sustention Fund proposal, but they worried it would take too long to implement so members of the Church Court decided on an interim measure. The Synod established a Supplemental Fund which topped-up ministers from

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{29 \textit{The English Presbyterian Messenger}, (April, 1847): 407.}
\footnote{30 \textit{Ibid.}, (February, 1847): 369.}
\footnote{31 \textit{The English Presbyterian Messenger}, (May, 1846): 220.}
\end{footnotes}
the Home Mission Fund when their stipend fell below £100.32 While it was not as far-reaching as the original proposal and often struggled to meet demand, the Supplemental Fund ensured that the Presbyterian Church in England – especially in the north of the country - could compete with pulpit vacancies in the Free Church and the Regius Donum in Ireland. This made the Supplemental Fund – along with the creation of a day school - one of the more lasting legacies of Harvey’s ministry at John Street Church.

When he was not taking care of church business or tending to his pastoral duties, Harvey participated extensively in Maryport’s burgeoning adult education movement – something he would later repeat in Newfoundland. Harvey developed an annual series of lectures that took place at John Street33 and was a regular presenter at the local Mechanics’ Institute. Founded in 1842, the Maryport Mechanics’ Institute - like all other organizations of that name - sought to give the rising working class both a practical education and a solid grounding in the scientific principles that underpinned the skills they used on the job each day.34 Public lectures played an important part of Harvey’s life at the Belfast Academical Institution and, like most other Presbyterian ministers at the time, he firmly believed in the power of knowledge and in the God-given right of everybody to read and understand the Bible. To Harvey, intellectual betterment and the constant pursuit of knowledge was “the design of Providence” so he had little time for critics who warned of the dangers of educating the labourers and mechanics - “If knowledge be dangerous at all, it is equally dangerous to the rich as to the poor. If it will

32 Ibid.
turn the head of a peasant, it will do the same with a lord. If it be good for the student in the university, it cannot be bad for his brother who wields the hammer.”

According to Harvey, society had more to fear from a mass of people “sunk in brutality and ignorance” so he called on the middle and upper classes to do everything in their power to “render them intelligent and attached subjects of a good government.”

There is no list of the lectures that Harvey delivered at John Street or an annual program from the Maryport Mechanics’ Institution, but several of them were published in part by *The English Presbyterian Messenger*: “Popular Education” in April 1850; “Change and Progress” in February 1851; and, in June of that same year, “Man the Worker”. Another of his lectures, “The Characteristic Features of the Present Age, and the Prospects of the Coming Era” ended up in book form and was distributed widely in Great Britain by a printer in Edinburgh. Apart from being the first recorded examples of Harvey’s writing, these four pieces are interesting because of the ideas he raised and the overall approach he used to convey them to the audience. Not only do these works reflect much of what Harvey learned at the Belfast Academical Institution, they also highlight some fundamental beliefs that he came back to again and again throughout his life. While the passion with which he promoted these principles ebbed and flowed over the years, Harvey’s abiding faith in them remained largely unshaken.

The first of Harvey’s so-called “universal laws” was that – like the earth itself – humanity was ever changing and ever improving. “The present is an improvement on the
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past; the future will be an improvement on the present”\(^{37}\) and the human race is on a gradual but resistless march toward a “higher and happier place in the scale of existence.”\(^{38}\) Proof of this could be found in the very history of the inhabitants of the British Isles from their inauspicious beginnings as “wild, matted-haired savages” to the civilized people that they had become with railway trains, electricity, printing presses and telegraphs. While Harvey felt that every age was a reforming age, the second half of the nineteenth century was – in his opinion - poised for greatness. Not only was society benefiting from an unprecedented amount of scientific discovery, but new ideas were winning out in the struggle against worn-out institutions, old-fashioned notions and injustice. “Barbarism, war, feudalism, chivalry have had their day and are now regarded as the infant periods of humanity through which it has passed.”\(^{39}\)

The second principle that Harvey held to be self-evident was that every advance, idea and scientific achievement was part of the divine plan of a merciful and benevolent Creator. In true Common Sense and Baconian fashion, Harvey believed that no Christian should allow his or her faith to be shaken by scientific investigations – whether they be in geology, astronomy or biology:

\begin{quote}
Let us never be afraid of truth in whatever shape it comes – never tremble at the discoveries of science. Nature is one volume, and revelation another: both come from God; and when both are correctly interpreted there can be no
\end{quote}

discrepancy – no contradiction. Coming from the same source they must be harmonious.  

Science was not something to be feared, but something to be embraced. Anyone who suggested otherwise was either ignorant or woefully mired in the past. The ignorant, Harvey believed, could be enlightened because everyone had the innate ability to comprehend the laws of the universe and the world around them. There was, however, little hope for those who refused to recognize the reality that surrounded them and who tried to halt the “progressive advance of God-like virtue”. They were guilty of uttering treason against the government of the universe and blaspheming the very providence of heaven. While Harvey was convinced that his truth would triumph in the end, he did not think it would be easy to unseat the old guard and their traditional notions. He warned his listeners and readers that those in the vanguard often suffer and are mocked by those left behind. The modern prophet, like those of ancient times, could often be found “crying in the wilderness” – misunderstood and underappreciated.

Despite his allusions to being burned at the intellectual stake or not living long enough to witness victory in the battle for truth, Harvey’s early writings are infused with a prevailing sense of optimism. He believed there was a humanizing spirit evident throughout the land – one that brought “evils” to light, ascertained their causes, and

40 Harvey, Characteristic Features of the Present Age, 7.
41 Harvey, “Popular Education,” 299.
42 Harvey, Characteristic Features of the Present Age, 23.
43 Ibid., 15.
sought to remedy them. As proof, Harvey cited the establishment of temperance societies, town missions, “ragged schools,” hospitals, asylums, penitentiaries, and the early-closing movement:

Surely all this seems to say a better spirit is abroad – a holy, divine spirit of gentleness and love for the fallen, the wretched, the outcast – the spirit which the Saviour so earnestly preached and so touchingly exhibited. Surely the reign of love is commencing.

The “reign of love” was not confined to secular society. Harvey’s optimism carried over into religion. He believed that Christians, regardless of their denomination, were increasingly realizing that the essence of their faith was love and its attainment was the highest level of perfection and happiness that any human being could achieve. “Bigotry and intolerance in every form are disappearing. Sectarianism, though still strong, is losing ground.” To Harvey, the latter half of the nineteenth century was the start of a glorious era and he rejected any criticism that his optimism was misplaced or his views Utopian. Being anything but enthusiastic about the future would be, for Harvey, akin to denying the existence of gravity.

Along with outlining the three fundamental tenets of his world view - the irresistible march of progress, the harmony between science and revelation, and the bright promise of what is to come - Harvey’s early writings displayed certain
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44 Ibid., 17.
45 Ragged schools were charitable schools established in the nineteenth century to educate destitute children in mainly working class areas of Britain.
46 Harvey, Characteristic Features of the Present Age, 17.
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characteristics that remained fairly consistent throughout his life. His lectures and articles always had a purpose. While he no doubt hoped to appeal to a broad audience with his writing, the goal was never solely to entertain. Harvey wanted to educate, enlighten and convince people that his convictions should be theirs. To this end, his articles were carefully constructed with every claim supported by evidence that substantiated his argument.

Harvey also made a point to use examples that were current and familiar to the general public, rather than relying on more academic sources. When discussing the advances of science, for example, Harvey directed his audience to London’s Crystal Palace Exhibition; the Leviathan Telescope in Ireland; Justus von Liebig’s invention of nitrogen-based fertilizer; the discovery of chloroform; and the wonders of the daguerreotype photographic process. He also made ample use of popular poetry and sprinkled its verses throughout his remarks. In his published lectures to the Workington and Maryport Mechanics’ Institutes, Harvey quoted at length from Thomas Hood’s “Song of the Shirt” and “Bridge of Sighs” as well as the work of Charles Dickens. He also included lines from poems written by Sir Walter Scott, Thomas Campbell, Ebenezer Elliott, Wathen Mark W. Call, Alfred Tennyson and Henry Wadsworth Longfellow. Harvey’s choice of poets could be a study in itself but the common denominator is, for the most part, that they tended to share his liberal, evangelical views of society and were incredibly popular with the general public. Thomas Hood, for example, was one of the best known British poets of the nineteenth century and his poetry alone tripled the

---
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circulation of the magazine *Punch*. And the fact that Harvey included much of this poetry without attribution meant that he expected his audience to know it by heart – as they would the biblical verses that he also referenced.

Another thing is clear from Harvey’s writing and that is his deep fascination with the steam engine. He deemed it “the greatest wonder of the day.” There was no other object, Harvey confessed, that he had greater admiration for than the “huge fiery dragon” capable of transporting goods and passengers along his “iron road” at speeds up to 70 miles an hour.

Yes, this is the great civilizer of the day, that is at this moment powerfully promoting the spread of brotherhood, and carrying knowledge over the length and breadth of earth, scattering old prejudices and aiding the reign of new ideas, linking together continents and islands, and binding the children of a common father by the ties of interest, and these will lead to nobler and holier ties.  

According to Harvey, the railroad had – in the words of the prophet Isaiah – the power to ensure that “Every valley is exalted, and every mountain and hill brought low; crooked places are made straight, and the rough things plain.”

Given Harvey’s day job, it is not surprising that his writings and lectures during this period have a certain sermon-like feel to them – especially since he viewed progress and science as definitive proof that God’s hand was at work in the world. The preaching

50 Harvey, *Characteristic Features of the Present Age*, 13.
51 Isaiah 40: 4, quoted in Harvey, *Characteristics of the Present Age*, 11.
style of many Presbyterian ministers at that time was shifting to reflect the changes in society and to respond to the growing pressure from the various Protestant revivalist movements across Britain and Ireland. The doctrinal content of sermons was still of vital importance with congregations, some of whom were always on the lookout for hints of heresy, but a preacher also needed the ability to attract new followers. Harvey’s skill at combining orthodoxy with warmth, enthusiasm and cultural relevancy likely made him a popular figure on both the religious and secular speaking circuit in the Northwest of England. This reputation undoubtedly attracted the attention of the influential Colonial Committee of the Free Church of Scotland and set the wheels in motion for Harvey’s move to St. John’s, Newfoundland.

The Colonial Committee – or the Committee of the Colonial Scheme of the Free Church of Scotland, as it was originally called – was the body that sought to place ministers in Free Church congregations throughout the British colonies. Church fathers saw the Disruption as a perfect opportunity to plant and grow dissenting Presbyterianism in the New World and thus placed a great deal of importance in, and financial resources behind, the Colonial Committee. The nearly 80 members of the Committee (half clergy, half elders) in turn responded with enthusiasm, energy and great personal commitment. They saw to it that no request from a missionary field went unanswered, vetted hundreds of ministerial candidates, and raised funds to cover travel expenses and guarantee the salaries of their charges for up to three years. The passion of the Colonial

52 Holmes, *Shaping of Ulster Presbyterian Belief and Practice 1770-1840*, 158-162.
Committee was embodied in its convenor from 1846 to 1864, the Reverend John Bonar who also served as minister of Renfield Street Free Church in Glasgow. Bonar strongly believed in the Committee’s mission and personally recruited many of his clerical colleagues to the cause. He was also often on hand as missionaries steamed out of port on route to India, Australia and British North America.\textsuperscript{54}

Unfortunately, no record exists of the correspondence between the Colonial Committee and Moses Harvey so there is no way of knowing how the opportunity in Newfoundland was positioned or whether they offered Harvey a choice of pulpits. What is clear from the Minutes of the Presbytery of Cumberland is that the Committee approached him and not vice-versa.\textsuperscript{55} By all accounts, Harvey was happy in Maryport and the congregation of John Street was very happy with him. The thought, however, of a missionary posting in the New World that “opened up a more extensive field of usefulness” proved irresistible.\textsuperscript{56} The sizeable increase in stipend, from around £100 to well over £200, must also have influenced Harvey’s decision\textsuperscript{57} – especially given the change in his family situation.

On July 7, 1852, Moses Harvey married Sarah Ann Brown\textsuperscript{58} at the Independent Chapel in Cockermouth, England. The service was conducted by the Reverend William

\textsuperscript{54} Ibid., 236.
\textsuperscript{55} From the Minutes of The Colonial Committee, August 10, 1852 – “It was reported that Mr. Lumsden had corresponded with the Rev. Moses Harvey, minister of the Presbyterian church, Maryport, and that he was willing to undertake the charge of St. Johns (sic), Newfoundland …”
\textsuperscript{56} “Presbyteries’ Proceedings – Presbytery of Cumberland,” The English Presbyterian Messenger, IV, (October 1852), 318-319.
\textsuperscript{58} Later in life, Mrs. Harvey added an “e” to both her middle and her maiden name.
Gordon of the Presbyterian Church in Workington. Miss Brown was the second daughter of Isaac and Mary (Cort) Brown – both of whom died within months of each other in 1833 when Sarah was only thirteen. Brown and her ten siblings were then raised by her brother Joseph who took over the family grocery business from their father. Apart from that, little more is known about the early life of Sarah Ann Brown and no real indication of how she and Moses would have met. Cockermouth, located about 11 kilometres from Maryport, was the main market-town for the area and the closest administrative centre for government business. It also drew tourists, even in the mid-nineteenth century, given its close proximity to the Lake District and the fact it was the birthplace of both the poet William Wordsworth and Fletcher Christian, who led the mutiny on the *Bounty*. These factors, and Harvey’s prominence on the local lecture circuit, make it likely that their paths crossed. The Browns, though members of an Independent or Congregationalist Chapel, were more theologically aligned with the Presbyterians. Sarah Brown’s grandfather led a very public split in the late eighteenth century when a new minister attempted to introduce Arianism into the congregation. Following that, keeping a watchful eye out for signs of heresy against Nonconformist orthodoxy was seen as a Brown family birthright.

Before Harvey departed Maryport with his new wife for their new adventure, he ensured that the John Street congregation would not be left bereft of a minister by arranging for the calling of his brother William as his replacement. The speed with which

everything transpired suggests a certain amount of advance planning. The Presbytery of Cumberland accepted Moses Harvey’s resignation on August 18, 1852; it declared John Street Presbyterian Church officially vacant on September 19th; and inducted the Reverend William Harvey as its new minister less than a month later.\(^60\) What makes the move even more remarkable is that William Harvey had only been the minister at his previous charge in Wigan for a little over a year – though he preached there for many months prior to ordination. Perhaps the need to provide for a new wife played into his thinking too. William married Frances Lowe from Wigan on January 10, 1852. Like his brother, William Harvey displayed considerable enthusiasm for his ministry, raising £260 for new schools\(^61\) and publishing articles in *The English Presbyterian Messenger*. Interestingly, while Moses Harvey’s articles were on worldly topics, William’s discourse was decidedly more theological in nature expounding instead on the benefits of religion in the current age.\(^62\) Regardless, the arrangement suited both shepherd and flock because William Harvey remained at John Street until his retirement in 1872 due to declining health.\(^63\)

With the congregation of John Street taken care of and safely in the hands of his brother, Moses Harvey packed up his belongings and travelled by train via Carlyle to


\(^{62}\) William Harvey, “Religion the Glory of Age”, *The English Presbyterian Messenger*, II, (October 1850)

\(^{63}\) Upon retirement, William Harvey was named minister emeritus of John Street and received some financial support from the congregation, including the right to remain in the manse, but had to petition the Synod several times for an increase. Synod eventually moved him onto the roll of the Aged and Infirm Ministers Fund. See *Minutes of the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of England*, Volume II, 50. Harvey died on April 18, 1888. He and Frances had four children Jane Holmes, James, John and Frances, who went by Blanche. James and Blanche remained in Maryport.
Greenock, Scotland on the Caledonian Railway. From there, he and Mrs. Harvey boarded the brand new steamship *Lady LeMarchant* for the eighteen-day crossing to Newfoundland.\(^6^4\) The *Lady LeMarchant* was on its maiden voyage to St. John’s and then Harbour Grace where it would provide steamship service to Conception Bay for her owners Thomas Ridley, John Munn, James Rorke, William Donnelly, and Joseph Devereux.\(^6^5\) Along with his personal baggage, Harvey took with him a view of the world that had been shaped by his education, his religion and his experiences in Maryport. Harvey’s liberal outlook on society, evangelical – but orthodox – approach to faith, and his deep trust in the dual powers of progress and Providence by no means made him unique in the mid-nineteenth century. What did make him stand out, however, was his energy, optimism and great desire to make a difference in both the spiritual and practical life of his adopted country.

---

\(^6^4\) *The Newfoundlander*, 7 October 1852.

CHAPTER FOUR – FROM PREACHER TO PROMOTER (1852-1878)

As the train to Greenock pulled out of Maryport Station on the evening of September 16, 1852, Moses Harvey reflected on his time in the seaside town - years that he believed were the most important of his life:

How familiar I am with every corner and chimney-top; with every green lane and path in its vicinity. What musings and questionings I have had over those hill-tops now dimly visible against the evening sky, or by that wave-kissed beach. What a mental change one passes through in a few years by converse with men, the world, and books.¹

This sentiment is not surprising since John Street Presbyterian Church was Harvey’s first pastoral charge after graduating from the Royal Belfast Academical Institution. Learning how to be a minister is one thing but putting it into practice with an actual congregation is something completely different. Maryport clearly helped shape Harvey’s views on faith, his pastoral duties and the greater role he could play in society. It also gave him the confidence to “cut the cable” that bound him to home and travel across the Atlantic for what would be a twenty-five year ministry in St. John’s, Newfoundland.²

This period, from 1852 to 1878, is key when it comes to understanding Harvey’s later writings on Newfoundland’s past and his belief in its progress-filled future. It was during this time that he established himself in St. John’s, both as a clergyman and as a figure of some note in the broader community. It was also when Harvey first encountered

¹ The Newfoundland Express, 2 August 1853. The article was also republished in The Presbyterian Witness and Evangelical Advocate, 20 August 1853.
² Ibid.
a host of political, literary, academic and business people who figured prominently in the
so-called “policies of progress” of the late nineteenth century. Lastly, it is an important
period because it covers the start of what would be Harvey’s second career as a
correspondent, editor, author, and promoter. By the beginning of the 1870s, Moses
Harvey managed to combine a full-time ministry with regular writing for a wide range of
newspapers and periodicals in Canada, the United States and Britain. Through these
writings, it is possible to trace the changes in how Harvey viewed Newfoundland. He
went from seeing the island as the “land of fogs and codfish” when he arrived, to
viewing it as a misunderstood, often neglected and under-developed colony when he
stepped down from the pulpit in 1878.

***

A large crowd of curious onlookers, investors and Presbyterians gathered at St.
John’s Harbour on October 4, 1852 to welcome the ship built to provide steamship
service to Conception Bay. Perhaps the only people happier to see the Lady LeMarchant
pass through The Narrows that day were the ship’s passengers. On its maiden voyage
across the Atlantic, the Lady LeMarchant faced what its seasoned captain described as “a
tremendous sea”. The waves were so high and the head winds so strong that most on
board, including Moses Harvey, ended up thoroughly seasick. For three days, he stayed in
his bunk dreaming of land. While the article Harvey wrote about the voyage makes no

---

3 The Newfoundland Express, 2 August 1853.
4 Ibid.
mention of how his new bride fared during the crossing, the experience likely fell short of her honeymoon expectations.

Apart from his immense relief at seeing the “Light at Cape Spear” and the “bold, rugged frowns of the Newfoundland coast”,\(^5\) there is no record of Harvey’s first impressions of St. John’s, which is unfortunate. The city and its residents were just starting to turn the page on a fairly dark chapter in their history. In 1846, fire destroyed almost three-quarters of St. John’s including most of its commercial buildings.\(^6\) This was followed by a massive gale, an infestation of potato blight, several outbreaks of typhus and a stubborn economic downturn that left many parts of the Avalon Peninsula in serious distress.\(^7\) By the time Harvey arrived in 1852 though, things were looking a little brighter. New stone and brick buildings lined Duckworth Street; the impressive neoclassical Colonial Building, home of the Legislature, had been officially open for two years; and the landmark Roman Catholic Basilica was then on the way to completion.

Given that he lived in both Belfast and Maryport, the sights and sounds of a seaside city would have been familiar to him. The primary focus of activity in the harbour, however, likely differed considerably. Belfast in the nineteenth century was a shipbuilding powerhouse and one of the largest linen producing centres in the world. Maryport harbour also hummed with trade in coal, iron and steel as well as secondary manufacturing industries. In the St. John's of 1852, as for centuries before, cod was king. Numerous flakes filled with salted and drying cod dotted the landscape, waiting to be

\(^5\) Ibid.


\(^7\) O’Flaherty, *Lost Country*, 21-22.
transported to countries in Europe, the Caribbean and South America. Newfoundland at that time exported an average of 959,126 quintals of dried cod\textsuperscript{8} worth about $2.5 million.\textsuperscript{9} In return, the colony imported most of their foodstuffs, merchandise and other material. A significant amount of this trade and commerce was handled by many of the people who Moses Harvey had come to serve – the Scottish community in Newfoundland.

While there is some speculation that Scots were trading in Newfoundland as early as 1704, it was during the period between the American Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars that their involvement really took off.\textsuperscript{10} Initially, Scottish merchants simply supplied the military garrison at St. John’s and provided material for other companies taking part in the fisheries. When the European demand for fish increased dramatically between 1790 and 1810, however, Scottish merchants jumped into the marketplace with both feet.\textsuperscript{11} Centred in Greenock on the bank of the Clyde River, the trading houses sent food, alcohol, tea, textiles and manufactured goods – produced mainly in Scotland – to St. John’s. The ships then returned to their home port laden with dried codfish, as well as seal and cod oil. This pattern changed with the post-war crash of global cod prices in 1816. The subsequent economic depression led to the bankruptcy of eight of the twelve Scottish firms involved in the Newfoundland trade. The remaining companies – which included Stewart and Rennie, Baine Johnston, Henderson and Bland, and Hunters – moved their main operations from Greenock to St. John’s, where it was easier to keep an

\textsuperscript{8} Shannon Ryan, “The Newfoundland Salt Cod Trade in the Nineteenth Century” in Hiller and Neary, \textit{Newfoundland in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Century}, 41.
\textsuperscript{9} David Alexander, “Newfoundland’s Traditional Economy and Develop to 1934,” in Hiller and Neary, 20.
\textsuperscript{11} \textit{Ibid.}, 19.
eye on the state of the balance sheet. They were joined by a number of Scottish clerks and merchants who, seeing a trade vacuum, established sole proprietorships in Newfoundland.\(^{12}\) As a result, there was a strong and growing Scottish community firmly planted in the colony by the late 1820s.

What is interesting about the Newfoundland Scots in the nineteenth century is how insular a community they were. Scots overwhelmingly tended to go into business with, trade with and marry other Scots. Unlike the English and the Irish merchants, though, the Scots did not have fellow countrymen actually catching the fish. Their involvement was on the wholesale end of the business. Scottish merchants in St. John’s dealt with a network of agents in the outports – two-thirds of whom were Scots themselves.\(^{13}\) These agents provided fishing communities with a wide variety of foodstuffs and manufactured goods on credit in exchange for their cod, which was then transported to St. John’s to be exported. One of the few exceptions to the St. John’s rule was the firm of John Munn & Company in Harbour Grace. The Munn family ran one of the most successful fish-trade companies in the outports, if not the entire colony\(^{14}\) and would figure prominently in many aspects of Moses Harvey’s life. Apart from these ethnocentric peculiarities, Scottish merchants in Newfoundland ran their businesses much like their contemporaries. They purchased goods from suppliers in Scotland, Ireland and

---

\(^{12}\) Orr, “Scottish Merchants in the Newfoundland Trade,” 75.

\(^{13}\) Jeffrey A. Orr, “Scottish Merchants in St. John’s, 1780-1835” in Four Centuries and the City: Perspectives on the historical geography of St. John’s, ed. Alan G. Macpherson, (St. John’s: Memorial University of Newfoundland Printing Services, 2005), 48.

later from British North America on repayment terms of up to six months. In turn, they advanced credit to agents and dealers against their catch in the fall. Profitability came from ensuring that the annual supply costs were lower than the price of a quintal of cod.\textsuperscript{15}

The slow rate of Scottish settlement in Newfoundland explains why a Presbyterian Church was not built in St. John’s until 1842 which was quite late by British North American standards. Up until that point, Presbyterians in St. John's worshipped at the Dissenting Church of Christ, or Congregationalist Meeting House, which adhered to the Westminster Confession of Faith. In fact, in a situation that was somewhat unique to Newfoundland, Baptists, Congregationalists, Methodists, and Presbyterians all worshipped together at the same meeting house until the creation of a separate Methodist Chapel in 1815.\textsuperscript{16} The move among Presbyterians to establish their own church began in 1838 when six prominent members of the Scottish community: James Douglas,\textsuperscript{17} John McDonald, Thomas McMurdo,\textsuperscript{18} David Sclater,\textsuperscript{19} Kenneth McLea,\textsuperscript{20} and Dominie Rogers met in a local school house to discuss the question. There is no surviving record of the

\textsuperscript{15} Orr, “Scottish Merchants in the Newfoundland Trade,” 106.
\textsuperscript{17} James Douglas was a local businessman involved in import/export, the sealing trade, the Newfoundland Patriot newspaper, a retail store and a drugstore in partnership with Thomas McMurdo. In the late 1840s, his sealing business went under and Douglas then relied on his income as Commissioner of Roads to earn a living. Douglas also ran as a Liberal in a predominantly Catholic district of St. John's during an 1840 by-election. See Gertrude Crosbie, "Douglas, James (1789-1854)," in Dictionary of Canadian Biography, vol.8, University of Toronto/Universite Laval, 2003-, accessed February 17, 2014, http://biographi.ca/en/bio/douglas_james__1789_1854_8E.html
\textsuperscript{18} Thomas McMurdo arrived at St. John's in 1823 to set up a pharmacy. He and his family developed a large retail trade in drugs, medicines, cosmetics and surgical equipment. One of McMurdo's daughters, Jessie, ended up marrying Moses Monroe, Moses Harvey's nephew.
\textsuperscript{19} David Sclater operated a successful dry goods business on Water Street.
\textsuperscript{20} Kenneth McLea was a St. John's merchant and president of the local St. Andrew's Society. He is best known for running for a St. John's West seat in the 1861 Election. His candidacy led to a riot on Water Street where three people were shot to death by the military.
meeting, but enough progress was made for the Crown to conditionally grant land for the building of a "Scotich Church" within two years.\textsuperscript{21} For reasons unknown, many Presbyterians in St. John's initially opposed the idea. Rogers, one of the original six, was so vehemently against the proposal that the congregational leaders shelved the project for several years until it was pushed again, this time successfully, by Kenneth McLea in the early part of 1842.\textsuperscript{22}

Despite their initial reluctance, local Presbyterians raised almost half the necessary building funds in a matter of months and were in a position to call a minister by the summer of 1842. The minister in question was The Reverend Donald Allan Fraser of the Presbyterian Church in Lunenburg, Nova Scotia. Fraser immigrated to Pictou County in 1817 and was the first Church of Scotland minister in that part of the colony. In fact, of the 19 clergymen who made up the newly formed Synod of Nova Scotia, only three were Church of Scotland. Fourteen came from the Secessionist tradition and the remaining two were Congregationalists.\textsuperscript{23} The attempt at Presbyterian unity in Nova Scotia was short-lived with the Church of Scotland, spurred on by the arrival of a large number of Gaelic-speakers, forming its own Synod in 1833 with upwards of twenty ministers.\textsuperscript{24} Unity talks resumed five years later with each Synod striking their own committee to look into the matter. Donald Fraser was the Kirk's choice for chair, even

\textsuperscript{21} Moncrieff, 22.
\textsuperscript{24} \textit{Ibid.}, 68.
though he reputedly called his counterparts "malignant and unprincipled." The Fraser committee's unity proposal in 1841 was to admit "all Presbyterian ministers and congregations into full connection with the Kirk." Not surprisingly, this gesture was soundly rejected by his non-conformist brethren.

After 25 years of service in New Glasgow and Lunenburg, Fraser arrived in St. John's on Christmas Eve, 1842 to take up his new duties. For most of his first year, he conducted services in a vacant factory building and occasionally from the Wesleyan Chapel. However, on December 3, 1843, St. Andrew's Presbyterian Church opened its doors. Located directly under Fort Townshend, the building was said to be "neat, well-constructed and substantial" with a spire that could be seen from all approaches to the city. Unlike Presbyterians in Nova Scotia, Newfoundland does not appear to have been initially afflicted by the constant struggle between the Kirk and the Secessionist traditions - though there is no question where Fraser's loyalties lay. St. Andrew's was clearly a Kirk. At the laying of the cornerstone, Kenneth McLea declared it "the first place of public worship in connection with the Established Church of Scotland" and a special pew was set aside in the gallery of the church for the exclusive use of the Governor of the Colony, as the Sovereign's representative. Governors were also reminded that the Church of Scotland was part of the Ecclesiastical Government of Great Britain so Presbyterians in Newfoundland should be afforded the same considerations given to the Church of England.

25 Ibid., 69.
26 Moncrieff, 25.
27 Templeton, 8.
28 Moncrieff, 26.
Donald Fraser preached his first sermon at St. Andrew's on December 3, 1843 and a little over twelve months later, he preached his last. Following the service on December 15, 1844, Fraser fell ill and took to his bed where he stayed until his death two months later at the age of fifty.\textsuperscript{29} Though his ministry in St. John's was short, Fraser left his mark by successfully building the first Presbyterian Church in Newfoundland and helping the young congregation pay off its debts in short order. He also got directly involved in the Colony's politics by vigorously opposing an Education Bill that called for the creation of two colleges in St. John's - one Protestant and the other Roman Catholic. Fraser, along with representatives from the Wesleyan and Congregational churches, fought hard for one educational institution "totally free from all religious tests and sectarian domination or preference."\textsuperscript{30} While Fraser and his colleagues were successful, the non-denominational college was not built because both Roman Catholics and Anglicans refused to participate.

It is impossible to say what would have happened to St. Andrew's had Donald Fraser's ministry been longer, but his death certainly had a negative impact on the young congregation. Not only were they without a minister, but they started to feel the repercussions of the 1843 Disruption that led to the formation of the Free Church of Scotland. Immediately following Fraser's death, The Reverend John McLennan of Belfast, Prince Edward Island, took the services at St. Andrew's. McLennan was a long-time friend of the Fraser family and an Established Church minister. McLennan stayed in

\textsuperscript{29} Moncrieff, 27. 
\textsuperscript{30} Moncrieff, 26.
St. John's for almost seven months before returning to his home congregation. That summer, the congregation issued a call to The Reverend J.M. Brooke, an Established Church minister in Fredericton, New Brunswick, but it was rejected. Several months later in November of 1845, the first Free Church minister from Scotland visited Newfoundland.

The Reverend Hugh MacLeod was on his way back to Scotland after spending time in the New England States and Nova Scotia when his steamer grounded on Cape Race in the fog. Mr. MacLeod took advantage of a lengthy lay-over in St. John's to visit with Presbyterians there and in Harbour Grace. The MacLeod visit not only left a lasting impression on some members of St. Andrew's, it also put the congregation on the Free Church's radar. For the next twelve months, the Colonial Committee of the Free Church and the Free Presbytery of Halifax sent a series of missionaries to St. John's in an attempt to spark interest in the new sect.31

The Free Church attention did not please everyone at St. Andrew's. Several prominent members of the congregation, who held true to Established Church principles, viewed it as an attempted take-over and vowed to do something about it. Matters came to a head when The Reverend Matthew Wilson, a Free Church minister from Cape Breton, was invited to take the services at St. Andrew's in late May of 1846. The Trustees32 of the Church, worried that some in the congregation would issue what they viewed to be an illegal call to Wilson, sought to prevent him from officiating but discovered that the Free

31 Moncrieff, 28-29.
32 Trustees in the Presbyterian tradition were, and still are, legally responsible for the oversight of all church property.
Church sympathizers within the congregation had the keys to the building. As a result, the Trustees resorted to legal action and posted the following notice on the front door of the church:

We, the undersigned, trustees of the Established Church of Scotland, in St. John's, Newfoundland, in order to prevent any unseemly interruption of divine worship on Sunday next, the 24th instant, or on any succeeding Sabbath, do hereby give notice, that no minister has at present any license or authority from us to pray or preach in the said church, as minister thereof; and should any person disturb the congregation of the said church, by attempting to pray or preach therein, without our sanction and license, he will be deemed a trespasser, and prosecuted in due form of law.


In presence of us, Harcourt Mooney, Counsel, Thomas H. Channell, Attorney, For the Trustees.

St. John's, 23d May, 1846

---

33 John Stuart came to St. John's as a clerk for the firm of Rennie, Stuart and Company. He was a member of the Chamber of Commerce, a founder and director of the Newfoundland Bank and a director in the St. John's Gas Light Company. He was a Conservative member of the Legislative Council in the mid 1840s and, after his company went bankrupt, served as the clerk of the House of Assembly until his death in 1882. See Melvin Baker, "Stuart, John (1813-82)," in Dictionary of Canadian Biography, vol.11, University of Toronto/Universite Laval, 2003-, accessed February 17, 2014, http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/stuart_john_1813_82_11E.html

34 Walter Grieve arrived in St. John's in the late 1820s to join his brother James in the firm of Baine, Johnston and Company. By 1837, he effectively ran the St. John's branch of the company. In 1855, Grieve relinquished control of the company to his nephew Robert and established his own firm, Walter Grieve and Company. He eventually transferred that company to another nephew, Sir Robert Thorburn. Grieve was appointed to the Executive Council as surveyor general in the mid-1840s but supported the Liberal leader Philip Little in the 1850s and the anti-confederate Charles Fox Bennett in 1869. See James K. Hiller, “GRIEVE, WALTER,” in Dictionary of Canadian Biography, vol. 11, University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–, accessed February 17, 2014, http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/grieve_walter_11E.html.

While Wilson conducted the service without interruption or being arrested for trespassing, the Trustees' action led to a protracted legal battle over who actually owned the church building. This fight lasted close to three years and eventually went all the way to the Supreme Court of Newfoundland.

In February of 1849, Chief Justice Francis Brady and his two assistant judges A.W. Des Barres and J.J. Simms heard three days of arguments from two parties over which of them could rightfully exercise control over what went on within the walls of St. Andrew’s. The plaintiffs – John Stuart, Walter Grieve, John McWilliam, Peter McBride, Andrew Milroy, and Robert Rodger – argued that they were legally bound to respect the original intent of the congregation; to be part of the Established Church of Scotland. They cited the fact that Donald Fraser was a duly ordained minister of the Established Church; money for the church building came from the General Assembly of the Established Church of Scotland; and that the land the Crown granted for a church was made specifically to the Established Church. The defendants – Samuel Carson,

---


37 Milroy was the first manager of the Bank of British North America in St. John’s. His daughter Susannah married Sir Robert Thorburn, Prime Minister of Newfoundland. See D.W. Prowse, A History of Newfoundland (London: MacMillan and Co., 1895), 455.

38 Brian Dunfield (ed.), The Reports 1846-1853, Decisions of the Supreme Court of Newfoundland (St. John’s: J.W. Withers, King’s Printer, 1915), 59.

Thomas McMurdo, Francis McDougall,\textsuperscript{40} James Douglas and James Gibson\textsuperscript{41} – countered that any money raised was for a place of worship to benefit Presbyterians generally; they cited the fact that Donald Fraser himself, after 1843, stated that St. Andrew’s would neither adhere to the principles of the Established nor the Free Church; and they pointed to the Trustees’ support for issuing a call, ultimately rejected, to The Reverend Hugh McLeod, a recognized Free Church minister.\textsuperscript{42} In a lengthy ruling, Chief Justice Brady held that St. Andrew’s was part of the Established Church of Scotland both in practice and in law. As a result, he ruled that the Trustees had the right and the responsibility to keep the church within the ecclesiastical fold. Brady ended his remarks, however, with a hope that “all animosities and unhappy differences may give place to kindly and charitable feelings” and that they would “Love God, and your neighbour as yourself.”\textsuperscript{43}

The Judge’s plea fell on deaf ears. Immediately following the ruling, adherents of the Free Church formally left St. Andrew’s and made arrangements with the managers of the Congregational Chapel for the use of their building.\textsuperscript{44} For the next two years, the new congregation relied on a series of short-term supply ministers that the more missionary minded Free Church presbyteries in Nova Scotia and Scotland were only too happy to

\textsuperscript{40} Francis McDougall was a partner in the local merchant firm of Boyd & McDougall.
\textsuperscript{41} James Gibson immigrated to Newfoundland from Lanark, Scotland in 1833. He purchased a 75 acres “country residence” on Topsail Road called Healthfield from the local tailor William Cluny. Gibson then farmed the land for hay, oats, potatoes, and vegetables. He also kept cows and other livestock. See Robert MacKinnon, “Farming the Rock: The Evolution of Commercial Agriculture around St. John’s, Newfoundland, to 1945,” \textit{Acadiensis}, 20, 2 (1991): 49-50.
\textsuperscript{42} Dunfield, pp.64-65. McLeod went on to serve as a Free Church minister in Sydney, Nova Scotia – eventually becoming Moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Canada in 1877.
\textsuperscript{43} \textit{Ibid.}, 82-83.
\textsuperscript{44} Moncrieff, 31.
provide. Free St. Andrew’s comprised almost half of the original congregation, including two-thirds of its communicants or full members, and set out immediately to raise the funds necessary to erect a church building.\textsuperscript{45} By November of 1849, a site had been secured on Duckworth Street next to the Bank of British North America and twelve months later, the new church opened its doors. It was a wooden, modern gothic structure that cost an estimated £1400 and was able to accommodate a congregation of up to 500 people. Free St. Andrew’s was a going concern from the moment it opened its doors. Worshippers filled most of the pews and the Sunday School numbered an impressive eighty children with fifteen teachers.\textsuperscript{46}

Apart from the numerical advantage that the Free Church had over St. Andrew’s, there was little to distinguish the two congregations. Like other Presbyterian churches in Scotland, Canada and elsewhere in the world, there were few discernable patterns when it came to the type of person who stayed with the Kirk and those who left for the Free Church. Both congregations in St. John’s were largely of Scottish descent and came primarily from the merchant class. Each was also comprised of Liberals and Conservatives; recent immigrants and native-born Newfoundlanders; as well as new entrepreneurs and long-standing business people. Even family connections and existing business relations were not necessarily a good indicator of which side of the denominational schism people ended up on.\textsuperscript{47} The decision, it seems, rested mainly on

\textsuperscript{45} \textit{Ibid.}
\textsuperscript{46} \textit{Ibid.}, 33.
\textsuperscript{47} Many of the early records of St. Andrew’s Presbyterian Church in St. John’s were destroyed by fire and while there is not a complete congregational listing, the “Communion Roll of Free St. Andrew’s Church”
how individuals reacted to the missionary zeal of the Free Church message – especially the preaching of The Reverend Hugh McLeod – and how they felt about the state’s involvement in ecclesiastical matters. That the ownership of the church building went all the way to the Supreme Court also suggests a fair degree of passion and personal animosity, though both factions were still able to come together on issues that mattered to the entire community including education, shared social concerns and, of course, business.

When Moses Harvey arrived at the Free Church on Duckworth Street in the fall of 1852, he took over the reins from The Reverend Adam Muir, another missionary sent by the Colonial Committee in Scotland, who had been in St. John’s since August 1849. Muir successfully oversaw the construction of the new church and conscientiously built up the fledgling congregation. In fact, members tried to get him to stay but he decided instead to serve the Presbyterian Church in Bermuda. This disappointed his flock, but others in the capital likely breathed a sigh of relief. During his tenure, Muir was quite outspoken in his condemnation of the “Popery” and “Puseyism” that he saw throughout Newfoundland. According to him, the Roman Catholics entirely relied on priests for their political views and heresy inflicted almost every Episcopal clergyman on the island. He also harshly criticized Established Church members for “expelling” the Free Church from a building that he contended was now hardly being used. The only groups that Muir saw worthy of praise in Newfoundland were the Methodists and the Congregationalists. Without the

---

does survive from the years 1849, 1855 and 1864. The Duder History also contains the names of prominent members of both congregations.

48 The Home and Foreign Record of the Free Church in Scotland, III, (September 1852): 50.
Methodist missionaries, “Scriptural religion” would be unknown in many parts of the Colony and, under the leadership of The Reverend George Schofield, Muir believed the future of the Dissenting Church seemed bright.49

Moses Harvey took a decidedly different and far more conciliatory approach to his ministry in Newfoundland. For the first decade or so, Harvey mainly concentrated on serving and growing his new congregation. As in Maryport, his main vehicles for advancing this – apart from the Sunday service itself – were the public lecture and education, both religious and non-denominational. Soon after he arrived in St. John’s, Harvey put together a weekly speaking series at the Free Church that was open to all. Every Wednesday evening at 7:30 p.m., he spoke to a general audience on a wide variety of topics that, while mainly religious in nature, had popular appeal as well.50 Subjects ranged from Old Testament figures - Isaiah, Job, Solomon and Jonah51 - to Reformation leaders such as John Knox, Martin Luther, John Wesley, Ignatius Loyola, as well as notable nineteenth-century defenders of the faith like John Kitto,52 Hugh Miller,53 Henry

50 The Public Ledger, 13 March 1860.
51 Titles included – “Isaiah, as the representative of the Prophets – His age, career and writings,” “Book of Job, its structure and the reconcilement,” “Solomon – His writings, science and public works,” and “Jonah’s visit and the fall of Nineveh”.
52 Kitto (1804-1854) was an English biblical scholar and missionary best known for his “Pictorial Bible” cited by evangelicals at the time as being their number one defence against liberal theology. See Leslie Stephen (ed.), Dictionary of National Biography, Vol. XXXI, (New York: MacMillan and Co., 1892), 233-234.
53 Miller was a self-taught geologist and lay theologian who greatly influenced the way many Presbyterians in the early nineteenth century saw the relationship between science and the Bible. Miller believed geology and the physical world’s ongoing progress clearly illustrated the presence of Divine design. Dictionary of National Biography, Vol. XXXVII, 408-410.
Havelock, and Samuel Budgett. All were evangelical in their outlook and missionary-minded in their actions. Two qualities that Harvey valued highly and that reflected his general approach to ministry in Newfoundland.

Another favourite topic for Harvey’s Free Church lectures was science – especially the newly developed field of archaeology – and how it reaffirmed, not challenged, the Bible. In the mid-nineteenth century, the western world was captivated by the discovery of the ancient city of Nineveh and other parts of the former Assyrian Empire. French Naturalist Paul Émile Botta and his English friend Austen Henry Layard excavated a series of sites in Khorsabad and Kuyunjik near Mosul, now part of Iraq, during the late 1840s and uncovered a treasure trove of statues, bas-reliefs, tablets and palace ruins dating back to 700 BC. The discoveries confirmed many of the historical elements of the Old Testament in the Books of Genesis, Kings, Isaiah and Jonah – as well as the Gospels of Matthew and Luke. Christian scholars and clergymen around the world
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54 Havelock had a storied military career in the British Army serving in the Anglo-Burmese War, the First Afghan War and the 1857 Indian Mutiny. As an evangelical Baptist, he also distributed Bibles to soldiers; started all-ranks Bible study classes; and initiated non-denominational worship services for military personnel. See J.C. Marshman, Memoirs of Major-General Sir Henry Havelock (London: Longman, Green, Longman and Roberts, 1860).
56 Botta was France’s Consul in Mosul during the 1840s. As a naturalist, he spent much of his spare time looking for objects and artifacts of historical significance. His discovery of King Sargon’s palace with its over 200 rooms was the highlight of his career. See Francis H. McGovern and John N. McGovern, “Paul Émile Botta,” The Biblical Archaeologist, 49, 2 (June 1986): 109-113.
seized on the artifacts and records from the reign of the Assyrian kings, referenced in the Bible, as concrete proof that Holy Scripture was not just a collection of fables, but the Word of God.\textsuperscript{58}

Like his counterparts in Great Britain and elsewhere, Harvey used the discoveries at Nineveh and the accounts written by Layard and others to systematically lay out the case for the Bible as an historical document. In a series of seven lectures, Harvey went almost verse-by-verse linking each mention of Assyria in the Old Testament with an artifact or reference found at the architectural dig site.\textsuperscript{59} While his talks contained little of what could be classified as original material, they were well-researched. He also showed the ability to condense fairly complicated theories down to a level that a general audience would not only understand, but actually enjoy. At a time when most academic work was written in a dry and formal style, Harvey’s approach was far more popular in tone and deliberately so. In each preface of the published versions of his lectures, he almost apologized for “avoiding lengthened, minute details” and focusing instead on the “more important and striking outlines of the subject.”\textsuperscript{60} Harvey – as he did in his public addresses in Maryport – also interspersed fact with poetry and current cultural references to keep his audiences engaged. This is a technique that he used most effectively in his public speaking.

\textsuperscript{59} Moses Harvey, \textit{The Testimony of Nineveh to the Veracity of the Bible} (St. John’s: Thomas McConnan, 1854)
\textsuperscript{60} The prefaces for \textit{The Testimony of Nineveh} and other works by Moses Harvey – \textit{Thoughts on the Poetry and Literature of the Bible} (St. John’s: Thomas McConnan, 1853), \textit{Lectures on the Harmony of Science and Revelation} (St. John’s: Thomas McConnan, 1856) and \textit{Lectures: Egypt and its Monuments, As Illustrative of Scripture} (St. John’s: Thomas McConnan, 1857) – all included a variation of this phrase.
Another theme that ran through many of Harvey’s lectures in the late 1850s was humanity’s steady march of progress. In his discussion of the Assyrian civilization, he went to great lengths to point out how advanced they were in the manufacture of glass, the construction of palaces and canals, as well as the use of pulleys. Without them, modern society would not have its railways, printing presses, steam-driven ships or wonders like the Menai Suspension Bridge linking Anglesey with mainland Wales. According to Harvey, the inhabitants of Assyria laid the foundation and western civilization built the superstructure.\textsuperscript{61} Harvey also believed that the ruins of Nineveh and the pyramids of Egypt confirmed the theories of the eighteenth-century Anglo-Irish philosopher George Burkely. They held that global progress moved from east to west:

The sceptre of the world has been steadily, though slowly, moving from the east towards the west. Once the east was the centre of life and action; the west, meantime, being in a state of the rudest barbarism, or covered with the primeval swamp. From the glowing, sun-scorched plains of the east, fierce, steel-clad warriors rushed to the conquest of the world. Great empires, magnificent cities, gorgeous palaces and temples, huge pyramids and all the results of art and industry first arose in the east. But over it slowly moved “decay’s effacing finger.”\textsuperscript{62}

Interestingly, Harvey did not see progress stopping with the nations of Europe. North America, with its untapped coal fields and vast mineral resources, was destined to play an important part in the history of the planet - though he did warn his audience there was no

\textsuperscript{61} Harvey, The Testimony of Nineveh, 2-3.
\textsuperscript{62} Ibid., 34.
guarantee that Anglo-Saxon society would not eventually go the way of the ancient Egyptians or the Assyrians.

Beyond his weekly lectures at the Free Church, Moses Harvey also played an important role in the growth of social clubs in St. John’s dedicated to public education and exposing the population to a wide variety of literary and scientific ideas. This movement, evident throughout most of the English-speaking world at the time, took root in Newfoundland largely during the mid-nineteenth century. While there was some form of public library in the capital as early as 1810, it took until 1823 for the St. John’s Library Society to be established and another twenty years after that for the Reading Room and Library to open its doors. Along with the Reading Room, there was also a Mechanics’ Institute (not to be confused with the Irish Roman Catholic Mechanics’ Society), a small circulating library operated by the pharmacist Thomas McMurdo, and the Young Men’s Literary and Scientific Institute founded by Moses Harvey in 1858.63

The Young Men’s Literary and Scientific Institute in St. John’s based itself on those operating in both Britain and the United States at the time. Its goal was to provide a venue for the delivery of public lectures on topics of a literary and scientific nature, as well as a reading room to access reference material, popular magazines and newspapers. Among the publications available there were the London Evening Mail, Economist, Punch Magazine, Scientific American, Freeman’s Journal (Dublin), Edinburgh’s

---

*Scotsman, New York Tribune, Toronto Globe* and the *Nova Scotian* from Halifax. The lectures themselves tended to lean more toward the literary than the scientific with topics like “Sebastian Cabot”, “China and the Chinese”, “The Catacombs of Rome” and “Westminster Abbey.” The speakers included members of the legal community such as D.W. Prowse, Robert J. Pinsent and Bryan Robinson; clergymen like Charles Pedley from the Congregational Church, Donald Macrae from the Kirk and H.M. Lower of the Anglican Cathedral; and educators such as choirmaster and composer William Stacy and J.W. Marriott, Vice Principal of St. John’s College. The cost for a full season’s worth of lectures was two shillings and sixpence for an individual or six shillings per couple. The price for individual talks was just sixpence a ticket.

While Harvey’s Institute and its lectures appeared to be popular, the limited potential audience and the significant overlap in effort between the various cultural clubs led to them joining together to form the St. John’s Athenaeum in 1861. The broad goal of the amalgamated organization was the “cultivation and diffusion of knowledge” through a library and reading room; public lectures on literary and scientific subjects; instructional classes for “young men”; the maintenance of chemical and natural
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64 Public Ledger, 7 July 1859.
65 A list of upcoming lectures, which ran between January and March of the following year, were published in the *Public Ledger* on 13 March 1860 and 19 March 1861.
69 Public Ledger, 13 March 1860.
philosophy apparatus; and the establishment of a museum of natural history.\textsuperscript{70} The Athenaeum quickly became an intellectual and cultural hub in St. John’s during the mid to late nineteenth century, boasting a membership of over 300 at its peak. Harvey was part of the original board, served as its president for a time and remained active within the Athenaeum throughout its history.

Another educational institution that Harvey held dear was the General Protestant Academy. Like his Presbyterian predecessors, Harvey preferred a non-denominational education system but since the Assembly soundly rejected that concept, he worked hard to ensure that students of the General Protestant Academy would receive the best instruction possible. Despite the name of the school, only the Presbyterian churches (Kirk and Free) and the Congregationalists operated the Academy. The Methodists were originally part of the venture, but broke away in less than a year to start their own school in 1852. The six-member board of the General Protestant Academy included two representatives of the Free Church, two from the Kirk and two from the Congregational Church.\textsuperscript{71} The respective clergy did not become formal board members until later in the school’s history, but the ministers played an active role in its running. When the Academy fell into financial difficulties in the late 1860s, the board deputized Moses Harvey and Donald Macrae to raise much needed funds. In short order, they collected

£202 (£41 of which came from Harbour Grace) and Harvey secured an interest-free loan from a local merchant for £500.\textsuperscript{72}

While the General Protestant Academy operated on a shoestring budget, the education students received was of a high quality. They studied Latin, English, French, History, Geography, Arithmetic, and Algebra – all under the watchful eye of their headmaster, and often sole teacher, Adam Scott. Scott was a Scotland-educated instructor who immigrated to St. John’s in the late 1840s and while he attended the Free Church, met with the approval of all participating congregations.\textsuperscript{73} Annual examinations at the Academy – as with other St. John’s area schools – were done publicly in front of the board of directors, family and the general public. At the end of 1863, Harvey and his Congregational counterpart Charles Pedley presided over examinations that included their own children. Nine year-old Charles James Harvey and his eight year-old brother Alfred Joseph received recognition for their work in Latin and English, while the elder Pedleys (Hugh and Charles) were singled out for Arithmetic and essay writing.\textsuperscript{74} A third Harvey son, Frederick Carson, was too young to be considered for the General Protestant Academy, having been born in July of 1859.

Along with adding three new Harveys to the ranks of the Free Church and attracting others through his public lectures, Moses sought to extend the denomination’s reach beyond St. John’s during this period. He worked closely with John Munn to establish a congregation in Harbour Grace and petitioned both the Colonial Committee in
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\textsuperscript{72} Ibid., 28.
\textsuperscript{73} Ibid., 29.
\textsuperscript{74} Public Ledger, 19 December 1863.
Scotland and the Presbytery of Halifax to send a minister to the community. Free St. Andrew’s, Harbour Grace, opened its doors on May 20, 1855 and immediately called the Reverend Alexander Ross from Nova Scotia to be its minister. By 1866, the congregation numbered 26 families with the Munns (John, Robert and Archibald) playing a significant financial role – not only in Harbour Grace, but in the Presbyterian Church at large. Along with supporting a minister, manse and cemetery, St. Andrew’s ran a small grammar school staffed by John Roddick and generously donated to a variety of mission projects, as well as to the General Protestant Academy in St. John’s.

Moses Harvey helped establish two other Presbyterian churches in Newfoundland during his ministry including one at Bay of Islands on the west coast and another serving Betts Cove, Little Bay and Tilt Cove on Notre Dame Bay. The Bay of Islands’ mission started in 1866 and served roughly a dozen families who came mostly from Cape Breton, as well as some local members of the Church of England. Missionaries stationed at Bay of Islands also travelled to the Labrador coast during the summer months to serve those taking part in the summer fishery. The mining boom in Notre Dame Bay and the influx of workers from Great Britain and the Maritime Colonies led to the establishment of a Presbyterian presence at Little Bay. Though there were Presbyterians in the area as early as the 1860s, it was not until about a decade later that their numbers were deemed sufficient to warrant a church. Baron Francis von Ellershausen, who controlled most of
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75 Moncrieff, 67.
76 Roddick’s son Thomas, an early student at Harbour Grace, became a world-renowned surgeon and Professor of Medicine at McGill University.
77 Moncrieff, 71.
78 Ibid., 95-96.
the mining rights in the area, supplied the land for the church building and generously supported the congregation with significant financial contributions. With donations from Free St. Andrew’s in St. John’s, local members opened small schools associated with each new church but like the congregations themselves, attendance was tied to the economic fortunes of the community. Harvey’s dedication to home missions in Newfoundland, however, never faltered and neither did his belief in the power of education to advance society.

Along with basic education and public lectures, Moses Harvey also embraced the growing publishing industry in Newfoundland and the rest of British North America. As in Maryport, local newspapers often carried transcripts of Harvey’s public talks and articles also ran in many Presbyterian publications. The St. John’s Daily News and the Newfoundland Express were the two local papers most likely to publish Harvey’s material. John Burton published the Express as well as the Star and Conception Bay Journal, the Star and Newfoundland Advocate, and the Telegraph and Political Review. Interestingly, Burton did not edit any of his newspapers, leaving that to others and, in the case of the Daily News, to James Seaton. Seaton previously edited The Courier and is listed in some sources as a Presbyterian – which may explain why Harvey’s lectures were reprinted. The Winton brothers – Robert and Francis – operated the Daily News that often clashed with Seaton’s Express. The Wintons came from a long line of newspaper

---


editors. Their father, Henry David Winton, was the long-time editor and publisher of the 
*Public Ledger* who often criticized the involvement of Roman Catholic clergy in early 
nineteenth century Newfoundland politics.\(^{81}\) Though staunchly Conservative, the Winton 
brothers were decidedly less strident than their father, but encouraged ways to highlight 
the Protestant view of the world.

The Presbyterian publications that printed Harvey’s work included the *Colonial 
Presbyterian and Protestant Journal*, the *Presbyterian Witness and Evangelical 
Advocate*, and the *Home and Foreign Record of the Presbyterian Church of the Lower 
Provinces of British North America*. These three denominational newspapers are of 
particular interest because they introduced Moses Harvey to influential people from the 
literary and political world, in what would become Canada, and served as a gateway to 
his later life as a correspondent.

*The Presbyterian Witness and Evangelical Advocate* was published in Halifax, 
Nova Scotia by local printer and bookseller James Barnes.\(^{82}\) While the newspaper began 
in 1848, it took off when Robert Murray became the editor in 1855. Murray, a licentiate 
of the Free Church, added a secular section to go with the religious material and started 
weighing in on current affairs. Murray supported Confederation, trumpeted the potential 
of Canada's natural resources, lobbied for a free school system, and advocated for an

\(^{81}\) Patrick O’Flaherty, “WINTON, HENRY DAVID,” in *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 8, 
University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–, accessed May 8, 2014, 

\(^{82}\) Not much is known about James Barnes other than his occupation and the fact he was also the Queen’s 
Printer for Nova Scotia. Barnes did, however, publish several of Harvey’s books.
intercolonial railway. Under his editorship, The Presbyterian Witness expanded its readership and became popular with audiences in the Maritimes and beyond. Murray also edited the Home and Foreign Record. The Record was primarily a vehicle to distribute the official proceedings from presbytery and synod meetings, as well as reports from Presbyterian missionaries in foreign lands. As he did with the Witness, Murray expanded the Record's offering to include topics of current interest to congregations in the lower colonies. One such topic was whether Presbyterians in Canada should expand their hymnal. Murray commissioned Moses Harvey to write what amounted to a seven part series on the subject.

Hymnology was a very contentious topic amongst Presbyterians in the mid-nineteenth century. The success of the evangelical Protestant movement in British North America and the vibrancy of their public worship had some Presbyterians wondering whether the rather staid nature of their own church services meant they were in danger of being left behind. As a result, there was a push by some to go beyond the Scottish Psalms and Paraphrases to include other scripturally based hymns. Traditionally, Presbyterians believed that the poetry in the Book of Psalms was the only form of music suitable for public worship because it was directly inspired by God and set down in the Bible. Opponents of expansion viewed any suggestion that the church needed to go
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84 There were ninety-eightmetrical psalms and sixty-sevenapproved biblical paraphrases in the Presbyterian hymnal.
85 Instrumental music did not become a part of the service until the late nineteenth century. Instead, a presenter sang the first line which was then repeated by the congregation. See Stewart J. Brown, “Beliefs
beyond the Psalms as an attack on the perfect nature of the Almighty and contrary to the cause of true religion.\(^{86}\)

Harvey realized he was wading into treacherous waters and stated up front that the views expressed in his articles were his alone. With that disclaimer out of the way, Harvey carefully laid out his arguments for expanding the Presbyterian hymnal. He stated that nothing in the Bible or the Westminster Confession of Faith prohibited the use of scripturally sound hymns in public worship and argued that the addition of the Paraphrases in the eighteenth century proved it.\(^{87}\) Harvey then went on to give, in great detail, examples of divinely inspired praise from the pages of the New Testament to the early Greeks to the Reformation. To him, there was little difference between prayer and praise so if addressing God freely in non-scriptural prose was acceptable, why not freely in song.\(^{88}\) The Home and Foreign Record series provides a useful glimpse into Harvey’s theological leanings. He was most definitely evangelical in his outlook and fairly liberal in his attitudes – willing to entertain whatever was truly “Christ-like in other Churches”.\(^{89}\) Harvey's liberalism, however, must be measured against a Presbyterian yardstick. While he had a healthy appreciation of other denominations and was open to new approaches to worship, Harvey firmly believed in the divine nature of Presbyterian governance, the orthodoxy of the Westminster Confession and the primacy of the Bible. He also rarely
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\(^{86}\) Letter from the Reverend James Thompson, The Home and Foreign Record, (May 1869): 125.


\(^{88}\) Moses Harvey, “Christian Hymnology, No. VI,” The Home and Foreign Record, (June 1869): 146.

\(^{89}\) Harvey, “Christian Hymnology, No. 1,” 7.
hesitated to make his views known - which is what the editors of the *Presbyterian Witness* and the *Home and Foreign Record* wanted.

The *Colonial Presbyterian* in New Brunswick focused a little more on the business of the church than its neighbour publication, but its editor was no less influential. The Reverend William Elder founded the *Colonial Presbyterian* in 1856 while ministering to the Free Church congregation at St. Stephen, New Brunswick. Elder, originally from County Donegal, received his post-secondary education at the Belfast Academical Institution before going on to the University of Glasgow and New College Edinburgh. His active ministry in Canada lasted until 1863 when Elder moved to Saint John to take up journalism full time. While editor of the *Colonial Presbyterian*, Elder started the *Saint John Morning Journal* because he felt that he could wield greater influence through the secular press.  

A staunch supporter of Confederation, Elder and his *Morning Journal* worked hard to elect Samuel Leonard Tilley's government in the crucial New Brunswick election of 1866. Elder was assisted in his endeavours by another Irishman, the Reverend James Bennett. Born in Boardmills, County Down, he followed an educational path similar to Elder, attending both the classic and collegiate schools at Belfast Academical Institute before receiving his formal theological training in Glasgow and Edinburgh. Unlike Elder, however, Bennett carried on his literary pursuits while maintaining a full time pastoral charge in Saint John. He helped edit Elder's publications

---

when needed and was a prolific contributor to literary journals such as *Maritime Monthly*, which he founded, and *Stewart's Quarterly*.91

Hailed as Canada's "first national magazine", *Stewart's Literary Quarterly* sought to give Canadian writers a local platform for their work, lessening the appeal of British magazines and the dangers posed by a potential flood of American literature.92 George Stewart, a pharmacist by trade, got into the publishing business through stamp collecting. He started the *Stamp Collector's Monthly Gazette* that quickly went beyond stamps to include political commentary, local poetry and fiction.93 The popularity of this offering convinced him to publish the *Quarterly* that showcased the work of politicians like

---

Thomas D'Arcy McGee; poets such as Charles Sangster and Alexander McLachlan; the theologian and philosopher William Lyall; and Moses Harvey.

Harvey’s work in *Stewart’s Quarterly* and the *Maritime Monthly* focused mainly on subjects of historical interest, current events and – of course – Newfoundland. His articles ran anywhere from 10,000 to 20,000 words, so he had much space to expound on his views and opinions. Topics from the past that interested Harvey included - Christopher Columbus’s discovery of the new world, the Scottish poet Robert Burns, the life of railway magnate Thomas Brassey, and the destruction of Pompeii. He was particularly drawn to subjects who put society before self, advanced the cause of progress and inspired the population with either their words or actions. Like many others in the Victorian age, acts of adventure, bravery or courage also captured Harvey’s attention. He
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97 Lyall was a Presbyterian minister and scholar who taught at the Free Church College in Halifax and then at Dalhousie. A theologian in the common sense tradition, Lyall wrote a meta-physics text that was used in seminaries for many years. See - William B. Hamilton, “LYALL, WILLIAM,” in *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 11, University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–, accessed May 10, 2014, http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/lyall_william_11E.html.
wrote at length about the Polaris Expedition to the Arctic that spent six-and-a-half months trapped in the ice off Labrador before being rescued by a Newfoundland sealing vessel.\(^9\)

The fifteen passengers of the *Queen of Swansea* were not so lucky. They left St. John’s en route to the mining community of Tilt Cove on December 5, 1867 but soon hit gale-force winds and then a winter storm that left them foundering off Gull Island on the eastern tip of Baie Verte Peninsula. Without food, drink or any way of signaling for help, the passengers perished but not until they had spent an estimated thirteen agonizing days on the barren island.\(^10\) Their bodies were not discovered until April of the following year. Harvey chronicled their tragic tale for readers of *Maritime Monthly* from notes and letters that the passengers left behind.

Along with these stories of heroism and loss, Harvey waded into some areas of social commentary. He reprinted two articles that the *English Presbyterian Messenger* originally published – “Human Progress: Is It Real?” and “Man, The Worker”\(^11\) – and wrote essays on the power of democracy and the positive contribution made by cities on civilization. After the American Civil War, some questioned whether people could be trusted with the ability to govern their own affairs. To Harvey, democracy – like progress itself – was a sign of society’s improvement and nothing could ultimately stop its advance. He criticized those who raised fears that universal suffrage meant tyranny of an


uneducated and uncultured majority who would trample on the rights of individuals. While admitting that there was a chance of abuse, Harvey reminded readers that “incompetency, blundering, cold-blooded, narrow-minded selfishness has too often distinguished the government of an aristocracy and also the rule of the middle class.” He urged people to take a broader view of democracy and help build safeguards into the system, citing the work of John Stuart Mill on Responsible Government. He also felt that the greatest protection for the rights of the minority came from educating the majority – “warming its religious faith, purifying its morals, inspiring it with a love of justice and a reverence for law and religion.” This abiding faith in the fundamental goodness of humanity and the ability of knowledge to improve the collective lot carried over into Harvey’s views on cities. He acknowledged the immense social problems and inequality present in most urban centres, but felt that ultimately cities played an indispensable role in furthering the goals of society. They allowed thought to be concentrated, ideas to be developed and the results disseminated in a quick and cost-effective manner.

The pages of Stewart’s Quarterly and Maritime Monthly provide an interesting glimpse into the mind of Moses Harvey, but they are most valuable as a baseline for his views about Newfoundland – a topic that he wrote about for the next thirty years. While Harvey did produce earlier articles on Newfoundland, the three-part, 10,000-word series he did for the Quarterly in 1869-70 was his most comprehensive. It gave his view of the Colony’s history, its relationship with the Imperial government and tackled a broad list of
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misconceptions. He also assessed the current state of the island’s economy, including the
cod fishery, and its potential for growth in the areas of manufacturing and mineral
extraction. Throughout the series, there are a number of themes that would arise again
and again in his future writings.

It is clear from the outset that Harvey’s main goal is to make the Island of
Newfoundland better known to a much broader audience. He believed that even among
the educated classes of Britain and American, the most people could say about the
Colony was that “large quantities of codfish are caught around its shores, and that its
dogs and fogs are on a gigantic scale.” Harvey found that fact astounding since the
landmass of Newfoundland, Britain’s oldest colony, was considerably larger than Ireland
and nearly four times the size of Belgium. He also questioned why so much of the island
remained unexplored at a time when adventurers and scientists were practically falling
over themselves in search of the source of the Nile River, the North West Passage and
other exotic mysteries. Newfoundland lies “within easy distance of England, and yet far
less is known of its uninhabited interior than that of Africa; its internal plain, lakes,
mountain-ranges are unmapped, its forests and river courses undetermined.” Harvey
felt that Newfoundland had been misunderstood and, in some cases, intentionally
maligned. He sought to set the record straight and by doing so usher in a new age of
prosperity.

106 Ibid., 288.
The three misconceptions topping the list were: that Newfoundland’s climate was damp, foggy and inhospitable; its arable soil practically nonexistent; and, that the Colony’s only resource of any value was the cod fishery. Harvey countered these assumptions one by one. The impression that fog, cold and rain drenched Newfoundland throughout the summer came from the fact that people’s main exposure to the island was during trans-Atlantic travel - far out at sea where the Gulf Stream met the Arctic current. The weather on land was actually far more temperate than “the fierce cold and the scorching heat of Canada and New Brunswick.” Most of the area, with the exception of the southern shore, was also fog-free. Harvey judged the mean temperature to be 44ºF with a high of 96ºF and a low of 8ºF - perfect for life-long health. Unfamiliarity was also seen as the reason for people’s harsh assessment of Newfoundland's agricultural capabilities. While Harvey admitted it was not a "fertile country", the island had more growing potential than it was given credit for. Most visitors only saw the Avalon Peninsula and villages along the rocky coastline, which were by far the most barren part of Newfoundland. The soil in the rest of the colony - especially St. George's Bay and the Codroy Valley on the west coast - was far richer and the climate much warmer. When properly cultivated, Harvey believed the land could produce root-crops in abundance, grasses for grazing sheep and even cereals like barley, oats and wheat. The problem was, with the exception of an influx of Cape Breton farmers on the West Coast, a lack of agricultural skill and interest. Why spend all year working toward one harvest on land,

107 Ibid., 294.
108 Ibid., 289-290.
when the sea gave the chance of a harvest a day?\textsuperscript{109} The significant commercial value of Newfoundland's fishing industry did not mean, however, there was nothing more the colony could offer. Harvey listed a whole series of recent mineral discoveries including copper, iron ore, lead, gold and coal – relying heavily on the island’s geological surveys for his information.\textsuperscript{110}

Despite the facts and reports cited on the pages of \textit{Stewart’s Quarterly}, Harvey realized that the most effective argument against his position was the problem of Newfoundland's scant progress in spite of the potential he claimed it possessed. His answer to that argument was threefold - a history of suppressed settlement, Imperial neglect and a lack of financial capital.

On the issue of colonization, Harvey felt the original prospects were really quite bright and had Sir Humphrey Gilbert not drowned off the shores of Newfoundland in 1583, things would have been very different. He also cited the early settlement attempts of John Guy at Cupids in 1610, Sir George Calvert’s Ferryland colony and Sir David Kirk’s royal charter of 1637. While each ended in failure, Harvey placed the blame on circumstances beyond their control and certainly found no fault with the island itself. Explorers either planted their settlements in absolutely the worst location or were constantly being distracted by Imperial obligations.\textsuperscript{111} He directed most of his criticism, however, squarely at the door of English West Country fish merchants. According to

\textsuperscript{109} \textit{Ibid.}.
\textsuperscript{110} \textit{Ibid.}, 295-296.
Harvey, they actively discouraged new permanent residents in the eighteenth century to protect their economic interests and pressured the British Government to legislate against any further settlement attempts.

With such laws in force, the wonder is, not that the colony did not advance, but that any resident population whatever should be found to occupy its shores. If Newfoundland is not now abreast of her sister colonies, if her resources are so imperfectly developed, her fertile lands unsettled, and her interior unexplored, we see enough in these unrighteous laws to account for such a state of matters. Progress, under such a system, was an impossibility.\textsuperscript{112}

Harvey’s take on Newfoundland’s past and his views on early settlement came from Sir Richard Bonnycastle’s \textit{Newfoundland in 1842; Discourse and discovery of New-found-land}, written by Captain Richard Whitbourne in 1620; and \textit{The History of Newfoundland} which was published in 1863 by the Reverend Charles Pedley, a Congregationalist minister at St. John’s. Each of these accounts of the island’s history was referenced in his \textit{Quarterly} articles.

An even bigger obstacle to progress than Imperial action, in Harvey’s mind, was Imperial inaction to address the injustices that stemmed from the 1713 Treaty of Utrecht. The diplomatic agreement guaranteed to France – in exchange for relinquishing its claim on Newfoundland – fishing rights from Cape St. John on Notre Dame Bay to Cape Ray near Port aux Basques. While the treaty did not prohibit British settlement on the west coast of the island, it effectively shut off development of the most resource-rich portion of the colony.

\textsuperscript{112} Ibid., 133.
The consequence has been that the “concurrent right” has fallen into abeyance, and that, for all practical purposes, that portion of the coast is closed against the people to whom belong the soil of the island. The same cause has operated to prevent the inhabitants of the island from settling in the fine, fertile regions along the western coast; and has cooped them up along the comparatively barren southern and eastern shores, and driven them to subsist mainly by fishing. It is true the French cannot cultivate the soil or open a mine, but the method in which they have been allowed to exercise their fishery rights practically excludes British subjects from the soil that is confessedly their own.  

Harvey was particularly critical that the British government missed opportunities to solve the so-called French Shore issue in the First Treaty of Paris in 1763, the Treaty of Versailles in 1783 and the second Treaty of Paris in 1814. Instead of pushing its advantage with France in the new world, the British government always seemed intent on sacrificing Newfoundland’s interest for the greater geo-political and diplomatic goals.  

Harvey was particularly scathing in his commentary on British inaction. He wrote –

“Though John Bull fights manfully, when he comes to shake hands his feelings overcome him, he blubbers, embraces his late enemy and gives up everything for which he had fought.”  

When combined with the restrictions on settlement, the lack of appreciation by the Imperial government for what it had in Newfoundland resulted in a “system of wrongs” far worse than those inflicted on Ireland.

The final affliction keeping Newfoundland from reaching its full potential was a lack of home-grown financial capital. In Harvey’s estimation, the entire economy of the

---

colony was in the hands of about “a dozen capitalists” and chances were slim that they would invest in sectors outside their primary profit-maker, the fishery. As a result, Newfoundland needed to attract business people with the money and ideas necessary to introduce manufacturing, improve transportation links, and connect local communities with each other and the broader world.\textsuperscript{117} This, in turn, would increase the number of cultural and social amenities available in St. John’s and encourage the wealthy to stay in the country. With few exceptions, most of the so-called upper classes returned to Great Britain after becoming successful, which deprived the colony of a “resident gentry who will take a hearty interest in the well-being of the community, and look to Newfoundland as their own home, and as a fair field for the energies of those who are to inherit their name and fortune.”\textsuperscript{118} If ready sources of foreign and domestic capital could be secured, then Newfoundland would be able to expand beyond the fishery and place its economy on a more stable footing.

What set Harvey apart from other boosters of Newfoundland’s future prospects, however, were his views on the fishery. While he firmly believed that the economy needed to diversify, he felt it would not come at the expense of its primary staple. Harvey argued that by establishing other industries which could also employ its growing population, Newfoundland would actually be protecting its most valuable resource. In order to ensure the long-term viability of fish stocks and maximize the financial return on

\textsuperscript{117} Harvey, “Newfoundland As It Is,” 300.  
\textsuperscript{118} Harvey, “More About Newfoundland,” 24.
the resource, Harvey proposed improving the methods for catching and curing fish as well as expanding the harvest beyond cod.

The major theme running through Harvey’s entire *Stewart’s Quarterly* series was, with a little understanding, a lot more capital and a renewed focus on the part of politicians, innovators and business people, Newfoundland would be able to reach its full potential. The key to all three was setting the record straight and spreading Newfoundland’s message to a wider audience. This would become Moses Harvey’s main mission and one that would extend far beyond the literary community in Saint John, New Brunswick. It is hard to say with any certainty who initiated the idea of writing about Newfoundland, but Harvey was a known quantity to both Bennett and Elder. All three went to the Belfast Academical Institution at the same time – Bennett was a few years ahead of Harvey and Elder two grades behind. They were also Free Church ministers in the same Synod.

Through William Elder, Harvey started a regular correspondence with the *Saint John Daily Telegraph and Morning Journal*. His initial offerings were simply reprints of his *Stewart Quarterly* article “Newfoundland As It Is,” but in the early 1870s, these contributions transformed into news columns. This, in turn, sparked the interest of newspapers such as the *Halifax Citizen, Montreal Daily News, New York Evening Post, Canadian Illustrated News, Toronto Globe* and *Montreal Gazette* so Harvey soon began to regularly write for them as well. While there was some overlap in the topics and events covered, most of these columns contained original material. Other newspapers like the *Canadian News* in London, *Boston Traveller, Royal Gazette* and *Newfoundland*
Advertiser, and the North Star and Newfoundland News simply re-ran excerpts from articles that appeared elsewhere.

Of the media outlets that Harvey wrote for in the 1870s, the most influential in terms of circulation and political reach were: the Toronto Globe and the Montreal Gazette in central Canada; the Saint John Telegraph and Halifax Citizen in the Maritimes; the Canadian News in London; and the New York Evening Post and Boston Traveller in the United States.\(^{119}\) In terms of political leanings, Harvey’s columns had cross-partisan appeal. The Toronto Globe, under the editorship of George Brown, and Edmund Mortimer McDonald’s Halifax Citizen supported the Reform Party while the Gazette and Telegraph fell in behind Sir John A. Macdonald’s Conservatives. Both the Post and the Boston Traveller backed the Free Soil Party and then the Republicans. The editor of the New York Post at the time was the noted poet and abolitionist William Cullen Bryant.\(^{120}\) The Canadian News of London is interesting because of its publisher and the audience the paper touched. Frederic Algar operated a series of colonial-focused newspapers for expatriates living in London and Britons with an interest in the affairs of places like Canada, Australia and India. Algar was as well a member of the powerful

---

\(^{119}\) The Canadian figures can be found in Paul Rutherford, *A Victorian Authority: The daily press in late nineteenth-century Canada*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982), 42 and circulation numbers for some of the other publications are available through G.P. Rowell’s *American Newspaper Directory: Containing accurate lists of all the newspapers and periodicals published in the United States and Territories, the Dominion of Canada, and British Colonies of North America* (New York: Geo. P. Rowell and Co., 1869).

\(^{120}\) While there is no indication that Harvey and Bryant knew each other personally, Harvey often quoted his poetry in lectures and articles.
lobby group, the British North American Association, which pushed for the construction of a railway from Halifax to Quebec and for Confederation itself.\textsuperscript{121} Regardless of their geographic location or their politics, newspapers appreciated Harvey’s letters because they were reliable and entertaining. They also informed readers of a part of the continent that few knew much about. His “pictorial style” of writing had broad appeal and stood out at a time when “knowledgeable” often meant dry.\textsuperscript{122} The general economic boom in North America during the late nineteenth century and the advances in printing technology made it feasible for many newspapers to increase their circulation from weekly to daily. The number of dailies in Canada, for example, increased five-fold over twenty years and the number of pages in each edition doubled.\textsuperscript{123} This drove a demand for content on the part of editors and led to the hiring of reporters in greater numbers, as well as the securing of correspondents from various parts of the world.

The motivation for Moses Harvey, beyond communicating with an audience that reached well beyond Newfoundland, was monetary. With two sons attending university on the mainland – first at Dalhousie in Halifax, then at McGill – Harvey needed to supplement the stipend he received from the Free Church congregation in St. John’s. Harvey estimated in 1870 that his newspaper correspondence brought in an extra $480 a year. This amount likely rose over the next ten years as more publications asked him to

be their regular Newfoundland contributor. Harvey also approached editors, either directly or through his personal contacts, to pitch the idea of including his columns in their publications.¹²⁴

For newspapers like the *Telegaph, Citizen, Globe* and *Gazette*, Harvey wrote an original column of approximately 2,000 words at least twice a month on average. Many of them appeared under headlines like “Newfoundland Affairs” or “Our Newfoundland Letter” and ran alongside dispatches from Great Britain, Boston, New York and other parts of Canada. The format that Harvey eventually settled on mirrored the one used by his fellow writers. He wrote about current events that he felt were newsworthy and divided the column into a series of short sub-headings. Harvey’s February 1872 letter to the *Toronto Globe*, for example, covered the following topics – Governor Hill’s Speech; Prosperity of the Colony; The Treaty of Washington; The Case of the S.S. Monticello; Steam Fog Whistle at Cape Race; New Mail Contract; Floating Debt; House of Assembly; New Steamers for the Seal Fishery; Sir Francis Brady; Steamship Hibernian; and The Weather.¹²⁵ While there was a certain amount of “whatever struck his fancy” to Harvey’s columns, they generally covered politics (local and international), economic development, the fisheries and any social advances. His ultimate goal was to shatter myths and for audiences in Canada and around the world to learn the truth about Newfoundland, its potential and its ability to progress like other countries in the British Empire.

¹²⁴ Personal correspondence from Moses Harvey to Robert Bell (7 December 1870), Robert Bell fonds, MG29-B15, Volume 21, File 64, National Archives of Canada, Ottawa.
¹²⁵ *Toronto Daily Globe*, 20 February 1872.
Ironically, Harvey’s efforts at myth-busting received a huge boost from a decidedly mythical creature – the Giant Squid. In October of 1873, a group of men from Portugal Cove went out onto Conception Bay in a small boat to investigate something floating on the water. Thinking it was a sail or a piece of boat wreckage, one of the men struck it with a hook. Any thought that the object was inanimate vanished as a giant cephalopod reared up and grabbed the boat with its tentacles. A quick-thinking boat-mate, later identified as twelve-year-old Tommy Picco, took a hatchet and cut off two of the animal’s arms – thereby releasing the dory from its grasp and sending the crew off with a harrowing tale to tell. Both tentacles were destined to become bait, until the Reverend A. Edmund Gabriel\footnote{Alfred Edmund Gabriel was a medical doctor and Anglican missionary with the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. Originally from County Devon in England, Gabriel and his family immigrated to Newfoundland in 1859. He served in Upper Island Cove and Lamaline before moving to Portugal Cove in 1873. A brief history of the Gabriel Family can be found in the Blow-Me-Downer, an online newsletter about the Outer Bay of Islands, Newfoundland. http://blowmedowner.webs.com/documents/Gabriel%20Family%20v3.0.pdf} intervened and suggested the one remaining arm be sent to Moses Harvey in St. John’s.\footnote{Moses Harvey, “The Devil-Fish in Newfoundland Waters,” The Maritime Monthly, III, 3, (March 1874): 200-201.} Harvey purchased the tentacle for $10 and together with Alexander Murray, the head of the Geological Survey in Newfoundland, set about preserving and documenting their find. Months later, a fisherman from Logy Bay just outside St. John’s caught a giant squid in his nets and offered the full specimen to Harvey.

After taking photographs of the animal draped over a shower-bath in Mrs. Harvey’s living room, Moses set about contacting zoological experts around the world to alert them to his discovery. He wrote to Professor William Dawson, geologist and
principal of McGill University; Louis Agassiz, professor of zoology and geology at Harvard; and Professor A.E. Verrill from Yale. The correspondence with the latter turned out to be the most fruitful, with the two exchanging information and findings for the next ten years. Verrill went so far as to name the species Architeuthis harveyi and wrote a detailed scientific account of the Portugal Cove/Logy Bay discoveries, as well as others, in a report to the U.S. Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries.128

In her M.A. thesis on the giant squid, Alison Earle reviewed the biology surrounding the Newfoundland specimens and concluded that Harvey’s scholarly contribution was more literary than scientific. This may be true, but Earle underestimated Harvey’s academic training and his knowledge of the field. She suggested that his education did not extend beyond high school and he lacked formal training in either natural or physical sciences.129 In the nineteenth century, few scientists could claim to have formal training and many clergymen, like Harvey, played a key role in the advancement of nineteenth century science by recording their observations and findings in the areas of geology, biology, oceanography and botany.130 Harvey, at least, had two post-secondary degrees. While theology was his principal preoccupation, Harvey’s courses included chemistry, practical science and natural philosophy. His

130 For a more fulsome analysis of the role that natural history or inventory science played in nineteenth century North America, see Suzanne Zeller, Inventing Canada: Early Victorian Science and the Idea of a Transcontinental Nation (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987). In fact, Jennifer Hubbard argues in A Science on the Scales: The Rise of Atlantic Canadian Fisheries Biology, 1898-1939 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006) that the move away from the in situ observations of amateur scientists and the local knowledge of fishers contributed to poor resource management practices in the early twentieth century.
interests also went well beyond the ocean. Harvey discovered fossils in geological formations on the Avalon Peninsula\textsuperscript{131} and catalogued the birds and fauna of Newfoundland. While an amateur, he was well-read and quick to share information with experts in St. John’s, Canada, the U.S. and Great Britain. Harvey’s primary interest, however, was sharing the beauties and peculiarities of his island home with a broader audience. The giant squid allowed him to do just that.

Along with the regular list of newspapers, publications as varied as the \textit{New York Times}, \textit{Lloyd’s Weekly Newspaper} in London and the \textit{Illustrated Police News} picked up the story. Tommy Picco’s heroic struggle against a “green-eyed monster” or “devil-fish”, seemingly straight out of Victor Hugo’s \textit{Toilers of the Sea}, made for a compelling tale – especially in the hands of an Irishman. While Harvey was careful not to stray too far from the facts, he certainly played up the drama of the encounter and the dimensions of the sea creature.\textsuperscript{132} He also included a paragraph or two on the scientific importance of the discovery which attracted inquiries and correspondence from professors and nature societies across North America and Great Britain. Though not about Newfoundland and its economic potential \textit{per se}, the story of the giant squid considerably boosted Moses Harvey’s notoriety and increased his standing as an expert in the eyes of the broader public.

\textsuperscript{132} \textit{Toronto Globe}, 22 November 1873. Similar accounts appeared in the \textit{Halifax Citizen}, \textit{American Sportsman, Rod and Gun Magazine}, \textit{Forest and Stream}, \textit{Magazine of Natural History} and the \textit{Hampshire Telegraph}.
By the mid-1870s, Harvey’s literary output was quite impressive. He wrote, on average, a newspaper column every week to one of his regular media outlets, as well as a longer piece to a periodical or magazine. Telegrams were also sent out for breaking news. On top of all that, Harvey delivered at least two weekly public lectures and two sermons on Sunday. With journalistic endeavours taking up more of his time and a ministry at St. John’s already spanning more than twenty years, the Free Church congregation decided to start planning for the future. In March of 1875, they called the Reverend N.R. Forsyth, a minister from the Presbyterian Church of Ireland, to serve as a “colleague and successor to Rev. M. Harvey” – though there is no indication as to when that hand-over would occur.\textsuperscript{133} Later that year, the Presbyterian Church in Canada was formed; bringing together various synods from Ontario, Quebec and the Maritimes. The Presbyterian churches in St. John’s and Harbour Grace followed suit and the Presbytery of Newfoundland was born.

From its very first meeting in November of 1875, talk at the Presbytery centred on the possibility of a union between St. Andrew’s and Free St. Andrew’s. This was not, however, the first time the subject had been broached. St. Andrew’s raised the idea of a union after the departure of their long-time minister, the Reverend Donald Macrea, in 1870. The Church of Scotland established a special committee that developed a unity proposal for the Session of Free St. Andrew’s to consider. They suggested that St. Andrew’s stone building be used for worship and that two ministers serve the joint congregation – the senior from the Free Church with St. Andrew’s providing the

\textsuperscript{133} Moncrieff, 37.
assistant. The understanding being that on the retirement of the senior minister, and with
the approval of the congregation, the assistant would assume the role. Each minister
would receive a stipend of £300, but the assistant from St. Andrew’s would retain use of
the manse.\textsuperscript{134} In a sign that old divisions remained, even after twenty years, Free St.
Andrew’s rejected the Kirk’s overture because they felt it amounted to a takeover and
worried that the broader Church of Scotland would have undue influence over the new
entity. According to the Free Church, any talk of closer ties would have to wait until
their respective synods united first.

Feelings hardened further when the dispute spilled over in the pages of Halifax’s
\textit{Presbyterian Witness}. The Reverend James Fraser Campbell from Nova Scotia wrote
about the issue in the \textit{Church of Scotland Missionary Record}. He said that the people of
St. Andrew’s “feel hurt at the reception which their overtures met, and the breach
between the two [congregations] is thus unhappily wider than it was before.”\textsuperscript{135} Moses
Harvey took exception to this account and attempted to set the record straight in the
\textit{Presbyterian Witness}. He claimed that many of St. Andrew’s conditions were
unreasonable and perhaps even contrary to good Presbyterian process. Also, he
suggested that it was the Kirk that ended the talks by refusing to consider the Free
Church’s view that the new congregation should have only one minister.\textsuperscript{136} Regardless of
who was right, both sides retreated to their respective corners and St. Andrew’s began the
task of finding someone to fill their pulpit.

\textsuperscript{134} \textit{Presbyterian Witness}, 13 May 1871.
\textsuperscript{135} \textit{Presbyterian Witness}, 13 May 1871.
\textsuperscript{136} \textit{Ibid.}
While the creation of the Presbytery of Newfoundland reignited the unity movement, it took an actual spark for the talks to truly begin in earnest. On January 30, 1876, the Free Church’s wooden building on Duckworth Street burned to the ground and by the end of February a joint committee had come to terms on a “basis of union”. The new congregation would be jointly led by the Reverends J.D. Patterson and N.R. Forsyth of the Kirk and Free Church respectively. Moses Harvey agreed to step aside in exchange for a life annuity of £180 a year which would be increased by an extra £20 when he moved out of the manse. They agreed to erect a new building, worship together jointly in the meantime and operate in association with the Presbyterian Church in Canada. 137 While the joint committee was quick to come to an agreement, the twelve articles in the basis of union also required the approval of both congregations. This took considerably longer. The Presbytery of Newfoundland did not sign off on the union until May of 1878.

No records exist to explain the delay but the process appears to have been anything but smooth. Firstly, fire claimed the Kirk in October of 1876 and then Forsyth resigned his position after only four months. The other minister J.D. Patterson remained in place until the first official service in June 1878, but he also left two months later. 138 In the merger agreement, Moses Harvey is said to have stepped aside “in order to facilitate Union” but it is unlikely that his gesture was completely voluntary. 139 Not only was Harvey the public face of the Free Church’s rejection of earlier merger proposals, 137 Appendix III in Duder, St. Andrew’s Presbyterian Church, 56-58. 138 Moncrieff, 40-41. 139 Appendix III, 56.
but his newspaper columns criticizing the anti-confederation government of Charles Fox Bennett no doubt raised the ire of prominent Kirk members like Robert Thorburn and Walter Grieves – both of whom campaigned strongly against union with Canada. It may not have sat well with some Free Church members either. The merger agreement also pointed to declining health as a reason for Harvey’s decision with talk of hearing trouble or a loss of voice. “Loss of voice” was a phrase that Moses Harvey used himself but it was likely more of a euphemism than it was reality. He kept on lecturing long after retirement and served as the interim minister of the Presbyterian Churches at Betts Cove and Bay of Islands from August to October of 1878.

While the timing of Harvey’s retirement may not have been entirely his own, he seemed ready to turn the page on a ministry of over twenty-five years and concentrate on his literary endeavours full time. Rather than leave for another Presbyterian pulpit in Canada or Great Britain, Harvey decided to remain in Newfoundland. Not only had he become attached to the island colony, but his family was putting down strong roots there as well. His sons Charles and Alfred returned to St. John’s after completing their education in Canada and Scotland. After several years at Dalhousie University in Halifax, both men received degrees at McGill – a Bachelor of Arts for Alfred and a Bachelor of Applied Science in Civil and Mechanical Engineering for Charles.

140 Evening Telegram, 4 September 1901.
141 Moncrieff, 145.
142 Calendar and Examination Papers of Dalhousie College and University: Session 1870-71 (Halifax: Nova Scotia Printing Company, 1870) and Graduates of McGill University, Montreal: Corrected to 1890 (Montreal: John Lovell and Son, 1890).
went on to the University of Edinburgh where he was awarded a medical degree in 1876. Each of them planned to set up shop in St. John’s.

Members of Moses Harvey’s extended family also made Newfoundland home and by the late nineteenth century were well established in the colony. Moses Monroe, the second son of Harvey’s sister Jane, immigrated to St. John’s in 1860 to become a dry-goods clerk in the firm of McBride and Kerr. When the company was sold ten years later to James Goodfellow, Monroe was made a partner in the new business and though that arrangement quickly dissolved, he set up his own dry goods/fishery supply operation in 1873.¹⁴³ By the end of the decade, Moses Monroe’s business was doing well enough for him to bring his brother James Harvey Monroe over from Ireland to work with him. James was soon joined by his brother Daniel as well as his sister Julia who married local merchant David Baird.¹⁴⁴ The Newfoundland branch of the Harvey/Monroe clan was rounded out by Frederick Alderdice and Walter Stanley Monroe who both moved to St. John’s to work for their uncle Moses Monroe.¹⁴⁵

Twenty-five years after arriving in Newfoundland from Maryport, England, Moses Harvey’s commitment to the island ran deep. His family was well established and prospering; he was a respected member of St. John’s society; and a driving force behind

the growing cultural and literary life in the colony. Harvey was also making a name for himself around North America and Great Britain as a Newfoundland expert. Prominent newspapers and periodicals carried his articles and gave him a significant platform to share his views on the island’s economy, its politics and its prospects for the future. If an English speaker was reading something about Newfoundland in the late nineteenth century, chances are Moses Harvey wrote it. By the time he stepped down from the pulpit in 1878, Harvey’s pastime had become more of a career and one that he was extremely passionate about. This, and a lifetime annuity of £200 a year, sweetened the deal for retirement to make way for union.  

It also helped that, at the time, many clergymen saw journalism as an extension of their vocation – especially Presbyterian ministers from Ulster. Irish Presbyterians in the mid-nineteenth century made a concerted effort to get involved in public life and politics through the founding of newspapers. More often than not, ordained clergymen edited these new publications. Examples closer to home for Harvey would be two of his Belfast Academical Institute colleagues, the Reverend William Elder and the Reverend James Bennett who edited the *Presbyterian Witness, Maritime Monthly* and the *Saint John Telegraph*. In describing the power of newspapers, the Nova Scotian lawyer and writer J. Macdonald Oxley said:  

> It reaches a wider audience than the pulpit; it uses more effective arguments than the platform; it smites harder and more  

---

146 To put Harvey’s annuity in perspective, the salary for the new senior minister of the united St. Andrew’s Church was £300 a year.  
enduring blows than the sword; and its work, when well done, lasts longer than that wrought by any other human agency.¹⁴⁸

Moses Harvey would likely agree with this sentiment. He viewed societal progress, economic development and technological advance as divinely inspired. Taking up the pen in support of his adopted country, therefore, was simply a continuation of his mission – one he would embrace in earnest for the next two decades.

CHAPTER FIVE – FROM THE PROMISE OF PROGRESS TO POLITICS (1878-1889)

Twenty years into responsible government and with Confederation on the backburner, Newfoundland’s politicians turned their attention to economic diversification and carving out the island’s place in the British Empire. The period saw both economic prosperity and retrenchment; the construction of a trans-insular railway; the adoption of policies to foster agriculture, forestry, manufacturing and mining; and diplomatic efforts to resolve France’s outstanding claims on the northwest coast of the island. A major player in both the public and private debate surrounding each of these subjects was the Reverend Moses Harvey.

After stepping down from the pulpit at the Free Church in St. John’s, Harvey focused all of his energy on promoting Newfoundland and pushing for its progress both locally and internationally. He continued to correspond with a number of newspapers in North America and Great Britain - though as the years went on, the regularity of those columns dropped off until The Montreal Gazette was the home of his only regular letter. Harvey sent the newspaper a column on Newfoundland political, economic and cultural affairs every two weeks up until his death in 1901.¹ He also turned his attention to a local audience and became the primary editor of the Evening Mercury. This daily St. John’s

¹ In his entry on Moses Harvey in the Dictionary of Canadian Biography, F.A. Aldrich claimed that Harvey wrote for the Gazette under the pen name “Delta” which is now repeated in most academic references to him. This claim, however, is not accurate. Harvey wrote for the Gazette as simply “our Newfoundland correspondent” and while “Delta” is listed as one of his pennames in William Cushing, Initials and Pseudonyms: A Dictionary of Literary Disguises, (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell & Co., 1885), 451, it is not clear how often Harvey used it. Elizabeth Browne found references to Delta in articles carried by the Boston Traveller but in Newfoundland, the pseudonym was used by a New Party supporter in publications like the Twillingate Sun to attack the Whiteway Government – something Harvey would not have done - at least not in the late 1880s.
newspaper started publishing in 1882 and served as the official mouthpiece for both Sir William Whiteway’s Conservative Party and later Sir Robert Thorburn’s Reform Government. Taken in context, Harvey’s journalism provides a useful primary source on the period that stretches from the election of the Whiteway government in 1878 to its political return in 1889.

For the most part, the historical themes for Newfoundland during the late nineteenth century are well established. The construction of a trans-insular railway, while well-intentioned, did not lead to the prosperity promised and instead added a crippling amount to the public debt. By 1900, Newfoundland’s public debt was over $17 million and its revenues were roughly $2.3 million. The geological surveys forecasting untold mineral and agricultural wealth in the interior of the colony were overly optimistic. As a result, the government’s attempts at landward economic development were often misguided and took much needed attention away from the fisheries. When politicians did focus on Newfoundland’s main natural resource, their efforts tended to be on scientific quick fixes rather than tackling the structural problem inherent to the industry. This led to lost opportunities for producers in the international market and made the colony even more vulnerable to the sector’s boom and bust nature. The opportunities

---

3 Cadigan, Newfoundland and Labrador: A History, 125.
the government did try to take advantage of were hindered by the indifference of the Colonial Office in Britain or its micromanagement – especially in relation to the French Shore question and foreign policy issues with Canada and the United States.⁵ This, along with the promises of prosperity and reoccurring unease over talk of Confederation, fostered a growing sense of nationalism that coloured Newfoundland’s actions well into the twentieth century and beyond.⁶

In a time period where there is a dearth of diaries and personal papers belonging to public figures, the writings of Moses Harvey in the late nineteenth century provide an interesting window into the thinking and motivations behind some of the colony’s most significant political decisions. He viewed the railway as an essential ingredient in economic development and unabashedly promoted its construction. He believed science held the key for advancing the old economy and the new. He also felt that the only thing holding Newfoundland back was a lack of political will – both domestically and at Westminster. While by no means unbiased, Harvey’s commentary helped shape the public debate; represented the official views of key politicians – either in government or opposition; and influenced how foreign audiences viewed Newfoundland.

***

On the 11th of February 1878, Moses Harvey arrived at the new Athenaeum on Duckworth Street to give his first post-retirement public lecture. The impressive gothic red-brick building contained a 2,500 volume library and reading room, as well as a hall

---
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with a capacity for nearly 1,000 people. It was also, somewhat fittingly, in the shadow of the newly united St. Andrew’s Presbyterian Church being constructed across the road on the corner of Cathedral Street. While Harvey was a frequent guest at the Athenaeum’s podium, his talk on February 11th differed from his usual fare in both content and purpose. Rather than discussing an archeological discovery or a book from the Old Testament, Harvey’s subject was far more topical. It focused on Newfoundland and made the case for a grand trunk railway across the island with branch lines to all the major districts. Harvey tried hard to distance his remarks from partisanship by saying he had “no axe to grind” and was “uninfluenced by any political bias” but given how closely the railway issue was tied to the Conservative government of Sir Frederic Carter, the audience likely thought otherwise.

Three years earlier in 1875, the Carter government undertook the first serious study into the feasibility of a trans-insular railway across the island. It conducted a survey of possible routes overseen by the engineer-in-chief of the Canadian Pacific Railway, Sir Sandford Fleming. Fleming’s involvement in the project grew out of an idea he floated in 1864 to use Newfoundland to create a short-route between Great Britain and North America. According to Fleming, a trans-insular railway would shave four days off the journey from London to New York and more than justify the cost of construction. He believed strongly enough in the project to finance a partial survey of the

---

7 Moses Harvey, *This Newfoundland of Ours: A Lecture Delivered by the Rev. M. Harvey on Behalf of the St. John’s Athenaeum, 11th February, 1878*, (St. John’s: F.W. Bowden Printer, 1878), 113.

island himself in 1868, but political enthusiasm for the idea waned when it got caught up in the rhetoric surrounding the Confederation election the following year.⁹

Harvey was an early advocate of the Fleming scheme and trumpeted its benefits in magazine articles and newspaper columns.¹⁰ To him, the idea offered Newfoundland – with a population of only 160,000 and an annual revenue of $800,000 – its most realistic opportunity to build over 300 miles of railway track across the island. For the project to succeed, both the governments of Canada and Britain had to be involved. Even then, Harvey doubted whether the railway could be built without Newfoundland agreeing to join Confederation – something he ultimately favoured.¹¹ This doubt intensified after the 1875 survey. While buoyed by the results that showed a railway was indeed feasible, Harvey noted that the cost of the survey alone was enough to put the colony’s balance sheet into deficit.¹²

The high cost of construction and fears of reigniting the Confederation issue led Premier Carter to adopt a very cautious approach to the issue. He also wanted to avoid an international flair-up over the proposed terminus of the railway located at St. George’s Bay on the controversial French Shore. While a confrontation over France’s claims was exactly what many railway advocates like Harvey hoped to provoke, Carter focused his diplomatic efforts on shorter term objectives such as getting the Colonial Office to
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¹⁰ Harvey, “Newfoundland As It Is,” and Toronto Globe, 2 November 1869.
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appoint magistrates for the region. In addition, he wished to secure British approval for his own appointment to the Newfoundland Supreme Court. As early as January 1876 – less than two years after his re-election as the colony’s premier – it was public knowledge that Carter wanted to be elevated to the bench once Justice Bryan Robinson retired. By telegraphing his career plans, Carter made it more difficult to exercise control over some of the more ambitious members of his government like William Whiteway and Ambrose Shea. Both were seen, by Harvey at least, as potential leaders.

Whiteway, a St. John’s lawyer, represented the riding of Trinity Bay in the House of Assembly and served as Attorney General in the Carter government. He entered politics in 1859 at the urging of one of his wealthy clients, Charles Fox Bennett, and quickly rose up the ranks to become Speaker of the House in 1865. Whiteway broke with Bennett over the issue of Confederation, however, and it cost him his seat in the 1869 election. Whiteway advocated for Confederation because he believed that in order to advance, Newfoundland needed a diversified economy and Canada offered the best avenue to reaching that goal. While political defeat tempered his commitment to Confederation, it did not lessen his conviction that the island’s long-term prosperity lay beyond the fisheries.

Ambrose Shea, a Newfoundland-born businessman, came from a very political family. His father and brothers owned and edited the *Newfoundlander* – a weekly newspaper founded in 1827 that advocated for representative government in the colony and then supported measures it felt would strengthen the political or economic voice of the colony. Ambrose Shea, however, showed more interest in politics than the newspaper business. Elected to the House of Assembly in 1848, he represented a variety of ridings over his career from St. John’s to Placentia to Harbour Grace. Like Whiteway, he strongly supported Confederation and paid for it with his seat in the 1869 election. Shea’s pro-Confederation views also put him at odds with other Roman Catholic Liberals – though this was not unusual, given his family’s ongoing efforts to keep religion out of politics. It came as no surprise then, when Shea ran for Carter’s Conservatives in a January 1874 by-election and ended up as the representative for a predominantly Protestant district.

As a member of the Carter government, Shea quickly joined forces with Whiteway to advance initiatives designed to diversify Newfoundland’s economy – particularly Fleming’s plans for a railway across the island. While their initial success on this front was limited, that started to change as 1877 came to a close. In early November, Judge Robinson retired to Ealing just outside of London to be closer to his daughters. He was knighted and received an extremely generous pension from Newfoundland of £666
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Robinson’s retirement meant that, at last, Carter could be appointed to the Supreme Court and the way cleared for Whiteway to become the next premier of Newfoundland. At the same time, the colony was savouring an impressive victory at the Halifax Fisheries Commission established by the Government of the United Kingdom and the United States to determine whether the Americans received undue benefit from fishing rights conferred under the Treaty of Washington (1871). Toward the end of 1877, Commissioners ruled that they had unduly benefited and awarded the Dominions of Canada and Newfoundland $4.5 million and $1 million respectively. Attorney General William Whiteway represented Newfoundland in front of the Commission and received extensive praise for his efforts, with Harvey leading the cheers in the pages of the Montreal Gazette.19

Whiteway’s first order of business as premier-in-waiting was to set the stage for his agenda and the November general election. The railway played an important part in that strategy, as did Moses Harvey’s speech at the Athenaeum in February. While there is no direct evidence that Whiteway coordinated the address, he was too shrewd a politician for the timing and content to be purely coincidental. Whiteway, Shea and Harvey also travelled in many of the same social circles, so there was ample opportunity for sharing ideas and hatching plans. Whiteway served as District Grand Master at the Masonic Lodge in St. John’s where Harvey was chaplain; and Ambrose Shea’s first wife
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Isabella attended the Free Church. In addition, the three men were close to Alexander Murray, the director of the Geological Survey of Newfoundland.

Moses Harvey spoke to the St. John’s Athenaeum on Monday, February 11th, four days after Governor John Glover delivered a fairly uninspired Speech from the Throne on behalf of the Carter Government. The Governor went through a shopping list of accomplishments from the year previous, including increased public works to make up for a downturn in the fisheries; advances in agriculture, despite a severe case of potato blight; the Washington Treaty settlement; subsidies for the fledgling shipbuilding industry; and the appointment of magistrates on the west coast of the island. Glover also highlighted a series of issues that would be coming before legislators during the session, from an expiring ocean mail contract to expanded telegraph services to a new fog alarm system at Cape Spear.

Speeches from the Throne are rarely literary masterpieces, but this session-opener certainly reflected the fact that Carter was merely biding time until his judicial appointment. Whiteway, on the other hand, was a man anxious to become prime minister and acutely aware of the looming election in November. Harvey’s lecture to the St. John’s Athenaeum, entitled This Newfoundland of Ours, served as an unofficial manifesto for what became known as Whiteway’s politics of progress. It was also an unabashed sales pitch for the construction of a railway to link the east and west coasts of
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the island. Over the course of about 90 minutes, Harvey walked his audience of
politicians, businessmen, educators, and other community leaders through the case for
such a project. In so doing, he touched on several themes that occur again and again in
late nineteenth century Newfoundland.

Harvey reassured listeners that there was no inherent impediment to
Newfoundland’s advancement. The colony had all the necessary ingredients to reach its
full potential. The fact that it still had a ways to go was neither the fault of the colony
nor its residents. Newfoundlanders came from good British stock and, unlike other
colonies in the Empire, its first settlers were not men forced to “leave their country for
their country’s good.” Instead, they were brave adventurers from Devonshire or hand-
picked colonists from Ireland, with a dash of Scottish blood added for good measure.
These strong, pure Celtic-Saxon genes, mixed with one of the “healthiest climates in the
world” and a fish diet “favorable for intellectual development,” were a recipe for success.
In Harvey’s words:

All that could be asked for, as the elements of national
greatness, are here in profusion; and if this country does
not rise into prosperity, in coming years, it must be either
from the people proving untrue to themselves, or from
some combination of unfavorable conditions of which we
do not yet see the slightest foreshadowing.24
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So if Newfoundlanders were blameless when it came to the island’s slow pace of economic and social development, where did the fault lie? According to Harvey, the culprit could be found in the colony’s past.

Harvey divided Newfoundland’s history into three distinct periods: the chaotic or anarchic period, stretching from 1583 to 1728; the transitional period that ran all the way to the present; and the period of maturity, of which, he assured his audience, the country was on the brink. Harvey spent the most time describing the anarchic period because it explained why the island had not advanced as far as other colonies in British North America or other parts of the Empire. He defined it as a time marked by misrule, oppression and neglect. English ship-owners and traders viewed Newfoundland as nothing more than a stage for curing fish and a nursery for training seamen. They discouraged settlers; threatened women with removal; and administered justice through Fishing Admirals – the masters of the first ship that entered the island’s harbours each season.25 What Harvey found remarkable was that the British Government of the day not only went along with these practices, but even encouraged them and yet, despite the obstacles, settlement still occurred. Just imagine, he asked his audience, “what Newfoundland would be today had settlement been encouraged and civilization fostered, as in the other provinces, instead of being thwarted and trampled down.”26

To underline this point, Harvey reminded the audience of all the landmarks of civilization achieved since the beginning of the nineteenth century: a Supreme Court;

25 Ibid., 109.
26 Ibid., 110.
post office; newspapers; roads; and, of course, the establishment of Responsible Government in 1855. Harvey viewed local self-government as the most significant milestone in Newfoundland’s progress since the appointment of the colony’s first governor in 1728. With the ability to elect their representatives and make their own laws, the people of Newfoundland were “as free as any people under the sun” and “are jogging on now fairly towards the stage of our maturity, as an organized and civilized community.”27 The colony’s ability to reach maturity, however, depended entirely on constructing a grand truck railway across the island with branches to all its principal districts. Despite the significant headway made in road-building and the improvements to steamer service, Harvey warned that further economic, social and political progress would be impossible without a railway.

Harvey’s case for a railway was primarily economic. He saw it as the only way to open up the west coast of the island and take full advantage of the region’s potential for mining, agriculture and forestry. A railway also meant increased immigration and a growth in manufacturing, retail sales, property values and employment at good wages. To those who said that a poor colony like Newfoundland could not afford such an expensive project, Harvey replied that the island’s precarious balance sheet was the very reason why it should proceed because a railway had the power to transform poverty into wealth. He also believed that the Newfoundland government finally had the financial wherewithal to make the dream of Fleming and others a reality. Less than three years earlier, Harvey publicly doubted that it would ever be possible without the assistance of
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Canada or Great Britain since the colony struggled to even cover the cost of the survey. The reason for his change of heart and renewed optimism was the Washington Treaty settlement. Not only would it result in an infusion of capital, it also showed that Newfoundland could exercise power on the international stage – especially when wielded by its soon-to-be premier William Whiteway.28

Along with making the factual case for a railway, Harvey tried to imbue the project with a sense of national pride. Newfoundland was not a barren rock or iceberg stranded in the North Atlantic, but a rapidly progressing society with all the elements necessary for prosperity. With a railway, it would soon overtake its sister colonies – all of whom had a substantial head start in the development race. What Newfoundland required was for patriotism to continue to rise above party strife and denominational zeal. Its citizens needed to put the country first and make sacrifices to promote Newfoundland’s higher interests.29 To drive home his point, Harvey sent his audience out onto Duckworth Street with a couple of stanzas from Charles Mackay’s poem about three preachers – one who exhorts his congregation to cling to the past; another advocating the status quo; and the third who presses his people onward. Not surprisingly, Harvey identified with the clergyman extolling the virtues of the future and looking forward. “Standing still is childish folly, going backward is a crime; none should

28 Ibid., 116.
29 Ibid., 121.
patiently endure any ill that he can cure … Science is a child as yet and her power and scope shall grow, and her triumphs in the future shall diminish toil and woe.”

Forward and future were certainly the watchwords of William Whiteway. Just before he took over the premiership from Frederic Carter at the end of the legislative session in April of 1878, Whiteway – seconded by Ambrose Shea – moved that the Newfoundland House of Assembly consider the question of a railroad across the island, as well as the completion of roads to open up its agricultural and timber lands. Elected members discussed the issue over the course of two days using many of the arguments and even some of the phrases contained in Harvey’s speech to the Athenaeum a couple of months before. Whiteway challenged his colleagues to rise to the occasion and ensure that Newfoundland made full use of all its natural resources rather than importing products from the Maritimes and Britain that could be produced more cheaply at home. He also revived Sandford Fleming’s plan to use the Newfoundland railway as a shorter route between Europe and North America. Other politicians, like the Receiver General J.J. Rogerson and Opposition member J.J. Dearin, focused their arguments on the vast amount of economic development that would naturally flow from the project. While Harvey said he would do anything short of stealing to secure the financial capital necessary for construction, Dearin felt the angels would overlook a little bit of lawbreaking if a railway was the result. This spirit of optimism infused most of the debate – though there was not enough disagreement to actually call it a debate. The only
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voice raised in opposition was that of former premier C.F. Bennett who believed the colony could not afford a railway and, like Prince Edward Island, union with Canada would be the unfortunate result of such a project.33

The House of Assembly, with the sole exception of Bennett, recommended that a railway be constructed from St. John’s to St. George’s Bay or some other suitable port on the west coast. Any company willing to assume this undertaking would receive an annual grant of $120,000 from the government along with significant land grants. Members called on the Governor in Council to approach the British and Canadian governments for a joint subsidy of the main line. They also wanted to see surveys conducted for a branch line from Carbonear to Harbour Grace, as well as roads planned through the Humber Valley connecting Bay of Islands with Notre Dame Bay and from Gambo to Grand Lake.34 After quick consideration, the Legislative Council reported back to the Assembly that it approved all of their recommendations and then the parliamentary session was prorogued a week later on April 18th. At the end of June, Governor John Glover dissolved the Legislature and issued a proclamation for a general election in the fall.35

By getting the railway addressed before the vote, Whiteway successfully took it away from the Liberal opposition as an issue they could use to rally public support on the campaign trail. John Joseph Dearin, an outspoken Liberal for St. John’s East, had been very critical of the Carter government for not following up on the 1875 railway survey

34 Journal of the House of Assembly, 11 April 1878, 149-150.
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and accused them of letting this vital national plan gather dust on the shelf.\textsuperscript{36} Though the politics of railroads certainly played a part in Whiteway’s decision-making, he also genuinely believed in the project and its ability to kick-start the diversification of Newfoundland’s economy.

***

Most of Whiteway’s confidence came from the findings of Alexander Murray, the Director of Newfoundland’s Geological Survey, who had been exploring the island since 1864. He held that the central and western portions of the colony contained a vast, untapped quantity of mineral and timber resources, as well as ample land for agriculture.\textsuperscript{37} While it is easy now in hindsight to dismiss his research as overly enthusiastic or based on slender evidence, few questioned the science behind his methodology in the late nineteenth century.

Murray began his North American surveying career in 1843 as an assistant to William Logan, the head of the Geological Survey of Canada, whose outlook, philosophies and techniques he would follow in his later work. Logan, born in Montreal and educated in Edinburgh, was a recognized expert in using geology to determine the location of coal and other valuable mineral resources. In the early 1800s, there was much controversy over the origins of coal. Some scholars believed that coal accumulated like


\textsuperscript{37} Murray reported his findings regularly to the House of Assembly and the press, but the full surveys can be found in Alexander Murray and James P. Howley, Geological Survey of Newfoundland, (London: Edward Standford, 1881).
driftwood, while others felt it grew like a peaty swamp – though there was little agreement on the type of vegetation needed for that to happen. Logan, acting on the cumulative wisdom of Welsh miners, observed that under every coal-seam there was a bed of clay containing fossilized material from the *stigmaria* plant.\(^\text{38}\) His theory proving that coal grew *in situ* not only settled the debate surrounding the origins of the valuable resource, it gave companies and governments a practical guide for finding it.

This practical application of geological theory was a hallmark of Logan’s later work and that of his mentor, Charles Lyell, who changed the way people viewed the science. In his *Principles of Geology* published in the early 1830s, Lyell theorized that magma and fire from the earth’s core played a central role in the formation of the planet – and not just water and catastrophic events, as previously believed. He also suggested that geological change happened gradually over a much longer time frame through forces that were still active in the present. Lyell’s theory became known as uniformitarianism because it held that natural laws and processes were constant across time and space. This allowed geologists to read the history of a locale and determine its likely natural resources through the stratification and make-up of the earth’s layers. Lyell’s work inspired Logan and Alexander Murray to view North America as a unique tableaux and not simply an extension of Europe.\(^\text{39}\)

Murray not only learned most of his geological theory from Logan, he also received practical tips on how to operate and ensure the continued financial viability of a


geological survey. Logan masterfully balanced the pursuit of scientific knowledge with commercial goals of finding lucrative natural resources like coal, copper and iron ore. He was careful not to jeopardize the integrity of his findings, but Logan purposefully designed his surveys to match the political goals of the politicians and businessmen from all parties who financed his efforts. He also realized that his reports to the legislature were as much political documents as they were scientific, so he offset any disappointments with other discoveries of potentially valuable minerals. Murray used this same approach when he started the second geological survey of Newfoundland in 1864. The British geologist J.B. Jukes conducted the first in the late 1830s but since he focused most of his efforts on the Avalon Peninsula and found little of potential value, the legislature stopped funding his work. That was not a mistake Murray planned to repeat.

Starting in 1865, Murray and his party went straight to the northern peninsula of Newfoundland to begin surveying and annually worked their way down the west coast into the interior of the island. As with the Geological Survey of Canada, the goal was to establish and map the geological make-up of the country using observations, precise measurements, fossils, and soil and mineral samples. Unlike surveying in Great Britain or even Canada, the task in Newfoundland was particularly arduous. Surveyors could
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only access many parts of the island by boat and much of the coastal area, where the best rock formations could be found were largely inaccessible. The lack of roads also made travelling in the interior difficult. As a result, Murray kept his surveying party small and relied heavily on the expertise of Mi’kmaq guides. Inaccurate or incomplete topographical maps also hindered progress. Before he could properly survey an area, Murray often needed to map it, which required a fair amount of time, patience and precision. Despite the setbacks and challenges, the Geological Survey of Newfoundland made steady progress – though Murray warned that it might take decades for a full geological picture of the island to emerge.

The fact that Murray had the ability to compare his findings to the work he and William Logan had already completed in Canada, thereby situating the results in a broader North American context, certainly sped things along. It also allowed him to include more hopeful predictions in his annual reports to the Assembly via the Governor. The reports generally started off with a summary of what Murray hoped to accomplish, along with recommendations. They then went on to outline the geological characteristics of the area surveyed and to list the economically significant minerals found within. Coal was of primary importance but copper, iron, lead, gold, nickel, granite, slate, limestone, gypsum, quartz, and petroleum were also highlighted. He also reported on the interior’s timber and agricultural potential.

Murray believed that highlighting areas of economic growth was an important part of his mandate because to him, the value of a geological survey was not only scientific but financial:

> A geological map of a new country, accompanied by sections and well-arranged specimens, is perhaps the best advertisement that could be publicly given to induce the introduction of labour and capital; and to construct the former and judiciously arrange the latter is most especially the province of the geological surveyor.\(^{44}\)

It was the economic potential uncovered by the geological survey that Murray, Howley and their backers continued to push to justify the public expense of continuing to underwrite the project. Like his mentor Logan, Murray placed great importance on fostering broad support for his work as well as managing expectations. In this, he had a great ally in Moses Harvey. Harvey included updates and discoveries from the Geological Survey in almost every column he wrote for newspapers across North America and in Great Britain. Murray kept him well informed as did others involved in the sector, including his son. Charles Harvey, newly graduated from McGill University with a degree in engineering, worked with James Howley on mapping projects in Bay of Islands.\(^ {45}\) He also helped survey the potential route for Newfoundland’s railway. These connections, along with a personal fascination with the subject matter, provided Moses Harvey with a constant source of material to publicize the seemingly vast potential of Newfoundland.

\(^{44}\) Murray and Howley, *Geological Survey of Newfoundland*, 52.  
\(^{45}\) *Ibid.*, 466.
When it came to the future of mining in the colony, both Murray and Harvey played it fairly straight. Murray was cautious in his predictions, never straying too far from the science. His reports carefully pointed out where coal or other mineral deposits were likely too small to be economically viable and in the case of larger finds, he usually called for further investigation to confirm his hypotheses. Where Murray and especially Harvey let their enthusiasm take over was in describing the “good time coming” from opening up the interior of the island and extracting the mineral wealth on the west coast. Harvey pictured an influx of thousands of people who would fill the Humber Valley from shore to shore replacing its forests with cornfields and meadows.46 These rhetorical flourishes generally targeted a business or political audience and sought to encourage investments of capital or skilled labour – both seen as essential for Newfoundland to make profitable use of its natural resources.47 Despite the occasional hyperbole and an over-reliance on examples from Canada’s geological survey to predict the future, people like Murray, Howley and Harvey were voices of reason compared to the countless other mining promoters who “unhesitatingly give most exaggerated statements without the slightest foundation in fact.”48

Newfoundland in the 1870s experienced a mining boom that stemmed from the discovery of large quantities of copper at Tilt Cove in Notre Dame Bay. The mine,
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operated by Smith McKay\textsuperscript{49} and C.F. Bennett, employed over 700 workers at its peak and exported over £1,000,000 worth of copper by 1879 – making Newfoundland the sixth largest producer of the mineral in the world. Such economic success sparked a rush of claims throughout Notre Dame Bay and elsewhere by amateur prospectors and mining promoters whose knowledge of the industry was often quite limited. Investors looking to make a quick profit would buy property around the claims staked by recognized mining experts in the hopes of striking it rich or reselling the land once a future survey confirmed its value.\textsuperscript{50}

Copper fever intensified even further when, after becoming premier, C.F. Bennett removed the 2.5 per cent royalty on gross mining profits. St. John’s politicians, merchants, lawyers and other professionals with money to invest all seemed to have some stake in Newfoundland’s growing mining sector. Moses Harvey, along with promoting new mineral discoveries in his newspaper columns, also had a financial interest in seeing the industry develop. In December of 1869, at his suggestion, a partnership was formed between Harvey, Ambrose Shea, John Munn, \textit{Morning Chronicle} editor Henry Winton, and several others to explore for minerals in the area surrounding Tilt Cove.\textsuperscript{51} The ownership was limited to a dozen shareholders, with £100 being Harvey’s investment, but it was quite active. The company hired a young mineralogist from the University of Toronto named Hugh Fletcher and paid him $200 a month to conduct surveys around

\textsuperscript{50} Martin, \textit{Once Upon A Mine}, 25.
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Notre Dame Bay in search of economic opportunity. Several seasons of surveying eventually led to the group staking a claim on Pilley’s Island. Harvey also launched other smaller exploration ventures with the prospector Daniel Henderson and St. John’s merchant James Goodfellow – two of his congregants. They included property on Belle Isle, off the Northern Peninsula; as well as Black Joke Cove, Black Tickle and Indian Harbour in Labrador.

Harvey’s entrepreneurial drive came from a need to supplement his ministerial stipend. Not only did he have university-aged sons to support, he also feared a life of poverty in his retirement. “We poor ministers have to tug away ‘til we break down on a pittance which barely enables us to live. When old age comes we are sometime dependent on charity.” Shares in a profitable copper or iron ore mine would guard against that – though Harvey also reassured friends that he recognized the importance of keeping his religious calling free of secularism. Harvey’s visions of mining profits and financial independence, however, were not to be. Like many investors, he ended up losing more than he made though, fortunately for him, the losses tended to be less than £50. Despite his connections, Harvey faced a number of challenges in trying to develop his claims that he shared with his fellow speculators. These obstacles tended to be technical and financial.
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The lack of accurate maps and an unreliable land registry system led to claims being staked on non-existent land or cases of overlapping ownership. The government restricted mining claims to three square miles of unoccupied land and the investment required from prospectors was $24 for two-year license that could be renewed indefinitely. This effectively tied up many promising areas and deterred larger companies who needed more land to turn a profit.\textsuperscript{56} Coastal access was also a problem; it either did not come with every claim or fishing communities already occupied the closest safe harbour.\textsuperscript{57} As previously mentioned, the Geological Survey of Newfoundland was rectifying the problem, but the mapping process was arduous and time-consuming. A workable claim also required a proper survey and given the scarcity of local talent, these skills had to be hired from off the island. In Harvey’s case, he leaned heavily on his relationships with key members the Geological Survey of Canada for these surveys. His friend Robert Bell, the Survey’s assistant director for Lower Canada and the son of a Presbyterian minister, often took an ownership stake in Harvey’s mining ventures in return for his professional services.\textsuperscript{58} Harvey in turn acted as an agent for the McGill professor in Newfoundland, registering mining licenses on his behalf. Bell also analyzed the numerous geological samples and fossils sent to him by Harvey since that expertise
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was not available in Newfoundland.\textsuperscript{59} Even Murray and Howley shipped much of their material to the mainland for review.

While these technical obstacles could be overcome, the financial hills that investors faced were much harder to scale. Mining in nineteenth-century Newfoundland was an expensive prospect. The skilled workers came from places like Cornwall and required room, board and other infrastructure. General labourers, largely local, loaded the ore onto ships that then transported their cargo across the Atlantic to be processed by smelters in Swansea and elsewhere.\textsuperscript{60} To offset these costs, the revenue side of the ledger depended on the purity, quantity and price of the commodity in the marketplace – each of which had to be quite high for investors to profit. For example, Harvey’s sample from Pilley’s Island contained 36 per cent copper - considered good by the experts - yet he deemed it insufficient to make the venture pay.\textsuperscript{61} Given the amount of capital required, part-time investors like Harvey and his consortium hoped to sell their property to wealthy individuals from Canada or the United States. The catch was, however, that they often insisted on the same maps, analyzed samples and regulatory framework that local entrepreneurs also lacked.

The growing frustration in many quarters over Newfoundland’s seeming inability to turn its considerable mineral potential into profit led to increased support for the idea of a trans-insular railway. A railway meant more money for surveys and the
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\textsuperscript{60} Martin, 19-20.
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establishment of a reliable export route not dependent on ocean access. It also meant – in theory – an influx of settlers to open up the interior, clear land for agriculture and bring order to a timber industry operating largely without oversight. At the very least, such a project would be a visible sign of Newfoundland’s progress and an indication that it was a Dominion in its own right – one worthy of outside investment.

***

In the summer of 1878, the path to a trans-insular railway appeared to be fairly straightforward. The railway resolutions passed quickly through both the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council with only former premier C.F. Bennett strongly against the project. Some in St. John’s – especially long-established merchants – also expressed concerns, but their opposition was neither particularly vocal nor organized. Their main arguments were that the colony could not afford such an expense and scarce funds would be diverted away from the cod fishery which, interestingly enough, was also what they said when the Bennett government embarked on a program of road building in the early 1870s. William Whiteway countered these fears with the confident prediction that Imperial support was all but guaranteed. After all, Canada received aid from Britain to build its railway. Supporters like Moses Harvey went further still suggesting that, given the project’s benefits for all of North America, Canada and the United States would also be quick to invest. Spirits were buoyed even more when Sandford Fleming, who happened to be in London, offered to oversee the proposal process with the Colonial
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Office and to invite construction tenders from companies who – according to Harvey – were already expressing interest.\textsuperscript{65} Optimism started to wane, however, when Whiteway ran headlong into political reality – first on the international stage and then locally at home.

In retrospect, it is difficult to fathom why Whiteway underestimated the British government’s negative reaction to his plans for a trans-insular railway with a western terminus at St. George’s Bay – part of the disputed French Shore. The area had been a sensitive subject between Britain and France for years and just months before Whiteway came forward with his proposal, the two governments had renewed negotiations aimed at settling the issue once and for all. As a result, the Colonial Office refused to let Fleming advertise Newfoundland’s railway venture or to call for construction tenders fearing it would alarm the French government and scuttle their diplomatic efforts.\textsuperscript{66} Secretary of State for the Colonies, Sir Michael Hicks Beach, wrote to Newfoundland’s Governor in August of 1878 recommending that the construction of a railway be indefinitely delayed. Whiteway protested the decision and argued that to address years of imperial neglect, London was duty-bound to support the railway, contribute to the building of a dry dock and subsidize transatlantic mail rates.\textsuperscript{67} The Premier’s pleas fell on deaf ears and Hicks Beach even refused Whiteway’s counter offer of a rather paltry £5,000 grant for letters and parcels travelling between the colony and Great Britain.

\textsuperscript{65} \textit{Montreal Gazette}, 29 May 1878.
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Imperial rejection sparked little in the way of public outrage and it had no discernable impact on Whiteway’s electoral fortunes. The Member for Trinity Bay and his party won the general election later that fall and increased their majority in the House of Assembly, doubling the seat count of the opposition Liberals. The delay in approvals for the railway also did not appear to immediately trouble Moses Harvey. The subject only appeared in his *Montreal Gazette* in March of 1879, after the Throne Speech omitted any reference to the construction of a railway. Harvey placed the blame squarely on the “interference of the Imperial Government” and complained that London’s hard line on the French Shore was making a farce of Newfoundland’s territorial rights on the west coast.  

Despite his disappointment, Harvey – like Whiteway – remained confident that Imperial attitudes would change as negotiations progressed and thus transform the dream of a railway into reality. The Newfoundland premier even travelled to London and Paris to assist in the negotiations and softened the colony’s hardline stance on the French Shore in the hopes of securing a deal.  

His thinking apparently was that if the Colonial Office was no longer preoccupied with matters of diplomacy, it could turn its attention to Newfoundland’s economic development and reward Whiteway for his role in achieving a compromise.

When talks between Britain and France dragged on for almost a year and the Colonial Office showed no sign of budging, however, Whiteway decided to go it alone. With a negligible public debt and relatively low levels of taxation, the Premier argued
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that Newfoundland had the capacity to borrow the funds needed to build a railway and the revenue room to service the loan. The new plan also called for an initial line between St. John’s and Hall’s Bay linking the capital to mineral-rich Notre Dame Bay with the thought that increased economic growth would more than offset any cost overruns. 70 Whiteway referred the matter to a joint committee of the Assembly and Legislative Council which he chaired. The rest of the committee comprised Charles R. Ayre, Peter G. Tessier and Robert Thorburn from the Legislative Council and Robert Kent, Joseph Little, Alexander Mackay, John Rorke, and Ambrose Shea who sat in the House of Assembly. It was an interesting mix of individuals. Kent and Little came from the opposition Liberals but, like many in their party, were strong proponents of a railway. Tessier, Ayre and Thorburn were merchants who, at least in the case of the latter two, went on to express serious doubts about Whiteway’s plan.

Despite their partisan differences and future concerns, the committee produced a report recommending the construction of a narrow gauge railway to the mining region of Notre Dame Bay and called on the Government to borrow up to $500,000 a year to make it happen. 71 While the report recognized the significant financial obligations required to build a railway, its authors believed that the colony’s economic conditions in 1880 were favourable enough to undertake such a project without unduly taxing resources – especially if the Imperial Government guaranteed the interest on Newfoundland’s
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bonds.\textsuperscript{72} Thorburn later told the Legislative Council that committee members understood that the project would only proceed if it continued to be affordable, but that caution does not appear in the report presented to the House of Assembly.\textsuperscript{73}

Debate over the Railway Loan Bill in the Legislature itself was fairly limited with most who spoke going on record in favour of the project. A handful of Members did raise concerns about certain parts of the resolution – though not about the wisdom of moving forward. R.J. Parsons, a Liberal from St. John’s East, made his support conditional on not raising taxes or joining Confederation, but his biggest complaint was the appointment of five commissioners to implement the Act. He saw that as nothing more than a patronage reward for Conservative-friendly “hangers-on.”\textsuperscript{74} The Speaker, A.J.W. McNeily, played it down the middle. He warned that by adopting the principle of the bill, the Assembly had “cut the bridge by which we might possibly retreat.” In the same speech, however, McNeily expressed the view that most of the obstacles to a railway were “merely imaginary” and “trusted the day was not far distant when this work would be consummated.” His main objection appeared to be with the how and not the what. McNeily doubted the likelihood of an Imperial guarantee and thought the money might be better attained through a loan on the foreign markets, supported by a tax increase of 4.5 cents a head.\textsuperscript{75} The loudest voice in opposition to Whiteway’s plan came from Lewis Tessier, the brother of Peter Tessier who helped write the report that the bill was based on. The Member for St. John’s West acknowledged that he was in the
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minority, but felt duty-bound to express his serious reservations. According to Tessier, the committee underestimated the cost of construction and the negative impact it would have on the colony’s finances. He predicted the only things that a railway would bring were high taxes, financial ruin, and eventually Canadian citizenship. Despite this warning, the Assembly passed the Railway Loan Bill with minor amendments and with only Lewis Tessier and S.B. Carter from Twillingate-Fogo in opposition.

The spirit of consensus turned out to be short-lived. As with most things railway-related, the political gamesmanship tended to occur outside the Legislature and after decisions were taken. Whiteway wasted little time in appointing railway commissioners and hiring the engineering firm of Knipple and Morris to survey the new line. These actions galvanized those groups who seemed quite content only to debate the benefits of a railroad as long as it stayed strictly theoretical. The realization that Whiteway and Shea seriously intended to go ahead with the project mobilized certain elements within the business community, as well as the premier’s political rivals. They attempted to halt the project by appealing to the court of public opinion or, at the very least, delaying it until the matter could be resolved through the upcoming general election in 1882. St. John’s newspapers served as the primary weapons for this fight and Moses Harvey soon found himself leading the charge on behalf of the pro-railroad forces.

***

76 Ibid.
In her dissertation on the history of newspapers in Newfoundland, Maudie Whelan pointed to the 1880s as a turning point. Long-established editors who saw the colony through responsible government had either died or planned to retire. Technological advances in the production of newspapers meant publishers could make their operations daily instead of three times a week. This meant, however, that owners needed to decide whether to reinvest or to simply close up shop. Many chose the latter, but those who went the daily route were sustained by the passionate, prolific and partisan debate over whether a railroad made economic sense for Newfoundland. The publication at the centre of the debate and the main catalyst for change in the colony’s newspaper industry was the *Evening Telegram*. William J. Herder started the newspaper in April of 1879 with a printing press acquired from his former employer, the *Courier*. In its early days, the *Telegram*’s focus was advertising, with notices for products and services taking up three of its four pages. Herder kept advertising and subscription costs low and in a matter of months, increased his circulation to an impressive 1,200. The actual news content of the paper was fairly sparse – mainly court reports, sports scores and social events – but this increased over time.

The *Evening Telegram* initially ignored the railway issue carrying only transcript accounts of the debates in the Legislature, but withholding editorial judgment. This changed after the Railway Loan Act passed in April of 1880. Letters and columns to the newspaper started to raise doubts about the affordability of the project; questioned whether the average Newfoundlander would see any economic benefit from a railway at
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all; and portrayed the entire scheme as a thinly veiled attempt to force the colony into
Confederation. These arguments were not new but the fact they were now being
espoused by the *Evening Telegram* concerned Whiteway and Shea. The editorial views of
the *Telegram* on most issues leaned towards the traditional making it a natural home for
those opposed to the railway. It also no doubt helped that Whiteway’s party shut the
*Telegram* out of all government printing contracts – a considerable and steady source of
revenue for newspapers in the nineteenth century.79 These two factors, plus the backing
of an influential group of St. John’s merchants, made the *Telegram* a political force to be
reckoned with.

The pro-railway response to the *Telegram* came through the pages of the *Morning
Chronicle*. On the face of it, the *Chronicle* and the Whiteway government made for
strange bedfellows. The newspaper and its editor Francis Winton were strong opponents
of Confederation and clashed repeatedly over the years with Carter, Shea and
Whiteway.80 Their collaboration over the railway, however, illustrates the political
realignment that was taking place in Newfoundland because of the issue. Moses Harvey,
writing under the pseudonym “Locomotive,” laid out the case for the railway in a ten-part
series of articles that ran in the *Chronicle* from July to August of 1880. While Harvey
claimed to be acting independently, many of his arguments either originated from, or
were repeated in, public speeches made by Sir William Whiteway. The *Telegram*
immediately countered his arguments with a series of its own written by correspondents

79 Whelan, 275-276.
named “Au Revoir” and “Terra Nova.” Taken together, these exchanges provide a window into the development of political themes that appear again and again throughout the late nineteenth century.

The first set of themes involved the supposed motives behind either supporting or opposing the railway project. According to Harvey, Newfoundland’s population had reached the point where it could no longer be sustained by the fisheries alone. Despite technological advancements, the total cod catch remained essentially unchanged from the 1860s but the population had increased by almost 20,000. This growth, to his mind, was unsustainable without new industries and a railroad – the key to economic and social progress. Harvey portrayed the merchants opposed to the idea as “old school Conservatives” who directly profited from keeping the island wholly dependent on the fisheries. They opposed any new idea whether it was C.F. Bennett’s copper mining venture or the introduction of coastal steamers – both now viewed as successful and essential. Harvey coined the term “fish-flake party” to describe these merchants which was effective and long-lasting. It harkened back to the rhetoric used in past fights for the right to settle in the eighteenth century; representative government in the 1820s and responsible government in the 1850s. The Evening Telegram, in the hopes of alienating supporters of the Whiteway administration, accused Harvey of besmirching the entire business company, but he went to some lengths to separate the enlightened from the

\[81\] Morning Chronicle, 6 July 1880.
\[82\] Morning Chronicle, 8 July 1880.
\[83\] Evening Telegram, 14 July 1880.
backwards merchant. In his opinion, the former far outweighed the latter and if the business community was polled, the railway would win the day.\textsuperscript{84}

The \textit{Evening Telegram} in turn cast itself as the defender of Newfoundland’s interests and merchants as the only ones willing to stand up to a government overstepping its bounds. In his letters, “Au Revoir” was careful not to oppose the idea of a railroad. Instead, he objected to what he called a “political or Government Railway” designed to further the partisan or economic cause of the party in power. The \textit{Telegram} correspondent contended that Whiteway and Shea did not have a mandate from the people to use public funds in pursuit of their course of action.\textsuperscript{85} When Harvey pointed out that merchants served on the Joint Railway Committee and the Loan Act received near unanimous support from both branches of the Legislature, “Au Revoir” called the process rushed and accused representatives of being “bribed off.”\textsuperscript{86} If Whiteway’s railway truly had economic merit, then investors should be willing to put up their own money and not require a government subsidy.

Another major area of disagreement surrounded the financing of the railway. Harvey held that the colony could easily cover its portion of the cost through interest earned on the Fisheries Award; the existing operating surplus; reductions in steamer subsidies and poor relief; and by trimming government expenditures.\textsuperscript{87} Taxes need not
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be raised. He also underlined that in sparsely populated places like North America, public investment in railways was the norm, not the exception. The *Evening Telegram* doubted that sufficient foreign capital would be available without an Imperial loan guarantee and questioned how a colony with annual revenues of only $8 million could commit $5 million to laying tracks to Notre Dame Bay. “Au Revoir” predicted a tax increase of 20 per cent at best and in the worst case scenario, a hike approaching 50 per cent.

Finally, Harvey and the merchants writing in the *Evening Telegram* differed over the likely impact of a railway on the colony. Harvey believed the project would unlock the island’s considerable agricultural and mineral wealth. Rather than suffering as a result, St. John’s merchants would be among the prime beneficiaries. Immigrants and newly prosperous residents required more goods. Those who remained in the fisheries would receive a greater share of catch and supply a better product. The *Evening Telegram*, on the other hand, saw nothing but financial ruin and forced Confederation with Canada. The fact that Harvey also wrote in the *Montreal Gazette* was taken as proof that Canada would be the ultimate beneficiary of Whiteway’s plan. Even if Moses Harvey’s predictions came true, “Au Revoir” argued that only foreign investors would reap the economic benefits. Jobs that came with railway construction were only
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temporary, leaving Newfoundlanders with an unremunerative and unsustainable transportation system:

The railway is an execrable political plot which would sell our country into the hands of strangers, strangle our children with inextricable taxation, mortgage from us that natural inheritance we received from our ancestors and bring upon us the Canadian curse of Confederation.\textsuperscript{92}

This was too high a price to pay for a scheme designed to keep Whiteway in power and Ambrose Shea provided with a “situation for life” as Chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners.\textsuperscript{93}

Both sides sharpened their attempts over the summer months and into the fall, using every new development as an opportunity to press their case. Anti-railway advocates decried the importation of 19 assistant surveyors from Canada by Knipple and Morris, saying it proved that native Newfoundlanders would not see the jobs promised by the Whiteway government. When those same surveyors encountered violent opposition from an angry crowd of Foxtrap residents, the \textit{Evening Telegram} used it as confirmation that they alone represented the people’s real wishes. Railway proponents, like Harvey, saw the incident differently. To them, Foxtrap showed that old school merchants would do anything to stop the railway – even enflaming the passions of “ignorant people” to protest a project that would give them good jobs and wages.\textsuperscript{94} The 1880 Report of the St.
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John’s Chamber of Commerce criticized the Railway Loan Act and the process used to pass it. Directors also blamed the year’s poor economic returns on the imposition of a 15 per cent tax increase earlier in Whiteway’s mandate. It was seen as a warning of tough times to come since, in their opinion, a railway could only be financed by boosting revenue. Supporters of the government, however, viewed the Chamber’s Report as an act of desperation from a small group of “old merchant monopolists” trying to keep Newfoundland from evolving into more than a station for drying fish.\textsuperscript{95}

The rhetorical tit-for-tat in the press continued until early in 1882, when there was finally something substantive to debate. At the beginning of the legislative sitting, Whiteway announced that it had received two substantive proposals to build lines to Harbour Grace and Notre Dame Bay – one from an American syndicate headed by A.L. Blackman and the other from the Canadian firm of W. Shanly & Co., represented by G.W. Plunkett. On paper, partners in both ventures were reputable and had extensive experience in similarly sized projects. The American firm included individuals who built railways in Kansas, Kentucky and California, as well as heading wealthy companies like Western Union.\textsuperscript{96} Shanly oversaw construction of the western portion of the Ogdensburg Railroad, supervised the building of the Bytown and Prescott Railway and worked with Sir Casimir Gzowski on the Grand Truck. He and his partner Edmund Plunkett also won the contract to build the Western Counties Railway in Nova Scotia.\textsuperscript{97} For Harvey, the
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fact that two groups of foreign financiers saw such potential for profit in Newfoundland validated his decades-long optimism in the future prospects of the colony.

Events moved quite quickly when the House of Assembly returned in February of 1881. Whiteway tabled full details of both bids and immediately struck a joint committee to decide which one made the most economic sense for the colony. Whiteway chaired the group and was joined by fellow representatives Robert Kent, J.J. Little, A.M. Mackay, John Rorke, and Ambrose Shea. The Legislative Council added Charles Ayre, A.W. Harvey and Peter Tessier. The Shanly/Plunkett bid proposed that the government underwrite three-quarters of the cost of a broad gauge line for a total annual liability of $250,000. On completion, the company promised to pay 1 per cent of railway revenue to the government, which Plunkett estimated would eliminate the subsidy debt in 37 years. In exchange for building the line, the company would receive 5,000 acres per mile – the location of which would be subject to negotiation. The proposal also stipulated that railway property and the resources found thereon would be tax-free, and coastal steamers must be maintained to bring passengers to the line. Blackman, on the other hand, agreed to cover the construction costs of the line in exchange for an annual subsidy of $252,000 that was guaranteed to end in 35 years. Unlike Plunkett, he also supported the narrow gauge option and asked for alternating plots of land along the proposed line totalling 6,400 acres per mile. Though there was much to commend in both bids,
Harvey felt that the financial uncertainty in Plunkett’s proposal, coupled with the loss of
tax revenue for the government and the company’s ability to handpick its parcels of land,
gave Blackman the edge.

After several weeks of review and negotiations, the Joint Committee appeared to agree with Harvey’s assessment and presented its report in favour of Blackman’s proposal to the House of Assembly on the 20th of April 1881. Cost, the lack of upfront financial risk to the public treasury and a promise to give priority to local labour seemed to be the deciding factors. Blackman amended his original offer, reducing the land grant to 5,000 acres/mile and the annual subsidy to $180,000.100 Whiteway supporters saw this as a significant victory, but it did not satisfy opponents of the railway. They attempted to defeat the motion at second reading. James Winter moved, seconded by the Surveyor General William Donnelly, that the Blackman contract was unjust to the colony and contained little security in return of heavy subsidies of land and money. It exposed the people of Newfoundland to calamitous danger and violated the spirit of spirit of the Railway Commissioners report. The House of Assembly defeated the amendment by a vote of 20 to 6 and then passed the original motion.101 Despite the last minute drama, the final outcome was never really in doubt. Whiteway clearly favoured the Blackman contract and even threatened to resign when questions were raised about the suitability of narrow gauge.102 A petition from C.F. Bennett, signed by some of the leading mercantile firms, was met by counter petitions from communities throughout the Avalon Peninsula
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including one sent by the Roman Catholic Bishop of Newfoundland, the Right Reverend Thomas J. Power.\textsuperscript{103}

As with the Railway Loan Act that preceded it, the real fight against the Newfoundland Railway Act and the Blackman contract took place beyond the walls of the House of Assembly. Before the politicians cast their final votes, the \textit{Evening Telegram} was already denouncing a deal it said was designed to enrich speculators not citizens. Where before editorialists dubbed the project the “political railway”, they now called it the “mining railroad” and accused Whiteway of looking after his own personal investments in Notre Dame Bay.\textsuperscript{104} These attacks intensified when it became clear that not only was Whiteway Blackman’s agent in the colony, but he was also a director in the Newfoundland Consolidated Mining Company – an American-owned venture that included many of the investors who were part of the firm that won the railway contract.\textsuperscript{105} The \textit{Telegram}’s language on landward economic development also shifted. Instead of warning against any move away from the fisheries, the newspaper’s writers now lamented that Newfoundland’s future prosperity had been sold to a few New York millionaires and residents would see little in return.\textsuperscript{106} Through out the fall, the \textit{Telegram} never missed an opportunity to remind its readers that “foreigners and aliens” controlled their natural resources. In fact, editorialists predicted that the wealth contained in the Syndicate’s existing land grant would be enough to build six railways.\textsuperscript{107} They also
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openly doubted that Blackman and his partners had the financial resources necessary to complete the project, thereby stoking fears that the Americans would simply take the money and run.

During this period, the *Telegram* firmly aligned itself with the upstart New Party established by J.J. Rogerson, A.W.J. McNeily and others in order to oppose the railway contract. Their goal was not to form government, but to influence it. They hoped to win enough seats in the 1882 election to make proceeding with the existing arrangement impossible. According to the *Telegram*, the New Party would be a much needed check on the government’s power since Whiteway, Shea, Mackay and Liberals Little, Kent and Scott were all reportedly on Blackman’s payroll.\textsuperscript{108} How much of an impact these charges had on public opinion is hard to gauge, but the constant sniping and doubt-raising concerned Whiteway supporters. Pro-railway journals like the *Standard, Advocate* and *Newfoundlander* rallied to the government’s defence, but their efforts seemed to be no match for the rhetoric of the *Evening Telegram*. Whiteway’s allies, including Moses Harvey, decided to start their own daily newspaper.

In November of 1881, Harvey approached John E. Furneaux with an offer to become the proprietor of the soon to be launched *Evening Mercury*. It is unclear why Furneaux was chosen to head the paper since he had no newspaper experience and, until that point, worked for a local drapery business.\textsuperscript{109} Regardless, the 27 year-old Furneaux jumped at the opportunity and soon found himself in Ambrose Shea’s office discussing
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terms. The Whiteway group supplied Furneaux, free of charge, with the press and printing plant – likely obtained from Francis Winton whose *Morning Chronicle* ceased production in May of that year. In return, and to make sure he toed the party line, Furneaux agreed to take out a mortgage on the machinery which Moses Harvey held. Despite this arrangement, Furneaux was to be the sole proprietor. There were no shareholders and neither principal nor interest was to be paid to the newspaper’s financial backers.\(^\text{110}\) This ensured a degree of separation between the politicians and the press that supported them. The original plan called for an editor to be brought in from outside Newfoundland but when that proved difficult, Harvey stepped in and took on the role himself. It was a decision he came to regret because it made him a convenient foil for the *Telegram’s* attacks throughout the life of the *Mercury*.

The *Evening Mercury* published its first issue on 4 January 1882 with a clear mandate to advocate for the railway and “enlightened progress.” It promised to support any government policy designed to advance the “moral and material well-being” of the people and criticize any group or measure that sought to hold them back.\(^\text{111}\) In case the written prospectus was not clear enough, a smoke-billowing locomotive appeared in the middle of the masthead under the banner “This Newfoundland of Ours” – the title of Harvey’s Athenaeum speech from January 1878. The first few issues of the *Mercury* set the tone with articles on the colony’s thriving native industries and examples of the economic improvements resulting from the Whiteway government’s actions. Harvey
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also went to work systematically challenging the *Telegram*’s assertions about the Blackman contract and portraying the New Party as proponents of stagnation and starvation – in particular, its reputed leader A.J.W. McNeily. Harvey’s arrows hit the mark. The *Telegram* was soon on the defensive and McNeily was forced to clarify his position on the railway. The Speaker wrote that he was a “firm believer in railways as a civilizing influence” and recognized that they brought “forces which tend towards our world’s advancement.” What he vehemently opposed was the Blackman contract which he believed was “unjust to the country.”¹¹² This was an early victory for the *Mercury* and a good indication of the railway’s political potential.

Personal attacks in the pages of the colony’s newspaper were not a new phenomenon but the battle between the *Telegram* and the *Mercury* in the months leading up to the 1882 election was particularly nasty. The *Telegram* accused Whiteway of personally profiting from the government printing contracts awarded to the *Mercury*. Ambrose Shea was said to be skimming five per cent off the top of every public payment for railway goods and services, so he could buy off his riding of Harbour Grace and others across the island.¹¹³ And the *Telegram* portrayed A.L. Blackman and members of his syndicate as near-penniless fraudsters who planned to squeeze as much out of Newfoundland as possible without any intention of completing the promised rail line. This characterization enraged Blackman so much that he threatened Speaker McNeily in
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the House of Assembly and set upon James Murray with a walking stick as he walked along Duckworth Street.\textsuperscript{114}

The connection between Murray, owner of the Terra Nova Bakery, and the\textit{Evening Telegram} is an interesting one. While there is little hard evidence putting Murray at the helm of the newspaper in the early years, Moses Harvey and the\textit{Mercury} certainly believed he was editor-in-chief. The biscuit maker, as the called him, was said to have paid for the\textit{Telegram}’s new machinery in the hope of advancing – unopposed – the cause of the New Party.\textsuperscript{115} While Murray did financially support the newspaper and write for it on occasion, A.A. Parsons was likely its first and only editor. The thought of Murray as his main nemesis would have been particularly galling for Harvey. Murray had been a long time member of the Free Church and served as Sunday School Superintendent during Harvey’s ministry, teaching alongside his wife Sara Ann.\textsuperscript{116} He also gave Harvey a £550 mortgage to buy his first house in St. John’s.\textsuperscript{117}

Moses Harvey himself was a frequent and easy target for the\textit{Telegram}. While several prominent newspapers in British North America had clergymen as their editors-in-chief, the\textit{Mercury}’s arrangement was a first for Newfoundland – a place where people viewed clerical involvement in politics with suspicion. The\textit{Telegram} took the position from the start that when he became a partisan, Harvey turned his back on the cause of righteousness in order to line his own pockets. They littered their editorials with Bible
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verses about worshipping the god Mammon and worried openly that by associating with such scoundrels, he was placing his soul in danger. “Had I but served my God with half the zeal I served the Ring, He would not in mine age have left me naked to mine enemies.”118

By July, Harvey felt compelled to address the matter in an editorial entitled “A Personal Statement.” In it he underlined that as a private citizen, he had every right to offer opinions on matters of local politics and that expressing them did not place him at odds with his clerical calling. Harvey also stated that he received no salary for editing the Mercury nor had he asked for any favour from the Whiteway government. He assumed the role, reluctantly and temporarily, because of his long-held belief in the importance of a railroad and his support of the premier’s progressive policies. Harvey closed with a plea for civility saying that if respectable contributors like him were driven from the field, then the press would be left “in the hands of the ignorant, low-minded and unprincipled.”119 Unsurprisingly, the Telegram mocked his plea and intensified its needling.

Harvey likely welcomed the November election with relief and the results of “our political Waterloo” with a sense of satisfaction.120 Whiteway and his coalition won 27 of 33 seats taking twelve out of the fifteen Catholic ridings and fifteen of the eighteen Protestant ones. As a result, Whiteway formed, in the words of J.K. Hiller, the first truly

118 Evening Telegram, 20 June 1882.
119 Evening Mercury, 7 July 1882.
120 Evening Mercury, 4 November 1882.
interdenominational government in Newfoundland’s history. The New Party, backed by the *Evening Telegram* and many St. John’s mercantile firms, suffered a significant defeat. Prominent figures such as J.J. Rogerson, Charles Bowring, James Murray, and A.J.W. McNeily all failed to win a seat. Of the movement’s leaders, only Augustus F. Goodridge was returned to the House of Assembly.

After a significant amount of crowing, Moses Harvey turned his attention to finding a replacement as editor-in-chief of the *Evening Mercury*. The Reverend Robert Murray, a friend of Harvey’s and the editor of the *Presbyterian Witness* in Halifax, recommended he approach an ambitious young journalist named Albert B. Morine. By the end of April 1883, Morine was in St. John’s and on the job – though he did not take over the editing duties until the first of July. Harvey stayed on and helped with the transition, familiarizing Morine with Newfoundland issues and expectations of an official party organ. In Morine, Whiteway and his associates found a vigorous defender. The new editor took on the *Telegram*, the New Party and any critic of the railway with a ferocity that Harvey lacked. Temperamentally though, Morine could be hot-headed and a bit thin-skinned. After a series of personal attacks in the *Evening Telegram*, Morine publicly wrote to the minister of the Congregational Church – where A.A. Parsons was a member – asking for the newspaper’s editor to be disciplined for lying. The Reverend David Beaton wisely declined to act. Morine’s tendency to put passion before reason

---
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would ultimately bring Moses Harvey back to the *Mercury* as the newspaper and its party faced an incident that brought great change to both of them – the Harbour Grace Affray.

***

On 26 December 1883, about 500 members of the Loyal Orange Association gathered in Harbour Grace and began their annual march through town. Newspapers reported that as they approached the predominantly Roman Catholic community of Riverhead, marchers met a line of over 100 men protesting the Orange encroachment on their territory. The two sides clashed leaving five dead and dozens more injured. Six men were arrested, tried and acquitted, twice.\(^{125}\) The controversy surrounding the incident at Harbour Grace and the subsequent verdicts led to the fracture of Whiteway’s government along denominational lines, the resignation of the premier and the election of the Reform Party – an offshoot of the New Party that voters so handily defeated just years earlier.

The Affray also led to a realignment of the daily newspapers in St. John’s. The *Evening Mercury* became the official mouthpiece of Robert Thorburn’s Reform Party with the *Evening Telegram* lining up behind William Whiteway who staged a political comeback in the late 1880s. The flip-flops did not end there. By the end of the decade, the Reform Party had reversed itself on two of its major planks – amalgamation with Catholics and the railway – embracing both before the election in 1889.

---

\(^{125}\) The Harbour Grace Affray has been traditionally interpreted as an all-male event driven by elites. Willeen G. Keough turns that theory on its head, showing that women played an important role in the conflict and that the clash was largely between members of the “popular class” rather than the broader clash that newspapers portrayed it as at the time. See Willeen G. Keough, “Contested Terrains: Ethnic and Gendered Spaces in the Harbour Grace Affray,” *The Canadian Historical Review*, 90, 1, (March 2009): 29-70. The focus here, however, is not the Affray itself or its ethnic/religious origins, but the political fallout that resulted from it.
The timeframe from 1885 to 1889 in Newfoundland raises many interesting questions about the motivations of its leaders, the extent of popular support for railways and landward development, and the role of that sectarianism played in local politics. While they may not provide all the answers, the writings of Moses Harvey provide a unique perspective on the major events of the period. He advocated the loudest for Whiteway’s policies of progress and fiercely denounced the denominational nature of Newfoundland society, yet he strongly supported Thorburn’s government. This seeming contradiction is worthy of further investigation.

From the beginning, the *Mercury* and the *Telegram* took differing approaches to cover the trouble at Harbour Grace and its aftermath. A.B. Morine published full details of the incident and the subsequent investigation. He also made it clear that his sympathies were with the Protestants. According to the *Mercury*, the Catholics were the aggressors and fired first on the unarmed marchers – though it conceded later that some Orange sympathizers carried weapons.126 The *Telegram*, on the other hand, remained largely silent on the matter and accused its rival of jeopardizing the cause of justice by covering the story at all. Eventually, the New Party paper came out in support of the Catholics, though given the Orange leanings of the publisher and editor, was an attempt to embarrass the Whiteway government more than anything else. Moses Harvey avoided taking sides locally and instead confined his comments to the *Montreal Gazette*. He expressed concern that 23 years of relative peace between Protestants and Catholics had

126 Evening *Mercury*, 29 December 1883.
been broken and prayed that harmony would soon be restored.\textsuperscript{127} It was not to be. On the 30\textsuperscript{th} of June 1884, a jury – composed entirely of Roman Catholics – found the Harbour Grace defendants not guilty. The verdict outraged Protestants and, even though the Legislature was not sitting, questions started to be raised about the viability of Whiteway’s coalition.

Almost immediately both of the major daily newspapers began jockeying for position, trying to show their parties represented the smartest choice for Protestants angry at how the supposed injustice had transpired. The \textit{Mercury} pointed out that Protestants made up the majority in Whiteway’s government. The only reason for the disproportionate number of Catholics was because the Methodists broke off and created the New Party, so it was time to unite under Whiteway’s leadership.\textsuperscript{128} The \textit{Evening Telegram} put the blame for Harbour Grace squarely on the Conservatives for entering into a coalition with the Catholics in the first place and called for Protestants to come under their banner. Everything came to a head after the second not-guilty verdict and the procedural maneuvering following the Speech from the Throne.

Whiteway hoped to placate both the Catholics and the Protestants by including a passing reference to the “disturbed feelings” following the Harbour Grace Affray. It was clearly not enough for some. Orangeman Alfred Penney, the government representative from Carbonear, moved an incendiary amendment denouncing the Affray as an

\textsuperscript{127} \textit{Montreal Gazette}, 17 January 1884.  
\textsuperscript{128} \textit{Evening Mercury}, 3 October 1884.
“unjustifiable outrage” and criticizing the Supreme Court for its lack of justice.\(^\text{129}\) The Assembly defeated the Penney motion but rather than letting the matter die, Whiteway moved a similar motion which he must have known his Catholic colleagues could not support. J.K. Hiller suggests it was a strategic decision to force both the Liberals and the New Party into voting against it, making him the only true Protestant Alternative.\(^\text{130}\) If that indeed was the plan, then it failed miserably. New Party members voted with the government, the motion passed handily and his Catholic supporters crossed the floor to be in, but not of, the opposition. The former Receiver General told the Assembly that while he and his co-religionists could not sit with the government, they would not oppose the premier on substantive issues.\(^\text{131}\) Harvey praised the Catholic members for how they handled themselves but warned – “When religion is brought into the political arena, unhappy influences are sure to follow.”\(^\text{132}\)

With talk of a new Reform Party in the offing, William Whiteway spent the summer trying to solidify his leadership but that task got considerably more difficult with the resignation of James Winter in June. As Grand Master of the Orange Lodge, Winter was an essential piece of the political puzzle if Whiteway hoped to remain in power. Instead, Winter joined McNeily, Goodridge, Grieve, Goodfellow, Rogerson, Ayre and others in the Reform Party with every expectation of being named leader.\(^\text{133}\) The Reform Party’s manifesto that Winter later signed was virulently anti-Catholic with “No

\(^\text{130}\) Hiller, “History of Newfoundland,” 118.
\(^\text{131}\) Evening Mercury, 3 March 1885.
\(^\text{132}\) Montreal Gazette, 11 March 1885.
\(^\text{133}\) Montreal Gazette, 23 June 1885.
Amalgamation” as its centrepiece; though as the Mercury pointed out it also guaranteed Catholics the full measure of their political and civil rights.\textsuperscript{134} Whiteway issued his own manifesto in response and it looked like there would be two Protestant parties contesting the November election.

By early October, however, cooler heads prevailed and negotiations began in order to find a compromise. Whiteway realized he could not win and the Reform Party feared a Legislature where Catholics held the balance of power.\textsuperscript{135} Surprisingly, after weeks of manifestos, discussions seemed to centre primarily around leadership not policy. Under the new arrangement, neither Whiteway nor Winter would head the merged party. Whiteway was to retire and receive a future patronage appointment. Negotiators floated the idea of Attorney General in the new government, but Whiteway refused. Both sides asked Robert Thorburn to consider taking on the leadership of the Reform Party. The Presbyterian merchant was highly regarded in St. John’s and, importantly, was not a member of the Orange Order. He also had not been part of the Reform Party’s earlier calls for “no amalgamation with Roman Catholics.”\textsuperscript{136} Thorburn reluctantly agreed to head the party and resigned his seat on Legislative Council.

With the leadership settled, a joint committee set about nominating one Protestant candidate to stand in each riding. Others could come forward, but they would not receive support from either of the parties. This meant in most Protestant ridings, the agreed-upon

\textsuperscript{134} Evening Mercury, 17 September 1885.
\textsuperscript{135} Hiller, “History of Newfoundland,” 121-122.
Reform Party candidate was a shoe-in. It also made for a rather dull affair – especially since candidates were prohibited from saying a negative word against the former government as part of the merger agreement. “There will be nothing to fire the blood. Not even a glass of rum.”  

The 1885 election is often portrayed as a passionate, spirited affair but most of the excitement and intrigue occurred well before the vote. The results themselves were almost a foregone conclusion with most newspapers predicting 22 seats on the government side and 14 representatives in opposition. The contest that started with cries of “no amalgamation” ended with Catholics voting for Reform Party candidates in most of Newfoundland’s Protestants ridings. As Moses Harvey said, “It will not be a change of government, but simply a readjustment.”

This attitude explains why the Evening Mercury so easily transitioned from William Whiteway to Robert Thorburn. Publisher John Furneaux described it this way –

The paper supported the administration of Sir W.V. Whiteway until his party entered into an amalgamation with the Reform Party. In supporting the new government I was supporting Sir W.V. Whiteway for he was a party to the amalgamation.

Another reason for the Mercury’s quick acceptance of their new political masters was the replacement of the fiery Albert Morine with Moses Harvey as editor-in-chief.

---

137 Evening Mercury, 9 October 1885.
138 The actual results were 20 Reform, 13 Liberal and 3 Independent.
139 Montreal Gazette, 26 October 1885.
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Morine left the newspaper in late September of 1885 to run for Whiteway in Bonavista. Angry at the merger, Morine clashed with Furneaux; broke with the *Mercury* and ran as an independent. He lost handily and then became an ongoing source of exasperation for Thorburn’s party.\(^{141}\) Harvey reluctantly agreed to take the editor’s position at the personal request of Whiteway who wanted to ensure the newspaper did not fold after the merger. Both men, it appears, viewed Whiteway’s retirement as a temporary setback and believed he would be back at the first opportunity.\(^{142}\)

That opportunity came mere weeks after the 1885 vote when the Colonial Office named Ambrose Shea as Newfoundland’s next Governor. Given the political climate, it was a controversial move. Robert Thorburn immediately sent a strongly worded protest to London and threatened to resign. The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court F.B.T Carter, who lobbied the Colonial Office for the position himself, also complained loudly.\(^{143}\) Newfoundland’s fragile sectarian truce was showing signs of breaking and, according to Harvey, Whiteway would soon be called upon to put things right. It would, however, require a concerted and deft political campaign in the pages of the *Mercury*, something Harvey appeared not to have the stomach for. In a rather apologetic letter to Whiteway, he wrote

> Were I to assail this appointment now, I should be at once involved in turmoil of the most disagreeable description and become the object of the bitterest assaults. For an old

\(^{141}\) *Evening Mercury*, 10 November 1885.  
\(^{142}\) Letter from Moses Harvey to William Whiteway, 1 January 1886. See Robert Bond Collection, 237, Box 6, File 3.05.004, Centre for Newfoundland Studies Archive, Memorial University of Newfoundland.  
\(^{143}\) Hiller, “History of Newfoundland,” 125.
Harvey again severed his connection with the *Mercury* but promised Whiteway he would use his influence with Furneaux to at least ensure that the newspaper remained neutral on the Shea appointment. Whiteway’s window of opportunity closed when the Colonial Office rescinded their decision, but he likely did not forget Harvey’s hesitation to act.

Despite Harvey’s solemn vow to never again engage in political party writing, he found himself back in the editor’s chair of the *Mercury* in roughly six months. The reasons for his change of heart are unclear, but Harvey’s return to Prescott Street coincided with the Premier Thorburn’s announcement of a branch line to Placentia and that two Catholic members were joining his government – W. Donnelly as Receiver General and M. Fenelon in the role of Colonial Secretary. These moves brought immediate howls of outrage from Thorburn’s critics and some of his allies. They accused him of breaking his promise not to amalgamate his party with the Catholics and of only building a railway to entice them to cross the floor. The Grand Master of the Orange Order even called a special meeting to denounce the “false friends and open enemies”

---

144 Harvey to Whiteway, 1 January 1886. Bond Collection, 237, Box 6, File 3.05.004, Centre for Newfoundland Studies Archive, Memorial University of Newfoundland.
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who betrayed them. The majority of Lodge members, including A.J.W. McNeily and Alfred Penney, refused to condemn the government’s actions.\textsuperscript{147}

Thorburn’s motives for apparently backtracking on two key Reform Party planks provoked debate at the time and are continued cause for speculation today. In his article re-examining railway development in late nineteenth century Newfoundland, Kurt Korneski took issue with the traditional answer of “politics” as the reason for Thorburn’s actions. He argued that a railway represented a standard of Britishness to which Imperialists like Whiteway, Thorburn, and Harvey aspired. This is certainly true and it was a strong motivator. Korneski also makes a strong and important case for the role that working people played in advocating for railways. The will of voters mattered more and more to politicians as the 1880s went on. One argument Korneski missed, though, is that the traditional answer of politics is “unsatisfying” because Thorburn’s actions did not represent an “abrupt or sudden shift.”\textsuperscript{148}

Firstly, while “no amalgamation” was part of the Reform Party manifesto, it was not a promise made by Robert Thorburn. He was the compromise leader of a merged party and as Moses Harvey later said, “Anyone who knows R. Thorburn must be aware that he would not consent to be at the head of a government founded in bigotry or intolerance.”\textsuperscript{149} He also intended to include Catholics in his government from the outset. Thorburn offered to make Donnelly the Receiver General in 1885. When Donnelly

\textsuperscript{147} O’Flaherty, \textit{Lost Country}, 161.
\textsuperscript{149} \textit{Evening Mercury}, 22 July 1886.
refused, Thorburn kept the position open. A railway to his district may have smoothed
the crossing, but neither politician acted out of desperation.

Secondly, most Reform Party members were not philosophically opposed to
railways. What they objected to was the Blackman contract and the clear financial ties
the American Syndicate had to the former government. There is also no incongruity in
voting against a railway in April of 1885 and voting for one months later. The original
opposition motion came after the Blackman line fell into receivership and Ambrose
Shea’s appointment as Governor was withdrawn under pressure from the premier. It was
designed to embarrass and would also have been considered a confidence motion.\(^{150}\) As
a result, the government defeated it - though only by three votes. By way of contrast,
when the Placentia Railway Bill was brought to the House of Assembly, only three
representatives opposed it. Prominent Reform supporters like Legislative Councillor
A.W. Harvey certainly spoke out against the project, but some of its advocates in 1886
were the greatest critics of the railway five years earlier. Walter Baine Grieve even
agreed to serve as Commissioner.\(^ {151}\)

Finally, a key driver for any politician, regardless of the time period, is winning.
Once in government, most leaders try to stay there because certain advantages come with
power – no more so than in late nineteenth century Newfoundland. Not only did
controlling the House of Assembly provide an opportunity to enact a legislative agenda,
it was also a steady source of income for many of the lawyers and merchants who served

\(^{150}\) Montreal Gazette, 7 April 1886.
\(^{151}\) Evening Mercury, 20 June 1887.
within its walls. Whiteway, Shea, Kent, Morine and others all used their political positions to further their private careers and members of the Legislative Council often held director positions in the colony’s banking institutions, that allowed them to underwrite their business ventures. The lure of a political sinecure was so strong that only a judicial appointment – with its substantially higher salary - could voluntarily induce a politician to leave the Assembly and, in the case of Sir James Winter, return when those salaries were cut.152

By the latter half of the 1880s, it became harder and harder to find any meaningful policy distinctions between the political parties in Newfoundland – the Conservatives merged with the Reform Party; the Liberals gradually disintegrated, as Catholics joined Donnelly on the government side of the Assembly; and, politician now espoused what they once denounced. Partisan lines blurred even further in the fall of 1887, when Sir William Whiteway issued a public manifesto announcing his return to active politics. Whiteway’s comeback had been rumoured for some time, but it took an ultimatum from Albert Morine and Robert Bond – two of the dwindling number of opposition members in the Legislature – for the former premier to take the plunge.153

Given their long personal and professional history together, Whiteway’s political resurrection likely left Moses Harvey feeling more than a little conflicted. On the one hand, Harvey had a strong sense of personal loyalty to Whiteway but he also helped

transform the Reform Party into an interdenominational government committed to railways, economic diversification and modernizing the fisheries. Harvey’s decision was made for him when Whiteway accepted the *Evening Telegram*’s offer to be his party’s official organ. A.A. Parsons met with Whiteway and Bond in February of 1888 and agreed to run his editorials by the party in exchange for the promise of patronage when it formed government.\(^{154}\) Printing contracts and other subsidies brought in consistent revenue for newspapers in the nineteenth century and the *Telegram* had been shut out by consecutive governments since it began publishing in 1879. The benefit for Whiteway in the arrangement, likely remembering Harvey’s hesitation in the Shea affair, was a hungry and tenacious defender who would stop at nothing to win. Stung at the rejection, Harvey – who the *Telegram* later said made a similar offer of support\(^{155}\) – turned his pen against his one-time political friend.

The rhetorical back-and-forth between Moses Harvey and A.A. Parsons as Newfoundland approached the 1889 election is not for the faint of heart. The attacks were highly personal and usually involved charges of hypocrisy. Since both newspapers had essentially switched sides since the last vote, there was a seemingly endless source of editorial material. While Harvey could mix it up with the best of them, he generally got worse than he gave. His standing in the community and his time in the pulpit made for an easy target. The *Telegram* referred to him interchangeably as “our Reverend Contemporary”, “the Sage of Devon Row”, “the Mephistopheles of Prescott Street”, “a

\(^{154}\) Whelan, 295.
\(^{155}\) *Evening Telegram*, 24 April 1888.
venomous old snake” and a “vindictive false prophet” who, like a cuttle fish, brews his
own ink. Charges and counter-charges flew and the libel suits started to pile up at the
Newfoundland Supreme Court. There were so many at one point that the Telegram
started a “Newspaper Defence Fund” and solicited donations from the general public.157

The one substantive issue that the newspapers clashed over was the Bait Act
which prevented the capture and sale of bait without a license. Thorburn’s government
and the colony’s supplying merchants believed it would curb the French fishing fleet
whose cod catch off Newfoundland was steadily increasing.158 After being disallowed by
the Imperial government, the Bait Act came into force with much praise from the
Evening Mercury who saw it as the answer to slumping fish prices. According to A.A.
Parsons, it meant an immediate loss of $400,000 to the public treasury and hardship for
fishing communities on the west and south coast at the worst possible time.159 According
to the Evening Telegram, the only people benefitting from the Bait Act were Thorburn
and the monopolist merchants who ran the government.

In a complete reversal from 1881, Harvey’s rhetoric was now being used against
him to great effect. The Telegram called him the mouthpiece for the Fish-Flake Party;
the advocate for starvation and stagnation; and a subsidized scribe in the pocket of Water
Street merchants. Like the New Party did with the Conservatives, Whiteway supporters
accused the government of misusing public funds, personally profiting from every

156 Evening Telegram, 26 November 1887.
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158 For a full discussion of the Bait Act, see Chapter V of James K. Hiller’s “History of Newfoundland.”
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decision and neglecting the needs of fishermen and their families. These charges hit home because they played to existing prejudices and times were tough for the Newfoundland fishery. Despite substantial spending on poor relief, thousands of jobs on road and rail construction, Thorburn proved no match for the populist messages of William Whiteway. He was the “Friend of the Workingman and the Apostle of Progress.” “Vote for Whiteway and $1.25 a day!” The Telegram even had a ready-made answer to Thorburn’s promise of a railway extension to the northern districts. They agreed with the idea but opposed the plan; calling for an “honest railway” – the same language used by McNeily and others in reply to the Blackman contract seven years before.

In retrospect, the electoral obstacles facing Thorburn and his party seem obvious. Harvey, however, predicted a great victory with the only thing in question being the size of the majority. To him, it all came down to the Bait Act. Thorburn’s position held the key to solving the French Shore problem, without having to rely on Great Britain, and Whiteway’s promise to scrap it would be seen for what it was – pure political opportunism. Newfoundland voters, however, did not see it that way. They returned Whiteway to power with an overwhelming majority. Thorburn and his entire cabinet were defeated and the Reform Party reduced to just five seats. Whiteway’s Liberals won 28 seats with the remaining three being Independents.

---

161 Evening Telegram, 26 October 1889.
163 Montreal Gazette, 8 August 1889.
In his analysis of what went wrong, Harvey wrote that the new act introducing a secret ballot and manhood suffrage made the difference. It turned the contest into the “masses versus the classes”\(^\text{164}\) –

The more unlikely the candidate, the larger the number of votes obtained. It was not at all a question of persons, or merits or qualifications. A great democratic spring-tide rose up and submerged the whole Government candidates who were regarded as the representatives and supporters of a “mercantile government,” which it was determined must be swept out of existence.\(^\text{165}\)

The other thing that ended up being swept out of existence was the *Evening Mercury*. It published its last edition on the 31\(^{st}\) of December 1889. It exited the stage to make room for the new *Evening Herald* – the new organ of “The Patriotic Association” which is how the Reform Party rebranded itself soon after the election. In a strange twist, the editor of the new *Herald* was A.B. Morine who split with Whiteway over Confederation, then won his seat in Bonavista as a Reformer.

In his valedictory editorial in the *Evening Mercury*, Harvey looked back over the newspaper’s eight-year existence and proclaimed that it lived up to its original mandate of advancing the country’s economic development through railway construction and the promotion of local industries. Newspaper writing was ephemeral, but it helped shape public opinion which was lasting.\(^\text{166}\) This appeared to be Harvey’s hope anyway as he assessed his contribution and took his leave of local politics. Over the next decade,

\(^{164}\) *Montreal Gazette*, 13 November 1889.

\(^{165}\) *Montreal Gazette*, 28 November 1889.

\(^{166}\) *Evening Mercury*, 31 December 1889.
Harvey continued to comment on public affairs in the pages of the *Montreal Gazette*, but he focused most of his energy on writing books about Newfoundland and advancing the colony’s number one industry – the fisheries.
CHAPTER SIX – FROM FISH TO THE FINISH LINE (1889-1901)

In many ways, Moses Harvey epitomized the optimism that pervaded much of official Newfoundland in the latter half of the nineteenth century. He strongly advocated for a railway; pushed for opening up the interior; and, encouraged the growth of local industry. Historians often quote Harvey’s rhetorical flourishes and overly sunny predictions to explain why the colony’s decision-makers seemingly turned their backs on the sea and embraced landward development. If William Whiteway was Newfoundland’s apostle of progress, then Moses Harvey wrote the gospel. The trouble is these portrayals do not tell the whole story of the man or his views. Harvey recognized the fishery as Newfoundland’s current, and future, staple industry and, by far, the colony’s main employer.1 All the copper mines, rope factories and Codroy Valley farms in the world would not change that fact. He believed, however, the same powers of science and technology that would build the new economy, could transform the old. This belief in the modernization of the fishery set him apart from other boomers like Prowse and Howley. It also illustrates that landward development did not necessarily have to come at the expense of the island’s primary staple.

Harvey’s main vehicle for promoting ideas and innovations to make the colony’s primary industry more efficient, profitable and sustainable was the Fisheries Commission. Established in 1888, the Commission grew out of an earlier call from Ellis Watson, the representative of Trinity Bay, for a committee to provide guidance on how to set up a formal fisheries department. While the Thorburn government was not prepared to

---

1 Evening Mercury, 20 June 1882.
go that far, it did agree to name a bipartisan commission of inquiry to examine the fishery in general and to recommend whether a permanent department was needed. Long-time Legislative Councillor Augustus W. Harvey (no relation) chaired the Fisheries Commission, while Moses Harvey served as its corresponding secretary. It turned out to be a powerful combination. Moses brought enthusiasm; solid connections to the broader scientific community; and a prolific pen. Augustus gave the group instant credibility. He was an inspired choice to lead the investigation into the future of Newfoundland’s fishery because he straddled all elements of St. John’s society. A.W. Harvey was a merchant who supported the transinsular railway and headed a fish exporting firm that diversified into mining, forestry and manufacturing. He also counted both Whiteway and Thorburn as friends.

The Commission would need all of A.W. Harvey’s political skills to avoid the fate of its predecessors. There had been past attempts to investigate Newfoundland’s fisheries, but they were short-lived. In 1876, Charles Bowring hired the Nova Scotia-based professor and geologist Henry Youle Hind to search for minerals on the coast of Labrador. In the course of his explorations, Hind discovered an immense new fishing ground in the north of the territory near Aillik Bay. The find was promising enough for

---

the Newfoundland government to hire Hind the next year to continue his work, but that contract was delayed because he needed to testify as an expert witness for Canada in front of the international commission looking into the Treaty of Washington. The Canadian connection raised the ire of some in the House of Assembly who feared Hind’s objective in Labrador would be to further the interests of Canada over Newfoundland. A.W. Harvey and Robert Thorburn both defended Hind’s work, but it was not enough for the Conservative government. They bowed to the political pressure and deferred the Labrador expedition indefinitely. Despite his personal support for Whiteway’s policies on the railway and development, Moses Harvey strongly criticized the government for its short-sightedness when it came to the fishery.

Moses Harvey had long been calling on the government to devote money to the scientific study and regulation of the colony’s main natural resource. In his opinion, there was no excuse for Newfoundland’s main resource to be operating with virtually no oversight – especially when other colonies with fisheries of lesser value seemed to be able to support a separate department. Administration of the fishery directly by the Legislature and the Executive did not provide the industry with the attention it deserved and any regulations were haphazard, vague and unreliable. The key for Harvey was scientific research. He believed that with facts came the ability to improve an industry, and the quality of a way of life, that “has gone on here without much variation for generations.”

---

6 Montreal Gazette, 3 April 1878.
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Harvey praised Hind’s theories on the fisheries – especially the effect of ocean temperature on the movement of cod.\(^8\) Hind also argued that the migratory patterns of cod were local – from the nearest deep-water feeding area to closest coastal spawning ground and back again.\(^9\) In Harvey’s opinion, the research done by Hind and others was extremely valuable because Newfoundland needed information like this to truly understand what was in the best interest of the industry.

Hind’s theories, and the scholarly work he referenced, greatly influenced Harvey’s thinking about the nature of cod. In *Newfoundland: The Oldest British Colony*, the history he wrote with London-based journalist Joseph Hatton in 1883, Harvey included a chapter entitled “Natural History of the Cod”. In it, he gave a detailed account of what made Newfoundland, with its cold Arctic currents, the world’s most abundant source of cod. Harvey also, in his words, “exploded” a series of myths long associated with the fish. Codfish were not itinerant wanderers, but homebodies whose movements were limited and determined by the presence or absence of food, spawning instinct and the temperature of the water. Contrary to popular belief, they lived in what Harvey described as distinct colonies around the island. Every year, these colonies moved in the most direct line from their winter home in deeper water to their own local bay or inlet.\(^10\)

The two key observations in Harvey’s book were: cod instinctively return to the place of

---

\(^{8}\) *Ibid.* and 4 July 1878.


their birth to reproduce; and, waters can be overfished because all cod are local. Both these theories – fairly new at the time – underpinned much of the work that Newfoundland’s Fisheries Commission did in the late nineteenth century.

The other main driver behind much of what the Commission did was Norway. The rise in fortunes of the Norwegian cod fishery during the 1880s attracted a fair amount of attention in Newfoundland. The Nordic country had gone from exports that were roughly half of Newfoundland’s total in 1850 to being the colony’s main competitor in many of its traditional markets.11 This was despite the fact that Norway had what experts considered to be an inferior codfish. Norwegians made up for it, however, with a better quality finished product that was more reliable and commanded a higher price. This, in turn, drove prices in Newfoundland down at a time when the colony was already experiencing lower than normal catch levels.12 Norway’s success led newspapers – especially the Evening Mercury – to take a closer look at the differences in how each country ran its fishing industry. Under Harvey’s editorship, the Whiteway government’s organ ran nearly two articles a month on all aspects of the Norwegian trade from their fishing methods to how they cured and then marketed the end product.13 The issue dropped off when Morine became editor-in-chief, but returned when Harvey did in 1886. While the fisheries did not receive the same amount of coverage as the railway, mining and home-grown manufacturing, the industry was by no means ignored. The Evening

11 Hatton and Harvey, 276.
13 Evening Mercury, 25 March 1882; 28 March 1882; 04 April 1882; 20 April 1882; 20 June 1882; 24 February 1883; 05 June 1883.
Mercury supplied its readers and members of the governing party with a steady stream of ideas on how to modernize the harvesting of the colony’s staple resource. Harvey pleaded with Newfoundland’s politicians and the St. John’s mercantile class to “bestir” themselves to address the looming threats facing the fisheries. He argued that focusing on quality and efficiency, not simply catch volume, was the best way to ensure economic success in the future. Newfoundland, he warned, was in danger of ultimately losing the race to Norway’s more practical and scientific approach to the cod fishery.\(^1^4\)

It comes as no surprise then that when the Fisheries Commission was looking for its first superintendent, Harvey put forward the name of Adolph Nielsen, the assistant to Norway’s Inspector of Saltwater Fishery Jens Dahl.\(^1^5\) Harvey met the two Norwegians in the summer of 1887 when they were in Newfoundland as part of a North American fact-finding tour. He spent almost two weeks with Nielsen and Dahl as they examined all aspects of the industry and came away impressed with their knowledge of cod and their views on what ailed Newfoundland’s fishery. Harvey reported the Norwegians believed that while the colony’s cod was superior, its method of curing the fish and the credit system that the industry operated under were causes for concern. He also highlighted the success that Dahl and Nielsen were having in restocking Norway’s depleted bays through artificial propagation and their belief that a similar program could work in Newfoundland.\(^1^6\) Harvey was so taken with the Norwegians’ advice that he asked
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\(^{1^4}\) *Evening Mercury*, 20 April 1882.


\(^{1^6}\) *Montreal Gazette*, 16 August 1887.
Nielsen to write a report on Norway’s department of fisheries and recommend how a similar body could be established in Newfoundland. He was also to include a general overview of the fisheries, a list of regulatory measures and information on cod hatcheries. Nielsen submitted his report in October of 1887 and, in many ways, it formed the basis of the Fisheries Commission’s approach to fulfilling its mandate.

The Fisheries Commission officially started its work in 1888 by contacting Canada, Great Britain, Norway, and the United States for information on their fisheries departments and related organizations, as well as their opinion on the viability of establishing cod hatcheries in Newfoundland. Canada and Norway responded positively about the prospects for artificial propagation, while Britain urged the colony to focus on regulating the fishery instead. The United States did not immediately offer an opinion because its fisheries department was without a head, but the Commission viewed the hatcheries run by the U.S. National Fishery Bureau as a model for the colony.

The Commission’s enthusiasm for artificial propagation came from its chair, A.W. Harvey, who advocated for the idea as early as 1880, although it also had the strong support of other members. Inshore catch totals in some of Newfoundland’s major bays had been steadily declining for a number of years. This raised concerns about the use of traps and nets. It also led to complaints of overfishing and increased discussion around
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19 *Evening Mercury*, 10 April 1889.
whether the resource could actually be over-exploited. Artificial propagation offered the promise of immediate improvement to the health of the cod stocks with the least disruption to fishing communities and merchants alike. Without a program of hatcheries, the Commission argued, restoration would take years and need all fishing in certain bays to stop in order for the cod population to recover naturally. Such a ban would be extremely unpopular and next to impossible to enforce. Cod hatcheries, on the other hand, did not necessitate a major overhaul of the fishery; nor did it require much in the way of government involvement.

The artificial propagation of marine life in general, and cod in particular, was also a promising avenue of scientific research and commercial activity in the late nineteenth century. Norway led the charge through the work of G.O. Sars who, in 1864, developed a method of releasing artificially hatched cod into the wild. He believed this would supplement the natural regeneration of the stock – thus bringing stability to an industry plagued by economic uncertainty. Captain G.M. Dannevig used Sars’ theories to establish the Flødevigen Hatchery in 1882. At the same time, Spencer Fullerton Baird from the Smithsonian was building a similar facility at Woods Hole, Massachusetts. Baird’s work is of interest because his practical approach mirrored the motivation behind Newfoundland’s embrace of the technology. He and his colleagues – especially Baird’s
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21 Montreal Gazette, 9 May 1890.
assistant Addison Verrill – were also well-known to Moses Harvey. Harvey corresponded regularly with Verrill, a renowned expert in invertebrates, about the Giant Squid.24

Baird’s Fish Commission grew out of concerns about overfishing off Cape Cod. Inshore fishermen complained that the use of nets or traps, set by larger commercial interests, was destroying the stock and severely harming their livelihood. The U.S. Congress commissioned Baird to study the situation and make recommendations. Baird’s answer was to combine a prohibition on nets during spawning with an artificial propagation program. Given the jurisdictional difficulties surrounding regulation and the cost of enforcement, politicians on Capitol Hill chose hatcheries as the most feasible solution.25 Along with being a pre-eminent scientist, Baird was very politicially astute, so constantly balancing research with economic interest was a hallmark of the Fish Commission up until his death in 1887. It searched for new fishing areas, demonstrated the value of improved gill nets, introduced a beam trawl and designed a sturdier offshore schooner.26 Baird’s utilitarian approach, coupled with the fact that both the United States and Norway were building hatcheries, paved the way for the adoption of a similar strategy in Newfoundland.

Construction on Newfoundland’s first cod hatchery began at Dildo Island, Trinity Bay in April of 1889. Adolph Nielsen personally chose the site, after carefully considering locations in other bays, because Dildo Island was well-sheltered; a relatively
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24 Montreal Gazette, 17 October 1877, 7 November 1877 and 28 November 1881.
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short distance from shore; and, had ready access to deep water.\textsuperscript{27} When built, the facility measured just under 3,400 square feet, contained the latest in propagation technology and had the ability to hatch up to 250,000 cod ova in a season. This made it the largest and the most advanced cod-breeding operation in the world.\textsuperscript{28} While it took only three months to put up the building, a lack of knowledge into the specific reproductive habits of local cod hindered the Fisheries Commission’s ability to get its project fully operational. Fishermen in Trinity Bay told Nielsen and his team that spawning cod could be secured through to September when, in reality, the fish only reproduced during the months of May and June. In 1891, a flu outbreak delayed things into early July – thus limiting the hatchery’s output.\textsuperscript{29} Despite the setbacks, there were concrete results that the Commission could point to as signs of success. The number of cod hatched in 1890 was 17 million and that more than doubled the following year. In 1892 and 1893, the number of cod hatched was 165 million and 201 million respectively. Along with the qualitative data, local fishermen also reported seeing a marked increase in the amount of juvenile cod in the Bay. This was taken by the Commission and its supporters as proof positive that artificial propagation provided a good return on investment.\textsuperscript{30}

This reaction, however, was far from universal. The cod hatchery had its opponents – most notable among them, D.W. Prowse. The Judge wrote a series of critical columns in the \textit{Daily Colonist} and ended up in a prolonged, and very heated, public discussion.

\textsuperscript{27} \textit{Montreal Gazette}, 23 April 1889.
\textsuperscript{28} Hewitt, “Exploring Uncharted Waters,” 52-53.
\textsuperscript{29} Hewitt, “Exploring Uncharted Waters,” 53-54.
\textsuperscript{30} Moses Harvey, \textit{Newfoundland As It Is In 1894: A Hand-Book and Tourists’ Guide} (St. John’s: J.W. Withers, 1894), 164-166.
exchange with Moses Harvey. Looking at the Prowse-Harvey debate in greater detail is useful for two reasons. Firstly, it underlines that while the so-called “boomers” in Newfoundland’s historiography agreed on broad themes, they often differed on practical and political matters. Secondly, Prowse’s views on the nature of cod remained unchanged. He included a chapter on the Fisheries Commission, written by Harvey, in his 1895 History of Newfoundland but added an extraordinary post-script in which he restated his disagreement with the theory of cod being a migratory species that returned to the place of its birth every year to reproduce. In Prowse’s words – it was “a theory with no scientific proofs to sustain it.”

This fundamental difference of opinion is important because Prowse took over as corresponding secretary in the Department of Fisheries after Harvey’s death in 1901.

At the heart of Prowse’s opposition was his fervently held belief that, unlike salmon or lobster, cod was not a local fish. It roamed freely in the seas with no discernable pattern to its migration. Furthermore, when cod came close to shore, it was in search of food and not to spawn. As a result, Prowse argued that the Fisheries Commission was wasting its time and the government’s money by trying to artificially propagate cod at Dildo. Even if the hatchery produced significant numbers of juvenile cod, Trinity Bay would not be the main beneficiary. The results of the government’s investment would simply swim away because no one can control a cod’s movement. As Prowse put it, not even the President or the Secretary of the Commission “will be able to
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hold these tom-cods.” To bolster his case, the Judge pointed to anecdotal evidence of widely-travelled codfish from local fishermen, as well as the theories of Thomas Henry Huxley. The noted evolutionary biologist postulated that ground fish, such as cod, were inexhaustible because of their sheer overall number and the relatively small amount harvested compared to annual reproduction rates. Unlike salmon - where humans pose the greatest danger to the sustainability of the species, “nothing we do seriously affects the number” of cod. This was enough for Prowse who wrote that when it came to a practical understanding of fisheries biology, he preferred “Huxley to Harvey.”

In his response to Prowse, Harvey stressed that when it came to the nature of the codfish it was not his opinion that mattered, but the views of the wider scientific community. And when it came to that, the Judge – in Harvey’s opinion - had not kept up with the literature. According to the editor of the *Evening Mercury*, the fact that cod was a local fish, with a defined habitat and a limited range of movement was irrefutable. He gave a long list of noted experts who supported this point of view and gave systematic accounts of their reasoning. Harvey’s list included Spencer Baird, G.O. Sars, Frank T. Buckland, Sir Lyon Playfair and James Bertram, whose 1885 book *The Harvest of the*
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36 Frank Trevelyan Buckland (1826-1880) was a British natural historian who had mass appeal in the late nineteenth century. He had a particular interest in both recreational and commercial fishing, and participated in four UK Commissions on the subject between 1875 and 1880. Buckland also wrote a series of books on the natural history of fish, including one on fish hatching and fish culture. See R.M. Shaw, R.A. Bowen and G.E. Paget, *All Heal: A Medical and Social Miscellany* (London: William Heinemann Medical Books Ltd., 1971), 85-95.
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Sea made the case that species like herring and cod could be overfished. Harvey also mounted a spirited defence of Newfoundland’s investment in the Dildo cod hatchery. He strongly believed it made theoretical sense, addressed the immediate concerns around declining coastal catches and, at the very least, allowed the colony to keep pace with its major competitors – all of whom were either building or enhancing their capacity to artificially propagate cod.38

None of these arguments, however, caused the Judge to change his mind. Prowse held firm to his belief that humans could no more tame cod in local waters than they could control the atmosphere. Unlike lobsters or salmon, whose artificial propagation the magistrate actually supported, any attempt to hatch cod was doomed to failure.39 The public debate got increasingly personal as the exchange went on. Harvey lamented the Judge’s ignorance and complained about his “usual slapdash, magisterial style.”40 Prowse, for his part, took full advantage of Harvey’s former vocation as a Presbyterian minister. He littered his columns with numerous references to the biblical Moses and suggested that the Mercury editor wanted to usurp the role of “Divine Providence” by trying to control the forces of nature. Prowse even implied that the ecumenical make-up of the Commission “in which no delicate shade of the minor Protestant has been omitted” coloured its outlook and action.41 While these jabs were, no doubt, entertaining and reveal a fair bit about Prowse’s Church of England attitude toward Dissenters; of greater

38 Evening Mercury, 6 April 1889.
39 Daily Colonist, 1 August 1889.
40 Evening Mercury, 2 August 1889.
41 Daily Colonist, 8 April 1889.
concern to Harvey were the accusations of partisanship. The Judge, a strong support of Whiteway’s return to politics, repeatedly claimed that Harvey’s motivation had less to do with science and more to do with the alleged paycheque he received from the Thorburn government for being their official mouthpiece.

Harvey vigorously denied all of Prowse’s charges and expressed hope that the Commission’s work would not become a political issue in the general election scheduled for November of 1889. Harvey’s concern stemmed from the fact that his arch-nemesis, A.A. Parsons of the Evening Telegram, had recently taken aim at the Commission’s superintendent Adolph Nielsen. The newspaper accused the Norwegian of leaving a Trinity Bay fisherman out in a storm and then trying to physically assault him. Witnesses eventually disproved the story and, the Fisheries Commission largely remained out of the headlines for the duration of the campaign. A.W. Harvey’s involvement and the Commission’s bipartisan membership likely saw to that. It also ensured that the initiative continued after Sir William Whiteway’s decisive victory, despite it being so closely associated with the Thorburn government.

While his government continued to support the work of the Commission, Premier Whiteway’s enthusiasm for the project paled in comparison to his predecessor. His main political focus was, of course, on the completion of the transinsular railway and the diversification of Newfoundland’s economy but his views on the fishery were closer to those of Prowse and Huxley, than of Harvey. When the Fisheries Commission first came forward to the House of Assembly with recommendations restricting the mesh size on
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cod traps and seines, as well as implementing closed seasons for cod and lobster,
Whiteway’s opposition was noted in the official proceedings. He disagreed with all the proposed measures to regulate the fisheries with the exception of the Commission’s desire not to license cod traps.\textsuperscript{43} The \textit{Journal of the House of Assembly} states that Whiteway gave reasons for his opposition, but they were not recorded. It is not too much of a stretch, however, to assume that Whiteway still believed – as he had in 1878 – that technology and human activity had no impact on the overall health of Newfoundland’s cod stocks.\textsuperscript{44} The House of Assembly passed all of the Commission’s recommendations and renewed them annually but, given the Premier’s ambivalence, they did not receive the political attention needed to implement them completely and effectively.

Newfoundland’s cod hatchery met with a far more receptive audience off the island. As corresponding secretary, Moses Harvey ensured that every milestone, discovery and success was widely publicized in major newspapers and journals. It was rare for his \textit{Montreal Gazette} columns in the 1890s not to include an update from Dildo or the results from another Fisheries Commission initiative. Certainly other countries were quick to take notice. Albert Bickmore, founder of New York’s American Museum of Natural History, visited the hatchery in 1890.\textsuperscript{45} Bickmore had a particular interest in ocean life and was a contemporary of Spencer Baird. In fact, Bickmore, Baird and Samuel Wilmot, from Canada’s Department of Marine and Fisheries, were all honourary

\textsuperscript{43} \textit{Journal of the House of Assembly of Newfoundland} (St. John’s: Evening Telegram, 1890), 99-100.
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members of the American Fish Culturist Association. 46 Wilmot visited the hatchery the same year as Bickmore and wrote about it favourably in his annual report to the Canadian Government. 47 The Scottish Fishery Board also investigated the facilities at Dildo when it was in the process of establishing its own sea-fish hatchery in the East Lothian town of Dunbar. 48

Along with this international interest, Newfoundland’s artificial propagation initiative resulted in several personal honours for Moses Harvey himself. In 1891, the Royal Society of Canada elected him as a Fellow of the organization, which recognized outstanding contributions in the arts, humanities and the sciences. Harvey then submitted a paper entitled “Artificial Propagation of Marine Food Fishes and Edible Crustaceans” which was read into the Proceedings of the Royal Society. 49 Also in 1891, Harvey received an honorary degree of Doctor of Law from McGill University. The LL.D. was awarded “in absentia” by the Principal, Sir William Dawson, and unanimously approved by the Board. Interestingly, McGill received two petitions – one from St. John’s and another from Halifax – requesting that such an honour be bestowed on Harvey. Immediately after unanimously agreeing to the award, the University Board passed the following motion – “That this Corporation deprecates the circulation of petitions in favour of Honorary Degrees and will in future refuse to accept or consider any such petition.” 50

50 Minute Book of the Corporation of McGill University, 29 April 1891.
Despite the international attention and acclaim, the artificial propagation of cod in Newfoundland never met the lofty objectives that Adolph Nielsen, Moses Harvey and others set for it. On paper, the experiment at Dildo was a success. At peak production, it hatched over 200 million cod into the waters of Trinity Bay every year. Anecdotally, fishermen in the area told of seeing huge numbers of juvenile cod in places where they had not been seen in years.\(^5\) The economic benefits, however, were difficult to measure and there was no reliable way to tie any catch increase to the propagation program.\(^5\)

Given their lifecycle, the artificially produced cod would also not be ready to spawn for at least three years, so financial success required patience and by the late 1890s, that was in short supply. The Chamber of Commerce, which initially promised to fund a portion of the enterprise for five years, lost interest and so did the Government of Newfoundland. It eliminated its grant in 1895 – though the hatchery continued to operate for several years after that. A.W. Harvey and Adolph Nielsen each covered the costs for at least one season and Moses Harvey still referenced the hatchery in his *Montreal Gazette* columns as late as June of 1900.\(^5\)

The Fisheries Commission had better luck rallying political, business and popular support for the artificial propagation of lobster.\(^5\) There are several reasons for this: 1) There was no controversy about the science of hatching lobster and the benefits were more readily apparent; 2) Harvesting lobsters was a growth industry in
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Newfoundland and the obvious consequences of overfishing were not limited to one region; 3) The techniques and technology involved in artificially propagating lobster were easier and cheaper than those for cod; and, 4) France’s efforts to grow its lobster packing efforts on the disputed French Shore ensured that Newfoundland lobster factories always had the government’s attention.

As with the cod hatchery, Adolph Nielsen introduced a series of innovations to the propagation of lobster that quickly captured the attention of scientists in Canada, the United States, Great Britain and Europe. He invented a floating incubator that was cheaply made, portable and greatly facilitated the hatching of lobster ova. In its initial season of operation in 1889, the Dildo-based enterprise released over four million juvenile lobsters into Trinity Bay. The following year, the Fisheries Commission distributed 432 incubators to factories in six bays around the island. This resulted in over 391 million lobsters being released into the waters off Newfoundland. It also coincided with a significant increase in the total catch of lobster – almost doubling since 1878 – so deserved or not, the propagation efforts received some of the credit.

The perceived economic return from the artificial propagation of lobsters, and the direct involvement of individual factories in the process, meant a warmer reception to the Commission’s recommendations regarding conservation. As with cod, members asked for a closed season and limits to be placed on the size of lobsters that could be
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Unlike cod, the measures concerning lobster were implemented more quickly – with most of the momentum coming from within the industry, rather than from government. Fishermen and factory owners generally respected the restrictions on when lobsters could be harvested, especially when it was thought that canning those caught out of season led to a discolouration of the product. They also adopted ways to protect juvenile lobsters – though that sometimes took a while. Nielsen designed a new trap in 1891 that allowed smaller lobsters to escape, but packers did not agree to the changes until five years later. Unlike cod trap owners, lobster factory operators agreed to be licensed. Some politicians opposed the idea saying the cost could force out smaller players and create a quasi-monopoly – a common political charge in nineteenth century Newfoundland – but the majority believed licenses protected the industry from unqualified packers. Factory owners agreed, purchasing 186 licenses in the first year after the new regulations passed and even buying floating incubators at their own expense. The willingness of individual operators to invest their own money in the project set it apart from the artificial propagation of cod.

Another underutilized species that the Fisheries Commission tried to spark economic interest in was herring. While the silvery fish was a major export for countries like Norway and Iceland, Newfoundland companies predominantly sold it for bait – mainly to the United States, France and Great Britain for use in the pursuit of cod on the

59 Montreal Gazette, 8 April 1896. The Commission later determined the “blackening” was the result of cheap tin and a bacteria that could be eliminated by boiling the product three separate times. See Montreal Gazette, 14 January 1898.
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Grand Banks. Large-scale commercial operators in Placentia Bay and off the west coast of the island profited from shipping frozen herring to foreign markets, but individual fishermen also benefited from the trade. Moses Harvey described it this way in one of his Montreal Gazette columns:

The practice followed by the United States vessels is, either to hire a Newfoundland fisherman, owner of a seine, who knows the localities of bait, to proceed to the herring ground and secure the necessary quantity of bait for the banker, he being paid a certain sum for the use of his seine and the services of his men; or the vessel goes to the residence of Newfoundland fishermen and hires men to take the bait and put it on board; or contracts for so much bait and pays according to quantity.63

Either way, the transaction was in cash so despite the relatively small impact of the overall catch on the colony’s balance sheet, it was a valuable source of income for many Newfoundland communities.

Given its importance to the Norwegian economy and the Fisheries Commission’s general push to modernize and expand Newfoundland’s approach to the industry, it is not surprising that Adolph Nielsen and his colleagues made herring a priority. The Bait Act and the ongoing dispute over the French Shore also gave the Commission’s expansion project political significance. Harvey estimated that herring was worth $250,000 annually to Newfoundland and he saw no reason why that could not be increased to between $2 million and $3 million a year.64 The Commission’s first order of business was addressing consistency problems with the curing and packaging of the product. In 1885, a government inspector raised concerns over the traditional practice of

63 Montreal Gazette, 1 January 1878.
64 Montreal Gazette, 16 December 1891.
freezing herring before salting them and the bulk shipping of non-salted fish from Labrador. Both practices resulted in a tainted product that was often not fit for human consumption. This, and an uneven system of inspection, severely damaged Newfoundland’s reputation in the market to the point where some buyers refused to accept herring from the colony. 65

Despite the official warnings to government, the problems still persisted five years later with no real signs of improving. In response, Adolph Nielsen published a pamphlet on “The Cure of Codfish and Herrings.” It was a practical guide intended to ensure consistent product quality across the island, as well as to introduce advances in salting, drying and packaging that were being used by Newfoundland’s competitors. The Fisheries Commission printed over 2,000 copies of the pamphlet and distributed it widely. The Government of Ireland received permission to reprint it and the pamphlet was even translated into French because fishermen in St. Pierre and Miquelon expressed an interest in it. 66 The pamphlet’s positive reception, however, did not translate into a change in practice. This led the Commission to send Adolph Nielsen to Sound Island, Placentia Bay so he could conduct a hands-on demonstration of the right way to cure and package herring.

It is interesting that the Commission chose herring and not cod. Like herring, the reputation of the island’s cod suffered from a business model that increasingly emphasized quantity over quality. Even though the cure on Newfoundland’s salt cod was certainly in need of improvement, members of the Commission likely realized that the

system was too entrenched to change. Merchants purchased much of their fish from Labrador *tal qual* (“as it comes”) at a fixed price, then they shipped it to markets in Spain, Portugal and the Caribbean as fast as possible to get the best return on their investment. This meant there was little incentive on the part of either merchant or fisherman to take the time to produce a superior-quality cure.\(^{67}\) The idea of exporting herring for something more than just bait, however, was relatively new to Newfoundland so the odds were greater that the process could be influenced for the better.

Nielsen supervised the processing and packaging of 100 herring barrels on Sound Island and, according to Moses Harvey, five leading fisheries companies were so impressed that they immediately agreed to adopt the new methods. During the 1891-92 season in Placentia Bay, “thousands” of barrels were packed according to Nielsen’s instructions and while an exact price was not reported, the Newfoundland product was said to compare favourably to the return Norway was getting on the American market.\(^{68}\) Despite the apparent success of the Nielsen experiment and the buy-in of leading fish companies, the changes to the curing method did not last. The old ways returned in very short order and the Commission, later Department, was back to pleading and persuasion. Harvey, for one, could never understand why fishermen would sell herring for between 50 cents and a dollar per barrel, when packaging Nielsen’s way would bring in over eight dollars.\(^{69}\) Quality control also slipped. While the government did increase the number of inspectors, it fell short of what the Commission called for. At best, inspectors could only
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examine 10 per cent of the overall catch, which was deemed inadequate. Nielsen and Harvey ideally wanted several centralized shipping points around the island, but even they knew that was highly unlikely.\(^70\)

As with lobster and – to some extent – cod, the Commission had greater success in the area of conservation measures. The House of Assembly passed recommendations on closed seasons for the harvesting of herring and introduced restrictions on the allowable mesh-size for seines.\(^71\) While initially there was some reluctance to the new regulations in communities along Placentia Bay and on the west coast, fishermen quickly realized that it was in their financial interest to protect the health of their herring stocks. There are numerous examples in the press of communities taking enforcement into their own hands and reacting aggressively to American or French crews who flouted the rules.\(^72\) They also petitioned the government for help in tracking the movement of herring and investigating the feasibility of summer season – similar to that in Norway and Scotland. The government sanctioned and financed Adolph Nielsen’s efforts in that regard with some success.\(^73\)

Neither the Fisheries Superintendent nor Moses Harvey, however, put forward a hypothesis as to why their seemingly sound financial arguments for improving the quality of Newfoundland’s cured herring failed to resonate with merchants or fishermen. It is likely, however, that theory bumped up against economic reality. As with cod, the business model for herring was based on quantity and speed – especially in Labrador. It
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was also difficult to compete with the lure of ready money being offered by the American and French banker fleet. The United States trade rules also meant that herring caught and processed by Newfoundlanders was subject to a duty; while herring caught in Newfoundland but placed aboard an American ship, entered the country duty-free.\textsuperscript{74} Merchants in the late nineteenth century also focused most of their investment on the retail end of their business and not on the production of fish.\textsuperscript{75} Expanding their efforts to other species like seal and herring, as well as to new fishing grounds like northern Labrador were seen more as ways to offset potential losses in the cod trade, than as profit centres in their own right.\textsuperscript{76}

One notable exception to this approach was the Munn family from Harbour Grace. For most of the latter half of the nineteenth century, John Munn & Co. ranked as one of Newfoundland’s top fishing firms – along with W. Grieve & Co., P&L Tessier and Baine, Johnston. In 1874, for example, the Company exported 178,222 quintals of dried cod, second only to W. Grieve; led the pack with 82,651 seal skins and a corresponding amount of oil; and caught the largest amount of herring at 27,206 barrels.\textsuperscript{77} They also employed, either directly or indirectly, close to 10,000 people.\textsuperscript{78} William and Robert Munn, John’s son and nephew respectively, ran the company – though Robert took over sole control in 1881. Besides being a prominent businessman, Robert Munn played an active role in Newfoundland politics. He strongly supported
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William Whiteway’s plans for a transinsular railway in the early 1880s and later backed Robert Thorburn’s Reform Party.\textsuperscript{79} Robert Munn was also instrumental in the establishment of a Free Church in Harbour Grace which is how he first met Moses Harvey. The two remained close and held common views when it came to the economic future of Newfoundland.

In terms of the fishery, J. Munn & Co. conducted most of its business like any other firm on the island – with a focus on speed and quantity. It even took things a step further by introducing the practice of loading steamers in Labrador and sending the fish directly to European markets.\textsuperscript{80} Despite its reliance on traditional methods of packaging and marketing fish, J. Munn & Co. was quick to adopt some of the advances outlined in Nielsen’s “The Cure of Codfish and Herrings” – in particular, something called “boneless codfish.” Moses Harvey explained the process in one of his \textit{Montreal Gazette} columns. Workers placed carefully washed fish in pickling barrels until needed; then, after letting them drain for a day and dry for another, they skinned and dressed the cod, layering them in fifty-pound boxes. They sprinkled a combination of boracic acid and salt between the layers for preservation. Everything was then compressed. After a time, workers cut the finished product into one or two pound bricks, six inches long and three-and-a-quarter inches wide, that were then shipped to market. According to Harvey, packers in Gloucester, Massachusetts received ten cents per one-hundred pounds while the pay for


\textsuperscript{80} \textit{Ibid.}
skinner...twenty-five and forty cents for the same weight. There is no indication what Newfoundland’s wage rate would be, but cheaper labour was cited as a distinct advantage over similar businesses in the United States.

Harvey touted the product as a way for Newfoundland cod to expand in the American and Canadian markets since it was easier for families to use and had greater consumer appeal. It also countered the threat posed in the European market by Norway and by French bounties that equaled seventy-five per cent of their catch’s value. Robert Munn appeared to agree. He purchased the necessary machinery, hired and trained workers and soon started shipping 60,000 boxes of boneless cod annually to markets throughout the world. The Harbour Grace Standard expressed hope that the Newfoundland government would officially approach Westminster and ask them to use the product in “army and navy hospitals, prisons and other public institutions,” but there is no indication that this avenue was ever pursued. Munn’s Boneless Codfish did, however, receive international recognition in 1893 at the Chicago World’s Fair, winning top prize in its category. A.W. Harvey was at the World Fair as well to discuss artificial propagation – though interestingly, his focus was on lobster and Nielsen’s floating incubator; not cod. Both men went to Chicago on their own initiative because the Newfoundland government rejected the Fisheries Commission’s request to exhibit the
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colony’s fish products at the show. This was largely due to the cost which was estimated at $10,000.87

Along with adopting some of the Fisheries Commission’s recommendations on the processing of cod, J. Munn & Co. expanded into other suggested areas as well. It processed the skin, fins and bones of the cod – selling it as Munn’s Liquid Fish Glue and Munn’s Fish Fertilizer.88 It also invested in the manufacturing of cod liver oil, with Adolph Nielsen overseeing the process. While Newfoundland had been exporting cod liver oil for some time, the amount was limited and the method of extraction fairly rough. Workers boiled the livers until the oil could be skimmed from the water. It was then filtered three times through moleskin or flannel and put into wooden barrels. Almost all of the product went to London where it was sometimes mixed with other oils and substances that negatively affected the quality.89 Using Nielsen’s method, J. Munn & Co. steamed the oil from the livers; filtered it two times through cotton; and then froze the entire batch to remove the stearin, a white powdery by-product that can act as a thickening agent. Another important innovation involved shipping the finished product in tin containers rather than wooden barrels, which often contaminated the oil.90 J. Munn & Co. acted on all of Nielsen’s recommendations. They were later published in a pamphlet by the new Department of Fisheries. His product soon rivalled Norway’s cod liver oil that commanded a fifty-cent premium per gallon. Indeed, the cod liver oil
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operation was the only portion of the business to survive the Bank Crash of 1894, the sudden death of Robert Munn days after, and the firm’s bankruptcy in 1895.

J. Munn & Co. was not the only casualty caused by Newfoundland’s financial collapse. Established firms like E.J. Duder, Thorburn & Tessier, and Baine, Johnston all fell victim to the crash of two of Newfoundland’s major banks. This happened when the large British firm of Prowse, Hall and Morris called in loans made to the Commercial Bank. The Commercial did not have sufficient cash on hand to meet the demand and closed its doors. This led other Newfoundland financial establishments to call in their loans which resulted in a run on all the banks, forcing many to close their doors for good. Among the causes of Black Monday was an economic system reliant on debt, unsecured loans, expensive capital investments and unpredictable financial returns. Not unlike the fishermen they bought from, St. John’s merchant firms relied heavily on credit to finance their purchases in the hopes that the debt would be covered by the following season’s catch. As the market for salt cod softened and merchants spent less in production, the system became unsustainable.\footnote{Cadigan, \textit{Newfoundland and Labrador}, 149-151.}

Moses Harvey, who had long railed against the credit or truck system, used the crisis as an opportunity to call for a complete overhaul of the way the fisheries, predominantly cod, operated in Newfoundland. From his earliest articles in the \textit{Maritime Monthly} and \textit{Stewart’s Quarterly}, Harvey blamed credit for most of the ills associated with the industry in the late nineteenth century. He believed it led to a lack of care and attention to the cure on the part of fishermen, since merchants simply took the fish as is.
Merchants, in turn, cared little about the quality of the product because their financial return was based on quantity and beating their competitors to market. The answer, according to Harvey and Adolph Nielsen, was to make the system cash-based and to completely separate the catching of cod from its processing. Nielsen gave further details in a report he wrote in early 1895 for the Department of Fisheries. The transition plan recommended that fishermen focus their efforts solely on harvesting and be paid for their catch in cash. The cure then became the responsibility of the merchant. It was to be overseen in central locations by experts – though women and children could still be employed under the supervision of trained curers. The benefits of this new system to Harvey were clear. It released fishermen from the “demoralizing” effects of debt and reduced the risk for merchants. It also allowed a uniform cure that could be done in a variety of styles, “so as to suit the tastes and wants of customers in different markets.”

Employing agents in countries like Spain and Brazil to educate retailers on the benefits of Newfoundland fish and to oversee quality was seen as another important ingredient in reforming the industry.\(^\text{92}\) There is no indication, however, that Nielsen’s report was ever considered by either the Department of Fisheries or the government.

The energy of, and the enthusiasm surrounding, the Fisheries Commission depended a great deal on the constitution of its superintendent. Bouts of poor health in the late 1890s forced Adolph Nielsen to return for extended periods to his native Norway. Work continued in his absence, but some of the innovation tailed off. The head of the Commission (later Department), A.W. Harvey, was also preoccupied with his business
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following the bank crash and focused much of his attention on his fledgling pulp and paper operations in the interior of the colony. One exception during this period was the Cabot Whaling Company started by Nielsen in 1898 with a capital investment of $100,000 – half from Norway and the other half from A.W. Harvey and a few individual investors. Along with Nielsen and Harvey, William Whiteway and Moses Harvey were both directors of the company.\textsuperscript{93} Cabot Whaling established stations at Snook’s Arm, Notre Dame Bay in the north and Hermitage Bay in the south and soon began harvesting up to four whales a day. Workers then rendered the fat into oil and used the carcasses to produce fertilizer. The venture met with considerable success, all of which was widely publicized by Harvey in his columns. While the company declared no dividend in its first year, by 1901, its shareholders received a dividend of 35 per cent, with another 10 per cent going to retained earnings.\textsuperscript{94} This was enough to elicit rare praise for Adolph Nielsen in the St. John’s newspapers and spark the creation of a second whaling company on the island.

A criticism of the Fisheries Commission is that it focused too much of its time and effort on artificial propagation. It is true that hatcheries were often front-and-centre, but, this is not surprising. The artificial propagation of sea-life represented a promising avenue of research in an age when science was seen as the ultimate problem-solver and essential to society’s progress. As the Commission’s reports and the writings of Moses Harvey show, hatcheries represent only a small part of their thinking. They

\textsuperscript{93}Montreal Gazette, 13 July 1901.

recommended conservation measures, equipment improvements, better use of technology, new fisheries, marketing changes and ways to overhaul the entire system. The success of the Commission’s proposals depended a good deal on whether they financially benefitted both fishermen and merchant alike. The support of the government, in turn, often rested on whether or not the proposals were in its political interest.

At the very least, the work of the Fisheries Commission – and especially the direct involvement of Moses Harvey – forces a closer look as to whether the push towards landward development really caused politicians to turn their backs on the fisheries in the late nineteenth century. The railway and landward development had no bigger supporter in Newfoundland than Moses Harvey, yet much of his focus in the 1890s included ways to change, improve and grow the colony’s staple industry. His writings on the subject were extensive and hardly a fisheries advance, idea or improvement anywhere in the world escaped his attention. He publicized many of them – especially those from Norway – in the Evening Mercury, the Montreal Gazette, his many books and in reports from the Fisheries Commission. If politicians and merchants did not act, it was not for a lack of information.

The reason for their reluctance more likely stemmed from the fact that many of the proposed changes required a level of commitment that they could not give. Merchants were too heavily vested in the traditional system and the competitive nature of business prevented anyone from going it alone. Even Robert Munn, the Commission’s most willing participant, kept a foot in both camps. He invested in new cures and products, while at the same time buying expensive steamers to get Labrador cod to
market faster. On the government side – while it certainly could have invested more in protection, inspection and marketing – it is doubtful that any politician in late nineteenth-century Newfoundland would risk the political capital necessary to make some of the sweeping changes that Harvey and Nielsen proposed. More importantly, it required acceptance of the principle that cod was a local species that could be overfished. While Harvey had his supporters, he was more persuasive on the railway than he was on the fisheries. The view that codfish were itinerant wanderers and represented an inexhaustible resource for Newfoundland was more widely held.

***

Outside of the Fisheries Commission, Moses Harvey continued to write about the economic progress and future prosperity of Newfoundland, as well as current events. After the demise of the Evening Mercury in December 1889 and its rebirth as the Evening Herald, Harvey tried hard to remove himself from local partisan politics. It was, for the most part, a promise that he kept. Harvey still commented on the House of Assembly and held definite views on the decisions that its occupants took throughout the 1890s, but he expressed them from the relevant safety of the Montreal Gazette. Harvey’s arch-enemy, A.A. Parsons of the Evening Telegram, still tied his name to anti-Liberal initiatives whenever possible, but there is little evidence that Harvey played a direct role in any of them.

Harvey continued to be the main source of Newfoundland news in the late nineteenth century for most audiences in Canada, the United States and Great Britain. When fire decimated two-thirds of St. John’s on 8 July 1892, destroying $13 million in property including most major churches, schools and businesses, it was Harvey’s first-
hand account that Newfoundland’s neighbours reacted to. The fire started in a barn on Freshwater Road just as Harvey finished handing out prizes to General Protestant Academy students in the basement of St. Andrew’s Church, Duckworth Street. He hurried to the location and, for the next six hours, followed the fire’s destructive path right up to his own doorstep. With buckets, blankets and brooms, Harvey and others successfully saved their homes – though 11,000 other residents of the city were not so lucky.\(^9^5\) After the fire burnt itself out, the need was great but fortunately, so was the response. Cities like Montreal, Saint John, Halifax and Boston all sent shipments of medical supplies, clothing, building material and, of course, cash to aid in the rebuilding.

Harvey also wrote a series of handbooks in 1894, 1897, 1899 and 1900. They targeted tourists interested in visiting Newfoundland and financiers looking for profitable ventures. The local government commissioned the work and published the books through the Queen’s Printer, distributing them widely to interested parties. The initial order for *Newfoundland As It Is In 1894* was 2,000, with 1,200 of those being ordered locally.\(^9^6\) The standard format of these guides mirrored the second half of *Newfoundland – The Oldest British Colony*, the book Harvey wrote with Joseph Hatton in 1883. After a brief historical sketch, he included chapters on Newfoundland’s geography, climate and people; its railway and natural resources (agriculture, mines, forestry and the fisheries); information on crown lands, education and other government services; and then sections

\(^9^5\) Moses Harvey, *The Great Fire in St. John’s, Newfoundland, July 8, 1892* (Boston: Rockwell and Churchill, 1892), 20-25.
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directed mainly to tourists on scenery, travel, hunting, and sport fishing. Harvey then simply updated subsequent editions of the handbook with the latest information from the colony’s trade numbers and census, as well as any notable advances or events. He used the popular Baedeker’s guides as a model for his chapters geared toward tourists and later wrote a section on Newfoundland for *Baedeker’s Canada*.98

The number of tourists visiting Newfoundland climbed steadily throughout the 1890s as its railway advanced further and further into the interior. Many of the visitors were sportsmen in search of deer, ptarmigan and salmon, but others were potential investors from Canada and the United States. Harvey made a point of meeting many of the prominent guests personally and made mention of their impressions in his columns. Visitors included: Sir Sandford Fleming; the Reverend George Monro Grant, Principal of Queen’s University; the Montreal industrialist Sir William Van Horne; Charles Walcott, head of the U.S. Geological Survey; and former Canadian Prime Minister Mackenzie Bowell. All of the tourists Harvey highlighted were favourably impressed with the beauty and economic potential of Newfoundland – though a common complaint was the lack of hotels and other services to accommodate visitors.99

One unintended consequence of Harvey’s handbooks, at least for the government, was that they attracted the attention of potential immigrants to Newfoundland. While Harvey had long supported immigration as a way to grow the economy, especially in relation to agriculture, successive governments worried more about dealing with the
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population they already had. This is why William Whiteway’s settlement plan during the 1897 election campaign focused on land grants along the rail lines for existing residents. In March of 1899, however, Moses Harvey received a letter from one of the leaders of Finland’s Patriotic Party who, opposed to Russian rule, considered organizing a mass immigration to British North America. Arthur Borgstrom and his friends had read Harvey’s books and translated portions of them for the Finnish press to illustrate what life in that part of the world could be like. The letter to Harvey asked whether he and his countrymen would be welcome in Newfoundland. Harvey immediately went to the newly arrived Governor Henry McCallum and received permission to extend an official invitation.

When the Finnish delegation landed in St. John’s, W.G Reid placed a rail car at their disposal and gave them a guide to help them explore the interior. After a week, Governor McCallum met them at Port-aux-Basques and personally toured them around the rest of the island. Harvey reported that while Borgstrom reacted favourably to all he saw, the hope was to find a tract of land suitable for the settlement of between 5,000 and 10,000 families. Harvey stated quite clearly that it was not possible. For all of the hyperbole that sometime slipped into his writing on Newfoundland’s agricultural potential, he presented a very realistic view of the colony’s potential:

> Our cultivable belts of land are along the valleys, but they are often separated from each other by barren or swampy stretches; and though in the aggregate, they make up a large extent of excellent land, these fertile belts are not continuous to such an extent as the Finnish delegates
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require. But, if they were to settle in small communities, or villages and townships, we could accommodate a large number of them.\textsuperscript{102}

The Finns ended up finding the amount of land they needed in British Columbia, but the experience shows a willingness on the part of some in official Newfoundland to entertain immigration. It also illustrates the impressive reach of Moses Harvey’s writing.

Not all of Harvey’s contemporaries, however, were impressed with the breadth of his readership. In 1897, Judge Prowse tried to replace Harvey’s \textit{Short History of Newfoundland} as one of the textbooks in the colony’s schools. Prowse proposed that the Council of Higher Education purchase 3,000 copies of a soon-to-be-written book at a cost of 25 cents each. The work was to be based on his highly acclaimed history of the island and, to entice the Council further, he sent them two sample chapters.\textsuperscript{103} The Council declined the offer saying they did not have the budget for such a purchase, nor was it their practice to tell teachers what books to use in class. Judge Prowse angrily accused members of the Council of corruption and suggested they must be profiting from the sale of Harvey’s textbook. The Council responded in kind saying they had read Prowse’s sample chapters and found the language “unintelligible”, the punctuation “capricious”, the sentence structure “faulty”, and the entire book “unsuitable for schools.”\textsuperscript{104} Harvey took some pleasure in recounting the public spat while expressing
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surprise at the Judge’s latest literary output, given the very high quality of his *History of Newfoundland*.

These very public disagreements between what Patrick O’Flaherty referred to as the “boomers of Newfoundland”\(^{105}\) – Harvey, Prowse, Bishop Michael Howley and others – were commonplace in the latter decades of the nineteenth century. All shared a belief in the power of progress and the vast economic potential of Newfoundland. But, as seen with the Fisheries Commission, they sometimes disagreed quite passionately about what progress involved and how best to get there. The issues that they disagreed about did not even need to be particularly weighty for sparks to fly.

In the months leading up to 1897 – the 400\(^{th}\) anniversary of John Cabot’s discovery of North America – a disagreement arose in Newfoundland as to where and how to mark the occasion. Judge Prowse believed that Cabot made landfall at Bonavista, so a commemorative breakwater there made the most sense. Howley argued that the explorer’s ship, the *Matthew*, landed further north on the Baie Verte Peninsula at Cape St. John and proposed a granite monument in Bannerman Park. Not to be outdone, Harvey said they were both wrong because – citing the work of William Dawson – Cabot’s point of discovery was likely Cape Breton Island. He did think that Newfoundland should mark the occasion and suggested that something on Signal Hill would be appropriate.\(^{106}\) The argument spilled over into the committee established to oversee the Cabot celebrations which bogged proceedings down for months. After a good deal of wrangling, a public meeting was held where attendees decided to build a
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meteorological and signalling station in the name of Cabot atop Signal Hill. The building would also serve as the colony’s recognition of Queen Victoria’s Diamond Jubilee Year.\footnote{107}

Harvey also clashed with Bishop Howley over Dr. Grenfell’s Deep Sea Mission to Labrador.\footnote{108} An early supporter of Grenfell’s efforts to provide medical assistance and other necessities of life to sealers, migrant fishermen and their families, Harvey took exception to Howley’s suggestion that the doctor grossly exaggerated the living conditions on the coast of Labrador. He also bristled at Howley’s claim that the Mission’s goal was more religious conversion than health care. Harvey expressed dismay, but not surprise, that someone of Howley’s stature would attack such a noble cause. He told readers of the Gazette that the Bishop had a habit of making unsubstantiated charges and thought nothing of blackening the reputations of public figures for his own benefit.\footnote{109}

A far more serious dispute erupted between Harvey and Bishop Howley\footnote{110} over the Winter government’s controversial contract with the Reid family. R. G. Reid and his business partner G.H. Middleton owned the company contracted in 1889 by the
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returning Whiteway government to complete the railway across the island. In 1893, Reid agreed to operate the railway for ten years after completion in exchange for a land grant of 5,000 acres per mile of track. After Robert Reid’s sons took over the day-to-day running of the business in 1896, they started putting out feelers to the government about extending the contract in exchange for more concessions.  

The Newfoundland government showed little enthusiasm for negotiating a new deal until Sir James Winter defeated Sir William Whiteway in the Election of 1897. When Winter and his Finance Minister A.B. Morine took the reins, they discovered that the colony’s balance sheet was worse than expected and they feared Newfoundland would soon be bankrupt. After attempts to secure financial assistance from Great Britain came up short, the idea of arranging new terms with the Reids gained momentum.

The deal, negotiated by William Reid and Alfred Morine, sought to lessen Newfoundland’s financial burden while, at the same time, making profit for the company. In exchange for an immediate payment of $1 million, the Reids would lease the railway from the government and operate it for a period of fifty years – at the end of which the ownership would be transferred to the family. The operating loss of the railway – estimated at between $150,000 and $200,000 a year – was to be offset by an additional land grant of 5,000 acres per mile of track, bringing that amount up to 10,000 acres. Other measures in the sweeping deal included: buying the dry dock for $350,000, saving the government $7,000 a year in operating costs; building seven new coastal steamers in return for a $90,000 subsidy from the House of Assembly; redoing
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the rail line between St. John’s and Whitbourne for $350,000; and taking over the telegraph system which had operated with an annual deficit of $18,000. Reid also promised to pave Water Street, build sidewalks, repair rail facilities and even construct a cold storage system for the fisheries.\textsuperscript{113}

For a government worried about its debt and ongoing operating costs, the Reid deal – with its immediate $1 million payment – must have seemed like a godsend. The political and public reaction to the Reid Contract was swift and negative. The opposition, now led by Sir Robert Bond, denounced the deal, and its official organ the \textit{Evening Telegram} called it an insult to Newfoundland patriots.\textsuperscript{114} Critics charged that the land grants, totalling over 4 million acres, made Newfoundland the Reid’s private fiefdom and accused the government of selling public assets at a mere fraction of their worth.\textsuperscript{115} While Moses Harvey steered clear of directly engaging the \textit{Evening Telegram} or attacking Bond’s Liberals, he did launch a public defence of the Reids through the pages of the \textit{Gazette} in Montreal – where R.G. Reid and his bankers were based. Harvey must have had a sense of coming full circle because he ended up countering many of the same arguments used to criticize the Whiteway government’s contract with the Blackman Syndicate almost twenty years earlier.

The first charge Harvey countered was that the Reids now held a monopoly over the entire island and its wealth of natural resources. He pointed out to readers that while the land grants were significant, the colony still controlled an equal amount in

\textsuperscript{113} \textit{Montreal Gazette}, 14 March 1898.
\textsuperscript{114} Hiller, “History of Newfoundland,” 347.
\textsuperscript{115} \textit{Montreal Gazette}, 14 March 1898.
alternating blocks along the rail line. He also underlined that the land itself would be worthless unless the Reid family made significant investments in attracting settlers, developing mines or building saw mills. Secondly, Harvey challenged the assertion that $1 million was too small a price to pay for an asset that Newfoundland spent almost $12 million to build. He argued that with annual operating losses of at least $150,000, any offer that took that off Newfoundland’s balance sheet was a good deal for its residents. With a 50 year lease, that alone amounted to a savings of $7.5 million – not to mention the relief from expenses relating to the dry dock, the steamer service and the telegraph system. The only way the Reids profited from those acquisitions was by running them properly and, if that happened, then the entire island would also benefit.\footnote{Ibid.} Lastly, Harvey dismissed allegations that A.B. Morine was in a conflict of interest because he also acted as the agent for the Reid Company in Newfoundland. He pointed out that William Whiteway, Ambrose Shea, George Emerson and other solicitor politicians all negotiated government deals with similar professional arrangements in place and the Crown ruled none of them ineligible.\footnote{Montreal Gazette, 19 November 1898.}

Harvey saved his greatest scorn, however, for Governor Murray and Bishop Howley. Murray forced the resignation of A.B. Morine over his ties to the Reids and then advocated for the deal to be disallowed by the Colonial Office. He also made his opposition known publicly, which was rare, even for a governor of Newfoundland. According to Harvey, this showed that Sir Herbert had a tenuous grasp of the meaning
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of responsible government and had clearly overstepped his constitutional authority.\footnote{Montreal Gazette, 30 July 1898 and 26 August 1898.} He had allowed personal opinion to cloud his duty, as did the Bishop of St. George’s. Howley gave a series of interviews to American and Canadian journals denouncing the deal and alleging corruption on the part of the Winter government. He inferred that the contract was altered before Governor Murray saw it and accused Morine of rejecting a competing offer of $5 million in order to give the railway to the Reids for $1 million.\footnote{Montreal Gazette, 22 October 1898 and 5 November 1898.} Harvey challenged Howley repeatedly to prove his allegations and stated that it was partisan politics and not the facts that motivated the bishop.

Interestingly, for a man who spent the latter years of his career in Newfoundland speaking on behalf of either the Whiteway or Thorburn governments, partisan politics no longer seemed to motivate Moses Harvey. He was careful in his defence of the Reid Contract not to malign Sir Robert Bond – even after the sudden disintegration of the Winter government, due to a messy split with A.B. Morine. Bond went on to make the renegotiation of the Reid Contract a central plank in his platform during the 1900 election, but the only thing Harvey expressed was his hope that a compromise could be reached. He even defended Bond publicly when his old friends at the now \textit{Evening Herald} claimed that a Liberal victory meant Newfoundland’s annexation to the United States.\footnote{Montreal Gazette, 25 May 1900.}

When the Bond government did reach a compromise with Reid and Company, Harvey pronounced himself satisfied that it was in the best interest of both parties and,
most particularly, the people of Newfoundland. The revised deal would see the railway revert back to the colony after 50 years, with the Reids receiving their original investment plus interest, which was estimated at six per cent per annum. The telegraph system was to remain in government hands and the size of the land grant scaled back.  

In his final *Montreal Gazette* column, published on 16 August 1901, Harvey sounded as optimistic about Newfoundland’s future as he did in the 1870s. With the energy of the Reids and the support of the Bond government, he wrote, “we may look forward to a great and striking and permanent improvement in this colony before many years shall have rolled away.”  

Whether it was the fisheries, the railway or landward development, Moses Harvey held firm to the belief that Newfoundland would continue to move forward and that any setbacks were merely temporary. Contrary to the traditional portrayal of those in the late nineteenth century who advocated for progress, Harvey felt advances in the new economy need not come at the expense of the old. Science and technology had the power to revolutionize Newfoundland’s fishery just as a locomotive would fundamentally transform the island’s landscape and its society.
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CHAPTER SEVEN - CONCLUSION

The Reverend Dr. Moses Harvey died alone in the early hours of the third of September 1901, on the boardwalk near the back door of his residence at 3 Devon Row. The Evening Telegram reported that, suffering from insomnia, Harvey planned to go for a walk; something he did quite regularly in his final years. Authorities found his body just after four o’clock in the morning. The official reason given was first heart failure which then changed to apoplexy, but like his Old Testament namesake on Mount Nebo, there is a certain amount of mystery surrounding his death. Some in his family believed that Harvey may have hastened his end and a case could be made for that conclusion.¹

Eleven years before - almost to the day - on the fourth of September 1890, Harvey’s eldest son Charles drowned in Long Pond at the young age of 36. Newspapers speculated that he had an accident while swimming, but also referenced that the “arduous nature of his work must have pressed heavily on his physical and mental resources.”² The tragedy was compounded by the fact that Charles’ wife Jane gave birth to a baby girl named Marion Emma less than six months before. Charles Harvey was an accomplished engineer who helped survey the railway, conducted geological studies and oversaw major projects with the Municipal Council of St. John’s. His

¹ Moses Harvey’s granddaughter Muriel Ritcey advanced this theory in an interview with Bob Osmond. See Bob Osmond, “Nineteenth Century Newfoundland’s Most Important Man of Letters – A Biographical, Bibliographical and Critical Study of The Rev. Dr. Moses Harvey,” (Unpublished manuscript, Memorial University, 1974), 41.
² Evening Telegram, 5 September 1890.
untimely death and the circumstances surrounding it likely weighed heavily on his father.

Harvey dealt with other domestic sorrows on top of that. His middle child Alfred, a prominent medical doctor in town, was rumoured to be an alcoholic and died only four years after his father at age forty-six. Harvey’s youngest son Frederick was born with a slight mental handicap and lived at home, working for Bishop & Monroe – run by his cousin Walter Monroe – as a messenger.³ After his father’s death, Frederick Harvey lived in James and Charlotte Foote’s rooming house at 11 Queen’s Road and later moved to Cape Breton.⁴ Finally, Moses Harvey’s beloved wife Sarah died of complications from diabetes on June 5, 1900 – though the official cause of death is listed as congestion of the lungs.⁵ According to his obituarist, D.W. Prowse, Harvey seemed to age considerably after the death of his wife – “His friends could see that he had become an old man bearing a life-long sorrow in his heart. There was no more joy for him in living.”⁶

In light of Harvey family lore, those sorts of observations take on added meaning. There is, however, a strong possibility that Moses Harvey did actually die of natural causes. As all the newspapers mentioned, he was in his 82nd year, his health had been visibly declining for months, and they included a long list of ailments in their articles. Harvey also started to act like a man who felt that the finish line was not too far off. He made a will on June 8, 1900 - just three days after his wife died – and then
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regularly added duly witnessed codicils on December 27th, as well as on May 21st, June 3rd, June 10th, June 24th, July 9th, July 18th, August 15th, August 19th and August 22nd of 1901. By that last addition to his will, Harvey’s handwriting – not great at the best of times – had noticeably deteriorated.

While public persona is not always a good indicator of mental health, there is also no hint of trouble in his writing leading up to September of 1901. It is hard to believe though, that a man who spent almost 30 years promoting every single step that Newfoundland took along the path to progress, as well as his own role in it, would voluntarily leave this earth without one final opportunity to state his case. Regardless - how Moses Harvey died takes nothing away from the contribution he made while he lived. He was a driving force behind the railway and pushed for both economic diversification and a renewed focus on the fishery. He acted as the mouthpiece for two premiers within the colony and the voice of Newfoundland to the wider world. The late nineteenth century was a period of substantial change for the island and Moses Harvey placed himself in the centre of much of it.

***

David Nasaw, the author of books on William Randolph Hearst, Andrew Carnegie and Joseph P. Kennedy, referred to biography as the “history profession’s unloved stepchild, occasionally but grudgingly let in the door, more often shut outside with the riffraff.” Robert Craig Brown, Sir Robert Borden’s biographer, used a similar
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analogy, but felt his colleagues viewed him more like an “eccentric cousin.”

Regardless of which branch of the family tree that biography is hung from, there is still an ongoing debate within some academic circles as to whether it has value as a historiographical method. How can the life of a single person, no matter how important, capture the trends, forces and complexity of a particular location or chronological period? The answer, according to a group of prominent academic biographers based in the United States, is context. Biographical studies can be useful in analyzing important questions or theories as long as the individual’s role is not separated from the larger historical context and his or her personal background, biases and influences are accounted for. As Robert Craig Brown wrote:

The biographer’s subject lived in a society, interacted with other persons and with groups, was influenced by and may well have influenced, in turn, private and public institutions, participated as a producer and a consumer in an economic system, shared or rebelled against the cultural and political norms of his society. It is in this context, as an actor in the historical process, that the biographer’s subject assumes significance for the historian.

The study of Newfoundland’s political history in the nineteenth century has been largely done through general surveys, with J.K. Hiller writing the seminal work on the island’s politics between 1878 and 1901. Outside of the Dictionary of Canadian
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Biography and the Encyclopedia of Newfoundland and Labrador, there are few biographical studies of the major players of the period – which is unfortunate. In Canada and the United States, academics and other writers are taking second looks at many of their nineteenth-century leaders. In Newfoundland, however, important figures like Whiteway, Thorburn, McNeilly, Winter, Morine, Howley, and Bond still wait for a first glance. Most of the broad themes of Newfoundland's nineteenth century are not likely to change when viewed through the eyes of its politicians and opinion leaders. What biographies offer, however, are fuller, more nuanced accounts of what led to some of the period’s major political decisions, positions or compromises.

Another shortcoming of the existing historical research that touches on the attitudes and ideas of the period is the tendency to portray the “boomers” as one unified school of thought. While they did collectively believe in Newfoundland’s vast economic potential and that Imperial neglect and self-interest had delayed the colony’s natural progress, there was much that divided them. Passionate disagreements filled the pages of local newspapers about the fisheries, partisan politics, Confederation, certain elements of the colony’s history and whether railways should be run by government or privately operated. Patrick O’Flaherty coined the term boomer in The Rock Observed, a 400-year survey of Newfoundland’s literature and history, so generalizations are to be expected. In studies focused on the late nineteenth century, however, there is more to be learned by digging deeper.

There is also a need to go beyond Daniel Woodley Prowse. The Judge was a big, bearded “force of nature” with a deep voice that was compared to a ship’s horn. By
all accounts, he commanded the attention of any room that he entered.13 This dominance continues thanks, in large part, to his History of Newfoundland that was published in 1895 but has achieved almost mythical status in the 100 years since. In “Whigs and Nationalists: The Legacy of Judge Prowse’s History of Newfoundland,” Jerry Bannister argued that while largely discredited as an accurate historical record, the book shaped the way Newfoundlanders view the past and provided the thematic framework for the nationalism that pervades the island’s culture.14 If that is indeed the case, then the influence of Prowse and his History is far greater now than it was in the late nineteenth century. While commentators lauded the Judge’s comprehensive approach and his use of government records, the work did not represent a radical departure from the histories that preceded it.

What sets Prowse’s History apart, besides its primary sources, is its popular style, the book’s intended audience and the author’s birthplace. Prowse filled his pages with maps, illustrations and entertaining anecdotes that he collected from around the island while serving as a circuit judge. More than just a compilation of facts and figures, the book captured what life was actually like in the colony and, as a result, it had broad local appeal. Prowse also took an active, even aggressive, approach to book sales. Rather than leaving it up to the publisher, which was the norm at the time, the Judge sold copies out of his buggy and struck purchasing deals with the railway, coastal steamers and various governments. As his biographer, Philip Gosse, noted, many
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Newfoundlander who had never bought a book before in their lives ended up buying Prowse’s *History*. While it is unclear just how much the author made in the end, the approach ensured that his book found its way into almost every corner of the island. Lastly, the fact that the *History of Newfoundland* was the first account of the colony’s past written by a native-born Newfoundlander automatically enhanced its status with later academics like Patrick O’Flaherty, George Story and Leslie Harris; causing them to overestimate Prowse’s importance during the late nineteenth century.

While there is no question that D.W. Prowse was a prominent player in society and an active contributor to the political, literary and cultural life of Newfoundland in the late 1800s, he did not fully come into his own until the turn of the century after retiring from the bench. Prowse did write articles, give public lectures and correspond with newspapers before then, but he was at his most prolific from 1901 until his death in 1914. In 1901, he became corresponding secretary of the Fisheries Board, a contributor to the *Encyclopedia Britannica* and started to supply regular columns on Newfoundland for a series of foreign publications. Prowse also published guide books for visitors to the island in 1905 and again in 1911. It is no coincidence that these are all positions held, or roles played, by the Reverend Moses Harvey up to September of 1901.

This is not to argue that the attention paid to Prowse is undeserved. It does suggest, however, that the contribution of Moses Harvey has been overshadowed or unfairly dismissed. In his Prowse articles, Story does not include a single reference to
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the history Harvey wrote with Joseph Hatton. He also implied that Harvey’s 1894 tourists’ guide was somehow substandard – overlooking the fact that even after the publication of Prowse’s *History*, the government commissioned four more.16 O’Flaherty is even more dismissive; equating Harvey with the British military engineer Sir Richard Bonnycastle who was in the colony just long enough to write *Newfoundland in 1842: a sequel to “The Canadas in 1841.*17 Prowse’s history is certainly more thorough and entertaining than Harvey’s but for the clergyman, the colony’s past was simply a means to an end. It was a way to explain Newfoundland’s lack of progress and set the stage for what he really wanted to talk about – namely, the island’s vast economic potential. In this goal, Moses Harvey had no equal between the years 1878 and 1901; and unlike his fellow boomers, it was something to which he could devote his full energy. Harvey also actively and directly participated in most of the major political decisions that Newfoundland faced in the latter half of the nineteenth century. This, coupled with the sheer volume of his first-person accounts of life on the island, is why Moses Harvey is worthy of a biographical study.

***

Moses Harvey was in an uncharacteristically reflective mood when he sat down at the beginning of August in 1899 to write his biweekly letter to the *Gazette*. Instead of looking forward, he looked back on 24 years’ worth of uninterrupted correspondence chronicling current events in Newfoundland – its fortunes and misfortunes, the struggles of its political parties and its “whole historic march” during the last quarter of

the nineteenth century. Harvey admitted to making errors, especially when it came to “unfulfilled prophesy.” He confessed that his predictions regarding the development of Newfoundland’s natural resources may have been overly sanguine but it was better to build castles in the air, than dungeons.

Moses Harvey certainly built more than a few castles during his time commenting on, and influencing, Newfoundland politics in the late nineteenth century. His evangelical zeal for the subject matter and his colourful use of language in an attempt to popularize and persuade, assisted in their construction. It would be wrong, however, to simply dismiss Harvey as a fanciful dreamer or to view his arguments as uninformed or somehow detached from the reality that surrounded him. Harvey's castles came from widely held assumptions about progress and development in the Victorian age. They also grew out of a faith in the transformative power of science, which was born in the Scottish Enlightenment and nurtured by the seemingly unlimited potential of British North America. Given the technological and economic advances happening in Canada using the same ideas, methods and – to a certain extent – people, it would have been odd if the island did not pursue that particular path to progress.

The historical value of Moses Harvey’s writings go far beyond simply explaining the intellectual source of the optimism surrounding Newfoundland’s future during the late nineteenth century. His newspaper columns in particular – for publications as varied as the *Evening Mercury, Montreal Gazette, Toronto Globe, London Daily News* and *New York Evening Post* – provide a useful avenue to examine
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some of the major themes from that period in the colony’s history. Harvey’s public battle with A.J.W. McNeilly over the Blackman Contract; his promotion of the Reform Party’s government-built Placentia Line; and his defence of the Reid Deal shows that opposition to the railway was often more political than philosophical. Harvey faced, and fired, rhetorical salvos on self-interest, corruption, monopolies and the fear of Confederation. While it is true that some politicians opposed the railway on principle, others simply altered their views to reflect the will of potential voters. This became even more pronounced in the late 1880s as railway construction started to employ up to 2,000 local labourers in the off-season.

Harvey’s seamless transition from Whiteway’s spokesperson to Thorburn’s mouthpiece also suggests that the political and religious differences in the 1889 Election were not as stark as they are often portrayed. The House of Assembly did fracture along denominational lines after the Harbour Grace Affray, but the election of the Reform Party did not represent a victory for anti-Catholic sentiment in the colony. While the Reform Party manifesto included the cry of “No Amalgamation,” that was before they chose Thorburn as their leader. Thorburn who, like Harvey, had no ties to the Orange Order was the compromise candidate – a way of avoiding a split with the Protestant elements of Whiteway’s Party. The election campaign that followed was not as sectarian as the original manifesto suggests, but one of the tamest and most predictable political contests in late nineteenth century Newfoundland.

Finally, Harvey’s involvement in the Fisheries Commission, while at the same time pushing for landward development, is an indication that one did not necessarily have to come at the expense of the other. Harvey’s direct influence on the government
had waned by the late 1880s and early 90s, but he promoted ideas for modernizing Newfoundland’s fisheries with the same energy as he did with the railway. Those that offered the promise of profit without major changes to the way the business operated – like the artificial propagation of lobsters – met with some success. Those that required significant investment before increased returns could be realized – such as an independent curing process and a cash-based purchasing system – received little pick-up. This also held true with the harvesters. Using the Norwegian methods of curing herring for a promised return of $8/barrel made little financial sense when the Americans paid ready cash for a lot less effort.

If politicians tried to enact Harvey’s sweeping changes to the fishing industry, they likely would have paid a heavy price at the polls. Unlike a railway across the island or the discovery of valuable minerals in the interior, revamping Newfoundland’s primary resource required capital, cooperation and confidence that the changes would actually succeed – all of which were in short supply. Despite Harvey’s best efforts, the view that codfish were itinerant wanderers in an inexhaustible ocean still predominated. Why invest in something that will do just fine without it?

In the last chapter of Henry David Thoreau’s *Walden*, the philosopher wrote – “If you have built castles in the air, your work need not be lost; that is where they should be. Now put the foundations under them.”19 The foundations built under some of Harvey’s castles are perhaps his most lasting legacy. Though Harvey himself believed that Newfoundland’s future lay with Canada, his glowing predictions of untold

wealth beyond the Avalon Peninsula actually fed a growing nationalism that was already on the rise in the colony. He also made it acceptable to base public policy on the promise that good times were just around the corner. Blame for any shortcoming or disappointment was conveniently placed squarely on the shoulders of those who had a vested interest in the status quo – thus avoiding the need for any serious self-examination.

In her book *Inventing Canada*, Suzanne Zeller analyzes how the various elements of Victorian science shaped the new nation’s sense of direction, stability, confidence in the future and its sense of self. A similar case can be made for Newfoundland – though unlike the other colonies of British North America, the promise of future prosperity caused the island’s leaders to look inward and fanned the glowing embers of nationalism. It also reinforced the notion that Newfoundland had the natural resources and the economic potential to go it alone, if only outside forces would stop hindering its development. Science and the idea that humanity was continuously marching forward had a huge impact on Newfoundland’s identity in the late nineteenth century and well into the next. The person who, more often than not, gave voice to this optimism was the Reverend Dr. Moses Harvey. While far from unbiased or infallible, he wrote extensively about most of the major issues facing the colony at the time and often did so officially on behalf of two of its prime ministers – William Whiteway and Robert Thorburn. He chronicled one of the most transformative periods in Newfoundland’s history and this is where Moses Harvey’s value lies – not as

---

a researcher into the colony’s past or a forecaster of its future, but as a window on the
time and place in which he lived.
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