Church and State in the Confederation Debates of 1865

By

Ian Alexander Robert Mackay

A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of

The University of Manitoba

in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of History

Joint Master's Program

University of Manitoba / University of Winnipeg

Winnipeg, Manitoba

Abstract

Since the 1990s, historians and political scientists have been studying the previously discounted political thought of the Fathers of Confederation. They have uncovered much, but have so far neglected ideas concerning relations between church and state. This thesis recognizes the Victorian, Christian context of Confederation and asks what influence faith had on Canadian constitution making. It studies discussions relevant to political philosophy, education, and worldview in general in the Province of Canada's ratification debates on the Quebec Resolutions in 1865. Chapter 1 demonstrates the influence of beliefs about Canada's standing as a Christian nation, the sinfulness and fallibility of human nature, the importance of religious liberty on the founders' constitutional preferences, and their support for the British constitutional tradition of mixed government. Chapter 2 shows how their different Protestant and Roman Catholic convictions about the eternal nature of the human soul impacted their views on the group rights issue of educational systems. Chapter 3 examines the presence of providence-based understandings of history and how they shaped the Canadian founders' vision for the new dominion. The thesis argues that a perception of 'God and state' had a widespread and foundational influence at Confederation. An orientation towards Christian truth and responsibility shaped the founders' worldview, political philosophy, specific political clashes, and, ultimately, their constitution making. The thesis also reassesses the 'political nationality' interpretation promoted by W. L. Morton, Samuel V. LaSelva, Janet Ajzenstat, and others.

my academic work, but whom I count no less influential to me in the last two years. Any faults

are my own.

This thesis is dedicated to

Dad, for establishing foundations and providing,

to

Mom, for instruction and encouragement,

and to

both, for their love.

Table of Contents

Introduction

The subject of Canadian Confederation has received surprisingly intermittent attention from historians. Their intermittent interest in it has left Canadians with a dull and uninformed impression of their country's origin, and an ignorance of its founding principles. Recently, though, political scientists and historians have begun to explore the intellectual foundations of the Dominion of Canada. They have demonstrated that there was a wealth of ideas in operation in the 1860s, and that studying these can help us to better understand and appreciate Canada's founding. One area that has not yet been given significant notice, however, has to do with the influence of Christian ideas on Confederation.

The scholarly work on Confederation can be divided into three categories.[1] The first is made up of the histories written closest to the event itself, some of which were composed by men who participated in the process. John Hamilton Gray's compilation of speeches, correspondence, and interspersed narrative commentary in *Confederation* is a good example.[2] The second comprises the core modern political histories by Donald Creighton, P. B. Waite, and W. L. Morton, written in anticipation of the 1967 Centennial, near the end of an era in which the nation was still the centre of historical study.[3] Their interpretations took the historiography in directions

---

[1] For the purposes of the present discussion, the contributions of historians and, more recently, political scientists, is meant. Paralleling the historiography described is work done by constitutional specialists like Richard Risk. It has been more consistently active than historical or political science analyses of Confederation. For a guide to this material, see R.C.B. Risk, *A History of Canadian Legal Thought: Collected Essays*, ed. G. Blaine Baker and Jim Phillips (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006), 33-65, 233-71, 341-399. This thesis does not deal with the constitutional scholarship on Confederation.

[2] John Hamilton Gray, *Confederation; Or, The Political and Parliamentary History of Canada, from the Conference at Quebec, in October, 1864, to the Admission of British Columbia, in July, 1871*, vol. 1 (Toronto: Copp, Clark & Co., 1872).

[3] Donald Creighton, *The Road to Confederation*: *The Emergence of Canada: 1863-1867* (Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1964); P. B. Waite, *The Life and Times of Confederation, 1864-1867: Politics, Newspapers, and the Union of British North America* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1962); W. L. Morton, *The Critical Years: The Union of British North America, 1857-1873* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1964); Carl Berger, *The Writing of*

that established the consensus that the Fathers of Confederation possessed few higher political

principles to guide their political actions.[4] The third category of literature originated in the 1990s,

after a dearth of studies due to the virtual replacement of national and state-centred political

histories by social histories.[5]

Scholars in the 1990s began to rectify decades of neglect of Confederation's primary

sources, and were willing to consider the political thought of the founders with an open mind.[6]

They treated the ideas they studied with a respect that did not dismiss their potential value before

they were understood.[7] These authors' enquiries were inspired especially by Canada's twentieth

century constitutional troubles.[8] The new perspectives on the study of Confederation have

increased in number, but are still relatively few. They have also largely neglected the major topic

of the relationship between church and state.

Canadian History: Aspects of English-Canadian Historical Writing Since 1900, 2nd ed. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986), 137, 260.

[4] R. Douglas Francis, Richard Jones, Donald B. Smith, and Robert Wardhaugh, *Origins: Canadian History to Confederation*, 8th ed. (Toronto: Nelson Education, 2013), 495-96.

[5] Berger, *Canadian History*, 259-60.

[6] Historians and political scientists returned to the Confederation debates to analyze the original ideas about federalism, the courts, rights, and other subjects. Some of the major works they produced included Robert Charles Vipond, *Liberty and Community: Canadian Federalism and the Failure of the Constitution* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991); Janet Ajzenstat and Peter J. Smith, *Canada's Origins: Liberal, Tory, or Republican?* (Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 1995); Christopher Moore, *1867: How the Fathers Made a Deal* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1997); and Paul Romney, *Getting it Wrong: How Canadians Forgot Their Past and Imperilled Confederation* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999). See Janet Ajzenstat, Paul Romney, Ian Gentles, and William Gairdner, *Canada's Founding Debates* (Toronto: Stoddart, 1999), 479-80.

[7] Azjenstat, et. al, *Canada's Founding Debates*, 479-80. Romney, *Getting it Wrong*, 6, 17.

[8] Robert Vipond was one of the first, and opened his book asking about the source of the country's division. He proposed there was an ongoing competition between philosophies of liberty and community in Canada's history. See Vipond, *Liberty and Community*, 1-2. Paul Romney was also concerned with the English-French divide, and how conflicting historical perspectives aggravated it. See Romney, *Getting it Wrong*, 3. Moore opened with frustration over the failure of the Meech Lake Accord. See Moore, *1867*, ix. Janet Ajzenstat and Peter J. Smith's collection followed a somewhat different course by setting out to challenge Louis Hartz's interpretation of Canadian political history as a progression from conservatism, to liberalism, to socialism. They created a dichotomy similar to Vipond's between liberalism and civic republicanism that was inspired by the models of American historians of political culture J. G. A. Pocock and Bernard Bailyn. See Ajzenstat and Smith, eds., *Canada's Origins*, 1-2, 4-5, 15-16.

Canadian church history, a field that was revitalized in the late twentieth century, likewise has said little on the subject. John Webster Grant included less than five pages on the churches and Confederation in his *The Church in the Canadian Era*, and cited the ratification debates on the Quebec Resolutions only once.[9] There has long been interest in the relations between religion and public life in Canada, but these analyses, too, have neglected Confederation.[10] This thesis makes its original contribution to historical knowledge by investigating the influence of Christianity on the genesis of the Dominion.

The major histories of Confederation published in the years leading up to Canada's Centennial said little about either the principles of the founders, or church and state issues. As they moved beyond the frontiers of the economic history that were dominant for much of the century, their goal was to outline the political achievements of the nation building process.[11] P. B. Waite, a student of Donald Creighton's at the University of Toronto, wrote the first of these works. He attributed an "empirical character" to Confederation that left the constitution flexible for future centralizing manipulation. He downplayed the possibility that the founders adhered to any higher principles.[12] In this he reflected the view of one of his teachers at the University of Toronto, Frank Underhill, who decried a seeming "lack of the philosophical mind" in Canadian history.[13] When Waite discussed religion, he usually did so as part of *pro forma* introductions to each of the provinces. In cases where he gave it slightly more attention, he often did so with a

---

[9] John Webster Grant, *The Church in the Canadian Era* (Burlington, ON: Welch, 1988), 24-29, 43.
[10] See, for example, Marguerite Van Die, ed., *Religion and Public Life in Canada: Historical and Comparative Perspectives* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001); David Lyon and Marguerite Van Die, eds., *Rethinking Church, State, and Modernity: Canada Between Europe and America* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000); Nancy Christie and Michael Gauvreau, *Christian Churches and Their Peoples, 1840-1965: A Social History of Religion in Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010).
[11] Berger, *Canadian History*, 137, 160-61.
[12] Waite, *Life and Times*, 325.
[13] Frank Hawkins Underhill, *The Image of Confederation* (Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, 1964), 3.

tone of subtle mockery, particularly of the Protestants of Canada West.[14] His statement that "politics [was] the central focus of society," even equating to "life itself" for the Victorians, displayed a striking skepticism towards the importance of religious factors.[15]

Creighton's 439-page political epic *The Road to Confederation* contained a remarkably small amount of material on issues of church and state. Two short discussions of the denominational schools question and the picture of "Christian British North America" celebrating the first Dominion Day in the book's conclusion were almost the only exceptions.[16] The most noteworthy nod to the influence of Christian ideas on Confederation was a paragraph explaining how, "As sober Christians," the Fathers of Confederation were "as far away from the dogmas of the eighteenth-century Enlightenment as they were from twentieth-century obsessions with race, and with racial and cultural separatism."[17] Creighton was born into a devout Methodist family, but spent most of his post-university life as a virtual atheist.[18]

W. L. Morton's account allowed for the existence of an important intellectual dimension to some issues at Confederation by adding the idea of a "moral purpose" of union between English and French, a bicultural interpretation Creighton abhorred.[19] It mirrored Creighton's work, however, in its lack of attention to religious aspects of the story. Morton, as a firm regionalist, did not share Creighton's centralist, national perspective. He saw the founders as creating a political union, rather than one with a common British culture.[20] His history allowed

---

[14] Waite, *Life and Times*, 117, 126, 135, 163, 179, 238, 290.
[15] Waite, *Life and Times*, 324.
[16] Creighton, *Road to Confederation*, 399-400, 409-12, 435-36.
[17] Creighton, *Road to Confederation*, 141-42. This brief comment was undoubtedly directed towards proponents of Canadian biculturalism and Quebec separatism.
[18] Donald Wright, *Donald Creighton: A Life in History* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2015), 94-108, 112.
[19] Morton, *Critical Years*, 277. Creighton was steadfastly attached to Canada's British heritage and sought to undermine the historical basis of biculturalism in his writing. Ralph Heintzman, "The Spirit of Confederation: Professor Creighton, Biculturalism, and the Use of History," *Canadian Historical Review* 52, no. 3 (September 1971): 246, 249.
[20] Morton, *Critical Years*, 176-77.

for the presence of political or religious principles, but at the same time highlighted regional discontent. As the nation ceased to be the central focus in the historiographical environment of succeeding decades, studies of Confederation became scarce, and the perspectives of the 1960s became engrained.

The epitome of the studies of the 1990s that began to seriously research the political principles of the founders came in the form of *Canada's Founding Debates*. The idea for the book was conceived by conservative social thinker William Gairdner, and completed with the help of historians Paul Romney and Ian Gentles and political scientist Janet Ajzenstat.[21] Its content was composed of topical selections from the ratification debates in seven colonies. The authors contended that historians had focused too much on Central Canadian goals and ignored wider discussions of the principles the new Dominion was to be based upon.[22] They arranged their material according to a range of major themes, but, despite the frequent Biblical references made in the debates, did not include church and state as one of them.[23]

Almost a decade later, Janet Ajzenstat published a study based on *Canada's Founding Debates* in which she argued for the influence of the ideas of John Locke on Canada's founding. She opened her work by challenging philosopher Charles Taylor's statement that Canadians share both political and social values, the latter including an acceptance of "collective provision"

[21] Ajzenstat, et al., *Canada's Founding Debates*, 1.

[22] Ajzenstat, et al., *Canada's Founding Debates*, 4. As early as 1968, L. F. S. Upton called attention to the neglect of Confederation's mental side. It took Meech Lake and Charlottetown, though, before scholars began to share his concerns. L. F. S. Upton, "The Idea of Confederation: 1754-1858," in *The Shield of Achilles: Aspects of Canada in the Victorian Age*, ed. W. L. Morton (Toronto: McClellandand Stewart, 1968), 184-207. In the same year as Meech Lake, Peter J. Smith examined Confederation political philosophy in Peter J. Smith, "The Ideological Origins of Canadian Confederation," *Canadian Journal of Political Science* XX, no. 1 (March/mar 1987). He inspired Ajzenstat, and the two later co-edited a collection of exploratory articles. Janet Ajzenstat, *Discovering Confederation: A Canadian's Story* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2014), 48-54. Ajzenstat and Smith, *Canada's Origins.*

[23] See, for example, Ajzenstat, et al., *Canada's Founding Debates*, 128, 150, 187, 238.

to assure order.[24] Ajzenstat denied that the founders affirmed shared social values. She built upon

Morton's thesis, arguing that they created a political identity, not a social one, in order not to

discriminate against differing views about the common social good.[25] The concept of "political

nationality," taken in the way it was laid out in Ajzenstat's book, continued to sideline the idea

that Christianity might have had an impact on shaping the new Dominion.

The efforts of Ajzenstat, Gairdner, Gentles, and Romney followed the publication of the

most recent full history of Confederation, Christopher Moore's *1867: How the Fathers Made a*

Deal. Moore made an effort to incorporate ideas, but focused on "the process by which a deal

was made, and made to seem legitimate," choosing not to address, among other things, religious

factors.[26] His more recent *Three Weeks in Quebec City: The Meeting that Made Canada* did not

adjust his approach to religion.[27] Other notable works, like Paul Romney's *Getting it Wrong:*

How Canadians Forgot their Past and Imperilled Confederation and Ged Martin's *Britain and*

the Origins of Canadian Confederation also looked at the political ideas about Confederation,

but not the religious dimension of it. Romney argued for the compact theory of Canada's

founding, while Martin emphasized the importance of the development of the very idea of a

union of the colonies, and Britain's part in it.[28]

---

[24] Janet Ajzenstat, *The Canadian Founding: John Locke and Parliament* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2007), xi.

[25] Ajzenstat, *Canadian Founding*, xi-xii. Another author whose thesis paralleled that of Morton and Ajzenstat's was Samuel LaSelva, who argued that Canada was built upon a principle of federalism that was founded on a moral imperative to protect diversity. See Samuel V. LaSelva, *The Moral Foundations of Canadian Federalism: Paradoxes, Achievements, and Tragedies of Nationhood* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1996), ix, xiii.

[26] Moore, *1867*, xiii.

[27] Religious issues came up on only a few pages. See Christopher Moore, *Three Weeks in Quebec City: The Meeting that Made Canada* (Toronto: Allan Lane, 2015), 27, 145, 157-58.

[28] Romney, *Getting it Wrong*, i. Ged Martin, *Britain and the Origins of Canadian Confederation, 1837-1867* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1995), 79, 157, 296. Andrew Smith followed Martin's focus on the British when he published *British Businessmen and Canadian Confederation* in 2008. The book was an economic history that followed "a revisionist interpretation of Confederation." Smith criticized what he saw as the pro-Confederation sympathies of Waite, Creighton, and Morton. Andrew Smith, *British Businessmen and Canadian*

Classical Canadian church historians did not ignore church and state issues like the clergy reserves and education, but they did not write on 1867.[29] Neither have recent practitioners of religious history, most notably Marguerite Van Die. The contributors to her edited collection *Religion and Public Life in Canada* joined her in challenging the idea that religion has become an exclusively private matter in Canada. They focused on themes like "gender, ethnicity, and regionalism" to show areas in which religion has manifested itself in the public sphere, but focused on recent times.[30] In *Rethinking Church, State, and Modernity*, edited by Van Die and David Lyon, Kevin J. Christiano made an extended denunciation of the Canadian founders' supposed lack of any noteworthy "foundational principles." He accepted the pragmatist interpretation of Confederation.[31] Michael Gauvreau and Nancy Christie have written about religious influences in Canadian life during the nineteenth century.[32] Their social history, though, also ignored Confederation.

A few of the new Confederation studies have approached the threshold of considering religion. One of these is a chapter by Frederick Vaughan in his book on Canadian federalism. Vaughan emphasized the founders' aversion to Enlightenment secularism and republicanism and stressed that historians have neglected "the positive importance of Christianity's role in Canada."[33] More direct are two articles by David W. Livingstone and Colin D. Pearce in Livingstone's *Liberal Education, Civic Education, and the Canadian Regime*. Livingstone

---

Confederation: Constitution-Making in an Era of Anglo-Globalization (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2008), 5, 8, 157.

[29] See, for example, C. B. Sissons, *Church and State in Canadian Education* (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1959); and Grant, *Canadian Era*.

[30] Van Die, *Religion and Public Life*, i.

[31] Kevin J. Christiano, "Church and State in Institutional Flux: Canada and the United States," in *Rethinking Church, State, and Modernity: Canada Between Europe and America*, eds. David Lyon and Marguerite Van Die (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000), 72-3, 74, 76.

[32] Christie and Gauvreau, *Christian Churches and Their Peoples*.

[33] Frederick Vaughan, *The Canadian Federalist Experiment: From Defiant Monarchy to Reluctant Republic* (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2003), 4, 138.

discussed Thomas D'Arcy McGee's ideals for education and their connections to his national

vision. He demonstrated the influence of sources like Edmund Burke, William Shakespeare, and

the Bible on McGee's belief that virtue must underlie good government.[34] Pearce's article was

about Egerton Ryerson's vision for state education. He argued that Ryerson saw the need for

schooling practices to help preserve a "Common Christianity" which transcended denominational

and party lines, existing as a non-political, un-chosen heritage of the country. Ryerson's goal was

to ensure that a knowledge of Canada's Western foundations in "Jerusalem and Athens" were

passed on to the next generation.[35] Pearce challenged Azjenstat's argument about "political

nationality" by affirming Ryerson as an example of a major figure whose position on Canadian

identity was "political-theological," and not "constitutional-institutional." Canada was based on

theological, not only constitutional Lockeanism, and Pearce wanted to understand how the two

related to one another.[36] His approach contrasted with former treatments of Ryerson. Alison

Prentice's important early work in the social history of education had positioned Ryerson's faith

as but a component of an educational philosophy designed to craft a "respectable" middle class.[37]

To Pearce, religion was a force of its own. Thus, though it was not the intention of either

Livingstone or Pearce to address the Confederation debates, their work nevertheless sparks

questions about the role played by the founders' religious beliefs and the effect they had on their

constitutional principles and national vision. Benjamin Jones, who worked on political

---

[34] David W. Livingstone, "Thomas D'Arcy McGee's Civic Paideia for Canada," in David W. Livingstone, ed., *Liberal Education, Civic Education, and the Canadian Regime: Past Principles and Present Challenges* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2015), 91, 104-06. David Wilson's two-volume biography of McGee makes evident the significant influence his Roman Catholic religious ideas exerted on him throughout his life. David A. Wilson, *Thomas D'Arcy McGee*, 2 vols. (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2008).

[35] Colin D. Pearce, "Canadian Guardian: The Educational Statesmanship of Egerton Ryerson," in Livingstone, *Liberal Education*, 122-23, 125.

[36] Pearce, "Canadian Guardian," 119.

[37] Alison Prentice, *The School Promoters: Education and Social Class in Mid-Nineteenth Century Upper Canada* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1977), 75, 184.

philosophy at the time of the Rebellion of 1837-38, called for such a study. He wanted further

research into Christianity's influence on prominent reformers and their dedication to civic virtue,

and into the influence on Confederation of the civic republicanism they promoted.[38]

Two research questions inform the directions taken by this thesis on Christianity and

Confederation. The primary one simply asks how the religious beliefs of the founders might have

shaped their political and constitutional understandings and work. The secondary question is

whether the "political nationality" thesis can be maintained if there is evidence of a significant

Christian influence at Canada's founding. To provide answers to these questions, the thesis is

divided into three chapters. Chapter 1 examines the political philosophy of the founders. It draws

attention to their understanding of Canada as a Christian nation, their Biblical view of human

nature, and the primacy of religious liberty in their thought. It argues that there was a significant,

commonly acknowledged Christian influence on political philosophy at Confederation. Chapter

2 shows how Protestant voluntarism and Catholic ultramontanism intensified the group rights

question of denominational schools. For both sides, constitutional arrangements took second

place to guaranteeing their children were educated in an environment that they believed aligned

with God's eternal truth. Chapter 3 analyzes the frequent statements made about providence in

Confederation-era pamphlets and the 1865 debates. It argues that the founders were conscious of

the sovereignty of God over the affairs of state, and that they took from this a sense of duty for

their work and a purpose to found a Christian nation. In sum, the thesis argues that widely held

ideas of 'God and state' were prerequisite and foundational to politics at Confederation. An

orientation towards Christian truth and responsibility influenced the founders' worldview and

---

[38] Benjamin T. Jones, *Republicanism and Responsible Government: The Shaping of Democracy in Australia and Canada* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2014), ix-x.

political philosophy, specific political clashes, and, ultimately, the shape taken by the constitution.

Brief notes on methodology, sources, and terminology are prudent. Concerning the first, this thesis operates under the conviction that a reasonably clear understanding of the past can be discovered through the careful use of primary sources. History is not just about how past figures framed reality or were framed by it. History is about trying to understand past reality in its complexity; ultimately, history is about the past. If it were not, there would be no hope of finding knowledge in it that is relevant and useful to us today. As such, chronology is significant, and no event should be divorced from its context. It is also necessary to appreciate the influence of wider developments and trends, while at the same time recognizing the significance of particular events. This thesis sets out the philosophical, political, and constitutional contexts of the Confederation debates. It avoids detaching the ideas it discusses from the real world and course of history. Discussing ideas apart from people and their experiences and traditions hinders coming to a full understanding of them and distorts their nature of being by ignoring their origins. The founders' religious ideas are allowed to appear here as sincerely and deeply held beliefs of men who expressed them in times of discernment and put them to concrete use. They are not viewed as mere rhetorical facades. An effort has been made to avoid what I see as deterministic, dichotomous models of oppression and resistance.[39] What is presented here is a history of state, politics, and political thought. It is not a social or a cultural history. If a label were to be applied, the best familiar designator might be intellectual history. The thesis studies

---

[39] It is for this reason that paradigms like that honourable clansman Ian McKay's liberal order framework are not relevant here. This thesis is interested in the founders' religious ideas and their influence in and of themselves. McKay saw Confederation as "the 'Consolidation of a General Liberal State Program'" and, like so many others, affirmed the oligarchic character of the Fathers of Confederation. He based his interpretive strategy for Canadian history on the tale of back-and-forth struggle told by Antonio Gramsci in his concept of "passive revolution." This thesis avoids such models. It tries, like many of the new Confederation studies, to approach the ideas of the time with an attitude of curiosity. See Ian McKay, "The Liberal Order Framework: A Prospectus for a Reconnaissance of Canadian History," *Canadian Historical Review* 81, no. 4 (December 2000): 632-33, 635-36, 642.

ideas, acknowledging the importance of their context, but does not take inspiration from 'linguistic turn' variants of intellectual history.[40]

For sake of space, I concentrate on the Province of Canada's Confederation debates, which took place between 3 February and 14 March 1865. These are contained in a 1,032-page volume of the proceedings that is currently the most widely available record of any of the provincial ratification debates.[41] In addition, the thesis relies on Confederation-era pamphlet literature and speeches by the founders, set in the context of larger historical developments in nineteenth-century Canada and the world. The focus is on ideas, rather than on the details of institutional workings.[42]

As for terminology, the term "founders" is borrowed from Ajzenstat as a way of referring to the legislators who participated in the ratification debates on the Quebec Resolutions in each of the provincial legislatures. The term "Fathers of Confederation" only includes the delegates to the three constitutional conferences at Charlottetown, Quebec, and London.[43] Another word that needs clarification is "dominion." It is used in the lower case to refer generally to the union the

---

[40] For an overview of intellectual history, see Annabel Brett, "What is Intellectual History Now?" in *What is History Now?* ed. David Cannadine (Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), 113-131.

[41] There is a sesquicentennial project called The Confederation Debates currently underway to digitize the debates in all colonies and territories, as well as the numbered treaty negotiations. Its goal is to provide an outlet for all Canadians to learn about their country's founding ideas. The Confederation Debates, 1865-1949, accessed 29 July 2017, http://theconfederationdebates.ca/.

[42] One of the major topics that has not been addressed here is the religious influence on ideas of federalism. Nonetheless, there are directions that might be taken on this topic. Scholars working on federalism are fully aware of the influence the Christian faith has had on Western constitutional thought and practice. Daniel Elazar, one of the leading scholars on federalism, traces its modern origins from Reformed Protestantism and its theology of covenant. Daniel Elazar, *Exploring Federalism* (Tuscaloosa and London: University of Alabama Press, 1991), 115-153. J. Wayne Baker showed the influence of Reformation theology on the development of Swiss federalism. J. Wayne Baker, "The Covenantal Basis for the Development of Swiss Political Federalism: 1291-1848," *Publius* 23, no. 2 (Spring, 1993): 19-41. There is more research to be done for the Canadian case, however. Marc Chevrier, who has written on Canadian and American federalism with an eye to the findings of the new Confederation studies, included no reference to Christian ideas. Marc Chevrier, "The Idea of Federalism among the Founding Fathers of the United States and Canada," in *Contemporary Canadian Federalism: Foundations, Traditions, Institutions*, ed. Alain-G. Gagnon (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009), 11-52. A useful starting point might be to consider the relations between evangelical Christianity and early liberal support for provincial rights. Oliver Mowat immediately comes to mind.

[43] Ajzenstat, *Canadian Founding*, 7.

colonies sought, and is capitalized for specific reference to the Dominion of Canada they

succeeded in founding. The title "Canada" has been used to refer both to the former Province of

Canada, and to the current country, but it is clear when a distinction is intended.

Finally, there may sometimes seem to be contradictory usages of "Christian" and

"Christian beliefs" as now implying unity, now conflict. This apparent contradiction is resolved

by recognizing levels of detail. There were certain commonalities between Roman Catholics and

Protestants in their political thought on a surface level (such as their mutual suspicion of human

nature). Much below the surface, however, serious doctrinal divides swiftly manifested

themselves (as in the schools issue). It can be said in general that Christian beliefs had an

important influence on Confederation. Further discussion must acknowledge the differences

between Protestants and Roman Catholics, and between Protestant denominations, in the

Province of Canada's politics.

Chapter 1: Enlightenment Political Philosophy and Canada's Christian Constitution

       The Victorian Era in which the Canadian founders lived was a time in which faith suffused the society, the culture, and even the politics of the British Empire.[1] While the history of Confederation must be understood within the context of international relations with the United States, British imperial concerns, the politics of railways, and other large scale developments, the religious context must not be dismissed. Any account of political philosophy at Canada's founding is incomplete without a regard for it. Historians and political scientists since the 1990s have focused on showing that the founders' ideas were based on freedom, with strong commitments to the British Constitution and liberal ideas. Pragmatic Tory oligarchs did not create Canada. These scholars have ignored the foundations of Christian belief that were critical to British liberty. The political thought that shaped the Canadian constitution was certainly influenced by the founders' Christian faith.

       This chapter discusses the influence of Christian ideas in political philosophy at Confederation. The founders of the new dominion were men who were adamantly opposed to Enlightenment ideas, standing by their British, Christian heritage, as has been suggested by Frederick Vaughan and Benjamin Jones. Vaughan wrote that the founders "resisted the Enlightenment's repudiation of revealed religion" because "Canada was firmly rooted in Christian principles."[2] Jones proposed the influence of a philosophy he termed "Christian civic republicanism" that held Christianity "as the logical foundation of a virtuous society," although

---

[1] See, for example, David Marshall, "Religion in Canada, 1867-1945," in *The Cambridge History of Religions in America*, Vol. 2: *1790-1945*, ed. Stephen J. Stein (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 675-701; and Nancy Christie and Michael Gauvreau, *Christian Churches and Their Peoples, 1840-1965: A Social History of Religion in Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010).

[2] Frederick Vaughan, *The Canadian Federalist Experiment: From Defiant Monarchy to Reluctant Republic* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2003), 5, 150-51. Benjamin T. Jones, *Republicanism and Responsible Government: The Shaping of Democracy in Australia and Canada* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2014), 220.

he stated that his book's focus was not broad enough to explore this theme.[3] It is evident from a review of the anti-Biblical heart of the Enlightenment, the Canadian founders' reactions to it, and their use of Biblical truths in their own political thought and constitution-making, that the influence of Christianity in the political philosophy of the Canadian founding was significant. Faith was a major factor shaping Confederation's intellectual side. While the founders affirmed the separation of church *and* state, they hardly believed in the separation of church *from* state.

Ajzenstat positioned the freedom-loving political thought of 1867 as the inheritance of a secular tradition. She argued that the British North America Act was "an excellent example of an Enlightenment constitution."[4] She was convinced that the founders were disciples of John Locke and founded the new dominion on the doctrine of popular sovereignty. Their beliefs about identity, equality, and human rights were related to this principle. Her proof came from a small number of quotes from the ratification debates in the legislatures of the Province of Canada and the Maritime colonies.[5] Beyond the issue of her sources, though, it is misleading on a philosophical level to make the claim that the founders were disciples of the Enlightenment. Doing so implies an association with the deistic and atheistic thinkers of the French stream of it. Locke specifically belongs to the seventeenth century Age of Reason, with the likes of Voltaire and Diderot dominating the Enlightenment proper in the eighteenth century.

Ajzenstat's goal was to challenge the views of those like historians Frank Underhill, P.B. Waite, and Ged Martin, who pictured Canada's founders as having been oligarchic or pragmatic,

---

[3] Jones, *Responsible Government*, 220.
[4] Janet Ajzenstat, *The Canadian Founding: John Locke and Parliament* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2007), 47.
[5] Ajzenstat, *Canadian Founding*, 24-26, 39. Ajzenstat's source material was light and selective, overemphasizing the role of the liberals and independents she tried to draw attention to. She used only one quote from each of the three Maritime provinces, and only a few more from the Canadas. Her book was a work of political science, however, and so the smaller degree of evidence was due to disciplinary norms, rather than to negligence or twisting the facts.

rather than philosophical in their cast of mind.[6] A key component of her Lockean thesis was that Canada was founded on the concept of a "political nationality." This principle saw national unity as being achieved simply through the representation of all the people in parliament. A common culture that was neither present, nor required. Indeed, promoting such would even lead to anti-Lockean discrimination.[7] It is not necessary, however, to prove an Enlightenment connection in order to show that Canada was not founded by unprincipled "defenders of a particular elite, a particular ideology and particular way of life."[8] The drive for democracy, freedom, and rights preceded the Enlightenment, originating especially at the time of the English Revolution. Men like Locke took inspiration from the already developed political theories of the Puritans and Dissenters he was surrounded with. The Christian influence on politics is what Ajzenstat missed.

The anti-Christian strain of the Enlightenment was not present in Locke, but he still professed heresies that would influence the political philosophy of the eighteenth century. Locke had been brought up in a committed Calvinist home and community, and maintained "[a] [l]ifelong [i]nterest in the Bible."[9] When writing about toleration, he did so with English Protestant suspicions, denying that it should be extended to Roman Catholics or atheists due to their foreign loyalties and lack of recognition of a higher authority than man, respectively.[10] Despite his background, however, Locke departed from Protestant orthodoxy later in life. First, he emphasized the primacy of reason and natural law as man's moral guides. Man's reason took a position of importance in Locke's political philosophy even above the Scriptures. Through reason, man could discover the laws by which he was to live without the help of revelation. Instead of the Bible, Locke wrote, "Reason, which is that Law [of nature], teaches all

---

[6] Ajzenstat, *Canadian Founding*, 3-4.
[7] Ajzenstat, *Canadian Founding*, xii, 8, 86, 108-09.
[8] Ajzenstat, *Canadian Founding*, xv.
[9] Kim Ian Parker, *The Biblical Politics of John Locke* (Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2004), 7-9.
[10] Parker, *Biblical Politics*, 16, 26. Vaughan, *Canadian Federalist Experiment*, 135.

15

Mankind."[11] Second, Locke denied that all men inherited a sinful nature from Adam. Whereas the Bible said that "The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked," Locke held a more optimistic, *tabula rasa* view of man's ability to be moral.[12] Both the primacy of human reason and a favourable view of human nature became of major consequence in political philosophy during the French Enlightenment, and continued to be so into the nineteenth century.

Some of the major figures of the eighteenth century Enlightenment were openly hostile to God. Voltaire wrote that "Every sensible man, every honorable man, must hold the Christian sect in horror." He came up with the slogan "Écrasez l'infâme" ("crush the vile thing") to summarize his policy towards the faith. Like Locke, he had an optimistic view of human nature. Denis Diderot was of like mind with him, greeting Voltaire as his "sublime, honorable, and dear Anti-Christ" in 1762.[13] Jean-Jacques Rousseau, one of the major theorists of popular sovereignty, was a deist whose classical studies had taken away his faith.[14] He famously believed that man is inherently good, but is corrupted by society. There were diverse beliefs among the *philosophes* of the Enlightenment, but they shared a general enmity towards the Bible and their Christian heritage, preferring to look back to the paganism and humanism of the Greeks and Romans for inspiration.[15] This spirit found its fullest expression during the French Revolution, when any semblance of Christianity was erased.[16]

The Canadian founders rejected French humanism, often speaking unfavourably of Enlightenment thinkers and the revolution they influenced. Antoine Chartier de Lotbinière

---

[11] John Locke, *Two Treatises of Government*, ed. Peter Laslett, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), 289.
[12] Jer. 17:9. Parker, *Biblical Politics,* 14, 23, 63-4.
[13] Peter Gay, *The Enlightenment: An Interpretation - The Rise of Modern Paganism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1968), 389-91.
[14] Gay, *Enlightenment*, 68.
[15] Gay, *Enlightenment,* 8, 31-32, 73.
[16] John Stevens Cabot Abbott, *The French Revolution of 1789: As Viewed in the Light of Republicanism,* vol. 2 (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1887), 360.

Harwood, a Roman Catholic seigneur and Secretary of the *Compagnie du chemin de fer de Vaudreuil* (Vaudreuil Railway Company), used grave language in his speech to defend Confederation's British style of government on 9 March 1865.[17] He decried the record of democratic constitutions, exclaiming "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity! How many sad and mournful memories are connected with those three words in France?" He then expressed the hope that God would save Canada from the "disasters and horrid crimes which, to the eternal shame of civilization, stain the history of certain portions of Europe at the close of the last century."[18] George-Étienne Cartier, the Catholic railway solicitor and leader of the Lower Canadian *bleus*, also abhorred what France had become.[19] He closed a speech for Saint-Jean-Baptiste Day in Ottawa in 1868 by saying

> la conquête nous a sauvés des misères et des hontes de la Révolution française. La conquête a fini par nous donner les belles et libres institutions que nous possédons aujourd'hui, et sous lesquelles nous vivons heureux et prospères, car nous sommes des 'hommes de foi et de progrès.'[20]

British governance had allowed French Canadians to remain 'truly French,' not casting off their faith and falling into the shames and miseries of the Revolution. Cartier did not look for national identity in the philosophy of the Enlightenment. French Canadians would rather live under British rule, where they could preserve their religion, than under democratic, republican, anti-

---

[17] *Dictionnaire des parlementaires du Québec de 1792 à nos jours*, s.v. "Antoine Chartier de Lotbinière Harwood" (National Assembly of Quebec, 2009), accessed 12 July 2017, http://www.assnat.qc.ca/en/deputes/harwood-antoine-chartier-de-lotbiniere-3609/biographie.html.

[18] Legislature of the United Province of Canada, *Parliamentary Debates on the Subject of the Confederation of the British North American Provinces, 3rd Session, 8th Provincial Parliament of Canada* (Quebec: Hunter, Rose & Co., Parliamentary Printers, 1865), 828.

[19] J.-C. Bonenfant, "Sir George-Étienne Cartier," in *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 10 (University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–), accessed 20 September 2017, http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/cartier_george_etienne_10E.html.

[20] "The conquest saved us from the miseries and shames of the French Revolution. The conquest finished by giving to us the beautiful and free institutions that we possess today, and under which we live happy and prosperous, for we are 'men of faith and progress.'" Sir Georges Étienne Cartier, "Discours prononcé le 24 juin 1868 à la fête Saint-Jean-Baptiste à Ottawa," in Joseph Tassé *Discours de Sir Georges Cartier, baronnet, accompagnés de notices* (Montréal: Eusèbe Senécal & Fils, 1893), 602.

Christian France. In another speech, he recounted an incident in which he was asked in France how the French Canadians kept their nationality under British rule. He had responded that they had done so by being saved from the upheavals of the French Revolution and by the benefits of the free British institutions they enjoyed.[21]

Speakers in the 1865 debates criticized and discredited their opponents by accusing them of association with irreligious Enlightenment figures. The Roman Catholic journalist and poet Thomas D'Arcy McGee asked the opposition to Confederation if anyone in the house actually expected the new constitution to exactly conform to his own expectations.[22] He satirized the idea, saying "No, sir, I am sure no legislator at least since ANACHARSIS CLOOTZ was 'Attorney General of the Human Race' ever expected such ideal perfection." The house responded with laughter.[23] Anacharsis Clootz was an icon of French Revolution atheism.[24] Similarly to McGee, the Catholic notary Joseph Dufresne criticized the democratic tendencies he saw in the opposition by emphasizing the influence of radical French thinkers on them.[25] He "beg[ged] them not to degrade the sacred name of religion, by using it as a political engine; not to drag the ministers of the gospel through the mire." He derisively referred to Voltaire as a demagogue and

---

[21] Sir Georges Étienne Cartier, "Discours sur la confédération des provinces de l'amérique britannique du nord, prononcé le 8 septembre 1864," in Tassé, *Discours*, 390.
[22] Robin B. Burns, "Thomas D'Arcy McGee," in *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 9 (University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–), accessed 12 July 2017, http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/mcgee_thomas_d_arcy_9E.html.
[23] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 136.
[24] Clootz was a low ranking Prussian noble who went to France during the revolution and became known for his fanatical propagation of its ideals. Among other things, Clootz declared himself to be "the personal enemy of Jesus Christ." He was executed during the Terror in front of the largest audience ever to watch an execution by guillotine. William Doyle, *The Oxford History of the French Revolution*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 270; "Clootz or Cloots, Anacharsis," in P. Lagasse and Columbia University, *The Columbia Encyclopedia* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2016). Abbott, *French Revolution*, 360; William Doyle, *The Oxford History of the French Revolution*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 270.
[25] *Dictionnaire des parlementaires du Québec de 1792 à nos jours*, s.v. "Joseph Dufresne" (National Assembly of Quebec, 2011), accessed 12 July 2017, http://www.assnat.qc.ca/en/deputes/dufresne-joseph-3003/biographie.html.

promoter of the French Revolution.[26] Many of Canada's founders were openly against the French Revolution and the thought that had helped to cause it.

Unlike the French revolutionaries, the founders sought freedom *for* religion, not *from* it. Just as they sought to preserve their connection to Britain and British institutions, so they sought to maintain a forum for their faith. Both Protestants and Catholics in 1867 had a legacy of fighting to conserve their influence in the Canadas. They preserved a prominent role for religion as establishment became plural establishment, and finally disestablishment. The separation of church and state was a process not of secularizing, but rather of Victorian voluntarizing, in which church and state were separated for the health not only of the state, but also of churches themselves and of individuals' consciences. Churches were left to rely on voluntary participation. John Scoble, an anti-slavery activist and a former Congregationalist minister, asserted in perfect voluntarist language that "religious equality is necessary to the peace and good order of government, as well as to the life of religion itself among the people."[27] Even with separation, however, religious questions continued to be among the most serious issues during the Confederation debates in 1865. The contentious histories of the Canadas' school questions, and the proper allocation of constitutional powers concerning marriage and divorce, came to a head in the Confederation debates and sparked their most intense moments. If voluntarism was powerful among Protestants, however, ultramontanism exercised itself among Catholics, trying to tighten the institutional connections between Church and state. Strict ultramontanes believed in the supremacy and primacy of the Roman church over the state. Religion mattered to the founders. If Confederation were to succeed, it was necessary that it be as much a seal of

---

[26] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 930.
[27] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 907. Elwood H. Jones, "John Scoble," in *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 9 (University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–), accessed 12 July 2017, http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/scoble_john_9E.html. Scoble helped end the apprenticeship system that succeeded slavery in the West Indies.

protection for religious freedom as a guarantee of colonial security and prosperity. Cartier argued

it would be exactly that. He believed that the federal arrangement proposed would "at once

secure and guard the persons, the properties and the civil and religious rights belonging to the

population of each section."[28] O'Halloran, a *parti rouge* lawyer in opposition to Confederation,

argued that it would not, and should therefore be rejected.[29] Though in the new dominion church

and state would be separate, they would be so in order to secure the presence of Christianity in

British North America.

The Canadian founders expressly spoke of Canada as a Christian nation. They did not

merely provide a place for faith to exist within a secular state. George Brown, the fervent Free

Church Presbyterian founder of *The Globe*, gave the fifth major speech in the debates on 8

February 1865. He outlined the goals and principles upon which the new dominion was to be

based. He stated that

> Our scheme is to establish a government that will seek to turn the tide of
> European emigration into this northern half of the American continent - that will
> strive to develope [sic] its great natural resources - and that will endeavour to
> maintain liberty, and justice, and christianity [sic] throughout the land.[30]

Brown envisioned a British North American union that would continue to be British by culture;

enterprising in character; free and just in government; and Christian by religion. The

maintenance of these core values would be its goals. This was a creed that went beyond the

political nationality thesis. Later, Harwood even more directly affirmed Canada's Christian

character. While touching on divorce, he expressed the hope that "that source of disorder and

scandal of every species will be effaced from the parliamentary records of every Christian

---

[28] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 62.
[29] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 793. *Dictionnaire des parlementaires du Québec de 1792 à nos jours*, s.v. "James O'Halloran" (National Assembly of Quebec, 2009), accessed 12 July 2017, http://www.assnat.qc.ca/en/deputes/o-halloran-james-4655/biographie.html.
[30] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 86.

community." All Catholics in the house were opposed to divorce, and Harwood's statement received a "[h]ear, hear."[31] His designation echoed Alexander Morris's poetic words from two weeks before. Morris was a devout Presbyterian whom McGee called a "principal agent" in the move towards Confederation when he quoted from his 1858 pamphlet *Nova Britannia*.[32] At the end of his speech, Morris used words from a former colonial minister that he thought represented "the views and sentiments of the people of all these provinces." He looked forward to the passing of the motion, when the colonies would come before Queen Victoria to inform her that "We desire, by your aid, with your sanction and permission, to attempt to add another community of Christian freemen to those by which Great Britain confides the records of her Empire."[33] Here, Canadians' three distinguishing characteristics were that they were Christian, British, and free.

Four months after Confederation, McGee gave a lecture to the Montreal Literary Club that expressed the Christian mindset at the Canadian founding. He reflected on "the forces of a nation" and what Canada needed to do to realize them to the fullest. These forces were "moral, mental and physical" ones.[34] The last was straight forward, and the first was founded upon the church.[35] McGee's intended topic, though, was the mental force, for, he said, "it seems to me that our mental self-reliance is an essential condition of our political independence."[36] He then entered into a discourse that was primarily concerned with the yet undeveloped literature of British North America. As a literary man and masterful orator, McGee stressed the need to cultivate a national literature in all subjects, and the need for it to be of a high and moral quality.

---

[31] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 834.

[32] Jean Friesen, "Alexander Morris," in *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 11, University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–, accessed 14 February 2017, http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/morris_alexander_11E.html. Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 127. Alexander Morris, *Nova Britannia; or Our New Canadian Dominion Foreshadowed* (Toronto: Hunter and Rose, 1884).

[33] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 441.

[34] Thomas D'Arcy McGee, "The Mental Outfit of the New Dominion," in *1825 - D'Arcy McGee - 1925: A Collection of Speeches and Addresses*, ed. Charles Murphy (Toronto: MacMillan, 1937), 1.

[35] McGee, "Mental Outfit," 19-20.

[36] McGee, "Mental Outfit," 2.

He lamented the proliferation of vain books with a low, even "vile and flatigious" character, and told the club that "We must battle bad books with good books." Good books were ones that expanded the mind, satisfied curiosity, increased knowledge, instructed readers in truth, and did all in keeping with morality.[37]

Above all good books, however, McGee said that there was "always as a corrective to diseased imaginations the Book of books itself - the Bible." He noted that he here spoke of the Bible for its values and literary quality, rather than of "its perusal as a religious duty incumbent on all Christians." McGee emphasized Scripture "as the highest of histories, the truest of philosophies, and the most eloquent utterance of human organs," and said that it "should be read for the young, and by the young, at all convenient seasons."[38] Near the end of his lecture, he cautioned his listeners that it would not be enough to have "a ready-made easy literature" that stemmed from American culture and upheld US democracy. He did not believe religion needed to retreat in order for mental culture to advance. Rather, he said,

> I rely upon Nature and Revelation against levelling and system-mongering of the American, or any other kind. In Nature and Revelation we should lay the basis of our political, mental and moral philosophy as a people; and once laid, those foundations will stand as firmly set and rooted, as any rocks in the Huronian or Laurentian range.[39]

McGee wanted Canada to become an intellectual and cultured nation that was unique, and he believed that it had to uphold a prominent place for the Bible in order to do so. It needed moral and religious character to be culturally creative. The socio-intellectual foundations of Canada had to be rooted in the Christian faith. McGee was, of course, speaking from a devout Catholic

---

[37] McGee, "Mental Outfit," 9-10.
[38] McGee, "Mental Outfit," 11.
[39] McGee, "Mental Outfit," 18.

perspective. He had mellowed from his radical ultramontane days only in recent years.[40] Here, though, he spoke generally of the Bible's literary value without reference to doctrine.

Other aspects of Christianity's influence on the founders' political philosophy become apparent by discussing their links to Edmund Burke's ideas. Unlike the thinkers of the French Enlightenment, Burke looked to Britain's Christian heritage for inspiration.[41] His major work, the *Reflections on the Revolution in France*, was a thorough refutation of the French Enlightenment ideas that climaxed in 1789. There are various ways in which his critique was grounded in Christianity, but two of the most important ones for comparison with the Canadian founders' ideas were Burke's emphasis on human fallibility, and the importance he placed on virtue as the foundation of good government. In both of these cases, he found trouble arising when Christian truth was forsaken.

The last pages of the *Reflections* summarized Burke's critique. He warned that the French, while being "illuminated," had "acted under a strong impression of the ignorance and fallibility of mankind." Their philosophy led them to create an impractical system of government that could not restrain human passions. On the other hand, Burke advised, God rewards statesmen who acknowledge their sinful nature and take precautions.[42] Rationalistic and irreligious political philosophy led to defective and immoral government, but the British constitution acknowledged man's sinfulness and fallibility. The "foundations of civil freedom" were in "a more austere and masculine morality" that France had given up in favour of "an

---

[40] David A. Wilson, *Thomas D'Arcy McGee*, vol. 1: *Passion, Reason, and Politics, 1825-1857* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2008), 285-86, 358.
[41] Edmund Burke, *Revolutionary Writings*: *Reflections on the Revolution in France and the first Letter on a Regicide Peace*, ed. Ian Hampsher-Monk (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 77-81. On pages 80-81, Burke wrote that "Nothing is more certain than that our manners, our civilization, and all good things which are connected with manners, and with civilization, have, in this European world of ours, depended on two principles; and were indeed the result of both combined; I mean the spirit of a gentleman, and the spirit of religion."
[42] Burke, *Revolutionary Writings*, 249.

insolent irreligion in opinions and practices."[43] Britain's constitution wisely relied on past experience and the influence of the Bible to counteract the worst of human nature.

Some of the most influential of the Canadian founders were heavily influenced by Burke's creed. Political scientist Rod Preece showed the similarities between Upper Canadian Conservative leader John A. Macdonald's political principles and those of Burke. Both stood for incremental reform.[44] Both were against utopian or speculative political ideas. Both believed in looking to the wisdom of the past.[45] Macdonald believed in liberty, but, like Burke, saw order as prerequisite to it.[46] In economics, Macdonald's cast of mind was synonymous with Burke's. Economics were of secondary importance; political principles came before financial gain. It was more important to build railways and canals to guard Canada's independence against the United States than to maintain strict budgetary restraint. Political and financial prudence, rather than short term fiscal goals, came first.[47] The most obvious difference between Burke and Macdonald was that Macdonald was more of a "political Christian," lacking the "deep-seated religious reverence which suffused Burke's thought."[48] Macdonald did, however, believe in and see the importance of Christianity, even if he was not devout. In a speech on the school question, he referred to himself as "an ardent Protestant who conscientiously believes that Protestantism and truth are one."[49]

Macdonald's first biographer, Sir Joseph Pope, gave an account of his faith that sat somewhere in between Preece's view and Macdonald's zealous words. Pope wrote that "Sir John

---

[43] Burke, *Revolutionary Writings*, 38-9.
[44] Rod Preece, "The Political Wisdom of Sir John A. Macdonald," *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 17, no. 3 (1984): 465.
[45] Preece, "Political Wisdom," 466.
[46] Preece, "Political Wisdom," 471, 479, 482.
[47] Preece, "Political Wisdom," 483-84.
[48] Preece, "Political Wisdom," 485-86.
[49] John A. Macdonald, *Address of The Hon. John A. Macdonald to the Electors of the City of Kingston, with Extracts from Mr. Macdonald's Speeches, Delivered on Different Occasions in the Years 1860, and 1861, &c*. ([Kingston?]: n.p., 1861), 26.

Macdonald was a firm believer in the truths of Christianity." He went to church, led family worship, and had a habit of writing "D.V." on his letters that spoke of the future.[50] He would write them in himself when his secretary forgot. Pope thought, though, that Macdonald preferred a private faith. He "cared little for external forms of worship." Macdonald was raised Presbyterian, but was not firmly devoted to that denomination. After his second marriage in 1867, he typically went to an Anglican Church with his wife Agnes. Nevertheless, he remained content with either Methodist or Presbyterian services.[51] Even if less religious than Burke, then, Macdonald still stood within the British, Christian tradition of politics expounded in the *Reflections*.

McGee drew inspiration from the insights of Burke's work. In 1856, he delivered a lecture for the St. Patrick's Society in Montreal that argued that Burke should be seen as a great Irish thinker, more specifically than a British one. McGee was, as an Irishman himself, proud to share his heritage with the man who had stood against the "monstrous apparition" of the French Revolution and its philosophy.[52] As a Catholic, McGee emphasized Burke's religious tolerance. He noted Burke's Catholic mother, his authorship of the first Catholic Relief Bill in 1778, and his role in obtaining asylum for 8,000 French priests in 1792.[53] Burke was, of course, a Protestant like his father, but had attended Catholic and Quaker schools and maintained sympathies for Roman Catholicism throughout his life.[54] McGee had high praise for Burke's political insights. He said that "If any young man present desired to contemplate the sublime of political science - the astronomy of affairs - he . . . would give him three authors; first, Burke; second, Burke; third,

---

[50] The letters "D.V." stand for "Deus Volent," Latin for "God willing."

[51] Joseph Pope, *Memoirs of the Right Honourable Sir John Alexander Macdonald, G.C.B., First Prime Minister of the Dominion of Canada,* vol. 2 (Ottawa: J. Durie & Son, 1894), 293.

[52] McGee, "Edmund Burke," in Murphy, *D'Arcy McGee*, 64, 67.

[53] McGee, "Edmund Burke," 65.

[54] Burke, *Revolutionary Writings*, xi-xii.

Burke."[55] The greatest orator of Confederation was no Enlightenment man. Rather, his political philosophy had a Christian basis.

Other founders also displayed the influence of Burkean political wisdom in their speeches. Col. Sir Étienne Pascal Taché, a doctor, militia officer, and the province's premier, opened the 1865 debates showing Burke's disposition to preserve.[56] He spoke both of the resolution Confederation would bring to the province's problems, and of its "intrinsic merits." The constitution based on the Quebec Resolutions would preserve Canada's connection to Britain, its institutions, its laws, and "even our remembrances of the past."[57] Hope Fleming Mackenzie, brother of future Liberal prime minister Alexander Mackenzie, looked to history, "reflecting upon the evils which have followed hasty constitution-making," and said that it had to be considered whether "the elements of stability" were manifest in the proposed constitution. He believed that they were, "so far as human foresight can determine."[58]

The banker and conservative Richard John Cartwright was of the same mind when he said that he hoped the future nation would strive to emulate the virtues displayed by its ancestors.[59] He applauded their courage, self sacrifice, determination and "patient, law-abiding spirit which has ever induced them to prefer reform to revolution, even when engaged in sweeping away the last vestiges of worn-out feudal systems in Church and State from their midst." He saw the Fathers of Confederation as carrying forward the same spirit, and hoped the

---

[55] McGee, "Edmund Burke," 67-68.

[56] Andrée Désilets, "Sir Étienne-Paschal Taché," in *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 9 (University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–), accessed 12 July 2017, http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/tache_etienne_paschal_9E.html.

[57] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 6.

[58] J. M. S. Careless, *Brown of the Globe*, vol. 1: *The Voice of Upper Canada, 1818-1859* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1959), 327. Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 681.

[59] Cecilia Morgan and Robert Craig Brown, "Sir Richard John Cartwright," in *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 14 (University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–, accessed 12 July 2017), http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/cartwright_richard_john_14E.html. J. K. Johnson, ed., *The Canadian Directory of Parliament, 1867-1967* (Ottawa: Public Archives of Canada, 1968), 103. Cartwright was the son of an Anglican minister. He was a Conservative and followed Macdonald until 1869, when he joined the Liberals.

new nation would also look back on them with admiration.[60] Others added the moral objective of

preserving their traditional institutions for future generations to their reasons for supporting

Confederation. This mirrored Burke's doctrine of society as being an intergenerational moral

trust.[61] Taché, H. Mackenzie, and McGee all listed securing British institutions for their children

as a reason to support Confederation.[62] Thus, many of the founders shared the mindset of the

Edmund Burke and his Christian-based political philosophy. They did not formulate or ratify the

Canadian constitution using Enlightenment ideas.

There are a number of specific areas in which explicitly religious influence was evident

in the political philosophies of the founders. The first of these was in their words about human

nature. They consistently expressed beliefs that man was inherently sinful, that he was incapable

of designing a perfect state constitution, and that more than a good system was needed to bring

into being the best possible polity. These beliefs were part of what made them intent on creating

a constitution after "the model of the British Constitution, so far as our circumstances will

permit."[63] It was held to be the best model for counteracting man's defects. Second, their

Christian convictions played a part in the doubt and hostility with which they viewed republican

and democratic constitutions. Third, the Bible's influence on Canada's founders showed in the

value they placed on religious liberty as a key variable in the Confederation debates. They valued

it both in and of itself, and as the cornerstone of a good commonwealth.

Cartier's belief in the fallen state of human nature was an important ingredient in his

understanding of the "political nationality" he said the new constitution would create. It would be

held by all citizens of the dominion and would not be dependent upon national (or, ethnic) origin

---

[60] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 824.
[61] Burke, *Revolutionary Writings*, 101.
[62] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 8, 146, 681.
[63] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 1.

or religious convictions. The federal government would legislate on matters of common interest, while controversial matters would be left to more homogenous localities. Canada's many 'races' would be free to maintain the particularities they would not give up, and would engage in friendly competition for the good of the whole. Some, he said, greatly regretted ethno-cultural differences and hoped they would eventually blend into one. Cartier however, argued that they never would, but that the political nationality would work nonetheless. He said that "Dissimilarity . . . appeared to be the order of the physical world and of the moral world, as well as in the political world."[64] In so doing, he was saying that, by nature, people differed in moral comprehension and standing, and that their inability to come to a common realization of truth made political difference inevitable. Mankind was imperfect by nature, and so the compromise solution worked out by the Fathers of Confederation was the best that could be hoped for. No design could be formulated that would bring about perfect unity. Cartier flatly stated that "The idea of unity of races was utopian - it was impossible."[65] Only in a utopia - a perfect world - could such be. The idea was contrary to the fallen state of the world they existed in.

Brown and Harwood echoed Cartier's sentiment. Brown said that while he agreed that portions of the Quebec Resolutions had been imperfectly framed, he believed it could not be helped. A new constitution was necessary, but

> No constitution ever framed was without defect; no act of human wisdom was ever free from imperfection; no amount of talent and wisdom and integrity combined in preparing such a scheme could have placed it beyond the reach of criticism.

In Canada's case, the Fathers of Confederation had had to deal with "the prejudices of race and language and religion . . . all the rivalries of trade and commerce, and all the jealousies of

---

[64] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 60.
[65] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 60.

28

diversified local interests."[66] Concessions were necessary in a world in which men's "prejudices" and "rivalries" and "jealousies" prevailed, and all their "wisdom" and "talent" and "integrity" could not surmount them. Brown was, of course, a devout Free Church Presbyterian. His evangelical denomination had always had a deep sense of mankind's depravity and inadequacy. Harwood spoke rhetorically in his speech on 9 March, asking "does not every work of man bear the impress of imperfection?" Confederation, like the US Constitution and the Code Napoleon, was not perfect, but was as good as could be hoped for in the circumstances. Moreover, in his opinion, it was an objectively good settlement.[67] That the Liberal Presbyterian Brown shared a suspicious outlook on human nature with his polar opposites, the *bleu* Catholics Cartier and Harwood, showed that the Biblical view of human nature was shared by Protestants and Catholics alike. Their remarks also demonstrated how the Christian view of man contributed to the moderation and compromise necessary in the Confederation scheme.

Caution about man's sinful nature was also expressed by John Sewell Sanborn, who opposed the motion for Confederation. Sanborn was a deacon in Sherbrooke's Congregationalist Church, and was the president of Quebec's Temperance and Prohibitory League. He also professed Calvinism, a doctrine holding human depravity as a fundamental tenet of belief.[68] Sanborn referred to Taché's opening assurances that the French of Canada East were generous in spirit and ready to do justice to the English minority in their future province. He agreed that the French were indeed tolerant, but, believing in the potential for "calamity" should religious

---

[66] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 87.
[67] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 837.
[68] Gordon O. Rothney, "John Sewell Sanborn," in *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 10 (University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003), accessed 11 February 2017, http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/sanborn_john_sewell_10E.html.

conflict emerge in the new country, he remained uncommitted to the Quebec Resolutions.[69]

Despite the liberal spirit of the French, Sanborn said,

> It would, however, be a grievous mistake to overlook the safeguards and rules necessary to perpetuate kindly feelings, and to prevent the dispositions to aggressions which existed more or less in all minds. That principle - the love of power - was found in every human heart, none were exempt from it, and the history of the world showed that no people had ever risen superior to it. The Honorable Premier had recognized this truth in the remarks he had made in regard of the difficulties between Upper and Lower Canada.

Human nature was reckless and selfishly ambitious and could not be left unchecked without creating a dangerous situation. Considering this, Sanborn voiced apprehensions about giving legislative power over property to local governments, rather than to the federal government. He asked where "the security of the great religious societies of Montreal" would be if "a sentiment hostile to monopolies were carried to extremes in the" provincial legislature. Taché and railway businessman John Ross both interrupted, saying that the federal power of disallowance would prevent abuses to religious groups.[70] Sanborn replied that the power was an "extreme" one whose use would be controversial and could not be relied upon. Giving provincial governments the power to legislate on property rights "was illogical and dangerous," and announced to "the world that the rights of property were not made sure."[71] Sanborn's distrust of human nature would not let him be guided by a hope for the best.

An exchange between the seigneur Henri Gustave Joly de Lotbinière and the doctor and seigneur Joseph Octave Beaubien eleven days after Sanborn spoke also showed the importance

---

[69] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 122-23.

[70] Paul Cornell, "John Ross (1818-71)," in *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 10 (University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–), accessed 12 July 2017, http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/ross_john_1818_71_10E.html.

[71] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 123. Sanborn was one of the members who called for a referendum. See Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 124.

of the founders' views on human nature.[72] Joly had been born in France to a Huguenot family

and was raised in an "austere and inflexible" Reformed church in Paris (Reformed churches are

Calvinistic in doctrine) prior to converting to Anglicanism in Canada.[73] He opposed

Confederation, fearing on the one hand that the federal form of government proposed was

innately flawed, and on the other that French Canadian nationality would be put in jeopardy.[74]

He argued that the differences between the French and the English were too great for the

proposed system to work. French Canadians, he said, would not seek to abuse their power over

the English minority in Quebec, but they themselves would be at the mercy of the English-

dominated federal parliament. He quoted Taché's assurance that French Canadians in Lower

Canada would do justice to the minority, and that the province would be vetoed when it did not.

Joly asked who would decide when an injustice was being done. When "a disinterested opinion

is but seldom to come," he said, "the sympathies of the majority in the Federal Parliament will be

against us." He warned that he saw "in this the prospect of a position which may prove to be a

most dangerous one for us; if the strife should commence, no one can tell when it will end."[75]

Upon this comment, Beaubien interjected. He did not think that strife would grow to such

an extent. Rather, he affirmed his "confidence in the conscience of the Federal Parliament." He

thought that the members "ought not to attribute evil intentions to men, but rather suppose that

they will treat us as they desire to be treated themselves, with justice, and in a conscientious

manner." Beaubien was paraphrasing from the Luke 6:33 rendering of the golden rule in Jesus'

Sermon on the Plain. Joly received the comment as idealistic. He replied, saying

---

[72] Marcel Hamelin, "Sir Henri-Gustave Joly de Lotbinière," in *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 13, University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–, accessed 15 February 2017, http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/joly_de_lotbiniere_henri_gustave_13E.html. Claude Vachon, "Joseph-Octave Beaubien," in *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 10 (University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–), accessed 12 July 2017, http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/beaubien_joseph_octave_10E.html.
[73] Hamelin, "Joly."
[74] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 346-50, 362.
[75] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 351.

> Despite the honorable member's sermon - I beg his pardon, I mean the honorable member's observation - I am of opinion that we ought not to leave interests so precious as those which are confided to us to the mercy of men with whom we are not always certain of living on good terms, without any other guarantee than their conscience.[76]

Man's conscience was unreliable. It could change if his sense of what was in his self-interest changed. Basing confidence on the goodwill of men was no guarantee, and was bound to disappoint. The differences between the English and French, not to mention between the Atlantic provinces and the Canadas, were too many, and self interest too much, to permit Confederation to work.

Joly believed the union had "established harmony between the English and French races in Lower Canada," and federation would destroy it. Moreover, relations between Canada and the Maritime provinces were then peaceful, if not close. If they were united, though, the federal parliament would become like "a field of battle" where they would take to

> the habit of contending with each other to cause their own interests, so various and so incompatible with each other, to prevail, and when, from repetition of this undying strife, jealousy and inevitable hatred shall have resulted, our sentiments towards the other provinces will be no longer the same.

The inevitable result of this discord would be to put all British North America in danger of annexation by the United States.[77] Increasing the colonies' ability to defend themselves against the immense war machine the northern United States had become during the US Civil War (1861-65) had been a major motivator for Confederation, but Joly warned the proposed solution would backfire. He believed that men were too selfish to permit a union of regions with diverse interests to work. For him, human nature suggested that the outcome of Confederation would be disastrous.

---

[76] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 351.
[77] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 351-52.

A crucial example of the influence of the Christian view of human nature in the Province of Canada's Confederation debates was found in the longest speech made.[78] The speaker was Christopher Dunkin, an English Protestant lawyer from Lower Canada. He attended an evangelical Anglican Church in Montreal and had introduced temperance legislation in 1864, although it is not clear how devout he was.[79] Dunkin was opposed to Confederation. His central argument was that it was an imitation of neither the British, nor the American Constitution, but that it contained all the flaws of the American one and would lead to divisions in the new country that would tear it apart. It would make members of parliament into groups of provincial delegates like in the American House of Representatives, violating the British principle of independent MPs. The upper house was not to be given any of the powers "wisely assigned to the Senate of the United States" and would create "dead-lock." Sectional representation in the cabinet violated the British principle of that body's responsibility "for every act of the Government." The likelihood of forming a sufficiently representative cabinet of reasonable size was also unlikely.[80] Annexation would be the inevitable outcome of the clumsy system.[81]

Dunkin's arguments from human nature appeared in two forms. The first concerned sectional tensions, while the second attacked the motives of the Fathers of Confederation. He began the first day of his speech (27 February) by drawing attention to "some sources of misunderstanding which may more particularly make trouble, unless human nature ceases to be human nature within this Canada of ours." These sources were the "two differences of language

---

[78] Dunkin took two days to complete his oration. He spoke for all of the 27th and 28th of February. His 62 pages make up 6% of the total text of the Province of Canada's debate on the Quebec Resolutions.
[79] Richard W. Vaudry, *Anglicans and the Atlantic World: High Churchmen, Evangelicals and the Quebec Connection* (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2003), 90. Mary Naylor, « Mark Willoughby », dans *Dictionnaire biographique du Canada*, vol. 7 (Université Laval/University of Toronto, 2003–) , consulté le 16 févr. 2017, http://www.biographi.ca/fr/bio/willoughby_mark_7F.html. Pierre Corbeil, "Christopher Dunkin," in *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 11 (University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–), accessed 16 February 2017, http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/dunkin_christopher_11E.html.
[80] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 513.
[81] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 539.

and faith" that he thought were the true reasons the Fathers of Confederation had opted for a federal arrangement. The system was designed "on purpose to meet a possible or probable clashing of races and creeds in Canada, and particularly in Lower Canada."[82]

In keeping with his main line of argument, he then compared the situation to the United States' founding. The founders of the American republic had had to deal with "jealousy" between states of varying sizes and with tensions between North and South over slavery. Instead of addressing these problems, however, the Americans had "buried the dragon's teeth." They later re-emerged to spark the Civil War that was raging as Dunkin spoke. He suggested that the Quebec Resolutions would do even worse for Canada's divisions of language and culture. Their framers freely professed to be establishing a constitution that would perpetuate differences, and these differences would lead to conflict. He asked the house: "Are we burying, or are we of set choice sowing, our dragon's teeth?"[83] Dunkin continued, saying

> we are setting ourselves as deliberately as we well can to keep up the distinctions
> and the differences which exist among us, to hold them constantly in everybody's
> sight - in the hope, I suppose, that while everybody is looking at them intently,
> somehow or other no one may see them at all. (Laughter.)[84]

Supporters of Confederation were trumpeting its ability to preserve their differences and bring unity and strength at the same time, but it was this very fact of the perpetuation of difference that would ruin their aspirations. Human nature was naturally self interested and uncompromising. As a permanent minority in the federal parliament, the French would become increasingly aggressive about controlling their MPs, even without wanting to, in order to maintain the little power they had.[85]

---

[82] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 509.
[83] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 509. The figure of 'sowing the dragon's teeth' comes from the ancient Greek legends of Cadmus and Jason. When the teeth were sowed in the ground, they emerged as warriors ready to fight.
[84] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 509.
[85] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 510.

The second part of Dunkin's critique from human nature was his assault on the framers of the Quebec Resolutions. He accused them of unwise haste.[86] He objected to their insistence that the motion had to be passed without amendment, or not at all. He suggested that their talk of compromise was in reality an insinuation that any disagreement would be unreasonable. He also suggested that they had "that particular kind of wisdom and foresight which marks the astute official politician," rather than that of "the far-seeing statesman." They were a self-interested group proposing everything, though without delivering, with the goal of aggrandizing their own position.[87] At the end of his speech, Dunkin objected that the response to all the valid critiques given had been to put faith in "men's good sense, good feeling, forbearance, and all that sort of thing" to work it out. If there were these, he asked, why could a solution not be worked out within the current union? He quoted 2 Kings 5:13 ("If the prophet had bid thee do some great thing, wouldest thou not have done it?"), saying that men naturally gravitate towards impracticably grand solutions, rather than practicable small ones.[88] Proponents of Confederation seemed to be doing just that, as if looking for personal glory. The motives of men were by nature dangerous. Those of the new constitution's movers had to be closely examined.

The understandings of human nature held by the founders translated into their determined support for the British theory of government and their opposition to democratic and republican forms. One of the core principles of the British constitution was that it developed 'organically.' There was no single date or document one could point to as its beginning. It

---

[86] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 483-84.
[87] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 488-89.
[88] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 544. In 2 Kings 5, Naaman, a high-ranking Syrian officer, went to the house of the prophet Elisha in hope that Elisha would heal his leprosy. Elisha did not come to meet Naaman personally, but instead had a messenger tell him to wash in the Jordan River seven times to be healed. Naaman was angered because he had expected the cure to be magnificent, befitting of his status (and ego), and his servants had to convince him to follow the humbling instructions he was given. When he did, he was healed, and pledged to serve the Lord. Dunkin was accusing the movers of Confederation of taking the prideful way out of their difficulties by seeking a grand solution where none was needed.

reached its current form by an accumulation of laws and precedents, built up gradually from experience and conflict over the ages. It was unwritten; its many parts collectively represented the sum of constitutional wisdom discovered by generations of past statesmen.

Another foundational principle of the British constitution was that it followed the model of mixed government, an ancient idea whose greatest expositors were men like Aristotle, Polybius, Cicero, and, more recently, Montesquieu.[89] Mixed government meant balancing the three types of government identified by Aristotle - kingship, aristocracy, and polity - against each other, so that they did not translate into their antitypes - tyranny, oligarchy, and democracy.[90] If one form predominated, the state would naturally degenerate into an existence that was beneficial only to the interests of that class of people. In its modern incarnation in Britain, the interests of democracy (or, polity) were represented by the House of Commons, aristocracy by the House of Lords, and kingship by the Crown. British government took advantage of each part while counteracting its dangers. The Commons stood for the rights of average people, the aristocracy provided sober second thought and protection for property, and the king gave stability, unity, and a common cause. As social and political commentator William Gairdner remarked in a footnote in *Canada's Founding Debates*, the theory of mixed government aligned with the "classical and deeply Christian image of the human being," wherein the Commons represented the body's passionate impetus; the Lords, the directing mind; and the monarch, the uniting spirit.[91] Even if not explicitly stated in this way, it is evident that, in a Christian society like Canada, belief in the Biblical revelation of the sinfulness of man naturally buttressed the concept. From their words in the Confederation debates, it is clear that the Canadian founders'

---

[89] Burke, *Revolutionary Writings,* ed. Hamphser-Monk, xxiii. Jones, *Responsible Government*, 30.
[90] Aristotle, *Politics*, III.7.
[91] Janet Ajzenstat, Paul Romney, Ian Gentles, and William D. Gairdner, eds. *Canada's Founding Debates* (Toronto: Stoddart, 1999), 83.

belief in this doctrine was important to their support for 'organic' and mixed government. At times, they explicitly expressed the linkage between their faith and their political philosophy.

Such was the way Dunkin explained his commitment to the gradualism of the British Constitution. Dunkin supported the continuance of the union of the Canadas and argued that its problems should be worked out gradually, rather than with sudden change. In true Burkean fashion, he feared the Confederation scheme was too hasty and artificial a reform to be wise. Dunkin explained his philosophy by saying

> I have no fancy for democratic or republican forms or institutions, or indeed for revolutionary or political novelties of any sort. The phrase of "political creation" is no phrase of mine. I hold that the power to create is as much a higher attribute than belongs to man, in the political world, as in any other department of the universe. All we can do is to attend to and develope [sic] the ordinary growth of our institutions; and this growth, if it is to be healthy at all, must be slow. There must be the same slow, steady change in political matters which answers to the growth visible in the physical world.[92]

In these words, Dunkin identified democratic and republican governments as unnatural. They were thus imprudent, and even un-Christian. Men were right to support the natural growth of the constitution because, in doing so, they did not presume to put themselves in the place of God by creating new institutions from nothing. Revolutionary pride went against the Divinely ordained order of things and could not have good results. Wise men maintained and built upon what constitution they found themselves with, rather than thinking they could remedy their difficulties by reasoning out an entirely new one. Dunkin's words invested the British Constitution with the authority of the Bible, and argued that Confederation was going against Christian-based constitutional wisdom.

---

[92] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 483-84.

The Conservative miller George Jackson comprehended the Christian cast of mind behind Duncan's beliefs about government and referred to it in his speech on 9 March.[93] He understood Dunkin to have meant "that nations and constitutions and governments owed their origin to that creative power to which all are indebted for existence and the means of perpetuating it." He quoted two lines from Shakespeare's *Hamlet* that he felt summarized the position, saying "There is a Divinity that shapes our ends, rough hew them as we may."[94] He then, however, turned Dunkin's convictions around to oppose the conclusions he made from them. Dunkin had spoken of the series of seeming accidents that had led to Confederation and accused the government for taking advantage of them. Jackson asked if he was being too rash, and if perhaps those accidents "might only be instruments in the hands of the Supreme Architect."[95] He then went on to profess that the proposed constitution was not perfect (for such would be impossible), and that with "patriotic men" and "room for the exercise of political virtue" a "scheme somewhat defective" could still be administered for good.[96] Jackson likewise upheld Burkean principles of preferring practical goals to abstract ones, and of waiting for natural opportunities presented by "passing events for directing the vessel of state into a secure harbour." Contrary to Dunkin, though, he suggested that the Fathers of Confederation were following a wise and statesmanlike course that was in accord with the natural movement of events.[97]

---

[93] C. H. Mackintosh, *The Canadian Parliamentary Companion and Annual Register, 1882* (Ottawa: Citizen Printing and Publishing Company, 1882), 162-63.
[94] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 885.
[95] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 486-87, 885.
[96] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 885-86.
[97] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 886.

Macdonald, McGee, and journalist Joseph-Édouard Cauchon also clearly stated their belief in mixed government.[98] They did not explicitly link it to Christian beliefs, but they did have the Biblical doctrine of human nature in view when speaking about it. Cauchon accused the opposition to Confederation of adhering to "demagogic principles," and hating the "monarchical character" of the Quebec Resolutions more than anything.[99] He asserted that supporters of them "move[d] in a different circle of ideas from that in which the Opposition moves." They wanted a monarchy with a parliament and responsible ministers to balance it. This system provided a firmer and more permanent basis for liberty. Britain's democracy, he said was made so great, so free, and so rich because of its embedment within a mixed constitution. America, on the other hand, had chosen a republican version of democracy, was seeing the rise of demagogy, and would soon come to tyranny.[100] Of course, the United States Constitution also acknowledged the principles of mixed government, but its republican form made the democratic element clearly dominant. Without counterbalancing popular interests, wicked men who falsely professed to represent the people's interests would take advantage of the lack of checks to seize power for themselves. Cauchon's "demagogic principles" were referred to by McGee as "the spirit of universal democracy," the "principles of democracy," and "this universal democracy doctrine" of the United States.[101]

McGee held democracy to be the greatest risk Canada faced if it did not vote for Confederation and protect itself from annexation. The "popular voice" of America pressured its leaders to support the idea of the country's 'manifest destiny' to rule the entire North American

---

[98] Andrée Désilets, "Joseph-Édouard Cauchon," in *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 11 (University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–), accessed 12 July 2017, http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/cauchon_joseph_edouard_11E.html.
[99] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 560.
[100] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 561.
[101] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 143.

continent. McGee equated universal democracy with universal monarchy. Both gave absolute power to one group of interests of sinful men that would oppress other interests.[102] Macdonald likewise equated "unbridled democracy" with "the tyranny of a single despot." Unlike Britain's mixed government, both lacked respect for minority rights. The British constitution gave "free institutions" and "constitutional liberty" to majority and minority alike.[103] The goal of good government for the Canadian founders was not simply to express the will of the people. Rather, it was to create a system in which justice was done to all by counteracting the sinful nature of each self-interested party.

Other statements made by the founders about the popular rule promoted in democracy and republicanism also showed the influence of the Christian view of human nature. Harwood warned that the alternative to Confederation was annexation, and that through it the opposition would come to know the emptiness of the promises of democracy. They would then "see the naked features of those democratic institutions which are in reality inconsistent with true liberty." In a democracy, he said, "liberty is but a name, a dream, an illusion, a mockery, often a snare."[104] Freedom of the press was nonexistent because, if what was written conflicted with the views of the majority of the people, it was not tolerated. In unbalanced democracies, Harwood said, "the will of the majority is law."[105] He then referred to the many tragedies of the French Revolution. The king was executed, provinces were destroyed, countless lives were lost, rebelliousness flourished, churches and monasteries were ruined, church people were murdered. The "three magic words" of liberty, equality, and fraternity had brought ruin to France. As another democracy tore itself apart to the south of Canada, Harwood professed the hope that God

---

[102] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 143.
[103] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 44.
[104] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 827.
[105] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 827-28.

would keep Canada from the evil and ruin that had come from democratic revolutions.[106] He did

not believe in government of, by, and for the people. The rule of the popular voice was not an

end in itself. All men were sinful beings, so the power of the people's will had to be balanced

also. If it were not, they would inevitably oppress the minority. Harwood's references to the

French Revolution and God connected democratic systems to Enlightenment deism and atheism.

His Christian view of human nature encouraged his support for British institutions and his

rejection of purely democratic ones.

George-Étienne Cartier's speech in the debates also conveyed skepticism about the

principle of rule by the people. The Americans, he said, had founded a federation with

democracy as its central tenet. Canada's federation, however, would enshrine monarchy, the

cornerstone of mixed government. Canadians had had the opportunity to observe the republican

experiment in the US for eighty years and now "felt convinced that purely democratic

institutions could not be conducive to the peace and prosperity of nations." Democracies

inevitably succumbed to "the will of the mob, the rule of the populace," as Cartier saw taking

place south of the border. The legitimacy of authority had been undermined by democratic

principles.[107] Like Harwood, he implied an association of democracy with anti-Christian ideas.

He said that while all compromising men supported Confederation, those who operated in

extremes, such as the "socialists, democrats and annexationists," opposed it. He laughed that the

members of the *Institut Canadien* and their leader, "citizen BLANCHET," had set themselves up

as protectors of religion in order to further their opposition. The *Institut* was known for its

disputes with the Roman Catholic Church over its supply of prohibited books to its members. He

---

[106] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 828.
[107] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 59.

also poked fun at "the young French gentlemen belonging to the national democratic party."[108] Cartier saw democratic government as associated with a secular tradition that had no place in Canada.

Joseph Dufresne also linked democracy with radical and secularist ideas when he accused the opposition of demagoguery. Those who had sympathies for anti-clerical, democratic ideas were raising their voices to argue that French Canadian Catholicism would be put in danger by Confederation. Dufresnse ridiculed their sudden piousness. He labelled them as disciples of French socialists like Louis Blanc, Victor Prosper Considerant, Louis Auguste Blanqui, and Charles Fourier, and proceeded to quote three paragraphs to show what the philosophies of the democratic opposition's "special apostles and patrons" were. He made the most of words from Considerant and Fourier that proclaimed man's passions to be pure and sacred things from God Himself. Dufresne marvelled at the idea that "The passions . . . are to be man's guides. Good or bad, it is all one." However absurd it sounded, though, "Such are the doctrines of the democrats, the great leaders of our demagogues." There was laughter as Dufresne concluded that "These are the principles of the men who have taken religion under their protection." He asked the opposition to stop turning religious fears into insincere political tools with which to oppose the introduction of a constitution that would enshrine mixed government. Before closing this section of his speech, he also quoted from an unnamed "famous demagogue" who promoted the French Revolution's anti-aristocratic philosophy and contributed to the devastation of France.[109] To Dufresne, democracy and demagoguery were closely tied to anti-Christian philosophies, and were trying to defeat the Confederation scheme's contrasting principles. Like the other founders,

---

[108] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 61.
[109] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 930.

Dufresne's skeptical view of human nature was part of his firm support for British mixed government over democratic and republican forms.

The theory of the British constitution simply made sense to minds like Dufresne's. It was so for both Protestants and Catholics, although the Catholics more determinedly spoke out against democracy. For decades, the Church had been in conflict with liberal, nationalist, and revolutionary ideologies in Europe that were all connected to the philosophy of popular sovereignty. These forces were challenging the "territorial and institutional interests" and "spiritual values represented by the church," and were denounced by both the current pope, Pius IX (1846-1878), and by his predecessor, Gregory XVI (1831-1846).[110] The political experiences of their Church and the proclamations of their popes gave Catholic members a particularly strong aversion to democracy. Protestants drew on basic Biblical principles and observed the destructive results of democratic revolutions in France and the United States to oppose democratic government. In forming their opinions, they did not, however, feel the influence of the officially anti-democratic Church hierarchy that Catholics did.

Another area that showed the importance of Christian belief to the founders' political thought was the importance they placed on religious liberty as a key feature of Confederation. It was, first of all, an end in itself. Scoble felt the founders were too concerned with religious liberty "to trespass on the rights of conscience, or to allow of state interference in matters of such transcendent importance as our relation to the Divine Being, and the service and worship we owe to Him." He said that "the most precious of all liberties" was "the right to worship God according to the dictates of our conscience, without let or hindrance from each other or the state."[111] For Protestants, religious liberty was a tenet of evangelical faith. For Catholics, it was a necessity in

---

[110] Paul E. Sigmund, "The Catholic Tradition and Modern Democracy," *The Review of Politics* 49, no. 4 (Autumn, 1987): 535-36.
[111] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 907.

a non-Catholic majority state. For both, it was essential to harmonious and just government in the new dominion.

The second reason why the founders valued religious liberty so much related to the ancient understanding of the relationship between good polity and good citizens. For many of the founders, Christianity certainly was a sincere personal matter. Among the members of the legislature of the Province of Canada sat former ministers, anti-slavery activists, and temperance advocates, as well as average, devout believers. They did not see Christianity simply as a useful tool of social or cultural control. For them, it was both a matter of the heart, and an instrument favourable for the widespread cultivation of the virtue that was necessary for the nation they founded to flourish. In the case of the politician or statesman, faith served as a moral guide. For good government, it was necessary that the men responsible for 'steering the ship of the state' be virtuous men. As Jackson said, the proposed institutions were good, but still required good men to run them if they were to yield all the benefits they could.[112]

The founders recognized the need for morality in political affairs and affirmed its basis in their faith. Cartier conveyed his beliefs in an address at a banquet in honour of finance minister Alexander Tilloch Galt on 22 May 1867. He celebrated the constitution the Fathers of Confederation had made because it paid close attention to protecting the rights of religious minorities. The American constitution had not taken religion into account at all, he said, even while making clear his respect for the document. In Canada, the religious question was of the utmost importance because the freedoms of both Protestants and Catholics depended upon the cooperation of the other group. Moreover, the mutual respect of Protestant and Catholic Canadians came from their religions themselves. Cartier said that

---

[112] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 885-86.

Les droits et les libertés des individus sont basés sur la conscience des peuples, et cette conscience, ni les lois, ni les institutions, ni rien d'autre chose au monde ne peuvent l'influencer dans le sens de la justice comme la religion. Je ne parle pas ici de la religion catholique plus que de la religion protestante; j'affirme seulement que la religion doit diriger la conscience.[113]

Tolerance, and thus good government, came from a Christian sense of justice. For Canada's institutions to function properly, they had to be worked by the right sort of men. Cartier explained that the Fathers of Confederation made "des lois pour une population morale et religieuse," but asked if religion could be maintained in Canada without its maintenance in the schools, as the constitution provided for.[114] To Cartier, Canada's constitutional care for religion rendered it a more sure foundation for good government than in the United States.

The idea that more than a good constitution is necessary to run a good state is an ancient one. Aristotle wrote that "a city is excellent because the citizens who participate in the political system are excellent."[115] Virtuous citizens made for easy rule and peaceful government. He also stressed that it was best that people without both virtue and intelligence should not become rulers.[116] The Bible contains the same basic principles. Six hundred years before Aristotle, King Solomon wrote in the Book of Proverbs that "Righteousness exalteth a nation: but sin is a reproach to any people."[117] Of rulers, he said that "It is an abomination to kings to commit wickedness: for the throne is established by righteousness."[118] In the New Testament, Paul and Peter instruct believers to obey civil powers, recognizing them as instruments of God for the

---

[113] "The rights and the liberties of individuals are based on the conscience of peoples, and that conscience, neither laws, nor institutions, nor any other thing in the world can influence it in the sense of justice like religion. I do not speak here of the Catholic religion more than of the Protestant religion; I affirm only that religion must direct the conscience." Sir Georges Étienne Cartier, "Discours prononcé le 22 mai 1867 à un banquet offert a l'honorable M. Galt par les citoyens de Lennoxville," in Tassé, *Discours*, 535.
[114] They made "laws for a moral and religious population." Cartier, "Galt," 535.
[115] Aristotle, *Politics*, VII.13.35-10.
[116] Aristotle, *Politics*, III.11.25-30.
[117] Prov. 14:34.
[118] Prov. 16:12.

restraint of evil.[119] The difference between the Greek and the Judeo-Christian doctrines have to do with the sources of virtue and obligation. For Aristotle, man became virtuous first by having the capability to be so by nature, being human; second, by developing good habits; third, by his reason.[120] Virtue came from human ability. In the Bible, the equivalent concepts have to do with repentance and faith, and obedience to God according to His revealed plan - whether under the Old Testament Law, or in Christ in New Testament times. Virtue in the Bible is a product of following God's way of salvation and sanctification, as opposed to man's moral deductions. The Greek conception was more closely related to the Enlightenment one than to the Biblical. The Canadian cast of mind was more in accord with the Christian than with the classical tradition in this area of political philosophy. The founders of the Dominion were conscious of God's sovereignty over man's affairs. In their discussions on religious freedom and the place of the church within the state, they spoke of more than goodness for its own sake, or for that of social order. They were alert to higher responsibilities, and considered higher ends.

The Christian faith and ideas of the Canadian founders were, then, key to understanding the constitutional arrangements they made in 1867. They were not, as Ajzenstat suggested, Enlightenment men.[121] They openly criticized deistic and atheistic thinkers, and looked with disgust upon the revolutions they helped spark. Like Burke, they looked to traditional British and Christian ideas of polity, rejecting the humanistic foundations of the *philosophes*. They accepted the Bible's testimony to human nature's fallen state. This was a factor in their commitment to the British models of organic and mixed government. They also placed significant value on religious liberty as both an end in itself, and as the foundation of peace, order, and good government. At the same time, however, their assertions of the need for Christianity in Canada did not mean that

---

[119] Rom. 13:1-7. 1 Pet. 2:13-17.
[120] Aristotle, *Politics*, VII.13.40-45.
[121] Ajzenstat, *Canadian Founding*, xvi, 47, 182-83.

Canada was a 'Tory' or 'collectivist' state. The founders so often spoke of liberty. The difference was that the liberty they spoke of was not a modern libertarian's liberty. It was a freedom according to the revealed truth of religion. It was a liberty with acknowledged moral absolutes. Canada's founders upheld faith and individual freedom at the same time. They drew on and professed traditions of political thought, the foundations of which rested upon the truth of the Bible to a significant degree, and rejected Enlightenment deism and its associated political theories. Protestants and Catholics were in agreement on many of these basic points in principle, if not always in practice. Their distinctions did matter, and this became more clear as they manifested in discussions on the provisions to be made for denominational education rights in the new dominion.

Chapter 2: The Education Question and the Temporality of States

The recurrent education questions in Canadian history have not wanted for scholarship,

so it is in some respects odd that their manifestation at Confederation has not been examined in

detail. One major reason for this oversight is that the *Separate School Act*, the last piece of

legislation on the issue in the Canadas, was passed in 1863.[1] Attempts to amend it failed, and it

became the basis of the educational settlement that was enshrined in the British North America

Act. Despite the lack of legal changes since 1863, however, the issue did indeed present itself

over the next four years. Although members of the coalition government tried to avoid conflict

over schools during the province's Confederation debates in 1865, legislators continually raised

the issue to challenge them on it. In fact, the most tense moment of their discussions was sparked

by questions of church and state pertaining to education. The topic was so controversial because

it was so foundational to the way Canadian children would be brought up. It naturally

highlighted doctrinal divides between Protestants and Roman Catholics, and raised questions of

truth, justice, and conscience.

This chapter analyzes the ideas behind stances on education at Confederation. Religious

beliefs created and intensified this question of group rights. They made the issue take on an

importance far above the mere logistics of school access. The founders commonly acknowledged

---

[1] Irish Catholic Richard William Scott introduced the bill. In its original form, it "smacked unmistakably of the rankest ultramontanism." The three key clauses would have made priests *ex officio* school trustees, given the Roman Catholic Church control over curriculum and regulations, and exempted separate schools from designated holidays and vacation periods to let them determine their own instead. The bill caused much controversy. It was edited in committee, but the government members were still divided over whether to support it. Scott withdrew the bill after T. R. Ferguson and others opposed it at second reading in 1862. The next year, he introduced a version of it that worked out a compromise between Egerton Ryerson and the common school system, the government, and the Roman Catholic Church. Three fifths of Upper Canada remained against it, however, and it became an election issue that year. John S. Moir, *Church and State in Canada West: Three Studies in the Relation of Denominationalism and Nationalism, 1841-1867* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1968), 171-75. Brian P. Clarke, "Sir Richard William Scott," in *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 14 (University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–), accessed 29 November 2017, http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/scott_richard_william_14E.html.

the primacy of man's right relationship to God over the structure of the temporal state, but the hostility between Protestant voluntarist and Catholic ultramontane doctrines created conflict over the place faith would occupy in the new dominion.

Some traditional studies of church and state in Canadian education did include brief discussions of the 1865 debates, but did not look at the ideas involved in great depth. C. B. Sissons' *Church and State in Canadian Education*, published in 1959, was a thorough narrative and legal account of the history of education in all ten provinces. In the 160 pages he allocated to Ontario and Quebec, however, only four touched on the Confederation debates (with quotations making up half of them).[2] His commentary focused on the Roman Catholic voluntarist John Sandfield Macdonald's attempt at the close of the debates to amend the motion to accept the Quebec Resolutions because they perpetuated school privileges for minorities.[3] Sissons explained Sandfield Macdonald's feelings by linking them to nineteenth-century liberal political philosophy. Liberalism held that the only protection minorities could and should have was the ability to try and convince the majority of the justice of their cause.[4] John S. Moir's *Church and State in Canada West* contained less than a page on the 1865 debates. Moir summarized the progress of the debate, but did so vaguely and referred to few individual speakers.[5] He was focused on proving his interpretation of Canadian educational struggles as a conflict between "*centrifugal denominationalism*" and "*centripetal nationalism*."[6] Both books provided good narrative backgrounds to the education question at Confederation, but there is more about the

---

[2] C. B. Sissons, *Church and State in Canadian Education* (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1959), 53-56.
[3] As a (nominal) Catholic voluntarist, Sandfield Macdonald was an anomaly. His support for the separation of church and state stemmed from his individualist personality, his liberalism, and the ostracism of Roman Catholic Scots within the Church hierarchy. Bruce W. Hodgins, "John Sandfield Macdonald," in *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 10 (University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–), accessed 12 July 2017, http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/macdonald_john_sandfield_10E.html.
[4] Sissons, *Church and State*, 53-55.
[5] Moir, *Church and State*, 177-78.
[6] Moir, *Church and State*, xiii. Emphasis in original.

founders' ideas of conscience, justice, truth, and the proper relation of church and state that can be learned by an analysis of what they did not cover, and of those they did not examine.

More recently, historians have tried to address the philosophical groundings of education in Canada. They have provided social, cultural, and intellectual historical analyses, but have not done so for the Confederation debates. Allison Prentice framed religion and education as tools of social control in her history of Upper Canadian schools.[7] She wrote to understand "the ideas of Upper Canadian educators about nature and the state, about class, [about] society and human nature." She wanted to show how they shaped "the purposes and structure of the school systems which were one of the major legacies of their times to ours."[8] Prentice's social control approach was sustained in articles by historians like Neil McDonald and Albert F. Fiorino in the late 1970s. Both saw education as having been used primarily as a tool for creating and maintaining stability in social hierarchies.[9] Colin D. Pearce's article in a collection edited by David W. Livingstone and partly inspired by Azjenstat changed direction.[10] Pearce discussed the mindset of Egerton Ryerson, who was the Chief Superintendent of Education in Upper Canada and Ontario from 1844 to 1876. Ryerson believed Canadians received a heritage from the Greco-Roman and Judaeo-Christian traditions that it was the educational system's job to pass on. He developed a formula he called "Common Christianity," which would seek to instill in students knowledge of their heritage without raising controversies between different denominations.

---

[7] Allison Prentice, *The School Promoters: Education and Social Class in Mid-Nineteenth Century Upper Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014), 75, 184.

[8] Prentice, *School Promoters*, 22.

[9] Albert S. Fiorino, "The Moral Foundation of Egerton Ryerson's Idea of Education," in *Egerton Ryerson and His Times*, ed. Neil McDonald and Alf Chaiton (Toronto: Macmillan, 1978), 78. Neil McDonald, "Egerton Ryerson and the School as an Agent of Political Socialization," in McDonald and Chaiton, *Ryerson and His Times*104.

[10] David W. Livingstone, ed., *Liberal Education, Civic Education, and the Canadian Regime* (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2015), 4-5.

Pearce also remarked that Ryerson's view of Canada did not support Azjenstat's account of the merely political nationality.[11]

This chapter will take a different approach from those of Prentice and Pearce. With reference to the former, to apply a dichotomous model of analysis, whether based on class, economics, culture, or some combination of each, does not assist the purposes of this thesis. There is order in human history and human relations, but this order defies modeling. A predetermination to divide all history into sides of oppressor and oppressed twists and distracts, and shuns personality and free will. Concerning Pearce's work, this chapter will discuss the ideas of a broader range of men, and will endeavour to explain their often intense feelings in a broader historical and spiritual context. To properly understand the often dire tone of the education question during the Confederation debates, it is most helpful to try to understand the world as the speakers did. Rather than viewing the founders as cogs in social or cultural machines, a more direct visualization is needed. Put one way, it is necessary to understand that God *is* real and that man *is* responsible before Him, for this was reality as they knew it. Trying to step into the same perspective, then, can only serve to increase understanding of their ideas. The founders frequently spoke from deeply felt religious beliefs. This chapter's analysis will examine sincere convictions and realities, rather than using socio-cultural models.

In order to understand the education question in 1865, it is useful to understand its history up to that time. The state took control of education in the Canadas in 1841 with the passage of Solicitor General Charles Dewey Day's *Common School Act* during the first session of the new Canadian legislature. Day's Act created a single school system for both sections of the province, with separate schools for local religious minorities. Separate schools were a compromise

---

[11] Colin D. Pearce, "Canadian Guardian: The Educational Statesmanship of Egerton Ryerson," in Livingstone, *Liberal Education*, 118-19, 122-25.

resulting from Roman Catholic objections to the Bible's use in schools, and universal concern for

pupils to be taught by instructors of the same religion.[12] Within the next five years, however, the

sections of the province parted ways. Upper Canada established common schools for all children

with the option for the religious minorities of an area to form a separate school. Separate schools

remained under the authority of the common school system, but gave parents the power to secure

a teacher of the appropriate faith.[13] Lower Canada set up two school boards in each city to divide

the population into distinct Protestant and Catholic components. In rural areas, it created

common schools while allowing dissenting institutions (whether Protestant or Catholic, as the

case might be) to be formed.[14] The major difference between the two Canadas at Confederation

was that Upper Canadian common schools were 'secular,' while Lower Canadian ones were

Roman Catholic. Similarly, separate schools in Upper Canada were Roman Catholic, while those

in Lower Canada were mostly Protestant (though they could also be Catholic in Protestant

majority areas).[15]

Religious conflict over education was relatively mute until about 1850, when the forces

of Roman Catholic ultramontanism increasingly began to be felt in the Canadas. The reigning

pope was Pius IX (1846-1878), who rejected his earlier liberal tendencies after battles with

Italian liberals and nationalists. He became a firm advocate of the supremacy of the Church over

the state, and opposed modernity and secularization. In 1850, he appointed Armand Francois

Marie de Charbonnel as the second Roman Catholic Bishop of Toronto.[16] De Charbonnel put

continuous ultramontane pressure on the government. He repeatedly accepted, then rejected

---

[12] Moir, *Church and State*, 131-32.
[13] Sissons, *Church and State*, 17-18.
[14] Sissons, *Church and State*, 135-35.
[15] J. M. S. Careless, *Brown of the Globe*, vol. 1: *The Voice of Upper Canada, 1818-1859* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1959), 171.
[16] Moir, *Church and State*, 144-45.

school laws, seeking more and more Church control in the realm of education.[17] Catholic

campaigning managed to win the *Common School Act* of 1850, which made separate schools a

right, rather than an exception available for the protection of Catholic consciences.[18] In his 1856

Lenten Pastoral, de Charbonnel even told Catholics that they were "guilty of a *mortal* sin" if they

did not vote for candidates who supported separate schools for Upper Canadian Catholics.[19]

Rising Victorian evangelical fervour in the form of voluntarism countered ultramontane

pressures. Free Church Presbyterian George Brown and his newspaper *The Globe* were at the

forefront of the Protestant outcry.[20] In fact, it was one of the main issues that had convinced

Brown to run for provincial parliament.[21] Voluntarists believed that if church and state were not

kept strictly separate, their entanglement would create problems in both. Churches, they held,

should be supported only by the free will contributions of their conscientious members, not by

state funding.[22] Roman Catholic schools were a violation of the sacred principle of the separation

of church and state. Upper Canada feared that Church interference would destroy the secular

common school system and fracture the civic unity of Upper Canadians.

Contrary to widespread voluntarist sentiment, Lower Canadian legislators were bringing

religion into public life by forcing Upper Canada into accepting Catholic separate schools. It

seemed to voluntarists to be in alignment with the Papal Aggression Crisis of Pius IX in

Britain.[23] Upper Canada was continuously outvoted, including in what became the 'final

---

[17] Sissons, *Church and State*, 42.
[18] Careless, *Brown of the Globe*, vol. 1, 119-20.
[19] Sissons, *Church and State*, 42. Emphasis in original.
[20] Moir, *Church and State*, 154-55.
[21] Careless, *Brown of the Globe*, vol. 1, 129.
[22] Careless, *Brown of the Globe*, vol. 1, 123.
[23] The Papal Aggression Crisis refers to "the reinstitution of a national hierarchy for Roman Catholics" in Britain by Pope Pius IX in 1850. He created twelve dioceses, bishops over each, and a "Cardinal-Archbishop" over them all. The move sparked outcry among Anglicans and Dissenters. Britain had been without bishops and standard Church government for two centuries. Walter Ralls, "The Papal Aggression of 1850: A Study in Victorian Anti-Catholicism," *Church History: Studies in Christianity and Culture* 43, no. 2 (June, 1974): 243.

settlement' of the question, Irish Catholic Richard William Scott's *Separate School Act* of 1863.[24] This legislation gave additional powers to Catholic parents to protect their consciences, but its most ultramontane clauses were tempered and the common school system continued in authority over separate schools.[25] Scott's most important supporter was Thomas D'Arcy McGee, who hailed the act as a final settlement to protect Catholic consciences. The result was an election in which the cry of "No Popery" was powerful, Scott lost his seat, and the principle of the double majority was defeated. This last outcome eliminated one more option for solving the province's political deadlock, and led closer towards Confederation as the only solution.[26] As the Canadas' debate on the Quebec Resolutions began on 3 February 1865, however, agitation by the Roman Catholic hierarchy was already beginning anew.[27]

The schools question brought up issues of truth and freedom of conscience that the new constitution would have to address. Roman Catholics would not have their children taught by non-Catholic teachers. They did not believe in sending their children to schools where the Bible might be read independently from authorized Church notes on it.[28] On the other hand, ultramontane advances reminded Upper Canadian Protestants of past struggles with the Church of Rome, and made them concerned for the success of their current educational improvement scheme. Lower Canadian Protestants began to fear for their religious freedom. Both Protestants and Catholics, though, agreed on the importance of religion for training Canada's next generation. Upper Canada's common schools were 'secular,' but still operated with Ryerson's "Common Christianity." If schools were tools of nationalism, as Moir argued, they also

---

[24] Clarke, "Sir Richard William Scott."
[25] Sissons, *Church and State*, 48-50.
[26] Moir, *Church and State*, 174-75. W. L. Morton, *The Critical Years: The Union of British North America* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1964), 125-26.
[27] Sissons, *Church and State*, 51-53.
[28] Franklin A. Walker, *Catholic Education and Politics in Upper Canada: A Study of the Documentation Relative to the Origin of Catholic Elementary Schools in the Ontario School System* (Toronto: J. M. Dent, 1955), 88.

functioned under higher convictions. The problem arose as a result of conscientious doctrinal differences over the proper relation of church (and, Church) to state. The Catholic practice of maintaining institutional entanglements between the two, combined with Protestant opposition to it, created the need for a compromise that enshrined group rights in the constitution of the new dominion.

The records of the Charlottetown and Quebec Conferences show that the education question was brought up in both cases. At Charlottetown, Lieutenant-Governor Arthur Hamilton Gordon of New Brunswick reported that there was "a very great divergence of opinion" over local government powers, with Lower Canadians being the most outspoken delegates. Gordon listed education as the first in his list of the powers determined to be assigned to local control.[29] At Quebec, the matter was concluded when McGee moved to insert a clause that would prevent the provinces from reducing the educational rights possessed by minorities at the time Confederation would be enacted. The motion passed unanimously.[30] This gave the 1865 debates a sense of finality and urgency. Lower Canadian Protestants, especially, feared for their fate in the future Province of Quebec if they did not receive protections by law before the Canadas were divided.

On 23 November 1864, Finance Minister Alexander Tilloch Galt gave a speech at Sherbrooke to explain the agreements reached in the Quebec Resolutions. The speech set the stage for the education question in 1865 debates. When he came to education, Galt acknowledged that it was the most important and unnerving question for both the Protestants of Lower Canada, and the Roman Catholics of Upper Canada. Galt himself had a sincere "religious

---

[29] Lieut.-Governor Gordon to Edward Cardwell, 26 September 1864, in *Documents on the Confederation of British North America: A Compilation Based on Sir Joseph Pope's Confederation Documents Supplemented by Other Official Material*, ed. G. P. Browne (Montreal and Kingston: McGill Queen's University Press, 2009), 47-48.
[30] Hewitt Bernard's Minutes of the Quebec Conference, 10-29 October 1864, in Browne, 82. A. A. Macdonald's Notes on the Quebec Conference, 10-29 October 1864, in Browne, 50.

outlook on life." He was born in 1817 in Chelsea, England, as the son of a Scottish colonial promoter and overseer who brought his household to Canada in the 1820s. During his youth, his parents saw to his attendance at an Anglican seminary in Chambly, Lower Canada, but he did not regularly attend church in adulthood and does not seem to have had a strict denominational affiliation beyond being a Protestant. He was also an influential railway entrepreneur.[31] Galt voiced his sympathy for the concerns of both minorities by affirming that "There could be no greater injustice to a population than to compel them to have their children educated in a manner contrary to their own religious belief."[32] He promised that the union of the provinces would be based on "principles of common justice," and announced the government's promise to bring in a new law to safeguard the Protestants of Lower Canada. The measure would equalize the educational rights of the minorities in both provinces before Confederation was enacted.[33] He also said that doing injustice to either minority could not be done "without sowing the seeds of discord in the community, to an extent which would bear fatal fruit in the course of a very few years."[34]

Galt's words on justice were significant for understanding the influence of Christianity at the Canadian founding. Justice is an inherently moral concept. It speaks of the compliance of acts with the requirements of an absolute and objective moral law. Justice is upheld when offences against this law are redressed. It was clear when Galt labelled violations of religious freedom as the greatest of injustices that he was speaking from his conception of a Christian

---

[31] Hamilton Baird Timothy, *The Galts: A Canadian Odyssey*, vol. 2: *Alexander Tilloch Galt, 1817-1893. Elliott Torrance Galt, 1850-1928* (Toronto, McClelland and Stewart, 1977), 172-73. Jean-Pierre Kesteman, "Sir Alexander Tilloch Galt," in *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 12 (University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–, accessed June 30, 2017), http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/galt_alexander_tilloch_12E.html.

[32] Alexander T. Galt, *Speech on the proposed union of the British North American provinces delivered at Sherbrooke, C.E., by the Hon. A. T. Galt, minister of finance, 23rd November, 1864* (Montreal: M. Longmoore, 1864), 14.

[33] Galt, *Speech on the proposed union*, 14, 22.

[34] Galt, *Speech on the proposed union*, 14-15.

view of what is just. Christian belief added gravity to the concept of justice for Protestants and Catholics. The Roman Catholic Vicar-General Angus Macdonnell had written to John A. Macdonald saying that if the grievances of his religious cohorts were just, they had to be upheld in law, for "justice is not a relative thing but is absolute and immutable."[35] Seen in Christian perspective, justice has its source and legitimacy in the goodness of God. It is of eternal and supernatural consequence. The question of justice for religious minorities at Confederation was discussed so frequently and so seriously in the debates because it was a matter that transcended states and politics. Religious freedom was a higher concern than other affairs of state. Its importance sat on a plain above other constitutional questions.

The importance of Galt's promise to the 1865 debates provides a convenient way to trace the progress of the education question through them. At three points, Luther Hamilton Holton used it to question the government in his opposition to Confederation.[36] As a Unitarian, Holton was an extremely unorthodox figure for the time. He opposed the Confederation scheme for not first appealing to the people, and hoped to gain support for the Liberals by doing so. Indeed, he did gain support amongst Lower Canadian Protestants whose first concern was for their religious freedom.[37] The first of his three questions marked the opening of the issue on the first day of the debate on 3 February. It was followed initially by cautious references to it in the first five speeches by government members, and afterwards by the opening salvos of both Upper and Lower Canadians. His second question on 22 February was followed by additional queries by others who interrogated the government to assure that Protestant consciences would be secure in

---

[35] Walker, *Catholic Education*, 305.

[36] H. C. Klassen, "Luther Hamilton Holton," in *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 10 (University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–), accessed 4 April 2017, http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/holton_luther_hamilton_10E.html.

[37] Henry C. Klassen, *Luther H. Holton: A Founding Canadian Entrepreneur* (Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 2001), 7-8, 156-57, 163.

the future Province of Quebec. It was also between his first and second questions that the uncomfortable exchanges over the *Syllabus Errorum* occurred. After Holton's third question on 6 March came more determined opposition from Upper Canadian members, including Sandfield Macdonald's attempt at amendment in the last hours of the debate. In each of the three periods, the seriousness of educational rights to both Protestant and Catholic religious consciences emerged. They were aware throughout of principles that stood above the mechanics of their constitution-making.

Holton's first question and the responses it garnered summarized the main positions of the legislators. He said that he "did not like to introduce anything of religious character into discussions of this House," but that the Protestant minority in Lower Canada had to be considered. There was, he said, "no phase or feature of these threatened changes which excited so much alarm as this very question of education." He wanted to know whether the government would let the assembly see the new school law before they had to vote on the Quebec Resolutions. Holton correctly believed that it alone would determine how some members voted.[38] Normally, religious questions were avoided to keep conditions in the legislature conducive to making laws for the peace, order, and good government of the province. The goal of Confederation for the Canadas was in large part to solve their seeming inability to achieve these equilibriums. A new solution was vitally necessary to break the deadlock that had been reached. For many, however, the religious question came before even a solution to Canada's political troubles, for it stood above them. Church came before state.

John A. Macdonald replied to Holton that if Confederation were voted for, members would be presented with amendments to the current school law that would "operate as a sort of

---

[38] Legislature of the United Province of Canada, *Parliamentary Debates on the Subject of the Confederation of the British North American Provinces, 3rd Session, 8th Provincial Parliament of Canada* (Quebec: Hunter, Rose & Co., Parliamentary Printers, 1865), 17.

guarantee against any infringement by the majority of the rights of the minority in this matter."[39]

The *parti rouge* lawyer and journalist Antoine-Aimé Dorion immediately asked if the changes would apply to both Canadas, to which Macdonald said that he thought the Upper Canadian law would remain as it was, the minority there being content.[40] He then discussed Holton's other questions, but was brought back to education by Thomas Campbell Wallbridge, who latter called for a referendum on Confederation.[41] Wallbridge asked if there would be a constitutional guarantee for Roman Catholic separate schools in Upper Canada. Macdonald did not commit to anything beyond the promised law for Lower Canada.[42] The education issue automatically suggested a renewed assault on the separation of church and state to Clear Grits like Wallbridge.[43]

Brown and McGee were the next members to discuss education, and their positions on it served as examples of the religious energies driving the debate. Brown laid out the Upper Canadian, Protestant stance. He restated his longstanding support for the common school system, explaining his twofold concern about sectarianism. The fear was that, if Roman Catholics were granted separate school privileges, other denominations might complain as well, and the common school system would break down as each one expanded its educational claims. This first would be "most hurtful to the best interests of the province." It would be a powerful force against unity. Second, it would create "enormous expense" in supporting the teachers required for "so prodigal a system of public instruction" that would prove difficult to maintain. With one

---

[39] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 18.
[40] Jean-Claude Soulard, "Sir Antoine-Aimé Dorion," in *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 12 (University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–), accessed 12 July 2017, http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/dorion_antoine_aime_12E.html.
[41] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 659.
[42] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 18.
[43] Bruce W. Hodgins, "Lewis Wallbridge," in *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 11 (University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–), accessed 12 July 2017, http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/wallbridge_lewis_11E.html.

condition, Brown saw no reason why schools with pupils from multiple denominations should not be satisfactory. This condition was that a place was always maintained for conscientious Christian instruction. He said that

> I regard the parent and the pastor as the best religious instructors - and so long as the religious faith of the children is uninterfered [sic] with, and ample opportunity afforded to the clergy to give religious instruction to the children of their flocks, I cannot conceive any sound objection to mixed schools.[44]

His voluntarism was evident. Church and state had to be completely separate in order to prevent discord and corruption from arising in both, or disrupt pure religion in the church. Brown put Christian faith above the political-fiscal requirements of the ideal school system. The sacred trust between parent and child, and between church and individual was more important than any temporal arrangement.

Brown was unhappy with the current educational settlement. He registered his objection to Scott's 1863 bill for Upper Canada (he had been absent during the vote on it) and affirmed that the perpetuation of separate schools was "a blot on the scheme before the House." Nevertheless, he acknowledged that it was a compromise that had to be made. The current extent of separate schools was doing little damage and could be tolerated.[45] His views on the situation in Lower Canada, however, were different. He insisted that a new settlement was needed for the longstanding grievances of Protestants there. The constitution had to protect Protestant schools so as to protect them from being forced to choose between the Roman Catholic mainstream institutions, or no education at all.[46] The key difference between Brown's views on Upper and Lower Canadian education was that he was willing to compromise on national and fiscal arrangements, even if begrudgingly, but he was not willing to compromise on issues of religious

---

[44] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 95.
[45] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 95.
[46] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 95-96.

conscience. This position recurred throughout the debates. Education was about more than politics and economics - it was about eternal truth and man's free, conscientious response to it.

McGee's words on schools were fewer than Brown's. This was intriguing, for McGee was a former radical ultramontane who had moved to Canada largely to take advantage of - and even help extend - the educational rights Catholics possessed there.[47] He had been in alliance with Brown for a time as "a means to the end of improved schools," but split with him after the Scott bill. McGee had insisted that religious freedom required separate schools, while Brown argued that Protestants and Catholics should be educated in the same schools, with their consciences secure, rather than being separated by Roman Catholic interference.[48] In the Confederation debates, though, the coalition government tried to avoid raising a renewed controversy until after the Quebec Resolutions could be approved by parliament. McGee merely insisted on the goodwill of French Canadian Catholics and announced that he himself would "cordially second and support any such amendment, properly framed," as would be proposed to secure Protestant rights in Lower Canada. He believed that they had, "in some particulars," legitimate grievances, and just cause in seeking redress. He commented on Brown's speech, saying only that he himself accepted the 1863 settlement as final, thinking it fair and accommodating to all parties. He did not want to reopen the question. The only word McGee wished to add was that "if there are any special guarantees or grants extended to the Protestant minority of Lower Canada, I think the Catholic minority in Upper Canada ought to be placed in precisely the same position - neither better nor worse."[49] The cry for equality was the cry of Catholics throughout the rest of the debates. The Scott settlement had been deemed a satisfactory compromise, and Catholic

---

[47] David A. Wilson, *Thomas D'Arcy McGee*, vol. 1: *Passion, Reason, and Politics, 1825-1857* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2008), 354. David A. Wilson, *Thomas D'Arcy McGee*, vol. 2: *The Extreme Moderate, 1857-1868* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2011), 19.

[48] Wilson, *McGee*, vol. 2, 135-36.

[49] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 144.

consciences were secure. Even so, however, the campaign might gain for the Church more of the control over education that many Catholics believed it should properly have.

In 1865, the separate school system was a secure guarantee, so McGee did not speak about education philosophically or theologically. In 1858, however, when the Orangeman Thomas R. Ferguson proposed to abolish separate schools, he charged himself to do so to the utmost of his abilities.[50] The speech he gave expounded the Catholic mind on the subject. McGee based his argument on the "high ground of inherent right - of natural right which no law can take away," and which opposed what he saw as the state's attempt to make itself the sole teacher of the nation's children.[51] He appealed to the natural law he saw manifested in English common law and Blackstone's *Commentaries* as much as in the Catholic Council of Trent (1545-63). It declared that the parent is responsible for both educating and feeding the child. McGee said that "This double responsibility springs from the Christian institution of marriage, and no power on earth, civil or ecclesiastical, can dispense a parent in possession of his faculties from directing the education of his child."[52] He affirmed that the "Christian Family . . . [was] . . . the well-spring and the feeder of our hereditary civilization." The current system of state education, on the contrary, was the invention of anti-Christian men in Prussia and France. Atheistic countries enshrined "the principle of the infallibility of the State" that violated the pact contained in natural law.[53]

The concept of natural law is an ancient one with roots in Greek and Roman philosophy. Though it is not a Biblical doctrine, it also found widespread support in medieval theology. Its

---

[50] Carole B. Stelmack, "Thomas Roberts Ferguson," in *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 10 (University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–), accessed 10 May 2017, http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/ferguson_thomas_roberts_10E.html.

[51] Thomas D'Arcy McGee, "The Separate School Question," in *1825 - D'Arcy McGee - 1925: A Collection of Speeches and Addresses*, ed. Charles Murphy (Toronto: MacMillan, 1937), 153.

[52] McGee, "Separate School Question," 158-59.

[53] McGee, "Separate School Question," 155-56.

major proponents included men like Thomas Aquinas. The basic idea of natural law is that

immutable laws of nature exist above human laws and legitimize or delegitimize them in turn. At

the same time, these transcendent laws grant inviolable rights to individuals, as McGee affirmed

for parents.[54] Its Christian variant sees God as having made universal laws in His creation that

are self-evident to man's reason. Any laws made by human states that are not in accord with

God's natural law are not valid.[55] The problem with the theory is that different religious and

cultural traditions will deduce the natural law with differing degrees of agreement, thus

questioning the self-apparentness of its universality. Its formulation in the modern West, though,

was done from a Christian perspective.[56] When the founders appealed to natural law, they were

acknowledging a pre-existing, extra-human authority that stood above the laws they made.

McGee's speech also alluded to the eternal nature of the human soul. He cited Lord

Brougham, who said that education should "fit the child 'for the after life.'"[57] The definition

stopped at that point, but McGee did not. He put a rhetorical question to the house, asking

> what is 'after life'? Is it the life between the schoolhouse and the churchyard? Or
> does it reach far beyond - away into the limitless prospects of Eternity? I trust we
> all believe in the immortality of the human soul; and that none of us are content to
> rest on the giddy brink of the Utilitarian's definition of 'after life'.[58]

Human institutions were properly established when their framers worked with their provisional

nature in mind. The government of a state of Christians had to acknowledge the eternal. It had to

resolve that its high purpose was to provide a forum for men to best serve God and prepare for

life after death. Nowhere was this more the case than in education, for it was in the formative

---

[54] Paul Foriers and Chaim Perelman, "Natural Law and Natural Rights," in *Dictionary of the History of Ideas*, vol. 3, ed. Philip P. Wiener (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1973), 14, 25, accessed 9 May 2017, http://xtf.lib.virginia.edu/xtf/view?docId=DicHist/uvaBook/tei/DicHist3.xml;chunk.id=dv3-04;toc.depth=1;toc.id=dv3-04;brand=default.

[55] Peter J. Stanis, *Edmund Burke and the Natural Law* (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1965), 5-7.

[56] Foriers and Perelman, "Natural Law," 17-19.

[57] McGee, "Separate School Question," 154.

[58] McGee, "Separate School Question," 154-55.

years that children could most easily be led away from a sound faith in God. The danger of mixed schools, McGee said, was that, while all are created equal, all are not moral equals. Mixing children of low moral calibre with children of the opposite would be corrupting to the latter. The most moral solution was to allow parents complete freedom to choose the most moral and conscientious route through which to educate their children.[59]

McGee ended with a stark illustration of his point. Though he believed children's lungs made them buoyant in water, he would not throw a child into a lake to see if he would float. Such absurd trials were "desperate experiments, which I cannot try with my own flesh and blood and with the immortal spirits committed during their helplessness to my care."[60] Exposing a child to corrupting education risked drowning him spiritually. McGee's philosophy of education went beyond disagreements over mere temporal forms and rights. Its roots were far more fundamental.

McGee's 1858 speech set political theory in the light of faith's primacy. He rejected theories that saw education as a tool to support a state's form of government and acculturate immigrants. Schools buttressed mob rule in US democracy and despotic tyranny in Russian autocracy.[61] French atheists exalted the democratic state and solidified their regimes by tailored education of the nation's children. This was anathema to God's natural law and the Christian family. McGee warned that "[a]n all-devouring uniformity is the passion of a democrat."[62] Democracy, authoritarianism, and anti-Christian philosophies had close links for him. McGee's Canada was better than democratic, and better than secular. Its Christian faith and British mixed government would be its defining features. It was defined in opposition to America as a *more* Christian state, rather than a less. Of course, his perspective grew out of his fervent Catholicism.

---

[59] McGee, "Separate School Question," 160. The founders' strong belief in difference, and specifically in moral difference, is a subtle but important issue that deserves further study.
[60] McGee, "Separate School Question," 161.
[61] McGee, "Separate School Question," 155.
[62] McGee, "Separate School Question," 157.

He had spent years of his life fighting what he saw as the anti-Christian, secularizing forces of United States Protestantism that were determined to destroy the "One True Faith" of Rome.[63]

After the opening speeches of 1865, opponents of Confederation used the education question as one of their objections. Lawyer and poet Louis-Auguste Olivier gave his support for the 'equal rights' cause.[64] He would not, he said, "vote for a Constitution which would not confer on the Catholics of Upper Canada the same advantages as are possessed by the Protestants of Lower Canada." He insisted that the issue be resolved before the vote on Confederation.[65] The influential Irish Catholic businessman Thomas Ryan announced that he had been in contact with Roman Catholic clergymen, and said that they would not oppose justice for the Protestant minority, but that they likewise insisted on "the same privileges" being given to the Catholic minority.[66] Luc Letellier de St. Just, a Catholic notary whose Liberal positions the clergy disapproved of, said that "it is a well known fact, that it is religious differences which have caused the greatest troubles and the greatest difficulties which have agitated the people in days gone by." The Protestant minority was not irrational to demand constitutional protections instead of relying on Catholic good will alone. Catholics would not settle for such if they were put in the same position. St. Just insisted religious concerns be dealt with before the Confederation vote.[67] He motioned to postpone the address to the Queen approving the Quebec Resolutions until

---

[63] Wilson, *McGee,* vol.1, 295.

[64] *Dictionnaire des parlementaires du Québec de 1792 à nos jours*, s.v. "Louis-Auguste Olivier" (National Assembly of Quebec, 2009), accessed 13 July 2017, http://www.assnat.qc.ca/en/patrimoine/anciens-parlementaires/olivier-louis-auguste-303.html.

[65] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 177.

[66] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 335. Gerald J. J. Tulchinsky and Alan R. Dever, "Thomas Ryan," in *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 11 (University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003-), accessed 10 May 2017, http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/ryan_thomas_11E.html.

[67] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 188. Robert Rumilly, "Luc Letellier de Saint-Just," in *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 11 (University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–), accessed 10 May 2017, http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/letellier_de_saint_just_luc_11E.html.

several items were made clear. The second one of these insisted on the details of the education

settlement promised by Galt at Sherbrooke. The amendment failed on a division of 38 to 20.[68]

Liberals Dorion and James George Currie had more pointed words on the subject. Dorion

strategically expressed his support for the Protestants of Lower Canada. He said he knew that

"majorities are naturally aggressive and . . . the possession of power engenders dispotism [sic]."

He affirmed that protections should be put in place to prevent harm being done if French

Canadian good will wore out.[69] Dorion was an example of one who did not oppose the separation

of church and state out of evangelical fervour, but rather as a result of his adherence to

liberalism. He was a liberal Roman Catholic.[70] Currie, a lawyer and militia officer, asked why

the government was not letting the legislature or the people see the education law promised

before the Confederation vote.[71] He said that he was unable to "see the propriety" of the present

legislative program.[72] Currie's remark was part of the debate he engaged in following an

amendment he had proposed to postpone Confederation until the will of the people could be

more fully known.[73] Later in the day's exchanges, Olivier again rose and declared that they were

not being presented with the complete scheme for Confederation, as proven by the lack of

definitive answers on education. Without surety about how the religious minorities in both

sections were to be protected, he called it a "sacred duty" to vote for Currie's delay.[74] He was not

---

[68] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 189. It appears that Billa Flint, MLA for Trent, was mistakenly counted as being both for and against.
[69] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 250.
[70] Soulard, "Dorion."
[71] Charles Herbert Mackintosh, ed., *The Canadian Parliamentary Companion and Annual Register, 1877* (Ottawa: Citizen Print. and Pub. Co., 1877), fiche, 253, CIHM no. 32951.
[72] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 272.
[73] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 269.
[74] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 311.

opposed to Confederation itself, but insisted on knowing the full version of its proposed form.[75]

Currie's amendment was defeated on a vote of 31 to 19.[76]

Billa Flint, a Wesleyan Methodist who helped found the Canadian Temperance League in 1845, opposed any extension of separate school privileges and voted against Confederation as a result.[77] He thought that education should not be mentioned in the constitution, but rather left to the provinces. Flint held that systems formulated on the common school principle, without anything that might offend different religious sensibilities, would be best. He objected to the principle of separate schools, stating "the children of our common country should grow up together and be educated together." Granting "exclusive rights and privileges" to special groups "had a tendency to weaken the good feeling which should subsist between all classes of the community, and which is now seen in the demand from both sections for different systems of education."[78] For him, security of conscience was not in question for Upper Canada. It seemed essentially a given. The major concern was to secure peace and unity in the new dominion.

After Holton first raised the question of the government's plan for education, both Catholics and Protestants showed their deep concern for faith in Canada. Catholics sought a positive role for religion, and one that involved greater Church control over schools. Protestants, however, affirmed a negative one that would guard against state interference with true faith, and church interference with national unity. Not every member spoke from personal religious convictions, but it was the influence of voluntarism and ultramontanism among many of them that gave the question its intensity. The clash between these two doctrines came out most dramatically in an exchange after Holton's second prodding. Before it did, however, there was

---

[75] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 311-12.
[76] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 316.
[77] Larry Turner, "Billa Flint," in *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 12 (University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–), accessed 4 April 2017, http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/flint_billa_12E.html.
[78] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 320.

another discussion of religious conscience that ensued as Liberal-Conservative commercial lawyer John Rose of the Lower Canadian Protestant minority responded to Holton's instigation to question the government on education.[79]

Rose raised complaints on behalf of Lower Canadian Protestants. He asked Cartier whether non-resident owners of a property under the promised legislation would have the ability to choose to have their education taxes support a dissenting school.[80] To this, Cartier answered that such was the government's intention. Rose's second question was whether or not the bill would address perceived unfairness in the way taxes from companies were distributed. Cartier again replied it would. The final question was the most important. Rose asked if "a more direct control over the administration and management of the dissentient schools in Lower Canada will not be given to the Protestant minority; whether in fact they will not be left in some measure to themselves." Cartier circumspectly affirmed that Protestants would be given "such management and control over their schools as will satisfy them."[81] Rose ended his questions on schools announcing that he was cheered by the ministry's responses and confident of the good will of the Lower Canadian majority.[82] He had moved rapidly through his concerns and had been assured they would be met. At the same time, though, he had clearly put forward the anxieties of Protestants whose consciences would move them if they were forced to pay for Catholic schools, or were forbidden full control over their own. The funding issues were less crucial than problems like those McGee had spoken about in 1858, but Protestants might still end up paying for others' children to be educated in a religion they did not believe in. Even this seemingly trivial offence to their sense of truth was important to Canada's founders.

---

[79] David M. L. Farr, "Sir John Rose," in *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 11 (University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–), accessed 13 July 2017, http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/rose_john_11E.html.
[80] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 410.
[81] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 411.
[82] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 412.

The second major exchange after Holton's second question resulted in one of the most contentious discussions in the 1865 debates. It was sparked by Col. Frederick W. Haultain's attempt on 3 March to expound the Protestant mind as McGee had the Catholic in 1858.[83] Haultain was a devout Presbyterian who later served as secretary in the Presbyterian Church's French Canadian Missionary Society. He had also been a Clear Grit supporter of Brown.[84] He began cautiously and politely, wishing "to speak openly and honestly," but "with all kindliness and feeling" towards Lower Canadians. On education as on no other point of Confederation, he said, he felt nervous about the security of Protestant interests.[85] Despite continued assurances of French Canadian goodwill and tolerance, men he discussed the issue with told him that there was "a very decided under-hand obstructiveness" to the extension of Protestant education.[86] Saying he felt their fears were reasonable, Haultain began to ease into the central issue. What gave their concerns merit was the fact that Roman Catholics "receive from the head of the Romish Church their inspiration; they are guided by principles that are laid down, and that are from time to time publically promulgated by the head of that Church." Again saying he wanted "to speak honestly, but, of course, courteously," he said there should be no surprise to Lower Canadians that Protestants were afraid, "[b]ecause they must themselves be aware what are the principles of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy." Charles Joseph Alleyn, an Irish Catholic lawyer who had once called religion "the cornerstone of education," interrupted to ask what these principles were.

---

[83] Later on, Congregationalist John Scoble said that he thought Haultain had accurately explained Protestant fears, even if he did not share the same degree of concern over the *Syllabus Errorum*'s significance. Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 911-12.

[84] Sandra E. Perry and Jessica J. Craig, *The Mantle of Leadership: Premiers of the North-West Territories and Alberta, 1897-2005* (Legislative Assembly of Alberta, 2006), 161-62. Haultain's family had a military tradition, and members of it had achieved high ranks in the service. Col. Haultain must not, however, be confused with his more famous son Sir Frederick William Alpin Gordon Haultain, who became the only premier of the Northwest Territories before Alberta and Saskatchewan were formed.

[85] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 640.

[86] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 640-41.

Haultain replied with brevity: "[t]hey are not tolerant."[87] The assembly then went silent with "[m]urmurs of disapprobation from various parts of the House."[88]

After the murmurs died down, Haultain was able to clarify what he meant. Alleyn quickly demanded whether Presbyterian churches were more tolerant, and if Haultain spoke of civil or religious tolerance. Haultain replied that the two were "so bound up that you cannot separate them." He was then asked for a direct statement that the Roman Catholic Church was intolerant of both civil and religious liberty. At this point, Haultain cited from article 10, section 78 of the Pope's recently issued *Syllabus Errorum*, which condemned Catholic countries that granted freedom of worship to non-Catholic immigrants.[89] The *Syllabus* had been issued on 8 December 1864 along with the papal encyclical *Quanta Cura*. In it, Pope Pius IX attacked a host of modern ideas, including freedom of the press, free speech, liberty of conscience, divorce, and the idea that education should be conducted by the state only.[90] Haultain asked Catholic members to consider the seriousness of the matter to Protestants in face of these declarations by the head of their Church. He asked them to imagine what their feelings would be if they themselves faced a similar declaration by a majority of Protestants. Meanwhile, he received "[r]enewed murmurs of disapprobation" and mocking cries of "[h]ear! hear!"[91] Haultain was then interrupted as Cartier affirmed the tolerance of Lower Canadians. Despite his Victorian politeness, he seemed almost insulted that it should have been insinuated otherwise. Sandfield Macdonald interjected to ask who actually spoke for Lower Canadian Protestants, Haultain or Cartier, and Alleyn tried to lighten the mood by proposing "that this part of the discussion be postponed till Sunday." It was

---

[87] Marcel Plouffe, "Charles Joseph Alleyn," in *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 11 (University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–), accessed 10 May 2017, http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/alleyn_charles_joseph_11E.html. Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 641.

[88] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 641.

[89] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 641.

[90] Alexander T. Galt, *Church and State* (Montreal: Dawson Brothers, 1876), 3, 16-17.

[91] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 641.

then that Haultain was able to make a new injunction for seriousness and begin trying to extract confessions of tolerance from Canadian Catholics.[92]

If religious relations in the new dominion were to be peaceful, Haultain said, it was necessary to speak frankly about them before Confederation was approved. He directly asked Alleyn if he agreed with the section he had quoted from the *Syllabus*. Alleyn said that he had not read the document, but that he was "in favor [sic] of liberty of conscience to the fullest extent."[93] In the discussion that followed, Haultain made two requests to the Roman Catholics of the house. The first was that they become familiar with the *Syllabus* and its declarations. The second was to issue an official statement of their stance on it. He hoped that this would be to "practically disavow it," however difficult that might prove to be for them. With an exchange of controlled compliments and assurances, the members attempted to move on and let Haultain finish the rest of his speech.[94] It was a testament to the maturity of Victorian manners and the spirit of compromise prevalent at Confederation that they could raise and dismiss such a tense debate while maintaining a level demeanor.

Before Haultain could continue, however, the *bleu* lawyer Paul Denis spoke up to register an objection.[95] If the Roman Catholic Church could be criticized in parliament, he asked why other churches should not be so also. It had been wrong, he said, for Haultain to voice his private opinion on business particular to the Church. Arousing suspicion was not conducive to well-reasoned discussion, and tended to provoke strife. His challenge received a firm and brief reply from Haultain, who wished to move on. He said that

---

[92] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 642.
[93] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 642.
[94] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 643.
[95] *Dictionnaire des parlementaires du Québec de 1792 à nos jours*, s.v. "Paul Denis" (National Assembly of Quebec, 2009), accessed 13 July 2017, http://www.assnat.qc.ca/en/deputes/denis-paul-2837/biographie.html.

whenever any one who has the right or authority to speak for Protestants enunciates such a doctrine as that which has emanated from the Pope of Rome, I am quite willing it should be thrown in my teeth on the floor of this House. . . . what [my honourable friend] ought to have been aware of, [was] that there is no analogy whatever - no similarity whatever - between the Pope of the Church of Rome and any minister of any other body of Christians.[96]

This last part of the *Syllabus Errorum* episode showed the root of the problem. Protestantism and Catholicism were two fundamentally different systems that were opposed to one another. Their very definitions implied conflict. Catholicity refers to universality, while Protestants obtained their title from protest against Roman Catholic rule and doctrine.

The whole affair exhibited at least two features of the Protestant-Catholic divide at Confederation. The first was that the structure of the Roman Catholic Church, and the doctrines it held, were sources of tension. The Church's doctrine had always supported linkages between church and state, and again the Pope had straightly declared its position with ultramontane determination. Many Protestant denominations also had a history of linking powers spiritual and temporal. It was in the Protestant world, however, that freedom of religion had so far developed, and voluntarism so triumphed, as was evident in Haultain's speech. The Catholic denial of, or at least soft adherence to, the doctrine of the separation of church and state created a problem. Both Protestants and Catholics at Confederation openly held that their country must keep a place for religion. Both, however, had different beliefs about what arrangement of church-state relations would best support that conviction. Given their mutual consciousness of God's immanency, conflict was inevitable if a palatable compromise were not reached.

The second aspect of the incident exhibited the contradiction between local and global Catholic positions. Lower Canadian Catholics repeatedly and even boastfully declared how tolerant they were, had been, and would be. Protestant members like Haultain often received

---

[96] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 644.

72

these proclamations and attested to their validity. Nevertheless, there was a contradiction between what issued from the mouths of Canadian Catholics and what came from the Vatican. The very nature of the Roman Catholic power structure created contradictions and controversies.

Between the *Syllabus* exchange and the end of the debate on the Quebec Resolutions, there was relatively little said on the subject of education. The new week opened with John A. Macdonald discussing the impact of the defeat of Samuel Leonard Tilley's pro-Confederation government in New Brunswick.[97] When Holton asked a third time about education, he was told that the law promised at Sherbrooke would not be brought forward this session. Holton raised what Galt called a "paltry quibble" over what he saw as a broken promise by the government.[98] The house quickly moved on, however. The few members who did mention education afterwards did so with brevity, but continued to raise issues of conscience and civil peace. The most novel contribution that directly presented a philosophy of education was made by the *bleu* lawyer Louis-Charles, Boucher De Niverville.[99] The debate then closed with attempts to amend the main motion that specifically referenced the educational settlement.

Three new members from Upper Canada made statements on schools in their speeches. Hope Fleming Mackenzie of North Oxford, the brother of future Prime Minister Alexander Mackenzie, felt that public opinion in his section, even including that of Catholics, was for the common school system.[100] He thought that "there should be no element of sectarianism," and that the common school principle was able to solve all disagreements. He was not prepared to reject Confederation on this question, though. If separate schools expanded no farther than at present,

---

[97] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 648-50.
[98] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 660-62.
[99] *Dictionnaire des parlementaires du Québec de 1792 à nos jours*, s.v. "Louis-Charles Boucher de Niverville" (National Assembly of Quebec, 2008), accessed 13 July 2017, http://www.assnat.qc.ca/en/deputes/boucher-de-niverville-louis-charles-2207/biographie.html.
[100] Careless, *Brown of the Globe*, vol. 1, 327. Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 680.

they could be pardoned.[101] There was no danger to religious conscience, at least, so Mackenzie was willing to compromise.

Liberal James L. Biggar, however, was not.[102] He had voted against Scott's bill and had promised his constituents never to vote for separate schools. His promise stayed with him, and he was willing to risk losing his seat over it. Biggar declared that he was "responsible to the people that sent me here, and to a higher power," and that he was "not going to be coerced into giving a vote which I cannot approve."[103] His stance based on his individual responsibility before God showed another way faith influenced politics at Confederation. The third Upper Canadian member, Conservative engineer Aquila Walsh, merely registered his support for the justice of the Protestant minority's desire for tax protections.[104] He said that he would feel unfairly treated if he were "called upon to contribute by taxation to the support of schools to which I could not conscientiously send my children."[105] The issue was not at the point, however, that it would keep him from voting for Confederation.[106]

De Niverville's remarks on education were both more positive and more philosophical. He extolled the freedoms of the British Constitution and their sure ability to preserve French Canadian cultural identity. He was confident in the plan presented in the Quebec Resolutions, but wished to offer another word of assurance to French Canadians who were not. Besides their freedoms and judicial rights, he said, they were guaranteed "one infallible means" to protect their language, religion, and laws: their educational rights. He defined education with a wide meaning. It included the learning children acquired from their parents, the formal education they received

---

[101] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 679-80.
[102] Henry J. Morgan, ed., *The Canadian Parliamentary Companion* (Montreal: J. Lovell, 1874), 128-29.
[103] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 883.
[104] Hartwell Bowsfield, "Aquila Walsh," in *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 11 (University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–), accessed 13 July 2017, http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/walsh_aquila_11E.html.
[105] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 808.
[106] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 810.

in schools and colleges, and the wisdom people gained through experience in business. De Niverville appealed to the "laws of Nature" to support his assertion that education would preserve French Canadian character. What was learned in the natural course of life, he said, "never fades from the mind on which it has been impressed - it remains fixed on the memory, like the characters which we engrave on the bark of a young tree, and which are found long years after, when it falls under the woodman's axe."[107] Control of a people's education was control of their very being. It was education, too, that "renders nations prosperous, rich and great, which elevates them to the rank of which they are worthy, and maintains them in it." The word "worthy" was important. As McGee had affirmed, the founders were convinced of the existence of moral difference. De Niverville's path to success was through "that education - Christian, moral and religious - which is so carefully, wisely and anxiously instilled into us."[108] It was not just any schooling that would produce the best kind of person. De Niverville's briefly stated philosophy showed another reason why education was looked upon with the utmost importance at Canada's founding.

De Niverville's ideas, and those McGee put forward in 1858, were a close parallel to the explanation of the question given by *bleu* journalist Joseph-Édouard Cauchon in an extended pamphlet he published around the time the debates began.[109] In it, Cauchon explained that the concession of denominational educational rights had been a necessary one. Confederation would have been "impracticable" for French Canadians if they had not been guaranteed control over the education of their children. This was the case "because education is society itself in a state of

---

[107] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 951.
[108] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 951.
[109] Taché opened the debate on 3 February 1865, and the translator's note in Cauchon's pamphlet is dated 15 February 1865. De Niverville spoke on Friday, 11 March 1865. Joseph-Édouard Cauchon, *The Union of the Provinces of British North America*, trans. George Henry Macaulay (Quebec: Hunter and Rose, 1865), v. Andrée Désilets, "Joseph-Édouard Cauchon," in *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 11 (University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–), accessed 13 July 2017, http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/cauchon_joseph_edouard_11E.

infancy." He continued, saying that education "comprises in its meaning and import manners, feelings, tendencies, and the works of generations still unborn."[110] Here he shared the organic view of society submitted by De Niverville, and put forward the same views McGee and De Niverville had when they appealed to natural law. In fact, Cauchon used much the same language as McGee had. He was relieved that the "rights of parents" had won out at the Quebec Conference, and that they did not need to fear that "the child might be taken away forcibly from its father and mother, to be instructed under a radical system, where the name of God and sacred symbols are not invoked."[111] His references to a secular, "radical system" showed the influence of the ultramontane Catholic thinking of the day. This radical system was the Protestant-supported common school system with the Common Christianity of Egerton Ryerson. Catholics and Protestants both wanted Christianity to maintain a prominent place in their country, but their doctrinal differences made necessary a group rights compromise over its place in education.

The education question was the last issue in the 1865 debates. In the final minutes of the house's sitting on 14 March, former premier John Sandfield Macdonald rose to propose an amendment to the address to the Queen. He believed that restricting the power of the majority in each province to legislate on the schools of the religious minority would be a source of strife. Examples from the history of the United States and the Canadas showed that "a denial of the right of the majority to legislate on any given matter has always led to grave consequences." In the US, the Constitution forbade Congress to legislate on slavery. Abolitionist movements had grown until the Civil War resulted. In the Canadas, the Clergy Reserve question had provoked the Rebellion of 1837-38. It was natural for the majority to rule. When it did not, conflict ensued as attempts were made to alter the *status quo*. Moreover, when certain groups were granted

---

[110] Cauchon, *Union of the Provinces*, 119-120.
[111] Cauchon, *Union of the Provinces*, 120.

special privileges, others would agitate for rights of their own. Sandfield Macdonald appealed to the house, saying "It is our duty, sir, to see a question which affects us so dearly as the education of our children - a question which has before now created no little excitement in Upper Canada - shall not be withdrawn from the management of the Local Legislature."[112] Instead of restricting provincial power with McGee's clause, he said, the minorities of each province should be left to argue their own cause, and to rely on the goodwill of the majority and the protection of the Crown.[113]

Before the vote, Alexander Mackenzie rose to oppose Sandfield Macdonald's amendment. He accused him of trying to provoke party strife in Upper Canada to defeat Confederation. He said that he should have fought harder when there was still the possibility of stopping separate schools. Mackenzie said that he himself was still personally against them, but that their very limited extent was doing little harm to the common school system. Though Confederation would engrain them, it might actually improve the situation for Upper Canada by preventing their further expansion and giving the province more room to legislate on them without interference from Lower Canadian members. It would at least freeze the incremental progress of separate schools and "substitute certainty for uncertainty." Sandfield Macdonald's amendment was overwhelmingly defeated on a vote of 95 to 8. The *rouge* Francois Bourassa then moved an amendment that the Catholic minority in Upper Canada be "placed on the same footing" as the Protestants of Lower Canada," which was defeated 85 to 20.[114] The unrecorded division on the main motion was then taken and passed.[115]

---

[112] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 1025.
[113] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 1025-26.
[114] Lionel Fortin, "François Bourassa," in *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 12 (University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–), accessed 13 July 2017, http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/bourassa_francois_12E.html.
[115] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 1026-27.

At least two points are worth highlighting from these last exchanges. First, they again showed the importance members placed on the religious question, as well as their willingness to compromise when religious conscience was not seriously in danger. Sandfield Macdonald was not afraid directly for freedom of religion. His voluntarism did not stem from the doctrines of his religious beliefs. He was a "nominal Catholic" who had attended a grammar school under a Church of Scotland minister, and had acquired an "independent, undisciplined spirit" during his youth that he frequently expressed.[116] His objections stemmed from his personality, and from the Victorian liberalism he held to that had been so influenced by Protestant voluntarism.[117] Mackenzie, on the other hand, left the Church of Scotland early in his life and became a devout Baptist. He also became a follower of George Brown during the days of the "crusade for responsible government, religious and civil liberty, and separation of church and state."[118] In 1865, though, Mackenzie spoke for a happy medium without mentioning any fears for conscience. Both men's views might have been different had they spoken about Lower Canadian Protestants, but the Sherbrooke promise kept that issue from becoming worrisome enough to make many members vote against Confederation based on it alone.

The second point worth noting is how the incident spoke to the nature of the Canadian federalist arrangement. The founders of the new dominion as a whole acknowledged the importance of Christian belief and values by enshrining protections for Christian minorities in their federal constitution. This was, though, only a general acknowledgement that let the provinces take their own positions on their particular religious identities. The Canadian Confederation was in one sense a federation of Christian denominations under one generally Christian tent.

---

[116] Bruce W. Hodgins, *John Sandfield Macdonald, 1812-1872* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971), 4, 7-8.
[117] Sissons, *Church and State*, 53-55.
[118] Dale C. Thomson, *Alexander Mackenzie: Clear Grit* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1960), 9, 26.

In the education debates of 1865, then, the question of the relation between religion and education was tied up with higher questions. It brought to mind man's eternal destination. It set nation-building in a grander, nobler perspective that held the security of man's conscience before God as a matter of prime importance. The highest cause of man was to know and serve God rightly, and his doing so would inevitably be impacted by the influences he received during his schooling. For many, security of conscience in education made Confederation a 'take it or leave it' issue. When it seemed that religious freedom would be put in jeopardy, they determinedly sought redress or delay. Whether in a positive or a negative sense, the founders sought to preserve a place for religious truth to be openly and widely expressed in Canada. The premise of many of them was, in any case, that God was as real and present as the room they were in, and that the new dominion had to recognize its constitution-making responsibilities in light of that fact. The education question was indeed about the age-old issue of group minorities, but it was about more than that. It was an issue of faith and truth.

If enough members in 1865 were satisfied that religious consciences would be secure in the future provinces of Ontario and Quebec, however, final settlement proved elusive over the next two years. In July of 1866, the promised bill was put forward to address the grievances of the Lower Canadian Protestant minority. Likewise, another one was submitted for Upper Canadian Catholics that contained a number of ultramontane clauses. Both, however, were defeated. The 1863 settlement remained.[119] In the meantime, as the delegates prepared to draft the British North America Act at the London Conference, Protestants cried for protections. The Provincial Association of Protestant Teachers of Lower Canada sent Governor-General Monck a petition to the Queen. It complained of the difficulty in starting denominational schools, the unfairness of being taxed for Catholic schools, and the "alarmed" state they found themselves in

---

[119] Moir, *Church and State*, 178-79.

with regard to the air of finality in the Quebec Resolutions. Current conditions were even causing some Protestants to leave Quebec, and others not to settle there. The petitioners requested constitutional guarantees that their taxes would only fund Protestant schools unless they approved otherwise, and that provincial grants to educational institutions would be distributed in proportion to population. They also asked for general protections for their interests in funding, school management and general administration, as well as the establishment of new institutions.[120]

At London, Galt was able to have an amendment approved that added additional clauses (Section 93, Subsections 2-4) to protect Protestants, but did not address the plea concerning taxation.[121] Subsection 2 declared that "All the powers, privileges and duties" of Upper Canadian separate schools were extended to "dissentient schools of the Queen's Protestant and Roman Catholic subjects in Quebec."[122] This was a gesture to dissatisfied Protestants, rather than a fulfillment of the goals of Catholics' equal rights drive. Lower Canadian Protestants did not gain the new privileges they had wanted, so the equal extension of Upper Canadian separate school rights became a non-issue. Had it been known during the Province of Canada's Confederation

---

[120] Gov.-General Monck to Lord Carnarvon, 29 November 1866, in Browne, 198-99.

[121] Final Draft of the British North America Bill, 9 February 1867, in Browne, 326.

[122] The entire completed section reads: "In and for each Province the Legislature may exclusively make Laws in relation to Education, subject and according to the following Provisions:
1. Nothing in any such Law shall prejudicially affect any Right or Privilege with respect to Denominational Schools which any Class of Persons have by Law in the Province at the Union:
2. All the Powers, Privileges, and Duties at the Union by Law conferred and imposed in Upper Canada on the Separate Schools and School Trustees of the Queen's Roman Catholic Subjects shall be and the same are hereby extended to the Dissentient Schools of the Queen's Protestant and Roman Catholic Subjects in Quebec:
3. Where in any Province a System of Separate or Dissentient Schools exists by Law at the Union or is thereafter established by the Legislature of the Province, an Appeal shall lie to the Governor General in Council from any Act or Decision of any Provincial Authority affecting any Right or Privilege of the Protestant or Roman Catholic Minority of the Queen's Subjects in relation to Education:
4. In case any such Provincial Law as from Time to Time seems to the Governor General in Council requisite for the due Execution of the Provisions of this Section is not made, or in case any Decision of the Governor General in Council on any Appeal under this Section is not duly executed by the proper Provincial Authority in that Behalf, then and in every such Case, and as far only as the Circumstances of each Case require, the Parliament of Canada may make remedial Laws for the due Execution of the Provisions of this Section and of any Decision of the Governor General in Council under this Section." The British North America Act, 1867, 30-31 Vict., c. 3 (U.K.), s. 93 (1-4).

debates what the final educational settlement would actually look like, some might have given their approval with more hesitation. The government's decision to postpone the final settlement for education until after the Quebec Resolutions were agreed to by the legislature was indeed a strategic one.

The religion question took a prominent place in the 1865 Confederation debates through the intermediary issue of education. Protestants fought for constitutional protections for the Lower Canadian minority, while Catholics sought extensions of Roman Catholic control over separate schools for the Upper Canadian minority. The matter was less a conflict between religious parochialism and nationalism, as in Moir's thesis, than it was a basically theological clash.[123] The founders agreed that Christianity had to take a foundational place in the new nation, but their deep doctrinal differences created a conflict over the proper relations between church and state. Roman Catholic ultramontanism put Protestants in a difficult position, and voluntarist fire intensified the matter. Compromise on religious conscience was unrealistic for both sides. In order to properly understand the education question at Confederation, it is necessary to understand the God-consciousness of many of the founders, and how it created and energized the question of religious minorities. At Confederation, religion was not just another question - it was the foundational question. On another note, it should also be seen that the schools debate was an instance in which serious individualistic concerns were commonly espoused, but with deeply Christian motivations. It was another illustration of the assertion that Canada's founding did not need to be based on Enlightenment principles in order to be rooted in freedom.

---

[123] Moir, *Church and State*, xiii.

Chapter 3: God Governs in the Affairs of Men: Providence and the New Dominion

Confederation-era pamphlet literature and the 1865 debates consistently expressed a perception of the providential conjunction of historical trends leading to the founding of the new Dominion. P. B. Waite remarked that "[t]here were not a few in Parliament who avowed beliefs about divine influence in Confederation."[1] If not discounted offhandedly, it can be recognized that in few other parts of the founders' speeches was their conviction of the immanence of God so evident. Providence is a Christian idea, referring to the sovereignty of God over all events in creation, whether natural or political. Many of the founders saw Confederation as an opportunity from God. Their belief in a Divine level of governance above that of the British Empire imbued them with senses of duty and purpose in their work.

This chapter examines the various manifestations of providentialism at Confederation. Sometimes it appeared in the form of deferential acknowledgements of, and personal reasonings about God's hand in the process. At other times, legislators and pamphleteers asserted the need to secure God's blessing over their initiatives. They also made statements about the values they hoped the new dominion would uphold under God. Providential faith was even connected to the title the Fathers of Confederation gave to the new nation.

It is useful to understand more fully what providence refers to. Nicholas Guyatt, a historian of the United States, explained it as the belief that God controls everything that happens on the earth. From the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries, most Europeans assumed that God

---

[1] His full observation read "In the circumstances that led to Confederation some Canadians discerned the hand of God: the June coalition uniting men long bitterly opposed, the accident of the Charlottetown Conference, coming, it appeared, at so opportune a moment, the dazzling success of Canadians at Charlottetown and at Quebec, and all when the American union seemed broken in the holocaust of war. There were not a few in Parliament who avowed beliefs about divine influence in Confederation." P. B. Waite, *The Confederation Debates in the Province of Canada* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2006), xliii. On the next page, Waite noted that "The Opposition were inclined to attribute Confederation to less exalted causes. They believed Confederation was a conspiracy engineered by Conservatives with a taste for office and naïve, well-meaning Reformers."

was at work in all events and that He worked them out according to His plan for history, even if men could not always possess a detailed understanding of what He was doing.[2] In his dissertation on nineteenth-century Canadian Presbyterian thought, historian Denis McKim defined providence as "the notion of the unfolding of a divinely authored universal design" brought about by the Creator Who "sustains, monitors, and exercises authority over all that is in existence." He further wrote that "the doctrine of providence therefore amounts to nothing less than the awe-inspiring assertion that literally no aspect of God's handiwork is exempt from divine oversight and influence."[3] A summary verse in the Bible is found in Paul's epistle to the Ephesians. He wrote of the exalted position of the believer in Christ who is guaranteed an inheritance from "him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will."[4] Providentialist beliefs see more than the visible forces of the material world at work in politics.

The background of belief in providence and its continued influence on Canadian patriotism in the 1860s helps clarify the place of religion in nineteenth-century public life. Some historians of the colonial period have set patriotism and nationalism in relation to providential thought. S. F. Wise studied Protestant beliefs in providence in British North America prior to Confederation, concluding that the colonies failed to develop a common "providential sense of mission" that could serve as the foundation for a unified Canadian nationalism. Unlike the Americans, they lacked a Canadian equivalent of the traditional British vision of being "God's

---

[2] Nicholas Guyatt, *Providence and the Invention of the United States, 1607-1876* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 14.

[3] Denis Beer McKim, "Boundless Dominion: Providence, Politics, and the Early Canadian Presbyterian Worldview, 1815-1875" (PhD diss., University of Toronto, 2011), 53, accessed 28 June 2017, https://tspace.library.utoronto.ca/bitstream/1807/30048/1/McKim_Denis_B_201106_PhD_thesis.pdf. See also the article version of McKim's thesis: Denis McKim, "'Righteousness Exalteth a Nation': Providence, Empire, and the Forging of the Early Canadian Presbyterian Identity," *Canadian Society of Church History*, Historical Papers (2008): 50-51. The thesis itself is soon to be published as a book.

[4] Eph. 1:11 (King James Version).

peculiar people."[5] It is the very British context, however, that should encourage a closer look at the place of providence in political thought during the founding of the Dominion. Guyatt emphasized that "there was nothing intrinsically American about the idea of a national destiny." The idea had its precedent in post-Reformation Great Britain.[6] Since the sixteenth century, many had viewed Britain as "the custodian of the pure word of God" and the Divinely appointed guardian of Protestantism.[7] John Strachan, Anglican Bishop of Upper Canada, forwardly declared that "the British were the Second Chosen People of God" appointed to be the keepers of God's truth. His vision was for Canada to set up a Christian polity with an established church that would make it an example of God's true design for states.[8] The union of church and state was one of the most fundamental tenets of Anglican thought before disestablishment. It was seen as the pillar of social and political stability, the maintenance of which was the duty of the Church.[9] Dissenters, on the other hand, tended to focus on personal, not national applications of providential belief, and disestablishment undermined the Anglicans' aspirations.[10] Even so, Wise admitted that the traditional providential outlook of the British people was still influential in Canada after Confederation, playing a part in movements like western expansionism and British

[5] S. F. Wise, "God's Peculiar Peoples," in W. L. Morton, ed., *The Shield of Achilles: Aspects of Canada in the Victorian Age* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1968), 53-54, 59. A. B. McKillop and Paul Romney later recycled the article's title for their edition of Wise's collected works. S. F. Wise, *God's Peculiar Peoples: Essays on Political Culture in Nineteenth-Century Canada*, eds. A. B. McKillop and Paul Romney, (Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 1993).

[6] Guyatt, *Providence*, 3.

[7] Michael Gauvreau, *The Evangelical Century: College and Creed in English Canada from the Great Revival to the Great Depression* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1991), 95.

[8] Wise, "God's Peculiar Peoples," 58-59, 61.

[9] Curtis Fahey, *In His Name: The Anglican Experience in Upper Canada, 1791-1854* (Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 1991), xiv-xv, 1-2, 8, 292.

[10] Wise, "God's Peculiar Peoples," 58-59, 61.

Israelism.[11] By the nineteenth-century, it took on new dimensions that emphasized Britain's mission to spread its culture and institutions as well as the gospel.[12]

The place of providence in national vision varied among Canadian Protestants. Anglican ministers preaching an establishment version of Britain's providential destiny were not the only ones to hold that the Empire had a special purpose to fulfil in history. Broadly speaking, Protestants believed in Britain's God-given responsibility to spread the benefits of its faith, institutions, and culture.[13] In few places was this more clearly seen than in the western expansionist movement that was in its first flowering at the time of Confederation. Protestant expansionists looked on the west in a somewhat similar way to missionaries: it was a land to be settled and filled with the blessings of civilization.[14] The practical benefits of expansion would be to strengthen Canada against the United States, to create an increasingly needed outlet for Protestant immigration in British territory, and to reduce the influence of Roman Catholic Lower Canada.[15] Expansionist proponents like George Brown, Alexander Morris, and the poet Charles Mair saw the west as lying vacant, "providentially" awaiting Canadian settlement.[16]

Brown, Morris, and Mair are three of the most commonly cited names in discussions of Canadian expansionism, and this fact points to the importance of Presbyterian confidence in the providential destiny of the British Empire. Brown and Morris were both devout Presbyterians, and Mair had a Presbyterian upbringing.[17] Canadian church historian John Webster Grant wrote that "the positive response of Presbyterians to the idea of confederation had as its background the

---

[11] Wise, "God's Peculiar Peoples," 53, 59.
[12] Carl Berger, *The Sense of Power: Studies in the Ideas of Canadian Imperialism, 1867-1914* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970), 217.
[13] Berger, *Sense of Power*, 217.
[14] Owram, *Promise of Eden*, 72-73.
[15] John Webster Grant, *The Church in the Canadian Era* (Burlington, ON: Welch Publishing Company, 1988), 25.
[16] Owram, *Promise of Eden*, 73.
[17] Norman Shrive, *Charles Mair: Literary Nationalist* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965), 12-15. Mair's religion does not seem to have featured as prominently in his adult life as Brown's and Morris's did in theirs.

Scottish concept of a nation committed to God by a solemn covenant."[18] This idea grew out of

Reformation covenant theology, which removed the distinction between the Old and New

Testaments and presented a unified interpretation of the entire Bible based on the idea of

covenant. The doctrine was then applied to other areas of life to understand things including

marriage and government as covenant relationships.[19] In its political aspect, covenant theology

asserted that modern Christian communities had their own covenant relationships with God in a

similar way to ancient Israel's. The application of this teaching was, for some, that these

communities had to live up to their responsibilities as parties to the covenant in order to realize

the fulfilment of their promised blessings.[20] These ideas promoted senses of both national

purpose and patriotic responsibility.

The providential understanding of history was also a factor in the different sense of

national purpose held by French Canadians. By the mid-nineteenth-century, Roman Catholicism

in Lower Canada experienced a 'revival' of sorts that saw religious orders grow markedly and

seminary enrollments expand. With the appointment of Ignace Bourget as Bishop of Montreal in

1840, the doctrine of ultramontanism became a potent force that tried to assert the Roman

Catholic Church's supremacy over the state.[21] Under the influence of men like Bourget, the

Church promoted an image of Lower Canada as "Catholic first, and French after that."[22] Abbé

Henri-Raymond Casgrain was one of the most influential framers of Lower Canadian, French-

Catholic nationalism. He said that providence had given Lower Canada a special mission in

North America. Its purpose was "to fight the materialistic instincts and crude egoism of Anglo-

---

[18] Grant, *The Church*, 26.
[19] Stephen Strehle, *The Egalitarian Spirit of Christianity: The Sacred Roots of American and British Government* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2009), 24-28.
[20] Strehle, *Egalitarian Spirit*, 24-25.
[21] Yvan Lamonde, *The Social History of Ideas in Quebec, 1760-1896* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2013), 245-48.
[22] Lamonde, *Quebec*, 308.

American positivism with the higher tendencies that are the heritage of the Latin races and an unmatched superiority in the moral order and in the realm of thought."[23] It was argued that Catholic Lower Canada possessed a civilization of unmatched excellence that it had a duty to defend and advance. The rest of the continent was dominated by aggressive secularism and Protestantism. Lower Canada stood for spiritual and chivalric values against American materialism.[24] French Canadian members of parliament lived in an environment in which a sense of the innate superiority and providential destiny of their people was prominent.

Providentialism was also easily integrated into trends in nineteenth-century historiography. Leopold von Ranke, one of the most influential professional historians of the modern era, saw the study of history as a way that mankind encountered the works of its Creator. For those who held similar views, history superseded philosophy as the way to understand the meaning of human existence.[25] The "providential tradition" was especially widespread in the British Empire. For orthodox intellectuals in Victorian Canada, most of whom were trained in Britain, history served as a source for the confirmation of moral philosophy that grounded its lessons in facts, rather than in the abstract reasoning of philosophers.[26] Also common was the 'Whig interpretation of history', whose prognosticators determined the heroes and villains in stories of progress from arbitrary government to British liberty. The "providential" nature of the introduction of British institutions was an orthodox perspective amongst Canadian history

---

[23] Lamonde, *Quebec*, 337-38.
[24] Lamonde, *Quebec*, 343.
[25] Georg G. Iggers, *Historiography in the Twentieth Century: From Scientific Objectivity to the Postmodern Challenge* (Hanover and London: Wesleyan University Press and University of New England Press, 1997), 25.
[26] A. B. McKillop, *A Disciplined Intelligence: Critical Inquiry and Canadian Thought in the Victorian Era* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2001), 58-60. Gauvreau, *Evangelical Century*, 72-75.

writers.[27] The belief in history's worth as a source of moral instruction also led to its frequent

usage in sermons. This was a natural application for it when "The doctrine of divine providence .

. . served as a philosophy of history." Canadian evangelicals were very interested in history and

did much to increase the spread of its influence.[28]

The references to divine providence in the 1865 debates were part of a commonly held

belief in it and in God's particular destiny for British North America. That allusions to, and

assertions of the doctrine of providence regularly featured in pamphlets pushing for

Confederation further evidenced this. One of these was *Nova Britannia*, the published version of

a lecture delivered by Alexander Morris to the Mercantile Library Association of Montreal in

1858. It was influential in the movement for Confederation, and was cited multiple times in the

1865 debates.[29] Morris had been born into an affluent and devout Presbyterian household in

Perth, Upper Canada in 1826, and was unusual during the time for his university education. He

was sent to Scotland for most of his schooling, attended high school at Madras College, St

Andrews, and afterwards studied at the University of Glasgow. In Canada, he studied law at

Queen's College and McGill College, where he became the institution's first arts graduate. He

was not, though, unusual in his generation for being an avid imperial visionary.[30]

Morris opened his address speaking of the incredible future of British North America as

"a great colonial empire." He spoke of the excellence of British freedom and civilization and said

[27] Kenneth N. Windsor, "Historical Writing in Canada to 1920," in *Literary History of Canada: Canadian Literature in English*, ed. Carl F. Klinck, Alfred G. Bailey, Claude Bissell, Roy Daniells, Northrop Frye, and Desmond Pacey (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1966), 212-15, 230-31.

[28] Gauvreau, *Evangelical Century*, 73, 94.

[29] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 127, 919.

[30] Jean Friesen, "Alexander Morris," in *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 11 (University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–), accessed 28 June 2017, http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/morris_alexander_11E.html.

that "Providence has cast our lot in a land destined to be great."[31] In the east, God had shaped geography so as to put a barrier between the British colonies and the United States.[32] In the west, a bountiful land stood open for them to benefit from. As continental expansion was one of his favourite causes, and was an important corollary of the Confederation movement in English Canada, Morris spent disproportionate time on it. He maintained that Canadians had a duty to fulfil the destiny providence had placed before them. They should go and improve the land of the west and take advantage of opportunity knocking.[33] At the same time, though, he said that the duty to go west also included responsibilities to the people already living there, and to prompt development of the area's resources. The goal should not be "a mere grasping thirst of territorial aggrandizement." Rather, "a large-spirited and comprehensive appreciation of the requirements of the country" was what was needed.[34] Moreover, in the meantime, British Americans ought to "grow also in those higher moral, social, educational and other features which mark the real prosperity of a people."[35]

With great opportunity came great responsibility. Providence had not appointed British North America to be great for the sake of base gain. Rather, God had "entrusted to their keeping" an excellent civilization and promising opportunities. That they held the gifts of providence *in trust* meant that they had to manage them with vigilance and moral diligence. They had to be noble, dutiful people. Near the end of his pamphlet, Morris urged the "right development and formation of the national character of this infant people." He recounted the honourable foundations "this new Britannia" had in the British, French, and other peoples that were

---

[31] Alexander Morris, "Nova Britannia; or, the Consolidation of the British North American Provinces into the Dominion of Canada," in *Nova Britannia; or Our New Canadian Dominion Foreshadowed*, ed. Canadian Press (Toronto: Hunter and Rose, 1884), 4-6. Note that the addition of the title "Dominion" is for this post-Confederation edition.
[32] Morris, "Nova Britannia," 21.
[33] Morris, "Nova Britannia," 29-30.
[34] Morris, "Nova Britannia," 32.
[35] Morris, "Nova Britannia," 46.

"rendered the more vigorous by our northern position," and encouraged recognition of the "duties

and responsibilities of no light character imposed upon them by Providence."[36] The key values

he listed for the future country he envisioned included, among other things,

> a wide-spread dissemination of a sound education, steady maintenance of civil
> and religious liberty, and of freedom of speech and thought . . . a becoming
> national respect and reverence for the behests of the Great Ruler of events, and
> the teachings of his Word - truthfulness and a high-toned commercial honour . . .
> a large and liberal appreciation of the plain and evident responsibilities of our
> position.[37]

Morris's Canada would be British, but more than British, and would hold to a moral vision that

was grounded in the Bible and motivated by responsibility to God. New Britannia would be its

own nation, and would strive to rule its domain in recognition of the blessings given to it by

providence. Morris's patriotic vision and sense of duty were soundly rooted in his Presbyterian

belief in the sovereignty of God over the nations. They also stood in opposition to the idea of

Canadian nationality as being only political.

Morris was consistent in his arguments for expansion and Confederation. He repeated

similar ones in a pamphlet containing a lecture he gave on "The Hudson's Bay and Pacific

Territories" in the winter of 1858. He opened with an analogy. The noble spirit of a man of

"sturdy, honest self-reliance" that presses on towards a clearly defined goal earns the respect

even of his adversaries, he said. So it is with nations. Canada's "Northern rising nationality"

needed a goal.[38] Its people had to "take high views of their plain and manifest responsibilities"

and understand their advantages and "vast resources which Providence has placed at their

disposal" in order to become a great nation. They had a great destiny before them, possessing as

---

[36] Morris, "Nova Britannia," 49.
[37] Morris, "Nova Britannia," 49-50.
[38] Alexander Morris, "The Hudson Bay and Pacific Territories," in *Nova Britannia; or Our New Canadian Dominion Foreshadowed*, ed. Canadian Press (Toronto: Hunter and Rose, 1884), 52-3.

they did "that rich inheritance of civil and religious liberty, and of high social and political privileges, which is their birthright as an offshoot of the three united nations who compose the British people."[39] Twice more Morris spoke of his perception of a Divine purpose for British North America. In "Anglo-Saxon" civilization's rapid advancement on the continent "the finger of Providence [was] plainly to be distinguished."[40] It should have seemed clear to "the most superficial observer that there [was] an overruling purpose in all this" that declared the mission of the English-speaking peoples' to the world.[41] The application of these musings was for everyone in British North America to live up to their individual responsibilities and take part in realizing the future greatness of their country.[42] The attitude Morris tried to inspire was not one of greed or conquest. Rather, he sought out noble spirits to do good for their nation that was a conscious recipient of a special providence in God's plan.

Another influential pamphlet was Samuel Edward Dawson's *The Northern Kingdom*. Its author was of Irish descent, being born the son of Rev. Benjamin Dawson in Halifax in 1833. He seems to have attended the school of Presbyterian Thomas McCulloch, who believed that Britain had been selected by God to spread the gospel to all mankind.[43] The family moved to Montreal in 1847 and became printers and publishers. Samuel Dawson's pamphlet was published anonymously after the Charlottetown Conference by the company he ran with his brother.[44] In it,

---

[39] Morris, "Hudson Bay," 53. The identities of these three nations were not specified, but, considering that Morris distinguished between British and French at the end of "Nova Britannia" (Morris, "Nova Britannia," 49), they must undoubtedly have been the English, Scottish, and Irish. It is hard to conceive of him mentioning the Welsh before the Irish when the latter had such a numerous presence in British North America. The Welsh were also excluded in the 1865 debates, where, for example, Cartier referred to the British races as being the English, Scottish, and Irish. See Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 60.
[40] Morris, "Hudson Bay," 54.
[41] Morris, "Hudson Bay," 55-56.
[42] Morris, "Hudson Bay," 89-90.
[43] George L. Parker, "Samuel Edward Dawson," in *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 14 (University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–) accessed 19 June 2017, http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/dawson_samuel_edward_14E.html. Wise, "God's Peculiar Peoples," 61.
[44] Parker, "Dawson." P. B. Waite, *The Life and Times of Confederation, 1864-1867: Politics, Newspapers, and the Union of British North America* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1962), 114-15.

he warned that Britain was on the verge of abandoning its Canadian colonies in order to deal with its own problems without the burdens of potential of involvement in conflict with the United States. Canada would soon see independence, and had to prepare to meet it bravely. He counselled adherence to tradition while at the same time urging Canadians to "say proudly, we too are a nation, descended of no mean stock, and, under God, we will care for our own future."[45]

In his conclusion, Dawson supported colonial union and autonomy with a British system of government. He called a "stable, limited Monarchy" under a prince of British royal blood "the hope of the Anglo-Norman [Canadian] race."[46] He exhorted Canadians, saying

> Let us look no longer backward on the Mother country, but forward to the future, putting our trust in the God of nations. And may the time speedily come when with national, humble prayer to Him we may receive our king, and lay the foundation of a limited monarchy in the New World.[47]

Dawson's words about God's providence (without using the word) were brief. They functioned as a sort of disclaimer, and this function is important to recognize. Though he made no attempt to create a vision of Canada as a special nation "under God" in the American sense, and although his discussion did not require a theological section, he nevertheless deemed it fit to include these small statements. They were humble acknowledgements of God's ultimate sovereignty in human affairs. Although he insisted that Canada should be bold to stand on its own, he acknowledged that it was God who would determine its success. Making these small mentions of providence were a way of invoking God's blessing to found a nation favoured by His will. The nation the colonies would become ought to remain a Christian one.

James Anderson's *The Union of the British North American Provinces Considered* expressed similar sentiments. Anderson was a Fellow of the Royal Society of Edinburgh (a

---

[45] Samuel Edward Dawson, *The Northern Kingdom* (Montreal: Dawson Brothers, 1866?), fiche, 9, CIHM no. 35063.
[46] Dawson, *Northern Kingdom*, 16, 18.
[47] Dawson, *Northern Kingdom*, 18.

scientific and literary national academy), editor of "The Farmer's Journal and Transactions of the Board of Agriculture of Lower Canada," and the author of "Currency and Corn Law Letters" and "Philosophy of Duty."[48] Under the pseudonym of "Obiter Dictum," he contended that colonial union would end strife and open up a field where talented statesmen would seek nobler patriotic ends.[49] It would "stimulate us to deeds which would gain us honor, respect and regard in every free and Christian nation."[50] Union would be a step towards "Independent Nationality," but this "when the time appointed by the decree of Providence should fully come round."[51] This was the same sort of thoughtful disclaimer used by Dawson.

Anderson went further than Dawson by speaking of Canada as a Christian nation. He argued that a federated British North America would be a strong ally to Britain in the future,

> If ever any attempt should be made to invade the palladium of *freedom and Christianity* [Britain], - in fact to be the true representative of British *freedom and civilization* on this Northern Continent as if Britain herself had taken one step in advance in her progress towards the distribution of *freedom and enlightenment* amongst the countless Isles of the Pacific.[52] [Emphases added.]

The variations in the three pairs of words Anderson used to describe the national virtues of Britain and Canada in this passage were significant. He repeated "freedom" each time, but changed its companion word twice. Initially, it was "Christianity." Then, Christianity became "civilization." Finally, it became "enlightenment." This binding up of terms added depth to the concept. Anderson made Christianity the first jewel of the treasures of Britain. The three implied an infusion of society with the faith. After Christianity came civilization, and from Christian civilization came a truly enlightened existence for mankind. For Anderson, Britain and Canada's

---

[48] James Anderson, *The Union of the British North American Provinces Considered, in a letter addressed to the Citizens of British North America by Obiter Dictum with Remarks by "The London Times" on the St. Lawrence Route, & Subsidies to Ocean Steamers* (Montreal: Owler and Stevenson, 1859), fiche, 1, CIHM no. 39130.
[49] "Obiter Dictum" is Latin for "speaking casually," or "incidental remarks."
[50] Anderson, *Union*, 10.
[51] Anderson, *Union*, 13.
[52] Anderson, *Union*, 8-9.

glory was intricately linked to their Christian edifice. Canada was a Christian country that respected God's providential rule in human affairs. Its duty was to expand the impact of its blessings to new regions of the globe. The whole passage showed the role understood for Canada as part of the providential destiny of the British people.

The impact of Roman Catholic philosophy showed in an 1858 Confederation pamphlet by Joseph-Charles Taché, the nephew of the Province of Canada's premier, Sir Étienne-Pascal Taché. As a French Canadian nationalist, Joseph-Charles was concerned with finding new areas for agricultural settlement to prevent the emigration of his countrymen to the seemingly immoral, anti-Christian factory towns of New England. As a conservative, he fought liberal ideas in the *Courrier du Canada*, where the chapters of *Des provinces de l'Amérique du nord et d'une union fédérale* first appeared. Taché championed Confederation as a way to safeguard the French Canadian way of life both from English, Protestant British North America, and from annexation to the liberal United States. His pamphlet was the most comprehensive exposition of a plan for federal union prior to the Quebec Conference.[53] It contained, among other things, a survey of the British North American colonies and their histories. In his account of Lower Canada (or, New France), Taché defended its honour as a place that had put spiritual concerns above all else, even though it lagged behind the English colonies in terms of material prosperity. The mission of the early French explorers had been to bring Christianity to Canada, glory to their kingdom, and satisfaction to their noble spirit of adventure. He said that they had brought all the "bravoure" and "gaieté" to their task with which God had gifted their race.[54] Taché also wrote of the colonies' abundant resources, given to them by providence, that were destined to make them a

---

[53] Jean-Guy Nadeau, "Joseph-Charles Taché," in *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 12 (University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–), accessed 30 June 2017, http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/tache_joseph_charles_12E.html.

[54] J. C. Taché, *Des provinces de l'Amérique du nord et d'une union fédérale* (Québec: J. T. Brousseau, 1858), 89-90. "Bravoure" is bravery, while "gaieté" is gaiety, or cheerfulness.

great nation. He said that the habitants, "à qui le travail en [la providence] est confié," ought to rise above "petites idées, toutes les utopies irréalisables," and meet the occasion.[55] The application of Taché's words on Divine government echoed Morris's on the patriotic duty of British North Americans to realize their providential destiny.

In the 1865 debates, the most common way the founders spoke about God's workings in history had to do with the providential conjunction of historical trends they witnessed. Despite years of political chaos that made union seem desirable, but at once impossible, events had now suddenly come together to allow the formation of a new nation. John A. Macdonald said that "it was only by a happy concurrence of circumstances, that we were enabled to bring this great question to its present position." If the legislature failed to measure up to the opportunity held out to it, the time would pass.[56] He suggested that "We should feel, also, sincerely grateful to benificent [sic] Providence that we have had the opportunity vouchsafed us of calmly considering this great constitutional change, this peaceful revolution." Canada was under the benevolent protection of Great Britain and had been saved the civil and revolutionary wars of other states.[57] George Brown emphasized the founders' duties in light of providence's workings. He listed the many circumstances that conjoined "at this moment to arrest earnest attention to the gravity of the situation, and unite us all in one vigorous effort to meet the emergency like men."[58] He closed by asking if they would "then rise equal to the occasion . . . without partisanship, and free from every personal feeling but the earnest resolution to discharge conscientiously the duty which an over-ruling Providence has placed upon us?" Both Macdonald and Brown were

---

[55] Taché, *Des provinces*, 11. "To whom the work is entrusted [by Providence]," and "little ideas, all the unrealisable utopias," are the English equivalents of the two phrases.

[56] Macdonald repeated the same thought several times. "It is," he said, "our privilege and happiness to be in such a position, and we cannot be too grateful for the *blessings* thus conferred upon us." Emphasis added. Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 45.

[57] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 44.

[58] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 114.

Presbyterians (although Brown was a much more devout, Free Church adherent), and for them it was not chance that had provided this "golden opportunity" to found a new country.

The seigneur Antoine Chartier de Lotbinière Harwood echoed the thoughts of the two Scots, saying that Canadians had a temporary "golden opportunity" and "providential piece of good fortune" to take advantage of for union.[59] He spoke of providence more than any other speaker, referring to Nova Scotian coal mines "which the hand of Providence has placed," praying Canadians would be saved by God from going the way of the French at the time of the Revolution, and saying he would have opposed Confederation "with all the power which Providence has given me" if the proposal had been for a legislative union.[60] His remark on the French Revolution was significant in relation to French Catholic national self-image. Part of Lower Canada's 'national myth' was that it had become a unique people by not following France into anti-Christian upheaval. It had remained a Catholic country in accordance with its founding. French Canadian supporters of Confederation argued that federal union was the way to guarantee their language, laws, institutions, and all-pervasive religion once and for all. Pride in Lower Canada's religious position was evident in the words of many French speakers in the Confederation debates.

Thomas D'Arcy McGee presented a more elaborate 'argument from providence' to seize the 'golden opportunity'. He said that there were three forces of influence that had coincided to push the Canadas towards Confederation: those from above, those from beside, and those from within. From above, there was British pressure; from beside, demagogic, republican America and

---

[59] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 826, 832-33. *Dictionnaire des parlementaires du Québec de 1792 à nos jours*, s.v. "Antoine Chartier de Lotbinière Harwood" (National Assembly of Quebec, 2009), accessed 12 July 2017, http://www.assnat.qc.ca/en/deputes/harwood-antoine-chartier-de-lotbiniere-3609/biographie.html.
[60] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 828, 831, 837. Yet more examples are on pages 837-39.

its upheavals during the Civil War period; from within, the Province of Canada's constitutional

problems.[61] He summarized his personal impression of events by saying that

> Up to the last year there was no conjunction of circumstances favorable to the
> bringing about of this union, and probably if we suffer this opportunity to be
> wasted we shall never see again such a conjunction of circumstances as will
> enable us to agree, even so far, among ourselves. By a most fortunate concurrence
> of circumstances - *by what I presume to call, speaking of events of this magnitude,*
> *a providential concurrence of circumstances* - the Government of Canada was so
> modified last spring as to enable it to deal fearlessly with this subject, at the very
> moment when the coast colonies, despairing of a Canadian union, were arranging
> a conference of their own for a union of their own.[62] [Emphasis added.]

McGee's view of history included actors both human and Divine. His philosophy of history was

greatly influenced by his Catholicism. He was the author of *The Catholic History of North*

America, a series of lectures that sought to demonstrate that devout Catholics and Catholic

groups were responsible for discovering and exploring the Americas, that it was Catholics who

had made the most considerable missionary efforts towards the Indians, and that it was largely

Catholics who had secured the independence of the United States (he was living in the US at the

time of the book's composition).[63] For him, it was not luck or chance that had brought the

colonies to the brink of union. Further, from this Catholic understanding of world events also

grew the conclusion that Canada was faced with a sort of responsibility to enter Confederation.

Being presented with a "golden opportunity" from God put the founders' under a sort of moral

obligation to vote for the good of their country. McGee quoted Roman Catholic Archbishop

Thomas Louis Connolly of Halifax, who said that he felt convinced that Confederation was a

---

[61] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 129-31.
[62] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 134-35.
[63] Thomas D'Arcy McGee, *The Catholic History of North America. Five Discourses. To which are added Two Discourses on the Relations of Ireland and America* (Boston: Patrick Donahoe, 1855), 9.

"measure alone, under Providence, [that] can secure to us social order and peace, and rational liberty," and that it was a duty to vote for it.[64]

James Ferrier in the Legislative Council also gave a personal 'argument from providence.' He, too, recounted the immediate history that led to the possibility of securing Confederation. He affirmed its higher significance, saying

> I believe that a Divine Providence guides the destinies of nations, and I believe a Divine Providence has directed the statesmen who were present at that Conference [the Quebec Conference] in their deliberations, and has brought conflicting interests into harmony in a most wonderful way.

He then asked a series of rhetorical questions meant to imply that it was God Who had brought about so many unlikely, but favourable circumstances.[65] Ferrier was a Presbyterian from Fife, Scotland, who became a Methodist later in life. He was actively involved in a number of Protestant evangelical associations and was known as a devout man who "had deep convictions, firm Christian principles, and . . . shaped his life by them."[66] His Christian understanding of the world led him to a reflective view of Canada's founding experience. He seemed inclined to think it a moral duty to respond fitly to the opportunity God placed before them. If they declined to accept Confederation, they would be declining to accept the workings of God's providence.[67] It was foolish to shun the blessing held out to them. Canada was the recipient of a special providence in God's plan, and had a responsibility to seek the good in light of it.

The founders consistently expressed the need for God's blessing on the way in which they chose to take up the opportunity presented to them. Sometimes, they did so with the 'disclaimers'

---

[64] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 133-34. David B. Flemming, "Thomas Louis Connolly," in *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 10 (University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–), accessed 13 July 2017, http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/connolly_thomas_louis_10E.html.

[65] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 198.

[66] Gerald J. J. Tulchinsky, "James Ferrier," in *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 11 (University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–), accessed 18 June 2017, http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/ferrier_james_11E.html.

[67] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 198.

of Dawson and Anderson. In one of the early government speeches during the debates, the non-denominational Protestant Alexander T. Galt brought his financial review of the question to a close by saying "Let us trust that this machinery, however faulty it may be, will yet under Providence open up for this country a happy career."[68] Canada's constitution was good, but imperfect, and the country needed Divine blessing to be successful. Ottawa Valley lumberman James Skead, another founder with a Scottish heritage, was quite optimistic about Confederation, but was sure not to forget God.[69] He was certain that "when these scattered provinces are united together, as is now proposed, and when the bond of that union has been sealed with the great Imperial seal of Great Britain - with the blessing and favor [sic] of an all-ruling Providence - I, for one, have no fear of the result."[70] Alongside Galt and Skead, McGee and Harwood both quoted the same statement by Archbishop Connolly that acknowledged that Confederation would only be a success "under Providence."[71] In the midst of constitution-making, the founders were conscious of another level of governance - a Divine level - that they had to take into consideration.

John Scoble, an anti-slavery activist and former Congregationalist minister, also voiced his belief in the need for Divine guidance in order to achieve good government.[72] His statement is interesting for its multilayered conception of providential sovereignty. Scoble addressed the Speaker of the House in closing, saying

> my most earnest desire and prayer is that by a well-considered scheme of union . . . results may follow of the most beneficial character, both to the colonies and the Mother Country; and that Providence may so guide the counsels and influence the

---

[68] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 71.
[69] Sandra Gillis and Robert Peter Gillis, "James Skead," in *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 11 (University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–), accessed 19 June 2017, http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/skead_james_11E.html.
[70] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 244.
[71] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 133-34, 839.
[72] Elwood H. Jones, "John Scoble," in *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 9 (University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–), accessed 18 June 2017, http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/scoble_john_9E.html.

acts of those who now direct our affairs, as to secure to the people of this country, and to succeeding generations, the blessings of a well-ordered government and a wise administration of public affairs.[73]

These words of Scoble's contained three important components. The first was the prayer. Scoble personally requested God's general blessing on the future dominion, and specifically prayed that God would "guide the counsels" of its leaders. It was right that God's blessing not be expected only, but sought. The second component was the decisions. Scoble hoped that providence would also "influence the acts" as well as "guide the counsels" of the Fathers of Confederation. There was a mental element to the process, but also a circumstantial one: there was an internal, and there was an external. The third part concerned the men themselves. Praying for God's blessing was important, but trusting in Him did not mean that Canada's founders did not have to carefully consider their work and make wise decisions. Believing in the necessity of God's guidance and blessing did not mean ignoring the responsibilities of statesmen under Him. Wise Canadian leaders had to pray, reflect, and work diligently.

Morris urged the necessity of making the proper human response to providential blessing. He only spoke about providence once in the 1865 debates, but did so in a way that was in keeping with his thoughts expressed in *Nova Britannia*. His words appeared in the same section of his speech in which he presented a hypothetical address to the Queen that would desire "to add another community of Christian freemen" to the Empire. Morris envisioned Canada telling Britain that it desired to remain under the protection of the Crown, but at the same time to do more for its own defence, and to be granted new powers "for the development of all the great interests which Providence has committed to our trust."[74] This idea of a "trust" between God and nation was the same idea he had more fully expounded in his pamphlet, and Brown had

---

[73] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 912.
[74] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 441.

mentioned in his own speech. It affirmed responsibility in relation to Divine blessing, and encouraged serious efforts to fulfil the duty. The "great interests" Morris spoke of would have included natural resources, but also civil liberty, religious liberty, freedom of speech, property rights, the maintenance of British parliamentary government against American republicanism, and other core concerns.

McGee made statements on God-given responsibility that concerned the concepts of liberty and unity. In a speech on the U.S. Civil War in 1861, he counselled that the blessing of the former could not be kept without the establishment of the latter. He compared unity to a desert cistern, saying that even "though Providence should rain [liberty] down upon our heads, . . . without a legal organization to retain, without a supreme authority to preserve the Heaven-sent blessing, all in vain are men called free, all in vain are States declared to be independent."[75] Constitutional freedom was a gift from God, but could not be maintained without care. The implication seemed to be that neither liberty, nor unity, was natural to a state. Wise states understood this and responded to it. The providential beliefs of Morris and McGee gave them a sense of national duty to make full use of the blessings God entrusted to Canada.

Another one of the founders who spoke about the need for God's blessing in order for their work to succeed was the retired British Army officer Col. Frederick W. Haultain.[76] Haultain went beyond those who spoke of the need for providential leading to express a desire to publically invoke God's blessing on the Confederation debates. At the end of his speech, he reflected upon Canada's uncertain future. He felt "forcibly reminded that the future is not in our

---

[75] Thomas D'Arcy McGee, "Canada's Interest in the American Civil War, " in *1825 - D'Arcy McGee - 1925: A Collection of Speeches and Addresses*, ed. Charles Murphy (Toronto: MacMillan, 1937), 184. This passage was also quoted from by David Livingstone. See David W. Livingstone, "Thomas D'Arcy McGee's Civic Paideia for Canada," in *Liberal Education, Civic Education, and the Canadian Regime*, ed. David W. Livingstone (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2015), 99.
[76] Sandra E. Perry and Jessica J. Craig, *The Mantle of Leadership: Premiers of the North-West Territories and Alberta, 1897-2005* (Legislative Assembly of Alberta, 2006), 161-62.

own hands; neither by any prudence or wisdom of our own, can we determine it." Haultain

seemed to be in a contemplative mood. He pronounced to the Assembly that its daily debates and

estimations

> [proclaim] our own impotence and our absolute dependence upon a higher Power.
> I feel deeply, sir - and I make no apology for expressing it - that we ought to look
> above for Divine guidance; and I regret that our religious differences should so
> operate as to prevent our performing together a public act of invoking God's
> blessing on our proceedings, without which all our deliberations will fail of
> success. (Cheers.)[77]

Haultain's dire reflections may well have stemmed from his Presbyterian beliefs.[78] His wish for a

"public act" by the representatives of the nation's people was reminiscent of the theology behind

the Scottish National Covenant and Solemn League and Covenant. He did not say that they

would certainly fail without a public recognition of God's sovereignty, or that they would

certainly not be blessed without making one, but he did think national statements of faith were

valuable and important. His faith gave him an added sense of responsibility that reached beyond

the immediacy of the political and constitutional worlds.

Though the majority of statements about providence in the 1865 debates were made in

support of Confederation, some speakers used it in their arguments against union. One of these

was Calvinist-raised Anglican convert Henri Gustave Joly de Lotbinière.[79] That he chose to

present his historical arguments in this way showed the prevalence of the providential view of

history. Joly acknowledged the need to act in accordance with Divine government, but argued

that the legislature would not be doing so if it followed the plan laid out in the Quebec

Resolutions. In keeping with the view of history prevalent in the nineteenth-century, he accused

---

[77] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 648.
[78] Perry and Craig, *Mantle of Leadership*, 161-62.
[79] Marcel Hamelin, "Sir Henri-Gustave Joly de Lotbinière," in *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 13
(University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–), accessed 18 June 2017,
http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/joly_de_lotbiniere_henri_gustave_13E.html.

supporters of them of ignoring "the experience of past ages," neglecting "the statesman's safest guide." History, he said, "ought to be the basis of all [the statesman's] conceptions; indeed it would be treating its lessons with contempt, were we to attempt to dispose of the future without first knowing how Providence has disposed of the past."[80] He quoted "a maxim" that "There is nothing new under the sun," (originally from Ecclesiastes 1:9), arguing that history is, at its most basic level, "a constantly revolving scene." Throughout it, "men have allowed themselves to be controlled by the same motives and passions," and "like causes produce like effects." Joly insisted that they must look to the past, not the uncertain future, to judge the wisdom of the scheme.[81] He proceeded to quote from historians and political philosophers like Lord Macaulay and Lord Brougham on the historical weaknesses of federal states. He then surveyed the recent history of the failure of the Latin American federations.[82] A providential view of history leant added gravity to his warnings. It was not just the opposition who made providential claims. More than rhetorical argument was at work in the Confederation debates.

Joly's historical understanding of God's decree for the fate of federations was, evidently, incorrect. That the Canadian Confederation now marks 150 years in existence, and the American one almost 250, implies as much. At the time, too, the words of other speakers in the debates challenged Joly's argument. McGee called "The principle of Federation" a "generous principle . . . that runs through all the history of civilization in one form or another, and exists alike in monarchies and democracies."[83] Teacher and farmer Hippolyte Cornellier dit Grandchamp accused Joly of using only republican confederations as examples.[84] Joly retorted that no

---

[80] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 346-47.
[81] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 347.
[82] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 347-49.
[83] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 145.
[84] *Dictionnaire des parlementaires du Québec de 1792 à nos jours*, s.v. "Hippolite Cornellier" (National Assembly of Quebec, 2009), accessed 13 July 2017, http://www.assnat.qc.ca/en/deputes/cornellier-hippolite-2653/biographie.html.

monarchical confederation was possible. To him, monarchy meant that power was vested in a single individual, whereas federation meant that it was vested in the multiple member states. Even a federation with a monarch, he said, would be a republic in actuality.[85] It appears that the disagreement stemmed from a confusion of terms and theories. The intriguing issue of the founders' understandings of the relationship between monarchy and federalism, however, is beyond the range of the present discussion. What is immediately apparent, though, is that a basic providential view of history was not enough to lead Joly to an omniscient interpretation of the lessons provided by past events.

The founders' providential view of the Dominion's founding influenced some of them in their convictions concerning what Canada's future form of government should be. *Rouge* notary Jean-Baptiste Pouliot and *bleu* journalist Joseph-Édouard Cauchon, both Roman Catholics, viewed their country as the recipient of a special providence in its political-constitutional affairs.[86] Pouliot said that he thought

> the whole of Lower Canada will sing with a great deal of pleasure, giving, at the same time, thanks to that Providence which, we love to think, watches with special care over our beloved Canada, for having preserved us from being plunged into the abyss, on the verge of which we were standing.[87]

Cauchon likewise recalled the Province of Canada's political turmoil and thanked God for ending it. It was a relief, he said, that "the level of the political soil, which had sunk down, from some of those secret causes known to Providence alone, again suddenly rose up to escape from the

---

[85] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 349.
[86] *Dictionnaire des parlementaires du Québec de 1792 à nos jours*, s.v. "Jean-Baptiste Pouliot" (National Assembly of Quebec, 2009), accessed 13 July 2017, http://www.assnat.qc.ca/en/deputes/pouliot-jean-baptiste-4967/biographie.html. Andrée Désilets, "Joseph-Édouard Cauchon," in *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 11 (University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–), accessed 13 July 2017, http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/cauchon_joseph_edouard_11E.
[87] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 880.

overflowing torrents of demagogic principles which threatened society at large."[88] Here, though,

he specified the threat providence had saved them from as democracy. This thought was similar

to Harwood's, whose speech had decried the record of democratic governments in France and the

United States. Harwood exhorted the Assembly to "hope that Divine Providence will guard these

new countries from the disasters and horrid crimes," resulting from democracy, that "stain[ed]

the history of certain portions of Europe at the close of the last century."[89]

Their comments taken together, Pouliot, Cauchon, and Harwood saw Canada as a nation

specially favoured by God that had to take a Christian path forward in its constitution-making.

More specifically, though, they spoke of Lower Canada, and of Catholic principles. In the

nineteenth-century, the conflict between democracy and the Roman Catholic Church was fierce.

Democratic revolutionaries attacked the Church and even forced the pope to flee Rome in 1848.

ultramontanes branded democracy as the product of "philosophism and Protestantism."[90] They

decried it as the doctrine of socialists, communists, and chartists.[91] Only monarchy,

ultramontanes asserted, could maintain the right institutional connection between Church and

state.[92] Thus, they shared with Protestants a providential understanding of Confederation and a

conscientious allegiance to the Crown. Paradoxically, however, they came to this agreement by

holding beliefs that were feared and opposed by most Protestants of the day.

Though the founders did not remedy Haultain's regrets, they did make a public

declaration of Canada's Christian foundations in another way. This was in the name they chose

for the new nation: the Dominion of Canada. The word "Dominion" had previously been used to

refer to British possessions, as in the Dominion of New England (1686-1689) and in legal

---

[88] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 560.
[89] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 828.
[90] Lamonde, *Social History*, 280-81.
[91] Lamonde, *Social History*, 270.
[92] Lamonde, *Social History*, 295.

reference to the sovereign's 'dominions,' but Canada's founders gave it new and enlarged connotations.[93] A 'Dominion' was not a 'dominion.' The new title was proposed during the London Conference in 1867. In the years leading up to Confederation, and in the 1865 debates, the word had not been suggested. There were various ideas as to what the new country might be called. The first titles that occurred to George-Étienne Cartier were "kingdom" and "vice-royalty."[94] McGee thought that "Federation" and "Kingdom" might be likely options.[95] The Lower Canadian Protestant Christopher Dunkin assumed the same two possibilities as Cartier.[96] If there was any consensus, it seemed to be for "Kingdom." The title "Kingdom of Canada" was used even in the fourth draft of the British North America Act, dated between the third draft on 2 February and the fifth and final draft on 9 February 1867.[97] The French equivalent of "Kingdom," "Royaume," was also the favourite title of the French-speaking founders.[98] Officials in the British government, however, had their doubts about boldly creating a large new "Kingdom" beside North America's most powerful republic.[99] In a letter to Lord Knutsford in 1889, Macdonald wrote that the final change from "Kingdom" to "Dominion" had been insisted upon by the British prime minister and foreign minister, Lord Derby, so as not to offend the

---

[93] "Tilley and the other Fathers of Confederation broadened the meaning of the word, making it a virtual synonym for sovereign state." Jean Delisle, "Through the Lens of History: Translating *dominion* as *puissance* - A case of absurd self-flattery?" *Language Update* 8, no. 4 (2012): 18.
http://www.btb.termiumplus.gc.ca/tpv2guides/guides/favart/index-fra.html?lang=fra&lettr=indx_titls&page=9spu01Mio3EU.html#note1.
[94] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 62.
[95] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 145.
[96] Legislature, *Parliamentary Debates*, 488.
[97] Third Draft of the British North America Bill, 2 February, 1867, in Browne, 264-65. Fourth Draft of the British North America Bill, undated, in Browne, 279. Final Draft of the British North America Bill, 9 February, 1867, in Browne, 302.
[98] W. L. Morton, *The Critical Years: The Union of British North America, 1857-1873* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1964), 213.
[99] Morton, *Critical Years*, 212.

sensibilities of the United States.[100] The story of the *origin* of the substitute term, however, was more colourful.

Leonard Percy de Wolfe Tilley, the son of Samuel Leonard Tilley, New Brunswick's premier at the time of Confederation, recounted his father's role in coming up with the term "Dominion" in a letter to George Smith Holmested in 1917. During the London Conference, "considerable discussion" arose over what to call the new country.[101] With no resolution, the "discussion on the name stood over until the next day." According to Tilley,

> The next morning, as was Sir Leonard's custom, he read a chapter from the Bible, and that particular morning he read Psalm 72, verse 8, "He shall have Dominion also from sea to sea." When reading verse 8 of the said Psalm, the thought occurred to him, what a splendid name to give Canada, the word "Dominion" of Canada. When he went back to the sitting of the convention that morning he suggested the word "Dominion," which was agreed to, and Canada was called the "Dominion of Canada."[102]

The chapter the verse came from is a Messianic Psalm describing the Millennial Reign of Christ. The full verse reads "He shall have dominion also from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth."[103] The reference to the Euphrates River might have been found all the more fitting to British North America by the other delegates. The other major use of the word "dominion" in the Bible - and probably the more significant - is found in Genesis 1:28, in which God commanded Adam and Eve to "Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth."[104] The Dominion mandate was the authorization for

---

[100] John A. Macdonald to Lord Knutsford, 18 July 1889, in John S. Ewart, *The Kingdom Papers*, vol. 2 (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1912), 384-85.
[101] Third Draft, in *Documents*, 264-65. Fourth Draft of the British North America Bill, 2 February, 1867, in Browne, 278-301. Final Draft, in *Documents*, 302. Leonard Percy de Wolfe Tilley to George Smith Holmested, 28 June 1917, Library and Archives Canada.
[102] Tilley to Holmested, 28 June 1917.
[103] Psalm 72:8.
[104] Genesis 1:28.

man to responsibly use and manage the earth's resources. McGee spoke about it in a speech on immigration and colonization in 1862.[105] The term's usages in these two passages were not unrelated to each other. In 1 Corinthians 15, Paul contrasted Christ's coming "kingdom" (relating to the "dominion" of Psalm 72:8) with the reign of death caused by Adam's sin. Later in the same chapter, Paul referred to Christ as "the last Adam."[106] The word "dominion" in the psalm referred to Christ's coming rule to re-establish the deathless world that existed before Adam's Fall. Its theological importance was not insignificant.

Calling Canada a "Dominion" had a twofold function. The first answered to the original intent to call the country a kingdom. The founders wished to emphasize the monarchical principle that made their government distinct from that of the United States. The Crown was the centrepiece of a constitutional understanding that was in opposition to those of the republics and democracies that rose following the American and French Revolutions. Colonial Secretary Lord Carnarvon explained to Lord Derby that, being vetoed on the use of the term "Viceroyalty" (evidently the second choice after "Kingdom"), the British North American delegates asked for "Dominion" as a "tribute on their part to the monarchical principle." Carnarvon thought it "somewhat in opposition to the institutions on the other side of the border, [but] not in any offensive opposition."[107] The second function, though, answered to the spirit of Haultain's wish for a public recognition of God's sovereignty over nations' destinies. Taking a title from the Bible was a way of declaring the new nation's continued identification with the Christian faith. The providential understanding of history encouraged such statements.

The title was an expression of the two greatest sources of influence on the new Dominion: British monarchical government, and Christian belief and morality. Constitutionally,

---

[105] Thomas D'Arcy McGee, "Emigration and Colonization," in Murphy, 213-14.
[106] 1 Corinthians 15:21-26, 45.
[107] Morton, *Critical Years*, 212-13.

Canada was British. The founders adhered to the theory of mixed government, instead of democracy. They chose to follow constitutional principles developed through the experience of centuries, rather than relying upon abstract reasoning to come up with an ideal new form.[108] They chose monarchy over republicanism. Some linked these choices to their Christian beliefs.[109] Culturally and morally, the Dominion was Christian. As the founders' statements about providence showed, Canada was considered a nation under God, and a nation whose people were striving to follow God. The founders did not write great theological assertions into the British North America Act, nor did they publish anything comparable to the Declaration of Independence, with its language stemming from a Christian version of natural law. Declarations of Canada's Christian heritage were less blatant. Nevertheless, they were present, and "Dominion" was a chief one among them. The word was at once an affirmation of monarchical government, a declaration of Canada's Christian faith, and an acknowledgement of providence by its nature as a subtle, but significant way of declaring a need and desire for Divine blessing. The course of events that led to using the new title was not over-dramatic, but that it was not is all the more important. That the founders took a title from the Bible without apparent controversy speaks to the seamless reality of the Christian influence in state and society at the Canadian founding.

On the morning of 1 July 1867, George Brown's *Globe* published a two-page article for "Confederation Day" describing the history and resources of the new Dominion of Canada.[110] In it, Brown encouraged Canadians to "gratefully acknowledge the hand of the Almighty Disposer

---

[108] This was the contrast between Britain and France identified by Burke in the *Reflections*. Burke, *Revolutionary Writings*, 34, 185-86.

[109] As per Chapter 1, they objected to democracy based on their belief in man's sin nature and associated it with French Revolutionary atheism.

[110] Richard Gwyn affirms Brown's authorship of the article. See Richard Gwyn, *The Life and Times of John A. Macdonald: Volume One: 1815-1867*, (Toronto: Vintage Canada, 2008), 437.

of Events in bringing about this result, pregnant with so important an influence on the condition and destines" of the present and future inhabitants of the Dominion. He also wished for them to "acknowledge, too, the sagacity, the patriotism, the forgetfulness of selfish and partisan considerations, on the part of our statesmen, to which under Providence are due the inception of" Confederation. Brown gave this comments a privileged place in the first paragraph after his introduction to the front page article.[111] Morris, too, in his speech at Perth on the first Dominion Day, again voiced his perception of "the workings of the finger of Providence." The report of his speech stated "He (Mr. Morris) was one of those who believed that the affairs of nations were overruled by Providence." It quoted the well-known lines on providence from Shakespeare's *Hamlet* that read "There's a Divinity that shapes our ends, // Rough hew them how he will.[112] Morris concluded by encouraging all to do their patriotic duty and strive to realize to the fullest the destiny offered to them of becoming a nation from sea to sea.[113] His speech was quite consistent with his older pamphlets. The providential faith of the founders was open and public, and not merely formal or rhetorical.

A historical-political belief in the sovereignty of God had a presence in the Confederation debates that has not been recognized by historians. Many legislators and pamphleteers saw Confederation as the work of providence. They expounded beliefs concerning the "golden opportunity" God presented them with, the need for Divine blessing going on, Canada's duties in light of God's working, and the need for Christianity to maintain a significant place in the new nation. The Fathers of Confederation chose a name for the nation that, while declaring their monarchical convictions, was also a direct statement of their Christian ones. The providentialist

---

[111] George Brown "Confederation Day," *The Globe*, 1 July 1867. ProQuest Historical Newspapers: The Globe and Mail.
[112] Alexander Morris, "Speech at Perth, on 1st July, 1867," in *Nova Britannia; or, our New Canadian Dominion Foreshadowed*, ed. Canadian Press (Toronto: Hunter and Rose, 1884), 127-28.
[113] Morris, "Speech at Perth," 134.

cast of mind was especially present among Presbyterians and Roman Catholics, whose deep

theological differences ironically led them to agree on Confederation. It seemed that both British

and French Canadians could realize their providential missions through union. At the founding of

the new Dominion, more was involved than just 'church and state' issues. There was also a

widespread perception of the relations between 'God and state.' Likewise, duty was an important

principle for the Victorian statesmen, and their recognition of duties in relation to God's

providence was an important influence on them. A Christian understanding of history and

politics had a serious place in the thought of the founders of the Dominion of Canada.

Conclusion

The pervasive influence of Christian ideas on the founding of the Dominion was publically evident in the Confederation debates and pamphlets, in disputes that occurred within them, and in the founders' lives themselves. This study of the 1865 ratification debates in the Province of Canada has shown as much. The founders neither hid their faith behind closed doors, nor left it at home. They expressed serious, public, and widespread Christian beliefs that shaped their cast of mind and actions during Canada's founding. God was real to them. When religious issues came up, the founders spoke about more than the institutional relationship between church and state. They often positioned matters in relation to the fundamentals of their religious thought.

The founders' beliefs about 'God and state' appeared in their discussions pertaining to political philosophy, education, and worldview in general. Chapter 1 showed how important their beliefs about God and man were to them as guides during writing the constitution. They unhesitatingly spoke of Canada as a Christian country. Their Biblical convictions about the sinfulness and inadequacy of human nature encouraged them to adhere firmly to the British constitutional tradition of mixed government to counteract as well as possible the worst impulses of the different classes of society. They held religious conscience in the foreground of negotiations on controversial topics. The education question examined in Chapter 2 demonstrated this modus operandi. It made clear the priorities of many of Canada's founders. In neither Upper nor Lower Canada could the state be allowed to interfere with what Protestants or Catholics believed was just and truthful schooling without conflict. The higher concern of safeguarding children's souls same first. The state and education were temporal, but man's position in or out of Christ was eternal. Protestant and Catholic founders shared basic concerns in

their worldviews, political philosophies, and educational goals, even if, when a closer examination is made, their agreements become ironic in face of their irreconcilable differences. Chapter 3 discussed how the founders regularly spoke about God's providential workings in history and in their own time. Not a few saw Confederation as the result of a special providence given to Canada by her God. The chapter explores that point, and considers how the founders proceeded from it to assert a responsibility to take up the opportunity to found a new nation and see its character was high.

Even considering Christianity's significant influence on Confederation, however, it cannot be said that Canada was a 'Christian nation.' Universally applicable parameters for such a definition would have to be found in the Bible, but none are given. New Testament churches were scattered outposts of believers that, far from wielding political sway, were subject to frequent persecutions. Nowhere in the New Testament are instructions given for setting up 'Christian nations' akin to ancient Israel. Roman Catholic and denominational theologies might suggest how such ought to be done, but nothing that can serve as a universal definition. Some of the founders explicitly declared the Canadas to be a Christian "nation" or "community," but these vague generalizations break down when the divides between Protestant and Catholic conceptions are examined even a little. Nevertheless, it is undoubtedly true that Confederation was influenced by Christian ideas. The determined secularism that prevailed in the United States was not definitely mimicked in Canada.[1] Even though there was no established church in British North America, neither was there complete separation between church and state. The state relied on the

---

[1] Kevin J. Christiano, "Church and State in Institutional Flux: Canada and the United States," in *Rethinking Church, State, and Modernity: Canada Between Europe and America*, eds. David Lyon and Marguerite Van Die (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000), 70.

113

churches in areas like health, education, and welfare well into the twentieth century.[2] It is clear from this thesis that churches also played a large role in shaping political ideas. It would be accurate to describe the young Dominion as a nation of Christians that was significantly influenced in its political and constitutional directions by its Christian faith. It is unfortunate that historians of Confederation have essentially ignored this important factor that shaped the new country.

Though it is more a question of political science than of history, the concept of "political nationality" has bearing on how the Christian influence on Canada's founding is perceived. Morton and Ajzenstat's interpretations are part of a tradition that rejects a social or cultural basis for Canadian national identity.[3] Ajzenstat argued that the founders rejected the idea of enshrining common social and cultural values in the constitution in order to reduce political disagreements and to avoid creating an exclusive identity that had the potential to harm minorities. They stuck to common *political* values of "equality, nondiscrimination [sic], the rule of law, justice, civil peace, and prosperity."[4] She did note that the founders "believed that a good country includes flourishing religious institutions, strong families, good neighbours, benevolent societies, and so

---

[2] David Seljak, "Resisting the 'No Man's Land' of Private Religion: The Catholic Church and Public Politics in Quebec," in *Rethinking Church, State, and Modernity: Canada Between Europe and America*, eds. David Lyon and Marguerite Van Die (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000), 132.

[3] Ajzenstat acknowledged that she drew on old ideas about "the distinction between civic identity and cultural identity," but did not elaborate. Ajzenstat, *The Canadian Founding: John Locke and Parliament* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2007), 12. For Confederation, W. L. Morton was the most important proponent of the civic identity interpreters that preceded her. He affirmed the validity of Cartier's "political nationality" phrase. Understanding that national and political sovereignty were held as distinct at Confederation was a "vital point." W. L. Morton, *The Critical Years: The Union of British North America, 1857-1873* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1964), 176-77. Morton wrote that "Any one, French, Irish, Ukrainian or Eskimo, can be a subject of the Queen and a citizen of Canada without in any way changing or ceasing to be himself." Canadian identity was a formalized political allegiance. W. L. Morton, *The Canadian Identity*, 2nd ed. (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1972), 85-7. See also Samuel L. LaSelva, *The Moral Foundations of Canadian Federalism: Paradoxes, Achievements, and Tragedies of Nationhood* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1996), ix, xiii. LaSelva argued Canada's foundational principle was a moral imperative to preserve diversity through federalism.

[4] Ajzenstat, *Canadian Founding*, 108-09.

on."[5] Even so, the distinction she set up between political values on the one hand, and social or cultural or religious ones on the other, underestimated the considerable impact of Christianity on politics at Confederation. Pointing this out is not to argue for blurring the useful conceptual boundaries between state, society, culture, and faith. Nor is it to discount the institutional validity of the "political nationality." It is, though, to say that it is vital to understand that Canadian thought and identity at Confederation was anything but secular (in the sense of non-religious). This has been largely overlooked even by the studies of Confederation's ideas that scholars have been slowly undertaking since the 1990s.

There are a number of areas that suggest themselves for further research based on the findings of this thesis. Topics that have only been touched upon here could easily become articles, theses, or books of their own. There is more to be said about the Christian influence on the history, philosophy, and practice of mixed government. Similarly, the linkages between the founders' religions and their preferences for monarchy and reluctant commitment to federalism bear examination. Studies of these themes would not be complete, however, without the more foundational subject of Protestant and Roman Catholic differences. This thesis has sometimes focused on the similarities between members of different beliefs, but has been careful not to ignore the fact that these differences were present and very impactful. It is especially through examinations of Catholicism that the influence of natural law philosophy might become appreciated. Aside from education, the fierce debate over giving the federal government the power to legislate on divorce would seem to be the most material subject in relation to this.[6] On a more abstract level, ideas of duty, progress, and noble aspirations are worthy of study. The

---

[5] Ajzenstat, *Canadian Founding*, 105.
[6] It was originally intended to have four chapters, with marriage and divorce being the subject of the third, but space did not permit this plan to come to fruition.

founders spoke of these values enough to suggest their relevance. The chapter on providence suggests that Christian beliefs were a part of them.

A final subject with significance to Confederation studies that has probable Christian connections is the idea of difference. The differences between equality and equity are simple, but profound. They exhibited themselves in the Confederation debates in discussions about the goals and composition of the upper house, and in common concerns about assuring the best of men would steer the ship of the state. Of course, concerning all these topics, it must be remembered that only the Province of Canada's Confederation debates and pamphlets have been discussed in this thesis. The four Maritime provinces, as well as the western provinces that entered Confederation in succeeding decades, each have their own documents that require re-reading.

It is hoped that this thesis will encourage the addition of a new strain of explanation for accounts of Canada's founding. If it does, it will not do so in a way that adds only another issue to be discussed alongside railways and economics. These three chapters represent a layered approach in order to show the pervasiveness of Christian thought amongst the founders. It is a foundational subject. The founders' faith was a key component of their cast of mind that included strong ideas about freedom, loyalty, patriotism, unity, compromise, national vision, and the British Constitution. The domains of church and state frequently overlapped in the 1860s. Their official separation was rather to increase religion's vitality and influence than to decrease it. The influence of churches upon statesmen was significant.

This thesis is meant to be an example of the rethinking that will add depth to the narrative history of Confederation by demonstrating the connections between religious and political thought. At very least, it is hoped that its findings will open more productive avenues for research into Christianity's influence on the Canadian state, and into how those with starkly

contrasting religious beliefs managed to cooperate enough to maintain civil peace and create a common national purpose. When it is recognized that the differences between Protestants and Roman Catholics were nearly as intense at Confederation as Christian and non-Christian religious ones can be today, the subject takes on a particular relevance. In this sesquicentennial year, there is still much to be written on the founding of the Dominion of Canada.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Abbott, John Stevens Cabot. *The French Revolution of 1789: As Viewed in the Light of Republicanism*. Vol. 2. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1887.

Aristotle, *Politics*. In *Readings in Ancient Greek Philosophy From Thales to Aristotle*. 3rd Edition. Edited by S. Marc Cohen, Patricia Curd, and C. D. C. Reeve. Indianapolis: Hackett, 2005.

Anderson, James. *The Union of the British North American Provinces Considered, in a letter addressed to the Citizens of British North America by Obiter Dictum with Remarks by "The London Times" on the St. Lawrence Route, & Subsidies to Ocean Steamers*. Montreal: Owler and Stevenson, 1859. Fiche, 10, CIHM no. 39130.

Browne, G. P., ed. *Documents on the Confederation of British North America: A Compilation Based on Sir Joseph Pope's Confederation Documents Supplemented by Other Official Material*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill Queen's University Press, 2009.

Burke, Edmund. *Revolutionary Writings*: *Reflections on the Revolution in France and the first Letter on a Regicide Peace*. Edited by Ian Hampsher-Monk. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Cartier, Georges Étienne. *Discours de Sir Georges Cartier, baronnet, accompagnés de notices*. Édité par Joseph Tassé. Montréal: Eusèbe Senécal & Fils, 1893.

Cauchon, Joseph-Édouard. *The Union of the Provinces of British North America*. Translated by George Henry Macaulay. Quebec: Hunter and Rose, 1865.

Dawson, Samuel Edward. *The Northern Kingdom*. Montreal: Dawson Brothers, 1866(?). Fiche, 9, CIHM no. 35063.

Galt, Alexander T. *Church and State*. Montreal: Dawson Brothers, 1876.

_____. *Speech on the proposed union of the British North American provinces delivered at Sherbrooke, C.E., by the Hon. A. T. Galt, minister of finance, 23rd November, 1864*. Montreal: M. Longmoore, 1864.

Gray, John Hamilton. *Confederation; Or, The Political and Parliamentary History of Canada, from the Conference at Quebec, in October, 1864, to the Admission of British Columbia, in July, 1871*. Vol. 1. Toronto: Copp, Clark & Co., 1872.

Locke, John. *Two Treatises of Government*. Edited by Peter Laslett. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967.

Legislature of the United Province of Canada. *Parliamentary Debates on the Subject of the Confederation of the British North American Provinces, 3rd Session, 8th Provincial Parliament of Canada*. Quebec: Hunter, Rose & Co., Parliamentary Printers, 1865.

McGee, Thomas D'Arcy. "Canada's Interest in the American Civil War." In *1825 - D'Arcy McGee - 1925: A Collection of Speeches and Addresses*, 168-190. Edited by Charles Murphy. Toronto: MacMillan, 1937.

_____. "Edmund Burke." In Murphy, 64-68.

_____. "Emigration and Colonization." In Murphy, 191-214.

_____. *The Catholic History of North America. Five Discourses. To which are added Two Discourses on the Relations of Ireland and America.* Boston: Patrick Donahoe, 1855.

_____. "The Mental Outfit of the New Dominion." In Murphy, 1-21.

_____. "The Separate School Question." In Murphy, 152-164.

Macdonald, John A. *Address of The Hon. John A. Macdonald to the Electors of the City of Kingston, with Extracts from Mr. Macdonald's Speeches, Delivered on Different Occasions in the Years 1860, and 1861, &c*. [Kingston?]: n.p., 1861.

Morris, Alexander. *Nova Britannia; or Our New Canadian Dominion Foreshadowed*. Edited by Canadian Press. Toronto: Hunter and Rose, 1884.

Pope, Joseph. *Memoirs of the Right Honourable Sir John Alexander Macdonald, G.C.B., First Prime Minister of the Dominion of Canada*. Vol. 2. Ottawa: J. Durie & Son, 1894.

Sidney, Algernon. *Discourses Concerning Government.* Reprint. Farnborough, Hampshire, England: Gregg International Publishers, 1968.

Taché, Joseph Charles. *Des provinces de l'Amérique du nord et d'une union fédérale*. Québec: J. T. Brousseau, 1858.

The Confederation Debates, 1865-1949. Accessed 29 July 2017. http://theconfederationdebates.ca/.

Secondary Sources

Ajzenstat, Janet. *Canada's Origins: Liberal, Tory, or Republican?* Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 1995.

_____. *Discovering Confederation: A Canadian's Story*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2014.

_____. *The Canadian Founding: John Locke and Parliament.* Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2007.

_____, Paul Romney, Ian Gentles, and William D. Gairdner, eds. *Canada's Founding Debates*. Toronto: Stoddart, 1999.

Baker, J. Wayne. "The Covenantal Basis for the Development of Swiss Political Federalism: 1291-1848." *Publius* 23, no. 2 (Spring, 1993): 19-41.

Berger, Carl. *The Sense of Power: Studies in the Ideas of Canadian Imperialism, 1867-1914.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970.

Brett, Annabel. "What is Intellectual History Now?" In *What is History Now?* Edited by David Cannadine, 113-131. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002.

Careless, J. M. S. *Brown of the Globe*. 2 vols. Toronto: Macmillan, 1959.

Chevrier, Marc. "The Idea of Federalism among the Founding Fathers of the United States and Canada." In *Contemporary Canadian Federalism: Foundations, Traditions, Institutions*. Edited by Alain-G. Gagnon. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009.

Christiano, Kevin J. "Church and State in Institutional Flux: Canada and the United States." In Lyon and Marguerite, 69-89.

Christie, Nancy, and Michael Gauvreau. *Christian Churches and Their Peoples, 1840-1965: A Social History of Religion in Canada.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010.

Creighton, Donald. *The Road to Confederation - The Emergence of Canada: 1863-1867*. Toronto: Macmillan, 1964.

Delisle, Jean. "Through the Lens of History Translating *dominion* as *puissance*: A case of absurd self-flattery?" *Language Update* 8, no. 4 (2012): 18. Accessed 31 July 2017. http://www.btb.termiumplus.gc.ca/tpv2guides/guides/favart/index-fra.html?lang=fra&lettr=indx_titls&page=9spu01Mio3EU.html#note1.

Doyle, William. *The Oxford History of the French Revolution*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Elazar, Daniel. *Exploring Federalism*. Tuscaloosa and London: University of Alabama Press, 1991.

Ewart, John S. *The Kingdom Papers*. Vol. 2. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1912.

Fahey, Curtis. *In His Name: The Anglican Experience in Upper Canada, 1791-1854*. Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 1991.

Fiorino, Albert S. "The Moral Foundation of Egerton Ryerson's Idea of Education." In *Egerton Ryerson and His Times*. Edited by Neil McDonald and Alf Chaiton, 59-80. Toronto: Macmillan, 1978.

Francis, R. Douglas, Richard Jones, Donald B. Smith, and Robert Wardhaugh. *Origins: Canadian History to Confederation*. 8th ed. Toronto: Nelson Education, 2013.

Gagnon, Serge. *Quebec and its Historians*: *The Twentieth Century*. Translated by Jane Brierley. Montreal: Harvest House, 1985.

Gauvreau, Michael. *The Evangelical Century: College and Creed in English Canada from the Great Revival to the Great Depression*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1991.

Gay, Peter. *The Enlightenment: An Interpretation - The Rise of Modern Paganism*. New York: Vintage Books, 1968.

Grant, John Webster. *The Church in the Canadian Era.* Burlington, ON: Welch Publishing Company, 1988.

Guyatt, Nicholas. *Providence and the Invention of the United States, 1607-1876.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Gwyn, Richard. *The Life and Times of John A. Macdonald*. Vol. 1: *1815-1867*. Toronto: Vintage Canada, 2008.

Heintzman, Ralph. "The Spirit of Confederation: Professor Creighton, Biculturalism, and the Use of History." *Canadian Historical Review* 52, no. 3 (September 1971): 245-75.

Hodgins, Bruce W. *John Sandfield Macdonald, 1812-1872*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971.

Iggers, Georg G. *Historiography in the Twentieth Century: From Scientific Objectivity to the Postmodern Challenge*. Hanover and London: Wesleyan University Press and University of New England Press, 1997.

Jones, Benjamin T. *Republicanism and Responsible Government: The Shaping of Democracy in Australia and Canada*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2014.

Klassen, Henry C. *Luther H. Holton: A Founding Canadian Entrepreneur*. Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 2001.

Lagasse, P., and Columbia University. *The Columbia Encyclopedia*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2016.

Lamonde, Yvan. *The Social History of Ideas in Quebec, 1760-1896*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2013.

Lande, Lawrence. *Confederation Pamphlets: A Check-list - Liste Abrégée*. Montreal: McGill University, 1967.

LaSelva, Samuel V. *The Moral Foundations of Canadian Federalism: Paradoxes, Achievements, and Tragedies of Nationhood*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1996.

Livingstone, David W., ed. *Liberal Education, Civic Education, and the Canadian Regime*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2015.

_____. "Thomas D'Arcy McGee's Civic Paideia for Canada." In Livingstone, 90-113.

Lyon, David, and Marguerite Van Die, eds. *Rethinking Church, State, and Modernity: Canada Between Europe and America*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000.

McDonald, Neil. "Egerton Ryerson and the School as an Agent of Political Socialization." In *Egerton Ryerson and His Times*. Edited by Neil McDonald and Alf Chaiton, 81-106. Toronto: Macmillan, 1978.

McKay, Ian. "The Liberal Order Framework: A Prospectus for a Reconnaissance of Canadian History." *Canadian Historical Review* 81, no. 4 (December 2000): 616-645.

McKillop, A. B. *A Disciplined Intelligence: Critical Inquiry and Canadian Thought in the Victorian Era.* Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2001.

McKim, Denis Beer. "Boundless Dominion: Providence, Politics, and the Early Canadian Presbyterian Worldview, 1815-1875." PhD diss., University of Toronto, 2011. Accessed 28 June 2017. https://tspace.library.utoronto.ca/bitstream/1807/30048/1/McKim_Denis_B_201106_PhD _thesis.pdf.

_____. "'Righteousness Exalteth a Nation': Providence, Empire, and the Forging of the Early Canadian Presbyterian Identity." *Canadian Society of Church History*, Historical Papers (2008): 47-66.

Marshall, David "Religion in Canada, 1867-1945." In *The Cambridge History of Religions in America*. Vol. 2: *1790-1945*. Edited by Stephen J. Stein, 675-701. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Martin, Ged. *Britain and the Origins of Canadian Confederation, 1837-1867*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1995.

Moir, John S. *Church and State in Canada West: Three Studies in the Relation of Denominationalism and Nationalism, 1841-1867*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1968.

Moore, Christopher. *1867: How the Fathers Made a Deal*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1997.

_____. *Three Weeks in Quebec City: The Meeting that Made Canada*. Toronto: Allan Lane, 2015.

Morgan, Henry J., ed. *The Canadian Parliamentary Companion*. Montreal: J. Lovell, 1874.

Morton, W. L. *The Canadian Identity*. 2nd ed. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1972.

_____. *The Critical Years: The Union of British North America, 1857-1873*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1964.

Parker, Kim Ian. *The Biblical Politics of John Locke*. Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2004.

Pearce, Colin D. "Canadian Guardian: The Educational Statesmanship of Egerton Ryerson." In Livingstone, 114-139.

Preece, Rod. "The Political Wisdom of Sir John A. Macdonald." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 17, no. 3 (1984): 459-486.

Prentice, Allison. *The School Promoters: Education and Social Class in Mid-Nineteenth Century Upper Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014.

Ralls, Walter. "The Papal Aggression of 1850: A Study in Victorian Anti-Catholicism." *Church History: Studies in Christianity and Culture* 43, no. 2 (June, 1974): 242-256.

Risk, R.C.B. *A History of Canadian Legal Thought: Collected Essays*. Edited by G. Blaine Baker and Jim Phillips. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006.

Romney, Paul. *Getting it Wrong: How Canadians Forgot Their Past and Imperilled Confederation*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999.

Seljack, David. "Resisting the 'No Man's Land' of Private Religion: The Catholic Church and Public Politics in Quebec." In Lyon and Van Die, 131-148.

Shrive, Norman. *Charles Mair: Literary Nationalist*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965.

Sigmund, Paul E. "The Catholic Tradition and Modern Democracy." *The Review of Politics* 49, no. 4 (Autumn, 1987): 530-548.

Sissons, C. B. *Church and State in Canadian Education*. Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1959.

Smith, Andrew. *British Businessmen and Canadian Confederation: Constitution-Making in an Era of Anglo-Globalization*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2008.

Smith, Peter J. "The Ideological Origins of Confederation." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* XX, no. 1 (March/mar 1987): 3-30.

Stanis, Peter J. *Edmund Burke and the Natural Law.* Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1965.

Strehle, Stephen. *The Egalitarian Spirit of Christianity: The Sacred Roots of British and American Government.* New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2009.

Taylor, Brooke. *Promoters, Patriots, and Partisans: Historiography in Nineteenth-Century English Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1989.

Thomson, Dale C. *Alexander Mackenzie: Clear Grit*. Toronto: Macmillan, 1960.

Timothy, Hamilton Baird. *The Galts: A Canadian Odyssey*. Vol. 2: *Alexander Tilloch Galt, 1817-1893. Elliott Torrance Galt, 1850-1928*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1977.

Underhill, Frank Hawkins. *The Image of Confederation*. Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, 1964.

Upton, L. F. S. "The Idea of Confederation, 1754-1858." In *The Shield of Achilles: Aspects of Canada in the Victorian Age*. Edited by W. L. Morton. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1968.

Van Die, Marguerite, ed. *Religion and Public Life in Canada: Historical and Comparative Perspectives*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001.

Vaudry, Richard W. *Anglicans and the Atlantic World: High Churchmen, Evangelicals and the Quebec Connection.* Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2003.

Vaughan, Frederick. *The Canadian Federalist Experiment: From Defiant Monarchy to Reluctant Republic*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2003.

Vipond, Robert Charles. *Liberty and Community: Canadian Federalism and the Failure of the Constitution*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991.

Walker, Franklin A. *Catholic Education and Politics in Upper Canada: A Study of the Documentation Relative to the Origin of Catholic Elementary Schools in the Ontario School System.* Toronto: J. M. Dent, 1955.

Waite, P. B. *The Confederation Debates in the Province of Canada*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2006.

_____. *The Life and Times of Confederation, 1864-1867: Politics, Newspapers, and the Union of British North America*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1962.

Wilson, David A. *Thomas D'Arcy McGee*. 2 vols. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2008-11.

Windsor, Kenneth N. "Historical Writing in Canada to 1920." In *Literary History of Canada: Canadian Literature in English*. Edited by Carl F. Klinck, Alfred G. Bailey, Claude Bissell, Roy Daniells, Northrop Frye, and Desmond Pacey. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1966.

Wise, S. F. "God's Peculiar Peoples." In *The Shield of Achilles: Aspects of Canada in the Victorian Age*. Edited by W. L. Morton, 36-61. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1968.

_____. "Sermon Literature and Canadian Intellectual History." In *God's Peculiar Peoples: Essays on Political Culture in Nineteenth-Century Canada*. Edited by A. B. McKillop and Paul Romney. Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 1993.

Wright, Donald. *Donald Creighton: A Life in History.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2015

Dictionaries of Biography and Ideas

Bonenfant, J.-C. "Sir George-Étienne Cartier." In *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*. Vol. 10. University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–. Accessed 20 September 2017. http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/cartier_george_etienne_10E.html.

Bowsfield, Hartwell. "Aquila Walsh." In *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*. Vol. 11. University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–. Accessed 13 July 2017. http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/walsh_aquila_11E.html.

Burns, Robin B. "Thomas D'Arcy McGee." In *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*. Vol. 9. University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–. Accessed 12 July 2017. http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/mcgee_thomas_d_arcy_9E.html.

Corbeil, Pierre. "Christopher Dunkin." In *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*. Vol. 11. University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–. Accessed 16 February 2017. http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/dunkin_christopher_11E.html.

Cornell, Paul. "John Ross (1818-71)." In *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*. Vol. 10. University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–. Accessed 12 July 2017. http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/ross_john_1818_71_10E.html.

Désilets, Andrée. "Sir Étienne-Paschal Taché." In *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*. Vol. 9. University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–. Accessed 12 July 2017. http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/tache_etienne_paschal_9E.html.

Dictionnaire des parlementaires du Québec de 1792 à nos jours. S.v. "Louis-Charles Boucher de Niverville." National Assembly of Quebec, 2008. Accessed 13 July 2017. http://www.assnat.qc.ca/en/deputes/boucher-de-niverville-louis-charles-2207/biographie.html.

_____. S.v. "Hippolite Cornellier." National Assembly of Quebec, 2009. Accessed 13 July 2017. http://www.assnat.qc.ca/en/deputes/cornellier-hippolite-2653/biographie.html.

_____. S.v. "Paul Denis." National Assembly of Quebec, 2009. Accessed 13 July 2017. http://www.assnat.qc.ca/en/deputes/denis-paul-2837/biographie.html.

_____. S.v. "Joseph Dufresne." National Assembly of Quebec, 2011. Accessed 12 July 2017. http://www.assnat.qc.ca/en/deputes/dufresne-joseph-3003/biographie.html.

_____. S.v. "Antoine Chartier de Lotbinière Harwood." National Assembly of Quebec, 2009. Accessed 12 July 2017. http://www.assnat.qc.ca/en/deputes/harwood-antoine-chartier-de-lotbiniere-3609/biographie.html.

_____. S.v. "James O'Halloran." National Assembly of Quebec, 2009. Accessed 12 July 2017. http://www.assnat.qc.ca/en/deputes/o-halloran-james-4655/biographie.html.

_____. S.v. "Louis-Auguste Olivier." National Assembly of Quebec, 2009. Accessed 13 July 2017. http://www.assnat.qc.ca/en/patrimoine/anciens-parlementaires/olivier-louis-auguste-303.html.

_____. S.v. "Jean-Baptiste Pouliot." National Assembly of Quebec, 2009. Accessed 13 July 2017. http://www.assnat.qc.ca/en/deputes/pouliot-jean-baptiste-4967/biographie.html.

Eakins, Peter R. and Jean Sinnamon Eakins. "Sir John William Dawson." In *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*. Vol. 12. University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–. Accessed 19 June 2017. http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/dawson_john_william_12E.html.

Farr, David M. L. "Sir John Rose." In *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*. Vol. 11. University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–. Accessed 13 July 2017. http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/rose_john_11E.html.

Flemming, David B. "Thomas Louis Connolly." In *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*. Vol. 10. University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–. Accessed 13 July 2017. http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/connolly_thomas_louis_10E.html.

Foriers, Paul, and Chaim Perelman. "Natural Law and Natural Rights." In *Dictionary of the History of Ideas*. Vol. 3. Edited by Philip P. Wiener. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1973. Accessed 9 May 2017. http://xtf.lib.virginia.edu/xtf/view?docId=DicHist/uvaBook/tei/DicHist3.xml;chunk.id=dv3-04;toc.depth=1;toc.id=dv3-04;brand=default.

Fortin, Lionel. "François Bourassa." In *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*. Vol. 12. University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–. Accessed 13 July 2017. http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/bourassa_francois_12E.html.

Friesen, Jean. "Alexander Morris." In *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*. Vol. 11. University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–. Accessed 14 February 2017. http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/morris_alexander_11E.html.

Gillis, Sandra, and Robert Peter Gillis. "James Skead." In *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*. Vol. 11. University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–. Accessed 19 June 2017. http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/skead_james_11E.html.

Hamelin, Marcel. "Sir Henri-Gustave Joly de Lotbinière." In *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*. Vol. 13. University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–. Accessed 15 February 2017. http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/joly_de_lotbiniere_henri_gustave_13E.html

Hodgins, Bruce W. "John Sandfield Macdonald." In *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*. Vol. 10. University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–. Accessed 12 July 2017. http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/macdonald_john_sandfield_10E.html.

_____. "Lewis Walbridge." In *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*. Vol. 11. University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–. Accessed 12 July 2017. http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/wallbridge_lewis_11E.html.

Johnson, J. K. ed. *The Canadian Directory of Parliament, 1867-1967*. Ottawa: Public Archives of Canada, 1968.

Jones, Elwood H. "John Scoble." Dans *Dictionnaire biographique du Canada*. Vol. 9. Université Laval/University of Toronto, 2003–. Consulté le 20 févr. 2017. http://www.biographi.ca/fr/bio/scoble_john_9F.html.

Kesteman, Jean-Pierre. "Sir Alexander Tilloch Galt." In *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*. Vol. 12. University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–. Accessed 30 June 2017. http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/galt_alexander_tilloch_12E.html.

Klassen, Henry C. "Luther Hamilton Holton." In *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*. Vol. 10. University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–. Accessed 4 April 2017. http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/holton_luther_hamilton_10E.html.

Mackintosh, Charles Herbert, ed. *The Canadian Parliamentary Companion and Annual Register, 1877*. Ottawa: Citizen Print. and Pub. Co., 1877. Fiche. CIHM no. 32951.

_____. *The Canadian Parliamentary Companion and Annual Register, 1882*. Ottawa: Citizen Printing and Publishing Company, 1882.

Morgan, Cecilia and Robert Craig Brown. "Sir Richard John Cartwright." In *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*. Vol. 14. University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–. Accessed 12 July 2017. http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/cartwright_richard_john_14E.html.

Nadeau, Jean-Guy. "Joseph-Charles Taché." In *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*. Vol. 12. University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–. Accessed 30 June 2017. http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/tache_joseph_charles_12E.html.

Naylor, Mary. 'Mark Willoughby'. Dans *Dictionnaire biographique du Canada*. Vol. 7. Université Laval/University of Toronto, 2003–. Consulté le 16 févr. 2017. http://www.biographi.ca/fr/bio/willoughby_mark_7F.html.

Parker, George L. "Samuel Edward Dawson." In *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*. Vol. 14. University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–. Accessed 19 June 2017. http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/dawson_samuel_edward_14E.html.

Perry, Sandra E., and Jessica J. Craig. *The Mantle of Leadership: Premiers of the North-West Territories and Alberta, 1897-2005*. Legislative Assembly of Alberta, 2006.

Plouffe, Marcel. "Charles Joseph Alleyn." In *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*. Vol. 11. University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–. Accessed May 10, 2017. http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/alleyn_charles_joseph_11E.html.

Rothney, Gordon O. "John Sewell Sanborn." In *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*. Vol. 10. University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003. Accessed 11 February 2017. http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/sanborn_john_sewell_10E.html

Rumilly, Robert. "Luc Letellier de Saint Just." In *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*. Vol. 11. University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–. Accessed 10 May 2017. http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/letellier_de_saint_just_luc_11E.html.

Soulard, Jean-Claude. "Sir Antoine-Aimé Dorion." In *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*. Vol. 12. University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–. Accessed 10 May 2017. http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/dorion_antoine_aime_12E.html.

Stelmack, Carole B. "Thomas Roberts Ferguson." In *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*. Vol. 10. University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–. Accessed 10 May 2017. http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/ferguson_thomas_roberts_10E.html.

Tulchinsky, Gerald J. J. and Alan R. Dever. "Thomas Ryan." In *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*. Vol. 11. University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003-. Accessed 10 May 2017. http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/ryan_thomas_11E.html.

Turner, Larry. "Billa Flint." In *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*. Vol. 12. University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–. Accessed 4 April 2017. http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/flint_billa_12E.html.

Vachon, Claude. "Joseph-Octave Beaubien." In *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*. Vol. 10. University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003–. Accessed 12 July 2017. http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/beaubien_joseph_octave_10E.html.