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ABSTRACT

Although Canadian historians have reinterpreted many aspects of missions histories since the 1970's, there have been no comprehensive studies of the roles, motives, and actions of Native missionary agents. This dissertation examines the Church Missionary Society's program of training and employing Native agents and the relationships between Native and European missionaries in the 19th century Canadian North-West. The Church Missionary Society portrayed interactions between the Native and European agents that it trained and employed as harmonious, supportive, and equal. It claimed that its Native agents were motivated by the same callings as European missionaries and that they disseminated its interpretation of Christianity in the same way.

Native agents and their wives, however, often differed in values, motives, and life-worlds from European-born missionaries. Perceptions about race, ethnicity, status, and gender shaped how these individuals viewed themselves and their roles, and how they viewed, and were viewed by, their missionary counterparts and their religious charges. The Church Missionary Society's own policies promoted visible and detrimental distinctions in status and responsibilities between Native and European proselytizers that effectively limited the roles and truncated the careers of Native agents.
INTRODUCTION

Historians in Canada have reinterpreted many aspects of nineteenth century missionary work. Aside from several case studies of individuals, however, there have been no re-examinations of the roles and activities of proselytizers of Christianity who were of Aboriginal ancestry. By examining the roles, beliefs, and life-worlds of Native proselytizers of Christianity who were in the paid employ of the Church Missionary Society (CMS) in the nineteenth century Canadian North-West, this study partly addresses that paucity in the historiography.

Historians of missions have typically viewed the values and motives of Native missionary agents\(^1\) to be the same as those of their European and Euro-Canadian counterparts. Cautions raised by postmodernist criticisms of the social sciences, findings of studies in peasant resistance, the reinterpretation of previously used source materials, and the application of methodologies from a variety of fields including anthropology, ethnohistory, and literary criticism, however, suggest that this understanding requires reconsideration. Native agents of the CMS and their wives often differed in values, motives, and perspectives both from their European-born counterparts and amongst themselves. This study will show that perceptions about race, ethnicity, status, and gender shaped how these individuals viewed themselves and their roles, and how they viewed, and were viewed by, their missionary counterparts and their religious charges.
Before this study is undertaken, it is important to elaborate upon the terms ‘Aboriginal’, ‘Indigenous’, and ‘Native’ as they are used in this work. In *Aboriginal People and Colonizers of Western Canada to 1900*, historian Sarah Carter observed that the term “Aboriginal” is “problematic . . . as it erases the diversity of very different people.” Carter nevertheless chose to use ‘Aboriginal’ in her work both because it replaces the “historical blunder” that is associated with the term “Indian,” and because it “is the term selected for use in the Constitution Act 1982.” For these same reasons, I have judged it appropriate to use the term ‘Aboriginal’ to refer to those peoples and their descendants who inhabited the region presently known as Canada from before the arrival of Europeans through to the end of the nineteenth century. Because this definition is geographically and temporally specific, and because it refers to a specific, albeit general, grouping of people, I have chosen to capitalize ‘Aboriginal’. When referring to specific cultural or political groups of Aboriginal peoples, I will note their band or tribal name or the location in which they lived.

On the global level, I judged it appropriate to use the term ‘Indigenous’ when referring to peoples in a specific European mission field whose ancestry was connected to that region. As with the term ‘Aboriginal’, the term ‘Indigenous’ is admittedly overly inclusive; it is, however, geographically restrictive. The term ‘indigenous’ (non-capitalized) is used when this geographical specificity is not present.
During the nineteenth century, the Church Missionary Society used the term 'Native' to distinguish between individuals in its employ who had been born in England and those who had been born in a foreign mission field. The constructed classification 'Native' therefore was ethnically explicit; it could apply to individuals who were of full European descent but who were born in the mission field as well as individuals who were of full or partial indigenous descent.

In *Civilising Subjects: Metropole and Colony in the English Imagination, 1830-1967*, Catherine Hall observed that “[i]t was colonial encounters which produced a new category, race, the meanings of which, like those of class and gender, have always shifted and been contested and challenged.” This dissertation demonstrates that changes in European understandings of the meaning of race and its relationship to status had significant ramifications for the CMS’s work in the Canadian North-West and for the roles, opportunities, and perceptions of its Native agents. Indeed, subsequent chapters show that in the Canadian context, the ethnically explicit definition of ‘Native’ was artificial and that contemporaries criticized it for being discriminatory on a personal level and for being detrimental to the extension of Christianity.

Missionaries who were of Aboriginal ancestry viewed themselves to be, and were viewed by others as being, distinct from proselytizers who were born in Canada but who were of full European descent. In fact, use of the term “Native clergyman” by contemporaries in the Canadian North-West was racially explicit; it almost exclusively referred to a person who was “wholly or
partly of Indian blood." Consequently, the term ‘Native’ is used throughout this work to refer to agents of the CMS who possessed at least some degree of Aboriginal ancestry because its accurately conveys the important role that race played in shaping nineteenth century perceptions about these individuals.

Like race and ethnicity, status and gender are culturally constructed concepts that are "structured through various types of discourse." In the nineteenth century Canadian North-West, understandings of status and gender were based on forces that included intermingled aspects of authority, respectability, morality, sexuality, class, and race. This dissertation examines the status and gender relationships that existed between various groups of peoples in the Canadian mission field and analyzes the impact that those relationships had on the roles, responsibilities, and careers of CMS Native agents and their wives. It demonstrates that in the Canadian mission field during the nineteenth century, race, ethnicity, status, and gender all had "social power" in that they organized and mediated social relations.

Another term which requires defining is ‘agent’. Contemporaries in the nineteenth century Canadian North-West sometimes referred to persons who were in the paid employ of the CMS as being “Agents” of that Society; the term is used in the same context in this dissertation. Because the Society controlled the training and compensation of its agents, it expected that it would be able to exert greater control over the actions and activities of these individuals than it would be able to over persons who were not on its payroll. In fact, the CMS expected its agents to be trained according to specific
standards and to disseminate Euro-Christian culture in ways and contexts that it considered to be desirable and appropriate.

The use of the term 'Canadian North-West' also requires explanation. Regions can be defined according to a variety of criteria. Using topographical and historiographical criteria, historian A.S. Morton distinguished between three distinct North-Westers: "the spacious prairies," "the vast forest belt to the north," and "The Barren Grounds" that "face the Polar Sea." From an economic and political perspective, after 1858 the term North-West Territory was used to identify the areas that remained under the jurisdiction of the Hudson's Bay Company. This study, however, focuses on the work of the Church Missionary Society among the Aboriginal peoples of Canada in its "North-West America Mission." This mission field encompassed the dioceses of Moosonee, Rupert's Land, Saskatchewan, Athabasca, Mackenzie River, and Selkirk. Consequently, in the context of this dissertation, the term 'North-West' refers to the areas that these dioceses incorporated: roughly all of the present day provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba; northern Ontario and northern Quebec; and the Yukon Territory, Northwest Territory, and Nunavut.

In 1971, historian James W.St.G. Walker surveyed the manner in which scholarly writers portrayed Canada's Aboriginal peoples and observed that the picture of the Indian as a human being that is being presented... is confusing, contradictory and incomplete. Clearly he is not often considered to be deserving of serious attention, or his society of scholarly analysis.
Walker noted that Canada's various Aboriginal persons tended to briefly “appear” as a part of the pre-contact environment and that “[o]nce the whiteman . . . arrived, the Indian [was] . . . given a role in the history of the European in Canada.” He attributed the development of this “derogatory” portrait of Aboriginal peoples in contemporary “Canadian history books” to a variety of crucial factors that often acted in conjunction with one another and that were connected to the analytical and interpretative tasks of historians.17

Almost a decade earlier, historian Martin Duberman penned “The Abolitionists and Psychology.” This insightful article clearly illustrated the influence that the contemporary environment in which a person writes has on that person’s interpretation of past events. Writing at the height of the Civil Rights movement in the United States, Duberman observed that

> [o]ut of their heightened concern with the pressing question of Negro rights, a number of historians, especially the younger ones, have begun to take a new look at the abolitionists, men who in their own way were involved in a similar movement of social change. About both them and ourselves we are asking anew such questions as the proper role of agitation, the underlying motives of both reformers and resisters, and the useful limits of outside interference.18

Duberman continued:

> From this questioning a general tendency has developed to view the abolitionists in a more favorable light than previously. As yet, however, it is a tendency only, and hostility to the abolitionists continues to be strong among historians. . . . Contemporary pressures, if recognized and contained, can prove fruitful in stimulating the historical imagination. They may lead us to uncover (and not invent) aspects of the past to which we were previously blind.19
Beyond his explicit argument, Duberman also demonstrated the influence that the contemporary environment has on the historical interpretations that a person forms when he described “the abolitionists” as “men.” Written in 1962, Duberman’s article pre-dated much of the impact that the feminist movement had on how historians portrayed women. Historians now recognize that women made crucial and diverse contributions to the abolitionist movement.  

A critical reading of Duberman’s article thus reveals not only that contemporary forces can assist historians in analyzing the past without “invent[ing] aspects of the past,” but also that the discourse of historians can create knowledge and describe realities that have no necessary relation “to the actual at all.” In challenging scholars who suggested that “[t]o the Hawaiians, Captain Cook was the God Lono,” for instance, anthropologist Gananath Obeyesekere argued that “this ‘fact’ . . . was created in the European imagination of the eighteenth century and after and was based on the antecedent ‘myth models’ pertaining to the redoubtable explorer cum civilizer who is a god to the ‘natives’.” Obeyesekere suggested that the “uncritical reading of texts” and “taken-for-granted beliefs” which he terms “doxa” have shaped the interpretation of Cook’s death by historians and anthropologists. He pointed out that just as “19th century anthropologists . . . in their time did not think themselves tainted with colonialism, we cannot imagine nowadays we harbour in out theories-ideologies implicit ideas or doxa coming from previously invented intellectual traditions.”
Indeed, because "history is not based on facts or events but thoughts about them," biases are inherent in historical records and scholarly interpretations of those records. According to Joyce McKay, the writing of history involves an interpretation of the past by the selection and manipulation of facts which have been filtered through the mind of the original recorder. This recorder must base his thoughts on an infinite group of facts. The historian again chooses from these facts of the recorder, which actually consist of thoughts about events.27

A variety of factors therefore can shape the form and content of a primary source, including that the author of that record intentionally or unintentionally chose what to note, what to emphasize, what to omit, what to exaggerate, and even what to lie about.28

In fact, historian Shirley Mullen bluntly observed that "the historian cannot assume that written sources are the mirrors of 'reality' - for the sources may be the creators as much as they are the mirrors of their historical context." She noted that the postmodern critique of the social sciences challenged "the ideal of objectivity" on the part of the historian, positing that such an "ideal" was "unattainable." Because interpretation begins with the individual, the environment in which that individual writes fundamentally effects that person's perception of a historical topic. Mullen therefore suggested that "it is the very seeking and striving after truth and a place of 'objectivity' -- not the achievement of these ideals -- that has characterized the historian's task."
From this perspective, Mullen argued that the work of historians is by its very nature "self-correcting." 29

Indeed, in *That Noble Dream*, historian Peter Novick demonstrated that "the evolution of historians' attitudes on the objectivity question has always been closely tied to changing social, political, cultural, and professional contexts." Novick observed that within the historical profession, "ideas of objectivity had always depended . . . heavily" on "consensus." 31 He suggested, however, that this consensus was not able to withstand the combined effects of the "loosely convergent assaults" of "postmodern" criticism and scholarly focus 32 and the "strong particularist currents" that "black and feminist historians . . . had introduced into historiography." 33

A central work that questioned "whether indeed there can be a true representation of anything" is Edward Said's *Orientalism*. 34 Said illustrated the degree to which racism and eurocentrism directly and indirectly shaped European knowledge and perceptions. He suggested "[t]he Orient was almost a European invention" and attempted "to show that European culture gained strength and identity by setting itself off against the Orient as a sort of surrogate and even underground self." 35 Said argued that because Orientalism was largely an invented way of looking at the non-European, it imposed limits, constraints, and unproven stereotypes on thought about the Orient and the Oriental. The Oriental, according to Said, was a constructed Other who European authors presented as being backward, degenerate, and inferior to the Occidental (the European). 36 The portrait of the inferior Other fit well with the colonial attitudes of
the eighteenth through mid-twentieth centuries: "[s]ince the Oriental was a member of a subject race, he had to be subjected: it was that simple."37 Said thus demonstrated that the divisive nature of Orientalist discourse established polarities between “us” and “they” and drew geographical, cultural, social, and ethnic lines.

Although Orientalism was a groundbreaking work, critics challenged Said on several fronts including that he inaccurately portrayed the Orient as being a homogenous and singular entity. Studies in the field of peasant resistance, however, have demonstrated that “there is never a single, unitary, subordinate, if only in the simple sense that subaltern groups are internally divided by age, gender, status, and other forms of difference.”38

Critics also charged that Said erred in portraying the Occident as being a single, unified, and homogenous entity. Political psychologist Ashis Nandy observed that subjected Others often created their own images of the various colonial powers and their relations to those powers. He noted that colonized peoples constructed “alternative West[s]” through which they participated “in a moral and cognitive venture against oppression.” Nandy argued, for instance, that “[t]he colonized Indians did not always try to correct or extend the Orientalists; in their own diffused ways, they tried to create an alternative language of discourse. This was their anti-colonialism.”39

Furthermore, as historians Mary T. Huber and Nancy C. Lutkehaus observed, “Orientalism was not a monolithic or unitary discourse.” They commented that “western representation of colonial subjects have varied
geographically and historically and have been complicated by the fact that
counters and represented included women as well as men." Said's
homogenous Occident in reality was a heterogeneous construct that created
and presented numerous discourses.

European and indigenous societies thus were (and are) fragmented
along numerous lines, including those of nationhood, gender, age, race, class,
vocation, and religious denomination. Rather than the singular colonialism or
colonial discourse that Said's Orient/Occident construct suggested, Nicholas
Thomas therefore proposed that it would be productive to think in terms not
only of colonial discourses, but also of colonial projects. Thomas noted that that
the word projects "draws attention not towards totality such as culture, nor to
a period that can be defined independently of peoples' perceptions and
strategies, but rather to a socially transformative endeavour that is localized,
politicized and partial." He wrote: "only localized theories and historically
specific accounts can provide much insight into the varied articulations of
colonizing and counter-colonial representations and practices."42

This dissertation examines one specific mission project, that of the
Anglican CMS’s work in the Canadian North-West, and in doing so contributes to
the breaking down of the previously dominant monolithic discourse of mission
language and mission histories. It also reflects a recent trend among Canadian
and other scholars to write less to celebrate missions, mission work, and
missionary personnel than to examine the relationships that existed between
missionaries, proselytes, and potential proselytes.43
Prior to the 1970's, most writings on nineteenth century missionary endeavours in the Canadian North-West were hagiographic in nature. Historian C.T. McIntire observed that older Canadian studies were written to tell the "story of missions" and to recount the "deeds of the missionaries." Those histories followed with pious respect the triumphs and the accomplishments of the missionaries and of the societies and agencies which supported them. They most often took the form of missionary biographies or of histories of denominational missions and other mission agencies. . . . This older missions history was designed to serve as a branch of theology or missiology.  

In these studies, writers often neglected the roles that indigenous peoples played in missionary endeavours and tended to portray them either as having Christianity imposed upon them for their own good or as cheerfully and uncritically embracing it to replace their 'inferior superstitions.'  

T.R. Millman's 1942 collection Publishers of Peace is characteristic of "the older missions history." To "provide a basis for the study of the work which the Church of England in Canada is doing by way of missionary outreach within our own Dominion," Millman collected eight articles that "centre[d] around individual men and women." Writing in a traditional mode of ecclesiastical history that was centuries old, Millman desired to "duly appreciat[e]" the "heroic service" of the individual Anglican missionaries and believed that because the very concept of Christian missions was rooted in personal contact the missionary therefore rightfully occupied the centre place in mission histories.
In the 1970's, ethnohistorian James Axtell argued that it was possible to develop a more comprehensive picture of missions history by examining the roles, motives, and actions of all parties who were involved in missionary endeavours. He observed that most authors and editors traditionally focused on the perspective of the missionary when analyzing the success or failure of missionary endeavours to indigenous peoples. Consequently, contemporaries of these efforts, and writers like those whose works were included in Millman's collection, considered factors like the number of converts to be an important measure of the success or failure of a mission.\textsuperscript{46}

Axtell pointed out, however, that the measure of a mission's success often differed when it was examined from the perspective of indigenous peoples. He suggested that while missionaries may have considered a mission that won few devout converts to be a failure, the Aboriginal peoples may have considered the same mission to be a success because it allowed them to adopt or adapt only those elements of Christianity that assisted them in adjusting to a changing socio-cultural environment.\textsuperscript{47}

Indeed, the authors of the eight articles that T.R. Millman selected to make up Publishers of Peace failed to recognize that personal contact implied a relationship between two or more people. By focusing only on the perspectives of missionaries, the authors relegated other participants in the missionary fields to passive roles. They did not examine the reactions of proselytes to the activities of the missionaries; rather, they concentrated on
how the missionaries and their families adapted to their environments and how they overcame the challenges that confronted them.

A case in point is Blake M. Wood’s article on the missionary activities of “Reindeer’ Walton.” Wood focused on a single theme (that “William Walton had one aim - to win Souls for Christ”) and described only the efforts of Reverend Walton and his wife to convert the “Indians and Eskimos” in the area of Fort George on the eastern coast of James Bay. While Walton himself recalled that “large numbers [of Aboriginal peoples] felt compelled to gain instruction at first hand,” Wood did not examine why these same peoples chose to accept Christian teachings or the sincerity of that acceptance.48

Furthermore, Wood argued that “[t]he outcome of this zeal on the part of both teacher and learners is a situation unique in North America. Namely, in a district as large as the entire province of Ontario every Christian native is baptized Anglican.” He suggested that this “widely scattered Christian community” was “sustained by many [Native] catechists,” but discussed neither what motivated these individuals to become catechists nor their impact on the success of Walton’s mission. Wood merely portrayed the Aboriginal peoples as passive recipients of the Waltons' Christian teachings.49

Following World War II, the rise of what one scholar called “a newly aroused racial consciousness, sympathy for oppressed racial and ethnic minorities, and condemnation of their oppressors” contributed to an increased academic interest in indigenous peoples and led historians to reinterpret how they traditionally portrayed those groups and their interaction with colonial
forces. These new perspectives resulted from an awareness of the plight of Jews, Gypsies, and other groups who were persecuted under the Nazi regime, and from the influence of Anti-colonial movements, and the Civil Rights, Red Power, and Feminist movements of the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s. Changes within Canada's Aboriginal community itself, including the increase in the Aboriginal population on reserves and in cities after World War II, the growth in Aboriginal political and cultural activity during and after the 1960s (and especially after the White Paper of 1969), the increased enrolment of Aboriginal peoples in post-secondary institutions, and the increase in works penned by authors of Aboriginal descent further shaped the perspectives of historians.

Historians also worked to correct the findings and arguments that arose out of the tendency of pre-1960's academics to focus upon political and constitutional topics and to consider written records to be the only legitimate source of historical information. A key methodological tool assisting in these corrections has been ethnohistorical methodology. Ethnohistory focuses on social and cultural interactions between peoples and between individuals, uses traditional and non-traditional source materials, and applies new perspectives to old source materials. By promoting the use of numerous sources and comparative ethnographic knowledge, ethnohistorical methodology also helps to identify and minimize the impact of the biases that are associated with the doxa of those who recorded the primary source
materials and with the doxa of scholars who analyzed and interpret those records.\textsuperscript{59}

The findings and methodologies of other disciplines including geography, demography, anthropology, psychology, literary criticism, and peasant resistance further influenced historians to revise their portrayal of Canada's Aboriginal peoples as being passive victims of dominant outside forces.\textsuperscript{60} Scholars "developed new interpretations of economic, social, religious, and political interactions between white and Indian," and overturned previous interpretations of the various Aboriginal peoples as being immoral or amoral, superstitious and lacking religion, economically naïve and easily duped, culturally static, and as possessing cultures inferior to those of Europeans and Euro-Canadians.\textsuperscript{61}

During the 1980's, historian C.T. McIntire reflected on the influences that these and other interdisciplinary findings and methodologies, and that the changes in the socio-political environment, had on the study of missions. He observed that scholars contributing to the "new missions historiography" recognized that missionary activity was a multifaceted endeavour. These authors proved that values and ideas were not merely imposed by missionaries and blithely accepted by Indigenous peoples; rather, missionary endeavours were interactions that took place on a variety of levels, between a variety of peoples, and involved a variety of motivations and responses.\textsuperscript{62}

McIntire acknowledged that newer historical analyses of missions and missionaries maintained the "sense of respect for the missionaries and their
work” that characterized older works and “continue[d] to regard Christian missions as primarily religious in character.” He observed, however, that the authors of these works also moved “dramatically beyond such matters,” seeking “as a conscious matter of method to analyze the multifactorial complexity of the missions and with a sense of critical fairness to identify the ambiguities of the work and the motivations of the people involved.” Scholars therefore examined not only the religious but also the social, political, and economic characters of missions. They studied missions “as acts of spiritual devotion” and “as relations of social classes, as relations between women and men, as encounters between cultures, as immigration, as modes of conflict, and much more.”63

The term 'life-world', as based on the work of Howard L. Harrod, is employed in this dissertation to help delineate and separate alternate interpretations and understandings of reality. Harrod proposed that human experience exhibits certain common features. At a very general level, human beings are social creatures, essentially characterized by temporality, and possess symbolic capacities. Co-intended meanings form the substance of the life-world and its cultural traditions. It is the way these dimensions of meaning are ordered that gives distinctiveness to the experience of individuals and shape to a culture. Conflicts between groups, from this point of view, become conflicts between alternate co-intentions of the world and alternate experiences at the individual level.64

Harrod then noted that

[w]hen applied to specific missionary contexts in the New World, this interpretative perspective will enable us to view the experiences of both the missionary and native 'from within,' on their own terms. The confrontation between missionary and
native will be understood as an interaction between two life-worlds, two systems of intended meaning, which generate alternate senses of experience.\textsuperscript{65}

Thus, according to Harrod, "native" and "missionary" life-worlds were distinct and while they may have shared some understandings, the reactions of each group to various situations and stimuli therefore could vary significantly.

This study shows that the life-world concept as defined by Harrod is too inclusive. In his article "Missions and Cultural Diffusion," G. Gordon Brown observed that because "[t]he missionary's aim is to teach . . . [and] to diffuse those elements of his culture which are, to him, of supreme importance," Brown cautioned that "[t]hey stress theology and the moral taboos more than do their fellow-countrymen . . . [and do so a]ccording to the prejudices of their sects." Brown also noted, however, that "missionaries and the groups which actively support them are definite subcultures," and that while missionaries were members of "a religious subculture," they traditionally "may be members of a regional, an ethnic, or a social class subculture."\textsuperscript{66}

Indeed, historian Kenneth Hylson-Smith argued that evangelical Anglicans, including those who founded and who belonged to the CMS,\textsuperscript{67} were not a homogenous body. Rather, he suggested, those who espoused evangelical religious beliefs belonged to subgroups whose "temperament and political ideology" differed "widely."\textsuperscript{68} While the discourse, motives, and actions of missionaries thus often differed from those of politicians, fur traders, tourists, and military personnel, they also could differ internally along racial and class lines. Indeed, this study shows that the life-worlds of Native agents and
their wives often varied significantly from those of other Native persons in the employ of the CMS and from their European counterparts.

In his 1978 paper "Assessing Nineteenth-Century Missionary Motivation," Stuart Piggin observed that "the inadequacies of written sources" had the potential to impede the efforts of historians to discern the motives of individual Christian missionaries. After highlighting David Hoge's argument that "[r]eligious motivation cannot be inferred from theological positions or external behaviour... [and] can probably best be done by a judge who is well acquainted with the person in question and can understand his system of motivation," Piggin suggested that the "historian is not usually sufficiently informed to act as a judge."

Similarly, in her article "Resistance and the Problem of Ethnographic Refusal," Sherry B. Ortner noted that in many post-1980 works on resistance, scholars "refus[e] to know and speak and write the lived worlds inhabited by those who resist [dominant social, political, or economic powers] (or do not, as the case may be)." She identified one of the main "reasons for this interpretative refusal" as "the so-called crisis of representation in the human sciences." Ortner wrote:

When Edward Said says in effect that the discourse of Orientalism renders it virtually impossible to know anything real about the Orient; when Gayatri Spivak tells us that "the subaltern cannot speak"; when James Clifford informs us that all ethnographies are "fictions"; and when of course in some sense all of these things are true – then the effect is a powerful inhibition on the practice of ethnography broadly defined: the effortful practice, despite all that, of seeking to understand other
peoples in times and places, especially those people who are not in dominant positions.⁷² Ortner argued, however, that “[t]he ethnographic stance holds that ethnography is never impossible . . . because people not only resist political domination; they resist, or anyway evade, textual domination as well.” Concluding, Ortner suggested that “[t]he notion that colonial or academic texts are able completely to distort or exclude the voices and perspectives being written about seems to me to endow these texts with far greater power than they have.”⁷³

Indeed, in their study of the use of textual deconstruction to analyze primary source materials, Russell Barber and Frances Berdan stated that “[b]y working backward from the document and from what is known of its author, the deconstructionist can draw tentative conclusions about the author’s viewpoints, biases, knowledge, and motives.”⁷⁴ By employing the techniques and findings of ethnohistory, literary criticism, textual deconstruction, and subaltern studies, all honed during the 1980’s and 1990’s, I argue that it is possible to discern many of the motivations and beliefs of missionaries and their sending societies and present reasonably accurate representations of their life-worlds.⁷⁵ To carefully and critically analyze source material, it is necessary to look beyond the text – the primary message that is contained in a communication (and not necessarily a communication that is in a written format) – because the text was intended for a specific audience⁷⁶ and was written within “hierarchies of disciplinary hegemony.”⁷⁷ To comprehend a
person's motives and to provide insight into the perspectives and sentiments of an author, one must examine the context and sub-text of a communication including its relation to other communications, its author, and its audiences; underlying themes; omissions in the text; and the use of words or phrases whose meaning varies by culture, language, or dialect.

Although authors of missions histories have begun to consider the motives, values, and actions of European missionaries and potential proselytes who were of Aboriginal ancestry, few have analyzed the roles, actions, and perspectives of Native proselytizers of Christianity or the family members of those individuals. In *Moon of Wintertime: Missionaries and the Indians of Canada in Encounter since 1534*, for instance, John Webster Grant studied the interactions between, and the motives of, both Christian missionaries of a variety of denominations and of the various Aboriginal peoples who accepted or rejected, in part or in whole, Christian thought and teachings. Grant nevertheless focused primarily upon European and Euro-Canadian missionaries and their interactions with the various Aboriginal peoples of Canada. Although he acknowledged the important role that Native missionaries, clergy, catechists, and laypersons played in the spread of Christianity, he largely ignored the motives of these individuals. Thus, while Grant made no explicit statement as such, readers of *Moon of Wintertime* are left with the impression that the motives, values, and life-worlds of Native agents who were sanctioned by Christian missionary societies to disseminate Christianity were similar to those of their European and Euro-Canadian counterparts.
Grant's descriptions were similar to those made by previous authors. In 1954, Frank Peake portrayed the motives and values of Reverend Robert Inkster as being the same as those of European missionaries. He described Inkster as "a half-breed, partly English and partly Cree . . . [who] threw his lot in with the Methodists." Peake neglected to examine why Inkster did so, however, and did not offer any corroboration for his description of Inkster as sharing the perspectives and motivations of his European and Canadian counterparts.  

Writing over three decades earlier in 1920, Jacob Anderson and Richard Faries, both of whom were ordained Anglican clergymen, suggested that into the late nineteenth century, many of the Aboriginal peoples in the James Bay region of North America "were still in heathen darkness, the slaves of savage superstition, and [that] such things as stealing, cannibalism, murder, polygamy, immorality and hardness of heart darkened the moral horizon." Continuing, they wrote that in response to this situation, the CMS sent Thomas Vincent, an ordained Native clergyman, to convert these "heathen." They wrote: "Thank God, the soul of Vincent had been arrested years ago by the living Christ and the touch of the Divine Master had revealed the hidden gold in his character, making him a strongman and shining light amidst the solid surroundings of heathen darkness." In their writing, Anderson and Faries (who himself was of Aboriginal descent) thus emphasized the dichotomy of Christian (in the form of Vincent) and pagan (in the form of the unconverted Aboriginal peoples of James Bay).

Grant, Peake, Anderson and Faries characterized Native proselytizers of Christianity in the vein of what Homi Bhabha called "colonial mimicry." These
authors presented Native missionary agents as being “reformed, recognizable other[s]” who were Anglicized “in opinions and morals” but not English, and who were “[a]lmost the same but not white.”

In his study of the psychological impact of the colonization of Madagascar, Octave Mannoni elaborates on that point. He acknowledged that “there is nothing to prevent a Malagasy acquiring a personality of the European type if he has been brought up from infancy in a European environment.” Mannoni observed, however, that

[The situation is quite different in those cases . . . where a Malagasy has during his youth -- and not, be it noted, in infancy -- acquired a European personality which is superimposed upon the Malagasy personality he already possessed. If he represses his Malagasy personality he is to all outward appearances a European, but his original personality has not been destroyed and will continue to manifest itself in disguise. If he returns to his own people his repressed personality will be awakened again by the environment . . . . The complexes of the 'assimilated' drive them to seek the company of the Europeans, but they are never received by them as equals. They are ill at ease in all societies.]

Thus, despite apparent assimilation, the life-worlds, values, and motives of colonized peoples, even those who were ordained Christian clergymen, were not necessarily the same as those of the colonizers.

While examining the printed works of Samson Occom, an eighteenth century author whom he described as “perhaps the first Indian writer of any significance,” David Murray demonstrated that “the process of translation, cultural as well as linguistic is obscured or effaced . . . [by] cultural and ideological assumptions.” Murray suggested that Occom’s works, like those of Euro-American missionaries, were “stage managed by whites.” Occom
therefore presented himself in a way that “reflect[ed] the tastes of the white audience” and “confirm[ed] to a large extent what at least some of them thought it was appropriate for an Indian to write or verbalize.” He also used this expected and accepted framework of discourse, however, to criticize the treatment of, and attitudes toward, Aboriginal peoples by Euro-Americans.88

Similarly, Penny Petrone observed that, in Southern Ontario, “the early native preachers” used protest literature to criticize Euro-Canadian policies and attitudes that facilitated the dislocation, poverty, alcoholism, and ill-health of Canada’s Aboriginal peoples. She argued that while “[t]he Bible was their chief literary influence, and their writings reflect a derivative and imitative style,” the works and protests of “native preachers” were “Aboriginal in origin, form, and inspiration.”89 Indeed, although the motivations and values of Native proselytizers of Christianity superficially appeared to be similar to those of European missionaries, this dissertation shows that this perception often was false.

The few authors who have analyzed the motives, values, and actions of Native missionaries in the Canadian North-West, have focused on several well-known individuals. In the early 1970s, Katherine Pettipas authored a University of Manitoba M.A. thesis in History on Henry Budd, the first individual of Aboriginal ancestry to be ordained Rupert’s Land, and edited his diary for publication.90 She observed that her works represented not only the first “extensive treatments” of Budd’s “labour in the missions of Manitoba and Saskatchewan,” but also the first significant treatment of any individual of
Aboriginal ancestry who was involved in missionary endeavours in those areas. Pettipas examined Budd's motives and actions on a variety of levels. To Euro-Canadian clergymen, Budd embodied what could be achieved by the CMS's Native Church Policy. Pettipas claimed that even as a youth in a CMS school, "Budd began to acquire the middle class Victorian attitudes and values to which he was exposed." She continued: "[i]t was the fact that he retained these values, in spite of his 'nativeness,' that elevated him as an exceptional student in the eyes of his instructors and the society." Pettipas further noted that "[a]lthough the degree of [Budd's] assimilation is difficult to measure, his journals and correspondence differ little in style and attitude from those of his European counterparts." In fact, she noted that Budd "so thoroughly 'identified with English habits,' according to his superiors, that he warranted a raise in salary to accommodate the expenses of the Victorian life-style." Pettipas also observed, however, that because of his ancestry, Budd approached those to whom he proselytized somewhat differently than did Euro-Canadian missionaries. Budd clearly recognized his position within a network of relations. Of his ordination, he wrote that

the most solemn vows that man can make to God on earth are now upon me; still greater expectations are raised with regard to my usefulness within this land. The society in England will expect more from me, the eyes of all the clergy in this country will be upon me, and the eyes of my countrymen are daily upon me.

Although he was "humbled by his native birth," Budd was aware that his knowledge of the language, customs, and traditions of at least some
Aboriginal peoples would facilitate his missionary endeavours. Pettipas suggested that unlike "many of his European counterparts," Budd "displayed an empathy with the native populations of the North." This empathy, however, did not diminish his confidence that it was for their benefit that they convert to Christianity.

Shortly after the publication of Pettipas' first studies on Henry Budd, Frank Peake published an article on Robert McDonald, an ordained "country-born" minister. Peake argued that although McDonald "felt that he had never been accepted as an equal by his European colleagues," he "identified himself with the white, English-speaking, Protestant element of the Red River establishment." As Pettipas had observed regarding Budd, Peake suggested that the CMS perceived McDonald to be "neither native nor European." Rather, the Society believed that "he was a curious mixture" of both. Peake believed that McDonald possessed empathy for the Aboriginal peoples which most of his British and Euro-Canadian counterparts lacked and noted that "McDonald was one of the few missionaries of his day who considered it worthwhile to study the culture of those to whom he ministered." Peake continued: "His interest may have sprung from the fact that he was himself part Indian."

John S. Long reached a similar conclusion when he examined the life of another Native clergyman, Reverend Thomas Vincent. According to Long, Vincent considered Native clergy and catechists to be distinct from, and in many ways superior to, European and Euro-Canadian missionaries. Vincent believed
that Native priests and catechists could live on less money than their European and Euro-Canadian counterparts, that they adapted more easily to the environment in the Canadian mission field, and that they often were more readily accepted by the Aboriginal peoples.¹⁰³

Vincent’s European counterparts nevertheless held prejudicial views regarding the capacities of Aboriginal peoples and they associated him more with his Aboriginal than his European ancestry. Consequently, these clergymen doubted Vincent’s ability to rise within the hierarchy of the CMS. In fact, European missionaries considered many of his actions and personal characteristics, including his “financial naiveté,” his “enthusiasm for the goose hunt,” his perceived lack of education, and his lack of social contacts in England to aid in fundraising¹⁰⁴ to be “unmissionary-like.”¹⁰⁵ Long concluded, however, that “the strongest argument levied against Vincent was that Europeans would not respect him because of his mixed race.”¹⁰⁶

The works of Pettipas, Peake, and Long suggested that although ordained Native clergy were significantly Europeanized, their life-worlds, values, and motives differed, at least to some degree, from their European and Euro-Canadian counterparts. Issues of class, respectability, and ability, all of which were rooted in perceptions of race and status, shaped how these individuals perceived others and, in-turn, how others perceived them. More recent studies confirm these findings.

To mark the 150th anniversary of Budd’s arrival at The Pas, several articles, including two on Budd by Katherine Pettipas and Frank Peake, were
Neither Pettipas nor Peake offered any new insight into the life-world, motivations, and actions of Budd or into his relationships with those around him. Both portrayed him as being an ordained priest of Aboriginal descent who, although empathetic to the plight of the Aboriginal peoples, identified himself with the European missionary community and their middle-class, evangelical protestant Victorian values.

Peake's work, however, did offer support for the idea that ordained Native priests straddled cultures and societies and in doing so experienced internal conflicts over their own identities. Peake noted that on the death of his son Budd mourned in the following way:

what would I not have done to torture my body in every possible way; according to the custom of my Tribe, cutting myself with knives and lancets until the blood would gush out profusely; cutting my hair, and going about barefoot and bare legs; and ready to go into fire, and into water, courting death rather than life.¹⁰⁸

Thus, as Mannoni observed when describing the psychological impact of colonialism on the Malagasy, Peake suggested that Budd "had never learned to integrate" his Christian faith with his Indigenous background, traditions, and culture. In addition, Peake suggested that Robert McDonald experienced a similar inability to reconcile his Aboriginal heritage with the Euro-Canadian values, attitudes, and beliefs.¹⁰⁹ Unfortunately, Peake failed to develop this interpretation or determine if other events in Budd's life confirmed his conclusion.
In an article in the same issue of the *Journal of the Canadian Church Historical Society*, George van der Goes Ladd combined historical and psychoanalytical methodologies to present his readers with, on the surface at least, a more complete examination of Budd's personal motives than did Pettipas or Peake. Framed within a biographical format and looking at Budd's "experience," van der Goes Ladd examined Budd's efforts to reconcile his Aboriginal heritage with his Euro-Canadian upbringing. He concluded that

"[In his thirty-five years of immersion in work with his own people Henry Budd passed quietly beyond the conventional wisdom of his superiors and dared to hope for an enduring translation of Christianity into Cree language and culture. . . . [At the Pas] he was able . . . to build a Native Christian community, indigenous in its leadership, literate in its own mother tongue. . . . He was able to do this because he had come to identify once more with his own people . . . Concerning the Native services, he wrote, "I felt I was on my own ground & in my element.""

This portrait of Budd as reconciled to his Aboriginal background and heritage differed significantly from the Europeanized Budd portrayed by Peake and Pettipas. Given the esoteric nature of psychoanalytical analysis, however, and the fact that he provided little concrete evidence to support his contention, van der Goes Ladd's findings alone are somewhat unconvincing. In light of Peake's arguments that neither Budd nor McDonald (who supposedly were two of the CMS's most Europeanized Native agents) were able to fully reconcile their Aboriginal and Euro-Canadian upbringing, however, van der Goes Ladd's findings raise doubts as to the degree to which clergy of Aboriginal ancestry shared the values, motivations, and life-worlds of European missionaries.
Furthermore, in addition to concurring with previous historians that racial and cultural hierarchies existed between employees of the CMS who were of Aboriginal descent and those who were of non-Aboriginal descent, historian Winona Stevenson demonstrated in her unpublished M.A. Thesis that similar hierarchies also existed between CMS agents who were of Aboriginal descent. Stevenson noted that by 1860, “the total Native workforce of the CMS employed in Indian Mission work was twenty-six but only three among them were ordained ministers.” She suggested that ordained priests were an elite among Native church agents, not merely because they were ordained and proportionately small in numbers, but also because “[t]hey appear to have been thoroughly indoctrinated in European values and perspectives.” Stevenson commented that ordained Native agents “were very much humbled by their origins and generally considered themselves ‘above’ their less enculturated country-men.”

In her separate case study of catechist Charles Pratt, Stevenson indicated that “his goals, values, priorities, and loyalties were often at odds with his CMS superiors,” including those who were of Aboriginal descent. Moreover, she argued that Pratt’s attitudes and actions often differed from those of his more Europeanized contemporaries who were of Aboriginal descent. Stevenson wrote that he “did not isolate himself from his people; rather, he entered their realm as an equal and amongst them as they shared everything; tents, cabins, horses, guns, tools and food.”
Richard Faries, an ordained "Native Clergyman" and contemporary of Pratt, provides a contrasting perception. Faries commented after meeting a group of Aboriginal people:

[W]e had to go through the task of shaking hands, I say 'task', because it is quite a task for a man with refined feelings to grasp a dirty greasy hand, which is sure to leave marks of an unpleasant kind & odour on your own hand. However, one has to pocket his pride & swallow his nice feelings & tastes, or else, his influence would be marred among these poor creatures. So we just had to shake hands & wash our hands afterward, when we were out of their sight.117

Differences in values, motives, and life-worlds therefore existed not only between Native missionary agents and their European and Euro-Canadian counterparts, but also between Native agents who were ordained and those who were not.

This brief historiography suggests that historians have failed to extend the same reinterpretation of the roles, activities, and motivations of Native proselytizers of Christianity that they have to other topics involving Canada's Aboriginal peoples. This study will redress some of that paucity. It establishes that Native agents who were connected to the CMS by employment or marriage often differed in values, motives, and life-worlds from their European and Euro-Canadian counterparts and among themselves. Issues of gender, status, race, and ethnicity shaped how these individuals viewed themselves and their co-workers, and how other inhabitants of the Canadian North-West viewed them.

The findings presented in this dissertation are based largely on the
records left by persons whom the CMS sanctioned and paid to disseminate Christianity and other elements of European culture. Consequently, to identify not only the value and insights but also the biases and shortcomings in these records, it is useful to examine the context in which they were created.

Written works, exhibitions, and meetings that described the activities, successes, and failures of Christian missions throughout the world proliferated during the nineteenth century. Secular newspapers, magazines, and publications that were funded by missionary societies all reprinted and disseminated religious tracts, the correspondence of missionary agents serving in foreign fields, and calls for financial aid and additional personnel.\textsuperscript{118} Since these writings were meant not only to inform, but also to promote and glorify, the information that they presented often was edited heavily and structured carefully. Indeed, many of the journals and letterbooks that presently exist in the CMS’s archival holdings are marked with notices (presumably made by the Secretary of the Society or by some other person who was responsible for the reprinting of such works) to “print” or “omit” specific passages.\textsuperscript{119}

Secondary editing often so distorted the image of mission work in Canada that CMS agents themselves complained to the Parent Committee. In 1873, Reverend J.A. Mackay wrote:

\begin{quote}
A missionary to the Indians of the Saskatchewan must be prepared to endure hardness if he hopes for any success, and it is surely better to go prepared than to have the mind filled with nothing by the highly coloured descriptions of the country which are now becoming rather frequent. A few years ago, to judge from accounts then current, and particularly a missionary reports [sic], this country was considered scarcely fit for human habitations –
\end{quote}
now the fertile valley of the Saskatchewan 'has become familiar in
the mouth as household words' and that too, by many who have
no knowledge of the country except from hearsay. The truth as is
generally the case lies between the two extremes.120

Mackay was convinced that the inaccurate image presented by the CMS of its
agents work in the Canadian North-West created false expectations not only for
settlers to the region, but also for missionary recruits.

Before any secondary editing took place, however, the intentions,
attitudes, biases, and goals of the original creator of a record shaped its form
and content. Paid agents of the CMS often structured their correspondence
to inform and impress their superiors, and were aware that the Society might
publish this correspondence for public consumption.121 In response to these
dual forces, some missionary agents exaggerated their successes regarding the
numbers of converts or the need for financial support and did not discuss their
failures and setbacks.

In the early 1880's, Reverend John Hines informed his superiors in
England that

the prevailing idea among subordinates in this country is to keep
from their superiors all that would be likely to give them trouble or
cause them any anxiety, and only tell them what they think will
please them, in short, to tell only the bright side of the story. This,
however good and charitable it may seem, is not faithful.122

Hines used the case of David Stranger to illustrate his point to the Committee.

He wrote:

For instance he [Stranger] told me in all his letters that everything
was going on satisfactorily with the exception of the school which
was not so well attended as when I left. On my arrival I found the
Church in a very dirty state ... [and] he then for the first time told
me that since I left not one of the women would clean the church
nor yet any of the men bring firewood for the Church & school,
but that he himself had to pay for it being done.\textsuperscript{123}

Hines ended his letter by noting that Stranger's "letters to me during the winter
were not altogether what they should have been. They were calculated to
mislead."\textsuperscript{124}

Over three decades earlier, Reverend E.A. Watkins emphasized the
negative impact that intentional or unintentional misrepresentation and
exaggeration could have on the CMS's work in the Canadian North-West.\textsuperscript{125} In
March of 1857, he addressed the Society "on a subject which has often
presented itself to my mind." His words are worth quoting at length because
they introduce concerns and perspectives that will be encountered throughout
this dissertation. Watkins wrote:

I refer to the somewhat exaggerated statements which occasionally appear in the Publications of the Society. I do not
wish to lay blame on any persons, but I think the fact cannot be
denied that we do sometimes see descriptions of an over-wrought
character. There is a tendency in the minds perhaps of all Missionaries to represent their work in an attractive a light as
possible, & to say as strict truthfulness is adhered to no objection
need be raised, but it is to be feared that the dark parts are kept
back or distorted in many instances, while what is hopeful is made
to appear as unmixed [?] good. I have no doubt this is the case in
some of the glowing accounts we have read of the Indians in
various parts of this Country, for I cannot think that those of East
Main are so very far below all others as truthfulness compels me to
represent them. When we read of the Indians connected with the
various Stations as "daily growing in grace," "Feeling a longing
desire for the courts of the Lord's house," being very "spiritually
minded" & much [?] like expressions, the idea conveyed to an
English Xlian is much more exalted than it would be if the plain truth
was stated. I hope there are some individual Indians who may be
thus described, but to apply such language to them as a body
must in my opinion do more harm than good to the cause of Missions.126

To support his concerns, Watkins quoted from a letter that “an English lady at the Red River,” whom he described as being “a sincere Xitian & . . . entirely unconnected with the Mission,” had written to his wife. She wrote:

There is one part of your letter I admire. You speak of being both unable to send home to the Society glowing accounts of your Mission and labors. The false descriptions which are usually given of the number of converts, their beautiful [?] traits of character, the miseries [sic] of the Missionary & his family, though they work upon the sympathies of the public, do not I think draw down a blessing upon Missions because in nine cases out of ten they are untrue. Your labour & that of Mr. Watkins is really meritorious [sic] because you meet with so little encouragement, but I think were you to come into Red River & see the numbers of Indians whose tents are scattered here & there over the settlement, & who have never been induced to embrace Xitianity, you would be astonished about the accounts that are published of the progress of the Mission work in North West America.127

Watkins, however, was very aware of the questionable accuracy of mission accounts that were published in England and elsewhere. In fact, he “confess[ed]” to Reverend J. Chapman of the Church Missionary Society that I have been somewhat disappointed for having formed my opinions mainly from the published reports of our Society. I have found from actual observation that my views were raised too high. Take for instance the number of Communicants which is certainly very large. This is generally considered I think by the members of our Society as proof of the prevalence of vital godliness & perhaps it is the very proof that can be given to persons at a distance, but I do not hesitate to say that as far as the inhabitants of Red River are concerned it is not a good criteria [sic]. It is I conceive as good a test as here as in England, but no better.128

Because Watkins’ “Missy. brethren ha[d] sent home colored [sic] & exaggerated statements,” and because he had formed his expectations and goals based on
those statements, he found that he was ill-prepared for the realities of missionary life in the Canadian North-West. His experience led him to believe that “the representation of the trials & hardships of the Missionaries as being more severe than they really are must ultimately injure the cause which we have at heart.” Furthermore, Watkins lamented that when compared to the “exaggerated statements” of his brethren, his own efforts, in print at least, appeared to be far less successful.

To minimize the impact on this study of intentional and unintentional confusions, misinterpretations, and omissions in the primary source materials, ethnohistorical methodology and the techniques of literary criticism and textual deconstruction were appropriate tools to identify and balance the biases, ethnocentric perspectives, exaggerations, and inaccuracies that existed within the source materials. While the very nature of missionary reports, letters, and journals ensured that Native agents in CMS employ left numerous detailed primary records, for example, it performed no such function with respect to women who were connected to the Society by birth or marriage. Consequently, records left by the wives and daughters of CMS agents, particularly those of Aboriginal ancestry, are scarce. It nevertheless is possible to understand the work, actions, and attitudes of those women by supplementing their personal correspondence with interpretations derived from the records left by their husbands and fathers.

Chapter One of this dissertation examines European efforts to “colonize th[e] consciousness of various Indigenous peoples in Africa, the Americas,
Asia, India, Australia, and New Zealand between the 16\textsuperscript{th} and 20\textsuperscript{th} Centuries, and the responses of those peoples. The Church Missionary Society and its experiences and actions in the Canadian North-West are placed within the broader context of its world-wide missionizing program in Chapter Two.

Chapters Three to Seven of this dissertation, establish that culturally centric beliefs (including those related to issues of race, ethnicity, gender, and status) fostered discord, friction, and a sense of separateness between the Society's European and Native agents. Chapter Three examines the attitudes of European agents of the CMS with respect to their Native counterparts, while Chapter Four examines the perspectives the Native proselytizers themselves. The effects of the CMS's policies on the careers and the daily lives of its Native agents are demonstrated in Chapter Five. Chapter Six shows that the Aboriginal peoples of the Canadian North-West had distinct and defined expectations regarding the roles, responsibilities, and obligations of proselytizers of Christianity and that their expectations often differed from those held by the proselytizers themselves. The roles and perspectives of Native women who were connected to the CMS through birth and marriage are examined in Chapter Seven.
CHAPTER ONE

EURO-CHRISTIAN MISSIONS AND NATIVE PROSELYTIZERS OF CHRISTIANITY IN CONTEXT

"[I]f Christianity is permanently to live in the lands that are now the object of missionary care, it must be by means of Native agency alone."¹

"Europeans are too few, and their subsistence costs too much, for us ever to hope that they can possibly be the instruments of the universal diffusion of the word amongst so many millions of souls."²

The extension of various European interpretations of Christianity was intertwined with the extension of European colonial empires after the late fifteenth century. As first Roman Catholic and then Protestant European powers extended their social, political and economic influence, they were confronted by millions of people who they viewed as being uncivilized and barbarous heathens destined to suffer eternal damnation unless they were reclaimed by Christ. Facing such great numbers and confronted by cultural and environmental barriers that often limited the effectiveness of Euro-Christian missionaries, Europeans conceded that, without the assistance and cooperation of indigenous proselytizers it would be impossible for them to convert more than a small percentage of these peoples. Theoretical support for indigenous missionary agents nevertheless generally was not translated into actual financial and educational support until the nineteenth century. Even then, issues of race, ethnicity, status, and gender raised barriers to achieving perceived or actual equality with Euro-Christian proselytizers that proved insurmountable for most Indigenous persons.³
This Chapter shows that the Church Missionary Society did not develop its policies and beliefs regarding Indigenous proselytizers of Christianity in isolation. Rather, the CMS learned from the previous missionary experiences of numerous Christian churches. While the general goal of evangelizing indigenous populations guided the foci and policies of Christian missionary societies, Christian missionary projects varied temporally and geographically, as did the responses of the various indigenous populations.

In *A History of Christian Missions*, historian Stephen Neill explained that “at the end of the fifteenth century, Christianity was almost wholly a European Religion.”\(^4\) Several factors, however, contributed to a vigorous extension of Christianity during and after the sixteenth century. These forces included the opening of sea routes in the late fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the Catholic Counter-Reformation, and the formation of colonial Empires by the Roman Catholic powers Portugal, Spain, and later France.\(^5\)

The quest for wealth was the primary motive for European exploration, but colonizing powers also used religious and cultural grounds to justify their geographic and economic expansion.\(^6\) In addition to dividing lands newly encountered by Spanish and Portuguese explorers between those respective governments, for example, Pope Alexander VI established that the Iberian powers also were responsible for the evangelization of the Indigenous populations who inhabited those lands.\(^7\)

As Roman Catholic orders accompanied the colonial expansion of the Franco-Iberian powers during the fifteenth and subsequent centuries, many
religious and some political leaders initially supported training and employing indigenous persons to proselytize Christianity. Prince Henry the Navigator of Portugal planned to train captured Africans as Christian missionaries and return them to their homelands, but he died before his plan came to fruition.8 The Portuguese nevertheless did train several persons from India, Asia, and Africa to disseminate Christianity to their countrymen, including one African who was “ordained as the titular Bishop of Utica in 1518, at the insistence of King Manuel of Portugal.”9

In 1536, the Spanish established a College in Mexico with “the dual purpose of forming a cultural élite among the laity and providing a certain number of native priests.” Historian C.R. Boxer, however, argued that this Spanish “experiment was not a success.” He noted that disappointments about the abilities of Indigenous clergymen, the contempt that many colonial Iberians held for non-European priests, and royal patronage in which the Spanish and Portuguese Kings “strove to fill most of the high ecclesiastical posts in their overseas territories with peninsula-born clergy,” contributed “to a hardening of the attitudes of all the religious Orders.” In fact, Boxer showed that in regions where they exerted religious influence, the Portuguese and Spanish religious Orders erected a “colour-bar” that effectively prohibited non-whites from active and sanctioned involvement in the proselytization of Christianity.10

Racial barriers also frustrated early Spanish efforts to raise a body of Indigenous proselytizers in Central and South America. Historian Adrian
Hastings commented that because most unions between Spanish or Creole (individuals who claimed full Spanish descent but who were born in Central or South America) men and Indigenous women were considered cohabitations rather than church sanctioned marriages, the offspring of these relationships "were canonically excluded from ordination to the priesthood." Although the desire to raise a body of Native clergy led Pope Gregory XIV to permit "the ordination of mestizos and illegitimate sons in 1576," Hastings suggested that "this hardly began to happen on any considerable scale for another 200 years." Indeed, he noted that the rejection by many indigenous peoples of Roman Catholic requirement of celibacy prevented many individuals from joining religious orders. Consequently, despite the "enthusiasm [that] Mexicans at first showed for their new faith," and although the Spanish established a college at Santa Cruz in present-day Mexico to "produce an Indian clergy," Hastings wrote that "none was ever ordained."

Although not as rigid as elsewhere, the Roman Catholic Church in India also used racial barriers to limit the career opportunities and roles of persons of Indigenous ancestry. Historian Carlos Mercês de Melo noted that the Portuguese "were the first promoters of the native clergy in India," and established a seminary to train persons of Indigenous descent who were of "presentable appearance and . . . talented enough for the priesthood." By 1614, one Jesuit priest observed that the institution had succeeded in training a body of Indian priests who "with great edification and spiritual profit, worked among the souls entrusted to their care, without forgetting the zeal for the
conversion of their native brethren which they had acquired during the years of training in the Seminary.¹⁵ The Seminary was closed after the expulsion of the Jesuits from Goa in 1759, however, and despite the fact that the Roman Catholic Church continued to promote the formation of a body of Indigenous Christian clergy into the nineteenth century, few Indigenous clergymen were ordained. De Melo attributed this overall failure to the lack of a training seminary, the low standards of education for Native and European clergy alike, and the poor treatment of Native clergy by European missionaries and European colonial populations.¹⁶

Contemporary political and religious leaders also considered employing Indigenous persons to disseminate Roman Catholicism in areas of French colonial interest.¹⁷ Historian Olive P. Dickason suggested that in New France "[t]he Recollets appear to have initially entertained the hope of training natives as priests," but that "this was not realized nor could it have been in the view of the prevailing sentiment against ordaining Amerindians."¹⁸ Indeed, James Axtell observed that the Recollet Friars "saw the natives as 'miserable dark Creatures' whose 'extremely stupid' faculties and naturally 'savage, brutal, and barbarous' customs placed them 'a prodigious Distance from God'."¹⁹

Axtell wrote that, in contrast to the Recollets, the Jesuits held in high regard the intellect of the Aboriginal peoples of New France and believed that "[e]ducation and instruction alone are lacking."²⁰ The Jesuits therefore sent Aboriginal children and adults to France to be educated and civilized according to French standards and on their return these individuals were
expected to live with the Jesuits “and to persuade their young Native companions to do the same.” The Jesuits also employed male and female “native dogiques to assist them in catechizing and enforcing Catholic morality” and to be “responsible for leading prayers and hymns, counseling families, catechizing children, instructing newcomers, enforcing morality, and occasionally baptizing the dying in the priest’s absence.” Axtell concluded that the ordination of Aboriginal persons was not a priority for the Jesuits, however, because, to the best of their ability, they maintained secular and religious control over converts.

Euro-Catholic missionaries also promoted the formation of a body of Indigenous clergy in both Japan and China. Historian Stephen Neill argued that a colour-bar did not exist in these countries because Europeans held Japanese and Chinese cultures in higher regard than they did other non-European cultures. Moreover, Japanese and Chinese rulers were able to effectively counter much of Europe’s social, economic, and political influence in their countries. Efforts to raise a body of Indigenous clergy in Japan and China therefore proved largely unsuccessful until the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Thus, from the sixteenth to the late eighteenth centuries, Euro-Catholic missionaries generally supported in principle the training and employing of indigenous peoples to disseminate Christianity to their countrymen. Several forces impeded the realization of this support in principle, however, including damaging racial stereotyping of indigenous proselytizers by European
missionaries, apathetic attitudes towards the recruitment and education of indigenous proselytizers by all parties, and the fluctuating political and economic fortunes of the various Euro-Catholic colonizing nations.

Euro-Protestant missionaries also supported the principle of training indigenous peoples to proselytize to their countrymen. The number and range of Protestant missions were limited until the nineteenth century, however, when the waning of Portuguese and Spanish power, the expansion of Protestant colonial empires, and the Evangelical Revival (and, in the United States, the Second Great Awakening) contributed to an explosion in Protestant foreign missions.

In his work *England in 1815*, Historian Elie Halévy argued that "[w]hen the 18th century opened and for many years to come there was not a single Protestant missionary in the entire world with the exception of the small German group of the Moravian Brethren." J.E. Hutton, author of *A History of Moravian Missions*, suggested that "[i]n 1800 the number of Moravian missionaries serving, not counting wives, was 90; in all other Protestant Churches [sic] combined it was only about 30." Thus, it reasonable for Charles Grant, a member of the evangelical Anglican Clapham Sect, which itself was instrumental in founding the Church Missionary Society, to lament in 1790: "Faint hopes ... [the British] people have of missions."

English Methodists had established "a regular system of foreign missions" three years before Grant made his statement. Historians, however, generally date "[t]he missionary awakening in Britain ... from the publication in

Commenting in 1817 on the rapid growth of European missionary work in the early nineteenth century, the English periodical *Missionary Register* observed that at that moment there were approximately 150 Protestant missionary stations in existence throughout the world and that some 100 English Clergymen were undertaking their missionary duties with "zeal." The growth of Protestant foreign missions continued thereafter to the degree that, by 1873, the CMS proclaimed that "[i]t is certain . . . that the commencement of the (19th) century witnessed such an outburst of Missionary zeal as was unknown before." In 1904, the CMS alone listed 1,330 men and women serving as missionaries while the figure for Protestant societies totalled over 13,300. On the organizational level, where twenty-seven Protestant missionary societies existed in 1838 (ten in Great Britain, seven in the United States, and ten "On the Continent"), 104 existed five decades later (with twenty-five in Great Britain "and the Colonies", thirty-nine in the United States, and forty "[o]n the Continent").
The few Protestant missionary societies that existed prior to the late eighteenth century theoretically supported employing indigenous proselytizers of Christianity. When the Puritans colonized North America during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, for example, they acknowledged that it was their Christian duty to evangelize those Indigenous peoples whom they encountered.37 Historian Everett Emerson nevertheless claimed that the Puritans initially “were not . . . seriously interested in Indian missions except for propaganda purposes,” and that it was not until “after 1650, twenty years after the colony was created,” that the Puritans saw their first successes.38

Their limited numbers and means forced the Puritans to train a “cadre of native preachers with full rights and responsibilities for guiding their brethren in the new ways, usually in an Indian Tongue.”39 In fact, James Axtell observed that by the 1770s, “at least 133 Indians had ministered to their brethren in southern New England” and that “[m]ost of them . . . [had] been ordained sometimes by the hands of English Ministers, and sometimes by the hands of Indian Ministers in the presence of the English.”40

Indigenous peoples also were crucial to early Moravian efforts. “Native Helpers, Native Catechists, Native Committee Men, and Native Teachers” not only familiarized the Euro-Moravian missionaries with local customs, religions, and languages in Africa, the Caribbean, the Americas, Greenland, India and Asia, they assisted with the dissemination of Christianity to their countrymen.41 Like many of their Euro-Catholic contemporaries, however, Moravian beliefs about the “the intellectual abilit[ies]” and “character” of the various indigenous
peoples whom they encountered impeded their efforts to train members of local populations. Consequently, despite their early start in the field of Protestant foreign missions, the Moravians did not seriously consider the roles that Indigenous peoples would play in the extension of Christianity until the second half of the nineteenth century and even then they were slow to transform theoretical support for training Indigenous agents into actual significant and tangible support.

It was only during the last decades of the nineteenth century and first decades of the twentieth century that the Moravians established colleges in Africa to train “Native preachers.” In contrast, the CMS established educational centres in Africa for the same purposes almost three-quarters of a century earlier. The CMS College at Fourah Bay in Sierra Leone produced “[a]t least 55 . . . native clergy” between 1827 and 1900, in addition to training “a much larger number [of] . . . catechists and teachers.”

By the end of the nineteenth century, indigenous proselytizers nevertheless were crucial to Moravian missionary efforts: in 1900 they claimed eighteen “Native Preachers” and 1,863 “Native Helpers” and by 1914 these figures had risen to 111 and 2,059 respectively. In contrast, in 1900 there were only 376 European Moravian missionaries and by 1914 this figure had fallen to 367.

Whereas the efforts of the Puritans and the Moravians pre-dated the late eighteenth century rise of Protestant missionary societies, the Baptist Missionary Society (BMS) was founded in 1792 and “set the pattern for the
voluntary society model of a mission agency which became so widespread in the nineteenth century.  

The BMS trained and employed indigenous persons to disseminate Christianity to their countrymen throughout the nineteenth century. During the Society's centenary celebrations, for instance, Reverend Dr. MacKennal observed that its "early missionaries" argued "again and again" that "the native teachers are to be used to evangelise the natives if the natives are to be won." In 1805, almost ninety years earlier, agents of the BMS observed that  

[i]t is only by means of native preachers that we can hope for the universal spread of the gospel through this immense continent [of India]. Europeans are too few, and their subsistence costs too much, for us ever to hope that they can possibly be the instruments of the universal diffusion of the word amongst so many millions of souls.  

Indeed, the BMS believed that by training and employing indigenous persons to disseminate Christianity to their countrymen, it could overcome the difficulties to its worldwide missionary efforts that arose from its limited economic and human resources. It cautioned, however, that for indigenous persons to be and remain effective Christian proselytizers, they should not become too Europeanized or otherwise "efface their nationality lest they thereby lose their influence."  

The BMS's founding of a College at Serampore in India illustrated both the importance that it attached to training and employing indigenous proselytizers during the nineteenth century, and its ultimate disappointment in this area. The BMS established the College in 1818 with the goal of training
“Christian Indians to be missionaries to their own people.” As part of this mandate, students were instructed in Euro-Christian science and theology but in Indian languages. Historian Brian Stanley observed, however, that “[t]he vision which lay behind the foundation of Serampore College . . . remained no more than a long-term goal.”

Difficulties in recruiting students whom it considered to be “suitable” according to its own Euro-Christian standards and a decline in the importance attached to theological training following the College’s affiliation with the University in Calcutta in 1857, hampered the BMS’s efforts to train a body of Indian missionaries. Stanley concluded that as a result, by the 1870s “[t]he bulk of the student body were elementary students . . . [and t]here were very few students in whom the staff saw the potential for Christian service in their maturer years.”

Nevertheless, by the beginning of the twentieth century, the results of the BMS’s efforts to train and employ indigenous proselytizers were comparable to those reported by other Protestant societies. In 1904, Protestant missionary societies classified eighty-five percent (69,670 out of 83,041) of their staff in “foreign” regions as “Native Workers”; for the BMS, the relative figure was only slightly lower at eighty-three percent (1,153 out of 1,397 persons).

At a “Conference on Missions” held in 1860, Reverend R.S. Hardy, a former Wesleyan Missionary to Ceylon, concisely summarized the beliefs that many Euro-Protestant missionary societies shared regarding training and employing Native agents as proselytizers of Christianity. Hardy suggested that
When we speak of Native Agency, we include the entire Church of the future; as it is evident that, if Christianity is permanently to live in the lands that are now the object of missionary care, it must be by means of Native agency alone. Foreign agents could not be found in sufficient numbers. If sufficient numbers were forthcoming, the means of their support could not be provided; and if the men could be both provided, and provided for, this would be an inefficient instrumentality to accomplish the work to be done. The truth must be naturalised; it must cease to be regarded as exotic, before it can thoroughly permeate and permanently regenerate any given nation. Its power can only be universally diffused by that which is alike native in its fount and its flowing: look, tone, word, imagery, idiom, all must be native. Every people, even the most degraded, has a nationality, and each tribe an idiosyncracy [sic]; sacred circles, that the stranger can never completely penetrate.55

Euro-Protestants believed that because they lacked the numbers, finances, abilities, and cultural knowledge necessary to successfully to indigenize Christianity and disseminate it throughout the world, Native agents were vital to the successful globalization of Christianity.

While the fortunes of Protestant foreign missions were rising at the end of the eighteenth century, Roman Catholic missionary endeavours were in a state of decline. The waning of Iberian power, Rationalist criticisms of Roman Catholicism, attacks on the Jesuit order that culminated in its dissolution, and the anti-Clericism of the era of the French Revolution and Napoleon contributed to a general diminishment in Roman Catholic missionary impulse. Several factors reinvigorated this impulse, however, including the end of the Napoleonic era, the revival in 1817 of the Congregation of Propaganda to fund foreign missions, the explosion of Protestant missions to non-Europeans, and the work of Pope Gregory XVI to support the concepts of local clergy, self-
support, and self-government within the organizational structure of the Roman Catholic Church.56 The Jesuit Order was re-established, older Orders were reorganized, and new Orders and Societies were created.57 Nationalism also stimulated the Roman Catholic missionary impulse: British Roman Catholic missions increased at least partly in response to the growth of French Roman Catholic missions after the first two decades of the nineteenth century.58

Growth in the theoretical support for indigenous churches and proselytizers of indigenous descent accompanied the revitalization of Roman Catholic missionary organizations and endeavours.59 In Mission Directives of Pope Gregory XVI, 1831-46, Robert S. Maloney wrote that the Pope

exhorted his vicars to prepare the way for the establishment of the local native hierarchy by providing for the training of a local clergy, and by procuring the independence of the missions from foreign support. Seminaries were to be erected. The clergy of the nation were to be considered to be on an equal standing with the European missioners. The young clergy of the mission areas was to be employed in positions of authority to enable it in one day to rule its own church. The pontiff also insisted on the necessity of introducing the various ecclesiastical institutions and associations that would help to secure the financial independence of the mission. Educational and charitable institutions were suggested as ideal means to this end.60

By 1901, “Native Priests” accounted for over one-fifth of all Roman Catholic ordained personnel who were actively engaged in missionary endeavours throughout the world.61

A variety of forces, however, continued to limit the roles that indigenous proselytizers played at Catholic missions. Historian Raymond J.A. Huel observed that despite their “best intentions and efforts” in the Canadian North-West,
between 1845 and 1945 the Oblates of Mary Immaculate ordained only four persons of Aboriginal ancestry. Huel attributed the failure of the Oblates to raise a body of Aboriginal priests to several factors. These factors included the requirement of celibacy, the preference of some Aboriginal persons for non-Native priests, language variances, and personal and economic the demands that relatives might make on ordained Oblate Aboriginal clergymen.62

Other historians have offered additional explanations for the failure of the Roman Catholic orders in the Canadian North-West. Martha McCarthy suggested that extended periods of study away from home was a factor,63 and Robert Choquette observed that many Aboriginal persons found Catholic requirements regarding marriage, dress, and appearance to be too restrictive.64

On a more global level, historian J. F. Ade Ajayi observed that "the essential Catholic doctrine was the universality and the pervading influence of the hierarchy of the Church, of which the local clergy were only a small part."65 Consequently, while many Roman Catholic orders and societies supported the concept of indigenous proselytizers of Christianity, they were less clear about self-governing indigenous Christian Churches. In fact, Adrian Hastings suggested that although many Euro-Catholic missionaries supported the idea of a Native Church, Roman Catholic canon law "ruled out realistic adaption to the needs of a viable local Church."66

Like many of their Protestant counterparts, most nineteenth century Euro-Catholic missionaries also envisioned indigenous clergy serving as diocesan priests rather than as missionaries.67 Historian Ruth Slade's
comments regarding Euro-Catholic missionary efforts in Africa are applicable to many of the Roman Catholic and Protestant missionary endeavours during the nineteenth century. Slade wrote:

The missionaries of the nineteenth century . . . were not half so ready as the Portuguese to give Africans ecclesiastical positions of responsibility and authority. They thought of Africans as children who needed protection and guidance, and training in order that one day in the distant future they might be fit for a place of responsibility in the Church. . . . The missionary was the father of his flock, and the day when he could become an elder brother, let alone a partner, seemed so distant that he very rarely considered it.68

Indeed, a Roman Catholic bishop of “non-European origin” was not consecrated during the nineteenth century until its closing decades.69

By the end of the nineteenth century, European Protestant and Catholic orders and societies were undertaking missions in most parts of the world. Believing that they lacked the money, personnel, abilities, and cultural understandings required to evangelize the heathen of the world, they actively trained and employed indigenous persons to disseminate Christianity to their countrymen. The responses of potential indigenous proselytes to Euro-Christian overtures, combined with paternalistic attitudes arising from eurocentric perceptions about non-European races and cultures, however, hampered these efforts. Consequently, by the turn of the twentieth century, most European sending societies and missionaries expressed disappointment with the results of their efforts raise Native Churches and train Native proselytizers. It was in this context of extensive experience and experiments
that the CMS developed and promoted its own policies regarding indigenous proselytizers of Christianity.
CHAPTER TWO

CMS POLICIES AND PRACTICES TOWARDS ITS NATIVE AGENTS IN THE CANADIAN NORTH-WEST.

"The Heathen cry and they cry to us - to us Englishmen of the nineteenth century."\(^1\)

"This Diocese is so wholly unlike all others that I feel more and more few of the rules which apply in Indian or the other Col. Diocese will do so here."\(^2\)

"You will observe that the Society’s principle is to recognise the distinction of races."\(^3\)

During the nineteenth century, the Church Missionary Society operated under the assumption that Native agents and Native Churches would facilitate the global extension of Christianity. The Society believed by training and employing Native pastors, it could devote its limited financial and human resources to missionary enterprises and promote the development of independent and vital Christian congregations. Although many of the Society’s policies and attitudes regarding Native agents and Native Churches were the same for all mission fields, it never intended to apply its Native Church Policy in the same manner across the globe. The CMS recognized that it would have to enact its policies and test its theories differently in the Canadian North-West than it would in Africa, Asia, and the Indian sub-continent.

For the most part, however, the CMS failed to adjust its policies to address the unique cultural, political, and economic environments of the Canadian mission field or the position of its Native agents in that region. Biases that were rooted in race and status negatively influenced the CMS’s
policies, actions, and attitudes and, by extension, hampered its efforts to disseminate Christianity in Canada. This chapter examines the CMS's Native Church Policy and how it envisioned that policy applying to Canada; subsequent chapters evaluate the failures and successes of those efforts.

The CMS was founded in 1799 as an independent and voluntary organization. Historian Jean Usher wrote that “some lay members of the Clapham Sect and several evangelical clergymen” established the CMS as “the first Anglican society devoted exclusively to the evangelisation [sic] of the heathen.” Originally called the Society for Missions to Africa and the East, it was renamed as the Church Missionary Society in 1812.4

The purpose of the CMS was to extend globally the evangelical Anglican interpretation of Christianity which was rooted in personal salvation and emotional expression. Evangelical Anglicans believed that while man was inherently sinful, Christ’s sacrifice made salvation possible.5 Indeed, the leader of the Evangelical Revival in London, William Romaine, commented that “corruption of our nature by the fall, and our recovery through Jesus Christ, are the two leading truths of the Christian religion.”6

These “two leading truths” lay at the heart of the CMS's raison d'être. Because members of the CMS and other evangelical Anglicans accepted that man was a fallen being who could be redeemed only through salvation and justification by faith, they believed that the soul of an unconverted non-Christian would be lost forever.7 Indeed, after hearing one evangelical minister preach for “almost an hour,” an English Church-goer wrote: “he said downright that all
unconverted people were in a state of damnation, and would go to Hell, if they did not believe on [sic] the Lord Jesus.\textsuperscript{8}

Evangelical Anglicans believed in the unity of mankind and that God had created all men as equals. Disagreeing with the arguments of contemporary polygenists who professed that white Europeans were a different species than Native Americans, Asians, and Africans,\textsuperscript{9} they argued that the “variety” between humans resulted from “the varying influences of climate, [and] habits of life” including the knowledge or lack thereof of Christianity.\textsuperscript{10} While evangelical Anglicans often held negative stereotypes of the religious, social, political, and economic institutions of indigenous peoples and believed that those of Britain were far superior, they also suggested that indigenous peoples could surmount most shortcomings if they “opened” their “mind[s] and heart[s] unreservedly to Christianity and European understandings of civilization.”\textsuperscript{11}

Several agents of the CMS described how these beliefs shaped the missionary impulse of Evangelical Anglicans. In 1900, Bishop W.D. Reeve of the Diocese of Mackenzie River wrote:

Of the importance of training up the children to be loyal subjects of our Sovereign, and to be useful members of society, and of bringing them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord I need say nothing. The value of a Christian education is so well recognized that I feel sure we have only to make known our position and needs in order to draw sympathy and help of those who love Him who said “Feed my lambs.”\textsuperscript{12}

Eighty years earlier, Reverend John West, the first CMS missionary to be stationed in the Canadian North-West, asked
[w]here is our humanity and Christian sympathy, and how do we fulfil the obligations which Christianity has enforced, if we do not seek to raise these wandering heathen, who, with us, are immortal in their destiny, from a mere animal existence to the partaking of the privileges and hopes of the Christian religion?13

CMS agents therefore believed that it was a Christian responsibility to evangelize non-Christians: a “Divine command that the Gospel should be preached to all nations.”14

In fact, evangelical Anglicans accepted that, by raising their nation to the pinnacle of civilization and Empire, and by conferring upon it the saving graces of Christianity, God had placed upon the British an “obligation to impart” Christianity to others.15 Bishop Samuel Wilberforce demonstrated this sense of commitment when he confidently stated in 1860:

[It was] the intention of God to make it the interest of this, the most active, the most ingenious, and the freest people on the face of the earth, to be up and doing, and to be in earnest in the . . . important work of spreading His Gospel throughout the world . . . . Was it not meant that God had given us our commerce and our naval supremacy - that industry, that patience which had given us to subdue the earth wherever we had settled . . . [,.] our wealth, with our mutual trust in each other, that we might as the crowning work of all these blessings, be the instruments of spreading the truths of the Gospel from one end of the earth to the other?16

Similarly, the editors of the Church Missionary Intelligencer observed: “[i]f our age is the age for Missions, no less plainly is our own country the messenger to the whole earth. The Heathen cry and they cry to us - to us Englishmen of the nineteenth century.”17

Contemporary Britons further supported missionary endeavours in part because they believed that the colonized of the Empire were, at least in
principle, fellow British subjects who were entitled to receive the benefits that they themselves associated with British culture, civilization, and religion. William Wilberforce, one of the most prominent members of the Clapham Sect, wrote:

"Animated, Sir, by this unfeigned spirit of friendship for the natives of India, their religious and moral interests are undoubtedly our first concern; but the course we are recommending tends no less to promote their temporal well-being, than their eternal welfare; for such is their real condition, that we are prompted to endeavour to communicate to them the benefits of Christian instruction, scarcely less by religious principle than by the feelings of common humanity. . . . [A]re not the natives of India, our fellow-subjects, fairly entitled to all the benefits which we can safely impart to them?"

Decades later, Bishop Machray echoed Wilberforce when, in his address to the 1875 Synod of the Diocese of Rupert’s Land, he observed that

[t]he thousands of poor wandering Indians along the inhospitable shores of Hudson’s Bay or the banks of the great McKenzie, have indeed as much right to the best we can communicate of spiritual or church privileges as the hundreds of thousands, or even millions, that are expected one day to occupy the great fertile belt of the south.

Thus, in addition to believing that it was a Christian responsibility to evangelize the Indigenous peoples of the Empire, evangelical Anglicans also argued that it was the right of those colonized peoples to receive that knowledge and spiritual amelioration.

The written word was a central part of the Church Missionary Society’s missionizing program. The Sixth of the Thirty-Nine Articles (the sum of which evangelical Anglicans accepted “as an almost perfect summary of the Faith”) stated that “Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be
required of any man, that it should be believed thereby as an article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation."21 Indeed, Reverend John West observed that "we derive all true sentiments in religious subjects from the Bible" including "the great charter of salvation, and the awful code of divine communication to the human race." West proclaimed that "the exercise of private judgement in possession of the Bible, was the birth-right of every man. Therein is contained the great charter of salvation.... 'A Bible then to every man in the world,' is the sentiment we would encourage."22

The CMS also supported introducing the Book of Common Prayer to indigenous proselytizers and Christian congregations.23 In his capacity as the Secretary of the CMS, Reverend Henry Venn wrote that the Book of Common Prayer set "the Anglican liturgical and ecclesiological parameters" within which Christian Native Churches were to develop. He noted that although "the prayer book [sic] is intended for an established Christian congregation, and [although] it is necessary to train up new converts by shorter and more elementary forms of worship," the Society's policy nevertheless was that "[a]s soon as the prayer book [sic] can be introduced it is introduced."24

The Bible and other written works were important parts of their missionizing programs, but the CMS and other evangelical Protestant missionary societies recognized that missionary agents were necessary to make the message contained therein intelligible and relevant to local populations. Dr. Nevius, an American Protestant missionary who worked in China and who was an influential evangelical author, wrote in the late
nineteenth century that the methods for disseminating Christianity, in order of increasing effectiveness, were:

1. Bible-distribution,
2. Tract-distribution,
3. Preaching in chapels,
4. Translation and literary work,
5. Schools,
6. Preaching on missionary tours,
7. Private social intercourse . . . between Christian and heathen natives.25

Thus, according to Nevius, the distribution written works alone was a far less effective method of evangelization than direct communication by proselytizers. Indeed, over half a century earlier than Nevius, the editors of the Missionary Register proclaimed that

Preachers are wanted, in the first place, to call the attention of the ignorant and careless Heathen to the Word of God -- secondly, to direct his mind to such parts of the Sacred Volume as are best adapted to his capacity and circumstances -- thirdly, to make explanations where the sense is not obvious -- and, finally, to enforce the truths of Scripture by argument and persuasion.26

“Bibles,” they concluded, “should, by all means, be circulated among the Heathen; but Ministers of Gospel should be sent along with them.” The editors argued that “[w]ithout Christian Teachers, an indiscriminate distribution of the Bible, in Heathen and Mahomedan Countries, would be but little better than throwing it away.” To support their position, they pointed out that “there is no instance on record of a Nation being evangelized by the Bible without the preaching of the Gospel.”27

To extend Christianity to the 'heathen' in foreign lands, the CMS did not rely solely upon British or European missionaries. Basic demographics
dictated that the global evangelization of non-Christians would require a greater supply of proselytizers than Britain and other European nations could supply. "Alas!" Henry Venn exclaimed in 1843:

how utterly inadequate, and in the eyes of men of this world, contemptible, does the instrumentality of a few scattered Missionaries appear! One to 100,000 heathens and how insufficient for these things does the Missionary appear in his own eyes when he compares his weakness, poverty and insufficiency with the magnitude of the work to which he is called.28

On a separate occasion, Venn observed that

[[It is a common calculation, "One clergyman to two or three thousand at home; one to two or three millions abroad . . . . One single fact will show the impossibility of evangelizing the heathen world by the agency of European and American Missionaries. Transplant the whole clergy of England into China, place them as they are placed here, so many clergymen to so many people, and what would be the consequence? You would have supplied just one-twentieth part of the population of China.29

To Venn and the CMS, Native proselytizers were "the best remedy" for the shortage of British missionary personnel.30

The Society’s perception that indigenous parishioners more likely would support a Native than European clergyman further bolstered their efforts to train Native Christian proselytizers. In 1884, Archdeacon Abraham Cowley, a CMS missionary in the Canadian North-West, observed that “Mr. McKenzie would do very well for St. Andrew’s” because he “is a Halfbreed [sic], & popular, & the population of St. Andrew’s being chiefly Halfbreeds [sic], might be proud of a native clergyman, & on this account the more ready to contribute to his support.”31 Four years later, the Bishop of Athabasca
suggested that because “[t]he Indian’s immutable idea is that the European is by inalienable right of blood & position the giver & the Indian’s relation to him that of the receiver,” congregants would be more likely to give contributions “for one of themselves than for an European Pastor.”

Financial concerns also motivated the CMS to employ Native agents and work to raise “self-supporting, self-governing, self-extending” Native Churches. Periodic “financial embarrassments” required the Society to restrict its expenditures and retrench its efforts. Following the Crimean War, for instance, the CMS informed its contributors and its agents that “it will be necessary to postpone many desirable objects” because

the great pressure arising from the war and the consequent increase of taxation and the cost of all the necessaries of life at home, continues unabated; while new demands are perpetually made upon the charity of the public: and that it would therefore be unreasonable that the Society’s income should remain unaffected.

Almost a half century later, Eugene Stock noted that while “it was the inadequate supply of men that led the Society to employ more Natives, so it was the inadequate supply of funds that led it to make resolute efforts to throw the Native Churches on their own resources.

Throughout the nineteenth century, the CMS produced numerous papers that outlined its policies, theories, and goals with respect to Native Churches and Native agents. In 1866, however, it published three of the most important as a single pamphlet. The first paper in this pamphlet was originally printed in 1851 and “record[ed] the views of the Society upon the
employment and ordination of native teachers." The CMS observed that because "the ultimate object of a mission" was

the settlement of a native Church, under native pastors, upon a self-supporting system, it should be borne in mind that the progress of a mission mainly depends upon the training up and the location of native pastors; and that, as it has been happily expressed, 'the euthanasia of a mission' takes place when a missionary, surrounded by well-trained native congregations, under native pastors, is able to resign all pastoral work in their hands, and gradually to relax his superintendence over the pastors themselves, till it insensibly ceases; and so the mission passes into a settled Christian community. Then the missionary and all missionary agency should be transferred to 'the regions beyond.'

The CMS thus distinguished between the roles of missionaries and pastors. Under its evolving Native Church policy, the missionary was to "preac[h] to the heathen, and instruc[t] inquirers or recent converts" and was to avoid becoming embroiled in pastoral responsibilities. Native clergymen or teachers "were to take up such pastoral care" and "ministe[r] in holy things to a congregation of native Christians."

According to the CMS's design, unordained Native teachers (who also were known as catechists or Christian leaders) occupied the level above converts in a progression upwards that included Native pastors, Native missionaries, and Native bishops. Consequently, the CMS might elevate worthy Native catechists to Native pastors, and worthy Native pastors to Native missionaries. Finally, when the "Christian progress of the population" required it, "the missionary district . . . [could] be placed upon a settled ecclesiastical system" in which "all native congregations should contribute to a
fund for the payment of the salaries of native pastors." The result of these efforts would be a self-supporting, self-governing, and self-extending Native Church "with Native bishops and clergy and synods and canons and formularies, independent of the Church of England, through an integral part of the Anglican communion."

In "The Failure of the Native Church Policy," historian Ian A.L. Getty suggested that because a self-supporting, self-extending, and self-governing Native Church did not develop in Canada "Henry Venn’s enlightened native church policy . . . came too late to stand up to the onslaught of European settlement in the [Canadian] west." The Secretary and historian of the CMS, Eugene Stock, however, wrote at the end of the nineteenth century, that

the North-West Canada Missions are in one important respect like the New Zealand Missions. To neither the Maori Christians nor to the Red Indian Christians can the Society’s plans for future Native Churches apply. In great Colonies where the white population, already far in excess of the aboriginal population, is increasing rapidly while the latter is but a remnant, the Natives can only be absorbed in the Colonial Church.

Indeed, historian Roger Chilton observed that "it was never the intention of the CMS either in New Zealand or Canada to establish native churches which would reach Venn’s three objectives."

The scattered and sparse local population base in the Canadian North-West made the prospect of self-support much less likely than in warmer and more densely populated regions. "Rapid changes" in the social, political, and economic environments of the region, including the Treaty and reserve system, the disappearance of the buffalo, and the increasing...
influence” of “civilization”\textsuperscript{47} and “settlement”\textsuperscript{48} further confirmed to the CMS that its Native Church policy required adaptation to suit the peculiarities of the Canadian mission field.

In the 1870’s, the Secretary of the CMS, Reverend C.C. Fenn, reiterated that the Society “hope[s] that the Native converts generally would ultimately follow the plan of forming separate Churches (of course episcopal) rather than continue to be members of the Church of England.” Writing to the Bishop of Athabasca on the topic of “the ecclesiastical position of the Native Converts,” however, he cautioned that the Parent Committee “expressly excepted those [?] . . . such as New Zealand & N.W. America, where the English colonials exceed, or are likely to exceed in number, the Native population.”\textsuperscript{49}

The Society’s agents in Canada also long recognized that the CMS’s Native Church Policy could not be applied in the same manner in all mission fields. Shortly after he arrived in the Canadian North-West, David Anderson, the first Bishop of the Diocese of Rupert’s Land, informed Venn that “[t]his Diocese is so wholly unlike all others that I feel more and more few of the rules which apply in India or the other Col. Dioceses will do so here.” He therefore suggested that, in the context of Rupert’s Land and “[i]n reference to Native Ministers . . . I feel convinced that experience here would lead to a different course.”\textsuperscript{50}

Other agents echoed Anderson’s sentiments. In 1871, Bishop Machray of the Diocese of Rupert’s Land suggested that a “model native church in a heathen city like Calcutta or Madras is admirable [but a] . . . native Christian
church amid the white Christian churches has no meaning.” 51 Two years later, he informed the Society that “in what remains with the Diocese of Rupert’s Land & in the proposed Diocese of the Saskatchewan,” the “plan” of having ordained “pious Indians . . . living in the wandering ways of their fathers” was “not practicable.” Machray observed that Native agents “cannot but be in contact with a great deal of white influence & dependant on many imported things.” He reflected therefore that “[t]hose who know Indian character & habits know that such a man will live far more economically if they can be got to learn a lesson of white carefulness & system.” 52 While the CMS recognized that the application of its Native Church policy in the Canadian North-West would differ from Africa or India, the following chapters, however, show that for most of the remaining century it nevertheless failed to adapt its policies accordingly.

In the Second Minute of the Pamphlet of 1866, the CMS addressed its concern that “so little progress had been made toward the formation of native Churches.” 53 It had hoped to have increased its 9 000 communicants in 1845 “sevenfold at the end of ten years”; by 1865 it had gained only 26 000. 54

The Society attributed this failure to the fact that its missionaries were becoming too involved with parochial duties. It therefore informed its staff that as the missionary devoted increasing amounts of his time to Christian converts, “he extend[ed] his personal labours to the heathen in a continually decreasing ratio.” It also observed that the converts themselves were becoming “dependents upon a foreign Mission, rather than members of a native Church.” Finally, it pointed out that as the missionary organization was
burdened with "a vast and increasing expense at its oldest missions," less funds were available for evangelizing the heathen.\textsuperscript{55}

Although the CMS was willing to provide financial support to a mission during its early years, it reiterated that "native converts should be trained, at as early a stage as possible, upon a system of self-government, and of contributing to the support of their own native teachers" and to a "Native Church Fund." When these funds were established, Native agents who were involved with parochial responsibilities would be paid out of the local Native Church Fund; the CMS would pay individuals who were "employed as assistants to the Missionary in his evangelistic work."\textsuperscript{56}

The third Minute in the Pamphlet of 1866 further defined the CMS's Native Church Policy. The Society observed that "[t]he first Minute [1851] seems indeed to hold out the prospect to native pastors" of being placed "in the position of European missionaries, as in the earlier stages of missionary operations." The Society, however, commented that

the case is now altered. Experience has proved that the employment by a foreign Missionary society of native ministers on the footing of English missionaries impedes, in many ways, the organisation of the native Church. The native Church needs the most able native pastors for its fuller development.\textsuperscript{57}

While "the Committee [did] reserve to themselves the power, in exceptional cases, of transferring a native pastor to the list of missionaries or assistant missionaries,"\textsuperscript{58} the general policy of the CMS was to restrict such persons to pastoral positions.
The CMS recognized that not all individuals were suited to missionary work. It cautioned that missionary candidates (who according to the CMS's policy thus most likely would be European) must exhibit "Christian character" and a "changed heart," the visible expression of which were central in the evangelical Anglican interpretation of Christianity.⁵⁹

Reverend Henry Venn, however, observed that the "supply of true Missionaries - men of firm faith, men of intelligence, men of zeal, men of power - is very limited." Venn asked, what could "these feeble Christians . . . establish [but] a feeble, nominal, native Christianity?" He then cautioned that "if I have learnt any one lesson in my long experience of Christian Missions, it is this, that a . . . feeble, nominal Christianity is the great obstacle to the conversion of the world." He therefore warned his contemporaries: "you must not regard the Christian Church as bound to send out Missionaries beyond the supply she can afford of men of the right spirit, which is in a very limited supply compared with the whole number of clergy at home."⁶⁰

Venn further noted that care remained necessary when stationing abroad men who appeared to be well-suited to religious proselytization. He wrote:

[f]riends at a distance have little knowledge of the peculiar qualifications required to make an efficient missionary to the heathen - many excellent men have been sent out who have been lost to the Church from their inability to discharge the special duties of a Missionary, or to learn the language, etc.⁶¹

In its numerous *Special Appeals for Recruits*, the Society therefore emphasized that potential missionaries should be charismatic, pious, and
independent thinkers who possessed strong physical constitutions and who were open to intellectual challenges that included learning new languages and overcoming indigenous religious beliefs.62

In Social History and Christian Missions, Max Warren touched on a point that is crucial to understanding the evolution of CMS missions and the roles therein of Native proselytizers. Warren observed that, with the exception of self-taught missionaries like William Carey and those from Scotland “who had benefited from that country’s traditional veneration of education,” the “actual [European] missionaries who comprised the missionary movement were, in the first part of the nineteenth century, men mostly without privilege of what we would call even secondary, let alone higher, education.”63 He observed that as a consequence “[i]t is not altogether without significance that being but slenderly equipped themselves with what the world calls learning,” mid-nineteenth century Euro-Christian missionaries “more readily expected that Pacific Islanders, African Negroes and Indian peasants would be able to rise to the same responsibilities.”64

Historian Frits Pannekoek was even more critical of CMS agents who were stationed in the Canadian North-West. He commented that the Society sent “[t]he best” of the students from Islington College, which was its training institution, “to India, where the CMS had extensive operations, and the more marginal to Rupert’s Land, a peripheral area of interest for the Society.” Pannekoek characterized the “vast majority” of the European trained agents that the CMS stationed in Canada as being “mediocre products” who possessed
flaws in character, knowledge, or piety that were significant enough for the Society to relegate them to a minor mission field.65

In the second half of the nineteenth century, however, the CMS and other missionary societies developed more rigorous, standardized, and institutionalized training programs. These programs produced better theologically and academically educated European missionaries.66 Max Warren argued that, as a result of these developments, after the mid-nineteenth century, "most of the missionaries from Britain . . . were far more highly educated men" than those whom the Society previously stationed abroad.67 Indeed, after the 1860's, European-born agents posted to Canada by the CMS increasingly came from, or were trained to disseminate, middle-class Victorian standards, attitudes, values, and mores.68

Warren also observed, however, that the changes in the training and proficiency of European-born CMS missionaries "contributed in some considerable measure to slowing up the process by which responsible indigenous ministry was created."69 Because the CMS intended that Europeans would serve in missionary capacities, it neither required nor desired Native agents to possess the same levels of theological or academic training as their European counterparts. It cautioned that "[a]s Clergymen of the Church of England," well-educated and trained Native pastors "would appear before their countrymen as belonging to a different class, and as the well-paid agents of a foreign society."70
Speaking for the Society on the subject of agents in India, Henry Venn argued that the training of Indigenous missionaries who were "affect[ed with] European habits and feelings" prepared not "a Native Ministry, but a kind of Indo-European agency which . . . is not a desirable agency for us to employ." He believed that as "exotics," Indo-European agents would be "unfit for holding the right position in the Church of their Nation." Venn commented that for Native Churches to prosper, "a Native Pastor should never be trained up in habits and expectation too far removed above his countrymen" with whom he was "to be in every way identified." Venn admitted that, as a consequence of CMS policy, when Native agents were "judged by Anglo-Saxon ideas they are sometimes pronounced unable to stand alone." He noted, however, that judged by a larger and wiser rule they are found to be fully qualified for standard-bearers in a native Church, and their efficiency will increase in proportion as they are instructed in biblical knowledge, and accustomed to so-operate in council and in the ecclesiastical administration.

Venn therefore warned Reverend J.C. Taylor, an African who was returning home after visiting England, "to let all European habits, European tastes, European ideas, be left behind you." He continued: "Let no other change be visible in your tone of mind or behaviour than that of a growth in grace and in the knowledge and love of God."

The CMS, however, realized that it could not continue to "recognize the distinction of races" between its agents in Canada. Subsequent chapters show that for Native proselytizers to succeed as agents of the CMS in the
Canadian North-West, they required training and compensation equal to that of their European-born counterparts. The CMS nevertheless failed to reconcile its policies as they were enacted in Canada with its philosophical theories regarding the region. Consequently, its own policies promoted visible and detrimental distinctions between Native and European agents in status, wages, performance expectations, and responsibilities. Furthermore these distinctions hampered the ability of Native proselytizers to effectively disseminate Christianity, impeded their career prospects, marginalized their roles, and seemingly confirmed to Europeans their racial stereotypes about the ability of persons of indigenous ancestry to serve effectively as agents of the CMS.

In the early nineteenth century, many Europeans and Euro-North Americans attributed the physical and cultural differences that existed between themselves and the Aboriginal peoples of North America to environmental factors or circumstances of history. Historian C. L. Higham observed that this belief in the mongenetic view of mankind contributed to the development of the image of the “Indian as the noble savage” and to the perception that “[i]f missionaries could simply surround the Indians with the right environment, the Indians would respond as whites did and quickly become productive citizens.”

In the 1830's and 1840's, however, scientific racism began to challenge the widely accepted belief in the unity of mankind and contributed to the hardening of British attitudes towards race. Higham noted that theories of
evolution and models of scientific classification provided seemingly convincing support for proponents of "biological explanations for the diversity of humans" who argued that "Indians" and other non-whites were "genetically inferior." While Protestant missionaries to the Aboriginal peoples of Canada and the United States largely rejected the arguments of scientific racism, Higham suggested that "those in the eastern half of the United States as well as European societies and their colonists in Canada no longer saw the Indians as noble savage held down by their environment, but associated their skin color and behavior with racial inferiority."80

Other scholars argued similar points. Historian Philip Curtin showed that during the nineteenth century, "the British image of Africa... was largely created in Europe to suit European needs."81 During the early Victorian period, and bolstered by the arguments of Darwin and Linnaeus, race went from being "an important influence on human culture" to being "the most crucial determinant." Consequently, Curtin argued that "the new racism was to become the most important cluster of ideas in British imperial theory" and that it "inevitably came to affect European attitudes towards Africans."82

Douglas Lorimer showed that until the mid-nineteenth century whites judged blacks who lived in England on an individual basis. Imperial forces including the fervour surrounding the Jamaica Revolt and the economic failures in the West Indies and domestic forces including stereotypes in minstrel shows and in popular literature as well as pseudo-scientific support for racial hierarchies, however, changed these perspectives. Many whites in
England increasingly associated blacks as a group with the residuum -- the lowest segment of English Society. Race thus became intertwined with class, status, and respectability.83

The controversy surrounding the resignation in the late nineteenth century of Bishop Crowther in West Africa illustrates the growing influence of racial stereotyping on the CMS’s efforts. Historian Charles Taber wrote that “Samuel Ajayi Crowther, a Yoruba educated in England, had been installed as Bishop” of the “Anglican Niger Mission” and that his “authority was accepted in this isolated post.” Taber noted, however, that “when [European] missionaries arrived, attitudes changed; then it was suddenly intolerable for white missionaries to answer to an African Bishop. So a pretext was seized and he was replaced by an Englishman.” Taber argued that Crowther’s experience “was not an isolated case” and that “[l]ong after racism and ethnocentrism were generally recognized as wrong and ostensibly repudiated in missions, power struggles and jealousy between missions and indigenous churches and their leaders often continued to be the order of the day.”64 Indeed, Chapter Four of this dissertation validates Taber’s thesis as it can far as it can be applied to the CMS’s work in the Canadian North-West and its relations with its Native agents.

Despite negative racial stereotypes, CMS missionaries in the Canadian North-West believed, as did their counterparts in England and abroad, that Native agents possessed skills and attributes that could be exploited to facilitate the extension of Christianity. They observed that even within
individual mission fields, the indigenous peoples of the world, including those of the Canadian North-West, often spoke a variety of languages and dialects and that Native proselytizers often possessed a “knowledge” of local languages that was more developed than their own. The editors of the 1849-1850 edition of the *Church Missionary Intelligencer*, for instance, reported that because the “Indian tribes” of the “North-West-America Mission” were “[s]ubdivided . . . into so many sections, speaking different languages, we need a native agency to do this work – a multilingual agency like that which . . . has been formed for us on the west coast of Africa.”

Indeed, in his unpublished “Reminiscences,” Reverend Benjamin McKenzie, a Native clergyman, observed that into the 1850’s “an interpreter was an absolute necessity” for “almost every one of the [English-born] Anglican clergy.” In fact, in 1868, Bishop Robert Machray of the Diocese of Rupert’s Land informed the CMS that Reverend John Horden was his “ideal . . . of a missionary” because unlike most of his English-born counterparts, he had successfully learned the language of the people to whom he preached. Machray in fact noted that Horden was “the first European missionary who has interpreted for me my address.”

The CMS “recognised and acted on the principle that the truths of the Gospel are rendered most acceptable to the Indian when the messenger is of his own blood and speaks his own tongue.” Its agents concurred, observing that the “heathen . . . are fond of talking with one who speaks their language.”
One Native agent, John Sanders, commented that he enjoyed success on his “first missionary journey” because the Aboriginal peoples at Flying Post “understood me, for I spoke to them not in Cree, nor in English, but in our own Ojibway dialect.” In light of this positive experience, Sanders was admitted “to Deacon’s orders” and established a mission “at Matawakumma among the Ojibbeways [sic].” The Bishop of Moosonee, John Horden, noted that Sanders “progres[sed] very favourably” because “it is the post for which he is well adapted, the language spoken there being his own and in the district at Flying Post, his father & mother still reside.” Acknowledging Sanders’ suitability to the post and the local population, the Bishop of Rupert’s Land intended to give him “another year’s instruction,” ordain him to the priesthood, and “return [him] to Matawakumma, making it his permanent home.”

In contrast to Sanders’ experience, Reverend W.D. Reeve illustrated to the CMS the impediment to missionary work of not being able to converse with local populations in their own languages. In 1870, Reeve lamented that he missed an opportunity to minister to “[s]everal Indians [who] have been to see me during the week” because “I had no servant & no interpreter” and therefore “could not speak to them at all.” Recognizing that the inability of a missionary to speak the language of potential proselytes could inhibit the process of evangelization, the CMS deemed that clergymen who were not able to learn “the language” spoken by potential congregants of a mission to be “not competent” for that particular station and removed them.
Following his appointment in 1849 as the first Bishop of Rupert’s Land, David Anderson informed the Society that “[t]o meet the inquiring spirit which exists among the widely-scattered population that wanders over the immense territories of the Hudson’s-Bay Company, a native agency is requisite -- one inclusive of individuals belonging to different tribes, and speaking different languages.”¹⁰⁰ The Society concurred and shortly thereafter informed John Umpherville that it was “taking . . . to send forth natives like Revd. Hy. Budd and yourself, who have advantages that strangers cannot have, to preach to your scattered tribes the riches of Christ.”¹⁰¹

Because many Native proselytizers were passably lingual in English and one or more indigenous languages or dialects, they often served as translators for Anglican clergymen.¹⁰² In late 1840, for instance, the CMS’s representatives in Canada appointed Henry Budd to Cumberland Station, noting that “because he is a native of that quarter, & understands the cree [sic] language he will . . . act as an interpreter to the missionary.”¹⁰³

The CMS also believed that Native agents would provide valuable assistance in translating Christian texts into Aboriginal languages. Anthropologist Abdelmajid Hannoum, however, has astutely observed that because translation is a “restructuring of semantic fields,” the act itself involves “not the transmission of a message from one language to another,” but rather “the creation of a new text.”¹⁰⁴ By training and sanctioning individuals as paid agents, the CMS hoped to minimize variations when translating its body of religious literature from English into indigenous languages. Not all Native
agents in the Canadian North-West or elsewhere, however, were skilled or appropriate translators.

Reverend Robert Hunt, who possessed a very basic understanding of Cree, recorded the following analysis of James Settee's linguistic skills. Hunt observed that Settee, who was translating for him, did not speak "the dialect of this district." Furthermore, he identified flaws both in Settee's approach to translating and in his linguistic knowledge. Hunt stated that Settee

\[\text{is so ignorant of the grammatical structure of this [the Cree language] or any other language as to believe any attention to grammar is unnecessary, he says the Indian speaks good grammar naturally, but my slender acquaintance with Cree enables me to detect various inaccuracies in the translation of the Services he is doing with me, and it is quite manifest that he does not know how to alter them.}\]

Given the important place that the written word held in the CMS's missionizing program, if Hunt's criticisms were accurate and if errors in translation were incorporated into printed translations of the Bible and other Christian texts, they could have caused serious problems for the extension of Christianity in Canada.

While Hunt's criticism of Settee was rooted in the latter's unfamiliarity with both English grammatical concepts and the dialect of the local population, other Native agents actively and intentionally preached their own sermons rather than translating verbatim the sermons of their employers. Still other Native agents refused to translate altogether.

Furthermore, the very fact that a clergyman required an interpreter underscored that he would find it difficult to evaluate adequately the actions
and abilities of his assistant. Reverend John Smithurst was keenly aware of this point when he permitted "Mr. Jacobs[,] a native teacher sent from Canada by the Wesleyan Missionary Society[,] . . . to address the people at the school room." The Reverend commented: "I am told by my Interpreter the address was very good, but being delivered in Indian I of course can give no opinion as to its merits."\textsuperscript{108}

Even when an English missionary did learn one or more of the various Aboriginal languages or dialects, they often required several years to become as familiar and as comfortable using it to disseminate Christianity as a Native proselytizer who had spoken it from infancy. Reverend John Smithurst praised the abilities of "Mr. Cook" to read "an Indian sermon" with "more fluency and emphasis than I could do" and therefore "consider[ed] it best to employ him to do it."\textsuperscript{109} Similarly, Reverend James Hunter informed the CMS that whereas he had "no translations of the scripture" and his grasp of Aboriginal languages was tenuous at best,\textsuperscript{110} the comfort and "fluency" of Native proselytizers in speaking Indigenous languages permitted them "to translate extemporaneously any portion of the Scripture that may be read to the Natives into the Cree [or other] language."\textsuperscript{111} The CMS therefore often exploited the linguistic abilities of its Native agents by stationing them among populations with whose "language" and "character" they were familiar.\textsuperscript{112}

The ability of a proselytizer (whether European or Native) to speak one Aboriginal language or dialect, nevertheless, did not mean that he could communicate effectively with all Aboriginal peoples in Canada. In 1895, for
instance, Reverend B. McKenzie, an ordained Native expressed his "willingness to go" and "take charge of the School & congregation at Black River," but was concerned that he "could not speak Saulteaux and was by no means fluent in Cree."\textsuperscript{113}

Almost a quarter of a century earlier, author and explorer Frederick Whymer recorded the following analysis of a service that he witnessed Reverend Robert McDonald, another Native agent, perform:

> During our stay, the Rev. Mr. McDonald, who is a representative of our Church Missionary Society, held several services with the Indians, addressing them sometimes directly, and sometimes through the Fort Interpreter Antione Houle - a man who speaks French, English and any number of Indian dialects. They listened with apparent attention and joined in some singing. This gentleman has taught some of the younger people to read English, and his influence is doubtless good. I could not, however, help thinking that with an audience of Indians representing half a dozen different tribes, speaking as many dialects, it must be very questionable whether they all understand the missionary's words. As in other places so here, there is a general jargon called "broken slavee" used for purposes of intercourse: but such a bastard dialect will barely express the language of common life, much less the figurative language of the Bible.\textsuperscript{114}

Whymer thus noted that language and dialect were not the only barriers to effectively communicating with potential proselytes: comprehension of abstract religious ideas for which many Aboriginal peoples had no historical frame of reference, also was vital.\textsuperscript{115}

As with their European-born counterparts, Native missionaries often required several years to learn an Aboriginal language. On his first journey to the Yukon in the early 1860's, Reverend Robert McDonald's inability to speak
the local languages forced him to rely upon interpreters.\textsuperscript{116} By 1867, however, McDonald informed Colonel Dawes of the CMS that he learned to “speak passably to the Indians in their own tongue without an interpreter.” McDonald then exclaimed to Dawes: “This is a great gain, as I can now instruct them more fully in the things of God, when I visit them in their camps.”\textsuperscript{117}

While some Native agents communicated effectively in both English and one Aboriginal language, they nevertheless struggled to learn a third language. In the late 1880's, for example, the CMS was forced to withdraw Reverend Robert Inkster, “a Cree Half-breed,” from his mission on the Sarcee Reservation and place him at a different station “among the Crees” because he “failed . . . in his efforts to learn Sarcee.”\textsuperscript{118}

Still other Native Clergymen were more at ease when communicating in English and remained uncomfortable and ill-prepared when speaking the languages and dialects of their Aboriginal congregants. While he was stationed at St. Andrew’s Church in Red River, Reverend J.A. MacKay recorded that he “enjoyed much the service in English, as I have been obliged to use the Cree constantly at Devon, and, although sufficiently well acquainted with that language, the English is more familiar.”\textsuperscript{119} Similarly, Archdeacon Abraham Cowley informed the CMS that Reverend Benjamin McKenzie was “uneasy in his present position” at the Dynevor Church because he was “by no means fluent in Indian, & has to write his sermons to enable him to preach in Cree.”\textsuperscript{120}

In fact, Archdeacon Thomas Vincent informed the Secretary of the CMS that “[s]ome of the country born even of mixed descent grow up unable to
speak any Indian language.” Notably, although Vincent himself was a “very good Indian talker,” his son George required instruction in Cree “for about 18 mo. or two years [because he] knew nothing of it before;” even then George’s fluency remained “very poor.”

In addition to linguistic skills, the CMS and its European agents believed that many Native agents possessed other attributes that could facilitate the extension of Christianity including ties of race and ethnicity and a greater knowledge than themselves of the “character” and “habits” of the various Aboriginal peoples. In the early 1840s, the Society’s agents in the North-West stationed James Settee at a school at Fort Ellice where he was to instruct “the Cree Indians from Beaver’s Creek” in secular and religious matters. Settee, who at the time was a catechist, travelled to Beaver Creek and announced to the Chief his intention to spread among his people “the knowledge of the True God.” The Chief responded positively to this proclamation, but cautioned Settee that the local population would accept or reject Christianity only on their own terms. “My children,” the Chief warned, “shall be taught to read and write but not baptized, when they have learned to read and understand this new religion they will know how to act for themselves.”

With these requisite conditions established, “[t]he Chief . . . began to speak of Joseph Harbidge a Cree Indian boy who died at the Church Mission School Red River in /24.” Settee informed the Chief that “he and I were at school together and I can come to you in his stead, to be the son of that person, who lost his child.” Harbidge’s father, who was present, responded to
Settee: “that is good, that is good, my son, my son . . . I own him [Settee] as my son.” Immediately thereafter, the Chief informed Settee that “[y]ou are one of us, and you shall go and winter with us, and when you return to your praying father in the spring, he shall not be ashamed of you, for you shall have a good horse to ride home upon.”129 The Chief’s initial rejection of Settee’s overtures illustrates that rather than his Aboriginal ancestry, it was Settee’s personal connection to Harbidge and his familiarity with Aboriginal kinship and cultural practices that facilitated his access to this group of potential converts.130

The CMS’s European missionaries further believed that Native agents also often were better suited to the emotional, psychological, and physical demands of foreign mission work. The Society believed, for instance, that by employing indigenous proselytizers in regions that were hazardous to European constitutions, it could protect the lives of British agents. In 1842, the Society proclaimed that its experiences to date had afforded additional and very painful proofs of the baneful influence of the climate of West Africa on European constitutions: so much so, that all parties are agreed, that to benefit Africa extensively, by imparting to her our religious and social blessings, Africans themselves must be the principle agents.131

Indeed, two decades later, the Society announced that “Abroad all is bright and encouraging.” It continued: “The difficulties in the way of extension we once experienced from the unsuitable climate of Africa to the European constitution have been alleviated by the extensive employment of native agency.”132
While European agents in Canada were not subjected to the same perils of deadly disease as their counterparts in Africa,\textsuperscript{133} missionary work in the Canadian mission field did differ significantly from parochial work in England and was characterized by one individual as “possibly the hardest field in the world.”\textsuperscript{134} Differences in clothing, transportation, and the types of food that were available,\textsuperscript{135} the fact that a single missionary tour in Canada could encompass thousands of kilometres and take months to complete,\textsuperscript{136} and “the difficulty of communications & the extent of the country” led many Missionaries to feel isolated from their brethren in England and in Canada.\textsuperscript{137}

In 1853, the Bishop of Rupert’s Land, David Anderson, informed Henry Venn that his “chief reaso[n]” for appointing Reverend Robert McDonald to York Factory was his concern that “an Englishman might become dissipated from the peculiarities of the spot.”\textsuperscript{138} Four decades later, Bishop Young of the Diocese of Athabasca observed that “[b]eing english [sic].” Reverend George Holmes “is not quite so well able to make the best of things around him as our native missionaries are.”\textsuperscript{139}

Bishop Bompas frequently highlighted to the CMS the ways in which he perceived Native agents to be better suited than Europeans to work in Canada. He observed that “a Native Pastor being used to the severity of the Climate and exposure in travelling is generally more efficient than the Europeans.”\textsuperscript{140} He suggested that

[w]ith respect to candidates from England it is needful that they be plain living men used to rough outdoor life, of sterling piety and zeal, and able to battle with the hardships of an arctic winter,
without the great personal suffering that one delicately brought up will probably undergo."141

Bompas believed that missionaries who were "used to town life" were "placed at a great disadvantage in this country."142 He suggested that "it is almost a Sin to withdraw them from more populous spheres of Labour while hardships and exposure which might be to them a matter of great self denial [sic] to undergo, could be to one born in this country only a matter of ease and enjoyment."143

Bishop Bompas therefore recommended that the CMS refrain from sending to Canada any more missionaries from England, and that it look instead to St. John's College. To support his position, he related his disappointment with Reverend Arthur Shaw. Bompas described Shaw as being "wholly ignorant of out door labour . . . [and] unsuited even to superintend such work" as "breaking ground for a small mission." Shaw, the Bishop continued, "has hitherto remained wholly at the Fort where we landed him at Shipewyan [sic] without an attempt to move anywhere, and is still living in a borrowed room."144

Those persons in attendance at the Synod of the Diocese of Rupert's Land held in 1883 expressed sentiments that were similar to Bompas'. Observing that "[t]he character of the work is so different" from that in England, they stated that "there is much doubt and anxiety in appointing English clergymen for our new settlements." They suggested that "even if" the English clergymen "had done well in home work, it is a question whether they will suit our work or be happy in it," and proposed that "for our general work
we can hardly expect young and effective men unless we get them from St. John's College.145

The CMS and its European agents thus believed that many Native proselytizers possessed knowledge of the "language and habits" of Aboriginal peoples that exceeded their own and that could be exploited along with ties of kinship and ethnicity, and their supposedly hardier psychological and physical constitutions to facilitate the global extension of Christianity. The Society did selectively modify its Native Church policy to suit the geographical and cultural realities of individual mission fields. The following chapters demonstrate, however, that several culturally and organizationally rooted factors combined to limit severely the effectiveness, career prospects, and roles of Native agents in the Canadian North-West.
CHAPTER THREE

THE CMS AND ITS EUROPEAN AGENTS: THE IMPACT OF RACE AND STATUS ON THE PERCEIVED ROLES OF NATIVE PROSELYTIZERS.

"[T]he same standard could not be applied to ... a native that we should require of a European."¹

“He is a good man & though not bright in an English point of view yet seen from an Indian stand point he is a city set on a hill a light shining in a dark place. In his own language he is eloquent & impressive.”²

“[You] must acquire the art of using those men notwithstanding their deficiencies.”³

Although the Church Missionary Society recognized that its Native Church Policy required revision to be effectively applied in the Canadian mission field, it was slow to abandon its practice of training its agents differently according to their race. Axioms about the social and cultural “inferior[ity]” of non-Europeans⁴ were so deeply ingrained in the Euro-Christian perception of the world that they necessarily influenced how European missionaries approached and interacted with their Native counterparts. Most European missionaries believed the Native agents were less able, of lower status, and in other ways inferior to themselves, and were reluctant to be placed in subordinate positions to them. This Chapter argues that organizational inertia, the CMS’s own policies, and Euro-Christian biases that were rooted in race and status, hampered the ability of Native proselytizers to perform the tasks expected of them, and, by extension, the Society’s work in the Canadian North-West.
In most of the CMS's foreign mission fields, its goal was to raise self-supporting, self-extending, and self-governing Native churches. To achieve this end, the Society "recognize[d] the distinction of races" between its agents\textsuperscript{5} and did not train its Native proselytizers "above" their countrymen.\textsuperscript{6} The CMS, however, recognized that these goals and policies were not appropriate for its efforts in the Canadian North-West where the increasing "Colonial character"\textsuperscript{7} of the region required that Native agents interact with both Aboriginal and European peoples. It determined that Native congregations would be best served by being absorbed into the colonial Anglican Church and that proselytizers of Native descent therefore should receive regimented and comprehensive instruction in religious and secular matters that was comparable to their European-born counterparts. While local committees in the Canadian North-West did endeavour to establish more formalized systems of education to meet these needs, broad perceptions and doxa about the influence of race on status, respectability, and personal character shaped how European missionaries approached and interacted with both the various Aboriginal peoples of the Canadian North-West and Native agents.

Earlier chapters of this dissertation showed that British attitudes regarding race became increasingly rigid and more influential over the course of the nineteenth century. While English born agents of the CMS rejected the underlying arguments of polygenesis,\textsuperscript{8} many nevertheless were disillusioned by their experiences in foreign mission fields and expected Native agents to possess the same negative traits that they associated with Aboriginal peoples
in general. Indeed, when European missionaries evaluated aspects of culture and life among the Aboriginal peoples of the Canadian North-West, they generally found them wanting.

One CMS missionary who held little respect for Aboriginal life-worlds, particularly those of persons who had not yet adopted many aspects of European culture or religion, was Reverend W.W. Kirkby. After his arrival in the Mackenzie River region in 1859, Kirkby formed the opinion that “[a]s a people” the local Aboriginal populations “are inferior to either the Crees or Saulteaux.” He informed the CMS that “the Indians here . . . are as low as can well be, poor creatures, in ignorance & degradation.” Elaborating upon his statements, Kirkby wrote: “many that I have addressed had no idea of God or of a fallen state. Their life is a mere animal existence without religion & without law. They are emphatically without God in the world.”

Several months later, Kirkby described the lifestyles of the Aboriginal peoples of the Mackenzie River District as virtually sub-human. He wrote that “[t]hey are by their peculiar lives & habits so completely animalized that one almost has to create a conscience within them as well as an intellect.” He continued:

You can form but little idea of their real state, especially that of the females. It is much worse than that of the men. They are filthy in the extreme, & their domestic condition is as evil as can well be imagined.

Kirkby nevertheless believed that the temporal and spiritual standings of these peoples would improve with Christian instruction.
Reverend William Cockran also found fault with Aboriginal cultures and intellects. In 1834, he suggested to the Church Missionary Society that

[t]he heathen here have been too long the companions of the wild beast[s] of the forest to be capable of discerning the value of either temporal or spiritual knowledge. Their minds are shrivelled beyond the belief or conception of anyone, except those who are attempting to instruct them, and in every respect so completely carnal as to have no desire after or relish for mental pleasure.\textsuperscript{12}

Cockran continued to express low opinions of the cultures and personalities of the various Aboriginal peoples of Canada into the 1840's and 1850's, characterizing them in broad terms as being “indolent,” “[b]arbarous,” “slothful,” “extravagant,” and “sickly.”\textsuperscript{13}

Like Kirkby, Cockran attributed these negative qualities to the fact that the Aboriginal peoples of Canada were not raised in a Euro-Christian setting. He observed:

We need not wonder that he [“the Indian”] finds it difficult to conform to the habits of the civilized man, industry and economy, two virtues indispensable to the wellbeing of civilized man in a new country where he has not only the soil to cultivate but to clear the fence and an establishment to build, are unknown to the Indians who have allowed day after day to pass without ever inquiring for what end his time was given. When property is acquired it is not valued according to its real worth nor employed in that frugal manner which it ought to be by persons in narrow circumstances. Thus want in every form and all the miseries of want arrest the Indian daily.\textsuperscript{14}

Cockran suggested that Canada’s Aboriginal peoples lived a life “of misery and privation [from] which he cannot rise unless he is raised by the generosity of the Christian.”\textsuperscript{15}
Even with the elevating influence of Christianity, however, Cockran was not optimistic about the future of his Aboriginal Charges. He stated that the "capacity" of the "Red Man" to adopt elements of Euro-Christian culture was less than that of the "white man," and that “[e]ven when the Indian has embraced Christianity and adopted the same course of life with the civilized man, . . . a greater amount of evil falls upon him, through his negligence, than happens to the white man.” Cockran therefore predicted that even if the Aboriginal peoples of the Canadian North-West “embraced Christianity and adopted the same course of life with the civilized man,” the “Red Man” was not “long to inherit the earth.”

While the CMS dismissed the argument that Canada’s Aboriginal peoples were inherently inferior to Englishmen and worked to prevent their extinction, it acknowledged that persons of Aboriginal ancestry likely would require several generations or more to receive the full benefit of the elevating influence of Christianity and English culture. In the mid-nineteenth century, the Society cautioned newly appointed European-born agents to the Canadian North-West to

[r]emember that you are leaving a land where the ordinances of true religion have been enjoyed for centuries, and where one generation after another has more or less been pervaded by its enlightening influence, you are proceeding to a little band just emerging from the darkness and degradation of that heathenism in which from their earliest years they have been matured.

Four decades later, it observed that in Canada just as “[i]n every other part of the world, where we have missions, we find that the Native Xns. of the 2nd & 3rd
generations are as a rule stronger...[?] than the heathen or even the first converts.¹¹⁹

The CMS therefore warned its European missionaries that many Native agents initially would be less capable than themselves of performing the duties required by someone of their position or social station.²⁰ The Society also maintained, however, that with academic and spiritual training, these individuals would become competent missionary agents.

European clergymen in Canada confirmed to the CMS that many Native agents lacked the basic personal qualities and abilities considered necessary to successfully complete the “spiritual and temporal” work required at mission stations.²¹ In 1875, for example, John Hines informed Reverend C.C. Fenn, that he found “[t]he way they go about work here is so strange” and wrote that his assistant “is as good a man as I could have for a native, but he is not to be compared to an Englishman.”²²

It is shown later in this Chapter that some European agents attributed perceived deficiencies in the abilities of their Native counterparts to the quality of their academic and spiritual training. Many of the criticisms that European missionaries levelled against Native agents, however, also were rooted in “weaknesses” that they associated with the “natural temperament and habits”²³ of persons who were of Aboriginal ancestry.

Indeed, by 1890, Hines’ doubts about Native proselytizers had hardened. In that year, he recorded in his Journal that
I am of the opinion, and I speak with an unbiased mind, that the natives of this country ought not to be admitted to the orders of the ministry, unless they possess a special faculty which I am sorry to say is rarely found in them. Their former habits and training having been such as to destroy all notions of honour and discipline.\textsuperscript{24}

On a separate occasion that same year Hines informed the Secretary of the CMS that the “Native agents . . . we have employed . . . [are] inferior. They set but little example for good to the Indians among whom they labour.” He observed that “[a]lmost without an exception they are indolent, and their spiritual knowledge and experience are not very extensive.”\textsuperscript{25}

Four decades earlier, Reverend John Smithurst informed Henry Venn that he doubted that the CMS would succeed in raising a body of independent and active Native proselytizers in Rupert’s Land. He commented that “[a] native does well enough under the guidance of an European but when left to himself sinks into an indolent bitterness and does next to nothing.” Smithurst attributed the perceived laziness and poor work ethic of Native agents to the “generally unstable” nature of “[t]he Native Character” and therefore warned that “the trusting [of] a Congregation to a Native Minister must be done with great caution.”\textsuperscript{26}

Other European missionaries agreed that “Native agents are not all we could wish,”\textsuperscript{27} that “as a rule the natives don’t do well alone,”\textsuperscript{28} and that Native agents were “apt to flag” unless they were “under constant superintendence.”\textsuperscript{29} In fact, Bishop William Carpenter Bompas suggested that one of the most important personal characteristics that a missionary candidate
could possess was "a readiness especially, chastity, in his moral conduct," because "in the backwoods . . . all restraint is removed." The Bishop lamented, however, that while "a firm moral character is essential in" missionaries, "this alas is, [sic] where the natives of this country are generally deficient."

Throughout the nineteenth century, English-born CMS agents cautioned the Society to take care when employing proselytizers of Aboriginal ancestry. In 1897, Reverend Lofthouse wrote: "I believe Revd. Wm. Dick is doing good work [at Trout Lake], but he is an Indian, and anyone knows what this means will see the need of visits at no great intervals." Like Smithurst, Hines, and other English-born missionaries, Lofthouse associated race with certain character traits and had little faith in the work habits of Native agents, even ordained clergymen, unless they were under the constant, watchful eye of a European superior.

Subsequent chapters of this dissertation, however, show that many Native agents were just as active and vital in their dissemination of Christianity as their English-born counterparts. Nevertheless, in addition to believing that Native proselytizers lacked the personal qualities and abilities necessary to successfully complete the mundane and spiritual work required at mission stations, many of the Society's European agents also believed that because of their Aboriginal ancestry, Native proselytizers did not possess the status necessary to motivate, convert, and lead other persons of Aboriginal descent. In fact, in 1849, David Anderson, the first Bishop of Rupert's Land, informed Reverend Henry Venn that the goal of raising a body of Native proselytizers
would not be realized for “many years” because “[t]he fear is their not possessing sufficient influence.”

Three decades later, Reverend J.H. Keen also concluded that “[t]he Indian race in its present state is . . . incapable of supplying any men suitable for native ministers.” Keen informed the CMS that “[t]hey are all more or less equally poor, & none of those social gradations exist [sic] among them that one finds in other nations.” He therefore suggested that “[a] man taken from among themselves wd. not carry with him the weight his office wd. require.”

William Bompas shared Keen’s sentiments. In his capacity as the Bishop of Selkirk, Bompas informed William Day Reeve, his successor as the Bishop of Mackenzie River, that “notwithstanding the popular enthusiasm for ‘Native Agents’ they are not well adapted to our Indian tribes unless in a subordinate capacity, because they cannot raise their country men above their Indian position in the social scale, which is the object in view.” For Keen and Bompas, the connection between race and status was clear: Aboriginal ancestry diminished the ability of a proselytizer to perform his duties.

European-born and trained missionaries nevertheless did admit that some individual Native agents succeeded in exerting the desired positive, elevating influence on their congregations. In 1864, for instance, Bishop David Anderson informed the CMS that Reverend Robert McDonald “has succeeded in gaining the confidence and affection of the Natives” in the “Youcon [sic]” and that “Mr. Kirkby bears the most honourable testimony to the success of his fellow-labourer: so do the Officers of the Hudson’s Bay Co’s service.”
Just over fifteen years later, Bishop Robert Machray commented that Reverend Baptiste, who was stationed at Islington in Ontario was "exceedingly respected by all in the whole country round." In general, however, the CMS's European missionaries believed that most "country born [proselytizers] . . . . , whether wholly or partly of Indian blood," lacked the influence and personal characteristics necessary to disseminate Christianity to the Aboriginal peoples of the Canadian North-West.

The CMS's European missionaries were even less certain about the ability of Native agents to effectively minister to European congregations. In the increasingly Europeanized environment of the Canadian North-West, the CMS's agents realized that Native proselytizers would be required to interact with European as well as Aboriginal peoples. Although the Society's mandate was to evangelize indigenous non-Christians, Chapter Two of this dissertation showed that it also accepted that it was a Christian responsibility to give religious amelioration to all persons, regardless of their racial ancestry.

Furthermore, contemporaries observed that European settlers and traders often set negative examples for Aboriginal Christians and "prove[d] the greatest hindrance" to the CMS's work. In 1842, for instance, James Roberts, an English layman in the Society's employ, lamented that "Europeans are the greatest obstacles in the way of civilizing the Indians of this vast country." He commented that "[t]he English and Scotch here have not only fallen into the habits of an Indian life but have frequently exceeded the savage in their savage customs."
The CMS itself concluded that it could facilitate the evangelization of the Aboriginal peoples by "improv[ing] ... the morals of the white population." It therefore permitted its agents to minister to "European settlers ... if doing so does not interfere with our work among the Indians."

The CMS's Native agents shared the belief of their English-born counterparts that, for the sake of their efforts among the Aboriginal populations, they could not ignore the religious and moral needs of non-Aboriginal settlers and traders. Indeed, in 1878, Reverend J.A. Mackay informed the Society that when he was "at home" at Battleford, he "found it necessary to give some attention to the white population." He continued:

I desire never to lose sight of our proper work among the heathen, but, at the same time, when we are thrown among white men without the ordinances of religion, it would do no little harm to our work if we neglected them.

A year later, Mackay similarly noted: "I have given more attention to the white population for we cannot expect our work to make much progress among the Indians, if we leave white people to practical heathenism."

Just as many European Missionaries were less at ease speaking an Aboriginal language than they were speaking English, however, some Native proselytizers never mastered the English language and communicated in a broken style that was punctuated by errors in spelling, pronunciation, and syntax. A limited knowledge of the English language or other aspects of Euro-Christian culture shook the confidence of some Native agents, damaged the image of authority and respectability that their position required.
them to project, contributed to the perception among European missionaries that they were superior in ability and status to their Native counterparts, and reduced the effectiveness of Native agents when ministering to, and communicating with, European and Euro-Canadian congregations.\textsuperscript{47} Indeed, several English-born missionaries suggested that because of the “quaint” linguistic skills of many Native agents,\textsuperscript{48} and because of axioms about the limited abilities of persons who were of Aboriginal ancestry, “immigrants” tended “to expect less from the Natives than of [?] their own clergy.”\textsuperscript{49}

In 1892, Archdeacon Winter illustrated this point to the Secretary of the CMS, Reverend C.C. Fenn. Winter observed that because “[t]here are (virtually) no heathen left in the district” around York Factory, it “seems scarcely the place now for a European Missionary.” Winter continued: “[t]he missionary is able to spend . . . the greater part of his work with the whites and half breeds [sic] and the few English speaking Indians.” He therefore informed Fenn that “[t]he right arrangement seems obviously to be to place a halfbreed [sic] or native clergyman in priest’s orders at York.” Winter doubted that such a plan would succeed, however, believing that a Native Clergyman “would scarcely be regarded by the whites as their pastor.”\textsuperscript{50}

The Bishop of Moosonee, John Horden, had long struggled to reconcile the CMS’s policy regarding the use of Native agents with his own belief that all but the most exceptional Native proselytizers lacked the skills and influence necessary to successfully minister to both Aboriginal and European congregations. In 1861, the then Reverend Horden forwarded to the Society
glowing reports about the conduct, abilities, and “influence among the Indians” of Thomas Vincent. Despite his praise, Horden nevertheless suggested that, at Moose Factory “where there [are] so many Europeans . . . , I do not think that the influence of a native would be very great.” Moreover, Horden informed the Society that “neither should I like to see a young native clergyman subjected to the temptations which a residence here, alone, must necessarily insure him.” He therefore recommended that “an European, not a Native clergyman” should superintend Moose Factory.

When the CMS granted him leave to return temporarily to England, the fact that a suitable European replacement was not available forced Horden to leave the mission at Moose Factory in Vincent’s care. Bishop David Anderson attempted to mollify Horden’s general concerns by informing him that he intended to ordain Vincent a Priest. Horden found further solace in the fact that the person who was in charge of the HBC post at Moose was “a good and able man” who “will give Mr. Vincent his countenance, and render him all the assistance which is in his power.” He therefore admitted that “I should, most decidedly, have preferred leaving the Mission in the hands of a tried European, but think the tolerably experienced native superior to the untried, inexperienced European.”

Several years after first leaving the Mission at Moose under Vincent’s care, Horden described “[t]he Native clergyman” as “diligent & painstaking” and “ha[d] nothing to say but what is greatly in his favour.” He informed the CMS that “in an English pulpit [he] would be listened to with respect, without
any allowance being made for his being a Native of Hudson's [sic] Bay. He nevertheless continued to doubt Vincent's ability to effectively minister to Europeans in the Canadian North-West. Horden characterized Vincent's "personal influence" at Moose as "inconsiderable" and believed that he does not possess that weight of character which is needed for so important a position as that which he occupied here. I therefore think that for some time at any rate, Moose & similar stations must be occupied by Europeans. When the native character has become more solidified, no one will rejoice more than myself to see them occupying the very highest positions in the management of the affairs of the Church in this country, but the time is not yet.

Consequently, although Horden characterized Vincent's "influence among the Indians" as "superior," he was less enthusiastic about Vincent's influence among Europeans and Euro-Canadians in the Canadian mission field. Because many English-born missionaries doubted the abilities of Native clergymen to minister to European and Euro-Canadian military personnel, settlers, and fur traders, they took great note of occasions when Native agents succeeded with these groups. In 1861, Bishop David Anderson observed that the ability, poise, and knowledge of Reverend Henry Cochrane surprised many of the Europeans to whom he preached at St. Andrew's in Red River. The Bishop commented that Rev. Henry Cochrane . . . is one of my most promising young native clergymen. Though his parents are both Indians, he is one of the most popular Preachers in English at the present moment. He took my own duty there that day, & the Governor spoke to me at once the following morning in his praise. He was much struck, & many others in a similar way, with his Sermon.
Anderson continued: "Before the departure of the troops, he once took the Military duty for me, & both soldiers & officers expressed their astonishment that one born & trained here, should have such power and ability." In his reports to the CMS, Abraham Cowley seconded Anderson's views. He commented that Cochrane "is an excellent person, preaches with great ease and fluency, and is generally beloved."

In 1877, Bishop Horden informed the CMS that he was impressed by another of its Native agents. Horden admitted that "was a little afraid" that Reverend John Sanders lacked the ability and personal authority to preach to English speaking congregations. After evaluating Sanders' progress at Matawakumma, Ontario, however, the Bishop observed that "[t]he congregation of English speaking people is not quite twenty, and to them Mr. Sanders preaches with much acceptance." Horden wrote: "I have examined several of his English sermons, and, although they are not free from mistakes, they are written with much feeling, and well fitted for those to whom they were addressed." Horden's successor as the Bishop of Moosonee, J.A. Newnham, concurred with his assessment of Sanders' ability to "minister" to "white families."

Native proselytizers themselves also informed the CMS of their successes in ministering to European congregations. In early 1864, Reverend Henry Budd commented that

[from the European part of our Congregation here [at the Nepowewin mission] we have ... encouragement. They appear to appreciate more and more the privileges they possess, in
having a Mission Station at their door when their childn. can receive instruction, and themselves assemble Sabbath by Sabbath to hear the Gospel proclaimed.  

Two years later, the *Church Missionary Intelligencer* reprinted an extract of a letter from Budd in which he noted that an HBC Postmaster complemented him for the "change" that he brought about "in the minds of some of the men of . . . European origin." Budd emphasized that "[t]his is the information of the trader at Carlton, and, coming as it does from a disinterested person, was the more valuable."  

The ability of Native agents to win the support and respect of Aboriginal and European congregations therefore was not as exceptional as the general tenor of the CMS's correspondence suggested. Rather, doxa regarding race and status led many European agents to conclude that Native proselytizers in general lacked the ability, character, and status required to successfully disseminate Christianity to either European or Native congregations.  

English-born missionaries in the Canadian mission field, however, also questioned the CMS's policy of not training Native proselytizers above the "habits and expectation[s]" of their countrymen. The CMS expected indigenous proselytizers to be as sincere in their piety as their European counterparts, but it did not expect or require them to possess an equal level of education, to be as well versed in British socio-cultural norms, or to be as fluent in the English language. These expectations held true even in the Canadian mission field where the Society intended that its Native agents would
preach to Aboriginal and European congregations and eventually be incorporated into the colonial Anglican Church.\textsuperscript{70}

The CMS's agents in the North-West observed, however, that this policy diminished the ability of Native agents to perform their "temporal and spiritual"\textsuperscript{71} duties and limited their career prospects. European missionaries in Canada therefore suggested that it was an "admirable idea"\textsuperscript{72} to provide "training of a systematic kind"\textsuperscript{73} to Native agents in the CMS's employ that was comparable to their own.

Shortly after he arrived in the Canadian North-West, Bishop Anderson observed that the training regime for Native proselytizers did not adequately prepare them to complete their secular and spiritual responsibilities. To rectify this situation, Anderson founded St. John's College and by 1855 proudly proclaimed that "[t]he instruction [there] is fully equal to that of most English primary schools." He nevertheless regretted that a Native clergyman trained in situ "has not the advantage of a year at Home to enlarge upon his ideas and to give him that depth of character which it is impossible for them to gain here."\textsuperscript{74}

Despite Anderson's optimistic outlook, low enrolment and an inadequate supply of capable instructors forced the School to close in 1859.\textsuperscript{75} Consequently, the CMS's European agents continued to express concern about the abilities of Native proselytizers to adequately complete the secular and business affairs connected to mission work.

In fact, only one year after the closure of Anderson's school, the Corresponding Committee of the Diocese of Rupert's Land recommended to
the "the Parent Comtee." that it "not receive any order for supplies from a
ative labourer, unless countersigned by the European Missy. in charge of the
District."76 A decade later, the Society itself decided to prohibit Native agents
"in all of its Missions" from billing trading Companies for goods and services
"except through the European Missionary."77

While these restrictions were designed to minimize possible
overspending by Native agents who were too spendthrift in the eyes of some
European missionaries,78 they also hindered the evangelizing efforts of
individuals who worked in isolated regions. The distances between mission
stations, the weather, and general topography often rendered sustained
communication between agents in the Canadian North-West difficult, if not
impossible, to maintain.79 Rather than being able to purchase needed supplies
when and where they were required, the CMS's new rules forced Native
agents to submit their requests to a European counterpart for approval. This
process not only damaged the image of authority and status that Native
agents projected, it also frustrated their initiative and created delays and
inefficiencies. Reverend Robert McDonald, for example, was unable to fully
and quickly exploit the reduction in the cost of goods that resulted from
increasing American commercial and passenger traffic on the Yukon River.80
Instead of personally ordering mission supplies from American traders,
McDonald was required to relay his request to Bishop Bompas who then either
rejected the proposed order, or signed his approval and forwarded it to
McDonald to present to the traders.81
The early career of Reverend Henry Budd, whom several European missionaries described as being "the model of a Missionary," illustrates how the CMS's general attitudes regarding the roles, place, and training of Native proselytizers of Christianity combined to impede their ability to perform their secular mission duties. Shortly after Budd was ordained to the Diaconate in 1850, Bishop David Anderson informed Henry Venn of the CMS that "[t]here is . . . no Catechist in the employment of the Society who approaches Mr. Budd in natural ability and power." Three years later, Anderson commented that "[t]he Reverend H. Budd surpasses all my expectations, he has great steadiness and solidarity of Character."

Anderson nevertheless was concerned that Budd would not be able to tend to a congregation as capably as a European missionary. In 1852, he informed the CMS that Budd was not a suitable candidate to replace Reverend Cockran at "the Indian Settlement." Anderson wrote: "I scarcely imagine that Mr. Budd would do for it, there is more secular business than he could overtake, living within the Settlement in a manner, it would almost take a European to control [sic] them."

Others among the Society's European agents shared Anderson's concern regarding Budd. In 1851, Reverend Robert James cautioned Venn that although Budd had been newly ordained to the Diaconate, "[w]e must not however expect too much [of him]." James suggested that "[a]s he will no doubt be much assailed, he needs to be upheld by our prayers lest Satan get an advantage over him."
That same year, when he temporarily withdrew to Red River to secure treatment for his ill wife, Reverend James Hunter placed his mission in Budd's care.\textsuperscript{87} Hunter recorded in his Journal that "I have much confidence that he will exert himself to the utmost for the temporal and spiritual prosperity of the Station." Hunter's confidence, however, arose not so much from his faith in Budd's abilities as from the fact that he left Budd with explicit and detailed "written instructions.\textsuperscript{88}

Indeed, although his communication to the CMS conveyed certainty about Budd's capabilities, Hunter nevertheless expressed relief on his return that "Mr. Budd had kept all in nice order." Hunter admitted "Mr. Budd deserves much credit for the way in which he has conducted this station in my absence, both as regards the spiritual as well as temporal matters." He believed that Budd, "with his knowledge and experience," was "invaluable" and therefore he had "great confidence in sending him to the Nepowewin" to "for[m] and carr[y] on a new Station."\textsuperscript{89} By 1853, when the Bishop of Rupert's Land ordained Budd a Priest, Hunter characterized him as "well qualified for the office."\textsuperscript{90}

As Budd gained experience, several of the Society's European agents acknowledged that he possessed "considerable business powers,"\textsuperscript{91} was "an excellent manager,"\textsuperscript{92} and was "a most earnest and successful missionary to his countrymen."\textsuperscript{93} Other agents, however, remained less than enthusiastic in their assessments of Budd's abilities. In 1862, Reverend E.A. Watkins wrote:

The Rev. H. Budd at the Neopewewin [sic] has been under a misapprehension respecting his stock of blankets, & finds he needs a few for next winter, so that I have made out a list of what
I think will be necessary, & these you will oblige here by procuring & forwarding by the ship in June. As I have no means of communication with Mr. Budd he may probably forward a list to the Secretaries & it may be considered larger than the one I have made out, as he is not so alive to the importance of economy in the matter as I should wish to see him.94

Thus, although Budd was not trained to the academic and business standards expected of Europeans, some CMS agents evaluated him according to those levels.

While English-born and Native agents alike encountered difficulties in running their missions economically and within budget,95 Reverend Cowley took it upon himself in 1866 to present to the CMS a solid and favourable report of Budd and his work. He recognized that while Native agents might perform admirably, or at least acceptably, according to the standards expected of them by persons who had spent some time in the Canadian North-West, these standards often were far below those held by freshly arrived European agents. Fearing that Robert Machray, the new Bishop of Rupert's Land, might be overly critical of Budd, Cowley asked the Society to balance any report from the Bishop with his own analysis. He deferentially concluded his report, however, that it was the responsibility of agents in the field to rise to the standards of the Bishop, not of the latter to come down to the standards of the former.96

Thus, while many CMS agents considered Budd to be “the model of a Missionary”97 according to Native standards, many also believed that his ability to effectively perform the spiritual and mundane tasks required of a Christian
missionary was inferior to their own. They therefore informed the CMS that they felt "the want of men of character, well educated in the first rudiments of knowledge," and recognized that if the Society's work in the Canadian North-West was to become more "stable," Native agents required a more "systematic" and comprehensive education.92

In 1864, Reverend James Hunter responded to the continued concerns about the practical and spiritual training of Native proselytizers and informed Henry Venn that

We want a Training Institution for the Natives, and a good stable man from home to superintend it. Well conducted, I am sure we could supply all the Stations with Native Ministers from this Country - We have young ones of talent & ability, & I am certain with care and good discipline in a few years we could easily supply an able body of Ministers from the land.100

Hunter argued that while "there are many native boys who could be trained up & prepared for Schoolmasters, Catechists & ultimately native Missionaries," the current educational system and practices of the CMS were not conducive to raising "a well-trained body of Native Ministers."101

One year after Hunter penned those words, and only months after Robert Machray was consecrated the new Bishop of Rupert's Land, Machray "propose[d]" to Henry Venn "to confine my efforts to a Theological School and to the training of the two or three young men who may from time to time turn up to go on with higher Latin, Greek & c." Commenting on the peculiarity of missionary work in the Canadian North-West, Machray noted:

Everyday I may say I feel more the absolute necessity of the Indian Catechists who are to be Clergymen having a course of
regular training. An Indian Catechist would be probably a journey of Days from the Missy. over him. It would be like a Clergyman in London directing the studies of a Catechist in Inverness or Wick.\(^{102}\)

The stated first “object” of the newly established St. John's College therefore was “[t]o obtain fit persons for the Sacred Ministry & for discharging the duties of Catechists & Teachers in Parishes or Missions within this Diocese of the United Church England & Scotland.”\(^{103}\)

Although Machray was frustrated with the lack of “plain Godly men” who possessed “vigour of character,” he nevertheless commented to Venn that “I am . . . anxious that you should not think that I intend insisting on any high standard in your Indian Catechists for Ordination.”\(^{104}\) In fact, although he informed the CMS that “I must satisfy myself that the Catechist possesses a sound knowledge of the Gospel Truth & of the Doctrines & Practices [?] of the Church,” he stressed that “I shd. not require much intellectual knowledge.”\(^{105}\)

Summarizing his sentiments, Machray wrote:

I am quite prepared to admit [?] any Man of experience and Godliness presented to me by Mr. Cowley & the Corresponding Comtee. respecting whom I can be satisfied of the following points.

1. That he has a Competent knowledge of the facts of the Bible, being able to read it in his own tongue.
2. That he has the power of imparting the Doctrines of the Bible.
3. That he can intelligently use the Prayer book (in his own language) and conduct any of the Services of the Church, when advisable, as prescribed.
4. That he has the capacity of managing his own affairs so as to live in some decent [sic] & not get into debt (things honest in the sight of all men).
5. That he has his family in subjection in the fear of God.
6. (not of absolute necessity) That he knows English sufficiently to speak it & to read it for his own self-improvement.\textsuperscript{106}

While Machray, his English-born brethren, and the CMS itself thus recognized that the distinct nature of the Canadian mission field warranted providing Native agents with training \textit{comparable} to that which was available in schools in England, they nevertheless remained reluctant to abandon the policy of not holding Native proselytizers to “the same standard[s]” as Europeans.\textsuperscript{107} Rather, they continued to place knowledge of the Bible, the ability to impart that knowledge to local indigenous populations, the “belief[ ] and love the doctrines, discipline &c. of the Church of England,”\textsuperscript{108} and “piety, common sense, & thoughtful and economical habits”\textsuperscript{109} above academic and spiritual education as the most important attributes in Native proselytizers.

An illustrative case is that of Baptiste Spence. In 1867, Reverend Cowley informed the CMS that although Spence “is an excellent native Xlian. of great humility,” he had never attended “school.” Cowley did believe, however, that if Spence “show[ed] signs of improving capabilities a winter or two spent at the College may render him quite eligible for ordination & the charge of the Native Church at Islington.”\textsuperscript{110} Indeed, one year later, Bishop Machray informed the CMS that he had ordained Spence to the Diaconate and intended to return him as as the “native Pastor of Islington.”\textsuperscript{111} Compared to European-born missionaries, Spence thus had the barest of academic and religious training in a formalized and systematic setting.\textsuperscript{112}
In 1874, Cowley lauded Spence, now an ordained Priest, for his piety and believed that, in combination with his knowledge of the language and culture of his Aboriginal congregants, it would compensate for his mediocrity in other areas. Cowley wrote:

Mr. Spence seems to be plodding on quietly and persistently at Islington & I doubt not God will bless him. I have not heard much of him lately but have great confidence in him doing the work of the Lord. He is a good man & though not bright in an English point of view yet seen from an Indian stand point he is a city set on a hill a light shining in a dark place. In his own language he is eloquent & impressive. ... Mr. Spence seems also to manage very well in worldly matters which in this country is an almost invaluable power.\textsuperscript{113}

Although the Society’s agents would not have considered Spence to be a strong candidate for ordination had he been English, as a Native candidate they were well-impressed with his piety, his ability to preach eloquently in an Aboriginal tongue, and his competence some of the more secular aspects of missionary work. As was the case with other Native agents in the CMS’s employ,\textsuperscript{114} however, overall level of training did lead some European-born missionaries to doubt his ability to perform his duties effectively in the face of increasing European and Euro-Canadian settlement.\textsuperscript{115}

The CMS and its European agents thus recognized that the divergence between its policies for the training and educating its Native agents in Canada and the actual requirements expected of those agents led to “deficiencies” in “those men” which reduced their effectiveness.\textsuperscript{116} Organizational inertia, however, frustrated most efforts to reconcile this divergence.
As the Society's agents themselves commented, even in "exceptional" cases "Public Bodies do not like to change such general Rules." Indeed, it was not until the late 1880's, when the impact of Euro-Canadian settlement and the Treaty system on the region and its inhabitants was clear, that the CMS acknowledged that "decided personal piety" and a "general ability and aptitude for mission work" were insufficient by themselves to ensure the "extended usefulness" of Native agents." That decade, the CMS definitively conceded that, "from the very fact of their giving more time & doing more work & having to look after a larger number of persons and having if not to direct, yet at least to counsel & advise," its paid Native agents in Canada "ought to be men of more education."  

In recognition of the need to better prepare Native agents for both the spiritual and temporal responsibilities of work in the Canadian North-West, colleges in Winnipeg and Prince Albert therefore increasingly emphasized secular topics like the study of "English, bookkeeping & accounts" in addition to "Bible studies, and the differences between Protestantism and Catholicism." Furthermore, the CMS's European agents envisioned that these institutions would offer courses beyond practical studies including "Higher English, in Classics, Mathematics & Science." By the last decades of the nineteenth century, "respectability" and "superior education," both of which were central to the status expected of an ordained clergyman, therefore became as important to the CMS as personal piety in selecting and training Native proselytizers in the Canadian North-West.
Better academic training, however, could not overcome the negative impact that deeply ingrained prejudices regarding race and status had on the effectiveness and careers of Native agents. In many of the CMS's mission fields, the expectation that European missionaries would undertake missionary endeavours while indigenous proselytizers would assume parochial responsibilities, ensured that Europeans would not be placed in positions in which they would be subordinate to even the most qualified indigenous clergymen. In Canada, however, the CMS followed a different model; Native and European agents alike undertook both parochial and missionary endeavours. Nevertheless, throughout the nineteenth century, the Society remained reluctant to put Native agents in Canada in superintendence of Europeans because it recognized that many Europeans would not serve under Native clergymen. From the European perspective, it was natural that Native agents would be subordinate to Europeans, even if the former were far more experienced and better qualified.

The influence of race on CMS decision making was clearly demonstrated in 1855. In that year, the local Corresponding Committee of the Diocese of Rupert's Land recommended that the then unordained “Mr. George . . . be associated in the first instance with the Rev. H. Budd.” Believing that George would chafe at being placed under Budd's direction and authority, the Society's agents in Canada determined “to combine the advantages of native experience and European superintendence” by ignoring Budd's seniority and having him “assist Mr. George in the Cumberland
District. Even after he ordained Henry George to the Diaconate in 1856, and despite his belief in Reverend Henry Budd’s “discretion & singleness of mind,” Bishop Anderson believed that “there might be some awkwardness in having the European in Deacon’s [and] the native mission[ar]y in Priest’s orders.” Bishop Anderson therefore informed the CMS that he would raise George to the Priesthood later in the year and believed that in that way any “difficulty would be obviated.” Budd had been in Priest’s orders several years longer than George and was widely recognized as the model of a Native missionary; for reasons associated with his race, however, he was placed in a subordinate position.

Budd’s experience was far from unique as several European agents explicitly requested that the Society not place them under the direction and authority of Native clergymen. Reverend W.C. Bompas, for instance, informed the Secretaries of the CMS that he did not wish to serve under the superintendence of Reverend Robert McDonald. In the mid-1860’s, McDonald, who had a history of physical ailments, informed the Committee that he feared that his health soon would fail entirely. Believing that McDonald’s death was imminent, the CMS sent Bompas to replace him. On his arrival, however, Bompas found McDonald in good health and actively engaged in evangelizing. Bompas therefore wrote to the Secretaries:

As Mr. McDonald had successfully conducted the Youcon Mission from the commencement it was only fair to him that any one sent to share his labours should act in the capacity of a junior assistant, a position which I did not care to assume because though his junior in years & in the ministry, I had
surrendered the Clerical office at home on the faith of being appointed to independent action among the heathen while Mr. McDonald though my superior in Missionary ability is a Native of this country.\textsuperscript{128}

Bompas' desire not to be placed under the direction of "a Native of this country" thus was central to his request not to work at the "Youcon Mission."

Two important anomalies to the practice of placing Natives in subordination to Europeans in fact involved Archdeacon Robert McDonald and Archdeacon J.A. Mackay. Both of these men were of Aboriginal ancestry, and as Archdeacons, both oversaw Native and European missionaries and congregations. Mackay's and McDonald's experiences, however, also highlight that Euro-Christian preconceptions about race and status and doubts among European agents about the quality of the academic and religious training of Native proselytizers continued to negatively impact the career prospects of Native agents throughout the nineteenth century.

While the CMS's goals for the Canadian mission field differed in many ways from those that it held for non-European settlement destinations, it "press[ed]," as it did in all of its mission fields, for the eventual elevation of a "country born" Bishop.\textsuperscript{129} Many of the Society's European-born agents shared this goal and when the CMS considered dividing the Diocese of Athabasca in the early 1880's to create a new Diocese of Peace River,\textsuperscript{130} several European-born missionaries believed that the elevation of Archdeacon McDonald to a Bishopric "would be hailed with joy."\textsuperscript{131}
William Carpenter Bompas, whom the CMS sent to Canada to replace McDonald but instead promoted past him as the Bishop of Athabasca, had great confidence in McDonald's ability to manage the temporal and spiritual duties of a vast mission field. In 1879, he secured permission from the CMS to place the "Youcon & Mackenzie River Missions under the superintendence of Archdn. Macdonald [sic]" and planned "to visit that portion of . . . [the] diocese every third year."132 Two years later, Bompas informed his wife that given the "plans for dividing & endowing the Diocese," it was "probable" that McDonald would "leav[e] us . . . in a year or two."133

Although he praised McDonald's abilities and character, Bompas cautioned the CMS that "Archdeacon MacDonald's [sic] enfeebled health & advancing age seem to me to preclude him from undertaking the charge of a new country like Peace River." He nevertheless continued:

should he recover his health & wish to return to his own Mission and it should be thought proper to clothe him with the authority of a Bishop I would willingly then make way for him either by resigning or by dividing the remainder of the see which would still be enough for two Diocese.134

Indeed, after McDonald's health improved, Bompas' support for his candidacy "for the Episcopate of a portion of the Diocese" solidified and he discussed with McDonald himself when his "consecration might take place."135

The CMS, however, remained deeply concerned about McDonald's health and questioned whether he had the strength to perform the duties that it expected of a Bishop in the Canadian North-West.136 These doubts were so
strong that into the last decade of the nineteenth century they were important impediments to his being consecrated a Bishop.137

Of even greater importance to the CMS regarding “the future Peace River district” than the status of McDonald’s health, however, was the prospect that European and Euro-Canadian settlers might soon overwhelm the region.138 Like many of the CMS’s agents in the Canadian North-West, the Bishop of Saskatchewan believed that with the Yukon River opening to American trade, and with the belief that it was possible to undertake profitable agriculture in the more southern parts of the Diocese, significant settlement was inevitable in the Diocese of Athabasca. He did not believe, however, that McDonald possessed the education or the personal authority necessary to “care” for both the local Aboriginal peoples and the expected settlers. The Bishop therefore proposed that an English-born “Cambridge Graduate” would be more suitable to the post. Indeed, when the Diocese was divided in 1884, the Anglican Church named Bompas as Bishop of the newly created Diocese of Mackenzie River and Richard Young, who was both English-born and a graduate of Clare College at Cambridge, as Bishop of the Diocese of Athabasca.139

Later that same decade, Bompas informed his fellow missionaries that he was considering resigning from his position as Bishop of Mackenzie River. In response, Archdeacon William Day Reeve wrote to him and “advocate[d] the nomination of Archn. MacDonald [sic] as your successor, because I think
he has the first right, especially now that Athabasca District has been taken from the Diocese.140

Bompas, however, informed the Society that he “cannot concur on this,”141 and cited several factors that led him to “not think Archdn. MacDonald [sic] well suited for the oversight of the Mackenzie Missions.”142 Beyond the usual concerns about McDonald’s age143 and his uncertain and frequently poor health,144 Bompas observed that the Archdeacon’s lack of “cordiality or assistance” to some of the European missionaries who were under his authority should preclude him from serious consideration for the position.145 Indeed, in March of 1887, Bompas informed the Bishop Richard Young that he could not support McDonald to succeed him “for the Archdn. seems to offend the Clergy by an apparent neglect and want of courtesy & I do not think they would serve under him.”146

Bompas showed that the Archdeacon’s demeanour towards European missionaries was rooted in tensions created by his race and his position of authority. While expounding to the Secretaries of the CMS on his reasons for opposing McDonald’s elevation to the Episcopate, the Bishop wrote:

I fear that the younger Missionary brethren from home have not found quite such cordiality or assistance at the hands of the Venerable Archdeacon as they expected & it is probably as well that the latter was not admitted at home to Episcopal orders. It must be my part if possible to allay any little abrasions that are always liable to arise between the European and Country born Agents.147

The “little abrasions” to which Bompas referred were primarily between McDonald and Reverend T.H. Canham.
Writing from Peel River, Canham informed the CMS that “since the arrival” of Archdeacon McDonald, “the state of things regarding the work here has been most unsatisfactory.” In particular, he criticized McDonald for not assigning him more responsibility,148 and caustically observed that “[t]he Archdeacon keeps well, and is so jealous of all the work to be done here that he requires no help.”149

McDonald, however, believed that he was more than capable of performing the tasks that his congregants and superiors expected of him and therefore was reluctant to surrender any of his responsibilities. He informed Reverend Canham that he should focus upon his “own mission” at Peel River150 and upon his work as “a missionary . . . for the Eskimo.”151

Canham responded that the distance from Peel River to the “Eskimo” and his inability to speak their languages hampered his work among them.152 He then played to the CMS’s concerns about expenditures in the Canadian North-West by commenting that “I am receiving my salary from the CMS for doing next, to nothing [sic] at least for ten months out of the twelve.”153 He continued to press McDonald for “a more equal division of the work, suggesting . . . if he wished to do the Indian work, that he would hand over to me the English, the school, Sunday service &c.” Although McDonald partially acquiesced and “consented” to Canham “preaching at the English service, two Sundays to his one,” Canham remained dissatisfied and only his removal to a new mission resolved the tension between himself and McDonald.154
Anticipating that the CMS would counter his criticisms of McDonald by informing him that it would prefer to see a Native agent named Bishop, Bompas suggested that McDonald's training and race could prove detrimental to the Society's work. The Bishop cautioned:

You may think that one experienced in the north would be better than a new comer [sic] but I am not sure of this. The introduction of Steam may prove the commencement of civilized life in these Northern climes & one fresh arrived from the civilized world would I think be most likely to inaugurate such a change.\(^{155}\)

Bompas therefore suggested that a candidate "fresh from home might make a better Bishop" for the Diocese, but also admitted that did not "have the same objection to Archdn. Reeve" as he did to McDonald.\(^{156}\)

Unlike Bompas, Bishops Young and Machray believed that Archdeacon McDonald's personality and the quality of his education were well-suited to the requirements and needs of a Bishop in the Canadian North-West. They shared Bompas' concern, however, that the Archdeacon's "health" was "an obstacle to his appoint[ment]" and therefore they also recommended Reeve over McDonald for the position.\(^{157}\)

The CMS, however, was reluctant to consider either Reeve or McDonald to replace Bompas. Agreeing with Bishops Bompas, Reeve, and Young, the Society observed that "Archdn. McDonald is clearly not strong enough." Furthermore, the CMS noted "we know [Reeve] well and we regard him as a brother possessing many good qualities but not those special gifts wh. wd. seem to us to point him out as the man to hold this particular post."\(^{158}\) In fact, several years earlier, the Parent Committee of the CMS objected to Bompas
elevating Reeve to the position of Archdeacon.\textsuperscript{159} Consequently, because it believed that “[t]he rest” of the candidates in the Canadian North-West are either too young, or still more obviously brethren limited for quite different positions,” the Society suggested that “[i]t seems clear that someone must be sent from this country.”\textsuperscript{160}

By the end of the 1880’s, the Society admitted that its efforts to find a suitable candidate for Bishop had “failed” and proposed “to consecrate Archdn. McDonald as Coadjutor Bishop, perhaps with no increase of salary, rather than form a new diocese.”\textsuperscript{161} The fragility of McDonald’s constitution remained a concern for the CMS, however, and it offered its suggestion only “if his health permits.”\textsuperscript{162}

Bompas did not believe that McDonald’s health would permit this course of action and in 1889 informed the Society that “I do not myself think him in sufficient health or strength to sustain the Episcopal Office.”\textsuperscript{163} One year later, Bompas stated even more plainly that he was “now quite convinced of the impossibility of Consecrating Archdn. McDonald as Assistant Bishop”\textsuperscript{164} because the state and uncertainty of his health made him “quite unfitted to undertake Episcopal duties.”\textsuperscript{165}

Controversy surrounding the legitimacy of McDonald’s marriage further strengthened Bompas’ refusal to “put forward the Archdeacon for a Bishop.”\textsuperscript{166} In 1890, several individuals informed the CMS that “when Archdn. McDonald was married to his present wife, he performed the marriage ceremony himself.”\textsuperscript{167} The Society was greatly concerned about this
revelation. Although it was “perfectly certain” that McDonald had performed the ceremony “conscientiously,” it noted that according to “English law such a union is not a marriage” and that if the same was true in Canada, McDonald “is not married in the eye of the lay; and his children are illegitimate.” The CMS therefore asked its agents to determine “[w]hat is the law on the subject in the Canadian Dominion” and enquired “[i]f the marriage is illegal what can be done now to rectify matters?

Bishop Bompas replied to Fenn that, while the marriage service itself was not a binding contract, the McDonald’s were in fact “married by Canadian law, which is I am told that any couple living together as acknowledged man and wife for a year, become married without any ceremony at all.” The Archdeacon’s actions, nevertheless, deeply troubled the Bishop. Bompas informed McDonald that if he did not “legally & effective[ly] solemniz[e]” the marriage “on the first opportunity,” other persons “may have . . . [an] opportunity of claiming your example as countenancing any irregularity in such a matter.” When Bompas pressed McDonald to let him solemnize the marriage according to Anglican standards, however, “the Archdeacon refused to consent,” arguing that the “marriage was legal.” Indeed, the Bishop observed that he “had been visiting Peel River shortly before and revisited shortly after his marriage so that his marrying himself seemed rather willful and intentional.” Bompas therefore informed Fenn that “I determined from that time that I would never put forward the Archdeacon for a Bishop, nor have I done so.” Given his numerous concerns about McDonald, Bompas
recommended "Archdn. Reeve as decidedly the best one for the Committee to send to Mackenzie River if possible."^{174}

Bompas' objections to the CMS's plans proved moot, however, as the "constitution of the ecclesiastical Province" permitted naming a Coadjutor Bishop only when illness rendered a Bishop incapable of performing his duties. Because Bompas remained active and in good health, it was not permissible to name McDonald, Reeve, or anyone else to the position of Coadjutor Bishop.^{175}

The CMS therefore again turned its attentions to dividing the Diocese and finding an individual to serve as Bishop. In 1891, the Society settled upon Reeve to succeed Bompas as the Bishop of the Diocese of Mackenzie River and upon Bompas to become the Bishop of the newly formed Diocese of Selkirk. While some of the Society's agents expressed "surprise" at the decision not to elevate McDonald,^{176} the consecration of Reeve was consistent with the decisions and attitudes of the CMS and the majority of its European agents. McDonald's age and health, concerns about the quality of his education, questions about his character, and doubts about his ability to win and retain the respect of Euro-Christian congregations and missionaries combined to frustrate his ascension to a Bishopric.

The CMS and its European agents also gave some consideration to elevating Archdeacon J.A. Mackay (whom they variously identified as being a "half breed,"^{177} a "native,"^{178} and "country born"^{179}) to a Bishopric; they ultimately rejected him, however, for many of the same reasons that they did McDonald. In 1882, Bishop Horden notified the CMS that when he eventually
left the Diocese of Moosonee, Archdeacon J.A. Mackay was well-suited to succeed him. Horden wrote that "[a]s to a man for Moose, a really good one ought to be there, one who might by & by take my place." The Bishop continued: "[w]hat I should have wished . . . would have been to have had my former pupil, the Revd. J.A. Mackay with me." Mackay himself, in fact, expressed great interest in being elevated to the Episcopcal Seat of the Diocese of Moosonee.

By the early 1880's, Mackay not only was an Archdeacon, but also the principal of Emmanuel College, the CMS's Secretary for the Diocese of Saskatchewan, and an active "missionary to the Indians on the south branch of the Saskatchewan River." Consequently, although he was of Aboriginal ancestry, Mackay was in a position of authority over several English-born missionaries. Because he was the "Secretary of the Missions" in the Diocese of Saskatchewan and "the [local] representative of the Parent Committee," CMS agents in that Diocese were required to direct all communications through Mackay. Some missionaries nevertheless disliked being subordinate to a non-European, and attempted to circumvent Mackay by communicating directly with the CMS. The Society chastized those individuals, however, for flouting authority and decorum and warned them to abide by the hierarchy that it had established in Canada regardless of the race of those occupying the offices above them.

The actions of these individuals were symptomatic of the aforementioned doxa and axioms regarding race and status that shaped the
life-worlds of many of the CMS’s English-born agents. Although Horden envisioned Mackay eventually replacing him as the Bishop of the Diocese of Moosonee, other agents of the CMS were not as supportive. John McLean, the Bishop of Saskatchewan believed that it would be “very wise” for Horden’s successor to “be a man from England.” Furthermore, despite praising Mackay’s “power of organization and management – thorough knowledge of the Country, and of the Native character – . . . [and] his sound judgement, quiet manner, and perfect acquaintance with the language,” Bishop McLean observed that

[t]he CMS has in its power to confer a great boon on this Ecclesiastical Province, and to give a decided impetus to Evangelical truth, by sending out from England as Bishop Horden’s Successor, one who, while holding clearly & fully the spiritual principles of the Society, is at the same time a man of ability, knowledge of the world, and either a graduate of an University or the Licentiate of some College, such as the CMS Islington College, where he has gone through the full College course. Such a man would be a tower of strength in our House of Bishops.

McLean believed that Mackay lacked these qualifications. He commented: “I should . . . be sorry to see him succeed to Moosonee from the simple fact that he has not had the advantage of a College or University training of any kind.” He observed that “[p]eople generally expect that a Bishop of the Church of England should have such a training” and cautioned that it was not “wise to run counter to such reasonable expectation unless some very exceptional circumstances seemed to call for it.” McLean therefore suggested that the Society cease considering the Archdeacon as a replacement for Horden.
While the issue of Mackay’s academic training and background was one prong of McLean’s argument against elevating the Archdeacon to an Episcopal Seat, Mackay’s Aboriginal ancestry was another. McLean pointed out that “[t]he Diocese of Moosonee has up to this time been exclusively an Indian sphere, but it may not long remain so.” The Bishop noted that “[i]t is in many quarters confidently expected that the Hudson’s Bay Route will soon be opened up, and in that case settlements of white people will be certainly formed in the Diocese.” McLean therefore suggested that the CMS and future congregations in the Diocese of Moosonee would be served best by a Bishop who was an Englishman rather than by Mackay whom he believed would be hampered by his racial background and his perceived scholarly shortcomings.191

Bishop Robert Machray of the Diocese of Rupert’s Land, however, disagreed with McLean. Machray informed the CMS that he both “knows the Archdeacon well” and “[is] convinced that he wd. be quite competent to deal with white settlers as well as with Indians.”192 Moreover, Machray believed that “the Bishop’s [other] objection is not so much to the Archdeacon’s want of a regular Theological Education as to his want of a University or good liberal education.” Machray countered that because Mackay had been educated at the Society’s schools in Rupert’s Land, he did in fact possess “a good liberal education” and believed him to be in all ways “eminently fitted for the position.” He described Mackay as “active, able, and well acquainted with the languages
needed, an admirable traveller [sic] and full of resources for anything needed in the isolated life and work of the Diocese.193

The Society recognized that unless "a Native Agent" visited England, it was "unable to judge the qualifications" of that person; it therefore carefully considered the reports and suggestions of both the Bishops.194 Relaying its position on the matter of Mackay and the Bishopric of Moosonee to its agents, the Society informed McLean that it was well-impressed not only with Mackay’s "plodding & hardworking" nature, but also his "mental gifts."195 To Horden, Reverend C.C. Fenn wrote:

We have been thinking much about the man to succeed you. But I find the Bishop of Rupert’s Land feels even more strongly than any of us that a country born man would be preferable to one sent out from England. He feels this very strongly; and moreover he has strongly set his mind on the very man that he had thought of Archdeacon J.A. Mackay.196

Consequently, in 1886, Fenn informed Horden that "I wd. now therefore strongly press on you the desireableness [sic] of promoting the appointment of Archdeacon Mackay."197

Two factors rendered moot the discussion of consecrating Mackay the Bishop of Moosonee. First, Horden reconsidered his decision to resign and remained the Bishop of Moosonee until 1893.198 Second, in response to the death of Bishop McLean, the CMS appointed Mackay to the position of "General Administrative Secretary" of the Diocese of Saskatchewan, the highest administrative position in the Diocese.199
With his appointment as General Administrative Secretary following McLean's death, and with Horden's decision not to resign, Mackay anticipated that he might be elevated to the Episcopate of Saskatchewan. In 1887, however, William Cyprian Pinkham, Mackay's own English-born brother-in-law, succeeded John McLean as Bishop of the Diocese of Saskatchewan. Six years later, J.A. Newnham, who also was English-born, succeeded Horden as Bishop of Moosonee; Mackay never rose any higher in the hierarchy of the Anglican Church than Archdeacon.

Three separate factors (all of which were interconnected with the prejudicial assumptions of European proselytizers regarding the race, status, and training of their Native counterparts) therefore combined to prevent Mackay's accession to a Bishopric. First, as the CMS and its agents placed increasing importance on the academic attainments of Native proselytizers, they saw Mackay's perceived want of "a good liberal education" as a significant personal weakness. Second, as European settlement increased, some of the CMS's agents suggested that European congregations would not accept a Minister, much less a Bishop, who was of Aboriginal ancestry. Third, as they had throughout the nineteenth century, most European missionaries were reluctant to serve in subordinate positions to Native agents.

Thus, although the CMS and its English-trained missionaries believed that many Native agents possessed knowledge of the "language[s] & habits" of Aboriginal peoples that could assist them in their evangelizing efforts, and that they were better suited than their European counterparts to the physical,
emotional, and psychological demands of the Canadian North-West, issues of race and status tempered their support for Native proselytizers. Many European clergymen expected Native agents of the CMS to possess the same negative traits that they associated with Aboriginal peoples in general. Moreover, the Society's own policy of providing its Native agents with different standards of secular and religious training than its European agents created and perpetuated the belief that Native proselytizers were less able and of lower status than their European counterparts. Consequently, throughout the nineteenth century, many European missionaries remained reluctant to serve in subordinate capacities to persons of Aboriginal descent and believed that European populations would be reluctant to accept Native proselytizers. The career prospects of Native agents of the CMS effectively were truncated with very few of them being raised above the position of Priest and none being consecrated a Bishop.
CHAPTER FOUR
THE IMPACT OF RACE AND STATUS ON NATIVE PROSELYTIZERS OF
CHRISTIANITY AS PERCEIVED BY THEMSELVES.

"Formerly, an Indian could hide behind an excuse, saying 'He could not
understand the English Missionary, even thro' an interpreter', now there is, &
can be no such excuse for they have it now pure, without any foreign
language whatever."\(^1\)

"Once upon a time a Mother of mine was a poor squaw and 'European
Missionaries' have not lost sight of the dusky fact."\(^2\)

"I have lived for years among the camps & whenever my food is prepared by
the women at the camps it always puts me wrong. I have no aversion to my
country women but it always happens so with me."\(^3\)

Although the Church Missionary Society did not provide its Native
agents with the same educational opportunities as its European missionaries, it
did expect all of its paid agents to share the same values, adhere to the same
policies, and disseminate the same religious and cultural knowledge. Native
and European agents in fact often joined the Society for similar reasons.
Furthermore, regardless of their race, CMS agents believed that Native
missionaries were crucial to the CMS's plans for evangelizing Canada's
Aboriginal peoples; that the CMS had to adapt its Native Church Policy to
address the unique social, political, and demographic environments of the
Canadian mission field; and that racially-based policies and actions both were
unfair to Native missionaries and their families and impeded their abilities to
function as capable missionaries.
On many other levels, however, the experiences of the CMS's Native and European agents were far from similar. Despite the fact that all parties acknowledged that Native proselytizers often possessed individual skills and knowledge about the Aboriginal peoples and the local environment that were superior to those of European missionaries, the latter often did not respect the advice of the former. The CMS's racially-based two-tiered policies and British imperial attitudes and doxa regarding race and status further contributed to the social, professional, and economic marginalization of Native agents within the Society. This chapter focuses on the perspective of the Native proselytizers of Christianity; it examines their motives for joining, and their perception of life within, the Church Missionary Society.

Chapters One and Two of this dissertation illustrated that a desire to act in the service of God and spread the teachings of Christ motivated many Europeans to join missionary societies during the nineteenth century; this desire also motivated some persons of Aboriginal descent to join or to receive training from the CMS. Many Native agents believed that they had benefited from the introduction of elements of European and Euro-Canadian cultures and religions into their lives and wanted to bring the same knowledge to other Aboriginal peoples. The CMS's Native proselytizers believed, as did their European counterparts, in the unity of mankind and that the differences that existed between peoples were the result of cultural and environmental factors rather than of immutable racial characteristics. Consequently, they accepted as fact that by introducing Christianity and other elements of English culture to
the Aboriginal peoples of the Canadian North-West, they would elevate proselytes above their current temporal lot and save their souls.

After observing, for instance, that “our brothers” were in a “wretched state,” living lives of “imperfection and wickedness,” James Settee informed the Society that “my whole aim” for undertaking the responsibilities and duties of a missionary “was to preach Jesus the Lord and point to every sinner the way to life.” On a separate occasion, Settee informed the CMS that because he saw all Aboriginal peoples as “bone of my bone and flesh of my flesh, . . . it must appear to them natural when I say I feel for them.”

Reverend Gilbert Cook also informed the CMS that he “entered the field with the soul [sic] object of being instrumental in doing some good to my fellow mortals.” Despite being confronted with numerous “troubles, trials, & anxieties,” Cook therefore proudly noted that he “cleaved to the work.”

After being educated as a child in the CMS’s schools, another Native agent, Henry Budd, worked as a farmer and fur trader before returning to the Society’s fold as a paid Catechist. This decision was rooted not in a desire for worldly recompense, but rather in a desire to spread the Gospel to the local Aboriginal peoples. Shortly after his ordination to the Diaconate in 1851, Budd wrote: “[m]y present situation as a Minister of our beloved Church, and of my being the first fruits of your North West America Mission, lies heavy on my mind, because it is connected with great responsibilities.” Indeed, earlier that same year, Budd expressed the sense of obligation, personal submission, and humility that he associated with his role when he wrote:
The more I meditate on the Sovereign mercy and love of our Heavenly Father in [?] . . . me from my race of Pagan countrymen, and in honouring me with the message of love & mercy to the heathen, the more I feel I cannot do enough for him. O that the influences of the Holy Spirit may be poured out upon me that I may be made more zealous, more active, and a more successful Missionary of Jesus Christ. I rejoiceth my heart to hear of the two Ordinations you speak of which has [sic] recently taken place in Bombay, and of the five Catechists in . . . [Tinnevelly]. I feel a true brotherhood with them engaged as they are in the same warfare against the powers of darkness, under the same Captain.  

Upon his ordination as a Priest two years later, he recorded in his Journal:

The most solemn vows that man can make to God on earth [sic] are now upon me; still greater expectations are raised with regard to my useful [sic] in this land; the Society in England will expect more from me; the eyes of all the Clergy in this country will be upon me, and the eyes of my Countrymen are daily upon me; if I do not act worthy, not only of the Christian name, but that of the Minister of the Gospel of Christ, will I not greatly disappoint the expectation of all my Brethren in the Ministry, and wound the feelings of all my Christian Friends and Countrymen. These thoughts and a thousand more, occupy my mind when about to take the vows of God upon me. And Oh! Who is sufficient for these things! [sic]

Budd thus shared the same sense of submission, humility, salvation, and obligation that English-born evangelical Anglicans often expressed, but also felt an added burden from ministering to non-Christians whom he considered brothers.

Other influences including the desire for "respectability" and "status" however, often were inextricably linked to the religious motivations of persons who joined missionary organizations. Writing about European missionaries in the nineteenth century, Stuart Piggin suggested that Evangelical religion sanctioned the climb to respectability and power of new classes against the resistance of older elites.
because progress for all was given the force of divine command. In an age of transition, to work for the glory of God was a more effective way to self-improvement than blatant forms of self-glorification. Piggin therefore noted that in addition to religious and spiritual motivations, “most [European] missionaries were influenced by a desire for respectability.”

Benefits of a more material and mundane nature also played a role in the decisions of some Europeans to enter the service of missionary societies. Chapter Five of this dissertation shows that European agents of the CMS received annual salaries, pensions, education benefits for their children, travelling allowances, furloughs, and other compensation worth in total approximately £400 per annum. In contrast, one scholar observed that “an assistant curate or indeed . . . many an incumbent in England” received less than £200 per annum and commented that although the material advantages of becoming an agent of the CMS “were never said . . . they were self-evident.” Thus, while a religious and spiritual impulse often was the primary motivating factor for Europeans who entered the CMS’s service, other more mundane and secular considerations also were important.

Like their European counterparts, persons of Aboriginal ancestry sought and accepted training from, and employment with, the Church Missionary Society for a variety of reasons beyond the purely spiritual. One motivating factor was the belief that training and employment with the CMS would improve their social, political, or economic status. In 1879, Reverend George Bruce, a Native clergyman, informed the CMS that several Aboriginal persons
had approached him and sought instruction in Christianity and in “teaching the scripture.” Bruce wrote, however, that “perhaps their motives may not always be of the right kind for they are more or less passionately fond of controversy and generally when they find a person unable to read, they think him inferior to themselves; wh. results at times for a desire to divine Knowledge.”

Thus, rather than being guided solely by an altruistic desire to spread Christian teachings, Bruce observed that some Aboriginal persons were interested in proselytizing because they desired to gain access to the knowledge, power, and influence that they perceived to be associated with the religion and culture.

Indeed, several potential Native proselytizers abandoned their training when they realized that it ensured neither their financial security nor their social standing. In 1863, Reverend William Mason informed the CMS that his attempt to train William Keje Kesick was “a failure.” He had taken Keje Kesick into his house and “gave him advances intending to give him daily lessons in English and Cree and thus prepare him for the work of a catechist and scripture reader to his countrymen.” Mason observed that “for a short time” his student “attended pretty well, but he soon became indifferent, and then quite careless,” and actively avoided instruction whenever possible. He lamented that Keje Kesick “would only come to his lessons when I went for him, was always out of the way at the proper time, would even hide himself, and at times I had difficulty in finding him once he went away into the woods.”
Keje Kesick's attitudes and actions clearly reflected his growing dissatisfaction with Euro-Christian methods of instruction. In fact, Keje Kesick’s 'carelessness' and 'indifference' as described by Mason were very similar to the resistance and avoidance techniques that scholars have identified Aboriginal students and subaltern groups employing in European educational settings.

Keje Kesick, however, also was frustrated by his slow progress in learning the skills and knowledge that he associated with Christianity. He believed that these skills would provide for his and his family's temporal needs and social status. After Keje Kesick's attitudes forced Mason “to give him up,” the Reverend “stated the case to his father,” but informed the CMS that the latter's “reply greatly surprised me.” Mason wrote that Keje Kesicks father “expected to see his son made a gentleman” and “[t]o be in all respect treated as a European.”

Mason advised the man that his designs and motivations for his son’s education and training ran counter to those that the CMS considered to be acceptable for its lay Native agents. “All we wished to accomplish in the education of his son,” Mason informed him,

was to impart such an amount of instruction as would qualify him to go amongst his countrymen & read & explain God's word to them as opportunities occur, while at the same time he could provide for himself in the sphere of life in which the providence of God had placed both himself & them.

Mason regretfully informed the Society that his “explanation” of its goals was “not satisfying [to] either Father or Son.” Keje Kesick and his family were
motivated not by an evangelistic calling, but rather by a desire to gain access to the material, social, and intellectual rewards that they associated with employment with the CMS.

European agents in fact, informed the CMS that their efforts to train Native proselytizers often failed because their students lacked “a zeal equal to that which shone in the life of the Apostle Paul.” They observed that rather than returning “to their countrymen as devoted Missionaries of Christ,” some students used the knowledge and skills that they gained to provide themselves with material comforts. In 1833, Reverend William Cockran wrote that after receiving instruction at the Society’s school at Red River, “Spogan Garry went across the mountains to his relatives.” The Reverend lamented, however, that “[b]eing always a boy of the world, a lover of a Good horse, and a fine coat, he is now selling what he freely received to the highest bidder” and in doing so “had gained 200 horses by his preaching.”

Interestingly, a decade later, Reverend J. Smithurst portrayed Garry’s work to the CMS in a more favourable light. Smithurst encountered a member of an HBC brigade who informed him that “Mr. Rundle the Wesleyan Missionary at Edmonton was getting on... ‘tolerably well’” because “he found a little knot of Indians on his arrival who were disposed to receive instruction.” Smithurst enquired as to how “the Indians... were disposed to receive instruction prior to Mr. Rundle’s arrival among them[?]” The trader replied:

Some years ago two boys out of that quarter [Spogan Garry and Kootenay Pelly] were sent to the schools of the Church Missionary Society at Red River. On returning home their friends
were so struck with the alteration produced in them and so much affected by what they heard from the youths about the way of salvation as taught in the word of God that all began to desire instruction. 28

Reverend Cockran, however, continued to espouse his less favourable perception of Garry in to the 1850's. 29

Still other Native students used the education and training that they received from the CMS to prepare themselves for employment in the fur trade. Reverend John Horden, informed the Society that James Vincent “was appointed” as a school teacher and catechist “to occupy Albany,” and reported that “from his journals I was led to suppose that he was working very diligently in the Lord’s vineyard.” Horden regretted, however, that “such has certainly not been the case; he was using the CMS’s service as a preparative to that of the Hudson’s Bay Company in which he would lead an easier life, and which would likewise bring with it great pecuniary advantages.” 30

While Vincent, who was the brother of the future Archdeacon Thomas Vincent, 31 left the CMS in 1867 and remained in the employ of the HBC for over a quarter of a century; 32 immediate pecuniary advantages were not his main motivation. In the late 1860’s, CMS catechists who also taught school were paid annual salaries of £50 and granted a “limited” amount of “free freight.” 33 Furthermore, throughout the nineteenth century, Native Deacon’s received salaries of £75 per annum and Native Priests received salaries of £100 per annum. 34 Vincent entered employment with the HBC in 1868 as a Clerk; his initial salary was £40 per annum, which was increased to £50 per
annun in the 1869-1870 fiscal year. By 1870-1871, Vincent’s salary as a Clerk was £75 per annum, and in the 1874-1875 fiscal year, Vincent earned £100 as a “Clerk in Charge.” In 1885, Vincent’s salary as Junior Chief Trader was £116.6 per annum. Because Vincent’s salary as an agent of the CMS would have been comparable to, if not more than, that which he received from the HBC, a preference for life in the fur trade likely was an important factor in guiding his career decisions.

Kenneth McDonald also used the Society’s training and education to prepare himself for employment in the fur trade. The CMS added McDonald as a student on its Church Mission List in 1866, and expected that after he graduated he would repay the Society for the cost of his education by committing to a term of 5 years employment in its service. As “[o]ne of the CMS scholars at St. John’s College,” and a “holder of the Cockran scholarship,” McDonald excelled in his studies. The Society’s agents variously described him as “able & a good scholar,” “very apt in languages and probably superior in Classics and Mathematics to most of your [the CMS’s] European missionaries in this country,” “an excellent Scholar and of great ability,” “a young man of great promise,” and “an efficient Mission agent.”

While the CMS’s agents commended the strengths “of his natural gifts & mental attainments,” they nevertheless were greatly concerned about his “spiritual qualifications” and doubted “from the first . . . his steadiness of character.” Indeed, when Bishop Bompas offered to admit McDonald to the
Diaconate, McDonald “had to decline” because he “felt no inward call to undertake the duties and responsibilities of the Ministry.”²⁵⁰ He informed the Bishop that he wished “under any circumstances to remain at present as a layman,”²⁵¹ and that he only ever intended to commit to the CMS the required period of time that was necessary to repay “the money expended upon him.”²⁵² In fact, when Kenneth McDonald completed his academic training, he attempted to buy out his period of service with the CMS, but Bishop Robert Machray, who hoped that after “a few years in the Mission Service” McDonald “may gain a love for it and abide in it,” refused.²⁵³ Machray sent McDonald to assist Reverend William Kirkby “for a few months” to round out his character²⁵⁴ before he joined his brother Reverend Robert McDonald in 1871.²⁵⁵

During his time as a catechist in the Society’s employ, Kenneth McDonald performed all of the tasks that the CMS expected of its paid Native agents. His contemporaries praised his abilities to conduct religious services, instruct local Aboriginal populations in religious and secular matters, and undertake extended missionary journeys.²⁵⁶ Although he received numerous accolades, McDonald nevertheless informed his superiors that he intended to “retir[e] . . . from the work” once his five year commitment expired.²⁵⁷

The CMS hoped to retain Kenneth McDonald,²⁵⁸ as did Bishops Machray and Bompas who believed that he “may be prepared to give himself to the ministry.”²⁵⁹ As an inducement, Bompas even “offered him [McDonald] ordination” as a Deacon and “an increase in salary”²⁶⁰ to “£100 a year & £20 allowance for freight and travelling.”²⁶¹
Because no other agents were available to replace him, McDonald agreed to remain in the Society's service for one more year. After that single extension, however, McDonald joined the Hudson's Bay Company "on very advantageous terms" that permitted him to contribute to the financial support of his sisters who, one contemporary noted, "are needing help."62 As evidence of his support for the CMS's work, however, McDonald "sent a donation to the Society of five hundred dollars and twenty one cents"63 and continued "to render some help to the cause of Christ, in conducting divine service with the Indians on Sundays, as well as in English [sic] with the Company's people."64

As was the case with Thomas Vincent, salary issues alone were not McDonald's main motivation for leaving the CMS. Whereas Bompas had offered McDonald a salary of £100 per annum, McDonald's initial salary as an "Apprentice Postmaster" with the HBC was approximately £73.65 The following year, McDonald was promoted to "Clerk in Charge" of Rampart House in the McKenzie River District, but his annual salary remained £73.66 By the end of the 1880's, the HBC had increased McDonald's salary as "Clerk in Charge" of Peel's River in the McKenzie River District to approximately £97.67 The wages that the HBC paid McDonald thus never exceeded what he could have earned as a Priest with the CMS.

Although he continued to support the CMS's work by providing financial assistance and holding religious services in a lay capacity, Kenneth McDonald never experienced the same missionary calling as his brother Robert.68
Furthermore, like James Vincent, McDonald found the reduced travel and more lax moral codes that were associated with employment in the fur trade preferable to life in the mission field.\textsuperscript{59}

Mundane reasons motivated individuals other than McDonald and Vincent to join the paid service of the CMS. Whereas the Society was a means to an end for Vincent and McDonald, some Native clergymen viewed employment with the CMS to be an end in itself. These individuals joined and remained employed with the CMS as paid agents because it provided them with a position of social status and authority and a secure salary.

The CMS and its European missionaries in the Canadian North-West criticized several Native agents for collecting their salaries despite not adequately performing the duties that their congregants and the CMS expected of them. The case of Reverend R.R. McLennon is illustrative. In one of the few exceptions to its policy of paying ordained Native clergymen salaries of £100 per annum,\textsuperscript{70} the CMS approved of the decision of the local Finance Committee to pay Reverend R.R. McLennon a salary of £150 in recognition of his earning a Bachelor of Arts degree from St. John's College in Winnipeg.\textsuperscript{71} Despite McLennon's academic and spiritual qualifications, and despite his receiving a base salary that was 50 per cent greater than that paid to other Native Clergymen, his “Indian” congregants “were much dissatisfied with him” because he “never preached to them, but simply read a part of the prayers on Sunday.”\textsuperscript{72}
In response to these criticisms, the local Committee dispatched Reverend John Hines to investigate the matter. When Hines arrived at Cumberland Station he “found that Mr. McLennon was not intending to hold [the Sunday morning] service himself, but one of the Indians was going to take it for him.” Hines reported:

Mr. McLennon said he was suffering from a sore throat, & gave that as the reason for not holding services, but admitted that he never preached. Judging from the fluent manner in which he speaks the Cree in common conversation, I cannot think an insufficient knowledge of the language can be put forward as an excuse for the non-fulfillment of his duty.73

Indeed, Hines later observed McLennon “walking about his garden” and noted that “[h]is presence at Church would have been a better example to the Indians, than his absence, especially as he was well enough to walk outside.”74

Similarly, in 1889, Hines recorded that Reverend John Sinclair, another Native agent, had not been able to visit an outstation at Moose Lake because he had been ill for several months. Despite the fact that Sinclair’s illness supposedly restricted his ability to complete in his missionary rounds, Hines was forced to rebuke him for spending his all of his “travelling allowance.”75 Although Sinclair did visit Moose Lake later that summer,76 he missed a “promised visit” the following year. Hines then lamented: “I am beginning to think Mr. Sinclair’s ‘illness’ is laziness.”77

Hines in fact suggested that McLennon’s and Sinclair’s attitudes were far from unique. He believed that the “main object” of many the Society’s Native agents “seems to be, to contract what debt they can” to the point that
their actions often "border[ed] very closely on what might be called fraud." While Hines was very critical of Native agents in general and associated Aboriginal ancestry with indolence and improvidence, Chapter Five of this dissertation shows that Native and European agents alike contracted debts that they were unable to repay.

Native and European proselytizers thus shared similar motivations for joining the Church Missionary Society. Some individuals accepted employment because it offered a secure source of income and an elevated social position; others joined out of a desire to spread the word of Christ; still others joined for a combination of reasons. The CMS's decision to "recognise the distinction of races," however, combined with the hardening of racist belief in broader European Society during the nineteenth century, burdened Native agents with a "stigma" of inferiority and made employment with the CMS less attractive than employment in the fur trade, farming, or other fields.

In 1876, William Bompas, the Bishop of Athabasca, informed the CMS that the newly ordained Reverend A.C. Garrioch was well-suited for missionary work in the Peace River region. The Bishop noted that Garrioch has been trained in St. John's College, acted as a Schoolmaster at Manitoba, knows as much Greek as Mr. Shaw, writes good Sermons, and in temper[,] disposition and general conduct, as well as in the fulliness [sic] of his duties he hither to shows himself all I could expect or desire.

More importantly from Bompas' perspective, Garrioch was "acquainted with the language, used to farming, & likely to attract the affection of the Indians
from his mother having been brought up in their country." The Bishop therefore concluded that Garroch "seems much more fitted than Mr. Shaw to take Peace River."  

While Garroch himself believed that his racial background might facilitate his efforts to proselytize to some Aboriginal peoples, he also observed that it hampered his interactions with his European counterparts. Garroch believed that many European proselytizers viewed him as their inferior in status and ability because of his Aboriginal ancestry. Garroch informed Archdeacon W.D. Reeve that "[o]nce upon a time a Mother of mine was a poor squaw and 'European Missionaries' have not lost sight of the dusky fact." He observed that "[i]f Half-breed Missionaries are to be treated like 'European Missionaries' in some respects, let 'European Missionaries' be treated like Half-breed missionaries in all other respects. Amen."  

Throughout the nineteenth century, Native agents complained that "European missionaries" treated them neither as equals nor with the "consideration" they believed that they deserved. Nearly, four decades before Garroch voiced his objections and several years before the ordination of the first clergyman of Aboriginal descent, a group of Native catechists were so disenchanted with how the CMS and its European-born agents treated them that they threatened to resign. In 1846, Joseph Cook informed the Society's Lay Secretary that he had joined the CMS's employ in the early 1830's as a "School teacher, Clerk and Interpreter." While he initially intended to volunteer his services for two years and rejected an offer of a salary of £30
per annum to stay on, he did agree to remain when Reverend William Cockran
offered him a salary of £50. After seven years, Cook asked for, and was
granted, an additional £10 for his services as an interpreter.\textsuperscript{90}

Cook cautioned the Secretary, however, that he would sever his
connection to the Society if it did not redress the racially-based differences in
how it treated its agents. He noted that while he received a salary of between
£50 and £60 for “holding these three offices,” his European “predecessors
had £100 for holding two offices, namely, School teachers and Clerks.” Cook
further observed that the disparate salary level was not the only “great
distinction which has been made between the European Catechists” and the
“Native Catechists.” He complained that European Catechists did not treat
their Native counterparts as equals and that European Missionaries
disrespected and misused the abilities of Native agents. Cook therefore
warned that he and other Native agents were “beginning to get disgusted with
our situations and the treatment and the distinction which has been made
between us and the European catechists, and the too much Lordship being
exercised over us [sic].”\textsuperscript{91}

Indeed, Cook commented that many European missionaries treated
Native proselytizers like “common labourers” and expected them to perform
far more manual duties than their European counterparts for significantly less
pay. He informed the Secretary that

\begin{quote}
[a]bout two or three years ago, the CMS sent out a Catechist to
Red River Settlement of the name of J. Roberts, he lodged with
Mr. Smithurst, during the winter, eat and drink with Mr. Smithurst,
and no doubt had his £100 a year, and was never once asked to assist me in the Sunday School during all the time he was here, when I had to attend the Sunday School myself every other Sunday when Mr. Smithurst had to go to preach at Mr. Cockran's Church, and I had to attend upwards of 160 scholars [sic].

Cook, who received half of the salary paid to Roberts for performing much more work, then asked: "what would the CMS think of us if we had acted so to them to make such a distinction between them and our countrymen?"

Cook, who was of mixed Aboriginal and European ancestry, anticipated that the CMS would claim that Native agents could and should live on less than their European counterparts and rejected the proposition outright. He "suppose[d] they will say [this], because I am only half an Englishman;" while he acknowledged that "this is very true," he pointed out that "I can eat as good a plum pudding as any Englishman." Cook continued:

When the first European Catechist left the Red River I was told he was so poor that the CMS made him a present of £40 to keep him from begging in London streets [sic]. This man had but 2 or 3 children. The second European catechist only saved £4 during the time he was employed, and the third, Mr. Smith when he was discharged was in debt £100 to the CMS and his family not so large as mine. Now my dear Sir how can it be possible we can make a comfortable livelihood with £50 particularly to those that are gone to a wild country where no cultivation can ever be carried on but must entirely depend on their Salary and when they have to pay so high a freight for their property carried to them [sic].

Cook complained that while he was "a man of 14 children," the CMS expected him to survive on half of the salary that it paid to his European counterparts.
Cook cautioned the Society that its racially-based two-tiered policies were alienating its Native proselytizers and harming its efforts to evangelize the Aboriginal peoples of Canada. "I am positively sure," he wrote,

there will never be that union and love between the C. Missionaries and the Native Catechists as it ought to be, nor can the propagation of the Word of God be carried on with that degree of success and quietness, if this great distinction which has been made between [us and] the European catechists which is so glaring, if it is not abolished. [sic]\(^{96}\)

To lessen the hardship on his family, and reduce tension between the CMS's agents, Cook therefore suggested both that the Society should pay its personnel equally for the work that they performed regardless of their race. He also argued that the CMS and its European missionaries should look upon Native agents as "fellow labourers in the Lord Jesus Christ" rather than "look[ing] on and treat[ing them] as labours [sic]." Cook's bitterness with the treatment that he and his fellow Native catechists received at the hands of the CMS's European agents, and with the policies of the CMS itself, shone through in the final lines of his letter to the Secretary: "You will excuse me my dear Sir for my bad English you well no [sic] I am poor a half Englishman."\(^{97}\)

To demonstrate that he was not alone in his criticisms of the Society, Cook included in his correspondence to the CMS a letter written to him by James Settee. Settee, whom agents of the CMS identifies as "a Cree,"\(^{98}\) noted that he and another Native catechist, Henry Turner, accepted that their duties included performing some manual labour; like Cook, however, they resented European Missionaries treating them like common labourers. Settee
expressed frustration, for instance, that in addition to spending significant amounts of time fishing merely to survive the "the scarcity of provisions" at his location, he "completed [cutting] two thousand boards that caused many a tiresome night and weakness."\textsuperscript{99}

In addition to highlighting the personal impact of the CMS's policies, Settee described their impact on its missionary work in the Canadian North-West. He lamented that because of the numerous menial tasks that he and Turner were forced to perform, they were forced to neglect their primary responsibility as agents of the CMS: instructing "our Heathen brethren" in "the word of God." To further illustrate his point, Settee noted "I sometimes forget to say my prayers in the morning with a very handful of business." Confronted with treatment and a lack of respect that they considered to be inappropriate for their positions, Settee informed Cook that he and Turner were willing "to give notices and asked him: "are the teacher sent out abroad [from England] to content themselves on those terms and is this what the Church Missionary Society wished [us] to do, and be employed about [sic][?]?\textsuperscript{100}

Like Settee and Cook, Henry Budd also criticized European missionaries for their inconsiderate orders and demeaning actions, and he too framed his complaints as warnings about how they harmed the Society's work. In 1846, he informed Reverend William Cockran that catechists occupied a position of social and economic status that was equivalent to Hudson's Bay Company Post Masters. Reverend James Hunter, however, treated Budd and other Native catechists, regardless of whether they were of full or partial Aboriginal
ancestry, in much the same way that HBC Post Masters treated servants or labourers. Budd observed that because Hunter’s demands were unfair and were beyond what was reasonably and socially acceptable for catechists, they created discord and dissension among the Society’s agents.101

Budd further noted that Hunter’s actions had a direct impact on the CMS’s evangelizing program. In 1845, he lamented to Reverend Smithurst:

I have scarcely had any School at all except Sundays, but I have been always kept at the squaring timber for Mr. Hunter’s house to this time, and with all probability, as we are going out again next Week to the woods, we shall not come back from there till next April, even then we shant finish all the Boards and Planks required of us.102

Budd regretted that because he had devoted so much time “in the woods getting wood, to finish Mr. Hunter’s house, and working for the Church,” he had been unable to conduct school for several months and would not be able to do so for the foreseeable future.103

Budd informed Smithurst that he was “begin[ning] to dislike this mode of proceeding,” and observed that “I must eventually shake it off one way or another.” He stressed that “it is not the work which makes me speak . . . but the school, which I may say is totally neglected, which I thought is my main object, indeed, my only work.” Budd regretted that “[t]he children will be in such a backward state before I can be allowed to attend the School next spring, and then very probably their waywardness and noneimprovement [sic] will be very unjustly laid to my charge.” Moreover, he warned that the Aboriginal peoples themselves were “begin[ning] to dislike putting their
children in the School, because they say they don’t get no more instruction here, than they get with their parents [sic].”¹⁰⁴

Some European missionaries also independently warned the Society that Native agents were growing frustrated with being treated unequally and unfairly because of their race. Reverend William Cockran observed that “Budd and Settee are just on the point of leaving.” Cockran informed the Committee that Reverend Hunter

ought to exact nothing from them except teaching the school and superintending the children in any thing that they may have to do after school hours. He has been treating them as common labourers. This is never done by the Hudson’s Bay Company to any of their Interpreters or Post Masters, and you may rest assured that they have studied what is most politic.¹⁰⁵

Cockran continued:

Mr. Hunter forgets there is no analogy between his position and theirs. If he toils to get himself a house he ought to remember that so has others [sic] done before him. And so has Mr. Budd and Settee. But they did not ask him to go and encamp out in the woods two months to saw the timber. The few luxuries which Budd and Settee have been able to command out of £50 per annum they have taken them the easiest way they could. They have never required Mr. Hunter to send a Canoe to any distance to furnish them. Now last Summer when Settee returned from Rat River he took him all the way from the Pas to Norway House to steer his boat. Let Mr. Hunter study the golden rule better and he will never again make such demands on these for the future as he has done for the past. You will oblige by touching on this matter to Mr. Hunter in the gentlest way possible.¹⁰⁶

Hunter nevertheless continued to treat Budd more like a common labourer than like a Catechist and in 1847 sent the catechist to saw wood “for some out houses . . . at his place: a Barn, stable, cattlehouse, and Icehouse [sic]."
Budd again objected to the CMS but focused his criticisms of Hunter's actions on the negative impact that they would have on its work. He wrote:

I do not regret so much of the inconvenience, as well as Double expense of provisions it puts me to; as I do for leaving the poor school children so long a time: for I always find that after any long absence, I find they have lost more in that time than they would have gained, if I had been teaching them regularly.107

Budd therefore regretfully observed that as a direct result of Hunter's demands, "our School is [not] a flourishing one."108

By 1848, the combined weight of the complaints from Native Catechists and the cautions of his European counterparts led Hunter to engage a "servant" for a period of "3 years." He noted that he would send the servant into the woods to supervise the cutting and squaring of logs and that this would permit Budd to pursue duties more appropriate to a catechist.109

Shortly thereafter, however, Hunter again illustrated his lack of respect and consideration for Native agents when he forwarded to the CMS “the translation of the Morning & Evening Service, wishing the Society to print it.”110 Hunter informed the Society that “I have the great pleasure of sending you my Translations of the Church Services, they will be invaluable to the native converts and children, should the Committee cause the same to be printed.”111

Bishop David Anderson and other European agents objected to Hunter's claim that the works were his own, observing that the translation "is chiefly the production of Mr. Henry Budd."112 Although there is no record of the Bishop rebuking Hunter for his oversight of Budd, Hunter himself later informed Venn that Mr. Budd "is a great help to me in my translations."113
Cognizant of Hunters' slight, Budd thereafter went to great lengths to ensure that his work was recognized. In 1855, Budd wrote to the Society's Secretary noting that:

During the last winter I devoted what time I could spare to the translations in Cree. I have translated for my part, the following: The two Epistles to Timothy, the Epistle to Titus, to Philemon, and the two epistles [sic] to the Thessalonians. Philip McDonald has done the Epistle to the Ephesians, and has nearly done the two Epistles of Peter, and Henry Cochran [sic] has done the Epistle to the Galatians & to the Colossians. The next winter (God willing) I hope to go over the whole, correct and revise them.\textsuperscript{14}

Four years earlier, he informed the CMS that "I am doing all the translations in Cree that I can do, the whole of my spare time is devoted to this work."\textsuperscript{15}

Budd also used his correspondence to the CMS to highlight his ability to manage both the business and spiritual requirements of missionary work. After the CMS appointed Budd to "temporary superintendence" of Christ's Church at Cumberland, Budd emphasized that little had changed since the withdrawal of Hunter from the station.\textsuperscript{16} Framing his self-promotion within the context of a status report on his efforts,\textsuperscript{17} he wrote:

I am thankful to be able to state that things connected with the mission continue in the same state as last reported. Besides attending to the secular labour connected with the mission, I have been enabled through God's assistance to carry on the spiritual work of the same. The Sunday Services have been kept up, the day & Sunday Schools have been attended to. I read the prayers, and preach the sermons every Sunday, and attend to the evening Lectures of the week, when Mr. McDonald and myself officiate alternately.\textsuperscript{18}

Implicit in this statement to the CMS was Budd's confirmation of his ability to oversee both the secular and religious activities of a mission station.
Just as European and Native agents shared motivations for joining the CMS, so too did both groups “fully believe” that the Society needed to revise its policies in the Canadian mission to reflect the regions’ distinct character.  

In his Annual Letter of 1868, Reverend J.A. Mackay, a Native clergyman, advised the Secretary that “[t]he opinions of Dr. O'Meara on the Subject of ‘Native Agency in Foreign Missions,’ as stated in the Conference on Missions at Liverpool 1860 deserve the attention of all interested in the work among the American Indians.”  

At that Conference, Reverend R.S. Hardy read a paper entitled “On Native Agency in Foreign Missions.” Hardy observed to his audience that

> [w]e have seen that in his homogeneity with the people, whom the teacher seeks to influence, consists a considerable portion of his power; and, consequently, that whatever tends to deprive him of this, renders him, so far, less fitted for his work. This will be the result, more or less, of scholastic training, of temporary isolation from his usual modes of living; and above all, of an increase of income greatly beyond the means of the people among whom he has to minister. These are evils to be guarded against in the training of native pastors.

Colonel Dawes of the East India Company, who also was the “Lay Secretary of the Church Missionary Society,” concurred with Hardy’s arguments. Dawes informed the Conference that “he preferred men brought up without a knowledge of the English Language” and who “eschew[ed] the adoption of European customs and even dress.” Dawes believed that

> [w]hen a native visited a village station, the people should be induced to regard him as one of themselves, in appearance and general mode of life; whilst the great points of difference between him and them should be found, not in dress and
manners, but in his enlightened views and opinions respecting religious questions, especially this idol-worship.\textsuperscript{122}

He continued:

The native agent should be, as much as possible, like one of those amongst whom he labours; not coming amongst them as one having received education in a following language, and having adopted a dress and manners half English, half Indian, but as one, in these private matters, in all respects like themselves. It should at once be seen that the great difference between him and them lies in something beyond externals; in the views which he entertains of the blessed gospel which he has been led to embrace; and in the earnest compassion with which he invites them, one and all, to receive that message of reconciliation which has been proclaimed for the whole world.\textsuperscript{123}

Dawes "was happy to think [that this] was the practice adopted by the native agents, especially in South India."\textsuperscript{124}

Shortly thereafter, Reverend O'Meara, a CMS missionary who was stationed in Ontario, commented on the views of Hardy and Dawes. O'Meara agreed "that in India it was desirable for native agents to be as much as possible assimilated in habits an mode of life to their fellow-countrymen amongst whom they laboured." He argued, however, that "[t]his was not the case among the North American Indians." The Reverend observed:

The Indian looks upon himself as being of an inferior race; and his desire is to rise as much as possible to that of the level of the white man. If a native goes amongst them to preach the gospel, but retains habits akin to their own, his word is regarded as of no moment whatever; for this reason it is desirable, nay, absolutely necessary, that a considerable degree of civilisation [sic], and of the habits attaching to the white man, should be attained.\textsuperscript{125}

O'Meara concluded by noting that "the North American Indians . . . expected words of wisdom" from the lips of European missionaries, and that a
"cultivated and earnest" Native clergyman could be "just as much looked up to as was the European himself."¹²⁶

Reverend J.A. Mackay suggested that for the CMS to successfully evangelize the Aboriginal peoples of the Canadian North-West, it must acknowledge the region's unique and dynamic social, political, and economic character. While journeying in 1879 to a CMS mission station in the Canadian North-West, MacKay commented that "[a] new era is beginning to dawn on this land." Elaborating upon this observation, he wrote that the "party with which I am travelling comprises, [sic] a Newspaper Editor, a Telegraph Agent, a Policeman, and a Lawyer."¹²⁷ All of these occupations were closely tied to the extension of Euro-Canadian concepts of culture, knowledge, and order.

Mackay also observed that changes were occurring among the various Aboriginal peoples. He noted that "[t]he opening up of the country, and the failure of their former means of subsistence, has made them more humble and teachable than they were in former times."¹²⁸ Mackay thus concluded that the social, economic, and political developments in the North-West boded well for the CMS's efforts at evangelization.

To fully exploit these changes, however, Mackay argued that the Society itself had to adapt. Like O'Meara, Mackay believed that while "it is very desirable to anglicise as little as possible the native pastors in the Mission churches in such countries as India or China . . . [,] the state of things in this country is very different." He therefore called for an end to the practice of treating missionary agents differently according to "the distinction of races"¹²⁹
because the policy "respecting the appointment of Indians to be the leaders or even the ordained pastors of their countrymen in their migratory life" was ill-suited to the Canadian mission field.\textsuperscript{130}

In 1875, Mackay noted that "[t]he few Native agents that we have, are, as a rule, utterly incompetent to manage for themselves in temporal matters, besides being greatly wanting in mental training."\textsuperscript{131} He did not believe, however, that these shortcomings were the result of racially inherent flaws in character or intellect; rather, he attributed them (and the "great a lack of efficient native agency" in the Canadian North-West) to the practices and policies of the CMS.\textsuperscript{132} He observed that because "[l]ittle or nothing has been done for the higher education of the Native, and, although men of undoubted piety can easily be found, they are not qualified to fill posts of responsibility."\textsuperscript{133}

Mackay therefore recommended that the CMS place greater emphasis on the secular and religious training of its Native agents. He highlighted a correlation between a well-educated and well-trained body of Native proselytizers and success in evangelizing Canada's Aboriginal peoples:

\textit{The distress that has prevailed among the Indians, and the near prospect of the extinction of the Buffalo, has awakened the Canadian government to the necessity of inducing the Indians to settle and farm. A number of men have been engaged to teach the Indians to farm on their different Reserves. In connection with our work, this will bring the Indians together, and afford opportunities of instructing them in the truths of the Gospel. Schools appear to be among the most valuable agencies that we can use for the promotion of the work among the Indians at present, but it is difficult to find the teachers of the right sort. I trust the Training College, about to be commenced at Prince Albert, will, in time, supply the kind of men we need.}\textsuperscript{134}
He noted that a “good deal of harm has already been the result of the ordination of men without sufficient training, and, having the experience of the past to guide me, we should be better able, with God's help, to avoid the same mistakes.”

Mackay and other Native agents also objected to the CMS’s policy of differentiating between proselytizers who were of full Aboriginal descent and those who were of partial Aboriginal descent. Although this policy dated to the earliest years of the CMS’s work in the Canadian mission field, when communicating with the Society, Native agents pointed out that they themselves did not observe such distinctions and usually referred to themselves in terms like “your Native clergymen.” Furthermore, Native agents noted that the various Aboriginal peoples of the Canadian North-West viewed the main division among the CMS’s agents to be between those who were of full European ancestry and those who were of full or partial Aboriginal ancestry. “It must be remembered,” wrote Mackay, “that the Indians recognise no difference between the European and the country-born white-man. The only difference they recognise is between the white-man and themselves.”

Towards the end of the nineteenth century, even the CMS’s European missionaries took the Society to task for continuing to promote and sanction what they believed was an inappropriate distinction. In 1885, the Bishop of Moosonee informed the Society that

I [do not] at all like the division into Country Born and Native as given in the C.M. Almanac, tending as it does to create a caste feeling, which naturally does not, and most certainly ought not, to
exist. Between [Reverend Thomas] Vincent and [Reverend John] Sanders, for instance, the difference is only one of degree; Sanders is not a pure Indian, and Vincent is not a pure white; his grandmother, who lived at Moose for many years after my arrival here, was a pure Indian woman as I have ever seen; his parents were both half caste which I believe is the case with all those mentioned in your Country Born Clergy list; not one of them would consider it a disparagement to be spoken of as a 'Native Clergyman', a term now applied to those who are to be considered as 'Indian Clergymen'.

The Bishop therefore called upon the Society to end what he believed was an artificial distinction that accomplished little other than fostering unnecessary socio-cultural divisions between agents.

Archdeacon Thomas Vincent agreed with many of the sentiments expressed by Mackay and Horden. Vincent acknowledged that issues of ethnicity did play an important role in determining the reactions of Aboriginal proselytes to potential proselytizers. He suggested that in the Canadian mission field "[i]t is good to be English, very good, but there is a possibility of being too English; in that case it does no good, but succeeds in doing a good deal of harm." He noted that "[t]he Natives do regard as foreigners the white missionaries sent to them from England and indeed all persons coming to them from other foreign lands." When the CMS asked Vincent whether or not "the natives" viewed or would treat a missionary differently due to "his having been born and brought up amongst the Indians, so that he spoke their language from infancy, though he be of pure white blood?", he therefore responded: "I do not think that this would make any difference, he would still
be considered only as a fellow countryman, even though his parents had been brought up with the Indians in the same way that he himself had been.¹⁴²

Vincent agreed with Horden and Mackay, that the main distinction that the Aboriginal peoples of the Canadian North-West observed with respect to CMS’s agents was between those who were of full European ancestry and those who were of full or partial Aboriginal ancestry. While he admitted that the Aboriginal peoples often looked upon “a man born in the country, though his parents be white, . . . as a countryman of their own,” the Archdeacon suggested that “[i]f . . . the party were of mixed descent, there is a change at once, and he is in all aspects considered a brother.”¹⁴³

As Chapter Three of this dissertation showed, the CMS assumed that Native proselytizers “wd. be better able (probably) to reach the Indians than a European”¹⁴⁴ because it believed that the former often possessed racial and cultural backgrounds that were more similar to those of the various Aboriginal peoples to whom they proselytized. Chapter Three also showed that the Society believed that its Native agents had “the advantage . . . of being better able to rough it”¹⁴⁵ and that they could “live more inexpensively than the European clergymen.”¹⁴⁶

The CMS’s Native agents themselves also recognized that they held certain advantages over European missionaries. Reverend Henry Budd, for instance, observed that as a Native clergyman he was “in very special circumstances wherein I can glorify God by preaching the Gospel of his dear Son.” Budd commented that “[p]ossessing as I do, the native language, and
thereby able to address the natives with ease, acquainted with their habits and superstitions and can enter into all their feelings, answer all their objections & [... I say this is a great talent that I have to occupy till my Lord's coming.]

Budd frequently used his race and his familiarity with Aboriginal languages, cultures, and "the Native turn of mind" to counter not only the objections raised against him and his evangelizing efforts but also the numerous techniques that Aboriginal peoples employed to resist or avoid the message of Christian missionaries. He recorded in his Journal that "formerly, an Indian could hide behind an excuse, saying 'He could not understand the English Missionary, even thro' an interpreter', now there is, & can be no such excuse for they have it now pure, without any foreign language whatever." On a separate occasion, Budd recorded that an Aboriginal person approached him after a Sunday Service and stated that

I have been informed some time ago before I saw you, that wherever any of the Missionaries have established a mission among the Indians, they have always given the Indians of that place some presents for the spot of ground which they occupied, and not only for the land, but for every stick which they cut down for their use.

Budd replied to the man that "he was misinformed on the subject." The Reverend continued:

"Missionaries", I said, "going out to the heathen land, for the express purpose of doing good to the heathen have no need to pay, nor yet have the Indians any right to expect anything of the kind from them. And whatever the Indians may expect of a foreigner to pay for the ground belonging to the Indians, it would not be easy to get me to pay for the spot I occupy here, because I am myself a native of the soil, and claim my right and privilege to
establish myself in any part of North America without paying the Natives of the soil.”

Budd thus saw clear advantages to being a proselytizer who was of Aboriginal descent and used those advantages to facilitate his work.

Other Native agents also utilized their skills and knowledge and exploited ties of race, culture, and kinship when evangelizing in the Canadian North-West. Many of the names, places, concepts, and locutions that were important to Christianity held no meaning for Aboriginal peoples who were unfamiliar with Euro-Christian history and culture. Reverend John Sanders, for instance, recorded that as a child

I used to see a Romish Priest when I was at Matawagaminague whom I was...[?] afraid of because I used to hear him say to my parents again and again 'nekahseeha tawah' (I will baptize him). The word 'baptize' in our language means to throw water over a person out of a vessel. Of course, I had no idea then what being baptized meant. I only thought is [sic] was very dreadful.

Consequently, Sanders observed that “[m]y first impression of Ministers was not a very favourable one.”

Adult proselytizers themselves had trouble comprehending the meaning and context of some elements of Christianity. In 1854, Reverend James Hunter observed that John Umpherville and Philip McDonald, who were in-training to proselytize as laymen to their countrymen, often lacked the background knowledge necessary to make sense of the Bible. Hunter informed the CMS that after Umpherville and McDonald read “several Chapters in Cree,” he had to “explai[n] to them what they did not understand.”
Many European agents struggled to make Euro-Christian concepts and ideas comprehensible and relevant to potential proselytes and established congregations. Reverend W.D. Reeve lamented that he found it "hard find words to express such words as goodness, justice, mercy &c."\textsuperscript{155} Even when he employed translators, Reeve toiled to identify terms and phrases in local languages and dialects that would convey the intended meanings. He was further hampered by the fact that peoples within the same language group often spoke in different dialects and "use[d] different words."\textsuperscript{156}

In contrast, many Native agents exploited their familiarity with Aboriginal languages and life-worlds to explain the Bible in ways that were comprehensible and relevant to various Aboriginal peoples. In 1868, Reverend William Mason applauded David Keji Kesick's efforts to explain Christian concepts in terms that made sense to his "very good & attentive congregation." He observed that Keji Kesick "illustrated sin by a man falling down a 'pow westick'[,] a fall of water, though he might not be drowned he had to struggle to extricate himself from the boiling current below."\textsuperscript{157}

Several years later, Reverend Henry Cochrane also used his familiarity with Aboriginal languages and cultures to make an abstract Christian concept relevant and comprehensible to his audience. In his Annual Letter for 1872, He informed the Society that

\textquote[\[another old man by the name of 'Strawberry' died in Jesus, he would not understand or comprehend the Gospel plan of salvation for a long time, although reading & explaining easy & plain texts of Scripture to him, he & I are alone in his daughters house, it struck me to use that as an illustration to show him what}
a merciful Saviour did for each one of us, I said, “Grandfather, supposing this house had been built for you, completed & furnished in every possible way, & you were brought to the house, the door was opened & you are asked to go in & told this house was for you, its given to you free of cost, all you have to do is to slip in & take possession; if you went into the house it is made yours, but if you refused you lost it. [sic]” This he at once comprehended. “Now” he said, “I know I must be in Christ, true, true.” With this knowledge the old man died, I trust in Jesus a few days afterwards.158

A large body of scholarly work has demonstrated that proselytizers and proselytes often held vastly different perceptions about the commitments required when one converted to Christianity; the issue of conversion itself in fact is much debated.159 Strawberry’s actions may have represented a true death-bed conversion, an act of desperation in the hope of being cured, a decision to add Christianity to his pre-existing religious life-world, or they may have been the result of some other motivation. It is clear, however, that Cochrane believed that his ability to translate Christian words, thoughts, and ideas into concepts that were intelligible and meaningful to Strawberry, combined with the empathy and cultural awareness that he showed by addressing him as “Grandfather” out of respect (rather than out of familial connection), facilitated the aged man’s apparent acceptance of Christianity.

The mere fact that a missionary agent was of Aboriginal ancestry nevertheless did not automatically mean that he could easily enter into or understand the life-worlds of potential Aboriginal proselytes. Chapter Two demonstrated, some Native agents spoke and understood only English while others did not speak the language or dialect of the people to whom they
proselytized. Native proselytizers therefore sometimes struggled to communicate effectively and accurately with potential proselytes. Similarly, cultures and life-worlds differed widely among the Aboriginal peoples in the Canadian mission field and an understanding of, or familiarity with, one culture did not translate into an understanding of, or familiarity with, all.

In fact, when disseminating Christianity, Native agents often found themselves to be as disadvantaged and uncomprehending as their European counterparts. In 1856, for example, Reverend Robert McDonald recorded in his Journal that “Catherine Mackenzie,” who was “very ill with” the measles, was “impressed with the idea for some time back, that she will become a cannibal, & is in great dread of the event.” McDonald, however, could not penetrate the Aboriginal life-world in this instance, and therefore could not determine the reasoning behind McKenzie’s fear. All he could offer the CMS in the way of an explanation was that “[i]t must be a strange sensation that comes over some of the Indians. I had thought that it was brought on through starvation; but it does not arise from that cause in her case.”

Furthermore, some Native proselytizers encountered difficulties in adjusting to the cultural differences that existed between the Europeanized context of their religious training and the realities of missionary life among Aboriginal peoples. In 1849, Reverend Cowley informed the Secretaries of the CMS that his schoolmaster, John Mackay, “is so thoroughly tired of his situation and disgusted with the dirt and filthy habits of the Indian Children
consigned to his care that he declares he could not for the whole world live longer with them than the ensuing spring.”163

In fact, throughout the nineteenth century, Native proselytizers, particularly ordained individuals who had received significant amounts of training at schools in Winnipeg or Prince Albert, expressed sentiments similar to Mackay’s. In the 1890s, Reverend Richard Faries, a “Native Clergyman” and later Archdeacon, commented after meeting a group of Aboriginal people:

[W]e had to go through the task of shaking hands, I say ‘task’, because it is quite a task for a man with refined feelings to grasp a dirty greasy hand, which is sure to leave marks of an unpleasant kind & odour on your own hand. However, one has to pocket his pride & swallow his nice feelings & tastes, or else, his influence would be marred among these poor creatures. So we just had to shake hands & wash our hands afterward, when we were out of their sight.164

On another occasion, Faries recorded that “[t]here is some pleasure in teaching men like these [from Trout Lake], although the odour from their greasy rags is far from being pleasant, but a Missionary has to get used to these things.”165

Personal hygiene, however, was not the only area in which Native agents experienced difficulty coping with life in the Canadian mission field. In 1875, Kenneth McDonald highlighted to readers in England the different natures of Aboriginal and European diets. McDonald wrote:

Charles Nootle, Chief, in whose lodge I am staying warmed a piece of dried salmon for me. I could eat only a mouthful or two of it. Shortly after a small piece of bear’s meat was brought in to me so that I had salmon[,] as a second course bear meat and lastly what I was please to look upon as desert – porcupine. I hope no ‘bon vivant’ will be scandalized at the manner in which
my meal was served, for it must be remembered that the rules of
etiquette can't be very strictly adhered to with the Thermometer
at 60 [degrees] below zero Fahr.166

Food preparation in the Canadian North-West, and the norms surrounding its
consumption, thus differed markedly from that which Anglicized individuals
were used to; these differences could prove troublesome for some individuals.

Indeed, in 1895, Reverend Gilbert Cook informed the CMS that he was
having difficulty adjusting to life at his mission at Lansdowne. Despite “getting
on nicely with the language (the Cree is his own) & preach[ing] . . . Christ in his
feeliness [sic],” Cook did “not feel easy & at home in his new sphere” and
complained to Archdeacon Cowley that “the Indians [were] great beggars & a
heavy tax upon his resources.”167 Cook argued that “knowing what Indians
expect of a Missionary, the assistance they believe they are entitled to upon
becoming Xtians,” his “salary was inadequate to meet the expenses incurred
and the many calls daily made upon our liberality.” Furthermore, Cook
informed the Archdeacon that he was unable to cope with “the effects of a
change of diet on my system,” and therefore “felt it a duty I owed my dear wife
and family to resign my charge.”168

Cook was not the only native proselytizer who found Aboriginal food
and the way that it was prepared to be disagreeable. In 1877, Reverend
James Settee wrote:

I have occasion to go out at night once I nearly fainted away. I
believe I would have fallen if I did not support myself with both
hands upon the ground. If my wife had been with me to dress
my food this might not have come upon me. I take her out with
me on short visits that she might see how my food is dressed. I
have lived for years among the camps & whenever my food is prepared by the women at the camps it always puts me wrong. I have no aversion to my country women but it always happens so with me.¹⁶⁹

Settee thus also experienced stomach problems on missionary tours that resulted from differences in food and food preparation.

While the CMS and its agents (both Native and European) agreed that Native proselytizers often possessed knowledge and abilities that their European counterparts did not, the cultural and linguistic diversity of the inhabitants of the Canadian North-West, combined with the Europeanizing effects of CMS training, therefore often left Native agents as disadvantaged as their European counterparts.

Moreover, the fact that Native proselytizers sometimes did possess a greater understanding of Aboriginal life-worlds, in and of itself, could create conflict and discord between European and Native agents. Some European missionaries, for instance, criticized specific Aboriginal proselytizers for conversing too thoroughly in “the Indian mode of speaking,” observing that it “looks to say the least of it like prevarication,”¹⁷⁰ a habit that they viewed “with the greatest horror and detestation.”¹⁷¹

European missionaries also criticized specific Native proselytizers for being lax towards behaviours that, according to middle-class Victorian standards, were unchristian. Different life-worlds led to difficulties between James Settee and Reverend Robert Hunt. In 1851, Hunt informed the Society that he and his wife had “uncovered a stink [?] of moral pollution [at the
school] which filled us with grief and horror.” Hunt and his wife launched an investigation after “[a]n Indian woman (Widow Venn) complained . . . that some of the elder boys had illtreated [sic] her little boy.” The results of the inquiry revealed that “the eldest boys from 12 to 16 years of age had taken the eldest girl, . . . [?] and having laid her upon a ton and exposed her person to all present proceeded to put Betsy Venn’s little boy upon her.”

Even more disturbing to the Hunt’s was the fact that their investigation uncovered that the students at the School had engaged in a variety of other sexual acts that they categorized as being “abominations.” Hunt informed the Committee that “all the girls, big & little were in the habit of practising the abomination mentioned Rom. 1:24.” He continued: “For this purpose the elder ones sometimes returned to the woods, sometimes merely covered themselves with a blanket in the School room: the little ones imitated them almost everywhere.”

Five months later, Hunt informed the CMS of a further “serious impropriety” involving W. Rat, one of the individuals who was implicated in the case surrounding Betsy Venn’s son. The Reverend wrote: “Only last night I heard of a young man’s being in the room where all the school-girls, & the woman who takes care of them were sleeping.” Hunt observed that “this young fellow is the same person who had behaved so badly to a school girl as mentioned in a former communication to the Committee.” He commented that the young man’s “subsequent bad conduct had compelled me to forbid him to come to the station unless for a visit, but he despised my authority . . .
and here he stays in spite of me.” It was in this context that Hunt informed the CMS that “I begin to fear that my own abhorrence of such serious impropriety will be smoothed down into passive compliance, or rather sufferance, from inability to do what I feel ought to be done.”

Hunt stressed to the Society that his concern for his own moral fortitude was well justified. He observed “that constant residence among the Indians and familiarity with heathen practices, had slanted the moral feelings of Mr. & Mrs. Settee.” Hunt suggested that the acts of “sinfulness” arose “from the indiscriminate manner in which both sexes, married & single, old & young have been accustomed to live together in crowded tents.” He accused the Settees of failing to bring an end to these habits and argued that the Catechist either did not believe that he could do anything to “introduce a new state of things,” or that he was unwilling to face down the opposition that might arise if he attempted to do so. One year later, in anticipation of Settee’s ordination, Hunt therefore warned the CMS that Settee “has not the moral sense, or moral courage necessary for the oversight of persons and property, or to raise the moral tone of a community of Indians by firmly and constantly as well as kindly opposing moral wrong or pecuniary injury done to the Society.”

The Settees did view the actions of the children differently and more liberally than the Hunts. Although the CMS’s agents in the Canadian North-West had inculcated in Settee some elements of middle class Anglo-Christian culture, his perspectives, and those of his wife Sally, who had even less exposure than her husband to Euro-Christian life, also were shaped by their
exposure to Aboriginal cultures and by their own upbringing. In the words of one of Hunt’s contemporaries, “the Indians . . . including Settee . . . ‘are but babes and know little of our English notions of right and wrong.’ Their selfish and insincere habits have been wrought unto him by their mode of life.”

The Settees did not view the actions of the children from the perspective of an evangelical Anglican missionary who was born, raised, and educated in early to mid-nineteenth century England, and did not consider them to be instances of “impropriety” and “abhorrence.” Rather, the Settee’s reserved their criticism for Reverend and Mrs. Hunt. They suggested that the Hunts erred in their decisions to separate the school children and to supervise them more closely and “efficiently.” Moreover, Mrs. Settee went so far as to “confront[t] and oppos[e]” Hunt, “deny]” his “authority in this matter,” and “addres[s] the Indian women not to attend Mrs. Hunt’s class for spiritual instruction.”

Although James Settee was not educated to the standards required of European clergymen, he was, in a sense, the model of what the CMS desired its Native proselytizers. Whereas the Society presented and portrayed Henry Budd, Robert McDonald, and J.A. Mackay as ideal representatives of what it could achieve through its efforts to train Native proselytizers in Canada, it continually cautioned its supporters that they should not expect or desire similar abilities and competencies in other Native clergymen, let alone non-ordained Native proselytizers. Rather, the CMS continued to believe that its Native agents would be best suited to missionary work in the Canadian North-
West if they remained as unanglicized as possible. Consequently, while Hunt believed that Settee did not measure up to the standards required of a European agent of the CMS, the Bishop of Rupert's Land noted that the comparison was flawed because the standards of academic, religious, and business training for European and Native proselytizers were not the same. In fact, the Bishop himself described Settee to the Committee as being "active, zealous, and earnest, and a favourite with his countrymen."

Other European missionaries also disagreed with their Native counterparts about the best ways to approach specific situations. A heated controversy arose between Charles Pratt and Reverend C. Hillyer regarding the most appropriate method of evangelizing Aboriginal peoples who "had never heard the Word before or very small portions of it, viz." Hillyer proposed to "confin[e]" oneself "entirely to reading it without note or comment." Consequently, following the arrival of several Aboriginal people at his mission, Hillyer recorded that "I thought it best to keep entirely to S[acred] S[cripture] in my 1st ministrations among them." Out of a concern for consistency and accuracy, Hillyer read directly from the Bible, reciting verbatim Chapter upon Chapter, Verse upon Verse.

Hillyer expected Pratt, who translated for him and served the CMS as a paid Native Catechist, to follow the same course of action. The Reverend observed, however, that his own approach did not please my Interpreter; & I have had the greatest difficulty in getting him to follow it; I was always catching him leaving his Bible and speaking 'de omnibus rebus it quibustdarn alus' at least
so far as the time he was digressing & the new names & words wh. I cd. here & there, enabled me to judge, his own confessions since have confirmed my opinion.\textsuperscript{189}

Indeed, when Pratt read directly from the Bible to a group of assembled Aboriginal people, Hillyer noted that one individual exclaimed that “we never heard words like those before’ and asked C.P. if they were his own or the words of the book?\textsuperscript{190}

Pratt in fact did disagree with Hillyer and argued that reading directly from the Bible was not the best way to reach the Aboriginal peoples. He believed that Hillyer’s approach did little to make Christianity and its concepts relevant to local populations and preferred to “begin with simple talk & then to give more of a sermon.” Consequently, rather than interpreting the Reverend’s verbatim reading of the Bible, Pratt often “stopp[ed] and preach[ed] himself.”\textsuperscript{191} In this way, Pratt laid a groundwork for the continued instruction of potential proselytes by informing them of lands, cities, peoples and events that were important to Christian theology, but for which they had no frame of reference or understanding.

The differences between the two approaches led to conflicts that threatened the stability and progress of the mission. Hillyer wrote that

[o]ne Evening I had for my audience at Eg. Prayers 4 of the greatest conjurors in this part of the country. I spoke to them from Acts XVII. 24-31. I was obliged some times to go from my plans on account of CP’s opposition to it, & that I might avoid the appearance of evil, as no one present on those occasions could avoid seeing that we disagreed about something & rather than this I should speak from memory, the same things that I wd. have had him read.\textsuperscript{192}
In fact, the discord between Pratt & Hillyer became so disruptive that Pratt "called [Hillyer] to acc[oun]t" and addressed David Anderson, the Bishop of Rupert’s Land, about the dispute.193

Upon first meeting Pratt in 1850, Anderson described him as being "a very engaging young man with a very good knowledge of Scripture, which he can quote fluently in English, both Old and New Testament." Furthermore, he informed Henry Venn that Pratt "is the best specimen of a Native that I have seen."194 On the other hand, the Bishop believed that Hillyer "wants a little tact and thought as to the reception of truth by a heathen." He noted that Hillyer imagines that God’s Word must act on the Soul, now this is true, but it must be understood first. He goes into a Tent and reads, and wished the words interpreted word by word, but the poor Indian does not know Paul or Athens or the Holy Land, or the fall of our just Parents. He would I think succeed better by allowing C[harles] Pratt to talk to them for some time familiarly beforehand about Creation, the Fall &c. & then he might profitably read a portion of God’s Word.195

Anderson concurred with Pratt's assessment and “advised” Hillyer “to allow the interpreter to begin with some simple talk & then give more of a sermon... [himself] in addition."196

Other Europeans also ran into conflicts with Native agents over issues of approach and methodology. Almost two decades after his troubles with Hillyer, Pratt encountered a similar controversy with Reverend John Reader. Upon first meeting Pratt in 1875, Reader described him as being “very useful in travelling” and “a very willing, earnest helper in the work.”197 As he had when working with Hillyer, however, Pratt continued to use his “native experience.”198
when working with Reader to make Christianity more relevant to local populations. Indeed, Reader complained to the Secretary of the CMS that, to his consternation, Pratt refused to interpret his sermons verbatim; rather, the Catechist often would “preach another sermon on the same subject.”

Tension between Pratt and Reader built in other areas. A state of “unpleasantness” arose between the two over whether or not the mission station at Touchwood Hills required relocation. Reader “was convinced that the spot . . . was quite unfit for the kind of Settlement which the Committee, according to their instructions to me on leaving England, seemed to wish to be established.” “This conviction,” Reader continued, “becomes stronger every day I live here.” Based on his experience in the region and his interpretation of the Society’s intentions, however, Pratt believed that it was best for the Mission to remain where it had been situated “for so many years.”

Friction between the Pratt and Reader became so severe that Archdeacon Cowley informed the Society that “Mr. Reader & Charles Pratt must now part [because] the former cannot manage the latter.” Shortly thereafter, Reader in fact did “dismiss Pratt.” Cowley then advised the Society that he intended to place the Catechist at a station on the Qu’Appelle River in the region of “Reserves No. 6,7,8,9,10, & 11.” Several months after Pratt’s removal, Reader observed that “[t]here is now a more friendly understanding between us”: nevertheless, he still could not sway Pratt from “the idea of re-building on the old place if possible.”
Thus, at first glance, the experiences of paid agents of the CMS were quite similar regardless of their race. Spiritual and temporal motivations led both Native and European proselytizers to join the Church Missionary Society. They also agreed that for the CMS to succeed, it had to recognize the distinct cultural, political, economic, and demographic natures of the Canadian North-West and abandon its racially-based two-tiered policies. They argued that these policies not only made their lives of Native agents and their families more difficult, they also hampered the CMS’s work among Canada’s Aboriginal peoples. Furthermore, Native and European missionaries recognized that the former often possessed skills, knowledge, and personal connections that the latter did not and that could be used to facilitate the CMS’s evangelizing program for the region.

These same attributes and abilities, however, also created discord and dissension between CMS agents. Because of racial biases and racially-based policies, many European missionaries were reluctant to defer to the expertise and knowledge of Native agents and believed that Native agents were inherently less capable than themselves. Moreover, because of the heterogeneous linguistic and cultural make-up of the Aboriginal peoples of the Canadian North-West, and because of their own Anglicization, many Native agents were just as disadvantaged their European counterparts when proselytizing. Native agents therefore resented the fact that while they faced the same trials, tribulations, and expectations as Europeans, the CMS used their race to justify providing them with significantly less compensation.
CHAPTER FIVE

RACE, STATUS, AND DISCORD: A MATTER OF PERSPECTIVE ON THE CMS'S OWN POLICIES.

"These men must be willing to live more inexpensively than the European clergymen, & must feel it a great honour and delight to receive low salaries."\(^1\)

"[I am] greatly disheartened having my hands as it were tied through want of due and requisite support simply because I happen to be a Native clergyman."\(^2\)

"[T]he great difference between the Incomes of the European & native born missionaries . . . [is] a kind of stigma."\(^3\)

Believing that it would facilitate its work in the Canadian Mission field, the CMS established ethnically-based distinctions between its agents. It believed that doing so would ensure that Native agents were not trained above their countrymen, that they could live according to the standards of the country, and that they eventually could be supported in full by local congregations.

Native proselytizers and many of their European counterparts, however, suggested that rather than advancing the CMS's efforts to evangelize the Aboriginal peoples of the Canadian North-West, racially-based policies often proved detrimental to its work. These critics observed that distinctions based on race caused "a good deal of misunderstandings" between its agents,\(^4\) that they were culturally and socially stigmatizing, and that they hampered the abilities of Native agents to perform their religious duties and meet familial responsibilities. This chapter examines the impact on the CMS's work in Canada of its policy of treating its agents differently according to their race,
and pays particular attention to its practices regarding salaries and the education of the children of CMS agents.

To fund its work in Canada, the CMS established block grants out of which local Finance Committees budgeted their expenditures. While the Society set the salaries that European-born agents in its employ received, it did not "fix the pay of Indian or half breed [sic] agents." Rather, this was "fixed by the local Finance Ctee." The Parent Committee, however, could approve or reject salaries, and could adjust or refuse to increase the block grants that it made to the local Finance Committees, thereby effectively frustrating any effort to raise salaries above the levels that it deemed to be appropriate.5

The Church Missionary Society paid ordained Europeans who served in the Canadian North-West annual base salaries of £2006 and European catechists annual salaries of up to £120.7 In addition, the Society also provided its European agents with paid furloughs, pensions upon their retirement,8 access to education for their children at the Society's school in England, and "extra" supplements if they had children.9 When these "in kind" factors, and others such as freight and travel expenses, "the produce of the farm, the surplice fees, the saving of Life Insurance by the CMS's guarantee to his widow in case of death, & the firewood which he draws from the land" were included, one contemporary estimated that ordained Europeans often received £400 or more per annum.10

In contrast, Native catechists received annual base salaries of between £35 and £7511 while ordained Native agents received a "usual Salary"12 of
between £70 to £75 for Deacons and £100 for Priests\textsuperscript{13} along with small "allowance[s] for freight and travelling."\textsuperscript{14} Strictly in terms of monies received, the CMS expected its Native agents to succeed in their work while living on half the income of its European agents. In 1883, for instance, the English-born Reverend John Reader received allowances of £130 for freight, missionary tours, and mission related repairs, £30 for his three children, and a salary of £200 for a total income of £360. That same year, several Native clergymen received allowances for the same purposes of between £60 and £80 and salaries of £100, for a total income of between £160 and £180.\textsuperscript{15} Moreover, the CMS rarely granted salary increases to Native agents to cover additional expenses that resulted from their having children,\textsuperscript{16} it provided little assistance with the education of their children, and for the most part it did not provide them with paid furloughs\textsuperscript{17} or pensions.\textsuperscript{18}

Thus, one way in which the CMS recognized "the distinction of races"\textsuperscript{19} between its agents was to pay its Native proselytizers salaries that were significantly less than those that it paid to individuals who had been born in England. In 1849, prior to the ordination of the first of the CMS's Native agents in the Canadian North-West, the Reverend Henry Venn informed the Bishop of Rupert's Land of the reasoning for this policy. In his capacity as Secretary of the Society, Venn wrote:

\begin{quote}
[t]he Society has often observed a disposition in its Agents abroad to fix too high a salary [for Native Clergy] with reference to the rate of payment which exists in secular employments. By this course the Native Pastors are liable to be thrown out of their proper position to become too European in their habits & the
Native Churches ["are liable to"] look to the Society for the perpetual support of a Native Ministry.\textsuperscript{20}

Venn continued:

the persons who are connected with the Mission abroad stand in a different relation to the Society from those sent out from home. They are not entitled to the same salaries or contingent advantages. Their pecuniary support is a matter of special arrangement \& in fixing the salary of Native Ministers the Committee are very anxious that the scale should have reference to Native wants \& habits \& not to European requirement. The salary ought to be such as Native Church will be ultimately able to provide for the sustentation of its Ministers.\textsuperscript{21}

Forty years later, another CMS Secretary, Reverend C.C. Fenn, suggested that "the pecuniary contributions of Indians will have a better prospect of being adequate to the demand if the religious teacher is himself an Indian accustomed to cheaper modes of life."\textsuperscript{22} Fenn in fact suggested that Native agents "must be willing to live more inexpensively than the European clergymen, \& must feel it a great honour and delight to receive low salaries."\textsuperscript{23} Throughout the nineteenth century, the CMS thus implemented policies that were based on the belief that Native agents could and should live on "less salary" than Europeans\textsuperscript{24} and "live as the Christian Indians themselves live."\textsuperscript{25}

From the CMS's perspective, its racially-based two-tiered salary policy was practical and theoretically sound. The Society intended that when it euthanized a mission and withdrew its financial support, it would be within the means of local Christian populations to contribute the full salaries of their ordained ministers. As it did in all of its mission fields, the CMS thus worked to ensure that Native proselytizers were not overly accustomed to European
comforts and material expectations and did not become too "anglicise[d]" or too "encouraged in European ideas of expenditure, or in European habits of life." The CMS's European agents in the Canadian mission field initially supported its racially-based salary policy because they too believed it was essential to creating a body of Native proselytizers whom the various Aboriginal peoples of the region could financially support. Furthermore, they observed that, until that goal was achieved, "a great saving will be effected to the Society[,] for the salary of one European Missionary will sustain at least two Native Pastors." As they became more familiar with the local economic, social, and political conditions of the region, however, the CMS's European missionaries in Canada increasingly disagreed with the Parent Committee over the salaries received by their Native counterparts. As early as 1850, only one year after the CMS stated that salaries paid to ordained Native clergymen "should have reference to Native wants & habits & not to European requirement," the Corresponding Committee in Red River resolved "to increase" Henry Budd's "salary from the time of his ordination to £100." This figure was "the lowest salary paid to any officer of the H.Hudson's Bay Coy." The CMS was skeptical that the local parishioners in Rupert's Land could support a clergyman whose salary was £100 per annum. It expressed its discomfort with the resolution, writing to Reverend Robert James that...
[y]ou have fixed the salary of Mr. Budd at £100 a year. The Committee cannot without further information sanction this salary as a precedent. They ask is there any prospect that the Indians themselves could ever afford such a salary for a native Pastor, or that endorsements to that amount can be obtained? ... You refer that £100 a year is the lowest salary allowed by the [Hudson’s Bay] Company to their officers. This is fixing a salary upon European rather than Indian principles.32

Nevertheless, the Society acknowledged that

Mr. Budd has been so much identified with the English habits that the salary was quite proper in his case. The students trained at the upper settlement would probably require the same. But we wish you to consider whether an Institution might now be devised in which native half-breed students could be taught to live upon means more within the compass of a native congregation.33

Thus, although the CMS did not wish to establish a precedent by agreeing to the local Finance Committee’s recommended regarding Budd’s salary, it did acknowledge that its more Europeanized Native agents should receive salaries that were comparable to those paid to officers employed in the fur trade.

Indeed, in 1853, the Bishop of Rupert’s Land recommended to the Society that, “as in the case of Mr. Budd,” Robert McDonald should “be paid £100 a year” upon his ordination.34 The Bishop believed that this level of income was necessary because McDonald, like Budd, was Europeanized “in look and address.”35 The Society concurred and consented to establishing McDonald’s base salary at £100.36

The Society’s Canadian agents recognized that their employer did not want to establish £100 as a precedent for the base salaries of ordained Natives. In 1853, the Corresponding Committee of the Diocese of Rupert’s
Land wrote that upon the ordination of James Settee as a Deacon, they recommended that his salary "should be fixed at £75." The Bishop of Rupert’s Land believed that this rate was "the lowest we can fix it at."

Nevertheless, in 1856, Archdeacon Hunter observed that Settee is now in full orders and we could not make any difference between the two men - either Mr. Budd’s must be reduced, or Mr. Settee’s made equal to Mr. Budd’s. Settee however is an old & faithful servant of the Society with a very large family & we hope therefore the Society will give him this increase.

Hunter therefore informed the Parent Committee that, following Bishop Anderson’s ordination of Settee to the Priesthood, it had been necessary to "put [him] upon an equal footing with Mr. Budd as to Salary at £100 a year."

The Society’s agents believed using the degree of enculturation as a criterion to determine the wage levels of Native agents not only would motivate them to become Europeanized (which was contrary to the expressed wishes of the CMS), it would create discord and dissension between the Native agents themselves. This concern proved true when the Local Committee of the Diocese of Rupert’s Land paid Reverend R.R. McLennon, who was of Aboriginal ancestry, a base salary of £150 because he possessed a Bachelor of Arts degree from St. John’s College in Winnipeg. Reverend John Sinclair, who like McLennon was a Native Clergyman, voiced his "dissatisfaction at the distinction made between himself and Mr. McLennon" and opposed the Society’s decision to pay McLennon a salary that was 50 per cent higher than his own. Reverend John Hines, who had been born in England, also criticized
the local Committee's decision, stating that not only was it "contrary to the Society's rules," it was unfair to other Native clergymen.41

Similarly, in 1859, the Local Committee in Rupert's Land was faced with a similar dilemma when determining Henry Budd Jr.'s salary. The CMS had sent Budd Jr., who was even more enculturated in "European ideas of expenditure" and "habits of life"42 than his father Reverend Henry Budd, for a period of study at its training College at Islington, England.43 When the Bishop of Rupert's Land prepared to ordain the younger Budd, uncertainty about his salary led Archdeacon Hunter to ask the Parent Committee "whether his Salary will be the same as that of the Native Missionaries, or of those sent from Home." Hunter informed the Society that "[t]he Bishop inclined to the latter, Mr. Cowley & myself to the former, as we think the other Native Missionaries might feel aggrieved if he received a larger Salary than themselves, and also looking forward to a Native Ministry supported in the Country."44 The Society responded that it would heed the recommendations of the Corresponding Committee regarding Budd Jr.'s salary. It did, however,

think that should he be sufficiently . . . [?] to enter upon his duties as an ordained minister he ought to receive the same salary as his father viz. £100 per annum. Previously to ordination they were disposed to think this sum too large; & this was intimated on [sic] sending out the estimates. The Corresponding Committee, however, are authorized to make him such allowances as in their judgement may be proper.45

Although the CMS instructed local Finance Committees to base salaries "upon need and expenses in the mission field" and "not . . . simply on the ground of . . . ordination,"46 it agreed with its agents in the Canadian North-West that to
avoid discord, all Native priests should receive the same salaries. Budd Jr.'s salary therefore was set at £100 per annum.47

The Society and its European agents also agreed that parishioners who secured steady sources of income should supplement with money and labour the base salaries of Native agents. The CMS informed Reverend Cowley that “[p]overty is no excuse” for local Christians failing to contribute to the support of their Native ministers. It suggested that if families “have food suffic[ien]t to support life . . . they should set apart one fiftieth of it (or equivalent to that) for the support of their Minister (Native Teacher). Such a course w[oul]d supply food for one Native Pastor for every fifty families.”48 In this manner, as local contributions increased, the CMS would be able to reduce its block grants to that region and eventually euthanize its responsibilities in the area.

The CMS’s agents in Rupert’s Land agreed with the Society’s reasoning. Several missionaries observed that by using race as a criterion, it was possible to legitimize paying all Native agents in the Canadian mission field the same reduced salaries. They also stressed to the local congregations, with varying degrees of success, that it was their duty and responsibility to contribute to the financial support of those who ministered to them.49

Many Aboriginal congregations responded positively to such calls. In 1860, Archdeacon Hunter informed the CMS that his parish “subscribed towards the salary of a native Catechist at the Indian settlement” and the following year “g[a]ve towards paying the salary [of] Rev. H. Cockran, the native Minister at Mapleton.”50 A decade later, Reverend Gilbert Cook asked
the population of High Bluff, which was "chiefly composed of Natives or Half Breeds," and whom he could visit no more than once a week, to "subscribe towards the Salary of a Clergyman." The congregation responded by contributing "£33.18 or nearly $170 towards [sic] the first year's income."51

Other Native clergymen observed that because some local populations desired to contribute to the support of their Native ministers but were unable to do so financially, many individuals and groups donated their labour. Reverend J.A. Mackay endeavoured to introduce "a plan of self-support and government" to those to whom he ministered. He noted that despite physical isolation and "the wandering mode of life of my people" his efforts were not without result. Mackay suggested that "one indication of progress among my people is their larger offering to the Church during the preceding year." He further noted that "[t]hey also have assisted me more than formerly in my secular work, & by appointing Church-Wardens & Vestry-men."52 When monetary contributions were beyond the means of the local populations, Mackay also "encourage[d] contributions in labour or in anything they can give for the support of the ministrations of the Gospel."53 His congregation responded by subscribing approximately £20, although "[t]he Indian's [sic] subscriptions are all in labour or in kind." Mackay was thankful nevertheless and observed that "considering their poverty, even the little that they are able to give is an indication that they value their Christian privileges."54

Reverend Benjamin Mackenzie also informed the CMS that his parishioners provided him and his family with valuable assistance. He wrote:
In the winter-time, not being able to afford to keep a servant, we had to carry our firewood on our shoulders. This appears to have been hint enough for them to come, a few every week, during the coldest part of the winter, to cut & place before our door enough wood for Sunday & part of the week.55

Despite this assistance from his congregation, Mackenzie fell into financial trouble which, as is elaborated upon shortly, he argued was a direct result of the CMS's discriminatory and unrealistic salary policy.

Many of the Aboriginal peoples of the Canadian North-West, however, lacked both the ability and the desire to contribute to the support Native proselytizers. In 1850, Reverend James Hunter informed the CMS that he saw "very little prospect at present of the Natives ever being able to maintain a native Ministry." He continued: "[t]hey are too poor . . . [,] too fond of hunting and wandering to remain long settled . . . [, and] are too indolent."56 Five years later, the Finance Committee of the Diocese of Rupert's Land similarly noted that "the poverty of the Indians" would for "many years" delay the goal of achieving self-support in the Canadian North-West.57

Native agents also commented that many of the local populations did not contribute in any way to the support of their ministers. Reverend James Settee frequently lamented that many "Indians . . . never think to help me."58 In 1854, while he was a Deacon, Settee recorded in his Journal that "I learnt by my wife & [son] James [sic] how they had been ill treated by the trappers and I saw our stage of fish dissolved to two or three scores, where we had stayed up about 3000 good fish. They rewarded us evil for our good."59
In 1869, at the height of the political and religious turmoil in Red River, Settee observed that he and his family received very poor treatment from some of the local Aboriginal peoples at yet another mission station. He wrote:

I have endeavoured to point out to my Christian Indians the necessity of raising a small collection to be applied for the service of God, should it be done only monthly. I saw that they could not do it weekly, but anxious to have a little raised from this poor Station, I put the question to the young Christian men, but unaccountably it gave the highest offence. I believe I should have received rough handling if one had not interposed; such is now the spirit of the native. The rebellion which is now at work in Red River, is turning the minds of the Indians.

This Aboriginal population not only opposed contributing to the support of Native proselytizers, it threatened violence when the subject was raised.

By 1875, the turmoil of five years earlier had largely subsided. When the local Committee transferred Settee yet again, the population at his new mission invited him to attend “an Indian meeting” that they called to discuss their “Reserve & the Trespass that was made upon it.” Settee took the opportunity to raise the topic “of self-support” and “asked them to begin, that out of nearly 2,000 of them who receive the treaty, all of them could afford to give a dollar towards the support of the Church & never miss it.” He noted regretfully, however, that “[n]ot one supported me even the Chief.”

Indeed, as is discussed more fully in Chapter Six, many of the Aboriginal peoples in the Canadian North-West were under the impression that the CMS and its agents (including those who were of Aboriginal ancestry) had “plenty of money.” Believing that Native proselytizers were well-paid and well-provided for, some Aboriginal people therefore accused missionaries of being selfish,
uncaring, and not honouring their obligations if they did not accede to the material demands made upon them. Consequently, the CMS’s two-tiered salary policy, on occasion, created tension and discord between Native agents and their congregants.

In the early 1840s for instance, the local population who lived near Cumberland Station accused Henry Budd of “not feeding the School children properly.” Budd denied the charge and informed the CMS that “I feed them according as circumstances will allow.” He continued: “In fact they are in this respect as well provided for, as ever I was when I was a School boy like themselves, even at Red River, where plenty could be had, and what more can they expect in such a poor place as this[?]” Budd believed that the “complaints” arose from his decision to ration the supplies of the mission rather than distributing “their whole stock of provisions to eat up in one day.” While to Budd his own actions seemed prudent, to the local Aboriginal peoples, however, they smacked of selfish hoarding.

Three decades later, Reverend James Settee expressed frustration over the “selfish” attitudes of some of the Aboriginal peoples to whom he was proselytizing. He wrote: “I made it a duty to run to my neighbours & read the scriptures and exhort them to repent of their sins so that they obtain the pardon and forgiveness of all their sins, but directly I turned about & leave them - they speak hard words about me.” Settee continued:

It is said by them that we get plenty of money and that we never help the poor. I have to buy the books to teach their children with my own private means, indeed, I have to do every thing for
myself. I find the Indians more selfish than they were thirty - forty years ago & less obliging. it [sic] is no use to expect help for the Mission cause from them.64

Soon thereafter, Settee complained that his congregants

want me to provide every thing and maintain the place with my own means. As one man told me Ought you to be paid for Preaching? I answered him Ought he to feed an ox when he is working for him? he said, Yes, well I said, a minister deserves his food and wages at his work.65

Settee continued:

There is a strange idea among the natives about a Minister of the Gospel, they have an idea that he ought not to be paid, how this came to their heads I cannot tell, but I think it arises from this that our Missionaries for years back gave too much gifts & worked too much for them in temporal matters, not to induce them to God; but to show them how to labour and provide for themselves. . . . The natives particularly in this province expect too much from their ministers.66

Thus, while Settee believed that the Aboriginal peoples were selfish both for making what he considered to be exorbitant demands on his rather limited means and for not contributing to the support of his station, the Aboriginal peoples viewed the Reverend's salary to be 'plenty' and believed that Settee himself, by not honouring his reciprocal obligations, was the one who was being selfish.67

Furthermore, while Native agents recognized and accepted that “the object of the CMS in allowing only a small salary to the Native clergy is to draw forth the liberality of the Native Church towards the support of the ministrations of the Gospel,”68 for many it was a source of “discontent”69 and of “great envy and grumbling.”70 They believed that by distinguishing between its
agents on the basis of race, the CMS placed unfair burdens upon them and their families, relegated them to positions of inferior status, and hampered their efforts to disseminate Christianity.

Previous chapters showed that contemporaries frequently characterized the last four decades of the nineteenth century in Canadian North-West as being ones of "transition" in which the social, economic, and political environments experienced "rapid changes." Accompanying these economic, social, and political rearrangements were rates of inflation that approached 100 percent per decade. Despite the resulting crippling increase in the cost of living in the Canadian mission field, however, the base salaries that CMS paid to its Native agents remained unchanged from the levels that it had established in the 1850's.

By the late 1860's, the Bishop of Rupert's Land suggested that £150 was "a minimum for affording a [Native] Clergyman in the [Red River] Settlement with a family a comfortable support." Several years later, the Bishop predicted that "a Clergyman with a growing family will find it difficult enough in the present state of things to be comfortable with less than £200" and observed that "[s]everal of our Clergy are not likely to have that at present in money." Faced with rising expenses and stagnant incomes, many of the CMS's Native agents did in fact experience "difficulty" both "living upon their salaries" and remaining "accustomed to cheaper modes of life."

When he was appointed to St. Peter's in the mid-1870s, Reverend J.A. Mackay reported that "[I] was not . . . prepared for the change in outward
circumstances, the impossibility of living in the Province on the Salary allowed me as a Native minister." The difficulties that he and other Native agents had living on their salaries led Mackay to question the soundness of the CMS’s racially-based salary policy. He informed the Society’s Secretary that “I have no doubt that it is very desirable to anglicise [sic] as little as possible the Native pastors in the mission churches in such countries as India or China but the state of things in this country is very different.” On a separate occasion, Mackay observed that

[w]ith reference to actual self-support the question is one of great difficulty. There is not only the poverty of the Indians, but their unsettled state. With our Indian population such as we have in the Cumberland District, we have a state of things to deal with totally unlike that can be met with in countries such as India or China, or even some parts of Africa. When I was in England I met one of your native African Missionaries from the Niger, and from his statement of things in his part of the world, a missionary with £75 per annum is better off than a man would be in this country with four times that income. In India or China a native pastor can live as his people live. For a clergyman to live or attempt to live in this country as the Indians live would be simply to strike at the root of any effort to elevate the race, and to make a burlesque of the office of the Christian Ministry.

Mackay observed that because the CMS’s goal for Canada was to form Native congregations who were ministered to by Native proselytizers and who eventually would form part of the colonial Anglican church, Native clergymen of necessity needed to be more Anglicized than their indigenous counterparts in other mission fields. He therefore argued that Native clergymen in Canada could not, and in fact should not, live as simply and as cheaply as the people to whom they proselytized. Furthermore, he believed that the Society’s policy
of paying its agents different salaries according to their race ignored the realities of life in the Canadian North-West and threatened the very success of its efforts to evangelize the Aboriginal peoples of the region.

Indeed, numerous Native agents ran their mission and personal accounts into debt because they could not keep pace with the increasing costs that were associated with establishing new missions or with repairing and maintaining older establishments. In 1893, Reverend John Sanders encountered financial difficulties while building a new mission house in the Diocese of Moosonee. Knowing that the CMS often published Annual Letters from its agents, Sanders plead for assistance from “some of our Kind Christian friends.” He wrote in his Annual Letter that because there was no pre-existing mission house at the site, and because he and his family “could not afford to pay rent,” they “were obliged to stay out in cotton tents” until they secured more permanent shelter. Furthermore, the cost of building the mission itself was “quite . . . heavy,” and although he used his own salary to pay some of the expenses, he noted that “[t]he Sum I require to pay the balance is $200, & to enable me to finish my mission house I need $150.” While expenses that were associated with missionary work stressed the incomes of European and Native clergymen alike, the latter often felt their impact more deeply because their base salaries were significantly lower.

Beyond the impact of inflation, the charitable demands of parishioners further stressed the abilities of Native clergymen to subsist on their base salaries and adequately perform the duties that their congregants and the
CMS expected of them. The requests of Reverend Gilbert Cook’s parishioners, for instance, were a “heavy tax on his resources.” In 1872, Cook informed Archdeacon Cowley that “my salary was inadequate to meet the expenses incurred and the many calls made daily upon our liberality.” Because he could not meet the needs of his congregation or his family, Cook “felt it a duty I owed my dear wife and family to resign my charge” and accept an appointment as “Native Pastor” at St. Peter’s Parish in Winnipeg.

Five years later, Reverend James Settee informed the CMS that “small-pox” had physically and financially devastated his congregation. He observed that “[e]xpenses in the matter of provisions have been great [...] to assist the destitute, who actually required help and yet to this day those people who escaped death from the Small-pox are as helpless as children they are so weak.” As a result of the charitable responsibilities that were associated with caring for the surviving members of his congregation, and of the high prices that he attributed to “the distressed state of the Province on account of the Grasshopper’s plague,” Settee lamented that he and several other “native Clergymen” had accumulated “significant debts” that were beyond their abilities to repay.

Indeed, the CMS’s salary policy also created tension and discord between Native agents and the operators of trading companies. The traders believed that, given the low base salaries of the CMS’s Native agents, and the costs that were associated with mission work, it would be impossible for many individuals who ran up debts at HBC’s establishments to repay them on their
current salaries.\textsuperscript{87} Employees of the HBC therefore suggested to the CMS and its European agents that the "native agents" of the Society "ought to get bigger pay" so that they might properly run their missions and pay their accounts.\textsuperscript{88}

The HBC's employees, however, also acknowledged that the indebtedness of some missions and missionaries resulted from the personal financial irresponsibility. Horace Belanger, for example, found fault with the personal spending habits and accountability of Reverends John Sinclair\textsuperscript{89} and J.R. Settee\textsuperscript{90} (both of whom were Native clergymen) and Reverends Joseph Hunt\textsuperscript{91} and James Roberts\textsuperscript{92} (both of whom were English-born). All four agents ran up significant debts in Belanger's district. In contrast, Belanger applauded Reverend R.R. McLennon, a Native clergyman, for always having kept "his account in a most satisfactory manner."\textsuperscript{93}

While some contemporaries associated the inability of specific Native proselytizers to control their budgets with their inadequate salaries or with personal failings, other individuals suggested that the fault lay with cultural flaws. Reverend John Hines commented to the Secretary of the CMS that "main object" of Native agents "seems to be, to contract what debt they can, and where they can, and in some cases, resort to accomplish this end which borders very closely on what might be called fraud."\textsuperscript{94} To support his argument, Hines observed that some employees of the HBC characterized "all . . . native agents" as being "only too ready to contract a debt with anyone & to any amount, & never think for a moment how they are going to pay."\textsuperscript{95}
Chapter Three of this dissertation, however, showed that Hines criticized the CMS and its representatives in Canada for ordaining and employing persons who, in his opinion, were not suited to the work. Hines believed that only “rarely” did “the natives of this country” possess the “special faculty” necessary to be paid proselytizers of Christianity.6 He argued that, as a consequence of their inherent limited ability, most of the

native agents . . . we have employed, in spite of what you may have heard to the contrary, to say the least [are] . . . inferior. They set but little example for good to the Indians among whom they labour, or show to their heathen friends the benign influence of religion in their daily life. . . . Almost without an exception, they are indolent, and their spiritual knowledge and experience are not very extensive.7

Hines thus attributed the debts that some Native agents accumulated to the fraudulent actions of persons of Aboriginal ancestry who possessed naturally inferior characters to those of Europeans.

Contrary to Hines’ assessment many Native proselytizers did in fact express “sorr[ow]” and “great uneasiness”9 about their mounting debts and liabilities, and requested postings away from established settlements so that they might live more inexpensively.99 Indeed, while some cases of overspending by Native proselytizers were attributable to inadequate salaries or to questionable actions, others were the result of honest mistakes. Reverend John Sinclair, for example, ran up debts in excess of £200 (twice his annual base salary) to the Hudson’s Bay Company and to Stewart and Company100 because he believed that the CMS owed him salary and allowances that would cover his debts. Horace Belanger of the HBC reacted
to Sinclair’s problems by informing Archdeacon J.A. Mackay that “we were told that the Society were [sic] in arrears of pay & that as soon as the Salaries were paid fully your agents would pay their accounts.” Belanger then noted that Sinclair “fancies that the Society yet owes him a whole years [sic] Salary, cheques not having been issued in his favor [sic], for himself and the Stanley Mission, while your predecessor The Rev. George McKay was Manager of the Financial Committee of The Church Missionary Society!”

Reverend Benjamin Mackenzie encountered financial difficulties that were partially rooted miscalculations that he made about the ability of the local Aboriginal peoples to supplement his base salary. In 1877, Mackenzie recorded that the population around Cumberland “cheerfully contributed” over £22 “towards [the] increase of my salary.” He continued:

This was altogether unexpected by us, & most thankfully received as we feel the need of it. I would not venture to say that such a sum could yearly be raised by them toward support of a Missionary. I think half the above amount would be nearer the amount which might be expected from them.

“[O]wing to the want of skill on the part of the Indians […] the Grant for the establishment of the Mission being too small,” the high prices charged at the Hudson’s Bay Company’s post, and the fact that the local food stocks “almost virtually disappeared,” however, Mackenzie realized that even this reduced estimate was too high and therefore concluded that it “would be unreasonable to expect but very little from them.” As a result of these combined forces, the Reverend soon generated an outstanding debt “against himself and Mission and [sic] amounting up to $632.70.”
While acknowledging his own fault, Mackenzie also subtly criticized the CMS's fiscal policy. Like many others in his position, he suggested that the Society's two-tiered salary policy was ill-suited to the social, demographic, and economic realities of the Canadian North-West. Faced with his significant and mounting debts, Mackenzie informed all those who read his Annual Letter that "[I am] greatly disheartened having my hands as it were tied through want of due and requisite support simply because I happen to be a Native clergyman."\textsuperscript{106} To the Finance Committee in Winnipeg he plead "the needs of a large family [of 13 children] & the heavy expense of freight for an addition to his present allowance."\textsuperscript{107} The Financial Committee responded by raising Mackenzie's freight allowances, but acknowledged that "chiefly owing to the barren nature of the country & also to the [?] . . . total failure of the fisheries," the Reverend would be "unable with his large family to keep within the limits of his increased allowances."\textsuperscript{108} Consequently, the Finance Committee of the Diocese of Rupert's Land departed from its normal operating procedure and budgeted McKenzie a one-time "special guarantee" of £50.\textsuperscript{109}

The ramifications of the CMS's racially-based salary policy, however, went beyond merely the financial. Native proselytizers pointed out that salary distinctions based solely upon race placed unfair hardships on them and their families and impeded their abilities to disseminate Christianity and to minister to their congregations.

Native and European agents alike experienced difficulties performing the manual work that was required to maintain mission stations. In recognition
of this fact, the CMS occasionally hired, or supplemented the hiring of, “man
servants” to assist its European agents in avoiding “unnecessary . . . secular
concerns” such as “plough[ing]” or “fish[ing].” Other European agents hired
assistants out of their own salaries. Manual labourers not only made mission
life easier, they permitted clergymen to focus upon their primary
responsibilities, namely evangelization.

The CMS conceded that paid Native agents who gave “their whole time,
instead of . . . only a part of it to spiritual work . . . in the same way as [any] . . .
European Missy. give[s] his whole time to spiritual work . . . wd. no longer have
time to work for themselves.” It nevertheless refused to hire assistants to
help them with mundane mission duties. Furthermore, because of their low
wages and the expenses that were associated with disseminating Christianity
in the Canadian North-West, Native agents generally could not afford to hire
their own helpers. Consequently, they were forced, to the detriment of their
own evangelizing efforts, to devote significant portions of their time to
“labouring with . . . [their] own hands for . . . [their] own support.”

Reverend Tomas Cook, for instance, wrote that “[a]t present I find it
impossible to employ any one to work for us, as my Salary will not afford it, &
nothing is allowed me.” As a result of his inability to hire an assistant to
perform the more mundane work at his missionary station, Cook lamented: “I
feel the weight of my work sometimes, providing fuel for three fire places,
besides making a few things for myself, as a table and two or three chairs.”
Reverend Henry Budd also bemoaned his inability to afford assistance with the temporal matters of his mission. He informed the Society that "[i]t is a very great trial to me that I am not allowed any helpers." He continued: "I have at these Journies [sic] to leave my house locked up; my garden and fields lying exposed to the Indian childn. and the cattle." Budd cautioned that the resulting losses in produce hampered his efforts, not only because he had less food to feed his family, the school children at his mission, and those in need, but also because he lost the positive effect that a successful harvest might have had in inducing people to take up settled agriculture.\textsuperscript{115}

European missionaries concurred that the inability of Native agents to subsist and work on their base salaries was harming the Society's efforts in the region. In 1866, Bishop Robert Machray and his counterparts on the Corresponding Committee of the Diocese of Rupert's Land observed that a Native proselytizer who was "stationed in the interior" often spent so much time "in cutting wood, carrying water, and attending to . . . household wants and . . . cattle that he can neither teach any Indian or other children near him or [sic] visit the Indian tents at a distance."\textsuperscript{116}

Two decades later, the Finance Committee of the Diocese of Rupert's Land called Reverend Gilbert Cook before it to answer charges that he was focusing on the temporal affairs of his mission to the detriment of his evangelizing responsibilities. Cook admitted that "owing to the drought this year, & his having in consequence to drive his cattle & horses two miles for water, he was afraid that too much of his time had been open in attending
them.” The Committee recorded, however, that Cook “felt it necessary to keep cattle to eke out his income, & be able to give to the Indians when in want.” The Reverend informed his superiors that “[h]e never visited the reserves without having to give, and he could not refuse the Indians.” The Committee accepted his arguments, but did send another agent to confirm the progress of mission.¹¹⁷

In addition to hampering the abilities of Native agents to subsist and to devote adequate time to their evangelizing responsibilities, the Society’s racially-based salary policy also reduced the over-all effectiveness of Native proselytizers by diminishing their status and the image of respectability and authority that they projected. Earlier chapters showed that in nineteenth century England, and to a lesser degree in its colonies, race became an increasingly significant limiting factor on a person’s or group’s social status. The size and source of a person’s income - reflected externally in material trappings that included dress, household items, and the use of personal servants - nevertheless also remained important determinants of status and respectability.

Because Native agents of the CMS had to provide for their families and run their missions on salaries that that were half of those of their European counterparts, many therefore were unable to maintain levels of dress and other decorum that they, their congregants, and potential proselytes alike deemed appropriate for Christian missionaries. The Bishop of Saskatchewan, for example, observed that Reverend John Badger “requires better clothes
and can do less work for his family now that people have to look up to him as their spiritual pastor." The inability of Native agents to afford assistants or to buy items or comforts that reflected their positions thus necessarily affected their status and the image that they projected; this, in turn, gave rise to social distinctions that were serious enough to threaten the Society’s work in the Canadian mission field.

Reverend John Horden made this point clear to the CMS when, in 1872, he requested that it approve an increase to his and to Reverend Thomas Vincent’s salaries. Horden asked for an increase to his own income “as expenses have increased b/c of rising prices for provisions, b/c of increased duties, and b/c of cost of residing at Moose compared to other places in the N[orth] W[est].” He informed the CMS, however, that Vincent, who “labours very faithfully, but among a very poor population,” required a salary increase “not only on a/c of the rise of prices but [also] because I think his social status should be higher than what it now is.” He observed that Vincent’s current status was “certainly lower than that of mere clerks in the H.B.C. service, and to three[-]fourths of them he is much superior both in intellect and energy.”

Sixteen years later, the Bishop of Athabasca similarly highlighted to the CMS the interconnection between salary and status. He recommended that the Society approve a general increase to the base salary of “Native Pastors” to “£150 per annum.” It was his opinion that £150 a year was “the lowest sum on which they can maintain themselves & their families so as to retain the
respect of the Indians among whom they labour & so as to maintain an
influence over them."120

Indeed, in an effort to maintain levels of dress and other material
trappings that they believed were appropriate to, and required of, their
position, some individuals were forced into “shortened circumstances.”121
Reverend Benjamin McKenzie’s “fear of being in rags” was so great that it
contributed to him overspending beyond his ability to repay his personal and
mission accounts with the Hudson’s Bay Company.122

The Aboriginal peoples themselves objected to the impact that the
CMS’s policy of paying its agents differently according to their race had on the
social and economic status of Native proselytizers. The Bishop of Rupert’s
Land observed that “many of the natives” in his Diocese believed that

the great difference between the Incomes of the European &
native born missionaries . . . [is] a kind of stigma put upon them
that one of their number though as efficient in his English services
and of course much more efficient in Indian, should be kept
permanently on a small income.123

Christian congregants thus believed that the practice of paying Native
proselytizers less than their European counterparts diminished their own social
and economic status as well as that of the Society’s Native agents.

The CMS’s racially-based two-tiered salary policy also made
employment with the Society less attractive. Bishop Robert Machray was
afraid our Mission service is anything but popular among the
Natives, from the dependent position in which Native agents are
kept. They have had small salaries in comparison and have been
too much ordered about – no doubt from the exigencies of the
service, but I fear with less consideration than in the case of European missionaries.\textsuperscript{124}

On a separate occasion, the Bishop informed the CMS that while “some of the most effective of your staff as missionaries are several of the Native Clergy,”

\[\text{\ldots it is doubtless a little trying to human nature to see themselves labouring with great difficulty and hardness on £100 a year in this now most expensive Country, whilst others inferior to them as they must feel in efficiency – in everything in fact – for their common work are receiving what really sometimes does not come short of £300 – simply because [they are] Europeans from England.}\textsuperscript{125}

Machray thus cautioned the Society that its two-tiered salary policy was destroying the morale of its Native agents.

Indeed, many of the CMS’s agents observed that the inability to train and retain qualified and competent Native agents was impeding the Society’s work in Canada. They noted that desirable Native agents “would find it very hard . . . to live and do real spiritual work on such an income” of between £70 and £100 per annum. As a result, the Local Committee was forced to employ “many” Native agents who it believed were “inefficient and unsatisfactory.”\textsuperscript{126}

Furthermore, confronted with inferior salaries, social status, and expectations of performance that were a result of the CMS’s decision to treat its agents differently according to their race,\textsuperscript{127} as well as with the prospect of living within a closely controlled moral environment at CMS mission stations,\textsuperscript{128} some students whom the Society trained opted to leave, or never enter, its service. In 1908, Reverend Wilfred Burman reflected that Emmanuel College, which had been established “[t]o train fit persons for the Sacred Ministry & for
discharging the duties of Catechists & teachers,” was “very successful in preparing men to become teachers.” He lamented, however, that “our young men, when prepared, refuse to teach Indian Reserve Schools at $25 per month; when they can earn better wages in our Saw Mills, our Lumber camps, with Farmers and in the City of Prince Albert.”

For other individuals, employment in the fur trade was preferable to employment with the CMS. While Aboriginal ancestry could limit one’s career path within the HBC, the perception existed that “life” in the fur trade was “easier” than “life” as a Native agent of the CMS.

Furthermore, many individuals were attracted to the HBC’s policy of basing salaries on the position rather than on race. Indeed in 1882, the Bishop of Moosonee highlighted to the CMS the damage that its racially-based salary system was having on its work in Canada. Horden observed that the decision to use race to justify paying Native agents less than European-born agents for performing the same tasks made it “a difficult matter for me to keep . . . [“Good, efficient natives”] out of the hands of the H.B.C. who naturally wish such to enter their service.” He suggested that “[t]here should be but little difference between the salaries of Europeans and Natives, as all have to live alike.” He noted that “in the H.B. service no distinction whatever is made; as soon as a Native has attained a certain position, he at once takes his place, in equal terms, with his European brother officers.”

By the early 1870’s, the Society itself acknowledged that “the disparity between the Salary of European Missionaries and highly qualified Native
Ministers" was creating "difficult[ies]" and discord. It nevertheless remained firm in its belief that Native Clergymen could live more cheaply than their European counterparts, and in 1871 informed the Bishop of Rupert's Land that even in the Canadian North-West "the Society's principle is to recognise the distinction of races." The differences in the base wages paid to European and Native proselytizers therefore remained in place.

Four years later, Bishop Robert Machray again informed the CMS that its racially-based salary policy was ill-suited to many areas in the Canadian mission field. He noted that "simple Indian Pastors - knowing only Indian - living in a simple way . . . will do well [in the Bishoprics of Moosonee and McKenzie River] in charge of roving, scattered Indian flocks of their Forefathers." He continued:

in what remains with the Diocese of Rupert's Land & in the proposed Diocese of Saskatchewan such a plan is not practicable - I do not mean as far as ordaining such pious Indians - but as far as their living in the wandering ways of their Fathers. They cannot but be in contact with a great deal of white influence & dependent on many imported things. Machray thus believed that in the ever increasing areas of European settlement, the CMS's position that Native agents could and should live more cheaply than their European counterparts was flawed and required revision.

Indeed, in 1876, grasshoppers caused significant crop loss throughout much of the Diocese of Rupert's Land and increased the already high rate of inflation. As a result, Reverend James Settee informed the Society that he and several other Native clergymen were "embarrassed with debts." Settee
reported that those to whom he preached were dependent “entirely upon charity” and could do little in the way of supporting him or supplementing his salary from the society. He nevertheless reaffirmed his belief that Aboriginal congregations could eventually support their Native clergymen “if the Country is free from the late plagues we have just undergone.” Settee concluded that while the land and the people were poor, increasing settlement by Europeans and Aboriginal persons and the proliferation of “the arts of the whites” held promise for the future. To address Settee’s immediate needs and those of other Native agents, however, Bishop Machray suggested that it was necessary to temporarily increase in their salaries.

Later that same year, Reverends James Settee, Henry Cochrane, and Gilbert Cook sent a memorial to the Bishop of Rupert’s Land and the local Finance Committee, in which they stated that

[w]e have endeavoured to the best of our abilities, to follow the steps of our predecessors [, “the distinguished Clergymen of the Church of England who planted the Banner of the Cross in Rupert’s Land,”] in their self-denial and many privations in holding forth the word of life to our Country: we believe the Reverend Prelates who have stood at the head of the work can bear witness to the truth of this testimony. But your Native Clergymen are extremely sorry to observe, that they are involved in debt and cannot get out of it, you must feel the great uneasiness it brings upon them, to be placed in the circumstances.

The Finance Committee read the memorial into the records and forwarded it without comment to the Parent Committee of the CMS.

In November, 1876, Bishop Machray again cautioned the Parent Committee that its two-tiered salary policy was causing great distress to its
agents and to its work in the region. He observed that "[t]he idea of cheaply maintaining Natives as in other countries is useless here. A Native in this climate must have warm clothing, food, & House, the same as a European."\textsuperscript{142} The following year, Archdeacon J.A. Mackay similarly reported that "[s]ome of our so called [sic] native agents in this country, are no more fitted to live as the natives do, than a European from home."\textsuperscript{143} Despite criticisms from European and Native agents alike, however, the Society stood firm and in 1882 reiterated its belief that its Native agents could "live as the Christian Indians themselves live in a simple [?] way."\textsuperscript{144}

Two years later, the CMS’s agents again warned that the salaries that it paid to Native clergymen were inadequate to meet their needs. The Rupert’s Land Finance Committee wrote that “while inserting in the Estimates” for 1885 the sum of £100 per annum, as the Salary of the Native Clergy, desire to express to the Society, in the strongest manner, their opinion, that, owing to the greatly increased expense of living in the interior of the country, and from a variety of causes, it is absolutely necessary for the support of thiese [sic] clergy, and the efficiency of their work, that the salary be raised to at least £125.\textsuperscript{145}

In the mid-1890’s, the Bishop of Rupert’s Land expanded on this argument, informing the Parent Committee that

\begin{quote}
[t]he long and severe winter necessitates animal food and warm clothing. The want of any market or means of procuring food from others compels the Agent to lay in at considerable expense in freight a supply of provisions – otherwise he would have to spend all his time, like the Indians, in hunting or fishing. The value in money, £300, that is stated to have maintained 192 teachers in Uganda, would not support more than 4 or 5 of those natives in these missions.\textsuperscript{146}
\end{quote}
The Society responded as it had throughout the nineteenth century, however, and cautioned that it was neither its responsibility nor its mandate to pay Native Clergymen salaries comparable to those paid to Europeans.

Despite assertions to the contrary from its agents in the North-West, the CMS stated in the late 1880's that because “Indian” and “country born of mixed descent . . . have the advantage of being regarded as fellow countrymen by the Indians & of being better able to rough it . . . they can of course live on less salary." Moreover, it continued to maintain that the needs of Native clergymen could be met locally. The CMS sympathized that many Aboriginal Christians remained too poor to contribute much if anything to the support of their pastors, but observed that those who were unable to contribute “money or money’s worth . . . should give personal service” to supplement their base salaries.

Thus, despite criticism from its Native and European missionaries alike that its racially-based two-tiered salary policy did not address the social, demographic, or economic realities of life and work in the Canadian mission field, the CMS refused to sanction a single salary system throughout the nineteenth century. Within a decade of the ordination of its first Native clergyman in the region, £100 became the established base salary for priests who were of Aboriginal ancestry and £70 became the established base salary for Native deacons; these figures remained unchanged for the remainder of the Century.
The paying of two levels of salaries was not the only racially-based policy of the CMS that fostered discord and discontent among Native proselytizers and “disencouraged [sic]” many of the Society’s “young Missionaries.” Eugene Stock, who was both a Secretary of the CMS and its major historian, noted that in 1850 the Society established a “Children’s Home” in England to meet the wishes of many of its European agents that their children be sent to England “to be reared in a better climate and for education.” By providing free education for the children of its European agents, the CMS addressed two concerns that might otherwise have affected their ability to evangelize in foreign missions. First, it ensured that their offspring would receive an English education in an English setting. Second, it permitted parents to limit their exposure of their young and impressionable children to the “perverse influence[s] of the “natives of the country” by removing them from a socio-cultural environment that they viewed as being uncivilized and, at best, nominally Christian.

Reverend James Hunter highlighted the importance of both of these points when he expressed his thankfulness at being able to send his son James to the “Missionaries Children’s Home” in England. He regretfully informed the CMS that “my time has been so occupied that I have been unable properly to attend to him.” Moreover, Hunter was concerned that James did not have any suitable friends and “fear[ed]” that his son’s “manners have suffered from mixing with the Indian Children.”
Native proselytizers also were concerned about the potential negative impact that the close confines of a mission station or school could have on the upbringing of their own children. James Settee complained about the "pestiferous influence with which" Aboriginal children "innoculate[d] his children" and Reverend Gilbert Cook believed that to ensure the futures of his own offspring it was "of vital importance" that they receive an education along European lines and in a European setting.

Native and European agents alike therefore often shared the belief that the Mission station or Indian Reserve was not a suitable environment to raise their offspring and consequently were "very anxious" that their children be educated in Winnipeg or Prince Albert. In the closing decade of the nineteenth century, the Bishop of Athabasca, Richard Young, summarized in three points many of the long-standing concerns that Native and European agents had raised regarding the education of their children. He observed first that "[t]he influences to which their children are exposed coming necessarily in contact with the Indian children [are] . . . in too many instances absolutely demoralizing." Second, he noted that "where the missionary is himself the teacher, it is not always the best arrangement that he should be the teacher of his own children." Finally, he believed that "a rudimentary school suited to the wants of the Indian children & others round [sic] the mission is very insufficient for children whose parents naturally wish for something better for them."

The CMS, however, refused to provide for the educational needs of the children of its Native agents. After receiving a request from Archdeacon
Robert McDonald to help with “the education of one of his sons,” the Secretary of the CMS, Reverend C.C. Fenn, informed Archdeacon Cowley that

[t]he Society gives help for this purpose to its agents labouring far away from their own native countries but does not do so for its European or foreign agents who are in their own country, as for example Secretaries in England or ‘native’ clergy in the mission field. We suppose that those labouring in their own country can make arrangements, or can procure help.\textsuperscript{157}

Two years later, Fenn again wrote to Cowley regarding McDonald’s request and informed him that

[a]s a rule, of course, we do not make allowances for the children of country born agents – to whatever race they belong; because in the first place it is difficult to decide how much help should be given and in the second place we think that is really the kind of help wh. might be asked for from their . . . [?] fellow countrymen. Indians or half-breeds or country born whites ought to feel it a joy & a privilege. . . . [T]here are perhaps faithful agents of the CMS who may need to be reminded that every dollar saved to the Society means another dollar spend in promoting the evangelization of the heathen.\textsuperscript{158}

Thus, as it did with its salary policy, the CMS established disparate racially-based policies regarding the education of its agents’ children.

Like many of his European counterparts, the Bishop of Moosonee, John Horden, supported the CMS’s decision not to provide for the education of the children of all of its Native clergymen in Canada. He observed that if the Society did commit to such a step, “this must become a general principle & be applied to all our Missions everywhere, which will entail very grave responsibilities.”\textsuperscript{159} Not only would the associated costs be prohibitive, it would run counter to the Society’s policy of not training Native agents (and presumably their children) above their countrymen.
The CMS's European agents nevertheless acknowledged that, because of the distinct character of the Canadian mission field and the difficulties that many Native agents experienced when trying to live on their base salaries, there existed a "somewhat pressing" need to "raise some money for the education of the Native Clergy's children." Bishop Horden, himself, expressed to the Society's Secretary "wonder that an attempt" to assist Native agents with the education of their Children "was not made much earlier in the Mission" because "it seems to me one of the very first requisites." Indeed, Bishop Young of the Diocese of Athabasca believed that "native' missionaries" were "fairly entitled to the Society's help . . . for the education of their children." Chapter Three of this dissertation showed that toward the end of the nineteenth century, the CMS's European agents expressed increasing frustration with the attitudes and abilities of many of the full-grown children of its Native agents. Rather than merely leaving parents to struggle with the education of these children, they therefore suggested that the Society could secure a competent second and third generation "of Native Ministers & Schoolmasters" if it leant some form of assistance in this area. Towards this end, the CMS's agents in the Canadian North-West established several scholarships to "defray the expense of a certain number of 'preparandi students'" at St. John's and Emmanuel Colleges.

While these scholarships did ease the burdens that some Native clergymen experienced when providing for the education of their sons, they were few in number and they were not available to assist their daughters. The
CMS's Native clergymen therefore continued to object to the fact that they and their families were penalized and their lives were made more difficult, solely because of their race.

Although Native missionaries desired that their children would receive the best available education, their low base salaries, the reluctance and inability of their congregations to supplement their salaries in any substantial way, and the cost of living and working in the Canadian North-West prohibited many from contributing much on their own towards this end.165

While he was a catechist, for instance, Henry Budd elaborated on his concerns for the future of his eldest son. He wrote: "Being most of all anxious and concerned, about his learning, I sometimes think of sending him to Red River school, where he would be taught more regularly if there was any prospect of his being there, should it drown every means of my command."166

Two decades, later, and anticipating that his sons might follow in his footsteps and be "useful to the Church in their day" by spreading the word of God among the various Aboriginal peoples of the Canadian North-West, Reverend Henry Budd hoped that they would be educated at St. John's college.167 Upon being informed of the death of his son David, Budd Sr. recorded and then crossed out the following passage in his Journal: "This is now my 4th Son and my last, that I have lost. I had educated them all with a view for the Church, at least as many as might be found inclined and made fit for the sacred work."168 Immediately thereafter, Budd replaced this passage with one that expressed a slightly different sentiment: "Four of my dear Boys I
have given up to be educated for whatever they should feel inclined to, at the same time if I was left to choose for them; I should say, for some services however mean, in the Church of God. Thus, while Budd preferred that his sons' education lead to their involvement in some capacity with the Anglican Church, he left to them the ultimate decision about their futures. For Budd, it was most important that his children receive an education beyond that with which he could provide; economic and career opportunities in their field of choice would follow.

Native agents were equally adamant that their daughters be educated in a setting that was removed from the mission station and any potentially corrupting or degenerating influences. Reverend Henry Budd, enrolled his daughters at school in Winnipeg and was reluctant to withdraw them even though the costs proved financially ruinous. To ease the plight of Budd's family, the Finance Committee of the Diocese of Rupert's Land granted him a total of £40 from the CMS's block grants so that his daughters would be able to continue their education in Winnipeg. The Finance Committee emphasized that this grant was in recognition of Budd's long and excellent service and was not intended to establish a precedent of funding the education of the Children of the Native agents.

Bishop Machray nevertheless felt it necessary to inform the Society that few Native Clergymen would be able to afford to send their daughters to the Ladies' School in Winnipeg unless they received some form of outside assistance. Indeed, the families of Archdeacon J.A. Mackay, Reverend
Gilbert Cook, and James Settee also experienced severe financial distress as a result of their decision to enroll their daughters at school in Winnipeg so that they “might have the advantage of education at St. John’s Ladies College.”

Many of the CMS’s Native clergymen therefore requested that the Society end its policy of not directly providing for the educational needs of their children, and its more general decision to treat its agents differently according to their race. They pointed out that this course of action was designed for, and well-suited to, mission fields where the goal was to raise a vital and self-governing Native Church. Because this was not the goal of the CMS’s efforts in Canada, they suggested that its policy of recognizing “the distinction of races” and treating its agents differently according to their race harmed, rather than facilitated, its work.

No individual was more vocal or proactive in his efforts against the Society’s disparate racially-based policies than Reverend Gilbert Cook. In 1877, Cook informed the Secretary of the CMS:

> It has pleased God in his mercy to bless us with a family of four children, all of whom are girls, the eldest of these should now be sent to Ladies College of St. John’s. Had I the means at my disposal I should gladly avail myself of the opportunity, without soliciting . . . [?] aid, and in acting thus, I should only be following out the advice of the Principal Miss Hart-Davis. But with my present income, and the frequent appeals made to my liberality in this parish there appears no possibility of doing so, and I feel sure that I do not stand alone in this difficulty. There are others besides myself in the Mission field who have daughters growing up and cannot afford to give them the necessary education.

Cook suggested that if the CMS could not increase the salaries of its Native agents, it might instead establish four scholarships “thereby enabling four
daughters of the native clergy to receive their education free of all charges.” He believed that this plan would not require the Society to alter its policy in other mission fields and “would obviate the present difficulty and if granted would be of infinite advantage to the daughters of the Native Clergy.”

Two years later, Cook noted with anticipation that the CMS “did tak[e] up that important question referred to in my memorial,” and hoped that it was “with the intention of making some permanent provision for the education of the sons and daughters of the native clergy.” The Society, however, rejected his suggestion and left him under a “great burden of anxiety.”

Shortly thereafter, Cook voiced his mounting frustration with what he saw as a divisive and discriminatory fiscal policy. He wrote:

We do the same work [as Clergymen from England] and I fail to see for my part why there should be such a vast difference [in salaries]. The Clergymen from England gets [sic] £200 besides an allowance of some [?] . . . £50 for mission expenses, and when he does reach his sphere of labor [sic] he has to avail himself of the services of an interpreter. Then at the end of ten years he gets a years furlough, a free passage to England & back, his children are taken to the home & educated free of expense. Whereas the Native Clergyman has only £100 with a small allowance of perhaps £20, and nothing done for the education of the children, and yet he preaches to Indian and English when so required.

Cook placed his daughter Edith in the Ladies College, but was able afford the “pretty high” charge of £15 only because “some kind friends in England have raised a little more than that amount which will relieve us for the first half year.” He informed the CMS: “I do not know how we shall manage for the next,” and
asked the Society, "why refuse" what for it and European clergymen would be “a small grant towards the education of our Children[?]”

Many of Cook’s Native and European counterparts shared his criticism of the CMS’s decision to treat its agents differently according to their race. They believed that the policy ignored the distinct social, political, economic, and demographic natures of the Canadian North-West as a mission field, and that it hurt the Society’s own efforts at evangelizing the region. European and Native proselytizers alike observed that by treating its agents differently, the CMS fostered discord and dissension not only between its agents, but also between its agents and the local Aboriginal peoples. Low wages and the lack of assistance in educating their children hampered their ability to care for their families, impaired their efforts to carry out their religious responsibilities, and diminished their status and authority not only in their own eyes, but also in the eyes of European missionaries and of their Aboriginal and European congregants. Furthermore, the CMS’s policy contributed to some of its Native agents accumulating significant personal and mission debts, damaged the morale of its Native agents and, as the nineteenth century progressed, made it increasingly difficult for the CMS to compete with alternate fields of employment for well-trained and well-qualified individuals.
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CHAPTER SIX

THE ABORIGINAL PEOPLES OF THE CANADIAN NORTH-WEST AND CMS AGENTS: THE IMPACT OF RACE, ETHNICITY, AND STATUS.

"[H]is Cree blood has caused certain prejudices against him [on the Sarcee Reserve]."¹

"They wanted to control Mr. Badger & order his work according to their own fancies."²

"The best thing that can be done is to remove our minister to some other place for we see the bad example. Send us someone in his place at once if possible."³

While the Church Missionary Society actively trained and employed Native agents, it acknowledged that some Aboriginal peoples expressed a preference for European missionaries. Indeed, the CMS’s goals regarding the global extension of Christianity and the formation of self-governing, self-supporting, and self-extending Native Churches were irrelevant to most of Canada’s Aboriginal peoples. Confronted by Christian missionaries who were from a variety of racial and ethnic backgrounds, potential proselytes and members of established congregations accepted or rejected agents of the CMS according to their own needs, expectations, and prejudices. Some individuals and groups welcomed Native proselytizers with whom they shared ties of ethnicity or kinship. Other individuals and groups rejected Native agents for reasons of personal jealousy or ethnic antipathy, because they doubted their knowledge and ability, or because they had prior negative experiences with Native proselytizers.
Although the responses of the various Aboriginal peoples in Canada to CMS missionaries differed, issues of race, ethnicity, and status were central to many of their decision-making processes. This Chapter shows that the various Aboriginal peoples of the Canadian North-West often held expectations regarding the roles, responsibilities, and obligations of CMS agents that were different to those held by the CMS and by the agents themselves.

The Introduction to this dissertation showed that the responses of Aboriginal peoples to Christian missionaries varied according to local conditions and needs and that these reactions therefore were neither static between peoples nor within groups nor across time. The Aboriginal peoples of the Canadian North-West responded in a variety of ways to the efforts of the CMS and its sanctioned agents. Many groups and individuals rejected the overtures of all missionaries because they believed that their message would harm their current or future lot. Some individuals did not want their kin or countrymen to call them “praying Indians” or in some other way malign, ostracize, or disparage them. Other individuals rejected missionaries because they feared that, if they embraced Christianity, they would not be reunited with non-Christian relatives in the afterlife. Still others rebuffed proselytizers because they believed that European religion and technology were “not merely opposed to but evidently meant to revolutionize their whole life.”

In 1852, Reverend Robert Hunt informed Henry Venn that on “a Missionary Journey up the Saskatchewan and Fishing Rivers,”
the Chief (Mahn-suk) interrupted me, and said that wherever religion came, it drove the animals away and they would not allow any Missionary to come nearer to them than the Pas, and English River, & Carlton. All his people had told him to inform Mr. Budd that they wished him to let them alone, and go back to the Pas, and if he would not do so, they wished him (the Chief) to let them know, and they all wd. come and tell Mr. Budd the same thing, and if he would not go quietly, they would bind him, and put him into the boat, and send him home down the stream.\(^7\)

The Chief suggested that “[i]f religion came among us, our children would starve” because “[y]our gardens spoil the country for animals.” Hunt himself admitted that, at least near mission stations and unless the Chief and his people turned to settled agriculture, Mahn-suk’s fears regarding food supplies were valid: Aboriginal populations visiting mission stations often did deplete local animal resources.\(^8\) Mahn-suk and his people thus opposed both Native (Budd) and European (Hunt) proselytizers, believing that the message and actions of either or both would negatively affect their way of life.

Reverend James Settee also informed the Society that some Aboriginal peoples rebuffed Christian proselytizers because they viewed them and their messages to be threats to their own cultures and modes of life. In 1871, Settee observed that

\[t]he Indian Tribes in general were always under the impression that the foreigners were usurpers and destroyers of their race and Country; that this land belonged to them exclusively; that they had sole claim to the rock, the ground, grass, timber, the fish & its waters; that all these things were created for them only; with these feelings they opposed every stranger & every body that did not belong to their tribe; murdered and killed each other from jealousy.\(^9\)

He continued:
Your Committee knew that this spirit by the Indians would stand against their Missionaries, & such has been the case. Even a native Catechist have had [sic] this reproach cast on his face, that he was joined to the usurper to deceive and ruin his country and bar[rier] their bodies and souls to the white man. I have myself had heaps of these reproaches made to me by my countrymen.10

In fact, only two years earlier, Settee feared that he would “receiv[e] rough handling” from Aboriginal peoples who took “the highest offence” to his efforts in “the service of God.”11

On an individual level, persons of authority in Aboriginal societies often opposed Christian missionaries, regardless of their descent, out of concern for their own authority and status. In the 1830's and 1840's, Reverend William Cockran repeatedly attempted to induce Chief Peguis and his band to take up settled agriculture and embrace Christianity. Cockran believed that their doing so would help them overcome the “indolent” and “licitious” Aboriginal nature and “acquire sober, industrious, and economical habits.”12 Peguis, however, was not certain that the supposed advantages that accompanied conversion to Christianity and taking up settled agriculture truly would benefit his people. Furthermore, he was concerned that Cockran’s “frequent residence at the Camp would . . . diminish his influence over his Band, and prejudice his interest.”13 Peguis therefore dismissed Cockran’s overtures until he determined that they would harm neither his position nor his people.14

The CMS's agents commented that many of the spiritual and medical leaders in Aboriginal communities opposed their proselytizing efforts because they were “afraid of the book [the Bible], or rather its influence on their grand
Reverend Robert Phair observed that not only is “[t]heir religion dear to them,” but also that “the headmen as a rule are medicine men & polygamists [and thus] they do not see it to be for their interest to allow their inferiors to adopt a religion so entirely opposed to their whole being.” Phair concluded it therefore “is very important to reach their head men and know their mind[s] as they exercise so much authority both in temporal and spiritual things over the whole band.”

Indeed, “Mistahpao" or Big Buck,” a “celebrated ‘Medicine Man’ among the Indians at" Cumberland Station, informed Reverend James Hunter that there were great obstacles in his way which kept him back from embracing Christianity, that it was much easier for the other Indians than for persons of his class, to renounce their heathen rites and ceremonies and embrace the white man’s religion; many of the Heathen Indians regarded him as their leader, especially in conducting their religious feasts.

Mistahpao therefore rejected Hunter’s efforts to draw his “attention to the Bible,” and continued in his capacity as Medicine Man to his people.

Just over a decade earlier, Reverend William Cockran commented that “[t]he Chief conjurer . . . looks upon the progressive steps of Christianity with a maligning eye” because he “sees his craft in danger.” He wrote that a Conjurer officiates at present in the complex character of conjurer and physician, and in the opinion of the Indian, the one without the other is not worth a rush. By holding conference with some invisible being, he learns the virtue of certain roots, and by magical charms the application of these roots is rendered effectual in healing certain diseases, and preventing peculiar evils. It is in his official capacity that he is a great man. From it alone proceeds his wealth and influence. He does not conjure unless well rewarded before he begins.
Cockran informed the CMS that the “Conjuror” therefore was justified in regarding Christianity with “malevolence” because “the light of the Gospel will dispel from the minds of his enquirers, the mist of ignorance and superstition, so that his [the Conjuror’s] idol shall cease to answer according to their wishes.” He concluded by noting that the Conjuror “perceives as the influence of the Gospel increases, his influence must diminish.”

As spiritual leaders and bodily healers, Medicine Men and Conjurers occupied positions within Aboriginal communities that agents of the CMS wished to usurp, they therefore represented clear and specific obstacles for missionaries to discredit and supplant. In their correspondence and publications, CMS agents portrayed these persons as “wicked” individuals who duped and swindled the Aboriginal peoples into believing in the Devil, in false gods, or in no gods at all.

Furthermore, agents of the CMS often recognized that they represented an alternate avenue for Aboriginal peoples to seek treatment for their sick or injured. One missionary proclaimed to an Aboriginal proselyte: “Our only object . . . in leaving our native land & settling amongst them was to do them good, both for their bodies & their souls.” A second CMS agent informed the Society that after having tried “all their own nostrums and conjurations without success,” a sick Aboriginal man “presented himself for Baptism because he looked upon me as an English conjurer” and therefore “wished to try the effect of one of our operations.”
Indeed, Aboriginal persons and groups recognized that agents of the CMS performed many of the same duties as Medicine Men and Conjurers, and therefore often granted them audiences or even accepted baptism out of the desire for spiritual and bodily protection. Reverend Smithurst remarked that some individuals requested Christian baptism only because they believed that it could break the influence of evil spells and counter malevolent conjuring. "The Indians," he wrote, "are believers in witchcraft & when anyone falls sick they fancy the sickness arises from the persons [sic] being bewitched." Smithurst continued: "The usual recourse in such cases is an application to the conjurer who goes through a number of incantations in order if possible to break the spell." Thus, "[i]f the patient recovers it is supposed to be owing to the influence which the conjurer has with the Gods." Consequently, "in a case where the combined efforts of all their conjurers have failed to break an enchantment [it was believed] that if the person who is the victim of the enchantment be baptized the spell will be broken."26

Smithurst further observed that because many Aboriginal persons believed that "no Indian conjurer has the power to do any injury to a Christian," some individuals desired baptism not only to counter the effects of malevolent conjuring, but also to prevent a person from falling victim to those effects in the first place.27 "This notion," he observed, "arises from the Indian conjurers [sic] giving out that they have no power to injure the white men because they have been baptized by their priest."28
The Society’s agents used the opportunities afforded them by the interest of the Aboriginal peoples in European medicines and medical practices to discuss Christianity. While “many” of the Aboriginal persons who came to see Reverend W.D. Reeve did so “for medicine,” Reeve also took the opportunity to “read some [Christian] translations.”

Similarly, in his autobiography, Archdeacon Robert McDonald recalled that “I baptized no adults till after the [Scarlet] fever” and then within two months “I baptized about 400 adults.” Reverend Henry Budd also reflected that distributing medicines to Aboriginal peoples both “reduc[ed] prejudices against Missionaries” and kept “the Indians away from Medicine men.”

Indeed, while some Aboriginal persons rejected the overtures of CMS agents because they believed that the introduction of Euro-Christian culture, religion, and technology would undermine their own societies, other individuals viewed the knowledge and skills that missionaries disseminated in a more positive light. Beyond caring for the sick and injured and providing spiritual amelioration, Native and European proselytizers performed a variety of other tasks that Aboriginal peoples exploited. In 1872, Reverend J.A. Mackay described his “own labours, during the past year” as being

as usual, chiefly of a threelfold character – ministering to my immediate charge, endeavouring to spread the truth in the regions beyond, and labouring with my hands for my own support and for the advancement of the temporal resources of the mission.

That same year, Reverend Thomas Vincent similarly informed the CMS that “[m]y duties have been . . . many and various, so that my time has been taken
up alternately in the pulpit, the schoolroom, the missionary journey, & on the secular work of the mission.  

The CMS and its agents viewed their relationships with the Aboriginal peoples of the Canadian North-West as being rooted in a web of reciprocal obligations. The Church Missionary Society accepted that it would bear all of the financial obligations that were associated with its evangelizing efforts during the initial years of its work among heathen populations. At its expense, the CMS through its agents would disseminate Christianity, educate children and adults, care for the sick and injured, and provide charity to those who truly required it. In exchange, the Society expected the Aboriginal peoples to permit its missionaries to use their land and resources and would learn and follow Euro-Christian ways. As its missions progressed, the CMS further expected that those persons who received the temporal and spiritual benefits of Euro-Christian knowledge and instruction would support, eventually in full, their own ministers and the Society's or the Colonial Church's global work. European and Native agents therefore were frustrated and disappointed when established local Christian congregations attempted to control the activities of CMS agents for "their own fancies" and when they refused to contribute, or only offered minimal support, to funding their efforts.

The Aboriginal peoples also viewed their interactions with Christian proselytizers as occurring within a web of reciprocal obligations, but their needs, motivations, and expectations regarding the roles and responsibilities of CMS missionaries often differed markedly from those of the missionaries
themselves. When agents of the Society proposed that Christian congregants contribute to the salaries of their ministers, some Aboriginal proselytes protested, claiming that there was "selfishness in view." Many individuals and groups argued not only that it was beyond their ability to contribute to the financial maintenance of their pastors, but that doing so was outside of the scope of their obligation or responsibility.

In 1870, Reverend Thomas Vincent unwittingly highlighted to the Society the importance of meeting the needs and expectations of potential proselytes and Christian congregations. Vincent noted that the Aboriginal peoples in the region of Mistassini had rejected the overtures of a Roman Catholic Priest, preferring instead his approach and the teachings propagated by the CMS. He recorded that the local population "told" the Priest that "they were quite satisfied with our teaching, as we taught them the word of God." Proudly informing the CMS of these events to demonstrate the satisfaction with which the peoples of Mistassini held his teachings, Vincent continued: "Indeed, the Chief told him that they did not want him there, if they did they would send for him, but until then he might keep away."37

A critical reading of the Chief's statement, however, reveals a clear implication (which Vincent either ignored or, more likely, missed) that should he or his people become dissatisfied with Vincent waver, they might invite (or threaten to invite) the Roman Catholic Priest to return. What was important to these people were their own needs and expectations; the race of the agent that the CMS sent amongst them meant little and neither did the CMS's grand
designs for Native Churches, the globalization of Christianity, and the pious
cornerstone and salvation of individual non-Christians.

In fact, Aboriginal congregants could react angrily when the CMS’s
agents failed to meet their needs and expectations. After tending to other
responsibilities, including visits that took him away from his missionary station
in the Nepowewin region, Reverend Luke Caldwell recorded in his Journal that
several of his “Xtian neighbours” confronted him when he resumed teaching
Sunday School for the first time “in a few months.” Caldwell noted that they
were “discontented with me for not teaching their children” and that “[t]he man
who told me [of] this affair, had compared me as a thief in the midst of our
conversation.” The Aboriginal peoples of Nepowewin expected Reverend
Caldwell to instruct their children in reciprocal payment for his “imparting” to
them “the Gospel truths”; they interpreted his failure to do so as theft because
he was reneging on an agreed upon exchange.38

While many proselytes expected medical assistance and spiritual
amelioration in exchange for their listening to Christian rhetoric, allowing their
children to be instructed in religious or secular matters, permitting the
construction of buildings on their lands, and allowing the exploitation of local
resources, other individuals were motivated by worldly “self-interest”39 and the
desire for “temporal” improvement.40 In the late 1880’s, Reverend J.W. Tims
informed the Society that some of the Aboriginal persons demanded payment
in goods or in kind in return for their granting him an audience. Tims related
that on one occasion “I was told that unless I had brought some tea with me I
might go home again.” Tims continued: “Of course, I do not always take tea with me, but I am invariably followed home, by a member of the family, who expects to get either tea[,] tobacco or rice from me.”

Four decades earlier, Reverend John Smithurst recorded that he “had a long conversation with a Salteaux who presented himself as a candidate for Baptism.” Smithurst noted this individual, “in common with all other Indians, is suffering much from want of provisions and thought if he could only get me to baptize him, that he would then have a claim upon me for a supply of provisions.” While Smithurst believed that the motives of the Saulteaux were “selfish,” the Salteaux believed that as a Christian he would have a legitimate “claim” upon Smithurst or any other Christian missionary.

In 1856, Reverend Henry George recounted an experience similar to Smithhurst’s. He wrote:

Today I came across a backslider one already baptized. I asked him what led him to be baptized. He said that he had been sick for a long time and applied for baptism. After receiving it he got over his malady, but was disappointed that he did not get ample remuneration for his trouble of turning to be a Xtian., and now he is the head man of the Metawin.

George reflected: “This is a difficulty to be often encountered, and one which give us much pains and trouble. We are looked upon in no other light than as distributors of bounty, and if we do not meet their wants they are offended and absent themselves from the House of God.” Indeed, a decade later, he similarly advised the CMS that a “resident Pastor whether Native or European is
looked at through the material aid he may chose to proffer in the way of food & clothing for the Indian children and assistance to adults to build and farm.  

While some European missionaries suggested that the "indolent," [b]arbarous," and "slothful" natures of Aboriginal peoples in general led potential proselytes and established Christian congregations to develop excessively extravagant pecuniary and material expectations, others conceded that the practices of the CMS's agents themselves reinforced such patterns of thought. Several missionaries commented that earlier "precedents" and "indulgences" confirmed to potential proselytes that the Society was willing to provide them with material recompense in exchange for their granting its agents the opportunity to disseminate the Christian message.

In February 1854, Reverend Robert McDonald recorded that Abraham James, a Native catechist, "made a feast for the Indians . . . that he might afterwards address them; - to exhort the Christians to be firm & steadfast in their newly assumed profession, & endeavor to induce others to follow their example." At the time, McDonald did not object to James' actions, but, three years later, he expressed "surpris[e]" at hearing the same catechist "tell the manner, in which he spoke to the Indians, when he was employed to do so, prior to the founding of the Mission" at Islington. James recounted that

half a cwt. of flour, & about the same quantity of pemmican were delivered to him, to make a feast for the Indians, along with goods which he was to give away to all those who would consent to become Xtians. After the necessary preparations were made, the Indians were gathered together, & he spoke to them, telling them that they were desired to become Xtians. As an inducement, he told them that all who would become Xtian would
receive presents, but that none of the rest would receive any thing [sic]. He said he thought he same plan ought to be adopted.50

McDonald “correct[ed]” James’ “mistake,” informing him that “he quite misunderstood the object for which the gifts were sent, that they were intended to assist in relieving the wants of the poor Indians, to make them know that there was a real desire to benefit them, & not with the hope of gaining converts through them.” When James again “came to request to be supplied with provisions to enable to give the heathen Indians a feast, in order that he might speak to them,” McDonald therefore informed him that he did “not approve of the plan” and declined. He nevertheless did give James “a small quantity of tobacco,” and observed that he “departed with it, but shortly returned, saying that he would give up the affair.” James informed McDonald that he “would not be able to obtain a favourable hearing, unless he were to give them a feast.”51

That same year, the English-born Reverend William Stagg recorded in that he himself had arranged “a feast for our Christian people.” After slaughtering a “large bull,” Stagg recorded the following entry in his Journal:

Very early this morning several of our people [were] walking about with their best clothes, evidently expecting something. As the day was fine we cleared a place [in] part of our house, and spread two large boat sails, and coverings, and afterward white cotton to place plates, cups and saucers, &c. As soon as the bell rang 150 collected – all sat down at the same time in a strait [sic] line. Mr. Settee asked a blessing in Indian, and then began the distraction. Puddings, Beef, potatoes, [?] . . . 52
While the CMS agents believed that faults in character led some “Natives” to “expect too much from their ministers,” the practices of CMS agents themselves therefore helped to create and reinforce such expectations.

Furthermore, in many Aboriginal societies and in the Euro-Aboriginal fur trade economies, it was an accepted practice for a person to present gifts to an individual or group with whom he or she sought an audience. Writing in 1844, Reverend Cowley commented that

> [O]ne old man expressed his astonishment at the mode of my proceedings, and contrasting it with that of the trader, more than hinted that unless I adopted his custom I could not expect that the Indians would give attention to me. It appears that when matters require the trader to collect and speak with the Indians belonging to his district, presents of tobacco, rum, or something of which the Indian is fond prepares the way, and opens the ear of the Indian to attend to whatever may be said.

Cowley, however, did not consider “this custom . . . right, advisable, or even practicable at all times to comply.”

Because proselytes generally believed that material recompense and spiritual amelioration were integral parts of the CMS’s obligations and responsibilities, they reacted negatively and vociferously when the Society attempted to separate the two. One agent informed the CMS that “in many instances they [the “natives”] feel vexed and chagrined, and really regard themselves in the light of injured parties, if their demands are not met.” While the CMS considered such reactions to be selfish or petty, to the Aboriginal persons they were valid responses to an apparent non-fulfillment of responsibilities and obligations by the CMS or its missionaries.
Believing that the introduction of Christianity in and of itself was a blessing to be appreciated and that the Aboriginal peoples should be supporting the Society and its agents, Reverend E. A. Watkins “set [his] . . . face against the practice of giving presents in order to win converts.” Watkins “believe[d] that this system had been pursued in many instances . . . to the injury of the true religion” and therefore informed the CMS that “since my arrival at this Station in ’58 . . . I have deprived my people of several of the indulgences which they have been accustomed to receive at the Society’s expense.” He noted that while this action “reduce[d] the expenditures” of the Station, he himself “incurred a very great amount of odium both from the Indians & from my schoolmasters.”

Indeed, several persons from among the local Aboriginal population took exception to Watkins’ unilateral decision to alter the standing relationship of reciprocal obligations that had existed between proselytizer and proselyte. They “considered” Watkins and other agents of the CMS to be “thieves” and warned the Bishop of Rupert’s Land that they were growing dissatisfied with the Priest’s “manner of conducting the affairs of the station.” Hoping to obtain someone more amenable to their wishes, they petitioned the Bishop to replace Watkins with another agent.

Fifteen years later, a separate group of Aboriginal peoples at American River took action against another agent of the CMS who was meeting neither their needs nor their expectations. In 1877, Reverend Robert Phair described the Catechist who was in charge of the mission at American River, Peter
Spence, as “a pure native” and “the right man in the right place.” In addition to being “related to the Indians” at American River, Phair observed that Spence possessed “a thorough knowledge of their language and ways besides being a carpenter and practical farmer.” Phair later wrote that

he is able to show them how to build houses, make doors and windows, and do many things about the mission which otherwise would entail expense on the Society. It is Mr. Spence’s duty to teach school daily except on Saturdays when he has to prepare for his Services on the Sabbath. Besides the School there are families to visit and numbers of little acts of kindness to be rendered to the widows and the aged for the latter Mr. Spence in his leisure moments has built several little houses.

Phair therefore believed that Spence was “well suited” to the tasks that he expected a catechist to perform.

According to Phair, however, the local Aboriginal population was making unreasonable demands upon Spence. He advised the CMS that “[l]ast time I visited the American River I found the Indians had the idea that Mr. Spence should do all the work while they sat in their tents gambling.” He further noted that “[t]hey had left him to plough their gardens and expected wood to make their fires when he was done.” Upon witnessing this situation, Phair redressed the populace and concluded that “they will not do it again.”

Two years later, circumstances forced Phair to admit that he had erred in his analysis. In his Annual Letter for 1879, he observed that “though Mr. Spence is so kind and useful, and I may add well liked among his people, he has to contend with very strong opposition.” A key individual in that opposition was “George Looka the Chief,” whom Phair described as being “a
very weak minded man, much more cosily persuaded to do wrong than right.” Phair informed the Society that “when Mr. Spence is unable to comply with his [Looka’s] wishes and give him all he wants, or do all he would like to have done, he will do his utmost to keep the people away from church and the children from school.” Phair therefore lamented to the CMS that he believed that elements of the local population again were pressuring Spence unfairly and inappropriately for their own temporal benefit.66

The CMS’s agents in Canada responded to Spence’s difficulties by removing him from the mission at American River and stationing him at Long Sault; unfortunately for Spence, however, he encountered a similar situation at his new mission. In 1882, Phair recorded that “a few of the Indians” at Long Sault “became dissatisfied with Mr. Spence because he refused to give them all the help they asked for and these disaffected Indians induced a few others to sign a paper which was sent up to me asking for Peter Spence’s removal.” In addition to the petition, the “disaffected Indians” also requested that Phair station David Prince among them, believing that he would be more amenable to meeting their expectations.67

Thus, within the space of five years, two different groups of Aboriginal peoples at two separate CMS stations criticized Spence and the CMS for not honouring their reciprocal obligations. While Phair and Spence believed that the demands of the Aboriginal congregants were exorbitant, the Aboriginal peoples themselves clearly believed that their expectations were reasonable. Phair’s own writings illustrated the concept of reciprocity: “[t]he disaffected
Indian[s] expected Spence to compensate them for attending the Church and the school; when he appeared to renege on his part of the reciprocal arrangement, the Chief and his people saw fit to withdraw from their own obligations and responsibilities.68

Throughout the nineteenth century, other Aboriginal populations also criticized and challenged European and Native missionaries who appeared to not to honour their responsibilities.69 Because their motivations for listening to proselytizers or converting to Christianity were numerous and often differed from those that the CMS deemed to be acceptable, it is not surprising that Canada’s Aboriginal peoples often held significantly different attitudes and expectations regarding the specific roles and duties of Christian missionaries.

While the CMS’s grand missionary plan called for Native congregations to support Native proselytizers, its Secretary, Reverend C.C. Fenn, admitted that “[n]ine out of ten Native Christians in all our Mission fields ask that they may have Europeans rather than their own countrymen as their ministers.”70 He nevertheless informed the Bishop of Athabasca that it “is simply out of the question” to staff CMS missions only with Europeans. Fenn warned that “[i]t would mean that all evangelization of the heathen must stop, all our resources material & personel [sic] being absorbed in supplying pastoral ministrations to the converts whom God has given us.” He therefore concluded that “[t]heir being ministered to by pastors from among themselves, either unpaid, or paid, at least partially, by themselves is an absolute necessity.”71
The Church Missionary Society repeatedly stressed to its agents that they must insist "that the Native Xns. look up to their countrymen as their Pastor[s], and... rebuke them severely in the name of the Lord if they fail to pay them the proper respect." Many of the Aboriginal peoples in the Canadian North-West, however, favoured European to Native proselytizers and the reasons that they gave for doing so fell into five general categories with race, ethnicity, and status being central to each.

First, some Aboriginal peoples preferred European to Native proselytizers because they did not "fully trust one of themselves to teach them the White Man's religion" or other aspects of Euro-Christian culture. In the early 1840's, the Society's European agents stationed James Settee at a school at Fort Ellice. From this location, they expected Settee to instruct "the Cree Indians from Beaver's Creek" in secular and religious matters. Reverend John Smithurst believed that because Settee himself was "a Cree," he was "well suited to the undertaking" and would have "many opportunities of saying to them a great deal on the subject of religion." Moreover, CMS catechist James Roberts observed that "James Settee was educated at the C.M. School" and "was afterwards a Schoolmaster at the Image Plain which gave him an opportunity to prepare himself in a great measure for the duties which he has now entered upon."

Given Settee's ethnic background, his prior schooling, and his work experience, the Society anticipated that he would experience great success at Fort Ellice. James Roberts, however, recorded that "the Indians... want a
white ‘Prayer Master’ to teach them the White man’s religion and customs.” He believed that “the Indians among whom he [Settee] labours cannot or will not be convinced that a man of the same nation as themselves can know much more than themselves, therefore they request a ‘White Praying Master’.”

Reverend William Cockran agreed that the Aboriginal peoples were “prejudiced” against Settee and observed that this prejudice is purely of an Indian [sic] origin. They suppose that as Mr. Settee is an Indian [sic] it is impossible that he can be so well informed as to teach them. . . . This prejudice has often operated powerfully against Mr. Settee’s usefulness, and not unfrequently [sic] brought the spiritual instructions, which he has delivered from the word of God[,] into contempt.

Thus, according to Cockran, the Aboriginal people at Beaver’s Creek not only doubted the accuracy and completeness of Settee’s understanding of Euro-Christian culture and religion, but also his ability to disseminate that knowledge.

These prejudices so impeded Settee’s work that by 1844 there were “but three Indian children in the School, and only one or two old people under instruction.” Cockran therefore recommended to the CMS that “if we are desirous that they should know the white man’s religion we ought to send a white man amongst them, who could teach them it more perfectly.”

As the Society’s agents became more familiar with James Settee’s predicament at Beaver’s Creek, however, they identified alternate reasons for his rejection by the local population. The CMS had stationed Settee at Fort Ellice in response to a request from the local population for spiritual amelioration. In this context alone, Settee’s ethnic, academic, and work
backgrounds might have facilitated his efforts. The Society’s agents, however, soon realized that they had misjudged the true intentions behind the request for a Christian missionary.83

Many Aboriginal peoples requested or accepted instruction from agents of the CMS on the understanding that, as part of a reciprocal relationship, they would receive material recompense in return. In late 1845, Reverend J. Smithurst informed the Society that upon reflection, the invitation of the Beaver’s Creek Cree “was clearly given to induce us to make them presents.” He noted that “[t]he Indians of the Fort Ellice District still manifest no intention to send their children to school and with only one exception they themselves show no desire to embrace the Gospel,”84 as a result, he “judged it best to give up the place.”85

The religious life-world of the local population remained intact and continued to meet its spiritual needs. Consequently, when it became clear to the Beaver’s Creek Cree that Settee did not represent an avenue of access to items of European manufacture or material wealth, they determined that Settee and the CMS had failed to fulfill their obligations. Indeed, although the CMS often criticized Native agents for being, in its estimation, too generous and spendthrift, a second reason that some Aboriginal peoples expressed a preference for European missionaries was that they believed that Native proselytizers, because of their race, either had less access to the CMS’s material wealth or were more selfish and less likely to share that wealth.86
Third, some Aboriginal peoples expressed a preference for European missionary agents for reasons of ethnic dislike or distrust. The Society and its missionaries were aware that for numerous economic, political, and social reasons, the Aboriginal peoples of the Canadian North-West often held deep-rooted "prejudices" and animosities towards one another and that these sentiments were not forgotten or overcome merely because a person from a group that they disliked also happened to be a Native in the employ of the CMS. In 1860, explorer Henry Youle Hind observed that "[w]hen conversing with the Crees of the Sandy Hills, many of them . . . did not appear to like the idea of their being taught by a native of a different origin." Hind continued:

It is a wrong policy to send a Swampy Cree among the Plains Crees, or an Ojibway amongst the Crees, as a teacher and minister of religion. These highly sensitive and jealous people do not willingly accept gifts or favours which involve any recognition of mental superiority in the donor from one not of their own kindred, language, and blood; although he may be of their own race. An Ojibway remains always an Ojibway, and a Swampy Cree a Swampy Cree, in the eyes of their haughty and independent children of the prairies, and they will never acknowledge or respect them as teachers of the 'white man's' religion.87

To emphasize his point, Hind noted that ethnic differences led "[s]everal of my half-breeds . . . to think that Mr. Settee would have troublesome times, and that he would not make much impression among the Plain Crees."88

Almost three decades later, the Bishop of Saskatchewan described Reverend Robert Inkster as "a Cree Half-breed" who "in character & ability [is] probably the best of the Native Clergy under me, [and who] has been for the past two years or so, at the Sarcee Reserve." The Bishop informed the CMS,
however, that because Inkster failed to learn Sarcee and because "his Cree blood . . . caused certain prejudices against him." The Bishop therefore removed Inkster from his mission and placed him "among the crees [sic]." He "confidently expect[ed]" that, in this new environment which was absent of ethnic tensions, Inkster would "do very well." Throughout the nineteenth century, issues of ethnicity thus continued to be a concern for the CMS regarding the placement of its Native proselytizers.

Fourth, negative experiences with Native proselytizers also led some Aboriginal peoples to express a preference for European clergymen. A group of "Christian Indians" at Landsowne in Manitoba, for example, criticized the abilities and actions of one of the CMS's Native agents, Reverend Patrick Bruce. The congregants informed Reverend Abraham Cowley and the Bishop of Rupert's Land "that Mr. Bruce's service was unsatisfactory." Several CMS agents including Reverends Settee, McKenzie, and Young investigated the complaints against Bruce and his work, but reported that they did not find "anything seriously wrong." Cowley himself informed the Society that "[a]t a former visit I felt satisfied with Mr. Bruce as a Native clergyman, & . . . could not but feel that we had the right man in the right place." Moreover, Cowley reported that some of Bruce's congregation were surprised by the charges and "were well content" with the situation at Landsdowne.

Shortly thereafter, however, the local Finance Committee discovered that "Mr. Bruce had cohabited with a young woman who from a child - being an orphan - had been reared upon the Mission premises" and who had given
birth to Bruce's son. Cowley returned to Lansdowne, but found the Priest and most of his belongings missing. He informed the Committee that the earlier accusations against Bruce appeared to be well founded and wrote: "From the Chief & other leading men I learned the sad take of Mr. Bruce's sin, the utter neglect of the parish, the great carelessness which he had long manifested, & the irreligious character which he had displayed." 

After Chief William Pennefattu and "the chief men of the band" informed Cowley that they were "very dissatisfied with the conduct of the Rev. P. Bruce" and commented on the level of distress that "had befallen the mission," they requested "some European Clergyman on whom they could rely" and who might work to "set matters right." Reverend Henry Cochrane, whom agents of the CMS described as being "an excellent native preacher" and who was "respected & beloved by his people," volunteered "to go out there for a year." The Finance Committee, however, determined that it was "absolutely essential that an ordained European clergyman should be placed in charge" of the mission and planned to send Reverend Phair to that location.

Several decades later, the population of Grand Rapids also expressed dissatisfaction with a Native clergyman who was in the CMS's employ. Archdeacon John Hines traveled to the mission at Grand Rapids to investigate the numerous complaints that the local population had raised against Reverend John Sinclair. Hines traced the root of the "disagreeable excitement" to Sinclair's refusal "to publish the banns of marriage between two
members of the band.” After “the chief and councillors” had arranged a match for marriage, the prospective groom objected, prompting Sinclair not to publish the banns. Given that the groom was “of age,” Hines convinced “all but the chief” that Sinclair’s refusal was justified.100

The Archdeacon observed, however, that because concerns of a more personal nature contributed to the air of “excitement” at the Mission, Sinclair “had brought the displeasure of the majority of the band upon himself.” Hines noted that “Mr. Sinclair also was charged with creating a disturbance & insulting certain parties both by words and actions.” He further commented that “the Indians complained of Mr. Sinclair’s family, saying they were very abusive, & had threatened to do violence to the school teacher, besides these, there were many other complaints too numerous to mention.”101

After convincing Sinclair and the school teacher to “let what had passed . . . remain as past and forgotten," and with “all, excepting the young woman’s father & the chief[,] . . . promis[ing] to attend the services of the Church as before the quarrel began,” the Archdeacon believed that he had resolved all areas of concern.102 When he returned less than a year later, however, Hines observed that the “[c]ongregation [was] painfully small, not one of the councillors, nor yet the Chief, were present.” Hines met with the Chief and Councillors and although he asked that they not speak of Mr. Sinclair, “they could not refrain from doing so.” Hines reported that they “did not attend Church” because Sinclair and his family “had done so much to destroy the peace & harmony of the Reserve.” Hines chastized the Chief and Councilors
for their "unchristian" and "unforgiving thoughts," but they remained adamant that they "could not go to Church as long as he was there." Consequently, when they were informed that Mr. Pritchard, a European, "had come to take [Sinclair's] . . . place," the Chief and Councilors "expressed their satisfaction."  

The fifth reason that some Aboriginal persons opposed the efforts of individual Native proselytizers of Christianity was personal resentment and "jealous[y]."  

Allen Hardisty, who assisted Reverend W.D. Reeve at Fort Simpson in the Mackenzie River District, encountered difficulties because several local persons resented his being placed in a position of apparent authority. Reeve commented that although Hardisty "has not given such good satisfaction as I expected," he hoped that "this has been owing more to his position than his disposition." The Reverend observed that "[t]here are several young men about his own age, & others, who remember that but a few years ago he was as ignorant as themselves, & who instead of being pleased to be taught by him, resent the idea of him setting himself up as a teacher." Reeve therefore believed that Hardisty "would do better at another post away from 'those of his own house'."  

Similarly, in 1890, Reverend John Hines noted that "all the men" at Moose Lake "did not agree" and "were nearly fighting" with Mr. Badger, the "new school teacher." Hines investigated the matter and was "quite satisfied . . . that Mr. Badger was not to blame." Rather, he suggested that

the Chief & his men were jealous of Mr. Badger, who though an Indian like themselves, was holding in a certain sense a higher
position than they did. They wanted to control Mr. Badger & order his work according to their own fancies. \textsuperscript{106}

Indeed, in an effort to reassert his authority, “the Chief told Mr. Badger that if he spoke to them about adultery on Sundays, i.e. forbidding it, he the Chief would close the school.”\textsuperscript{107}

For reasons that were rooted in issues of race, ethnicity, and/or status, many Aboriginal persons therefore either rejected Native proselytizers or expressed a very strong preference for Europeans. Race, ethnicity, and status, however, also often played important parts in the decisions of other individuals to support the CMS stationing Native proselytizers among them. In fact, throughout the nineteenth century different groups of Aboriginal peoples who otherwise might have rejected the overtures of Christian missionaries, welcomed individuals with whom they shared ties of language, race, or kinship.

In July of 1851, Reverend Cowley informed his European counterparts that he had sent Charles Pratt, a Native catechist, to the Swan River District. He observed that Pratt “is a native of that quarter, and [that] many of his relatives trade at Fort Pelly and Shoal River as do also many of his wife’s relatives.”\textsuperscript{108} Cowley and the local Committee correctly anticipated that these familial and ethnic connections would facilitate Pratt’s evangelizing efforts.

Shortly after he arrived at Fort Pelly, Pratt recorded that Cha-wuh-is, a Saulteaux Medicine Man, “came to my tent at night accompanied by his young man with is [sic] great conjuring article in his hand, quite displeased with me and forbidding me to build here.” Cha-wuh-is stated that his God instructed
him “to hate” Christian prayers. Pratt countered that Cha-wuh-is’ God in fact was the Devil who “means to destroy men’s souls in everlasting fire.” Cha-wuh-is and “his young man” rejected Pratt’s overtures and left his tent resolving to oppose the catechist’s efforts to disseminate Christianity. 

The following day, however, Pratt experienced the value that ties of kinship, culture, and ethnicity could have in facilitating the efforts of Native proselytizers. Despite the earlier tension, Pratt “paid a visit to the old man, with a piece of Tobacco.” After having “a long discourse” on Christianity with Cha-wuh-is, Pratt observed that “he seemed very sorry for what he said to me last night, not knowing that I was one of his country-men,” and stated that “[t]he old man went off quite pleased.” Pratt continued: “He told me to build on, & try to get the house up. ‘Do not be afraid,’ said he, ‘there will be no danger’.” In fact, when Reverend Cowley visited Fort Pelly several months later, he commented that “the Indians are very well disposed towards” Pratt.

Similarly, in 1863, Reverend W. Stagg informed the CMS that several individuals responded very favourably to the decision of the Bishop of Rupert’s Land to assign Luke Caldwell, who had been born in the region, to Fort Pelly. Fifteen years later, Reverend J.A. Mackay observed that the people of Stanley appreciated the efforts of John Sinclair, a CMS catechist who was “a pure Indian, a native of Stanley” and who “preach[ed] fluently, in his native Tongue [“the Cree”] and with considerable ability.” Likewise, in 1895, Reverend Isaac Taylor noted that Reverend Richard Faries, “who has grown up from childhood” at Moose Factory “and so both knows the individual characters of
each and also, of course, without effort knows the language," had "acquired great influence over the Indians" at Moose.115

In fact, just as Aboriginal peoples actively lobbied for the removal of Native proselytizers who did not fulfil their expectations or address their needs, so too did they pressure the Society to not move missionaries with whom they were well-satisfied. When they were informed in 1877 of the plan to remove Reverend James Settee from Netley Creek,116 the Chief and Council of St. Peter’s Reserve voiced their "regret" at the prospect of loosing his "services" and lamented to Archdeacon Cowley that "it is impossible for us to find one who laboured most faithful among our race." They continued: "We find no fault with our present Minister Rev. Mr. Cook unfortunately [sic] he has been sickly since his appointment to this large parish, & if it had not been for Mr. Settee we should have gone without a service for six Sundays." The Chief and Council therefore requested that the Society not remove Settee as "we cannot spare to lose him."117 The Rupert’s Land Finance Committee readily agreed to this "very earnest request" and informed the CMS "[i]t was thought advisable to keep the Rev. J. Settee at Netley Creek."118

That same year, another Chief actively and successfully lobbied agents of the CMS to reconsider their plans to remove a Native proselytizer from his mission. As part of a regular rotation of agents, Bishop Bompas of the Diocese of Athabasca intended to withdraw the catechist Allen Hardisty from the Fort Norman region and place him at another post. Chief Lambert, however, expressed "much regret" when he learned of the plan to remove Hardisty, and
“repeatedly requested” that the Bishop “permit him to return in the fall.” Bishop Bompas appreciated Chief Lambert’s earnestness and enthusiasm and “sent him [Hardisty] back at once.”

When the Society and its representatives had no specific objections to their agents remaining at a particular mission station, they often accommodated the requests of local parishioners to keep them in place. On occasion, however, parishioners voiced their support for a Native proselytizer whom agents of the CMS wished to move because they believed that he had “lost all influence . . . of the right kind.” When they determined that keeping the missionary in place would in someway threaten its evangelizing efforts and program, CMS agents often rejected the requests of local congregants. Nevertheless, the decision to deny the wishes of a congregation in and of itself could prove detrimental to the CMS’s work.

In 1888, Bishop Richard Young of the Diocese of Athabasca, reflected on the CMS’s experiences with many of its Native clergymen. Young observed that “[t]he Rev. Hy. Budd, Rev. Luke Caldwell, Revd. Hy. Cochrane, Rev. J. Settee, Rev. Baptiste Spence, Rev. Peter Badger have all laboured successfully & acceptably among the Indians.” He acknowledged, however, that while these individuals “offer[ed] much cause for thankfulness & encouragement,” the Society also had experienced several “disappointments” and observed that “[i]t after all depends upon the man himself.”

Young pointed to the career of Reverend Henry Cochrane to illustrate the importance of the character of “the man himself.” He noted that Cochrane
had "laboured successfully and acceptably among the Indians," and that "[n]o
man ever experienced a stronger influence over our foremost indians [sic] viz.
of St. Peter's." The Bishop admitted, however, that "blighted family happiness
& yielding to drink marred his ministry & compelled his suspension."122

From the CMS's perspective, Cochrane's career was one of failure,
disappointment, and unrealized potential. For the "indians [sic] viz. of St.
Peter's," however, Cochrane was and remained an influential religious and
spiritual leader. An analysis of Reverend Henry Cochrane's interactions with
the CMS and with his various Aboriginal congregations clearly illustrates the
differences in criteria that Aboriginal parishioners and the CMS used to
determine the acceptable and expected roles and responsibilities of
proselytizers and how these differences contributed to discord and
disagreement between the groups.123

After spending several years in the CMS's employ as a schoolmaster124
and studying under Bishop Anderson and "at the Collegiate School" in Red
River,125 Cochrane was ordained to the Diaconate in 1858126 and to the
Priesthood in 1859.127 The Church Missionary Society and its agents initially
categorized the Reverend as being "very acceptable,"128 "an excellent native
preacher,"129 "respected & beloved by his people,"130 and "an excellent
person."131 They commented that was he a "ready speaker in Cree" who
delivered in a "rich & soft voice" sermons that were "valued" by his
parishioners.132 Moreover, he made full use of his "knowledge of" Aboriginal
"language & habits" to facilitate his evangelizing efforts.133
In 1866, the Society appointed Cochrane to the position of “Native Pastor of the Indian Settlement” on St. Peter’s Reserve.\textsuperscript{134} In the years preceding and immediately following his appointment to St. Peter’s, Cochrane suffered several personal tragedies including the deaths of his first wife, his parents, his sisters, and his three children (by two marriages and including his “last & only child”) and the loss by fire of his stables, barn, and horse.\textsuperscript{135} His inability to deal with these setbacks in a manner that the CMS deemed appropriate had severe ramifications for his career.\textsuperscript{136}

Six years after Cochrane’s appointment to St. Peter’s, Cochrane transgressed the bounds of acceptable behaviour for clergymen by becoming drunk in public. Archdeacon Cowley related that on July 11, 1872

\begin{quote}
Rev. H. Cochrane went up the Settlement to do some business for his father-in-law, Mr. Budd of Devon, Boats from the Saskatchewan being then here, & fell into temptation, & a snare, which overcame him. He drank & was drunken! Lord this was known to many.\textsuperscript{137}
\end{quote}

When challenged about the accusations, Cochrane admitted that that the charge against him was “substantially correct.” Archdeacons Cowley and McLean therefore suspended the Reverend until they could reach a permanent decision about the matter.\textsuperscript{138}

The “Xtian Indians” reacted to the news of Cochrane’s punishment with great “excitement & distress”: Cowley advised the CMS that “after the second Sunday’s suspension they seemed unable to bear it.” Indeed, Cochrane’s congregants did not passively acquiesce to the decision of the Society’s agents. They lobbied in support of Cochrane on an individual basis, and “drew
up & presented a petition to Dr. McLean praying that their beloved Minister might be allowed one more trial.\textsuperscript{139}

In response to the petition and to the individual protests, McLean "called a counsel [sic] of clergy & laity, to advise" him on the case. After evaluating the situation, the Society's agents determined that Cochrane's actions and his perceived lack of self-control diminished not only his personal stature within the community but also his ability to lead by example. They found that Cochrane's personal failing therefore threatened the CMS's entire mission on St. Peter's Reserve.\textsuperscript{140}

The Council, nevertheless, decided that in light of the demonstrated and wide-spread support for Cochrane, and in light of the tension and dissension that his suspension had created, it would do more harm than good to continue enforcing its censure. The Council "agreed that, under the circumstances which were fully discussed, it would be well to receive and act upon the prayer of the petition,"\textsuperscript{141} and therefore reinstated Cochrane. Two months after the lifting of the Reverend's suspension, Cowley reported that "Mr. Cochrane is going on very nicely, and effectively; and apparently avoiding occasions of evil, and circumstances of temptation."\textsuperscript{142}

Over the course of the next two years, Cochrane slowly restored the Society's shaken faith in him, but in late 1874, the CMS's agents regretfully reported that the Reverend "has again fallen"\textsuperscript{143} having been "commonly charged with having become intoxicated."\textsuperscript{144} Archdeacon Cowley expressed "much pain & annoyance" at Cochrane's latest lapse and informed the CMS
that "I fear no sufficient guarantee can be had against occasional outbreaks, such as alas we have too often heard of, so long as he should remain within the reach of temptation."\(^{145}\)

While in 1872 the Society's representatives in the Diocese of Rupert's Land had forgiven Cochrane's excessive consumption of alcohol as being a singular lapse in judgement, in 1874 a pattern of behaviour began to emerge. Cochrane's history suggested that unless they removed him, he was likely to repeat his offence and by doing so damage both of his own authority and that of the CMS. The Finance Committee determined that "only one course remained & that was to place him away from the cause of temptation."\(^{146}\) Because it was "forbidden by stringent Laws to import liquor into, or to have any in the interior i.e. the North West Territory,"\(^{147}\) the local Committee agreed to remove Cochrane from Winnipeg area and send him to Stanley in the English River district where "he will not get liquor"\(^ {148}\)

As they did in 1872, many of Cochrane's congregation objected to the Society's plan and rose in defense of their Minister. They asked the CMS's representatives to grant Cochrane another chance and even conveyed "a threat of withdrawing from the Church if he were permanently removed."\(^{149}\) Cochrane, however, willingly accepted the transfer and thereby effectively frustrated the efforts that his congregants undertook on his behalf. In August of 1874, Mr. and Mrs. Cochrane left St. Peter's.\(^ {150}\) Mrs. Anabella Cowley, wife of the Archdeacon, described the Cochrane's departure as a "very sorrowful parting to us all." She informed the CMS that "[n]umbers stood on the bank to
shake hands, as they went to the boat & all were in tears, scarcely any one could say 'Good Bye.'"\textsuperscript{151}

Soon after Cochrane began work at his new mission at Stanley, however, it became evident that he was unable to adequately perform some of the more mundane responsibilities of the station. In 1875, Cowley advised the Society that Cochrane "is incompetent to manage the Grist mill or the press; and ... he cannot without the aid of an efficient carpenter carry on the contemplated building in which provision has been there made.”\textsuperscript{152}

In light of these inadequacies, in May of 1875 the Bishop of Rupert's Land removed Cochrane to Cumberland where there he would "be associated" with his father-in-law Reverend Henry Budd who was stationed at Devon.\textsuperscript{153} Budd, however, died less than two months later.\textsuperscript{154} Although he was deeply saddened by Budd's passing, Cochrane proactively assumed Budd's responsibilities at Devon Station and informed the CMS that he was working there "as if I had been appointed officially."\textsuperscript{155} In recognition of his initiative during a time of great personal distress, the Finance Committee formally authorized Cochrane to "take charge of Devon for the present."\textsuperscript{156}

The Finance Committee nevertheless remained concerned about the Reverend's weakness for alcohol and therefore in 1877 denied his request to visit either the Province of Manitoba or England.\textsuperscript{157} These concerns were well-founded because in early 1879, Mrs. Cochrane charged her spouse "with having imported spirituous liquors, drinking himself drunk, courtng her two
sisters, Mrs. Ballentine, & Miss Eliza Budd, & with beating herself with his fist, & with a horsewhip."

Mr. Adams, the person "in charge of the H.B.Co. post at the Pas," independently confirmed to Archdeacon Cowley that there was "a considerable ground for scandal" at Devon. Adams was so concerned about the situation that he recommend that "an investigation should be had" and that it would be beneficial to "change" personnel. He did not find any fault with Cochrane's preaching, but believed that the Reverend's tumultuous personal life was having an ill-effect upon the people of Devon. Adams advised Cowley that "we all bear great responsibility for the example we set in our daily life either for good or evil" and noted that Cochrane's example was very poor.

In response to the concerns raised by Adams and Mrs. Cochrane, Cowley proceeded to Devon to investigate the matter. In a lengthy report to the CMS, Cowley wrote:

On Monday [8th] I stated to Mr. Cochrane the object of my visit: He said he had asked Mrs. Cochrane to come over and see me, & that he expected her shortly; so I ceased till she should have arrived. Mrs. Cochrane being present, face to face with her husband, I declared what had brought me there; and recapitulated what Mrs. Cochrane had written to me, against her husband, adding that she had written the same to England. Mrs. Cochrane affirmed the truth of all she had written against her husband, and ... she also stated that it was on this account that she had left him, taking refuge with Mr. Clemons, over the river. Mr. Cochrane denied being drunk, & taking improper liberties with his sisters-in-law, but admitted slapping his wife, on account of her morose conduct, & unreasonable suspicion; producing in confirmation of what he said, a very irritatingly (?) paper which he had found in the house in her, Mrs. Cochrane's, handwriting. Here it is only proper for me to say that long since she had shown me a paper in Mr. Cochrane's handwriting, upon which
she grounded in part her suspicions of evil, & that she then & there referred to that slip of paper.\textsuperscript{160}

Cowley continued:

The interview was long & very painful. In summing up the evidence I addressed them both seriously, & showed the possible effect upon the people of the Mission Station their conduct, culminating in the one fleeing from the other, & their living apart, might have; & begged them to reconcile themselves, & again dwell together in unity. At my instance [sic] they kissed each other, & Mrs. Cochrane consented to remain in the Mission house. I remained ten days at the Mission going in & out among the people, visiting all the Indians living at the Station, & also the Company’s people. Found the Indians very reticent; but the general impression seemed to be that Mr. & Mrs. Cochrane were living a cat & dog life, & that he drank.\textsuperscript{161}

Thus, while Cowley was uncertain about the veracity of the charges against Cochrane relating to improprieties with his sisters-in-law,\textsuperscript{162} he was convinced, but lacked solid proof, that the Reverend had resumed drinking.

“[M]atters,” however, “did not improve” as that autumn the “chief of the Devon Indians” informed Cowley that he was dissatisfied with the local state of affairs. The Chief wrote:

I am very sorry to say anything that would be wrong – but I want you to take notice to what I have to say. The best thing that can be done is to remove our minister to some other place for we see the bad example. Send us someone in his place at once if possible.\textsuperscript{163}

The Chief’s words confirmed to Cowley that Cochrane’s actions were negatively affecting “the public morals” and led him to conclude that whatever the truth of the matter, “Cochrane’s influence for good, at Devon, is lost.”\textsuperscript{164}

After reading the Archdeacon’s report, Bishop Machray concurred with Cowley’s analysis. He too believed that “the charges of immorality . . .
probably simply came out of jealousy & [?] . . . imagination," but was inclined to accept the veracity of “Mr. Cochrane having been seen the worse of liquor.” Although he too lacked firm evidence against the Reverend, Machray relied upon his previous experience, and informed the CMS that “[f]rom my knowledge of Mr. Cochrane’s character I suspect there is ground for this part of the charge.” Like Cowley, the Bishop concluded that “Mr. Cochrane’s usefulness was gone, & that the Mission was deteriorating.”

Faced with diminishing support from his counterparts in the CMS, Cochrane “tendered his resignation” and advised Archdeacon Cowley that “as soon as I can be relieved of this Mission, my connection with the CMS & church will cease.” Cowley forwarded the document to the Bishop of Rupert’s Land, but because of the uncertainty surrounding the case, the Bishop temporarily delayed accepting Cochrane’s resignation.

The Society’s missionaries in the Diocese of Rupert’s Land struggled with the dilemma posed by Cochrane. Three times Cochrane had been accused of public drunkenness, and each time his counterparts noted that his actions hurt not only his position within his parish but also, by his setting a bad example, the parishioners themselves. The Finance Committee discarded the idea of transferring Cochrane to the Diocese of Moosonee because it believed that in that locale “his language would not serve.” It also rejected sending him to missions that bordered on the Saskatchewan River because “his whole case would be known, & his influence of little avail for good.” It further dismissed Touchwood Hills because of the “general feeling” that “temptations”
there "would be quite equal to those at Devon." After "very serious" and "pained" discussions, the Finance Committee regretfully informed the CMS that it lacked "confidence that [a] change of place would guarantee efforts of resistance & transformation."\(^{172}\)

The action that finally pushed the Bishop and Finance Committee to accept Cochrane's resignation from connection to the CMS, however, was his "objectionable & treacherous" decision to offer his services "as a minister" to the Wesleyan Methodists. After tendering his resignation, Cochrane suggested to the Wesleyans that if they appointed him to "St. Peter's or the Indian Settlement[,] . . . he could bring over the Indians."\(^{173}\) Cochrane, in fact, informed Archdeacon Cowley that "he would do all he could to open the door in this Reserve [St. Peter's] to dissenters."\(^{174}\)

Given Cochrane's history with alcohol and his actions towards the Methodists, the CMS's agents recommended to the Society that it accept his resignation. Reverend Richard Young wrote:

> Our desire all thro' this has been to treat Mr. C. with the greatest leniency & forebearance & we felt that the same standard could not be applied to him as a native that we should require of a European, but still with every allowance we have come to the conviction that to allow things to go on undealt with might only lead to yet greater offence."\(^{175}\)

The local Finance Committee believed that accepting Cochrane's resignation would minimize his corrupting influence at CMS's missions, and "prove such a shock to his feelings . . . [that it] shall lead him to reflection, repentance, and
thorough transformation of his life. The CMS concurred that Cochrane had “lost all influence . . . of the right kind” and accepted his letter of resignation.

The Bishop of Rupert’s Land informed Cochrane that the Society had “removed him from their list” and cautioned that “it was most unlikely that they would again place him on their list.” He then suspended Cochrane’s “License for 3 years and [would] not renew it then nor afterwards unless [he] . . . had satisfactory evidence of his conduct for 3 years.”

Nevertheless, when Cochrane returned to St. Peter’s in the Summer of 1880, he “held [religious] services” that were “contrary to the order of the Church of England because he had the consent of neither Archdeacon Cowley, nor the Rev. Gilbert Cook, who were in charge of the Parish and Mission.” Furthermore, Cochrane informed Bishop Machray that he would continue to work against the CMS’s efforts at St. Peter’s. He wrote:

I have tried all I could to keep the people quiet ever since I came, but from now on I will encouraged them to do as they please & let me tell you here, a great many of them are in favour [of] going over to the dissenters, & have actually made overtures to them. The other bodies may not take me in their Service. I do not intend to ask them [again] but I will not hide from you that I will do all in my power to open a door for them among these people, unless you make a change at once in this parish that will be more satisfactory to the people.

Cochrane, in fact, warned the Bishop that while the “congregation of St. Peter’s [was] intact, in another fortnight . . . it may be gone.”

The Society’s agents, initially underestimated both Cochrane and his popularity among his parishioners. Soon after Cochrane returned to the Reserve, Cowley advised the Society that the Reverend posed a very real
threat to the Mission at St. Peter's. He warned that not only was Cochrane "a very able & eloquent preacher," but that "he has entire possession of his mother tongue, the Cree, & also is very competent in Saulteau [sic]." In fact, by virtue of "his powerful eloquence in Cree, & his fascinating address," as well as "[h]is urbanity, commanding voice, native ease, & pleasant temper," Cowley reported that Cochrane had succeeded over the course of several months in "draw[ing] after him a large number of the congregation" at St. Peter's.

Cowley was frustrated and disappointed by the decision of the parishioners of St. Peter's Reserve to support Cochrane in open defiance of the CMS. He lamented that "the action of the Indians has shaken my confidence in their spiritual mindedness; & it grieves me greatly to see them carried away by eloquence, almost to ignoring the sin of drunkenness." In particular, Cowley disapproved of the parishioners' willingness to "think so lightly" of "the sin of drunkenness, & especially drunkenness in a clergyman!"

Cochrane's oratory ability, however, was not the only reason that many of the parishioners of St. Peter's abandoned the CMS's services. Many individuals were very dissatisfied with the abilities and actions of their current CMS sanctioned clergyman. Consequently, because the Society's agents failed to adequately consider the perspectives of the Aboriginal congregants when deciding how best to deal with Cochrane's return to St. Peter's, a "crisis" soon gripped the Parish and rendered the CMS's position within it tenuous.

In December of 1880, the Bishop of Rupert's Land informed the CMS that while six years earlier, Cochrane's parishioners at St. Peter's had
“expressed” great “discontent” over its decision to remove Cochrane as their Minister, Cochrane’s return “fanned discontent into a flame.”

The parishioners at St. Peter’s preferred Cochrane both to his immediate successor, Reverend J.A. Mackay, and to the incumbent CMS clergyman Reverend Gilbert Cook. While Cochrane’s voluntary decision to leave St. Peter’s in 1874 effectively limited the actions his parishioners could take in defense of their minister, in the early 1880’s the situation was vastly different: Cochrane had resigned his connection to the Society and was actively preaching at the Reserve in defiance of Cook and the CMS.

The parishioners at St. Peter’s surprised the CMS’s agents when many abandoned Reverend Gilbert Cook’s ministrations in favour of Cochrane’s. The Society’s missionaries believed that Cook was “a very estimable man” and although he had been unable “to wi[n] ... the affection of the people,” they were confident that he was “conscientious in the discharge of his duties.” Archdeacon Cowley believed that the “discontent” against Cook was “was only the work of a few” and that many of the charges brought against him were “trivial.”

Cook himself suggested that many of the reasons the complaints of his parishioners were relatively petty. Some individuals, for instance, expressed ill-will toward him for such minor issues (at least from his perspective) as his “wanting something to kneel on when offering prayers in the houses & not shaking hands with everybody.” Consequently, when Cochrane held “divine services on Sundays, morning & evening, in the upper and lower parts of the
parish" for several weeks in a row, the CMS's sanctioned representatives “[a]t first” took no direct action believing that it was “advisable to leave the agitators alone.”

They soon recognized, however, that as the “passionate clamouring [“by the Indians”] for Mr. Cochrane” continued to grow, so too did the “feeling of hostility manifested against Rev. G. Cook.” Archdeacon Cowley again informed the CMS that many of the parishioners of St. Peter's Reserve complained that Cook's health, temperament, and disposition were not what they expected of a Native clergyman. One parishioner argued that Cook was “not fit to be in the Parish, too weak for the Parish, too proud for St. Peter's, too wicked (i.e. short tempered) to be a clergyman, [and] . . . keeps too much spite.” Other parishioners agreed, suggesting that the Reverend was “a weak man” both in terms of personality and physical ability, bemoaning that Cook was “too proud,” and noting that his poor health left him incapable of carrying on religious services. Other individuals noted that Cook spoke their language poorly and that they could not hear his sermons because he was too quite at the pulpit.

Cowley informed the Bishop of Rupert's Land that the complaints against Cook could be “summed up” into five general areas of concern:

1. Physical weakness, not heard plainly, & want of power [?] in the pulpit.
2. Pride, want of a friendly, sociable spirit.
3. Shortness of temper, a want of consideration for the feelings of his people, & a refusal to accept their co-operation, suggestions about church matters being met by some such
expression as - "Which business is it of yours[?] I will do it when I think Proper."
4. A good many complaints... of a very trivial character.
5. A general complaint that Church matters were going backward, that there was no progress, no improvements, no additions to Church furniture or since Mr. Cochrane left.195

Thus, Cook and other CMS agents initially believed, and in some cases continued to believe, that the criticisms that the local congregants levelled against the Reverend were "trivial." Further investigation, however, revealed that many individuals disliked Cook and that many parishioners doubted his ability to meet their needs and expectations.196

Cowley advised the Bishop that "[t]he more serious thing is the fact that neither in our visiting the houses nor at the Public Meetings were there any warm expressions in his [Cook's] favor [sic]. All that was said amounted to 'Have nothing against Mr. Cook'."197 In contrast, Cowley informed the Society that "there was either silence about Mr. Cochrane or strong expression of feeling in his favour."198 In fact, at a meeting called during the investigation, less than one in ten of those present voted to retain Mr. Cook's services at the Parish, while a "large majority" voted "in favour of Mr. Cochrane."199

In addition to abandoning Cook's services in ever increasing numbers, many in the parish employed other more direct and proactive tactics to demonstrate their support for Cochrane and their opposition to the unilateral actions of the CMS. These activities included holding "Public Meetings," circulating petitions to secure Cochrane's re-appointment as their minister,200 and "attend[ing] the services of the Wesleyan Methodists" at Selkirk.201
Cowley reported that although the details of Cochrane’s various failings were well known to the people of the Parish, the congregants did “not believe Mr. Cochrane [was] guilty” of an offence serious enough to warrant the severing of his connection to the CMS.\textsuperscript{202} He advised the CMS that “Mr. Cochrane’s followers are raising the cry of persecution, & representing him as the innocent victim of European clerical jealousy, & malice.”\textsuperscript{203} Cowley noted that the congregants attacked and “abuse[d]” him “as the channel through which Mr. Cochrane’s deeds have seen the light, & as a barrier against the progress of the efforts of the disaffected.”\textsuperscript{204} He informed the CMS that John Thomas, who had been a “vestryman [for] about 18 years & [a] church warden before that,” warned a CMS delegation that “[i]f we do not get him [Cochrane] back we will not go back to the church (applause).” Thomas continued: “If it is impossible to get him back we will follow him (applause).” Cowley then noted that another person also received a round of “loud applause” for proclaiming that “[i]f we do not get Mr. Cochrane [we] will go elsewhere.”\textsuperscript{205}

By early 1881, Cowley regretfully informed the CMS that its efforts to introduce the concept of self-support had produced unintended results: “a subscription list for . . . [Cochrane’s] support is in circulation.” Moreover, Cowley noted that “the last phase [of “how matters go here”] is the attempt to introduce the “the ‘Reformed Episcopal Church’ which originated . . . some years ago in the United States.” Cowley wrote that “one of its bishops [sic]” was in “communication” with Cochrane and sent him “encouraging letters.”\textsuperscript{206}
Fortunately for the Society, at virtually the same time that the Bishop of Rupert's Land suspended Cochrane's license and that the Bishop of the Reformed Episcopal Church made overtures towards Cochrane, the government of Canada "conditionally offered to Mr. Cochrane" the "position of Teacher to the government school soon to be opened in the lower part of the Reserve." The local Chief, hoping to diffuse the increasingly tense situation on the Reserve, advised Cochrane "to take the school." Cowley also recommended that Cochrane accept the position in order to stem the flow of Protestant children to a day school that a Catholic Priest had established. Cochrane "consented to accept" the position of school master, pending the confirmation of "the Government," and pledged to "use his influence [in that position] to maintain order & quietness." Cowley observed that these concurrent events "seem[ed] to have influenced Mr. Cochrane to abstain from holding religious services in this Reserve."

Because the parishioners of St. Peter's were satisfied that Cochrane would remain among them, they redirected their attention to securing the removal of Reverend Gilbert Cook. Even after they were informed that Cochrane had accepted the position of school teacher and therefore would not be reinstated as their minister, "many" parishioners insisted that "that they will not again enter our church till Mr. Cook is turned out and Mr. Cochrane put in as Minister." In direct response to the "agitation" and the general sense of "crisis," the local Finance Committee "came unanimously to the conclusion that it was advisable to remove Mr. Cook while recognising [sic] no
culpabilities on his part. In 1881, it replaced Cook with Reverend Benjamin McKenzie, another Native agent.

The controversies surrounding Henry Cochrane illustrate that the Aboriginal peoples of the Canadian North-West had distinct and defined expectations regarding the roles, responsibilities, and obligations of CMS proselytizers and that these expectations often differed from those held by the proselytizers themselves. The controversies also show that Aboriginal congregants and potential proselytes acted proactively, aggressively, and according to their own needs, goals, and understandings when accepting, rejecting, or modifying the teachings disseminated by Christian missionaries.

Race, ethnicity, and status were central determinants in the decision making processes of Canada’s Aboriginal peoples. Some individuals and groups opposed all Christian missionaries, believing that they threatened their societies or their own positions within those societies. Other individuals welcomed proselytizers, regardless of their ancestry, because they believed that they could assist them in adapting to the changing social, economic, demographic, and political environments of the Canadian North-West. Positive or negative experiences led still other individuals or groups to express clear preferences for missionaries who were of a particular racial or ethnic background. Whether they opposed or supported proselytizers of Native ancestry, however, their own religious, social, and economic needs, and not the CMS’s designs and plans for the evangelizing the heathen of the world, determined the positions of Canada’s Aboriginal peoples.
CHAPTER SEVEN

PURVEYORS OF “RELIGION, MORALITY, & INDUSTRY:” THE IMPACT OF RACE AND STATUS ON THE ROLES OF THE WIVES AND DAUGHTERS OF CMS NATIVE AGENTS.

“[B]e in all aspects examples to the flock, to speak affectionately and earnestly of Christ and His Salvation and to glorify His name by a consistent and blameless life.”

“There is much loose talk about his wife . . . but I hope her crime consists of a too little dignified self-control, such as becomes the wife of a native clergyman.”

“[T]here is no surer foundation for future civilization than the training up of Christian mothers.”

In the introduction to Women and Missions: Past and Present, Fiona Bowie observed that “[w]omen and men live in different cultural worlds and this . . . inevitably manifest[ed] itself in missionary life and attitudes.” Bowie argued that “the experience” of women in the modern missionary movement therefore “cannot simply be subsumed under that of men.” This chapter similarly shows that the experiences of women of Aboriginal ancestry who were involved in the proselytization of Christianity cannot be subsumed under those of European and Euro-Canadian women. Just as the life-worlds of European men and women differed, so too did those of Aboriginal men and women and those European and Aboriginal women.

The Church Missionary Society believed that women, regardless of their race, could contribute to the evangelization of the Canadian North-West by making the home life of their husbands and fathers more comfortable, by performing manual tasks around the mission station, by serving as role models
to other women, and by actively inculcating congregants with Euro-Christian values, norms, knowledge, and culture. The Society also observed, however, that socio-cultural experiences impacted the abilities of women to perform these tasks and fill these roles. Despite professing a belief in the unity of mankind, the CMS and many of its agents doubted the ability of Native women to overcome weaknesses that, as the nineteenth century progressed, many Europeans increasingly saw as being racially inherent. Indeed, from a Euro-Christian perspective, Native women were in a doubly subordinate position: perceptions about race and gender shaped and constrained the roles and activities that were open to them in the proselytization of Christianity.

Historian Deborah Gorham has argued that in response to the "[d]oubt and anxiety" that arose because of the rapid "social and economic changes" that occurred during the nineteenth century, middle-class Victorians created "an idealised vision of home and family." She argued that "[b]y locating Christian values in the home, and capitalist values in the public world of commerce, the Victorians were able to achieve an effective moral balance."

"[P]ublic and private life," Gorham continued, were removed into "two separate spheres" with "[t]he public sphere of business, politics and professional life . . . defined as the male sphere" and the "private sphere of love, the emotions and domesticity . . . defined as the sphere of the woman."  

Historians have long used the idea of separate spheres to explain and interpret the different roles and activities that Victorians deemed to be acceptable, in the abstract ideal at least, for men and for women. In fact, in her
historiographical analysis of this concept, Linda Kerber observed that mid-nineteenth century contemporaries themselves believed that "[w]omen . . . live[d] in a distinct 'world', engaged in nurturing activities, focused on children, husbands, and family dependents."

By itself, however, the idea of separate spheres does not adequately explain or account for the dynamics either of gender relationships at nineteenth century Christian mission stations or the roles, actions, assumptions, and attitudes of and about Native women who were connected to the CMS. The ideals expressed in the concept of the cult of true womanhood and in the image of the perfect wife complement those embodied in the idea of separate spheres and explain why issues of race and status were important in shaping Victorian perceptions about the wives of CMS agents. They also show how Victorians reconciled the roles and activities that the wives of Christian missionaries were required to perform in foreign mission fields with those that were acceptable according to their "idealised vision of home and family."

In her study of the Antebellum United States, historian Barbara Welter demonstrated that members of the middle class held very defined ideas about the traits that a true woman embodied. Welter wrote: "[t]he attributes of 'True Womanhood' by which a woman judged herself and was judged by her husband, her neighbours and society could be divided into four cardinal virtues – piety, purity, submissiveness and domesticity." She observed that "[r]eligion or piety was the core of woman's virtue, the source of her strength" and noted that "[o]ne reason religion was valued was that it did not take a woman away from
her ‘proper sphere,’ her home.” Welter continued: “Unlike participation in other societies or movements, church work would not make her less domestic or submissive, less a True Woman.”11

Paralleling Walter’s observations of widely held ideals and sentiments in pre-Civil War middle-class America, Martha Vicinus demonstrated that middle-class English Victorians believed that “the perfect wife” performed vital and specific roles for and within the family. According to Vicinus, these roles included giving birth to children, raising those children and inculcating them with middle-class ideals and Christian doctrine, and contributing indirectly to the financial stability of the family unit by mending and making clothes, cooking, and maintaining the home.12

The roles and lifestyles that the CMS and its agents deemed to be acceptable for men and women in missionary fields often were very similar to those of middle-class England, America, and Eastern Canada.13 In its publications, the CMS presented the wives of its agents as being “pious[,] industrious, [and] indefatigable”14 when running their household, raising their children, and supervising their servants.15 The Society nevertheless subsumed the roles and responsibilities of these women within the family unit which it publicly embodied in the male missionary. Because of their gender, the wives and daughters of CMS agents therefore were an almost invisible component of missionary work among the Aboriginal peoples of Canada; issues of race, ethnicity, and status even further marginalized women who were of Aboriginal descent.
Despite limiting their visibility, the CMS acknowledged that within these accepted domestic roles, four important facts made women, regardless of their race, crucial to the success of its missionizing program in the Canadian North-West. First, the Society recognized that just as women were responsible for the operations of the household in England, the wives and daughters of its agents could carry out or oversee the mundane work of a mission station. Life at a mission encompassed much more than the singular act of religious proselytization. For a mission to succeed, livestock and gardens had to be cared for, clothing had to be made and repaired, meals had to be cooked, and the interior living space of each building had to be kept clean and functional. By performing these tasks, by caring for and dispensing medicine and advice to persons who came to the mission, and by assisting with translating Christian tracts, the wives and daughters of CMS agents permitted their husbands and fathers to devote more time to disseminating Christianity.

Unmarried missionaries, in fact, often lamented that being single impeded their ability to perform the duties that their superiors and congregants expected of them. In 1854, Reverend Hillyer apologized to the CMS for not keeping a comprehensive journal and offered as his excuse the fact that he was “single” and that “the nature of that charge is such as to render it very difficult for a person so circumstanced.” Two decades later, Reverend Robert McDonald informed the CMS of his marriage to Julia Kutug and, commenting that “[s]he will I trust prove an acquisition to the work of the Gospel,” highlighted his belief that his wife would facilitate his efforts to disseminate Christianity.
Second, beyond their caring for the physical aspects of a mission, its buildings, and its grounds, the CMS also believed that women could indirectly facilitate the evangelizing work of their husbands and fathers by stabilizing their home lives. Chapter Two of this dissertation showed that the mental and physical demands of missionary work in the Canadian North-West could be extreme. The harsh climate, missionary tours that encompassed hundreds or thousands of kilometers, the physical distances between missionary brethren, and cultural isolation all could negatively impact the quality of life of CMS agents. The Society and the men in its employ believed that wives and children could alleviate some of these pressures.

In the 1850's, Archdeacon James Hunter initially requested that the CMS send unmarried missionaries to work in the MacKenzie River region. After visiting the area himself, however, he revised his position. Hunter reasoned that because missionaries "will be so cut off from Society in these remote regions, for this may well be designated the Siberia of America, . . . they will find great comfort and assistance from a partner like minded with themselves." He therefore advised that "I should now recommend that they be married men."\(^{22}\)

Reverend E.A. Watkins also highlighted the positive impact that marriage could have on the personal lives of CMS agents. Commenting on the marriage of his "School-master [sic] Mr. Philip McDonald" to "a native of Red River," Watkins "trust[ed]" that she "will make him a suitable partner in life." He observed that "[a]fter having lived in solitude for many years whilst conducting the
scholastic & frequently other duties of the Station, he [McDonald] must really feel the need, I should think, of a change of condition.²²³

Third, the CMS believed that women played a central role in maintaining and protecting the social, economic, and cultural status of the family unit. Status in Victorian British society often was assigned based on perceptions of material wealth. Historian Deborah Gorham wrote:

The family’s style of life displayed its tastes and thus its status and its gentility. A man could achieve success through hard work and initiatives, and thereby gain economic power, but his social status, if not naturally determined through the family he established, was reflected through it. The style of family life, the quality of domesticity achieved, was the final determinant of the niche he occupied in the social structure.²⁴

Because women managed the private sphere, and hence “the outward forms of manifested and determined social status,” they were responsible for creating “an appropriate domestic environment” that “acted as an effective indicator of status in the public sphere.”²⁵ The wives and daughters of CMS agents filled this role by stocking their houses with items that were integral to, and expected in, middle-class English homes and by keeping their person, their house, and the mission station as “a pattern of neatness & cleanliness.”²⁶

The fourth reason that the CMS held the wives of its paid agents to be vital to its success in the Canadian North-West was that it believed that they could be “useful among the women and children.”²⁷ In 1831, Reverend William Cockran described women of Aboriginal descent in the following way:

The females being Natives & Half-Breeds, are consequently entirely ignorant of the ceremony and industry necessary to make a family comfortable in civilized life. And they are naturally so indolent,
thoughtless, and licentious, that it requires a great deal both of
instruction and grace to make them honest and virtuous Christians;
& it is equally difficult to keep the pious and virtuous in the path of
duty, while they are surrounded and constantly mixing with a host
of indolent, licentious women and girls, who go from house to
house, enshrouded in a blanket, and using all manner of detestable
conversation.28

Furthermore, he suggested that Aboriginal children "are all the children of rude
nature" and "grow up from infancy . . . following the bent of their own
inclinations; without ever being thwarted in their desires; or corrected for their
faults."29 While Cockran's sentiments were extreme, other CMS agents shared
his views.30

Most evangelical Anglicans nevertheless also believed that the "variety"
between humans resulted from "the varying influences of climate, [and] habits of
life" including the knowledge or lack thereof of Christianity.31 With the inculcation
of European religious values and cultural norms, the CMS therefore anticipated
that the various Aboriginal peoples of the Canadian North-West would overcome
the perceived debasing effects of cultural and physical isolation. The CMS
commented that the wives of its paid agents were crucial to its work in this
regard because there was "no surer foundation for future civilization than the
training up of Christian mothers."32

Thus, in addition to serving in their accepted capacities as the nurturers,
teachers, and care-givers in their own domestic environment,33 the wives of CMS
agents often assumed active roles in teaching at Mission schools.34 Women also
conducted classes at Sunday Schools,35 instructed Aboriginal congregants in
music,36 lead "Mother's Meetings,"37 and held "adult classes."38 The CMS, its
agents, and their wives believed that these methods of instruction inculcated into Aboriginal congregations the arts, standards, ideas, and practices of "the White man's mode of life," illustrated how they might "bring religion to bear on the duties and trials of their every-day life," and drew those congregations together to guard against backsliding.

Women also had other more informal avenues for "promot[ing] religion, morality, and industry." The Society believed that skills such as spinning and weaving, and the ability and desire to maintain both a clean house and "neatness of dress" assisted the survival of Aboriginal Christian households because they helped Aboriginal women and families overcome negative cultural traits and embrace Anglo-Christian values. Cockran wrote:

we think by assembling daily the young women and girls who have a desire for improvement, and teaching them to read, write, knit, sew, & spin. [sic] This will in the first place keep them out of the way of evil. They will also acquire sober, industrious, and economical habits which will make them respectable, useful, and prominent Settlers; and their idle gossipping, extravagant, and licentious customs will be forgotten by the young, and laid aside by the old.

The CMS therefore cautioned the wives of its agents "to be in all aspects examples to the flock, to speak affectionately and earnestly of Christ and His Salvation and to glorify His name by a consistent and blameless life." It instructed them to keep their person, house, and the mission station clean and well-ordered and to project respectful, chaste, and principled images expected of true women and perfect wives.
Furthermore, the reality of life in the Canadian mission field necessitated that women step beyond the accepted middle-class Victorian boundaries and ideals of hearth and home. The wives of CMS agents often were responsible not only for the house, but also "for the entire charge of [the] . . . school," the farms, and mission personnel. Also, while the Society limited the roles that women could perform in an organized and ecclesiastically sanctioned setting, it did consider them to be voluntary "helper[s]" in the "work" and expected them to disseminate Christianity in an informal lay capacity. Consequently, by reading aloud parts of the Bible, women gave "religious instruction" and "impart[ed] religious knowledge" to interested individuals and small groups.

Women thus assumed a wide variety of informal catechistical roles and active educational roles in the dissemination of Euro-Christian culture and religion in the Canadian North-West. Because the mission station itself was an extended private sphere, it was acceptable according to Victorian standards for women to exert authority and control in its daily operation without eroding their ability to be true women.

The CMS recognized, however, that the capabilities of these women necessarily differed according to their backgrounds and experiences. While it believed that all women, regardless of their race, could contribute to the success of its work in the Canadian North-West, it believed that Native women possessed several important advantages over their European-born counterparts. It understood, for instance, that European-born women would not possess any great knowledge of Aboriginal life-worlds or languages until
they had lived in the Canadian North-West for an extended period of time, and that even then that knowledge likely would be imperfect.56

In contrast, the CMS believed that women who had been born in the Canadian North-West often possessed knowledge of Aboriginal life-worlds and languages and expected them to use that knowledge to assist their missionary husbands. When the recently widowed Reverend James Hunter married Jane Ross, the “eldest daughter of Donald Ross Esqre. Chief Factor in the Hon: H.B.Co. service,” Reverend Smithurst exclaimed to the Secretaries of the CMS that “Mr. Hunter could not have selected a more suitable partner.” Smithurst observed that “Miss Ross is a very amiable & pious person, one who desires to see the conversion of the Indians.” He also noted that although Jane Ross was not of Aboriginal ancestry, through being raised in the Canadian North-West she had gained significant insight into Aboriginal life-worlds and languages. He wrote:

Though of Scotch parents, yet being a native of the country, she speaks the Cree language very well. There will be found many indirect advantages arising from Mr. Hunter’s marriage with Miss Ross, apart from her own personal character and suitableness for the Missionary work. Mr. Ross being chief in authority over that part of the country, has it in his power to do, or withhold favours at his pleasure, and may materially influence the Indians either for or against our cause.57

Smithurst thus believed that Mrs. Jane Hunter (nee Ross) possessed personal qualities, knowledge, and contacts that she could and would exploit for the benefit of the Society’s endeavours in the Canadian North-West.
Other individuals also praised Jane Ross' linguistic abilities and emphasized to the Society that she could employ her skills and knowledge to further its work. Bishop David Anderson of the Diocese of Rupert's Land informed Reverend Henry Venn that Reverend Hunter “reads the Church Services in Cree remarkably well & spoke as if with the assistance of Mrs. Hunter (who is in this respect invaluable and as good as any sound Clergyman) he could preach in Cree during the absence of Mr. Budd.”

In fact, Reverend Hunter himself commented to Venn that although “Mr. Budd is a great help to me in my translations . . . he does not understand much of the Grammar.” He continued: “it is from Mrs. Hunter that I have derived the most valuable aid in understanding the difficulties of the language and in obtaining a correct pronunciation of the same.” With the assistance of Jane Hunter and Henry Budd, James Hunter produced translations, including of the “Prayer Book in Cree,” that agents of the CMS used throughout the remainder of the nineteenth century.

Over a decade later, Reverend John Horden praised Thomas Vincent’s marriage to “the Daughter of Mr. Gladman of Rupert’s House” for reasons very similar to those raised in favour of Reverend Hunter’s marriage to Jane Ross. Horden observed that Mrs. Vincent could exploit her knowledge of Aboriginal languages and cultures for the benefit of the CMS’s work and that she could use her connections to the HBC to “greatly enhanc[e]” her husband’s “usefulness.” Furthermore, Horden suggested that marriage would make
Vincent's life as an agent of the CMS more "comfort[able]" and therefore concluded that his new wife "is in every way suitable for him."62

The CMS also recognized that linguistic and cultural barriers and the distances involved in missionary work in the Canadian North-West led many of the Society's European-born agents and their wives to experience feelings of isolation and loneliness. In 1840, Reverend William Cockran informed the Church Missionary Society that

[m]y wife has generally 3 rheumatic attacks in a winter. During which periods, she has a high fever, unable to move from the excruciating pain in her bones. As there is no white woman in my congregation, and all the Indian and Half Breed women are unacquainted with the mode of nursing white women; and by no means are partial to them. [sic]63

Thus, because of the lack of medical knowledge among the women in his congregation, and because of inimical feelings rooted in racial and cultural differences, Cockran's wife found little solace, comfort, or companionship during her frequent bouts of illness.

Almost four decades later, Reverend William Day Reeve informed the CMS that racial animosity led "[s]ome" of the Aboriginal women around Fort Simpson to be "very bitter" toward his wife. Because his wife performed numerous tasks for the benefit of these women and their families, including instructing their children in school and ministering to those who were sick or injured, he admitted that these sentiments eventually waned to the point where these same women came to "say she is like their mother." He
nevertheless informed his superiors that his wife’s initial experience at the mission was very difficult.  

To provide their wives with friendship and companionship, many European agents requested that the CMS send schoolmistresses from England. Bishop William C. Bompas anticipated that one Miss Mellet would prove to be a valuable addition to his staff both by teaching in the school at Buxton Mission and by being a friend to his wife. Unfortunately for both the mission and Mrs. Bompas, the Bishop was forced to transfer Miss Mellet to a different location because she proved to be too much of a distraction among the miners in the region. Bompas nevertheless hoped that by removing her to Rampart House, Miss Mellet might add to that mission by both teaching in the school for Reverend Canham and acting as a friend and confidant to Mrs. Canham. Furthermore, Bompas thanked the CMS for Miss Mellet’s replacement whom he described not only as being “efficient as a school teacher and manager,” but also as someone who would provide his wife with much needed “companionship.”  

In contrast, the CMS expected that Aboriginal peoples would be more receptive to persons with whom they shared at least some ties of race, language, and culture. Although ethnic antipathies did negatively influence the relationships of CMS Native agents and their wives with groups of Aboriginal peoples, many persons of Aboriginal ancestry were more receptive to Native wives of CMS agents than they were to women who had been born in England. Indeed, Reverend James Settee observed that “a number of
heathen women" were very open to his wife because "they are fond of talking with one who speaks their language."  

The CMS also doubted the mental and physical stamina of English-born women and expressed great frustration when the poor "state of . . . health" of an agent's English-born wife "compelled" that agent to withdraw from his assigned station. Nevertheless, while the Society believed that persons who were of "Indian" or "mixed descent" were "better able to rough it" than were individuals who were of full European ancestry, illness and frailty could impact Native and European women alike and to the equal detriment of the CMS's work in Canada. Less than two years after the CMS stationed the "Native Clergyman" Reverend James Irvine at Lac Seul, the ill-health of his wife forced him to consider resigning from the mission station. Despite doing "good work amongst the Indians," he informed the Secretary of the CMS:

I resigned from the Lac Seul Mission some time ago but through some delay on the part of the Gov. in putting up the building of Mr. Burman I consented to stay on here for the winter. After thinking on the matter more carefully . . . it would be much better for me to remain among these Indians now that I have their language perfect. My reason for leaving is that my wife is in poor health, & as I have frequently to make long journeys out among the Indians I can't leave her all alone. I would prefer staying here provided you can give me any help. Could you find a lady who would come out as a companion for my wife[?]  

The mere fact that a woman was of Aboriginal ancestry thus did not preclude her from becoming ill or developing infirmities that could negatively impact the Church Missionary Society's work.
Despite the many real and perceived advantages that Native women possessed over their English-born counterparts, racial suppositions led many European-born contemporaries to view these women as being generally inferior to European women as wives of missionary agents. The writings of Letitia Hargrave, wife of James Hargrave of the Hudson’s Bay Company, provide an illuminating look at the impact that ethnicity and status had on the relations that people established in the Canadian North-West.76 While at York Factory in 1843, Letitia Hargrave observed that “all hands have turned on . . . poor Mr. Evans,” a Wesleyan Methodist missionary who “was here lately in very bad spirits.” Although Evans previously had enjoyed good standing among fur trading families in the Norway House region, Hargrave noted that “[h]e got a very sharp letter from Sir George [Simpson, the Governor of the Hudson’s Bay Company] and has been informed that he must live at the Indian village & leave the Fort” at Norway House. Mrs. Hargrave traced the cause of Evans’ ostracism to the “successful rivalry” of Mrs. Evans & her daughters’ [sic] . . . over Mrs. Ross and her Children – For they were the derision of the whole passers by for their finery and exhibition of good education and knowledge of astronomy as Mrs. E used to say – whereas Mrs. Ross & Jane did not know the names of the commonest stars.77

Thus, while it was noted previously that Reverends Hunter and Smithurst and Bishop Anderson praised Jane Ross for her linguistic and cultural knowledge and for her personal connections and character traits, other English-born and educated individuals found fault with her education and upbringing.
According to historian Deborah Gorham, Victorians accepted that "all females, . . . even those who were not of the middle class, could be perfect wives or perfect daughters." They demanded, however, that the wives and daughters of missionaries would maintain and project certain minimal levels of status and respectability that were manifested externally in the form of appropriate and expected material possessions, and incorporated internally in the form of personal knowledge and in the embodiment of the traits expected of a true woman. To the Evans women, their education, clothing, and actions were signs of superior status; accordingly, they viewed the Ross women as their social inferiors. While this attitude earned them the scorn of the fur-trade families in the region, it reflected the expectations and assumptions of many middle-class persons who had been born, raised, and educated in England.

English-born men and women were even harsher in their criticism of women who were of Aboriginal descent than they were to women like Jane Ross who were Native-born but who were of full European ancestry. They suggested that the wives and daughters of Native proselytizers were of a disadvantaged social and cultural background and therefore lacked the ability to adequately organize and run their home so as to reflect the status and respectability appropriate for an ordained clergyman. They also believed that the wives and daughters of Native proselytizers were unable to overcome the "weakness" in "natural temperament and habits" that they associated with Aboriginal peoples, and therefore lacked the ability improve themselves to the degree required of a true woman and a perfect wife. While Europeans
complemented the piety and domesticity of many of the women of Aboriginal descent who were married to CMS agents, they often found them wanting in the virtues of purity and submissiveness.

Historian Susan Thorne demonstrated that the position of European women in mission fields "actively depended on the subordination of their heathen sisters" and that the "existence of a degraded female Other in the colonies and at home" facilitated for at least some British women an "escape from the separate sphere." Canadian contemporaries also employed Othering techniques to subordinate Aboriginal women. Historian Sarah Carter showed that "stereotypical images of Native and European women were created and manipulated to establish boundaries between Native people and white settlers to justify repressive measures against the Native population." These images included presenting white, non working-class women as civilizers and paragons of virtue and portraying Aboriginal women as adulterous, sexually liberal, and destroyers of civilized Euro-Canadian Society. While the CMS did not portray the wives of its paid agents in this fashion, for many Victorians the connection between licentiousness and Aboriginal ancestry was inescapable.

In fact, the Othering of Aboriginal women in general had important implications for the perceived ability of the wives of CMS Native agents to embody the purity required of persons in their position: for reasons of race Europeans saw these women as being especially prone to moral corruption. Nineteenth century Victorians placed great importance on the perception of
chastity and virtue of women in general and of the wives of missionaries in particular. Historian Barbara Welter observed that “[p]urity was as essential as püty to a young woman, its absence unnatural and unfeminine.” Welter noted that without purity, a woman “was, in fact, no woman at all but a member of some lower order.” Welter observed, however, that “[p]urity, considered as a moral imperative, set up a dilemma which was hard to resolve: marriage was, literally, an end to innocence.” The traits that characterized a true woman and a perfect wife thus were somewhat at odds.

Middle class Victorians overcame this dilemma by viewing wives and mothers to be “Angel[s] in the House” who stood as bulwarks against the morally staining influence of the public sphere and as inculcators of virtue and piety to the members of the household. Because accusations of sexual impropriety undercut the moral influence and pure image of the “Angel in the House,” they were usually critically damaging to the reputation of women.

Chapter Four of this dissertation showed that, in the late 1880’s, Reverend John Hines disapproved of Reverend R.R. McLennon’s propensity to let others conduct religious services in his Church while he observed the ceremonies from the Church pews or even “walk[ed] about his garden.” Hines, however, informed the Bishop of Saskatchewan, William Cyprian Pinkham, that McLennon’s “laziness” was not the only damaging influence at the Cumberland mission station; he also believed that McLennon’s wife was setting a very poor example for the local congregants. Hines regretfully noted that Mrs. McLennon had failed to present the chaste, respectful, and motherly
image that the CMS expected of the wives of its missionaries; rather, he commented that there was "much loose talk about" her. Although he "hope[d]" that "her crime consists [only] of a too little dignified self-control, such as becomes the wife of a native clergyman," Hines believed that her social standing, her position within the community, and the mission itself already had been damaged. "[O]n this account," Hines observed, "some of the young men have been tempted to act imprudently towards her."91 The birth of a child by her husband shortly after the accusations surfaced, and the uncertain nature of the accusations themselves, permitted Mrs. McLennon to overcome the damage to her reputation;92 the wives of other CMS agents were not so fortunate.

In 1898, Bishop William Day Reeve of the Diocese of McKenzie River informed the Secretary of the CMS that during the period that Archdeacon Robert McDonald was away in England on Society business, his wife Julia had fallen to temptation and in doing so had not only brought "bitter grief" to her husband but also gave "occasion . . . to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme." Reeve wrote:

I have always dreaded the incoming of a mining population on account of the effect it would have on the morals of our people but I did not think it would touch us so closely. A party of gold seekers wintered at Fort McPherson one of whom was a doctor who attended upon Mrs. McDonald in his medical capacity, and took advantage of her in a moment of weakness to seduce her from virtue.93
Reeve then lamented that Julia McDonald’s ability to project the image desired of the wife of a CMS clergyman was ruined because “the sad fact is known to all the people at that post, and, I fear, to many others besides.”

Reeve blamed Julia McDonald’s “weakness” and “lack of reticence” less on the loneliness that she felt from her being separated from her husband than on the fact that “she is an Indian.” He observed that Mrs. McDonald was left without a moral and paternal male Christian figure to watch over her and ensure that she did not give in to the base feelings and revert to the looser moral standards that many Europeans associated with persons of Aboriginal descent. Reeve suggested to his superiors that had Reverend Charles Whittaker not been “away at Herschel Island at the time . . . it might not have happened.” Once events had unfolded, however, Reeve regretted that he could do little except to ensure that Whittaker “and his bride” lived “in the same house with Mrs. McD. . . . [to] keep a strict watch upon her.”

Julia McDonald was far from the only person who was connected to the CMS who was accused of sexual impropriety. Several male agents, both Native and European born, left the Society’s service because of alleged sexual misconduct; others were able to overcome similar charges raised against them. Because Victorian middle-class culture placed great importance on the ability of the wives of Christian missionaries to convey images of morality and purity and serve as role models for converts and potential proselytes, however, charges of this sort were particularly damaging to women.
Moreover, many Native women were even further culturally removed from European-born women than were Canadian-born women who were of full European ancestry. While mission stations could provide basic academic education, religious instruction, and cultural inculcation, Chapter Five of this dissertation showed that the subsequent and more comprehensive educational opportunities for girls and women in the Canadian North-West were sparse and expensive. Europeans who viewed and judged the Native wives of CMS agents according to middle-class Victorian standards and expectations therefore often disparaged their actions and attitudes.

Victorian English, for instance, believed that true women should be "passive," submissive, and subordinate to their husbands. Consequently, many European missionaries were quick to criticize Native wives of CMS agents who appeared to be unbecomingly willful and outspoken. In the eyes of many of these individuals, for example, Sally Settee, the wife of Reverend James Settee, was far from the image of the perfect missionary wife. From the perspectives of Victorian English missionaries, Mrs. Settee admirably performed many of the duties that they expected of the wives of CMS agents: she cared for sick congregants, taught school, led mothers meetings, prepared food, and mended clothes. She did not, however, meet their expectations regarding acceptable submissiveness, moral standards, and social status.

Chapter Four showed that Mrs. Settee and her husband did not share all of the beliefs of their European counterparts regarding the acceptability of
specific behaviours and that because of this, European missionaries and their spouses claimed that the Settees lacked “moral sense” and “moral courage.” In reality, however, the Settees were more liberal than the Hunts because their perspectives were shaped not only by their experiences with the CMS and Euro-Christianity, but also by their exposure to Aboriginal cultures.

Furthermore, because of her strong personality and dominant nature, her familiarity with Aboriginal languages and life-worlds, and her position as the wife of a paid agent of the CMS, Sally Settee occupied a position of great influence among many of the local Aboriginal populations. Congregants and potential proselytes therefore sometimes followed her lead rather than that of European missionaries. On 31 December 1850, for instance, Reverend Robert Hunt blamed Mrs. Settee for derailing a “Missionary Meeting” that he had called “to endeavour to stir up our people to pray for the success of other Missions, and to feel more thankful that the Gospel had been sent to themselves.” Hunt noted that Mrs. Settee frustrated his designs “by not conceal[ing] at all her displeasure that the Indians should be thought fit objects to be introduced to Missionary subjects;” he lamented that as a result of her actions, “[w]e had but little encouragement at the meeting.”

Less than year later, Sally Setee’s actions again frustrated Reverend Hunt. Hunt purchased a “young bull” that was being held at an HBC “Fort” and sent Settee to retrieve the animal. Hunt recorded that the Catechist failed to complete his assigned task, however, because although he entered the Fort and spent the night there, Mrs. Settee’s “ill-feeling” towards the wife of the
HBC post-master was so great that the pair refused to enter the house. Consequently, the Settees made no effort to retrieve the bull and Hunt was forced to make alternate arrangements.\(^\text{106}\)

The cumulative effect of Mrs. Settee's outspoken nature, and of her tendency to "den[y]" the "authority"\(^\text{107}\) of European missionaries when she believed them to be wrong, was that by the 1860's and 1870's many Europeans considered her not only to be "quarrelsome" and "worthless," but also an actual detriment to the Society's work. The Bishop of Rupert's Land lamented that Mrs. Settee and her "worthless family neutralize greatly the old man's efforts wherever he is."\(^\text{108}\) Similarly, Reverend Cowley observed that "Mrs. Settee's temper & bearing" presented an "insuperable difficulty" to her husband's efforts to disseminate Christianity, and therefore "[h]e needs to be where these can in some way be nullified."\(^\text{109}\)

It was Reverend W. Stagg, however, who most succinctly summarized the reason that many European missionaries expressed consternation with the attitudes and actions of Sally Settee. Stagg informed the CMS that because Settee's "wife is not in subjection," she was "a great hindrance to him and his work."\(^\text{110}\) Reflecting on Sally Settee, Stagg recommended that "it is necessary [that] all Missionaries should be well married, especially our ordained natives."\(^\text{111}\)

Thus, while the CMS believed that God had created all persons equally and that differences between peoples were the result of environmental differences and cultural diversity, prejudices that were rooted in racial assumptions continued to govern the attitudes of English-born persons
toward their Native-born counterparts, both male and female. The CMS believed that the wives and daughters of its agents could facilitate its work in the Canadian North-West. The Society also recognized, however, that socio-cultural experiences would shape their abilities of missionary wives to perform the duties expected of them and observed that English-born women initially did not possess the same knowledge of Aboriginal life-worlds and languages as many of their Native-born counterparts. Moreover, the Society and those who were connected to it perceived English-born women to be more delicate and less well-suited to the physical, emotional, and psychological hardships of mission work in the Canadian North-West.

Despite believing that the Native wives of its agents possessed hardier physical constitutions than their European counterparts, and that many possessed ties of kinship, culture, and language that could be exploited to facilitate the Society’s work, the CMS and many of its agents doubted the ability of these women to overcome what they believed were racially inherent weaknesses. Furthermore, Victorian Othering techniques led European missionaries to question the degree to which the Native wives of CMS agents could embody the personal characteristics that they expected of true women and perfect wives. They viewed instances of infidelity and outspokenness not as personal moral failings and cultural differences, but rather as proof of the inability of most women who were of Aboriginal descent to embrace and project the core essential values and ideals believed necessary of middle-class missionary wives.
CONCLUSION

Historical writing about missions began to consider the motives, values, and actions of both European missionaries and potential proselytes only after the social, political, and academic turmoil of the 1960's and 1970's. Despite recent works on specific individuals by Winona Stevenson, John S. Long, Katherine Pettipas, and Frank A. Peake, however, there has been no significant and comprehensive study of Native proselytizers of Christianity who were active in the nineteenth century Canadian North-West. This dissertation has partially addressed the paucity in Canadian historical literature and reflects a recent trend amongst Canadian and other scholars to write less to celebrate missions, mission work, and missionary personnel than to examine the relationships that existed between missionaries, proselytes, and potential proselytes.

This work contributes to the breaking down of the previously dominant monolithic discourse of mission language and mission histories. It has examined the roles and relationships of Native proselytizers of Christianity in one specific mission project, that of the Church Missionary Society's mission field in the Canadian North-West. It has demonstrated that the CMS's goals and policies for the region differed from those that it held for other mission fields, and it has established that the actions and motives of CMS Native agents and their wives were not necessarily the same as those of their European-born counterparts. Furthermore, it showed that Aboriginal Christian congregants and potential
proselytes reacted to, and interacted with, CMS Native agents differently and according to contemporary local influences.

While the CMS attempted to raise self-supporting, self-governing, and self-extending Native Churches in many of its mission fields, as early as the 1850's the Society and its European born and trained agents acknowledged that this goal was ill-suited to the distinct cultural, economic, demographic, and political circumstances of the Canadian North-West. Nevertheless, the CMS did intend to raise a body of Native proselytizers in the Canadian mission field who would be the cornerstones of its efforts to disseminate Christianity in the region. It believed that many Native agents and their wives possessed knowledge of Aboriginal languages, cultures, and life-worlds that was superior to most European-born persons' and that could assist them in their evangelizing efforts. It also believed that persons of Aboriginal ancestry were better suited than their European counterparts to the physical, emotional, and psychological demands of the Canadian North-West.

The Church Missionary Society further maintained that the Native agents that it trained and employed accepted the evangelical Anglican interpretation of Christianity and that they were motivated by the same callings as their European counterparts. Consequently, in its literature the Society generally portrayed the interactions between its Native and European agents as being harmonious, supportive and equal.

This study has shown, however, that Native agents and their wives often differed in values, motives, and perspectives from their European-born
counterparts and amongst themselves. Furthermore, it explained how perceptions about race, ethnicity, status, and gender shaped the way these individuals viewed themselves and their roles, and how they viewed, and were viewed by, their missionary counterparts and their religious charges.

Superficially, the experiences of the CMS’s Native agents and their wives were quite similar to those of European-born missionaries and their wives. Regardless of their race, women facilitated the Society’s work in the Canadian North-West in several ways: they made the home life of paid agents more comfortable, they performed manual tasks around the mission station, they served as role models to other women, and they actively inculcated Euro-Christian values, norms, knowledge, and culture. Spiritual and temporal motivations led both Native and European proselytizers to join the Society, and they agreed that for the CMS to succeed, it had to abandon its ethnically-based two tiered policies. Furthermore, the heterogeneous linguistic and cultural make-up of the various Aboriginal peoples often caused Native agents and their wives to be just as disadvantaged as Europeans when it came to proselytizing to, or otherwise interacting with, local populations.

A careful re-examination of the experiences of Native and European agents in fact reveals that the values, motivations, actions, and attitudes of Native persons connected to the CMS often differed from other Native agents and from their European-born counterparts. The Society’s decision to provide its agents and their wives with different standards of secular and religious training than according to their race created and perpetuated the belief that
persons of Aboriginal ancestry were naturally less able to perform duties required of a Christian missionary or missionary wife and that they were of a lower status than their European counterparts. Throughout the nineteenth century, many European missionaries therefore remained reluctant to serve in subordinate capacities to Native agents and continued to doubt the ability of their Native wives to overcome what they believed were racially inherent weaknesses.

The CMS, its European and Native missionaries, and their wives recognized that the decision to treat persons connected to the Society by employment or marriage differently according to their race undermined mission work in the Canadian North-West. Organizational inertia and financial limitations, however, frustrated efforts to reconcile the divergence that existed between the CMS’s policies as they were enacted in Canada and its philosophical theories regarding the region. Consequently, throughout the nineteenth century, the Church Missionary Society’s own policies promoted visible and detrimental distinctions in status, wages, performance expectations, and responsibilities between Native and European persons in its employ that effectively limited the roles and truncated the careers of Native agents.
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CHAPTER ONE
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year:</th>
<th>Euro-Catholic Missionaries</th>
<th>Native Priests</th>
<th>Native Priests as Percentage of Total.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>1 155</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americas</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
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