

PROTESTANT AGRICULTURAL ZIONS FOR THE WESTERN INDIAN

By Fritz Pannekoek

Three evangelical Protestant denominations, the Anglicans, Methodists and Presbyterians established missions in the Canadian West from 1820 to 1870.¹ Their success was marginal, with no missionary achieving the ultimate goal of self-sufficient and predominantly agricultural communities. Their existence was never more than fragile. Agriculture was retarded, only in a few cases spontaneous, and always ancillary to hunting and "tripping".²

The missionaries were themselves responsible for many of the shortcomings of the agricultural missions. The Anglicans were unable to change their idyllic conception of agriculture to suit the harsh environment of the West. The Methodists were reluctant to impose civilization, and therefore agriculture until Christianity was firmly established. The Presbyterians were divided, the missionary adhering to the Anglican and the mission board to the Methodist view. Most important however, all denominations believed the Indian inferior and incapable of existence without the missionary's protection and leadership.

The missionary saw this inferiority as the cause of the repeated failure of agricultural experiment. Success, it was felt, could be achieved if the Indian were taught diligence, and if bountiful aid were extended. Until a complete conversion were made, the hunt, fisheries, and trip would be tolerated. Unfortunately given the harsh climate, the geography of the Canadian Shield and the absence of a substantial market, agriculture could not function as a sound base for the mission economy. The constant exhortation to pursue agriculture, the continued failure and the missionary's equally continuous assistance combined with the decline in wildlife after 1860 to bind the Indian to the missionary. After 1870, with the failure of the principal means of support, i.e. the hunt, the fisheries and especially the trip, and renewed increase in population, the idea of independent agricultural missions was completely abandoned. Instead the reserve system was adopted. The agricultural missions failed to sustain what fragile prosperity they experienced from 1840 to 1860. They became the pockets of poverty that dot the Shield today.

Although the first Anglican clergyman was in Rupert's Land as early as 1820, agriculture was not enthusiastically entered into until the Rev. William Cockran, the most diligent of the Church Missionary Society's clergymen, proposed the St. Peter's Indian Settlement in 1829. His views on agriculture dominated all future plans for Anglican settlement, and influenced both the Methodists and Presbyterians.

Initially agriculture was to play only a minor role in the evangelization of Rupert's Land. Benjamin Harrison, the Evangelical on the London Committee of the Hudson's Bay Company, the Rev. John West, the first Anglican clergyman in the West, and George Simpson, the all powerful governor of Rupert's Land, envisaged nothing as elaborate as a network of agricultural settlements. A school was to be established at Red River for the education of the Indian children. Agriculture's only function would be to recover the Indian youths from their "savage habits and customs," and to reduce the expense to the Church Missionary Society of keeping the children. After the completion of their education, they were to be returned to their relatives in the interior where, it was hoped, they would spread the Christian gospel.³

This early scheme never came to maturity and was completely abandoned in the late 1820's by both the Hudson's Bay Company and the Society. West's successor, the Rev. David Jones, was convinced that sending the Indian boys into the wilderness to propagate the gospel would result in failure. Their Christianity was too fragile. At the same time he was at a loss as to their future. He feared that the habits and disposition of the Indian would "burst over the feeble barrier of the School-boy's restraint."⁴

His solution, in addition to agriculture, involved instruction in trades such as rough carpentry and weaving. At most however, his ideas were very incomplete and his plans for the boys' future never more than a conviction that they would be absorbed into the Red River community, or eventually even be sent into the interior. Jones balked at any suggestion of an agricultural Indian mission which would absorb those boys too old for the school. He feared that such interference with the natives "would bring on an unpleasant collision" with the Company.⁵

The Rev. William Cockran had no such fear and almost immediately upon his arrival commenced a vigorous campaign for an agricultural mission. He condemned the former neglect of the Indian, especially the adult, by Jones and West. Cockran discarded the idea of itineracy, the idea that the Methodists and Presbyterians were to seize, and which indeed the Company would have preferred. He thought it impossible to benefit the native while they continued to hunt. To preach effectively to the continually wandering Indian would require a missionary for almost every family. Equally ludicrous, Cockran was certain, would be a missionary at every fur post. The Indians were seldom at the posts, they only came when they were in want of food or trade goods. Furthermore Cockran reasoned that the Chief Factors did not want the Indians about the posts. They constituted a substantial drain on the often scanty stock of provisions. No method, Cockran was convinced, would be effective save "civiliza-

tion." Indians *must* be gathered into self-sustaining Christian villages of five to six hundred, totally dependent on agriculture. Hunting and tripping must be abolished.⁶

The principal value of agriculture to Cockran was its ability to inculcate habits of industry and economy. Barbarism was the very cause of indolence which in turn led to poverty, want and debt. Cockran, and indeed all missionaries irrespective of denomination, glorified work as the "greatest friend Piety has on earth." Not work in the ordinary sense, or for its own sake, but Work for the Glory of God. Work established worldly comfort, but more important it freed man from his struggle for survival and allowed him to contemplate the nature of his existence and his God. Idleness was the first step on the path to hell, a path Cockran was certain the Indian was well down. He was firm in the belief that if the Indians became agriculturalists, they would become "rational beings." They would acquire "steady habits," and raise "respectable families." If they became hunters they would be "forever lost." Cockran's son-in-law, a missionary of lesser note, roundly denounced the hunt, certain that

the character and habits of the hunter [are] diametrically opposed to the right development of Gospel principle and practice. His habits are inseparable from prodigality, idleness and his never failing condition . . . that of beggary and extreme want.⁸

There was equal opposition to tripping. Those Indians engaged in transporting supplies from York to Red River were in Cockran's opinion "the most base, unprincipled, immoral people that inhabit this continent."⁹

Cockran's blueprint for the Indian Settlement envisioned a blissful, idyllic and pastoral existence. The Indians would

procure their livelihood in an honourable honest manner within the sound of the Gospel and the House of God, where their souls shall be fed with the bread of life, and where they shall be reminded of their duty to God, their neighbour and their own soul.¹⁰

Since the Indian, deep in poverty and ignorance, would be unable to procure even the barest essentials to commence farming, Cockran reasoned that the missionary, at least in the initial stages, would have to supply all. He intended to distribute not only the tools and seeds, but even to provide a man and two oxen to till a sufficient quantity of soil for the first crop. A modest house and root cellar and a fishing net were also to be supplied. Later when enough settlers had established themselves, a grist mill would be built. Clothing was essential. To Cockran

another article of economy and convenience [was] a bed. A man spends a fourth or one third of his time in this position. If a person throws himself down at night, on the ground or on a floor in the same apparel, which he wears in the day, it will not last more than half the time it would do if used in a proper manner. If the Capot is used for the day and the blanket for the night in their right order, both articles will last longer than if used promiscuously.¹¹

At the center of every village would be the mission farm and school. As well as providing the example of and opportunity for industry the farm was to supply the school and the settlers. After three years Cockran thought, rather optimistically, the Indians would no longer look to the mission farm for support. They would be self-sufficient. Rather than having the mission farm continue to provide seed and charity, a public granary under the supervision of the Indian Chief, the missionary and the miller was to be established. Every farmer would be forced to deposit a quantity of grain sufficient for next year's seed and to ward off famine. No Indian would be allowed to join the settlement who did not intend to farm or send his children to the mission school to be educated.

West's Indian school, which had continued to emphasize book learning, was to be converted into an Industrial School. The boys would be taught husbandry, carpentry and weaving; the girls, spinning, knitting, sewing, and milking. Cockran was particularly concerned about the Indian woman.

they must be made to bear a part of the burden of life, for the increase of their virtue and the safety of their souls. They are dreadfully given to gossiping, whoring, and lying: industry alone can recover them from their evil ways, and establish their minds in virtue.¹²

The entire scheme was to cost the Society not more than twelve to fifteen pounds for every Indian settled.

Cockran's plan for the Indian Settlement, and probably even more the settlement itself, became the model for agricultural missions throughout Rupert's Land. At the missions south of Saskatchewan such as Nepowewin, Partridge Crop, Westbourne, Fort Pelly, Fort Ellice, Scantebury, Portage La Prairie, and Landsdowne the model was pursued with the greatest vigour and conviction. Allowances must be made for individualism. Charles Pratt, the native catechist at Fort Pelly, and his wife would rather trap, trade and hunt buffalo than grub potatoes.¹³

The further north the mission the graver the doubts about the practicability of agriculture. The missionaries at Devon, English River, and Lac La Ronge seriously doubted the capability of the soil

and climate to provide sufficient for either white or red man. The missionary at Devon was one of the few who realized the impact of the new way of life. He noticed with alarm that while the Indian children were learning to read they were losing "the opportunity of becoming sufficiently dexterous at hunting" to be able to depend upon it for support.¹⁴ It was also realized that any gathering of Indians for a prolonged period would soon exhaust the wild life. Yet all were adamant that continued access to the Indian's mind, and civilization, were essential for any firm conversion to Christianity. The missionaries of the Canadian Shield admitted, though most reluctantly for they were in agreement with Cockran's condemnation of the hunt, that the hunt and tripping were necessary to subsidize the efforts of the plough. Fishing was however regarded with much greater favor for it at least allowed the Indian to remain in one location. The Lac La Ronge missionary even proposed to increase fish production by "depositing the ova of white fish and sturgeon" into the lake.¹⁵ The ultimate goal was however as idyllic as Cockran's — civilized and Christian villages dependent on the plough, the net and if necessary the hunt, and like Cockran they never stinted the assistance needed to achieve this goal.

Only one missionary, John Smithurst, showed a spirited opposition to Cockran's scheme. For the most part his twelve years in Rupert's Land (1839-1851) were spent at St. Peter's, Red River. Smithurst was most definite in support of the hunt, and thought it quite reasonable that it play an equal part with the farm. He would much rather that they were away hunting than employed among the European and Half Breed Settlers, where they would be exposed to the temptations of beer [and] rum.¹⁶

Smithurst, overlooking the role of the Indian woman in the hunt, reasoned that with the women and children taking care of the farms the hunters would be at an advantage.

Their movements are not retarded by a train of women and children and they are moreover not compelled to turn back upon every little failure as is the case with those who have nothing to depend upon for food but the animals that are caught. If the hunt be unsuccessful for a few days, starvation drives the heathen Indians to some fishing place; not however with the Christian Indians who have generally with them flour sufficient for a fortnights provision and need not of animals caught in hunting.¹⁷

Smithurst's second criticism was even harsher, and if followed would have spelled a complete reversal of Anglican policy from settlement to itineracy. Cockran was condemned for concerning himself

too much with the temporal wants of his people as if civilization was a primary and evangelization a secondary object.¹⁸

Smithurst viewed the objects in reverse. He felt that most of the difficulties at the Indian Settlement arose from the natives not "realizing all the dreams held out to them as to the advantages of civilization." Smithurst advocated a minimum of assistance. He even went as far as to suggest that the Indian should not alter his "mode of life." The Indian's temporal affairs were his own concern.¹⁹

Smithurst was however unprepared to do little more than indicate his dissatisfaction with Cockran to the Secretaries. In fact there was little deviation from Cockran's blueprint. Smithurst, except for approval of the hunt, believed civilization and Christianity inseparable, and was as industrious as any other in assisting the Indian to settle, providing cows, grain and agricultural tools. In contrast to Cockran, he was also firm in the belief that the Indian must work for all assistance except in cases of "old age or sickness." Smithurst's outburst was due to the refusal of the St. Peter's Red River Indians to fence their graveyard in 1845, while the Methodist Indians at Norway House had done so willingly. He reasoned that the cause must be Cockran's unrestricted charity.²⁰

The Church Missionary Society Committee in London reinforced the plans for agricultural settlement. During the first part of the nineteenth century, the Society's policy was one of "individualism" and "paternalism." The missionary's primary duty was to bring the native into the "external Church," to gather individual souls for which he would be both "father and mother." This is quite evident in Cockran's relations with the Indian boys at West's school.

They are perfectly satisfied with us. They look up to us for the supply of all their wants, and consider us as their adopted parents, and every boy seems willing to reside with us.²¹

By 1841 the Society had decided against "paternalism," primarily because it was financially impracticable. It was not however completely abandoned until 1851 when Henry Venn, Secretary of the Society from 1841 to 1872, enunciated a policy that was to prevail for the rest of the nineteenth century. His "Minute upon the Employment and Ordination of Native Teachers" regarded the ultimate object of a mission

to be the settlement of a Native Church under Native Pastors upon a self-supporting system, it would be born 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 into their hands, and gradually 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."²²

The ultimate goal was "self support, self government and self extension." That this should be the ultimate goal the missionaries all agreed, but not all whether it was possible.

Theoretically this goal combined with Cockran's agricultural missions should have provided a base from which at least some Indians could have achieved an independent existence and readied themselves for the inevitable white immigration that would follow the surrender of Rupert's Land to Canada. Some could have escaped the reservation.

The goal was never realized. The missionaries were never convinced of the Indian's ability to govern himself; there was a prevailing belief in his inferiority. Though most saw the principal causes of the Indian's short comings as barbarism, paganism, and the accompanying indolence and poverty, few believed the Indian more than a combination of immoral, capricious, intractable, indolent, callous, prideful, wayward, extravagant, ungracious, improvident, and careless. Cockran makes it quite clear that "the Dominant Race of this Continent are the English," the inferior the "aborigines," and that the latter could never be more than such.²³

In whatever light you contemplate the Indian on earth, you behold him destined to suffer a large amount of misery. In his heathen erratick state, he is ignorant, brutish, vicious and miserable; with a gloomy future of everlasting separation from God, the source of all good before him. In a Christian and civilized state, though his condition is ameliorated, he still continues poor, sickly, and miserable. It is only when you view him as heir of immortality, that you are cheered, with his prospects under the gospel.²⁴ Even the Indian and half breed missionaries and catechists thought their brothers "truly heathen and truly barbarous."²⁵

The Indian was regarded as extremely susceptible to the evils of European society.

The Indians appear to lose their ancient hardihood . . . by contact with Europeans. They acquire European diseases of a very fatal character . . . habits of smoking and alas . . . the savage too often becomes effeminate and degraded and soon falls prey to . . . the deadly curse the firewater or rum.²⁶

The Indian it was felt must be kept away from the degenerate half breed and corrupt European.

These beliefs in the Indian's inferiority and susceptibility to vice contained the germ of the idea for the reservation system and also increased the Indian's dependence on the missionary. The very idea of a native settlement contained in Venn's "Minute" implied a reserve. Certainly Cockran had no doubts that St. Peter's parish, the Indian Settlement, was a reserve and referred to it as such. The Rev. Abraham Cowley, in charge of the Settlement in 1862, was of the same opinion. When pressure was placed on the St. Peter's Indians at Red River to sell some of their land to allow expansion of the overpopulated St. Andrew's, a half-breed parish, Cowley pleaded that the government be so paternal as to respect the reserve and that the Indians be regarded as minors and therefore unable to negotiate the sale of their farms.²⁷ The interior missions however were never referred to as reserves nor specifically set aside as at Red River. But then there was no need, since the Indians were for the most part the only beings permitted, willing, and available, to settle elsewhere than Red River, at least until the mixed bloods migrated to the interior in the 1860's.

The belief in the Indian's inferiority also bound the Indian to a continued state of dependence. Instead of realizing the limitations that the environment imposed on agriculture, too often the missionary blamed all failure on the Indian's barbaric and heathen condition. The result was a constant exhortation to greater diligence to attain the elusive goal. Since the environment dictated continued failure, so it dictated continued charity.

The Methodists and Presbyterians were even less successful in their attempts to establish agricultural settlements, not because they opposed them, but rather because of their peculiar view of the relationship of Christianity and civilization. Their position was clearly stated in the *Christian Guardian* in an article by a prominent Methodist clergyman.

No sooner does the Gospel begin to operate upon the mind of the Heathen than it leads to the first step in civilization. It is shortly seen to be indecorous and improper for persons to meet together in a state of filthiness and comparative nudity in the public worship of Almighty God. The people themselves are soon made to feel, under the teaching of the Missionaries, that a more decent exterior is necessary; and thus the first step is taken in civilization and clothing is introduced. As the next step the Gospel induces a settled course of life, and tends to promote industry.²⁸

This conviction that Christianity must come before civilization placed a heavy emphasis on itineracy rather than settlement as the principal technique for evangelization in the initial contact with the

Indian. As Christianity took effect it would be supplemented and eventually superseded by settlement.²⁹

Itineracy was never as popular in the Norway House as in the Fort Edmonton area. Except for the Methodist superintendent's travels to points as distant as Dunvegan and Lesser Slave Lake, all attention was devoted to the development of the Rossville station. Several reasons can be offered for this discrepancy. First, the Plains Cree, with the relatively independent and satisfactory life the buffalo permitted, were unwilling to settle. Conversely, the Saulteaux and Swampy Cree of the Lake Winnipeg region were in such wretched and pitiable condition that little persuasion to settle was necessary. Second, the missionaries found it impossible to itinerate as well as superintend a mission. There had been an Indian settlement at Norway House since 1828 and this demanded so much of the missionaries' time that "the circuit had to be abandoned."³⁰ Indeed it was only with assistance that James Evans, superintendent at Norway House from 1840 to 1846, had been able to hunt souls further in the interior. Later missionaries stationed at Jackson's Bay or Rossville, never undertook any duty other than that of resident missionary.

Only the Presbyterians had a serious and effective plan for a joint itinerant and agricultural mission, and it was the result of an uncertain compromise between Rev. James Nisbet and the Foreign Mission Committee of the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Canada, rather than of thoughtful planning. Initially the Committee did not even feel a mission was warranted. When Nisbet finally persuaded them of its importance, they demanded an itinerant one, convinced as they were that Christianity must precede civilization, and that the cost of an agricultural settlement, estimated at twenty-five hundred dollars, was excessive, since neither the Committee nor Nisbet were willing to abdicate their position, the result was an excessively costly and well staffed mission at Prince Albert, with a "circuit" extending to Fort Carlton.³¹

Though all missionaries contemplated the establishment of settlements only general plans were outlined. It can be assumed with certainty that all would agree with Evans that the first function of any settlement would be

to afford the missionary greater facilities in instructing the rising generation . . . Education is well nigh out of the question where the natives retain all their wandering habits.³²

It was also believed that settlement would allow the resident teacher to acquire the "language" and "acquaint himself with the peculiar manners, existing vices and reigning superstitions."³³ Equally important, settlement would provide the missionary with a home for his family, a provision base from which to dispense charity, and a centre for his ministry. The further advanced the process of Christianization

and settlement the more complex the schemes became. James Evans envisages a manual training school at Rossville along the lines of Cockran's Industrial School, and Thomas Hurlburt, Superintendent of Methodist Missions (1854-1857), a training center for native agents.

Agriculture played a lesser role in Methodist and Presbyterian proposals for mission settlement than in Anglican proposals especially in the 1840's, though it became progressively more important in the 1860's. The Methodists at Rossville and Jackson's Bay believed it

not possible to enter upon any systematic course of training with them [the Indians] as their climate . . . is too severe for them to depend much on the cultivation of the soil.³⁴

It was concluded therefore that the Indian must depend almost entirely on hunting and fishing for subsistence.

There was never any attempt to discourage the hunt; indeed every encouragement was given "to such extent as the country may allow." The prevailing philosophy was that

if this [the hunt] is their [the Indian's] occupation the power of the Gospel cannot be otherwise than beneficial by making them more industrious and more intent on the discharge of their debts and more conscientious in not contracting them without a probability of paying.³⁵

Tripping and fishing were equally to be tolerated, though eventually the Indian was to be persuaded to engage in agriculture. It was still seen by all as a higher occupation, "one of the first lessons of Christianity," for it more than any other activity, and like Christianity itself, encouraged industry, settlement and a greater number of the virtues considered indispensable to civilization.³⁶

Tolerance for the hunt continued, but by 1860 the need for agriculture was seen as most urgent, especially by the Methodists. The Rossville fishery and the buffalo near Victoria and Prince Albert were failing. Missionaries such as the Methodist George McDougall realized that

the day has arrived when the work must assume a different form [from the previous itineracy]; it must be consolidated, Churches must be erected and Schools established, and the hunter taught to till the soil. This is his [the Indian's] only hope. His present resources will soon be exhausted.³⁷

Even so no definite Methodist plan for encouraging agriculture emerged and at best only a vague pattern can be determined. The first step was always the construction of a mission station, ice house, dairy store house and garden. Indians were encouraged to cultivate plots, and seeds and tools were provided, but there is no indication that assistance was anywhere as systematic or bountiful as that received

by their Anglican counterparts. It was rendered when required and asked, but agriculture was never forced at the expense of the hunt.

Like the Anglicans both denominations thought the Indian a lower being, mentally inferior and incapable of survival without the generosity of the missionary or the government. The Indian must be protected from the almost certain influx of settlers with their vices and recklessness, for if they were not "trials and dangers — such as we have not seen may be our lot."³⁸ The end result could only be the one Nisbet proposed. He advocated that

proper reserves be made for them, strong measures taken to prevent the bringing of strong drink among them, and assistance given by the Government to such Indians as wish to settle on land — at least for the first few years.³⁹

The Methodist-Presbyterian plans for agricultural missions were a failure. The policy of itineracy especially on the prairies delayed the transition from a nomadic to a sedentary life. Even where settlement was effective or at least persistently pursued as at Rossville and Prince Albert the means of survival hinged almost entirely on the trip and hunt rather than on agriculture. As the fur trade inevitably retreated northward, the mission economy collapsed. The Methodist and Presbyterian success was limited to the fur trade era of the nineteenth century.

While no missionary's over-sanguine expectations were realized, the result was nevertheless profound — communities of as many as five hundred that were an amalgam of civilization and barbarism — a balance between sedentary agriculture and fishing, and the nomadic hunt and trip. The forces of barbarism and civilization were always in precarious balance. No single economic activity could adequately support the mission. Yet the missionary, irrespective of denomination, continued to press for a sedentary agricultural existence. The Indian's inability to conform to the missionary's precise wishes reinforced racial arrogance. The end result was continued charity, paternalism, and the reserve.⁴⁰

FOOTNOTES

Profesor L. G. Thomas of the University of Alberta prompted this paper but bears no responsibility for its contents.

1. The West refers to the three prairie provinces.
2. "Tripping" is the Rupert's Land vernacular for boat labour with the Hudson's Bay Company.
3. H.B.C.A., A.6/40, fo. 63, Harrison to West, Feb. 26, 1822; 4.4/88, fo. 82, Simpson to Committee, Aug. 4, 1825; A.6/40, fo. 167-169, Harrison to Jones, March 12, 1824. Archives consulted by permission of the Hudson's Bay Company.
4. C.M.S.A., M.1, Jones to the Secretary, July 1, 1827.

PROTESTANT AGRICULTURAL ZIONS FOR THE WESTERN INDIAN

5. *Ibid.*, M.1, Jones, Journal, May 2, 1825; M.1, Jones to D. Coates, July 20, 1824; M.1, Jones to the Secretary, Feb. 10, 1829.
6. *Ibid.*, M.1, Cockran to the Secretary, Aug. 11, 1828, Aug. 7, 1829.
7. *Ibid.*, M.1, Cockran to Rev. E. Bickersteth, Aug. 3, 1829; Cockran, Journal, Dec. 5, 1832 Cockran to Secretary, July 25, 1833.
8. *Ibid.*, M.6, Henry George to the Secretary, Jan. 10, 1857, M.1, Cockran, Journal, May 24, May 26, 1827.
9. *Ibid.*, M.1, Cockran to the Secretary, July 25, 1823.
10. *Ibid.*, M.1, Cockran to the Secretary, Aug. 11, 1828.
11. *Ibid.*, M.6, Cockran to the Secretary, Aug. 5, 1861.
12. *Ibid.*, M.1, Cockran to the Secretary, July 30, 1833; M.1, Cockran to Bickersteth, Aug. 3, 1829.
13. *Ibid.*, O., Rev. Henry Budd to Major Straith, Aug. 1, 1859; M.3, Cowley, Journal, Feb. 13, 1843; M.5, Stagg to Venn, Jan. 29, 1855; M.6, George to Rev. J. Chapman, Feb. 5, 1860; M.5, Minutes of the Corresponding Committee, June 7, 1852.
14. *Ibid.*, O., Hunt, Journal, n.d. (approximately Nov. 1852).
15. *Ibid.*, O., Hunt, Journal, June 13, 1857.
16. *Ibid.*, M.1, Smithurst, Annual Report, Aug. 1, 1846.
17. *Ibid.*,
18. *Ibid.*, M.4, Smithurst, Journal, July 8, 1847.
19. *Ibid.*
20. *Ibid.*
21. *Ibid.*, M.1, Cockran to the Secretaries, July 30, 1827.
22. W. Knight, *The Missionary Secretariat of Henry Venn, B.D.* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1899), p. 307.
23. C.M.S.A., M.6, Cockran, Journal, Aug. 5, 1861.
24. *Ibid.*, M.4, Cockran to the Secretaries, Aug. 1, 1849.
25. *Ibid.*, M.5, Budd to the Secretary, Jan. 13, 1853.
26. *Ibid.*, M.7, Bompas to Anderson, Dec. 14, 1867.
27. *Ibid.*, O., Cowley, Annual Report, Jan. 31, 1862; *Nor'Wester*, Oct. 9, 1862.
28. Dr. Beecham, "Christianity and Civilization," *Christian Guardian*, Nov. 26, 1856.
29. John McDougall, *In the Days of the Red River Rebellion* (Toronto: William Briggs, 1903), p. 71.
30. H.B.C.A., D.4/92, fo. 46, Simpson to Committee, July 10, 1828.
31. P.A.M., Nisbet Correspondence, Nisbet to the Rev. Wm. McLaren, July 6, 1869; John Black to the Synod, April 7, 1864.
32. M.M.S.A., Box 14, Letter 258, Evans to Simpson, June 10, 1843.
33. H.B.C.A., D.5/8, fo. 370, Evans to Simpson, July 28, 1843.
34. "Missions at Norway House and Jackson's Bay," *Nor'Wester*, Sept. 28, 1860.
35. H.B.C.A., D.5/17, fo. 279, Evans to Simpson, May 22, 1846.
36. John McDougall, *Saddle, Sled and Snowshoe* (Toronto: William Briggs, 1896), p. 120.
37. "Extracts of three letters from the Rev. George McDougall, Chairman of the Hudson's Bay District, the first dated on the Plains, Aug. 28, 1862," *Christian Guardian*, March 11, 1863.
38. "From the Rev. John McDougall, dated Woodville Mission, Rocky Mountains, January, 1869," *Wesleyan Notices*, May 1869, p. 42.
39. "Letter from James Nisbet," *Presbyterian Record*, 1869, IX, p. 75.
40. For a full description of the settlements see Fritz Pannekoek "Protestant Agricultural Missions in the Canadian West to 1870" (Unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Alberta, 1870).