

"NO SLIPPERY UNDERTAKING" - THE PRESBYTERIAN UNION OF 1875

by

John A. Johnston

I

One of the notable facets of the year of grace, 1975, in which The United Church of Canada commemorates her fiftieth jubilee and The Presbyterian Church in Canada celebrates her centennial, is the increased interest in things historical and especially a concern for understanding the "rock from which we were hewn". One of the boulders of this foundation was the Union of 1875, inaugurating the largest single Protestant denomination in the Dominion of Canada.

Six hundred thousand Presbyterians, six hundred ministers, more than a thousand congregations from the Atlantic to the Pacific, composed the new denomination. Its assets were impressive -- Scottish caniness, a confidence in the presence of the Holy Spirit leading to this act of union, a missionary zeal, comparative easy position, involved laity, and future expectations. At least six British North America Presbyterian amalgamations had preceded the 1875 union. The union of 1817 between the (Burgher) Presbytery of Truro, the (Anti-Burgher) Presbytery of Pictou and some Church of Scotland (Kirk) ministers, established the Synod of Nova Scotia. In 1840, the United Synod of Upper Canada joined the corresponding Church of Scotland (Kirk) body with congregations in what is now Ontario and Quebec. The Presbyterian Church of Nova Scotia adhering to the Westminster Standards (Free) and the Presbyterian Church of Nova Scotia (largely Secession) united as the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of the Lower Provinces in 1860. A year later, to the west, The Canada Presbyterian Synod was formed, composing the former United Presbyterian Synod (Secession) and the Presbyterian Church of Canada (Free). In New Brunswick in 1866 the (Free) Presbyterian Church of that colony joined the Synod of the Lower Provinces under the latter name, while in 1868 the Atlantic synods related to the Church of Scotland formed the Synod of the Maritime Provinces in connection with the Church of Scotland (Kirk). In each of these unions, only denominations loyal to reformed

theology and Presbyterian church government were involved. All had similar Scottish and Scotch Irish backgrounds. Together they faced the common challenge of a developing nation, ecumenical and political pressures, and latterly a western perspective and a shrinking world.

The latter half of the nineteenth century has been characterized as the age of unions. Industry trembled under the tendency to takeover, commerce commended amalgamation. Politics argued for federation and union, whether given a trans-Atlantic point of view in the Italian or German states, or self-examination in North America. This trend was reflected among the churches of Christendom, and especially of Canada. The Canada Education and Home Missionary Society, established in 1827, sought to provide Presbyterian, Congregational and Baptist ministers for areas of British North America devoid of religious ordinances.¹ The French-Canadian Missionary Society was also emblematic of co-operative evangelical effort. Formed in 1839, this undenominational society sought the evangelization of French-speaking people in Canada.²

The advent of international Christian societies was also a mark of ecumenici in this period. Typical would be the Evangelical Alliance, founded in London, England in 1846 -- its motto, "In things necessary, unity; in things indifferent, liberty; in all, charity." Presbyterianism largely approved of the strong missionary emphasis and the membership tests based on the acceptance of the Bible's full authority, the Incarnation, Atonement, Salvation by Faith, and the Power of the Holy Spirit.³ In the Maritimes the Alliance gradually replaced local "Evangelical Associations" which had earlier been organized to oppose grants from the public treasury for denominational use, with particular reference to separate schools.⁴ The Young Men's Christian Association in North America was formed in Montreal in 1851, seven years after its beginning in England. By 1853, twenty-seven associations had been formed in Canada and the United States through which Christians sought "the salvation of young men through faith in Christ".

The Sunday School movement effectively drew together various segments of evangelical Christianity. In North America Sunday Schools were characterized by three things: (a) almost entirely a laymen's movement; (b) limited

to Sunday enterprise; (c) a movement in which laymen of various evangelical communions gathered for study, inspiration and policy-making, and then returned to the local Sunday School for practical application. Members of all the Presbyterian denominations supported the Canada Sunday School Convention or Union. By 1853 its agents travelled to all parts of British North America organizing and encouraging Sabbath Schools. During the 1860's Presbyterian congregations supported the Montreal Sabbath School Association.⁵ Quarterly meetings were lay-directed, with a strong executive which organized massed rallies, appointed representatives to various national and international conventions and prepared hymn books for use in the Sunday Schools. The Association appointed teachers and superintendents and opened new Sunday Schools in rented houses and other buildings, with grants received from individuals and congregations.⁶ Sunday Schools of both the Kirk and the Canada Presbyterian Church used identical Sunday School materials, published in Edinburgh.

References to Presbyterian unions in the Australian colonies were frequently used by the supporters of Union, showing how Kirk, Free and Secession bodies could consummate union with beneficial results. The terms of union in Victoria, for instance, were employed in Canadian discussions which resulted in the formation of the Canada Presbyterian Church in 1861.⁷ Presbyterian union movements in Great Britain were also closely studied, and every Scottish decision was carefully chronicled in the Canadian Presbyterian periodicals. Similarly, in the United States of America was the union of 1858 between Associate and Reformed Presbyterians and the 1869 union between Old and New School Presbyterians widely acclaimed throughout British North America. When the Reformed Church joined the Free Church of Scotland in 1875, it assisted Canadian congregations in union planning. Finally, the widespread support for the British and Foreign Bible Society in Canada emphasized an ecumenical approach to Christian witness. Although the B. & F.B.S. faced opposition from the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, Presbyterianism in its various branches provided wholehearted support, beginning with the appointment of the Rev. William Smart of Brockville as its first organizing agent for Upper Canada.⁸ By 1869, the Upper Canada Society alone reported 253 branches, travelling agents and

colporteurs. Laymen were not averse to speaking out in support of union and numerous meetings were held between laymen of the Montreal Presbyterian community. After 1864 these were often held in the home of J.C. Beckett. Men like John Redpath of sugar refinery and construction fame guided the discussion which resulted in "full and free interchange of sentiments".⁹ On March 14, 1866, elders from St. Andrew's Kirk, St. Paul's Kirk, Knox's, Cote St. and Cote des Neiges and Erskine were present. John Redpath occupied the chair and Mr. Beckett was appointed secretary. Resolutions concerning the advisability of union were unanimously adopted. They promised to bring the union question before their sessions and pledged their support to the cause, and results were to be forwarded to Mr. Beckett. Surprisingly, two-thirds of the congregations involved sent in returns. Nearly all commented on the unanimous desire for union within the congregations. The Montreal elders were jubilant. They then decided at their May meeting that each representative elder to the Synod meetings should be prepared to support union.

This lay direction was thwarted by the Fenian Raid. The Fenians, threatening the religious, political and social status quo, were immediately opposed and leading laymen rushed to arms. So much did the raids disturb the church that the Synods were almost devoid of representation by the Ruling Eldership. A motion in the Kirk Synod to commence union negotiations was quickly disposed of by unsympathetic ministers.¹⁰ Not a single layman from the eastern area was present in Synod to support the motion, although the Synod by statute is to be composed of fifty per cent non-ministerial membership. But the matter was not allowed to die. The Kirk Presbytery of Montreal re-affirmed the sympathy of the leaders of Montreal for the union movement. At the Kirk Synods of 1867, 1868 and 1869, the question of union was discussed, and The Presbyterian, operated by Kirk laymen in Montreal, did not hesitate to speak out on behalf of union. The secular press came out strongly and virtually unanimously in support of union. George Brown of the Globe ardently espoused the cause, greatly influencing many a Presbyterian household. "Whatever be the case with the clergy", he stated, "the Presbyterian people of Canada are anxious for such a union."¹¹ John Dougall of the Montreal Witness felt that Presbyterian churches with their identical Standards and Church Government were ripe for a beneficial union.

A most unique and influential effort by Montreal laymen to publicize union was done through the offering of a two hundred dollar prize to the individual presenting the most acceptable essay on church union. The winning paper was by the Rev. Robert Campbell, minister of St. Gabriel Street Kirk, Montreal. Reprints and digests of the paper were widely distributed. Advantages of church union were listed, two of which were unique to this particular paper. Mr. Campbell suggested that in union a greater independence of ministers and sessions would be forthcoming, in that a session would not be afraid to chastise an erring member, knowing that the person could not join another Presbyterian body to escape punishment. Also the author stated that union would attract better men into the ministry of the Church, for in a bigger organization are greater opportunities, and size appeals to the greatness in men. A Basis of Union was outlined by Mr. Campbell and, with rare vision, he suggested: the denomination be known as "The Presbyterian Church in Canada".

Ruling Eldership was less significant in the Kirk than in the Canada Presbyterian Church. In the Maritime churches, the lay element was all-important, in both Kirk and the Synod of the Lower Provinces. In the former body, not more than four ministers were listed by James Croil as actively involved in the union negotiations, and it was left to elders to bring the church into union.¹² In the same vein, many Pictou folk found union with political opponents unbearable. When congregations of the Pictou area voted against union, ministers, though often anxious to enter union, withdrew in order to minister to their flock as heretofore. In Manitoba, laymen joined wholeheartedly with ministers in supporting union. In British Columbia a different situation emerged. Scottish Kirk ministers, with stipends paid from the Church of Scotland, ministered to Scottish immigrants in several urban areas of the province and took little interest in Presbyterian union in Canada. Congregations were loosely organized and Canada Presbyterian ministers were few in number.¹³ The result was that the Kirk ministers did not choose to enter union, but all congregations as soon as possible affiliated with the Presbyterian Church in Canada after 1875.

In this age of unions, political confederation in Canada in 1867 demanded appropriate ecclesiastical response from the four Presbyterian denominations in the Dominion. The political union of 1867 was cited as a model for ecclesiastical union. Yet just as party rivalries before and after confederation threatened the unity of the new nation, so political considerations affected the Presbyterian union of 1875. Generally speaking, the adherents of the Canada Presbyterian Church and the Presbyterian Church of the Lower Provinces were more politically "Liberal" than the "Conservative" Kirk. In the 1861 union between Free and Secession bodies in the Canadas, political differences did not raise obstacles. Both tended toward reform sympathies and in questions such as Christ's Headship over the Nations, virtual forbearance was allowed.¹⁴ Letters and articles in the Free Church of Scotland's Record published in Edinburgh and in The Presbyterian recorded that politics prevented the Kirk from entering negotiations leading to this union. The latter periodical in 1862 recorded that, "The Church of Scotland, as a whole, is strongly Conservative, while the other Presbyterian bodies are, as a whole, strongly Liberal."¹⁵

Kirk ministers such as D.M. Gordon of Ottawa and Gavin Lang of Montreal were very active in Conservative circles. Douglas Brymner, later the Dominion's first archivist, used his pen in support of both Kirk and the Conservative Party against Liberal and Free Church policies. Hugh Allan of Montreal, active in the affairs of St. Andrew's Kirk, Montreal, and founder of the Allan Steamship Lines, was accused of collaboration with American interests in contributing large sums to the Conservative Party. An attack on Sir Hugh was an attack on Gavin Lang, his minister. With the 1873 "Pacific Scandal" and the 1874 election when John A. Macdonald was swept from office, in part through the opposition of Free and Secession voters and newspapers like the Toronto Globe, Montreal Witness, and Halifax Witness, all heartily supporting Church Union and the Free Church cause, battle lines were clearly drawn.

Many in the Kirk felt union with the Liberal-minded Canada Presbyterian Church would be intolerable. Gavin Lang told his Synod in 1874 that "there was not much political sympathy between them and the Church with which they proposed to unite".¹⁶ He felt that union could hold no political advantages for the Conservative party, and roused the ire of Liberal organs when he stated that democracy had no place in the church, and the Basis of Union should not be placed before the people themselves for their decision. Macdonnell of St. Andrew's Kirk, Toronto, demanded that politics should be kept out of the union negotiations, and felt his own congregation was evenly divided politically and hoped that the new denomination would never become an agent of any political party. Yet when a deputation from the Scottish Kirk had visited Canada, the statement of one of the deputies, Principal Tulloch, "Schemes of Union laid in political design, or secretly striving after party triumphs, can only come to grief, even should they temporarily succeed", was widely distributed by Conservative members of the Kirk.¹⁷

Canada's second Prime Minister was Alexander Mackenzie, born of Highland Presbyterian parents in Perthshire, Scotland. Although accepting the Baptist view of baptism as a young man, he continued more or less to support the Presbyterian doctrinal and organizational position. His biographer wrote that "his old associations and most of his personal friends being in the Presbyterian Church", and with his only child being married to a Presbyterian minister in Sarnia, he generally attended at least one service each Lord's Day in a Presbyterian church.¹⁸ By his background, as well as by predilection, he associated himself with the moral and social programme supported by the Canada Presbyterian Church. Swept out of office with John A. Macdonald were many influential Kirk supporters.

In the Maritimes, politics seriously affected union. The Kirk in Nova Scotia was often accused of being the tool of the Halifax oligarchy and allying itself with Anglican and Roman Catholic platforms. Almost without exception, members of the Secession supported liberal or reform

political parties in Nova Scotia.¹⁹ In the 1860 Union, politics proved one of the reasons excluding the Kirk from the negotiations. The fact that the politically Liberal-minded Presbyterian Witness, supported by Free and Secession groups, had assisted in bringing the Liberal government into power just a few months prior to union, did not help matters. The same paper lamented that "some people in Pictou support anything that comes to them under the name conservative".

After the 1867 Confederation, many Free and Secession voices were heard expressing grave doubts about the value of uniting with Ontario and Quebec. As a result, many of this group favoured a local Maritime church union while Kirk Conservatives like G.M. Grant came out in support of a Dominion-wide union.²⁰ When a letter of Dr. Ormiston was read to the highest courts of the two Maritime churches in 1870 suggesting union of all Presbyterians in British North America, voices were heard in opposition to the wider union. Men were unwilling to lose their ecclesiastical pre-eminence, as they had lost their political powers. The smaller Maritime Kirk feared an Atlantic union for the very reasons that the larger Free-Secession group favoured it. "For many," G.M. Grant writes, "union with the Anti-Burgers meant union with political antagonists and personal foes". The Kirk agreed to appoint delegates to discuss the wider union, relying on the stronger western group in connection with the Scottish Church for support. The Church of the Lower Provinces, still preferring the local, smaller union, agreed to appoint delegates to discuss the formation of the Canada-wide body. During the union negotiations, the Maritime delegates of the larger Church of the Lower Provinces continued to express reservations for union with the two western denominations.²¹ Even the name "Canada" was mentioned as little as possible in deference to the Maritimes who equated the word with "take-over".

The Kirk group in the Maritimes unanimously supported the wider union until 1873 and the breaking of the Canadian Pacific Scandal when it was forced to defend its associations with the corrupt Conservative Party. Supporters of church union began to waver. Gavin Lang of Montreal attended the 1874 Maritime synod and urged opposition to union. Everything changed.

The Liberals were in power and the Halifax Witness supported union. The Conservatives were out of power and eleven of the twelve or thirteen Pictou charges voted against union. In spite of Grant's continued support of union and his "trying to allay the distrust and suspicion of his co-presbyters", stating that the Scottish Kirk would continue to support the new denomination, the Presbytery of Pictou refused to enter union, determining to follow an independent existence and waiting for a better day.²² All four uniting denominations belonged to the same confessional family and upheld the same doctrinal standards. Traditional Biblical teachings, as understood by the Reformers and set forth in the Westminster Standards, were the doctrines supported by all the denominations. In the 1860's and 1870's, German scholarship had touched Canadian Presbyterian thought, but generally speaking, Biblical criticism had scarcely affected the overwhelming majority of the church's membership. At the 1870 meeting of the Joint Committee on Union, the following was quickly and unanimously approved:

1. That the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament being the infallible word of God are the supreme standard of Faith and Manners.
2. That the Westminster Confession of Faith shall be the subordinate standard of this Church, it being understood, 'that full liberty of opinion in regard to the power and duty of the Civil Magistrate in matters of religion, as set forth in said confession, be allowed and that the use of the Shorter Catechism be enjoined as an authoritative exposition of doctrine for the instruction of the people.'²³

The unanimous opinion of the Joint Committee on Union was not reflected in the statements of General Assembly Commissioners and the various Synods of the negotiating churches. Thomas Sedgwick of Nova Scotia demanded the Longer and Shorter Catechisms be included in the Basis, as they were in the Union of 1860. David Inglis of MacNab Street Church, Hamilton, urged the acceptance of the Catechisms as Standards of Faith, with Mr. Reid calling the Westminster Confession the sheet-anchor of the Church and the Catechisms the small anchors.²⁴ With the support of Canada

Presbyterian Church and Kirk bodies, the Joint Union Committee added the Larger Catechism to the Shorter as "appointed to be used for the instruction of the people."²⁵ John Ross of Brucefield felt that heresy would result from this "slur" on the Catechisms. The classic reply was given that the Basis upheld the Confession and Catechisms in the sense in which the Westminster "divines" had prepared them two hundred years earlier. Most were resigned to the fact the "one standard was as good as three" when they were all prepared by the same men.²⁶

In the union of 1875, historically orthodox theology was upheld. It would appear that the professors and graduates of Queen's College, Kingston, were less conservative in their theology than those from Knox or Montreal or Halifax. Yet no one denomination was the exclusive home of theological liberals or conservatives; the traditional Reformation position was held by the vast majority in all churches, with the result that union was consummated on a Basis which was faithful to the historic position held by Presbyterianism. The only exception to this theological unanimity was in reference to the "Headship of Christ" as set forth in Chapter Twenty-three in the Westminster Confession of Faith. Early Scottish secessions in the Kirk had been on this very point, with the Relief Synod, for example, requiring ordinands to vow that the Confession was "founded on and consistent with the Word of God, except insofar as said Confession recognizes the power of the civil magistrate to interfere in religious concerns". The Disruption of 1843 in the Church of Scotland, which brought into being the "Free" Presbyterian bodies in British North America, was the result of the Church demanding freedom from government interference. Unlike the "voluntaryism" of the earlier Secessionists, which believed that the State had no responsibility to support the Church and that the Church had no right to accept any government support, the Free Church was not opposed to an Established Church or State support for the church; rather, it was State interference in church affairs which was felt to be intolerable.

After 1844, attempts at Union between Free and Secession groups in

British North America were thwarted by the varying interpretations of "the Headship of Christ" which influential ministers in both camps demanded be clearly accepted in detail before any union take place. In the Maritime union of 1860, the Westminster Confession of Faith was recognized as a subordinate standard, but added "that the united body disclaim as unscriptural all rights on the part of the civil magistrate to try to regulate or review the procedure of the courts of Christ's Church". It was only after such individuals as John Bayne of Galt had died that the 1861 Union in the Canada's could be effected. A Preamble was added to the confession, stating that "in regard to the practical application of said fourth article, unanimity of sentiment is not required in the united body, and that if any particular case should emerge, it may, and can only, be considered and determined by the Church Courts."²⁷ Representatives of Free Churches in West Zorra, North Easthope, Barrington, Thamesford and Bruce protested against this compromise, as failing to guarantee the Headship of Christ, but in the end their churches entered the 1861 Union, with only Lachlan MacPherson in exile, although men like John Ross of Brucefield were later to regret their approval of the principle of forbearance.

At the first meeting of the Joint Committee on Union in Montreal, September 1870, the Headship question was briefly noted. The committee members did not find it any obstacle to union and concluded by unanimously agreeing to adopt the Westminster Confession of Faith as the Subordinate Standard of the united church with "full liberty of opinion allowed in regard to the power and duty of the civil magistrate in matters of religion."²⁸ The twenty-four influential committee members all felt that this statement would satisfy the membership of their respective churches, but they were soon to realize that many of their fellow churchmen had not reached this stage of toleration. Professor McKnight complained to the 1871 Synod of the Presbyterian Church of the Lower Provinces that Christ's Headship had not been guaranteed by the proposed Basis of Union.²⁹ This principal of Halifax Theological Hall was a graduate of

Edinburgh and had studied under Dr. Thomas Chalmers. Naturally the absence of the Headship statement reminded him of the Scottish situation and he did not want governmental interference to creep into the Canadian church situation. However, the 1870 Basis was accepted and it should be pointed out that neither the Maritime Kirk nor the Presbyterian Church of the Lower Provinces felt it necessary to call a fall meeting of Synod to discuss this or any other problem of union.

In the Kirk, the "Headship" concern was barely mentioned, but at the November 1871 General Assembly of the Canada Presbyterian Church, men like George Smellie, John Ross and Donald MacVicar sought to insert a clause in the Basis of Union to emphasize the Headship of Christ and the freedom of the church "from all external and secular authority".³⁰ Professor Caven of Knox College felt that this clause would be "holding up a flag before the other party".³¹ The motion was defeated by a vote of sixty to twenty-two. At the following year's General Assembly, the Rev. William Cochrane stated that the reviving of the question "indicated a wish on the part of this church to make Free churchmen of them before admitting them into the union".³² It was felt that many of the opponents to the Basis of Union's wording were merely using the "Headship" question to scuttle union. Although four Presbyteries had sought changes to the clause under the Remit sent down by Assembly, by a vote of eighty to thirty-one, it was agreed to keep the articles of faith in the Basis unaltered. The Assembly, however, stated that "in view of the fact that many esteemed members of the Assembly desire a recognition of the Headship of Christ over His Church, it be an instruction of the Union Committee to endeavour to secure in some way such a deliverance as shall meet the views of all parties in this church and report to next Assembly".³³

The Joint Committee on Union met in Montreal in December, 1872, and agreed that all the negotiating churches approved of the Headship of Christ and hoped the membership would agree. At the 1873 Joint Committee meetings held in St. John, N.B., both Maritime Synods agreed to "the liberty and right of the Church to administer its affairs, free from all

external and secular authority, and that all men in every capacity and relation, are bound to obey the will of Christ, as revealed in His Word", ³⁴ but in the Canada Presbyterian Church, where centred all the opposition to a Basis which did not contain a clause on the Headship, it was recorded that ninety-two Kirk Sessions opposed the Basis. Mr. Cochrane told the commissioners in Ottawa that "if there were more thought of the 'heartship' of Christ, there would be less said of the 'Headship'".³⁵

Joint meetings of both Kirk and Canada Presbyterian Church were held, chiefly dealing with the "Headship of Christ". It was recognized that vocal opposition came largely from ministers, but congregations and representative ruling elders were ready to follow. It was Principal Caven who spoke in 1874 of a Preamble as a non-technical explanation of the Headship which all evangelical churches could accept.³⁶ Such a Preamble was accepted by the Kirk Synod on the advice of Principal Snodgrass who stated that there would be a want of completeness in the union if some statement concerning the Supreme Head of the Church was not outlined. The General Assembly accepted the Preamble unanimously, with the exception of John Ross, who refused to follow his Canada Presbyterian Church into union, but referred to the Act as a "slippery undertaking".

The Rev. Gavin Lang of the Kirk wrote that the Kirk has given up everything for union. Douglas Brymner, in a pamphlet opposing union, charges the Canada Presbyterian Church of accusing the Kirk of tearing "the Crown from the Saviour's brow".³⁷ Such statements were scarcely noticed by the new church which clearly sought to divorce its doctrine from the practical implications of her Scottish background. By 1875, it was almost universally accepted that no magistrate could dictate to conscience and that a genuine division existed between church and state.

III

By what name was the proposed church to be designated? No delegation to the "Joint Committee of the Presbyterian Churches in the provinces of British North America on the subject of Union", meeting in Montreal in September, 1870, was prepared to accept the title of any of the other existing Presbyterian Churches in the Dominion. This problem was not settled until the very eve of the union. The western churches worked together in attaining a common goal, a name through which Presbyterians in all parts of the Dominion of Canada could unite. It was understood that in parts of the Maritimes, the word Canada was unpopular and would be unacceptable in the title of the new denomination. Also, for the Prince Edward Island congregations, the term 'Canada' was not suitable because this Island was not a part of the Dominion until July, 1873.

The first name approved by the Joint Union Committee was "The Presbyterian Church of British North America".³⁸ Some did not want the word "Presbyterian" as it was not found in the title of the Church of Scotland. When in 1872 the Rev. J.W. Fraser suggested to the Kirk that the title be "The Presbyterian Church of Canada" he was drowned out by other Kirk commissioners crying "No, no". In the end, the matter was left in abeyance and no title was officially supported. For the next two years, little attention was paid to the designation of the church. In 1874, however, the issue was pressed. The Maritime bodies, although still experiencing "a curious feeling against the name Canada", gracefully accepted the recommendation of the western churches.³⁹ The word "in" was used instead of the word "of" merely to prevent anyone confusing the new body with the former Free Church, and in June, 1875, the "Presbyterian Church in Canada" was welcomed into being.

More troublesome was the question asked by the negotiating churches as to the relationship of the proposed body to other churches in Christendom. Free and Secession ecclesiastics were unwilling to enter into a special relationship with the established Church of Scotland. On the other hand, Kirk groups in Canada had prided themselves as being "in

connection with the Church of Scotland" and the Maritime Kirk entitled her official periodical The Monthly Record of the Church of Scotland in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and adjoining Provinces. Compromise was clearly necessary if union was to become a reality. It was decided at the Joint Committee of Union meetings in 1870 that:

"this Church shall maintain fraternal relations with Presbyterian Churches holding the same doctrine and government and discipline, and that Ministers and Probationers shall be received into the Church, subject to such regulations as the Church may from time to time adopt."⁴⁰

This statement became part of the proposed Basis of Union, but Gavin Lang, seeking to scuttle church union, made a motion before the Kirk Synod that closest relations be held with denominations of "substantially the same doctrine". This relationship could conceivably be extended to the Church of England whose Thirty-nine Articles, many felt, approximated the Westminster Standards. Members of the Canada Presbyterian Church were sufficiently frightened that a further clause was added to the Basis of Union in order to guarantee a Presbyterian form of government for the new church:

"That the government and worship of this Church shall be in accordance with the recognized principles and practice of Presbyterian Churches, as laid down generally in the 'Form of Presbyterian Church government' and in 'The Directory for the public worship of God'."⁴¹

Upon further consideration, the Canada Presbyterian Church wondered whether any article on ecumenical relations might not prove a crutch to the Kirk which perhaps did not realize that the new church, in the eyes of the Canada Presbyterian Church, had to be completely independent. Besides this point, it was felt, was covered in the Westminster Confession itself. At the June, 1874, Kirk Synod, the Canada Presbyterian Church's recommendation to remove the Fourth Article of the Basis was accepted. In the end, it was agreed that the government and worship should be in accordance with the principles and practice of Presbyterian churches as laid down by the Form of Government and Directory of Public Worship.

A two-part resolution accompanied the Basis, stating that:

- a. This Church cherishes Christian affection towards the whole Church of God, and desires to hold fraternal intercourse with it in its several branches, as opportunity offers.
- b. This Church shall, under such terms and regulations as may from time to time be agreed on, receive Ministers and Probationers from other Churches, and especially from Churches holding the same doctrine, government and discipline with itself. This resolution, it should be realized, was a practical statement, expressing the ecumenical attitude of the new church, but not binding in any way similar to the actual Basis.⁴²

The Maritime Synods, as usual, accepted the changes graciously, and the Church of Scotland at the 1875 Assembly in Edinburgh wished "God-speed in their future labours for the Lord to brethren who propose to accept union", while promising to continue recognition of any who remain outside the new denomination.⁴³

Laymen of the negotiating churches were generally concerned with problems of union considered secondary by the theologians, such as the type of worship to be advocated in the united church. The practical query was heard, "How will the Sunday service be changed through union?" Laymen were aware of "Popish practices" which had been introduced into some urban congregations of the negotiating churches and wondered if elaborate rituals would be forced upon all congregations through union. In the '70's, the average Presbyterian pew-holder desired a minimum of liturgy and a maximum of preaching and extempore prayer. Psalms were sung unaccompanied by musical instruments under the guidance of a precentor who led the singing, line upon line. Extant sermons of the period were lengthy, with a propensity toward a theologically conservative doctrine. In the morning service, an additional exposition of the scripture reading was also offered. Prayers were lengthy and generally extempore.

Worship reforms came first to the Kirk, with its connections through establishment with non-Presbyterian churches in Europe. Hymns

were widely used in the Kirk while the Free Church continued to uphold the sanctity of the psalter and paraphrases.⁴⁴ City churches of all denominations, reflecting a certain urban opulence, erected new structures of architectural beauty, with the precentor's desk being replaced by choir and lectern. The "organ question" as it came to be called, proved to be "the chief agent of dissension between 1860 and 1880" in local congregations.⁴⁵ The movement began in the city Kirk congregations, plus several Secession churches, and gradually spread into smaller centres and other Presbyterian denominations. At first, harmoniums were placed in Sunday Schools; later, used in mid-week prayer meetings and choir practices. Finally, the organ reached the sanctuary. In 1851, for instance, a small melodeon was introduced into the Sunday worship in St. Andrew's, Toronto, but complaints were only heard in 1859 when it was replaced by a large organ. In spite of protests within the Kirk, Synod, it was decided in 1862 that any congregation could install an organ providing the harmony of the congregation was not disturbed.⁴⁶ By 1866, twelve Kirk congregations employed instrumental music in their services. Many members of the Canada Presbyterian Church seriously questioned the advisability of uniting with a church which officially countenanced "instruments of Satan". The first attempt to introduce an organ into the Free Church in the Canadas took place in Brockville, whose roots were American rather than Scottish. The Synod succeeded in procuring the removal of the "infernal machine". As early as 1857, Dr. Proudfoot of First (Secession) Church, London, had introduced an organ, but the Synod demanded its removal. Much of the opposition was due to the impending union with the Frees who, it was felt, would turn against the union if organs were allowed.

In the New Brunswick Free Synod, organs were officially considered to be "unwarranted by the supreme and subordinate standards and contrary to the constitudinary practice of this church". Discussion in the sister Synod in Nova Scotia revealed that opposition on such grounds was contrary to individual liberty, and could be considered a new qualification

to the union negotiations.⁴⁷ The remote congregation of St. Stephen's, New Brunswick, became a test case. An organ installed in that congregation was ordered removed by Synod in 1861. However, one concession was made; the organ could remain in use for a short period to train a choir. When the pulpit became vacant in 1864, with the organ still in place, the Presbytery refused to moderate a Call until the "kist o' whistles" was removed. The organ was not removed, no meetings of the Presbytery were held, and in the end the Presbytery became defunct.⁴⁸

When the Secession and Free Church Synods of the Canadas united in 1861, congregations were allowed to enter with the forms of worship which they had employed before union. Thus Secession Churches could continue to use their organs and very quickly former Free congregations began to install organs. Attempts to remove organs created much heat in various Presbyteries, but it was a losing battle. Opponents to union cited opposition to organs as a very practical reason why union should not be consummated, but by the 1870's, public opinion had been so won over to the use of organs within the Canada Presbyterian Church that the Presbytery of Montreal agreed to their use in Knox, and indirectly to their use in other congregations. At the 1870 Joint Committee on Union meeting, the Committee decided that present practices should continue in the various churches, with further action left to the legislation of the United Church. Some Kirk members felt that this clause left them open to persecution after Union. More serious was the opposition within the Canada Presbyterian Church, fearing such practices, for instance, as the kneeling for prayer as practiced in St. Andrew's Kirk, Montreal, and unbearable for most Free and Secession members. By 1874, however, opposition to the Worship Clause in the Basis of Union had dwindled to five or six persons. Union was consummated with the Worship Clause being generally interpreted as offering the fullest freedom in such matters. Most congregations, however, were loath to make changes. When the General Assembly finally authorized a collection of hymns, six years after Union, many congregations refused to use them.

To say that the love of money was another root of disunion would be an over-simplification, but financial problems early beset the negotiators and plagued the discussions year by year. Each denomination wanted to protect its financial interests. Worries of a takeover were expressed, with the smaller Churches fearing the influence and clout of the giants with their varied institutions, properties, and financial reserves. None of the negotiating Churches operated a central budget or a common fund upon which the various committees drew specified sums of money. Instead, each project or "scheme" of the Church had its own bank account and treasurer, and each year at Assembly or Synod, committees would be appointed to direct these "schemes" for the succeeding twelve months. Treasurers of such committees were generally laymen of recognized business ability. Amounts contributed by congregations depended greatly on the size and location of the Church. By the 1870's, the overwhelming support came from the cities. A "scheme" also depended on the interest of the individual minister and the efficiency of the Synodical or local treasurer. Usually one or more Sundays in the year were set aside for the seven or more special schemes of the Church, at which time special collections were received and canvasses often made.

Where representatives of the four Presbyterian Churches in British North America met in September, 1870, to discuss terms of union, questions of finance were not central. In June, 1871, the Kirk Synod of Canada appointed a committee to prepare a proposal for the disposal of its 'Temporalities' Fund -- monies from the Clergy Reserves Fund, etc., invested by the Kirk for the support of its ministers. This was the only denomination to have such a fund, which gave ministers annual augmentation of from \$200 to \$450 -- other denominations depended on current contributions from congregations for stipend augmentation. To the Kirk Synod, in 1871, came the following recommendation:

"As regards the Temporalities' Fund -- Resolved that it shall remain as at present, in the hands of a Board, the membership of which shall be continued after the consummation of the Union by the remnant members having powers to fill vacancies caused by death, resignation or otherwise..."⁴⁹

This report was unanimously accepted by Synod; those benefiting from the Fund would continue to do so until death did them part.

At the 1872 Synod meeting of the Kirk, much discussion ensued regarding the future of the 'Temporalities' Fund. Some suggested that the 1871 decisions to continue the fund for the benefit of Kirk ministers should be annulled and the monies turned over to the united church as the basis for a general Sustentation Fund. The motion was defeated, not because many members of the Kirk Synod were opposed to such a scheme, but because they knew that Canada Presbyterian Church was in opposition to such a fund.⁵⁰ Another defeated motion would have divided the fund between the two Kirk colleges and the Home Mission Fund of the united church after commitments were fulfilled. However, the Synod did agree to alter the source from which the non-privileged, non-commuting ministers might receive their annual \$200. Instead of taking this sum from the Home Missions Fund of the united church, (a move which would antagonize the other denominations since they themselves did not enjoy that right), it was successfully moved that the monies could be taken from the capital of the 'Temporalities' Fund if all other means failed. The Kirk Synod again discussed the 'Temporalities' Fund at the 1873 Synod. Dr. Cook and John Morris successfully moved that those ministers who had received only \$200. annually from the fund were now to receive \$400 a year when they retired. This increase of payments to ministers was regarded by some as buying their support of union. Congregations, Sessions and Presbyteries were asked to vote on the above decisions. Returns showed no strong opposition to the financial arrangements worked out by the church, although many would have preferred other financial arrangements.

At the Joint Committee on Union of the four churches, meeting in St. John, N.B., in September, 1873, the transfer of property into the united church was discussed. All agreed that the individual ministers or congregations which did not enter the union should have continued right to their annuities, property and other assets.⁵¹ Those opposed

to union demanded the entire 'Temporalities' Fund as being the real or continuing Kirk organization. The Rev. Gavin Lang extolled the 'Temporalities' Fund as "the great bond that linked our existence with the Mother Church". Students at Queen's and Morrin Colleges petitioned for a share of the 'Temporalities' Fund, stating that when they began their studies they had expected to share in the Fund, but present allocation would exclude them. The Synod, however, deemed it inadvisable to grant their prayer and the students were excluded from the benefits of the Fund. In order to separate the 'Temporalities' Fund from the united church, the 1874 Synod agreed to the self-perpetuation of the Board of Managers. An annual grant to Morrin College of \$850 was approved by the 1875 Synod and professors of Queen's College were given an interest in the 'Temporalities' Fund. Rights and privileges of those who remained outside the new church were guaranteed by provincial laws. Thus every minister on the Roll of the Kirk Synod of Canada in June, 1875, was cared for by these decisions of Synod. After union the General Assembly turned its back on the 'Temporalities' Fund. Never was a report submitted to this Court. Encroachments were made on the capital after 1875, so that by 1897 only about \$88,000 remained in the fund. Annuities were arranged for the twelve commuting ministers by Act of Parliament and payments to the remainder of the non-privileged, non-commuting ministers ended in 1900.

Following union, the various schemes of the uniting churches were reviewed and membership appointed, each to be operated for the following twelve months as if union had not been consummated. Finances were divided into the three geographical areas of Toronto, Montreal and Halifax, and three treasurers were appointed to receive money raised in these areas for the support of the schemes of the church. The same Assembly decided that a large committee of sixty-six ministers and twenty-two elders, representing various church backgrounds, be appointed to meet in Montreal, in September, 1875, to mature and co-ordinate the work of the church. Among its duties was the amalgamation of the church's projects; a \$700

minimum stipend, one Board of Management for the Home Missions of the Church. It was hoped that one Foreign Mission Board could be arranged but for the time being, the Maritime Provinces would continue to conduct their own projects. Ministers', Widows' and Orphans' Funds and the Infirm Ministers' Funds were centralized and minimum payments established. Through union, minimums were raised and the reorganization of the schemes of the church would provide for a more effective use of the available funds.

Probably the most delicate problem of union evolved around the church colleges. A quarter-century after union, the Presbyterian Witness recalled that union would have taken place in 1871 instead of 1875 if it had not been for the "college question".⁵² This viewpoint is an exaggeration, but does reflect the heat engendered by the competing colleges, as well as the principle of church involvement in higher education. Tens of thousands of dollars in buildings and endowments, hundreds of students, alma mater loyalties, diverse theological emphases and smouldering geographical prejudices all affected the "college question".

Six colleges were involved. The Theological Hall in Halifax, Morrin College in Quebec, The Presbyterian College in Montreal, Queen's College in Kingston, Knox College in Toronto, and Manitoba College in Winnipeg. The Maritimes Kirk never supported a theological college but sent its students to Scotland or Queen's. The Presbyterian Church of Nova Scotia had commenced theological training at Pictou as early as 1814, while the Free Church, soon after its organization, followed suit.⁵³ After the 1860 union between Free and Secession, the Theological Hall in Halifax met the need for the training of theological students. The arts training was closed in 1863 when Dalhousie re-opened, reflecting their view of education that the church must train its students in theology, and only provide literary or arts instruction when the state was unable or unwilling.

Presbyterian theological education in Ontario and Quebec also presented its problems. In 1841, a Royal Charter for Queen's was obtained

but members of the Kirk privately hoped that their theological education could be transferred to Toronto as soon as possible, with the passing of parliamentary bills which would have given Presbyterianism a voice in the management of King's College and an amalgamation with the Toronto institution. With the 1844 Disruption of the Kirk, almost all the student body left Queen's to join the Free Church. Fortunately, annual grants from the Church of Scotland, the sacrificial support of St. Andrew's, Kingston, and the leadership of men like Dr. Machar and Dr. Cook carried it through the following difficult years. In 1870, the failure of the Commercial Bank had drastically reduced the endowments, while many congregations refused to contribute to the College Fund, feeling that Queen's was a hot-bed of unionists. Queen's reflected the Kirk viewpoint that the church had responsibility for Arts as well as Theological education.

The only other college connected with the Canadian Kirk was Morrin College in Quebec City. Endowed with \$50,000 by Dr. Joseph Morrin, a native of Scotland and a physician of that city, the college opened in 1862 with Dr. Cook, minister of St. Andrew's Church, Quebec, as its first principal. A very limited constituency and inadequate finances restricted enrolment and faculty. Union was approached with trembling, knowing that in a united church, Morrin would be in competition with the Presbyterian College and the educational advantages of Montreal. The Free Church in Canada, immediately following its organization in 1844, established a theological seminary in Toronto to train the student body of Queen's which had joined the new church. For the first decade, three hundred pounds a year and an able faculty was contributed by the Free Church of Scotland. Knox College provided a classical training for theological students from within its own faculty until 1849 when University College was secularized and this department at Knox was closed. When the United Presbyterian Church united with the Free Church in 1861, the former's Toronto college (originally opened in 1845 in London), was amalgamated with Knox. As a result of agitation in

the new body for a college in the province of Quebec to train a ministry to the French-speaking populace as well as meeting the needs of Presbyterianism in eastern Ontario, Presbyterian College, Montreal, was chartered in 1865.

The only other Presbyterian College to enter the union of 1875 was Manitoba College, a product of the union negotiations and cooperation in the far West and a manifestation of the spirit of the 1870's in Canadian Presbyterianism. In 1870 twelve leading Presbyterians in Manitoba signed a prospectus for an institution of higher learning since the government had not provided such a school. The Presbytery of Manitoba supported the appeal and the Canada Presbyterian Church endorsed it. Although under the control of the Canada Presbyterian Church, Kirk participation was welcomed. Supported by the Lieutenant-Governor, Alexander Morris, a graduate of McGill and an influential member of the Kirk, the school soon outgrew its humble beginnings to play a leading role in the educational needs of the province.

In the deliberations of the Joint Committee on Union continued at that first September, 1870, meeting, the "College Question" was all important. The doctrinal questions took three hours to settle; the problem of the colleges took the remainder of the three days. The Maritime delegates just sat in silence, for the "College Question" was only of concern to Ontario and Quebec, and the Atlantic groups were ready to agree to whatever the western churches could accept.⁵⁴ One draft suggested the formation of a Presbyterian University, probably revolving around Queen's, and maintained by the church. Other colleges, like Montreal or Halifax, would receive degree-granting powers from the university senate. No mention was made of Knox College and some suggested that it be closed, with Queen's theological training being transferred to Montreal and the Arts remaining in Kingston. Agreement in the end was reached, suggesting the development of such a university "with such theological halls as may be found requisite to provide the necessary facilities for the education of ministers of the church in the various

provinces of British North America".⁵⁵

Protests were immediate. Many opposed this Kirk-supported concept of the church being involved in secular education. Staff and alumni of Knox, Montreal, and Morrin were greatly opposed to the supposed takeover by Queen's and the voluntarists in the Maritimes were most unhappy. Clarification was then offered by Dr. Topp, a leading member of the Union Committee, stating that all existing institutions would be retained. By implication, it was concluded that the committee was ready, unanimously, to retain the Arts faculty of Queen's under the jurisdiction of the united church.⁵⁶ No less dissension was evident in the Kirk. In spite of the assurance by Principal Snodgrass that Queen's would remain "as it is and where it is", many felt that Queen's was a hot-bed of union sentiment and the college would be sacrificed if need be for the sake of union. Douglas Brymer of the Dominion Archives in Ottawa said that he could not feel himself justified in giving one cent to Queen's "if the Church continued to push union with a Church which seeks to destroy Queen's and the whole Kirk tradition".⁵⁷ In a private communication to Principal Snodgrass, Dr. Topp expressed his conviction that if union was to be consummated, there could not be an amalgamation of the theological schools. Geographical and ecclesiastical ties were too strong in the churches to consider the closing of colleges even if such would be for the good of the church.

At the 1871 Joint Committee on Union meetings in Montreal, the "College Question" was all important. Grass roots membership was upset in both western denominations through editorials by men like George Brown in the Globe opposing a Presbyterian University and by Kirk pamphlets which insisted on the new church being responsible for non-theological education at Queen's. A motion was passed recommending that theological and literary institutions be kept intact and continue to operate in the new church under present conditions. However, the motion had no sooner passed then many of the Canada Presbyterian Church

delegates thought that it would accomplish nothing, was too conciliatory, and had to be reconsidered. After much discussion, a new resolution was adopted that each college should be asked to raise its endowments so that all would be financially independent of the united church. Queen's supporters were indignant, since that college had just passed through a campaign to recover an amount equal to the government grant now unavailable, and the sum lost through the failure of the Commercial Bank. Queen's and Morrin would lose their theological departments which would be transferred to Montreal and henceforth only responsible for literary and scientific studies. The theological halls at Halifax, Montreal and Toronto would be affiliated with Queen's and represented on the University Senate, with Dr. John Cook to become the first Principal. Principal Snodgrass cast the only dissenting vote at the meeting of the Union Committee but many rallied to his support.

The Canada Presbyterian Church at its June Assembly had agreed that the negotiating churches enter union with their present institutions, but meeting at an adjourned sederunt in November, 1871, it was decidedly opposed to the recommendations of the Joint Committee on Union to keep the Arts faculty of Queen's under the church's control and to unite Morrin and Montreal in the latter city, with affiliation with Queen's.

The General Assembly, in turning down the recommendations of its representatives of the Joint Committee on Union, reiterated its June 1871 decision and added that as it planned to raise \$250,000 to endow its theological institutions, it expected the Kirk to do likewise. It further recorded its opposition of State grants to denominational colleges and enjoined its committee to discover if there could be harmonious action in the proposed united church in this matter.⁵⁸ When sent down under the Barrier Act, only one presbytery disapproved this position. The Canada Presbyterian Church had officially and forcefully recorded its opposition to bringing the literary and scientific departments into the new denomination. Following heated discussion over several days,

the Kirk Synod of 1872 virtually bowed to the position of the Canada Presbyterian Church as approved a year earlier.

In the whole "College Question" the Maritimes remained silent. Knowing that the future of their own college was assured, they were content to let the western bodies work out a solution which they in turn were ready to accept, whatever it be. Because of the hundreds of miles separating the Atlantic Provinces from the rest of Canada, and the nature of the union problems which seemed to centre exclusively in the Canada Presbyterian and Kirk circles, the result was an acceptance simply of decisions approved in the west. No consensus could be reached between Kirk and Canada Presbyterian delegates regarding the appointment of professors to theological colleges. At the 1873 Joint Committee, it was agreed that the united church should not be required to elect trustees to the Arts Department of any of the church institutions. So ended the negotiations. With June, 1875, came union and the appointment of new governors for the Arts and Science departments of Queen's, with governing powers vested in a University Council. Fullest independence was assured, although reports were still submitted to the General Assembly. As a result of union, Queen's lost considerable monetary, as well as geographical, support. To the College Committee, meeting in September, 1875, two plans were put forth for the more adequate support of the colleges. The first was a common College Fund for the support of all; the second was the assigning of a specific territory to each college in which it could appeal for assistance. Due to the strong opposition to Queen's, the second proposal was withdrawn, and the first became the policy of the church. The Presbyterian College, Montreal, refused to support the common College Fund and privately sought out donors in the Synod to assist in the expansion of the college. A similar approach was followed by others, so that the plan eventually failed.

The suggestion of closing any of the theological colleges died with union. The result was a wider choice of theological facilities available to students. Practical reasons had forced the colleges into

union, and now each sought to make fullest use of the new financial possibilities which accompanied union. Competition for the enrolment of prospective students increased. Bursary funds were built up. The church's involvement in higher secular education was dealt a mortal blow through union. The concept of a Dominion-wide Presbyterian University failed, although the principle was applied to secular education after 1875.⁵⁹ Morrin College played an ever-decreasing role in the church's life up to and after union. On the other hand, Manitoba College, in 1875, under the Mission Board, increased in usefulness to the church as the West was opened to settlers. In the Maritimes, theological education followed the maxim of George M. Grant who said that "they in the Lower Provinces must always march in line with the people in the Upper Provinces". Fortunately for Canadian Presbyterianism, this man was called to the "Upper Provinces" to preside over Queen's and to give an effective Maritime- and Kirk-cultured leadership to Canadian Presbyterianism.

IV

A few weeks prior to the sederunts of the highest courts of the various Presbyterian bodies in British North America in June, 1870, the immediate Past-Moderator of the 1869 Canada Presbyterian Church, Dr. William Ormiston of Hamilton, sent a letter to the Moderators of the Synods of the other three Presbyterian bodies proposing union. The first body to receive official notice of this letter was the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland. In accord with the prayer of the letter a committee was appointed to meet with other Presbyterian bodies. Three days later, an overture was read from the Presbytery of Lindsay, setting forth the desirability of union with the Canada Presbyterian Church. The prayer of the Overture had been properly worded, but since it had limited union to one other body, the pro-union forces had arranged for Dr. Ormiston's letter to be read first so that plans for the wider union might not be delayed.

Some considered this step unconstitutional, although opposition on this ground was not voiced at the time.

Supporters of union sought the most prominent ministers and laymen as their representatives to this negotiating committee. Probably the most outstanding men of each geographical area were chosen -- Dr. John Cook of Quebec City, Principal Snodgrass of Kingston and Dr. Barclay of St. Andrew's, Toronto. The laymen were no less prominent -- Alexander Morris, a jurist, Dominion Cabinet member and financier, Sheriff Neil McDougall and James Croil, the editor of The Presbyterian and secretary of several of the schemes of the Kirk.

The opening sermon of General Assembly of the Canada Presbyterian Church was preached by Dr. Alexander Topp in the absence of the retiring Moderator, Dr. W. Ormiston. When Dr. Ormiston's letter was read, the Montreal group, including Principal MacVicar, spoke in support of the smaller union.⁶⁰ Voices were heard chastising Dr. Ormiston for addressing the letter to the Kirk Synods, but the final result was the defeat of the Montreal motion and the appointment of a committee of six to meet with other Presbyterian bodies. Membership of the Joint Committee on Union included Dr. Topp as Chairman, supported by such leading ministers as Dr. William Taylor of Erskine Church, Montreal, and Robert Ure of Goderich. Elders included the Hon. John McMurrich of Toronto, M.P.P. from North York, president of the Western Assurance Company, St. Andrew's Society, Toronto, and representative elder of Knox Church, Toronto, and David McKay of Montreal, well known for his commercial and philanthropic interests.

The Presbyterian Church in the Lower Provinces, this former Free and Secession body and the largest Presbyterian group by far in the Maritimes, had already taken the initiative in seeking union negotiations with the Maritime Kirk group, with a union committee already under appointment. Now it was decided to postpone discussion until the Kirk had decided whether to accept Dr. Ormiston's suggestion for a wider union, or merely to negotiate for a Presbyterian union in the eastern

provinces. At the Kirk Synod in the Maritimes, a motion to support the lesser union promised to carry unanimously, but after George M. Grant spoke about the wish of the Kirk in Upper Canada for the wider union, it was agreed to forward a letter to the Presbyterian Church in the Lower Provinces notifying them that they had accepted the proposal for the Canada-wide union.

To Dr. Alexander Topp must go the credit for organizing the first meeting of the Joint Committee on Union. From first to last it was the west in general and the Canada Presbyterian Church in particular which designed the Basis for the church which came into being in 1875. Western domination was seen in the choosing of time and place of meeting for as late as July 26, the eastern bodies had not been informed of the September meeting. Along with Dr. Topp, and Dr. Cook, Mr. Morris formed the inner circle. Prior to the September 28 meeting, private meetings were held by the two Kirk bodies in order to present a united front before the larger Free-Secession bodies. Monetary problems were also worrying the Maritime Kirk, and reductions in transportation fares to the conference were sought.⁶¹

At the first meeting of the committee, Dr. Alexander Topp was appointed secretary, with Dr. John Cook serving as chairman. Every minister appointed by their respective churches was present, with only two elders absent. Dr. Cook spoke of the "desirability and expediency of Union between the churches". Dr. Bayne, chairman of the delegation from the Presbyterian Church of the Lower Provinces, stated that "a most remarkable degree of unanimity had been reached".⁶² How often was quoted "that they all may be one". James Croil, in an editorial, rejoiced that the meeting had resulted in wide agreements. "Entire unanimity is not to be looked for; the wonder is, 'he felt' that the divergence was so comparatively slight."⁶³

Union discussions were central in the 1871 church courts. In the Canada Presbyterian Church was opposition centred largely on the "Headship of Christ" and the "College Question". It was agreed to

suggest changes to the Union Committee and to reconvene at a special adjourned meeting of the Assembly. Six members were added to the committee, including Principal MacVicar of the Presbyterian College, Montreal, and Principal Caven of Knox College, Toronto, both of whom had voiced criticisms of current union plans. The Kirk also spent considerable time over union, although there the concern centred on state aid to church controlled educational institutions and the maintenance of Queen's College. Six additional persons were elected to the committee, the most important being Dr. Jenkins of St. Paul's, Montreal, who earlier had been the minister of St. James Methodist Church in the same city and was very partial to this wider union. It was agreed that a special meeting of the Synod could be called if necessary to further discuss the Basis of Union. In the Maritimes, both Synods accepted the proposals of the Joint Committee on Union.

Theological education proved to be the great stumbling block at the Montreal gathering in 1871, with changes coming in two stages. First on September 29, it was agreed that the churches should enter union with the colleges which they had. On October 2, the joint committee reconsidered the above decision and in its stead adopted seven clauses dealing with the colleges. Endowments were sought for their support. Morrin and Queen's were to lose their theological faculties and concentrate on the literary training of students. Principal Snodgrass strongly opposed this decision, and as a result refused to call a special meeting of the Kirk Synod to discuss the Basis of Union. Rev. D. Watson, one of the members of the Kirk Union Committee stated that the Canada Presbyterian Church was trying to control everything and that the only type of union which would be produced would be one in which the Kirk would be absorbed by the Free and Secession bodies.⁶⁴

At the June, 1872, Kirk General Assembly, the proposed Basis of Union as adopted by the adjourned Assembly in 1871 and sent down to Presbyteries was discussed. Six Presbyteries had approved, one had disapproved and eight offered various comments and amendments. Several members of

the union committee submitted their resignations, stating that no further clause should be included in the Basis on the "Headship of Christ", as the Kirk's position was sufficiently clear and acceptable, and that the Kirk should not be asked to close its theological faculties. In the Kirk Synod, unanimous approval was given to the doctrinal terms of union but expressed difficulties over the 'Temporalities' Fund, colleges, etc. No special meetings of the Atlantic Synods had been held to discuss the Basis of Union. The Monthly Record of the Church of Scotland in Nova Scotia frankly acknowledged that its church took its cue from the deliberations of the western bodies.⁶⁵ When the Joint Committee reconvened during the Christmas holidays, 1872, no Maritime delegate turned up. To the western churches came the realization that greater consideration must be given the Atlantic bodies. For some time the request had been made for the Committee to meet in the eastern provinces. Western delegates were not eager to make this long trip, but Dr. Jenkins emphasized its importance. Saint John, New Brunswick, was chosen as the site for the April meetings of the Joint Committee on Union. The result was a common Basis of Union which could be presented to the four negotiating churches.

Opponents of union conducted a campaign of opposition through letters to the editor and dissemination of anti-union pamphlets. However, opposition by this time was very minimal, with a highly publicized anti-unionist meeting in the Agricultural Hall, Toronto, only attracting twenty-five or thirty persons. At the 1873 General Assembly of the Canada Presbyterian Church, the Basis was approved by a majority of 133 to 34. One and one-half days were spent by the Kirk Synod discussing the union, "the most important business of the Synod",⁶⁶ and by a motion of 57 to 7, the Basis was sent down to the lower courts for approval. At this Kirk Assembly, Dr. Cook, "in one of happiest efforts", impassionately addressed the Synod in support of union. The Rev. George M. Grant pictured "all the scattered children of John Knox in this Dominion going to take up the old standard and declare that they would start from the

same point at which their fathers started three centuries ago".⁶⁷ Delays were blamed on the Canada Presbyterian Church which wanted "to bring in more old books (laughter from the Synod) and wished to appoint a larger committee".⁶⁸ In the Maritimes, it was not going to be said that the east held up union. The Presbyterian Church of the Lower Provinces accepted the Basis "simpliciter". The Kirk sent the Basis down to Presbyteries, Congregations and Sessions.

By June of 1873, an enthusiasm for union was everywhere. A year earlier, defeatism and postponement were in the air. The Kirk had been accused of heretical teachings, the Canada Presbyterian Church with narrowness of outlook and emphasis on detail. It is interesting to note that up to 1873, opposition was chiefly centred in the Free and Secession churches, but when union came in 1875 there was almost unanimous support in favour of union. On the other hand, the Kirk groups which had earlier been almost unanimous for union failed to carry many congregations into the union of 1875. The dissidents in the Canada Presbyterian Church were loud in their opposition during the formative period and as a result their problems were discussed and changes made in the Basis. The Kirk minority, however, failing to speak, especially in the Maritimes, until a few months before union, were considered anti-unionists, and amendments in 1875 were not considered possible, without seriously disrupting the whole union question. The Canada Presbyterian Church learned that fourteen Presbyteries approved, simpliciter, three turned the Basis down, and two offered a qualified disapproval. One hundred and forty-four Sessions approved of the Basis, but ninety-two disapproved, with six others opposing individual clauses and one expressing a qualified disapproval. Whenever a minister opposed the union the Session invariably followed suit. This was less true in the congregational vote, with 168 approving the Basis and 87 still not satisfied. The General Assembly decided to seek a joint meeting with the Kirk in Canada (both were in session in that city) to discuss the Basis.

The Kirk was also experiencing difficulties, but the opposition

did not seem as widespread as in the Canada Presbyterian Church. Nine Presbyteries agreed to the Basis "simpliciter", one agreed with reservations and one disagreed. Most objections revolved around the disposition of the Temporalities and the position of Queen's College in the new denomination.

On June 6, the joint meeting of the two bodies was held in Ottawa. The Canada Presbyterian Church pressed for changes in the Basis, reflecting opposition comments on the "Headship of Christ" recorded under Barrier Act returns. On June 8, the Assembly was informed by delegates from the Kirk that these changes were accepted and another joint meeting was arranged for June 9, when a Preamble was added to the Basis, emphasizing the Headship of Christ, thus satisfying troubled members of the Canada Presbyterian Church. The Kirk also agreed to the Assembly's request to remove the Fourth Article which implied a continued connection with the Church of Scotland. The seventh Resolution accepting forbearance of opinion regarding state grants to the Church was removed by the Kirk Synod, as requested by the Canada Presbyterian Church. Lastly, the Kirk acceded to the request of the Assembly that the Kirk have sole responsibility for the distribution of the Temporalities' Fund.⁶⁹ It was decided to appoint committees to deal with the one problem of relations with other churches and to proceed to complete arrangements for union. This Revised Basis of Union was sent to Presbyteries, Sessions and Congregations for their consideration, the results of which were to be studied at the adjourned meetings in Toronto, November 3-5, 1874.

The Presbyterian Church of the Lower Provinces, meeting on the last Tuesday of June, 1874, in Halifax, was informed that all eight presbyteries had approved of the Basis. After western delegates were heard, the church unanimously agreed to accept the Basis with its additions and deletions and send it down to Presbyteries, Sessions and Congregations. The western churches made the changes, the eastern church agreed to them unanimously. In the Kirk Synod of the Maritimes, opposition was beginning

to crystalize. A visit of Gavin Lang helped to organize this sentiment. Eleven congregations, nearly all within the bounds of the Presbytery of Pictou, decided to oppose union, not on theological grounds but revolving around local politics and property rights. Unwilling to hinder the union negotiations at this stage, the Basis was sent down to the lower courts and the Synod agreed to meet again in New Glasgow on the third Sunday of October to study the results of the Remit. A meeting was held with the anti-union Pictou group but little was accomplished. The dissidents were told that a rump group of ten or twelve could not hope to survive, but no minds were changed. The anti-unionists were informed that the Church of Scotland wanted them to unite since their opposition would seem to tell the world that only a handful of congregations wanted to remain in connection with the Scottish Kirk. The Maritime Kirk, by a vote of 27 to 7, agreed at the October Synod to enter union. All ministers were invited to attend the Montreal meetings the following June when Union was to be consummated.

In the Canada Presbyterian Church, all nineteen Presbyteries approved, although London accepted the Basis only by the deciding vote of the Moderator. Two hundred and seventeen Sessions approved simpliciter, six dissented for various reasons, but only one opposed the union. The congregational vote showed two hundred and thirty-one in approval simpliciter, six dissenting and only one in opposition. Six months earlier, eighty-seven congregations had disapproved, but with the Headship Question covered in the Preamble, the opposition evaporated. A motion to consummate union in June, 1975, was carried by a vote of one hundred and eleven to two. In the Kirk the minority were not ready to accept the majority decision and anti-unionists immediately made plans to overturn this action. When a Bill respecting union was submitted to the Ontario Legislature, a suit was instituted in the Court of Chancery by anti-unionists in the Kirk body, seeking an injunction to restrain the two Presbyterian churches in the province from consummating union. Dr. Alexander Topp ably defended the Bill, although the opposition was from the

Kirk, not from his denomination, and the Court of Chancery refused to interfere. The Private Bills Committee of the Legislature unanimously accepted the Bill and it passed the third reading of the House without a division, and after the assent of the Lieutenant-Governor became law. Rights of the minority were recognized as well as those of the majority who favoured union.

In the Province of Quebec, spirited resistance was faced in the passage of the Union Bills, led by the Rev. Gavin Lang of St. Andrew's, Montreal. The Bill received the approval of the Assembly, but experienced much difficulty in the Legislative Council, after the Union Bills before the Quebec Private Bills Committee were rejected by a five to three decision. Supporters of union were irate. Protest meetings were held in Toronto, Kingston and Montreal condemning this action. Petitions in favour of union were distributed and Sunday worshippers were urged to sign the protests. Two thousand people signed, although Gavin Lang affirmed that many of the signatures were those of Sabbath School scholars. A large delegation travelled to Quebec in support of union. Such actions turned the tide. The Legislative Council refused to accept the recommendation of the Private Bills Committee and referred them back for further study. The battle was won. Slight changes were made in the Bills, but they passed substantially as drawn up and the last obstacle before the union committee had been removed.

Montreal was chosen as the location of the 1875 Union. In that central location both Kirk and Secession-Free influences were felt. An eastern location would have been much more expensive and less practical, and in Toronto only the Canada Presbyterian Church was strong. Principal MacVicar further argued that this show of Protestant unity and strength in a centre of Roman Catholicism was important. The four church courts were constituted in the second week of June, 1875. The retiring moderator of the Kirk Synod of Canada, John Rennie of Chatham, Ontario, preached on the text, "That they all may be one", to the Kirk commissioners assembled in St. Paul's. The retiring moderator of the Canada Presbyterian

Church used as his text, the passage from Ephesians 4:16, "It is universally acknowledged that union is strength." The Lower Provinces Synod dispensed with the usual sermon as their moderator was ill. The Maritime Synods agreed to the formation of one Synod to coordinate the work in the three eastern provinces. Interesting names like "Acadia" were suggested, but it was agreed to accept the term "Maritime". Publications were to be absorbed by a Dominion-wide periodical. In the Canada Presbyterian Church only two ministers, MacPherson the one-time teacher in Embro, Ontario, and Ross, his erstwhile pupil, remained opposed to union. In the Kirk, one and one-half days were expended in discussing union. Motions to postpone the union for a year were defeated, knowing that the Maritime denominations would find it almost impossible to make the second long journey "in toto" to consummate the union.

On Sunday afternoon, June 13, 1875, a gathering of Montreal Sunday School children was held in Victoria Skating Rink, with two thousand children in attendance, accompanied by an equal number of parents and friends. Both Kirk and Canada Presbyterian congregations were represented although those of St. Andrew's were noticeably absent. But Tuesday, June 15, was the day of days. The four church courts marched in procession to the Victoria Hall, the agenda arranged, followed by an afternoon service in St. Paul's Kirk, and a social period that evening in Victoria Hall. The first to arrive at Victoria Hall was the Canadian Kirk. The Maritime groups appeared at 11:00 a.m. as requested, with the Canada Presbyterian Church a quarter hour late. The six thousand seat hall was filled to overflowing. Decorated with streamers and flags, the hall hosted moderators, clerks and officials on a raised platform in the centre.

The ceremony opened with the singing of Psalm 100, "All people that on earth do dwell", led by a choir of one hundred voices, and given out by the Rev. G.M. Grant. Principal Snodgrass read portions of Psalm 132 and Professor Caven offered prayer. Minutes of the four church courts

were read by their respective Clerks and the oldest Clerk in terms of ordination read the Preamble and Basis of Union. The oldest Moderator in terms of ordination declared the union consummated. The four Moderators gave each other the right hand of fellowship and the audience joined in the singing of Psalm 133. The Montreal Witness reported,

"The vast audience joined hands in singing the 133rd Psalm with enthusiasm and feeling, probably never equalled in any preceding religious assembly in Canada. Aged ministers clasped each other's hands as they fervently sang the words of the psalm, while others seemed too deeply affected by their emotions to take a vocal part in the service, but all realized the truth of the words, 'Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity', as nearly five hundred ministers of four different churches stood at last in one common brotherhood."⁷⁰

Like so many of the pro-unionists that bore the heat of the day in the negotiating controversies, and who were honoured on the day of consummation, the Rev. Dr. John Cook, Chairman of the Joint Committee on Union, was unanimously chosen as the first Moderator of the Presbyterian Church in Canada. Dr. William Taylor of Montreal, a former Secession minister, gave the nomination address. "I look for a union", he told the throng, "before which the present--blessed and auspicious though we justly account it--shall appear slight and insignificant".⁷¹

At the evening meeting, thousands participated in an over-lengthy programme. J.L. Morris, a leading Montreal layman and unionist, spoke of the strength of the united church with its 600,000 supporters. Principal Snodgrass, although not a Canadian by birth, emphasized that the country needed a Canadian organization around which future generations could rally. Dr. William Ormiston was present to share in the union that he had sparked five years earlier. He entreated the new church to admit others without question "when they came tapping for admittance at the door of the Church", for he was convinced that "there was strength in numbers".⁷² Late in the programme, G.M. Grant of Halifax rose to speak. Disregarding his prepared address, he said, "Beloved, let us love one another, for love is of God and everyone that

loveth is born of God, and knoweth God; he that loveth not knoweth not God for God is love." Then he sat down, and after a moment's hush, a great burst of approval was heard, with one Maritimer crying out that now "our Church had a leader".⁷³

Dissidents of the Kirk immediately organized themselves into a continuing Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland. When the unionists left St. Paul's Church, Montreal, for the inaugural ceremony at Victoria Hall, minority remained behind to form their own Synod. They prophesied that the union "was held together by a rope of sand" and that disruption was the fruit of this amalgamation. Unionists were characterized as traitors "who for the past years have been insidiously sapping the foundations of the Kirk, shaking the allegiance of the people to her, scheming extensively for funds of all kinds professedly for the Church of Scotland, when they had in view her destruction."⁷⁴ Supporters of union were accused of maladministration of funds and of "bleeding the Kirk nearly to death and then reporting she could not live."⁷⁵ However, this continuing Kirk was of short duration. Novel efforts like excommunicating the unionists and the instituting of various lawsuits failed to keep them in the public eye. The continuing body was a ministers' church, with congregations only remaining out of union in loyalty to their minister. Within twenty-five years, only one or two congregations were still outside the Presbyterian Church in Canada.

The tiny minority of the Canada Presbyterian Church who remained outside the union decided to form their own Presbytery in 1876. Meeting in Brucefield, Ontario, in April of that year, John Ross and Lachlan MacPherson proclaimed themselves not as enemies of the united church but as peculiar servants of God. They considered themselves called upon to "guard the dykes" and to proclaim Christ's unadulterated Headship over Church and State. The only other congregations in Ontario and Quebec outside the new Dominion-wide church were to be found in a weak Presbytery in the Niagara area, association with the United Presbyterian Church

of the United States and in Montreal where there was a church in connection with the Presbyterian Church of the U.S.A.

In the Maritimes, the Kirk congregations in Pictou and the Macdonaldite congregations in Prince Edward Island remained outside the union, largely as a result of lay opposition to union. Opposition revolved around the change of name, relationships with the Scottish Kirk, etc., but political prejudices of the people underlay all. The Monthly Record was continued and a Synod formed. Aid was continued from Scotland, with George Monroe Grant complaining that such liberality "encouraged them in their wayward and rebellious course".⁷⁶ A third of a century later, many of the congregations were still outside the Presbyterian Church in Canada. Thirty ministers of the Kirk Synod of the Maritimes supported union and affixed their names to the roll of the first General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Canada. The Canada Presbyterian Church contributed three hundred and twenty-eight ministers, the Kirk of Canada one hundred and forty-one, and the Synod of the Lower Provinces one hundred and twenty-four, making a total of six hundred and twenty-three ministers in June, 1875. Approximately thirty-one ministers did not enter the union.

V.

Unlike American Presbyterianism which drew upon New England, Wales, Holland, and England itself for its impulse, spontaneity and adaptability, the foundation of the Presbyterian Church in Canada was largely Scottish Presbyterianism transplanted into British North America. To Canada had been carried the various divisions of historic Scottish Presbyterianism; membership of the Presbyterian Church in Canada had an almost unique Scottish background, and ministers were almost totally trained in Scotland or Ireland, or by ministers in Canadian institutions, trained themselves in Edinburgh or her sister theological colleges.

Doctrinal standards in all four uniting bodies were uniquely similar, reflecting their common Scottish heritage. The Standards

adopted by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in 1647 and established by Acts of Parliament in 1649 and 1690 were the doctrinal Bases of Union approved in 1875 in Canada. Dutch and Reformed Church immigrants to Canada were usually integrated into the Scottish dominated ecclesiastical system, rather than forming their own organizations. Similarly L'Eglise Reformé de France worked through the Canadian churches in seeking to witness to the French-speaking areas of Canada. This absorption of all "Reformed" elements into one Presbyterian body enabled the church to display a national spirit and sea-to-sea viewpoint.

It must further be reiterated that the predominantly Scottish influence came from the non-established churches in Scotland. The Kirk was never the force in the colonies that it was in the "land of the heather". In the Canadas, it was the Free and Secession organizations which moved west with the growth of population. The Kirk body in both the Canadas and the Maritimes was recognized as an "exotic" which leaned too heavily upon the Scottish parent body and failed to become indigenous to British North America. A study of the missionary enterprises of the various denominations entering union illustrates again the wider vision of the Free and Secession bodies. To the Red River settlers they sent Black, and to the Indians of Saskatchewan, Nisbet. The Secession Church of the Maritimes commissioned Geddie to the New Hebrides and the Canada Presbyterian Church sent MacKay to Formosa. The Kirk, for its part, failed to advance with the increase of population and to challenge its membership with a missions consciousness. While Free and Secession took a firm stand on spiritous liquors, Sunday observance, and readily made moral judgments, the Kirk usually remained silent. In politics, while the Kirk adherents generally voted for Conservative candidates and the Free and Secession for Reform or Liberal, the latter were more prone to discuss and legislate on political questions in the sederunts of Synod and General Assembly.

Impetus for union generally came from Free and Secession sources.

Even with the Kirk, leadership came from men like John Cook, the friend of Chalmers, who would certainly have entered the Free Church if he had remained in Scotland, or Jenkins who was earlier a Methodist in Montreal. In the final Basis of Union, it was the Kirk who gave up most, relinquishing the control over the Arts Department at Queen's, accepting forbearance in the matter of state endowments and the civil magistrate, denying the cherished relationship with the established Church of Scotland, and tolerating, if not accepting, the Secession interpretation of voluntaryism which was written into the practices of the new body. To the Union, the Canada Presbyterian Church brought more ministers, elders, congregations, Sunday School teachers and scholars than the other three bodies combined. In the latter category, the Canada Presbyterian Church listed 43,536 pupils, compared with 11,487 for the western Kirk, 4,970 for the eastern Kirk, and 13,409 for the Presbyterian Church of the Lower Provinces. Only in ministers' stipends was the Canada Presbyterian Church not in first place. Naturally one would expect the Canadian Kirk, with the proceeds from the Clergy Reserves available for the augmentation of salaries, to offer higher stipends; but it is interesting to note that both the Maritime churches offered higher remuneration than either the western bodies. Apparently the eastern churches experienced a degree of lay liberality and affluence resulting in stipends at least twenty per cent higher than in the Canada Presbyterian Church.

Union was a victory for Presbyterianism in Ontario, Quebec and the Canadian West. The Boards of the church became centred in Montreal or Toronto, and the interests of the Maritimes were gradually overshadowed by the developments in Western Ontario and the prairies. More and more the church became an urban organization, where stipends were more attractive, congregations larger, and resources more readily available. By 1875, city congregations were erecting graceful stone structures with seating for one thousand or more worshippers. The Schemes of the Church found their overwhelming support in the city congregations, and while the rural charge

continued to supply the majority of ministerial students, it was the urban charge which paid the expenses of their theological education. Although the 1875 union was a victory for ecumenicity among the ordained clergy, an all important role was played by Ruling Elders and pew holders in the various congregations of the uniting bodies. Laymen like James Croil or the Hon. Alexander Morris contributed much to the Joint Committee on Union. The effect of the secular press cannot be underestimated. Men like George Brown of the Globe, John Dougall of the Montreal Witness, or Robert Murray of the Halifax Presbyterian Witness cannot be disregarded. Questions of worship and politics were raised in the union negotiations, but it was laymen who caused them to assume their importance. It was the laity who supported union on practical grounds --a consolidation of resources and a more efficient use of finances and manpower--and the great importance of the laymen alongside the clergy in effecting the inauguration of the Presbyterian Church in Canada must be recognized.

Footnotes

- ¹ John I. Cooper, Canadian Historical Review, March 1945, p. 57.
- ² J. Campbell, The Presbyterian Record, January 1898, p. 9.
J. Wood, Memoir of Henry Wilkes, p. 34 ff.
- ³ Toronto Patriot, June 15, 1970.
- ⁴ Presbyterian Witness, July 3, 1858, p. 104.
- ⁵ Minutes, Quarterly Meeting of the Montreal Sabbath School Association, Oct. 20, 1868, Sept. 26, 1869, July 16, 1872, April 15, 1873.
- ⁶ Ibid., Sept. 26, 1869, July 16, 1872.
- ⁷ Home and Foreign Record, December 1870, p. 331.
- ⁸ Canadian United Presbyterian Magazine, March 1855, p. 73.
- ⁹ John C. Becket, Historical Sketch of Steps Taken to bring about an Union of the Presbyterian Church of Canada with the Church of Scotland.

- 10 The Presbyterian, 1866, p. 280. A letter to the Editor called these ministerial opponents to union, "Spiritual Fenians".
- 11 The Globe, June 1, 1871.
- 12 James Croil, Autobiography, p. 141.
- 13 Home and Foreign Record, August 1, 1857; 1862, p. 248.
- 14 Ecclesiastical and Missionary Record, November 7, 1858.
- 15 The Presbyterian, 1862, p. 329.
- 16 Toronto Globe, June 6, 1874.
- 17 Rev. Gavin Lang, The Union Question.
- 18 W. Buckingham, The Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, p. 55.
- 19 J. Robertson, History of the Secession, p. 242.
- 20 Ibid., June 28, 1873, p. 204.
- 21 W. Grant, Principal Grant.
- 22 Ibid., p. 146.
- 23 Minutes, Joint Committee on Union, September 30th, p.6.
- 24 Minutes, General Assembly, CPC, November 8, 1871, p. 11; Toronto Globe, November 9, 1871.
- 25 Montreal Witness, June 21, 1871; Minutes, Joint Committee on Union, October 2, 1871, p. 11.
- 26 Presbyterian Witness, July 29, 1872.
- 27 Minutes, Canada Presbyterian Church, 1861. App. 12-14.
- 28 Minutes, Joint Committee on Union, September 28, 1870, p. 2.
- 29 Home and Foreign Record, August, 1871. p. 209.
- 30 Minutes, General Assembly CPC, November, 1871, p. 12.
- 31 Toronto Globe, November 9, 1871.
- 32 Ibid., June 14, 1872.
- 33 Minutes, General Assembly, CPC, June, 1872, p. 36.
- 34 Ibid., June 5, 1873, p. 26.
- 35 Montreal Gazette, June 9, 1874.
- 36 The Presbyterian, 1874, p. 161.
- 37 G. Lang, Supplementary Statement, p.3; D. Brymner, Faults and Failures, p.22.

- 38 Minutes, Joint Committee on Union, September 28, 1870, p. 2.
- 39 Ottawa Times, June 12, 1874.
- 40 Minutes, Joint Committee on Union, September 30, 1870, p. 1.
- 41 Ibid. October 2, 1871, p. 12.
- 42 Statement of Union, Kirk Synod of Canada, p. 13.
- 43 Montreal Witness, June 10, June 11, 1875.
- 44 Montreal Witness, June 12, 1868. John Ross stated that "the popular hymnology of the present day had much to do with the alarming increase in infidelity, and a doubting of the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures."
- 45 John R. Waldie, The Kirk Session, p. 115.
- 46 Minutes, Kirk Synod, June, 1862.
- 47 Home and Foreign Record, PC, LP, August, 1866.
- 48 Minutes, Presbyterian Church of New Brunswick, June 1864, p. 7.
- 49 Minutes, Kirk of Canada, June 13, 1871, p. 44.
- 50 Toronto Globe, June 10, 1872, p. 135.
- 51 Manuscript Minutes, Committee on Union, Saint John, New Brunswick, 1873.
- 52 Presbyterian Witness, December 12, 1908.
- 53 Letter, McGregor to Keir, 1814.
- 54 Monthly Record, Church of Scotland in Nova Scotia, etc., Nov. 1872, p. 56.
- 55 Home and Foreign Record, 1870, p. 304.
- 56 Ibid., 1870, p. 378.
- 57 Letter, Douglas Brymner to Snodgrass, October 12, 1870.
- 58 Minutes, Canada Presbyterian Church, November, 1871, p. 17 ff.
- 59 Queen's College Journal, May 1, 1875.
- 60 Minutes, General Assembly, Canada Presbyterian Church, 1870, p. 50.
- 61 Letter, Bayne to Topp, July 29, 1870.
- 62 Home and Foreign Record, Lower Provinces, August, 1871, p. 209.
- 63 The Presbyterian, 1871, p. 31.
- 64 Letter, D. Watson to Snodgrass, December 9, 1872.
- 65 Monthly Record, Kirk of Maritimes, August, 1872.

- 66 The Presbyterian, July, 1873, p. 169.
- 67 Ibid., July, 1873, p. 167.
- 68 Ibid., July, 1873, pp. 165, 166.
- 69 Minutes, General Assembly, Canada Presbyterian Church, June 9, 1874,
p. 47.
- 70 Montreal Witness, June 15, 1875.
- 71 The Presbyterian, July 1875, p. 177 ff.
- 72 Montreal Witness, June 16, 1875.
- 73 Presbyterian Witness, December 12, 1908.
- 74 J. Croil, Life of James Croil; R. Campbell, Pretensions Exposed, p. 5;
Presbyterian Trade Unions, p. 3.
- 75 Ibid., p. 3.
- 76 Minutes, Kirk Presbytery of Pictou, August 30, 1876.