"The Quay of Greenock" — Jurisdiction *  
And Nationality in the Canadian Presbyterian Disruption of 1844

Lacking both racial homogeneity and a revolutionary tradition to provide the cement of nationalism, Canadians make a virtue of necessity by defining their nationality negatively as something not American and also not British. In a mixture of self-justification and self-congratulation, Canadians praise bilingualism (or multilingualism), biculturalism (or multiculturalism) and assert the superiority of all forms of cultural pluralism over anyone else's melting pot. Unity in Diversity is in fact the title of a Canadian history textbook, but the inevitable contrasts drawn by Canadians between their own historical experience and that of the United States are in several ways delusive, and nowhere more so than in the field of religion. Religiously Canada is almost monolithic when compared to the United States. The census of 1971 showed some ninety-two per cent of the Canadian population in just six denominations. As Canadian historians delight in repeating, the thrust of Canadian religious life has seemingly always been towards union and away from diversity, as if Canadians were trying to find in a territorialized church that elusive national identity.

There have been exceptions to this unifying trend in religion, and one example was the Canadian Free Church movement — an imported old world quarrel apparently irrelevant to the Canadian situation. Why should the 1843 Disruption of the Church of Scotland be duplicated by Canadian Presbyterianism? No one suggest—
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colonies and provide clergy for the emigrants.2
In the Canadas the Kirk's most specific interest was in obtaining a share of the three million acres of prime agricultural land reserved in 1791 to support a "Protestant Clergy". The imperial government tacitly agreed with the Tory and Anglican assumption that "Protestant" meant only the Church of England, but when the great wave of post-Napoleonic immigration into Upper Canada (where eighty per cent of the Clergy Reserves were located) was inflating the price of land, Presbyterians in the two Canadas cast envious eyes on the banquet of loaves and fishes which the Church of England enjoyed exclusively, de facto. Throughout the 1830's the Church of Scotland in Canada repeatedly claimed to be co-established in the empire and therefore entitled to share in the Clergy Reserves income. Although the Church of Scotland was granted a £750 pittance from provincial funds, the money was never given as a right until 1840.

The other and related aspect of the Society's interests was the sending of missionaries to Canada beginning in 1829. In the next fifteen years the Society (and its less Evangelical successor, the Colonial Committee of the General Assembly) despatched at least forty missionaries to the Canadas of whom twenty-five settled in Upper Canada.3 By 1831 the stage was set for confrontation or union between these invading Church of Scotland men and the rival local presbytery. That year the Synod of the Presbyterian Church in connection with the Church of Scotland was formed on recommendation of the Colonial Secretary in the imperial government as prerequisite to consideration of Presbyterian claims for financial support from the public treasury.4 Those tidy civil servants minds wanted only one Presbyterian voice, just as they dealt with only one Anglican and one Roman Catholic body in the colonies. The creation of this new Synod was therefore a first, albeit dictated, step towards Canadian Presbyterian unity and towards a share of the Clergy Reserves.

One week after the Kirk Synod was born the Presbytery of Upper Canada met and reorganized its fifteen ministers into a two-presbytery synod. High on this United Synod's agenda was the church union recommended by the Colonial Office. Union, it soon became obvious, would only be possible on terms dictated by the Kirk — namely adherence to a formula casting doubt on the validity of the Canadians' ministry — and while a few ministers of the United Synod did accept this humiliating offer after discussion and approval with their congregations, most remained aloof until

the assurance of also sharing in the Clergy Reserves fund brought about a union in 1840. "I should have felt better," reflected the Rev. William Smart, thirty-year veteran in Canada, "if the courtship had not been quite so long, and if the Marriage had taken place when our feelings were youthful and warm, however, as the Union or Marriage has now taken place, it only remains for the parties themselves, and their friends to make it as happy and prosperous as they can." The first-born offspring of the marriage was Queen's College at Kingston, a literary and theological institution for the enlarged Synod.

Members of this new Presbyterian Church of Canada were not the only Presbyterians in the two Canadas, but they were by far the most numerous. The next largest body was the Secessionist voluntarist, and temperance-minded United Presbyterian synod that had entered western upper Canada in the 1830s. Two separate similarly-minded miniscule groupings in the Niagara area owed their origin and their retarded growth to the American missionary enterprise, but together these three other brands of Presbyterians numbered barely 18,000 at the census of 1842, when the Church of Scotland counted 78,000.6 That census also showed the rapid population growth occurring in the areas west of Toronto. In 1824 the regions east of Toronto contained 80,000 persons, those west, 70,000. Eighteen years later the population had more than tripled, but the western districts which virtually coincided with the presbytery of Hamilton now boasted 259,000 to the eastern districts' total of 217,000, indicated a per centage increase of 365% in the west, to 275% in the east. By this date the western areas contained fifty-five per cent of the Upper Canadian population, but only forty-seven per cent of the Church of Scotland members in the colony.

Allowing that the population had doubled by natural increase in eighteen years, an average 10,000 immigrants must have entered the colony annually. By the same rough calculation it can be estimated that seven out of every ten immigrants into Upper Canada settled in the western half, making it the fastest growing part of British North America. It is impossible to ascertain either the number of Scots or Presbyterians among these most recent immigrants, but it is possible to identify several communities with a predominantly, almost exclusively Scottish character.7 Across the province, the Church of Scotland claimed sixteen per cent of the population — in the western half that per centage was only thirteen, a significant factor, if an inverted one, in the Disruption
of the Kirk just two years after this census had been made.

That "marriage" of 1840 was not fated to be either happy or prosperous. Exactly four years after Smart's hopeful comment, the Synod of the Presbyterian Church in connection with the Church of Scotland was torn apart and mortally wounded by Canada's version of the Scottish Disruption. If the union of 1840 can be viewed as a victory for Scottishness at the expense of the forces of indigenization and Canadianization, the Disruption of 1844 was even more clearly an example of transplanted ethnic consciousness. At first the union had seemed promising enough since the settlement of the Clergy Reserves question in 1840 by a division of funds among the four largest denominations (including the Roman Catholic church as "Protestant clergy") brought in £2600 to the Kirk in Canada the next year. But the Presbyterian eyes were now focussed on Scotland where the conflict over the power of patrons to intrude their candidates into congregations fascinated particularly those Presbyterians who had most recently arrived in the Canadas from the "auld country". As the crisis in the Church of Scotland approached, displaced Scots in Canada began to take sides in the overseas dispute.

Events "at home" had been reported in detail by the colonial press and no immigrant Scot could plead ignorance of the issues at stake. Short weeks before the Disruption of the General Assembly in May, 1843, sympathizers in Canada moved to establish their own newspaper to promote the cause of non-intrusion. Edinburgh-born George Brown and his father, Peter, had recently begun a journal in New York for British immigrants, and while visiting Canada George was offered financial support to establish a Free Church newspaper in Toronto. The younger Brown had found in Canada congenial spirits and unlimited opportunities, and so the Toronto Banner came into existence in August, 1843, as the voice of those who now espoused the cause of the new Free Church and rival of the older British Colonist which was trying to avoid the importation of Disruption.

Even before the first number of the Banner appeared the Synod had endured the first round of open controversy in its ranks. Its meeting at Toronto in July was presented with resolutions and counter-resolutions concerning the recent Disruption of the mother church in the mother country. Discussion began with a committee report on an overture from the presbytery of Hamilton. Its report called for the reaffirmation of the headship of Christ and expressed alarm at the conduct of the state in denying the spiritual independence of the Church of Scotland. While insisting that the Church of Scotland had no jurisdiction over this synod, the resolutions called on synod to defend its own independence from the state if necessary. Finally the resolutions reached the political crux — by expressing deep sympathy for the Scottish Disruptionists whose sacrifice for principle, "must ever command the admiration and respect of the Christian Church."11

The first response came from Rev Alexander Mathieson of Montreal, who asserted that no action was required of the synod because no communication had come from either church in Scotland.12 The intrusion issue did not concern Canadians and should not be raised because it would cause "disruption and confusion" in a synod already "too much divided." Mathieson's motion to defer further consideration was supported by Peter Campbell, one of the two professors at Queen's College. Campbell charged that the whole affair was a time-wasting, impractical exercise promoted by some interested persons who now claimed that the synod was committed to acting. He counselled against any hasty move that might, as the Canadian government had warned, lose the recently acquired share of the Clergy Reserves funds. Would not the people of Montreal and Quebec oppose such ministerial agitation? No, responded a voice from the other side where the anti-intrusionists were ranged in a block. Kingston people would, Campbell continued, charging at the same time that the clergy and laity were on opposite sides of this question.

Mark Y. Starke from Hamilton presbytery spoke next for the middle position, claiming that conscience dictated action now, even if that required foregoing all government aid, but the synod should remain in communion with both Scottish churches. Succeeding speakers generally supported the resolutions, the most interesting comment coming from John Cook, minister in Quebec, who admitted he had been converted by this discussion to support for the resolutions and avowed that even if his congregation opposed him, "he cared not for that when duty called him to act." Starke then introduced amendments mildly favourable to the Free Church, and Principal Liddell of Queen's offered a motion honouring the sincerity of the Disruptionists but condemning the Disruption. When at last the votes were taken after six hours of debate, four separate amendments were rejected and the original resolutions sustained by majorities of at least two to one, with John Cook moving the adoption of the committee's report.

The Banner had barely completed printing its lengthy account of
synod's proceedings when the issue of Disruption was raised in its columns. Letters asserting that the problem was Scottish, not Canadian, were answered by calls for separation to avoid sin by association. Invariably the conservatives tried to explain that the expression "in connection with the Church of Scotland" only meant holding the same standards. The plot thickened when the Colonial Committee of the residuary church wrote to Canadian ministers for advice on how to provide future aid in the colonies. The presbytery of Bathurst in eastern Upper Canada replied with a fulsome expression of attachment to the Church of Scotland, which reply was immediately denounced by Free Church supporters as a denial of synod's resolutions and an improper answer to an improper question. At the same moment five new ministerial recruits arrived from Scotland—three of them had come from the new Free Church in Scotland—all were received into the Presbytery of Hamilton. This was hardly surprising in view of the expanding population of that region and the fact that the synod's convener of home missions was a leading Free Church supporter and minister in the town of Hamilton.

The Presbytery of Hamilton, which had initiated the recent resolutions in synod, met in October, and denounced both the interference of the Church of Scotland's Colonial Committee in Canadian affairs and any reply thereto, and then the presbytery overruled the next synod to define its relationship to the Church of Scotland. These steps were followed by a letter to the Banner from M.Y. Starke claiming that the synod's sharing in the Clergy Reserves funds had nothing to do with any connection to the Church of Scotland, that he was confident the government of Canada would never interfere with synod's privileges, and that the synod and the Scottish Free Church held exactly the same principles regarding endowments and establishment.

Suddenly more heat was thrown on this ecclesiastical fire. In the autumn of 1843 the Banner discovered an unmitigated, unprecedented and unpresbyterian grab for power by those very Canadian clergy from the eastern districts who were unfriendly to the Scottish Disruption. A Temporalities bill had been introduced in the Canadian parliament to vest the church's property in presbyterian trustees rather than congregations, and to do so in the name of the Church of Scotland. The Banner claimed such a bill would give the state control over the church and would be a gross violation of the church's independence. More ominous still, this move was supposedly being promoted clandestinely. Eastern region clergy men tried vainly to divert popular wrath by reminding Presbyterian that the draft of this bill had been adopted by synod in 1842. Still the Banner would not abandon its anti-Erastian crusade nor would at least a dozen congregations where meetings had condemned the bill in strong language. Two former United Synod ministers—Boyd of Prescott and Smart of Brockville—actually withdrew their flocks from the synod in protest.

Although the Temporalities bill was ultimately abandoned, Isaac Buchanan claimed it had alienated three-quarters of the laity. A number of prominent Presbyterian laymen were roused to form a committee of correspondence in Montreal, and to call for a total renunciation of the Church of Scotland. "Scotchmen," said Buchanan, "when they don't (sic) like or differ with their Ministers will have an alternative besides going to the Episcopalians & losing all his (sic) weight or to sects who are in too many cases little more than political dissenters." At St Andrew's day celebrations a toast to the Free Church now usually replaced one to the Kirk. In the words of the Banner, "it is obvious that the question is about to be put." All that Canadian Presbyterianism needed was an organization-man to precipitate disruption.

The catalyst was the Rev Robert Burns, longtime secretary of the Glasgow Colonial Society, who responded to a request from several Canadian congregations that one of the Free Church deputies then raising money in the United States should visit Canada. Burns arrived at Toronto in early April and progressed with meetings and addresses in every major centre as far east as Quebec. No copies of the Banner have survived to describe Burns' impact but his own diary describes the month-long tour as a Roman triumph. Greeted everywhere by "many friends", "conveyed" from breakfast meetings to church services to long evening discussion sessions, and convoyed from Brockville to Prescott by a half-mile procession of men, women and children in carriages and on horseback, Burns injected an almost messianic note to the growing fervour for Disruption Scottish-style.

Burns only rebuff came at Kingston where the Rev John Machar, author of the ill-starred Temporalities bill, barred Burns from his pulpit. But when Burns left Kingston six of the seven theological students at Queen's avowed their intention to join the Free Church as soon as it was organized. Interestingly, in view of the final results, Burns stopped only at Hamilton in the vast presbytery of Hamilton. Before he returned to Scotland in May, 1844, the Rev Alex Mathieson assured the residuary church of the loyal-
ty of Lower Canada and the older parts of Upper Canada — "in the western districts I am sorry to perceive that a different spirit seems to prevail...."29 In fact, however, before Burns' departure several congregations had declared for the Free Church, and by the time synod met at Kingston in early July, twenty-two congregations had indicated their support for disruption. The synod resolutions of 1843 had seemed a happy compromise at the time but on the eve of the 1844 synod the Free Church in Scotland stirred the pot by advising the Canadian moderator that the synod's statement was "not in all respects what we could have wished."30

Moderator John Clugston opened the Canadian synod with a sermon on 2 Corinthians iv, 8: "We are troubled on every side." The next morning M.Y. Starke was elected as new moderator, the third Free Church sympathizer in a row to hold office. Various overtures on relations with the Church of Scotland were read, whereupon John Cook reported for a committee on relations with the Kirk that the Kirk in Scotland neither had nor claimed jurisdiction over the synod, that the synod had full liberty and expected no interference from the state, that the causes of disruption did not exist in Canada, and that correspondence with both churches in Scotland should cease.31 Immediately John Bayne of Hamilton Presbytery moved that "every connection with the Church of Scotland be ended, that the name of the Canadian body become simply "the Presbyterian Church of Canada"", even if that meant loss of government support. Two other conflicting resolutions were introduced and withdrawn, and after two days of discussion in synod came two days of adjournment.

In the midst of this debate the synod was electrified by the arrival of the two harbingers from the Free Church in Scotland. The first was a letter from Dr Welsh, convener of its Colonial Committee, who announced that, "it has pleased the Great Head of the Church to visit and support us with many and great encouragements." The second harbinger was a more corporeal Free Church deputy who was first invited to preach from Machar's pulpit but who, when Machar suddenly withdrew the invitation, preached the Disruption in a Methodist chapel.32

At last the votes were taken — for Bayne's version, twenty ministers and twenty elders; for Cook's original report, thirty-nine ministers and seventeen elders in favour. Bayne with nineteen ministers and nineteen elders at once submitted a protest and another protest by two more ministers was also tabled. The first signature on Bayne's document was that of Moderator Starke who now became first moderator of the Free Church of Canada or, more precisely, of the "Presbyterian Church of Canada".

Who were the Canadian Disruptionists, those men who, in the name of principle and Scottishness, had smashed the Kirk in Canada? Of ninety-one ministers on the Kirk's roll, thirty-three left and twenty-nine (or ninety-six per cent) of these were Scottish by birth (the residuaries' rate was only seventy-seven per cent).33 Of twenty-five Disruptionists whose degrees are known, ten came from the two Aberdeen colleges, eight from Glasgow and seven from Edinburgh. If educational origins have any relevance, however, it is more important that among the Canadian residuaries twenty-seven out of fifty-three were alumni of Glasgow. At first sight it is disconcerting to find that only fourteen of the twenty-seven Glasgow Colonial Society missionaries still in the two Canadas joined the Canadian Disruption. It is more valuable to note that seven of these fourteen were in the Presbytery of Hamilton, which had fifteen of the thirty-three Disruptionist ministers, the other eighteen being spread throughout four other presbyteries. By contrast, of the twenty-five former ministers of the United Synod only five joined the Free Church.

Of sixty-eight Church of Scotland congregations for which data is available, thirty-eight continued an uninterrupted life in the Kirk but nine other changes had not been re-established twenty-two years after the Disruption, indicating that congregations tended to leave or stay as a body rather than to split internally. Of those congregations visibly divided by the Disruption, eleven adhering to the Church of Scotland were left without ministers for an average of five years, but apparently in three instances only did the Disruption lead to legal actions over possession of congregational property.

The new Free Church was predominantly Scottish; it was strongest in the newly developed areas of the provinces; and its ministers were likely missionaries of the Evangelically-oriented Glasgow Colonial Society. Such an analysis is suggestive, but inconclusive. What is needed for control or balance is information regarding the Presbyterian laity — the men, and women, in the pew who put (or did not put) the money on the plate. Hints of lay pressure for disruption had been dropped in the great synod debate in 1843. Allusions to lay initiative at the congregational level were scattered throughout the columns of the Banner. Part of this pressure was due to the tradition that one minister west of Toronto called, "Ecclesiastic-phobia"34 — that ministers have their place,
and should keep in it: "Vile ecclesiastics" was one layman’s opinion of his spiritual advisers. 35 Certainly the affair of the Temporalities bill had aroused resentment against the same "clerical pretensions" that Kirk laymen had noted in the constitution of Queen’s University and in the management of the Kirk’s income from the Clergy Reserves. 36 Even before the Disruption those two vocal journalists and laymen, George and Peter Brown, were understood to be adamantly in favour of disruption.

Before the Disruption an outside observer, a United Presbyterian minister, remarked, "There are no indications of the ministers (except five or six) being generally in favour of any change... and probably (because of) the fear of losing their present pensions...." 37 One of his ministerial brethren later described the seceding ministers, "They came out from popular pressure, and are kirkish enough; but they have the popular cry after them." In a reported conversation at the opening of the crucial 1844 synod, one minister stated, "If there is not a disruption of the ministers, I fear there will be one of the people; for the pressure from without is great at present," 38 a point supported by Henry Esson, the Montreal voluntarist, who claimed a disruption between clergy and laity had occurred before the Disruption of the Church. "Scottish determination in Canada," said Principal Liddell, "was too weak to resist newly imported Scottish determination from Scotland." 39

By the time the Free Church Synod held its first working meeting at Toronto in October, 1844, it had thirty-two ministers on the roll and twenty-one congregations were listed as vacant. All the additional ministers were new arrivals. Isaac Buchanan, wealthy Upper Canadian merchant, was offering £50 to congregations joining the Free Church, if the congregation kept control of its property. 40 In succeeding years the Free Church grew by leaps and bounds — by 1846 it had forty-seven ministers; by 1856, one hundred and two. The immediate post-Disruption creation of Knox College provided a rapid and expanding supply of ministers made from local boys rather than immigrants. Knox’s student body grew from the seven dissidents at Queen’s to forty-four in 1847, and to fifty-two only one year later. Yet this very recruiting of young Canadians into the Free Church was one evidence that the 1844 victory of Scottishness was more obvious than real, more ephemeral than permanent. Proof of a trend towards Canadianization had begun to appear before the Disruption in the form of widespread voluntarist sentiment among the laity and some ministers.

The Free Church in Canada had accepted without demur the Scottish Free Church’s avowal of continued faith in the establishment principle as embodying the public recognition by a Christian state of Christ’s headship over the nations. The Scottish Disruptionists were fully agreed that the piper must be paid — their objection was against letting the payer call the tune for Christ’s piper. In Canada, however, the Scottishness of the local Disruption masked a division of thought over the very propriety of establishments. The Canadian Disruption had cost the young Free Church its claim to share in the Clergy Reserves. Should the Free Church, being de facto and by default voluntarist, pronounce itself voluntarist on principle, or should it maintain its support for the idea of establishment in Canada, even though the question of state aid was now seemingly as academic as the intrusion issue had been in 1844? In the late 1840’s the columns of the Banner carried letters, articles and news items, openly stating support for voluntarism, 41 but the moment of truth came in January, 1848, when the Canadian government announced that an accumulated surplus in the Clergy Reserves fund would be divided among any interested denominations, (except the four already receiving shares). 42

Five Free Church congregations in eastern Upper Canada (in fact in the old Bathurst Presbytery) petitioned for some of the preferred money. At the meeting of synod six months later, Brockville Presbytery overruled the synod to "secure a just proportion of said fund to the minister of this church." 43 To this a committee reported that, although state endowments might be legal, their acceptance or rejection should be "determined on the grounds of Christian expediency." Pressured by the laity, the synod rejected the overture and forbade any congregational requests to the government. This state support, it reasoned, offered "without reference to the distinction between truth and error," would "sow division and jealousy among our people," "diminish the usefulness of ministers and the liberality of the people," and permit "the evil influence which an irreligious government might exert through dependence (of the Church) upon the State...." "Christian expediency" had triumphed — the four-year old Free Church in Canada officially rejected endowments, and ultimately union in 1861 with the voluntarist United Presbyterians completed the transformation of the Free Church itself into a voluntarist and Canadianized Church.

For the Church of Scotland in Canada the Disruption ultimately
meant a slow death despite the fact that it still contained a majority of Canadian Presbyterians. True, it had been the Kirk that protested against the introduction of Scottish issues into the Canadian scene, but the combination in the Free Church of dynamic even aggressive expansionism with virtual voluntarism meant that within a decade of the Disruption the images of the two bodies had been ironically interchanged. Above all their respective stands on the reopened Clergy Reserves question made the Kirk appear as the conservative and alien Scottish influence, and the Free Church the more Canadian form of Presbyterianism. By default the Free Church had inherited that leadership of Canadian voluntarist Protestant opinion which the Methodists had enjoyed a generation earlier.

By 1851, just seven years after the Disruption, the Free Church members outnumbered the Kirk’s by seven to six. A decade later the membership of the Church of Scotland in Canada stood at 109,000, an increase of only seventy per cent (in a generation when the Canadian population grew by 210%), but the Free Church numbered 143,000, twice as many as the undivided Kirk could claim before the Disruption seventeen years ago. In 1866, on the eve of Confederation, the Church of Scotland had only 113 ministers (compared to ninety-one at the Disruption) and Queen’s University had graduated only fifteen ministers in a quarter century. On the other hand, the union of Free Church and United Presbyterian boasted 248 ministers and Knox College had graduated 125 in just twenty years.

For Canadian Presbyterianism the long-term results of the Disruption of 1844 can be seen in the decline of conservative and traditional churchmanship as exemplified by the Kirk, and in the rise to dominance of a Canadianized Free Churchmanship, thanks to rapid numerical growth and aggressive, almost intolerant evangelicalism. Forced by the loss of any claim to the Clergy Reserves in 1844 and by the partial victory of voluntarism in 1849 when that contentious issue was reopened, the Free Church advanced steadily from the day of Disruption. The ultimate step was the Canadian Presbyterian union of 1875 which virtually submerged every other Presbyterian tradition and enshrined the Free Church ethos in a single Canadian denomination from ocean to ocean.

In the Canadian Disruption of 1844 it had not mattered that the jurisdiction of the Church of Scotland ended at “the quay of Greenock” — what did matter was that Scots departing from that quay for British North America had carried with them a convic-
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