

## **Reverend Henry Cochrane: “Excellent Native Preacher,” “Bad Example” and “Innocent Victim of European Clerical Jealousy”<sup>1</sup>**

DEREK WHITEHOUSE-STRONG

---

In 1888, Bishop Richard Young used the career of Henry Cochrane to illustrate the importance of the character of “the man himself” in missionary work. He noted that Cochrane, an ordained Priest in the employ of the Anglican Church Missionary Society (CMS), had “laboured successfully and acceptably among the Indians” of the Canadian north-west and that “[n]o man ever experienced a stronger influence over our foremost indians [sic] viz. of St. Peter’s [Reserve].” The Bishop lamented, however, that “blighted family happiness & yielding to drink marred his ministry & compelled his suspension” and suggested that had this not been the case, “the Church in Rupert’s Land would have had no more eminent clergyman in the Indian field.”<sup>2</sup> From the CMS’s perspective, Cochrane’s career thus was one of failure, disappointment and unrealized potential.

An analysis of Cochrane’s career, however, reveals that he was and continued to be an influential religious, spiritual, and community leader to many of his aboriginal congregants. The controversies surrounding the priest illustrate that the aboriginal peoples of the Canadian north-west had distinct and defined expectations regarding the roles, responsibilities and obligations of CMS proselytizers, and that these expectations could differ from those held by the proselytizers themselves.

As is often the case when studying aboriginal persons in the nineteenth-century Canadian north-west, documentary evidence about Cochrane’s early life is sparse. It is clear that he was born to Cree parents who by the 1850s had settled at what came to be known as St. Peter’s

Indian Reserve.<sup>3</sup> In 1834, Reverend David Jones, one of the first CMS agents in the Canadian north-west, baptized the infant Cochrane.<sup>4</sup> Contemporaries described the priest as “a pure Indian,”<sup>5</sup> and the only recorded occasion that Cochrane identified himself as a non-Indian occurred in 1871 when, while applying for his deceased son’s Métis Scrip, he stated that he was a “half-Breed [sic].”<sup>6</sup>

After being employed as a schoolmaster and catechist at several CMS missions in the 1850s,<sup>7</sup> Cochrane studied under Bishop Anderson and later “at the Collegiate School” in Red River.<sup>8</sup> He was ordained a Deacon in 1858,<sup>9</sup> married Elizabeth Budd (daughter of Reverend Henry Budd) in 1859,<sup>10</sup> and later that year was ordained a priest.<sup>11</sup> Cochrane was then appointed to St. Clement’s Church at Mapleton where he remained until 1864 when he moved to Holy Trinity Church at Headingly.<sup>12</sup> In 1866, he was appointed “Native Pastor of the Indian Settlement” at St. Peter’s.<sup>13</sup>

Throughout the 1860s, agents of the CMS characterized Cochrane as being “very acceptable,”<sup>14</sup> “an excellent native preacher,”<sup>15</sup> and a man who was “respected & beloved by his people.”<sup>16</sup> They commented that was he a “ready speaker in Cree”<sup>17</sup> and in English,<sup>18</sup> that he delivered in a “rich & soft voice” sermons that were “valued” by his parishioners,<sup>19</sup> and that he fully exploited his Cree ancestry and his “knowledge of” Cree “language & habits” to facilitate his evangelizing efforts.<sup>20</sup>

The CMS also viewed Cochrane as the first true success of its efforts to train aboriginal proselytizers in the Canadian north-west. Throughout the nineteenth century, the CMS worked to educate and train persons of aboriginal ancestry to disseminate an evangelical Anglican interpretation of Christianity<sup>21</sup> and middle-class Victorian values, morality and culture to the peoples of the Canadian north-west.<sup>22</sup> The CMS, however, never intended to maintain a permanent presence in Canada; rather, its goal was to raise a body of trained aboriginal clergymen who would be supported by their own congregations and who eventually would become part of the colonial Anglican Church.<sup>23</sup>

Indeed, Bishop David Anderson hoped that Cochrane might have been “the first Miss[ionar]y of our own supported by ourselves.”<sup>24</sup> Upon Cochrane’s ordination in 1858, the Corresponding Committee of the Diocese of Rupert’s Land confirmed that “his salary would be provided by friends of the Church Missionary Society in Edinburgh guaranteed for three years, so as not to fall upon the Parent Society.”<sup>25</sup> More importantly to the CMS, however, Cochrane’s aboriginal congregations began contributing to his support in 1861.<sup>26</sup>

The inability or lack of desire of many aboriginal congregants to contribute to the financial support of Christian missionaries,<sup>27</sup> however, forced the CMS to place Cochrane on “its list of the Native Clergy” in 1862.<sup>28</sup> Consequently, while his aboriginal parishioners continued to support Cochrane partially through monetary contributions and contributions in kind, the Society assumed the responsibility for paying the bulk of his salary and continued to do so for the next two decades.<sup>29</sup>

Although Cochrane enjoyed professional success during the 1850s and 1860s, he also experienced personal setbacks and tragedies. His first wife (Elizabeth Budd was Cochrane’s second wife),<sup>30</sup> his sisters, and his three children (by two marriages and including his “last & only child”) all died during this period. As well, he lost his stables, barn, and horse to fire.<sup>31</sup> It is possible that these setbacks and his inability to deal with them in a manner that the CMS deemed appropriate contributed to his troubles with alcohol.<sup>32</sup>

In the late 1860s and early 1870s, the Bishop of Rupert’s Land twice “seriously admonished” Cochrane “for gross intemperance.” Because these events occurred privately (once in the Bishop’s house and once in Archdeacon Cowley’s house), the Bishop judged it prudent to limit his disciplinary action to personal warnings.<sup>33</sup>

Six years after his appointment to St. Peter’s, however, Cochrane seriously transgressed the CMS’s bounds of acceptable behaviour for clergymen when he became drunk in public. Expressing his own “pain,” “grief,” and “shame” about the incident, Archdeacon Cowley informed the CMS that on 11 July 1872

Rev. H. Cochrane went up the Settlement to do some business for his father-in-law, Mr. Budd of Devon, Boats from the Saskatchewan being then here, & fell into temptation, & a snare, which overcame him. He drank & was drunken! Lord this was known to many.<sup>34</sup>

When challenged about the accusations, Cochrane admitted that the charge against him was “substantially correct.” Concerned about the impact that Cochrane’s public drunkenness would have on the CMS’s efforts to inculcate Victorian notions of morality and respectability, Archdeacons Cowley and McLean suspended the priest until they could reach a permanent decision about the matter.<sup>35</sup>

Cochrane’s parishioners, however, did not perceive his drinking to be a significant cause for concern, and considered his ability to interact

with them in their own language and their own cultural contexts to be of greater importance. Consequently, the “Xtian Indians” reacted to the news of Cochrane’s punishment with great “excitement & distress.” Cowley, in fact, advised the CMS that “after the second Sunday’s suspension they seemed unable to bear it.” Individually Cochrane’s congregants lobbied on his behalf, and as a group they “drew up & presented a petition to Dr. McLean praying that their beloved Minister might be allowed one more trial.”<sup>36</sup>

In response to the actions of the parishioners, McLean “called a counsel [sic] of clergy & laity, to advise” him on the case. After evaluating the situation, the Society’s agents determined that Cochrane’s public actions and his perceived lack of self-control threatened the CMS’s entire mission on St. Peter’s Reserve because they diminished both his personal stature within the community and his ability to lead by example.<sup>37</sup>

The Council, nevertheless, determined that given the demonstrated and wide-spread support for Cochrane, as well as the tension and dissension caused by his suspension, continuing to enforce the censure would do more harm than good. It “agreed that, under the circumstances which were fully discussed, it would be well to receive and act upon the prayer of the petition”<sup>38</sup> and therefore reinstated Cochrane. Two months after Cochrane’s suspension ended, Cowley reported that “Mr. Cochrane is going on very nicely, and effectively; and apparently avoiding occasions of evil, and circumstances of temptation.”<sup>39</sup>

Cochrane’s congregants welcomed the end to the controversy and were thankful that the priest would continue to work amongst them.<sup>40</sup> In late 1874, however, the CMS’s agents regretfully reported that the Reverend “has again fallen”<sup>41</sup> and had been “commonly charged with having become intoxicated.”<sup>42</sup> Archdeacon Cowley expressed “much pain & annoyance” at Cochrane’s latest lapse and informed the Society that “I fear no sufficient guarantee can be had against occasional outbreaks, such as alas we have too often heard of, so long as he should remain within the reach of temptation.”<sup>43</sup>

In 1872, the Society’s representatives in the Diocese of Rupert’s Land had forgiven Cochrane’s excessive public consumption of alcohol as being a singular lapse in judgement; in 1874 a pattern of behaviour began to emerge. Cochrane’s history suggested that unless he left St. Peter’s, he was likely to repeat his offence to the detriment of his own authority and that of the CMS. The Finance Committee determined that “only one course remained & that was to place him away from the cause

of temptation.”<sup>44</sup> Because it was “forbidden by stringent Laws to import liquor into, or to have any in the interior, i.e., the North West Territory,”<sup>45</sup> the local Committee agreed to send Cochrane to Stanley in the English River district where “he will not get liquor.”<sup>46</sup>

As they had in 1872, many in Cochrane’s congregation did not believe that his actions were overly serious and rose in defence of their minister. They asked the CMS’s representatives to grant Cochrane another chance and even conveyed “a threat of withdrawing from the Church if he were permanently removed.”<sup>47</sup> Cochrane, however, realizing that the CMS was losing patience with him, willingly accepted the transfer and thereby effectively frustrated the efforts that his congregants undertook on his behalf.

In August of 1874, Mr. and Mrs. Cochrane left St. Peter’s.<sup>48</sup> Mrs. Anabella Cowley, wife of the Archdeacon, described the Cochranes’ departure as a “very sorrowful parting to us all.” She informed the CMS that “[n]umbers stood on the bank to shake hands, as they went to the boat & all were in tears, scarcely any one could say ‘Good Bye.’”<sup>49</sup> Unfortunately, Cochrane was unable to perform some of the more mundane responsibilities of mission work at Stanley. Cowley reported that Cochrane “is incompetent to manage the Grist mill or the press; and . . . he cannot without the aid of an efficient carpenter carry on the contemplated building in which provision has been there made.”<sup>50</sup>

In light of these inadequacies, in May of 1875 the Bishop of Rupert’s Land removed Cochrane to Cumberland where he would “be associated” with his father-in-law Reverend Henry Budd who was stationed at Devon.<sup>51</sup> Budd, however, died less than two months later.<sup>52</sup> Although he was deeply saddened by Budd’s passing, Cochrane proactively assumed Budd’s responsibilities and informed the CMS that he was working at Devon Station “as if I had been appointed officially.”<sup>53</sup> In recognition of his initiative during a time of great personal distress, the Finance Committee formally authorized Cochrane to “take charge of Devon for the present.”<sup>54</sup>

Cochrane fulfilled his missionary responsibilities to the satisfaction both of his congregants and of the CMS; he even served as an official interpreter during the Treaty Five negotiations.<sup>55</sup> The Committee nevertheless remained concerned about the Reverend’s weakness for alcohol and in 1877 denied his request to visit either the Province of Manitoba or England.<sup>56</sup> These concerns proved to be well-founded because in early 1879, Elizabeth Cochrane charged her spouse “with having imported

spirituous liquors, drinking himself drunk, courting her two sisters, Mrs. Ballentine, & Miss Eliza Budd, & with beating herself with his fist, & with a horsewhip.”<sup>57</sup>

Mr. Adams, the Hudson’s Bay Company Postmaster at the Pas independently confirmed to Archdeacon Cowley that there was “a considerable ground for scandal” at Devon. Adams’ concern led him to recommend that “an investigation should be had” and to suggest that it would be beneficial to “change” personnel. The Postmaster did not find any fault with Cochrane’s preaching; rather, he suggested that the priest’s tumultuous personal life was having an ill effect upon the people of Devon. Adams advised Cowley that “we all bear great responsibility for the example we set in our daily life either for good or evil” and noted that Cochrane’s example was very poor.<sup>58</sup>

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

Mrs. Cochrane affirmed the truth of all she had written against her husband, and . . . she also stated that it was on this account that she had left him, taking refuge with Mr. Clemons, over the river. Mr. Cochrane denied being drunk, & taking improper liberties with his sisters-in-law, but admitted slapping his wife, on account of her morose conduct, & unreasonable suspicion; producing in confirmation of what he said, a . . . [?] paper which he had found in the house in her, Mrs. Cochrane’s, handwriting. Here it is only proper for me to say that long since she had shown me a paper in Mr. Cochrane’s handwriting, upon which she grounded in part her suspicions of evil, & that she then & there referred to that slip of paper.<sup>59</sup>

Cowley continued:

The interview was long & very painful. In summing up the evidence I addressed them both seriously, & showed the possible effect upon the people of the Mission Station of their conduct, culminating in the one fleeing from the other, & their living apart, might have; & begged them to reconcile themselves, & again dwell together in unity. At my instance [sic] they kissed each other, & Mrs. Cochrane consented to remain in the Mission house. I remained ten days at the Mission going in & out among the people, visiting all the Indians living at the Station, & also the Company’s people. Found the Indians very

reticent; but the general impression seemed to be that Mr. & Mrs. Cochrane were living a cat & dog life, & that he drank.<sup>60</sup>

Thus, while Cowley was uncertain about the veracity of the charges against Cochrane relating to improprieties with his sisters-in-law,<sup>61</sup> and observed that “some people think that she is not blameless, & that she is wanting in prudence,”<sup>62</sup> he was convinced, but lacked solid proof, that the priest had resumed drinking. Nevertheless, Cowley hoped that the damage might be minimized if the Cochranes could maintain the appearance of civil cohabitation that was expected of missionaries and their wives.<sup>63</sup>

“[M]atters,” however, “did not improve” as that autumn the “chief of the Devon Indians” informed Cowley that he was dissatisfied with the local state of affairs.<sup>64</sup> Whereas the parishioners of St. Peter’s had been confronted solely with Cochrane admitting to drunkenness, at Devon the charges against Mr. and Mrs. Cochrane were more far-reaching. In addition to accusations of drunkenness, questions regarding marital improprieties and their living apart threatened the image of the middle-class Victorian home that the CMS was trying to instil.<sup>65</sup> The Chief wrote:

I am very sorry to say anything that would be wrong – but I want you to take notice to what I have to say. The best thing that can be done is to remove our minister to some other place for we see the bad example. Send us someone in his place at once if possible.<sup>66</sup>

The Chief’s words confirmed to Cowley that Cochrane’s actions were negatively affecting “the public morals” and led him to conclude that, whatever the truth of the matter, “Cochrane’s influence for good, at Devon, is lost.”<sup>67</sup>

After reading the Archdeacon’s report, Bishop Machray concurred with Cowley’s analysis. He believed that “the charges of immorality . . . probably simply came out of jealousy & [?] . . . imagination,” but was inclined to accept the veracity of “Mr. Cochrane having been seen the worse of liquor.” Although he too lacked firm evidence against the Priest, Machray relied upon his previous experience, and informed the CMS that “[f]rom my knowledge of Mr. Cochrane’s character I suspect there is ground for this part of the charge.”<sup>68</sup> Like Cowley, the Bishop concluded that “Mr. Cochrane’s usefulness was gone, & that the Mission was deteriorating.”<sup>69</sup>

Faced with diminishing support from his counterparts in the CMS and from his congregation at Devon, Cochrane “tendered his resignation”<sup>70</sup>

and advised Archdeacon Cowley that “as soon as I can be relieved of this Mission, my connection with the CMS & church will cease.”<sup>71</sup> Cowley forwarded the document to the Bishop of Rupert’s who, because of the uncertainty surrounding the case, temporarily delayed accepting Cochrane’s resignation.<sup>72</sup>

The Society’s missionaries in the Diocese of Rupert’s Land struggled with the dilemma posed by Cochrane. Three times the priest had been accused of public drunkenness, and each time his counterparts noted that his actions hurt not only his position within his parish, but also, by his setting a bad example, the parishioners themselves. The Finance Committee discarded the idea of transferring Cochrane to the Diocese of Moosonee because it believed that in that locale “his language would not serve.” It also rejected sending him to missions that bordered on the Saskatchewan River because “his whole case would be known, & his influence of little avail for good.”<sup>73</sup> It further dismissed Touchwood Hills because of the “general feeling” that “temptations” there “would be quite equal to those at Devon.” After “very serious” and “pained” discussions, the Finance Committee regretfully informed the CMS that it lacked “confidence that [a] change of place would guarantee efforts of resistance & transformation.”<sup>74</sup>

The action that finally led the Bishop and Finance Committee to sever Cochrane’s connection to the CMS, however, was his “objectionable & treacherous” decision to offer his services “as a minister” to the Wesleyan Methodists. After tendering his resignation, Cochrane suggested to the Wesleyans that if they appointed him to St. Peter’s “he could bring over the Indians.”<sup>75</sup> Cognizant that he still exerted significant influence among many of the Protestant inhabitants of St. Peter’s, Cochrane informed Archdeacon Cowley that “he would do all he could to open the door in this Reserve to dissenters.”<sup>76</sup>

Given Cochrane’s history with alcohol, his actions towards the Methodists, and doubts about his ability to convey appropriate middle-class Victorian values, the CMS’s agents recommended that the Society accept his resignation. Reverend Richard Young wrote:

Our desire all thro’ this has been to treat Mr. C. with the greatest leniency & forbearance & we felt that the same standard could not be applied to him as a native that we should require of a European, but still with every allowance we have come to the conviction that to allow things to go on undealt with might only lead to yet greater offence.<sup>77</sup>



The local Finance Committee also hoped that accepting Cochrane's resignation would minimize his corrupting influence at CMS's missions and that it would "prove such a shock to his feelings . . . [that it] shall lead him to reflection, repentance, and thorough transformation of his life."<sup>78</sup> The CMS concurred that Cochrane had "lost all influence . . . of the right kind" and accepted his letter of resignation.<sup>79</sup>

The Bishop of Rupert's Land informed Cochrane that the Society had "removed him from their list" and cautioned that "it was most unlikely that they would again place him on their list." He then suspended Cochrane's "License for 3 years and [would] not renew it then nor afterwards unless [he] . . . had satisfactory evidence of his conduct for 3 years."<sup>80</sup>

Despite these sanctions, when Cochrane returned to St. Peter's in the Summer of 1880, he "held [religious] services" that were "contrary to the order of the Church of England because he lacked the consent of either Archdeacon Cowley or the Rev. Gilbert Cook who were in charge of the Parish and Mission."<sup>81</sup> Furthermore, Cochrane informed Cowley that he would continue to work against the CMS's efforts at St. Peter's. He wrote:

I have tried all I could to keep the people quiet ever since I came, but from now on I will encouraged them to do as they please & let me tell you here, a great many of them are in favour [of] going over to the dissenters, & have actually made overtures to them.<sup>82</sup>

Cochrane continued: "I will not hide from you that I will do all in my power to open a door for them [the Methodists] among these people."<sup>83</sup>

The CMS's agents underestimated both Cochrane and his popularity among his parishioners. Soon after Cochrane returned to St. Peter's, Cowley advised the Society that the priest posed a very real threat to the mission. He warned that Cochrane "[is] a very able & eloquent preacher" who "has entire possession of his mother tongue, the Cree, & also is very competent in Saulteau [sic]."<sup>84</sup> In fact, Cowley reported that by virtue of "his powerful eloquence in Cree, & his fascinating address," as well as "[h]is urbanity, commanding voice, native ease, & pleasant temper," Cochrane had succeeded in "draw[ing] after him a large number of the congregation."<sup>85</sup>

Cowley was frustrated and disappointed that many of the parishioners of St. Peter's Reserve would support Cochrane in open defiance of the CMS. He lamented that "the action of the Indians has shaken my

confidence in their spiritual mindedness; & it grieves me greatly to see them carried away by eloquence, almost to ignoring the sin of drunkenness.”<sup>86</sup> In particular, Cowley disapproved of the parishioners’ willingness to “think so lightly” of “the sin of drunkenness, & especially drunkenness in a clergyman!”<sup>87</sup>

When deciding how best to deal with Cochrane’s return to St. Peter’s, however, the Society’s agents failed to consider adequately the perspectives of the aboriginal congregants. Although they accurately observed that Cochrane’s oratory ability and personality led many St. Peter’s parishioners to abandon the CMS’s services, they underestimated the deep dissatisfaction that many congregants felt regarding the abilities and actions of their current CMS sanctioned clergyman, Reverend Gilbert Cook.

The parishioners of St. Peter’s, therefore, surprised the CMS’s agents when many abandoned Reverend Gilbert Cook’s ministrations in favour of Cochrane’s. The missionaries believed that Cook was “a very estimable man” and although they admitted that he had been unable “to wi[n] . . . the affection of the people,” they were confident that he was “conscientious in the discharge of his duties.” Archdeacon Cowley stated that the “discontent” against Cook was “was only the work of a few” and that many of the charges brought against him were “trivial.”<sup>88</sup>

Cook, who also was of aboriginal ancestry, similarly described many of the complaints against him as being petty and unimportant. He noted that some individuals expressed ill-will toward him for such minor issues (at least from his perspective) as his “wanting something to kneel on when offering prayers in the houses & not shaking hands with everybody.”<sup>89</sup> Consequently, when Cochrane held “divine services on Sundays, morning & evening, in the upper and lower parts of the parish” for several weeks in a row,<sup>90</sup> the CMS’s sanctioned representatives “[a]t first” took no direct action believing that it was “advisable to leave the agitators alone.”<sup>91</sup>

The missionaries soon recognized, however, that as the “passionate clamouring [“by the Indians”] for Mr. Cochrane” continued to grow, so too did the “feeling of hostility manifested against Rev. G. Cook.”<sup>92</sup> Archdeacon Cowley informed the CMS that many of the parishioners of St. Peter’s Reserve complained that Cook’s health, temperament, and disposition were not what they expected of a clergyman.<sup>93</sup> One parishioner argued that Cook was “not fit to be in the Parish, too weak for the Parish, too proud for St. Peter’s, too wicked (i.e. short tempered) to be a clergyman, [and] . . . keeps too much spite.” Other parishioners agreed,

suggesting that the Reverend was “a weak man” both in terms of personality and physical ability, bemoaning that Cook was “too proud,” and noting that his poor health left him incapable of carrying on religious services. Still others noted that Cook spoke their language poorly and that they could not hear his sermons because he was too quiet in the pulpit.<sup>94</sup>

In contrast, parishioners praised Cochrane’s ability to interact with them on a personal level and to conduct in their own languages meaningful services that addressed their spiritual needs. One congregant stated: “I want Mr. Cochrane. I feel his preaching in my heart.” Another noted: “We loved Mr. Cochrane from the first. When he left the place [it] felt like our place was falling down & [the] church [was] falling down.”<sup>95</sup>

Further, Cowley reported that although the details of Cochrane’s various failings were well known to the people of the Parish, the congregants did “not believe Mr. Cochrane [was] guilty” of an offence serious enough to warrant the severing of his connection to the CMS.<sup>96</sup> He advised the CMS that “Mr. Cochrane’s followers are raising the cry of persecution, & representing him as the innocent victim of European clerical jealousy, & malice.” Cowley noted that the congregants attacked and “abuse[d]” him “as the channel through which Mr. Cochrane’s deeds have seen the light, & as a barrier against the progress of the efforts of the disaffected.”<sup>97</sup> Cowley informed the CMS that John Thomas, who had been a “vestryman [for] about 18 years & [a] church warden before that,” warned a CMS delegation that “[i]f we do not get him [Cochrane] back we will not go back to the church (applause).” Thomas continued: “If it is impossible to get him back we will follow him (applause).” Cowley reported that another person also received a round of “loud applause” for proclaiming that “[i]f we do not get Mr. Cochrane [we] will go elsewhere.”<sup>98</sup>

Thus, although CMS agents believed that the criticisms that the local congregants levelled against Cook were “trivial,”<sup>99</sup> many of the congregants expressed an intense personal dislike of the priest and doubted his ability to meet their needs and expectations of a minister.<sup>100</sup> Cowley advised the Bishop that “neither in our visiting the houses nor at the Public Meetings were there any warm expressions in his [Cook’s] favor [sic]. All that was said amounted to ‘Have nothing against Mr. Cook.’”<sup>101</sup> In contrast, Cowley informed the Society that “there was either silence about Mr. Cochrane or strong expression of feeling in his favour.”<sup>102</sup> In fact, at a meeting called during the investigation, less than one in ten of those present voted to retain Mr. Cook’s services at the Parish, while a “large majority” voted “in favour of Mr. Cochrane.”<sup>103</sup>

In addition to abandoning Cook's services in increasing numbers, many in the parish employed other more direct and proactive tactics to demonstrate their support for Cochrane and their opposition to the unilateral actions of the CMS. These activities included holding "Public Meetings," circulating petitions to secure Cochrane's re-appointment as their minister,<sup>104</sup> and "attend[ing] the services of the Wesleyan Methodists" at Selkirk.<sup>105</sup>

By early 1881, Cowley regretfully informed the CMS that its efforts to introduce the concept of self-support had produced unintended results: "a subscription list for . . . [Cochrane's] support is in circulation." Moreover, Cowley noted that "the last phase [of "how matters go here"] is the attempt to introduce the "the 'Reformed Episcopal Church' which originated . . . some years ago in the United States." Cowley wrote that "one of its bishops [sic]" was in "communication" with Cochrane and sent him "encouraging letters."<sup>106</sup>

Fortunately for the Society, at around the same time that the Bishop of the Reformed Episcopal Church made overtures towards Cochrane, a new government-funded school opened on St. Peter's Reserve. Chief Henry Prince, hoping to diffuse the increasingly tense situation on the Reserve, advised Cochrane "to take the school." Both Prince and Cowley also recommended that Cochrane accept the position in order to stem the flow of Protestant children to a day school that the Oblate Father Reverend J. Allard had established "without instruction" from the Department of Indian Affairs.<sup>107</sup>

Cochrane, who was no longer receiving a salary from the CMS, had been conducting classes "in the old school house" prior to the construction of the new building,<sup>108</sup> and "consented to accept" the position of schoolteacher should "the Government" offer it to him. Further, he pledged to "use his influence [as schoolteacher] to maintain order & quietness."<sup>109</sup> Cowley observed that this event "seem[ed] to have influenced Mr. Cochrane to abstain from holding religious services in this Reserve."<sup>110</sup>

Edgar Dewdney, the Indian Commissioner, reported to his superiors that Cochrane was "willing to undertake the duties [of schoolteacher] and as the Indians have confidence in him as a teacher, I would recommend that he be appointed."<sup>111</sup> The Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, however, preferred that a teacher with a "first class certificate" fill the position and doubted that Cochrane "comes within that category."<sup>112</sup>

When the position was advertised in early 1881, only two applications were received. The first application was from one H.A. Ross, who

only possessed at “3<sup>rd</sup> Class Certificate from the Board of Education”<sup>113</sup> but who had previously taught at another school on the reserve.<sup>114</sup> Ross, however, subsequently withdrew from the competition due to “a change in . . . [his] affairs.”<sup>115</sup>

Henry Cochrane’s was the second application,<sup>116</sup> and it included character references and a “Certificate of Competency”<sup>117</sup> confirming “his qualifications for becoming teacher in any of the Indian schools to which he may be appointed by the Department.”<sup>118</sup> The Deputy Superintendent of Indian Affairs acknowledged that Cochrane had “lost his position [?] as a Clergymen for intemperance,” but commented that his character references combined with a letter from Archdeacon Cowley led him to “hope he has reformed.”<sup>119</sup> The Department of Indian Affairs, therefore, “provisionally” appointed Cochrane for one year as the teacher at the new school on St. Peter’s Reserve.<sup>120</sup>

Because the parishioners of St. Peter’s were satisfied that Cochrane would remain among them, they directed their efforts to securing the removal of Reverend Gilbert Cook. Even after they were informed that Cochrane had accepted the position of schoolteacher and therefore would not be reinstated as their minister, “many” parishioners insisted that “that they will not again enter our church till Mr. Cook is turned out and Mr. Cochrane put in as Minister.”<sup>121</sup> In direct response to the “agitation”<sup>122</sup> and the general sense of “crisis,”<sup>123</sup> the local Finance Committee “came unanimously to the conclusion that it was advisable to remove Mr. Cook while recognising no culpabilities [sic] on his part.”<sup>124</sup> In 1881, with Cochrane voicing approval,<sup>125</sup> it replaced Cook with Reverend Benjamin McKenzie, another clergyman of aboriginal ancestry.<sup>126</sup>

Many individuals nevertheless continued to press for Cochrane to be “reinstated as Minister of the Parish.” Although the CMS believed that McKenzie was proceeding satisfactorily, and although he was more acceptable to the inhabitants of St. Peter’s than Cook, congregants criticised his inability to speak fluent Cree. In contrast, parishioners continued to praise Cochrane’s oratory ability and his “genial” personality. Cowley therefore did not doubt that if the decision to appoint clergymen was left to the parishes, “the Indians would be very clamorous for the reinstatement of Mr. Cochrane, as Minister of St. Peter’s.”<sup>127</sup>

The decision to appoint clergymen, however, was not the responsibility of the parishes, and Cochrane never applied to have his license reinstated. His salary of \$504 per annum<sup>128</sup> was equivalent to his previous salary of °100 per annum as a Priest in the CMS’s employ,<sup>129</sup> and school

inspections that followed described him as being “well fitted for the position.”<sup>130</sup> Further, he remained active on the reserve, but not as a clergyman. Rather, he “read the lessons in church,” took part in “frequent Temperance meetings,”<sup>131</sup> and remained employed as a teacher throughout the 1880s.<sup>132</sup>

Representatives of the CMS and Protestant members of St. Peter’s Indian Reserve thus had distinctly different visions of what was required of an ordained clergyman. The CMS initially portrayed Cochrane as the embodiment of what it could achieve under its Native Church policy. It believed him capable of embracing and inculcating the elements of middle-class Victorian values and religion that it wished to spread to the aboriginal peoples of the Canadian north-west. After witnesses on several occasions accused him of public drunkenness and sexual impropriety, however, the CMS no longer believed that he possessed the moral authority and respectability required of a Christian clergyman and severed its connection to the priest. From the perspective of his missionary contemporaries, Cochrane’s career thus was one of failure, disappointment, and unrealized potential.

To the Protestant aboriginal parishioners of St. Peter’s Indian Reserve, however, Cochrane was and continued to be an important and influential religious, spiritual, and community leader throughout his career. The fact that Cochrane became drunk in public on several occasions was less important to the congregants than was his ability to interact with them in their own language and in a manner that made Christianity vital, relevant, and appealing. Because he met their needs as a clergyman and later as a schoolteacher, many of the parishioners of St. Peter’s therefore were fiercely loyal to Cochrane, to the point of actively challenging the CMS and threatening withdrawal from the Anglican Church.

### ***Endnotes***

1. Hunter to Chapman, 7 October 1862, C.1/O (A91), Church Missionary Society Microfilm, Public Archives of Canada [hereafter cited as CMS]; Machray to the “Parishioners of St. Peters’ Parish and Mission” [c. 1881], C.1/O.1 (A109), CMS; and Cowley to Secretaries, 31 December 1880, C.1/O.1 (A109), CMS.
2. Anderson to Fenn, 20 September 1888, C.1/O.2 (A115), CMS.

3. Anderson to Venn, 27 September 1957, C.1/M.6 (A80), CMS. The area was also known as St. Peter's Dynevor Parish. Regarding the various names associated with this parish and Indian Reserve, see T.C.B. Boon, "St. Peter's Dynevor, The Original Indian Settlement of Western Canada," *Manitoba Historical Society Transactions* 3, No. 9 (1952-1953), and "Canada Department of Indian Affairs Treaty List for St. Peter's Dynevor Reserve, 1871-1883," Microfilm Reel M12, Provincial Archives of Manitoba, Winnipeg, MB.
4. Anderson to Venn, 27 September 1858, C.1/M.6 (A80), CMS.
5. Anderson to Venn, 27 September 1957, C.1/M.6 (A80), CMS.
6. "Claim of Henry Cochrane as Sole Heir to his Child Arthur H. Cochrane," 14 July 1871, Vol. 1319, Series D-111-8-a, RG15.
7. See Budd to Secretary, 31 July 1855, C.1/M.5 (A79), CMS; Journal entry of Budd, 13 June 1855, C.1/O (A83), CMS; and Cowley to Straith, 10 September 1858, C.1/M.6 (A80), CMS.
8. Anderson to Venn, 12 January 1858, C.1/M.6 (A80), CMS.
9. Anderson to Venn, 27 September 1858, C.1/M.6 (A80), CMS.
10. Journal entry of Cowley, 23 October 1859, C.1/O (A87), CMS.
11. Journal entry of Cowley, 27 December 1859, C.1/O (A87), CMS.
12. Boon, "St. Peter's Dynevor."
13. CMS to Cowley, 14 December 1866, C.1/L.3 (A76), CMS.
14. Journal entry of Hunter, 29 May 1862, C.1/O (A90), CMS.
15. Hunter to Chapman, 7 October 1862, C.1/O (A91), CMS.
16. Annual Letter of Cowley, 25 November 1868, C.1/O (A87), CMS.
17. Annual Letter of Hunter, 14 February 1862, C.1/O (A91), CMS. See also Budd to Secretary, 31 July 1855, C.1/M.5 (A79), CMS.
18. Machray to Fenn, 17 December 1871, C.1/M.8 (A80), CMS.
19. Annual Letter of Hunter, 14 February 1862, C.1/O (A91), CMS.
20. Hunter to Venn, 1 December 1864, C.1/O (A91), CMS. For a discussion of this topic, see Derek Whitehouse-Strong, "'Because I Happen to Be a Native Clergyman': The Impact of Race, Ethnicity, Status, and Gender on Native Agents of the Church Missionary Society in the Nineteenth Century Canadian

- North-West” (Ph.D. diss., University of Manitoba, 2004), 164-165.
21. See Whitehouse-Strong, “Because I Happen to Be a Native Clergyman,” 18-19.
  22. See Chapter Two of Whitehouse-Strong, “Because I Happen to Be a Native Clergyman.” Defining and characterizing the middle-class is beyond the scope of this study. See G. Kitson Clark, *The Making of Victorian England* (London: Methuen, 1962); J.F.C Harrison, *Late Victorian England, 1875-1901* (Glasgow: Fontana Press, 1990); and Walter E. Houghton, *The Victorian Frame of Mind: 1830-1870* (London: Oxford University Press, 1957).
  23. Whitehouse-Strong, “Because I Happen to Be a Native Clergyman,” 89.
  24. Anderson, 12 January 1858, C.1/M.6 (A80), CMS.
  25. Minutes of the Corresponding Committee, Red River, 28 May 1858, C.1/M.6 (A80), CMS.
  26. Hunter to Straith, 19 June 1861, C.1/M.6 (A80), CMS.
  27. Whitehouse-Strong, “Because I Happen to Be a Native Clergyman,” 186-190.
  28. Hunter to Chapman, 7 October 1862, C.1/O (A91), CMS.
  29. Resolutions of the Corresponding Committee of the Diocese of Rupert’s Land, 9 September 1879, Minutes of the Finance Committee, CMS, 1877-1885, Typescript (P.338), Archives of the Ecclesiastical Province of Rupert’s Land, Provincial Archives of Manitoba, Winnipeg, MB [hereafter cited as AEPRL].
  30. Journal entry of Budd, 10 July 1968, C.1/O (A98), CMS. See also Journal entry of Cowley, 23 October 1859, C.1/O (A87), CMS; and Cowley to Secretaries, 3 August 1867, C.1/O (A87), CMS.
  31. Cowley to Secretaries, 3 August 1867, C.1/O (A87), CMS.
  32. Machray to Fenn, 20 September 1888, C.1/O.2 (A115), CMS.
  33. Machray to the “Parishioners of St. Peters’ Parish and Mission” [1881?], C.1/O.1 (A109), CMS.
  34. Cowley to Secretaries, 26 July 1872, C.1/M.8 (A80), CMS.
  35. Cowley to Secretaries, 26 July 1872, C.1/M.8 (A80), CMS.
  36. Cowley to Secretaries, 26 July 1872, C.1/M.8 (A80), CMS.
  37. Cowley to Secretaries, 26 July 1872, C.1/M.8 (A80), CMS.



38. Cowley to Secretaries, 26 July 1872, C.1/M.8 (A80), CMS.
39. Cowley to Secretaries, 20 September 1872, C.1/M.6 (A80), CMS.
40. See Cochrane to Indian Affairs Branch, 3 November 1873, File 2673, Vol. 3604, Record Group 10, Public Archives of Canada Microfilm [hereafter cited as RG10]; and Asham to Minister of the Interior, 19 November 1873, File 2819, Vol. 3605, RG10.
41. Grisdale to Wright, 10 September 1874, C.1/M.9 (A81), CMS.
42. Machray to Fenn, 10 September 1874, C.1/O (A100), CMS.
43. Cowley to Secretaries, 22 October 1874, C.1/M.9 (A81), CMS.
44. Machray to Fenn, 10 September 1874, C.1/O (A100), CMS. Refer also to Grisdale to Wright, 10 September 1874, C.1/M.9 (A81), CMS.
45. Cowley to Secretaries, 22 October 1874, C.1/M.9 (A81), CMS.
46. Machray to Fenn, 10 September 1874, C.1/O (A100), CMS.
47. Machray to Fenn, 10 September 1874, C.1/O (A100), CMS.
48. Grisdale to Wright, 10 September 1874, C.1/M.9 (A81), CMS.
49. Anabella Cowley to Secretary, 1 September 1874, C.1/M.9 (A81), CMS.
50. Cowley to Wright, 1 May 1875, C.1/M.10 (A81), CMS.
51. Minutes of the Finance Committee of the Diocese of Rupert's Land, 17 May 1875, Minutes of the Finance Committee, CMS, 1850-1876, Typescript (P.338), AEPRL.
52. Grisdale to Wright, 8 July 1875, C.1/M.10 (A81), CMS.
53. Cochrane to Secretaries, 12 August 1875, C.1/M.10 (A81), CMS.
54. Minutes of the Finance Committee of the Diocese of Rupert's Land, 9 June 1875, Minutes of the Finance Committee, CMS, 1850-1876, Typescript (P.338), AEPRL.
55. See *Treaty 5 Between Her Majesty the Queen and the Saulteaux and Swampy Cree Tribes of Indians at Beren's River and Norway House with Adhesions* (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1969).
56. "Copy of the Minutes of a Meeting of the Finance Comtee." of the Diocese of Rupert's Land, 10 March 1877, C.1/O.1 (A102), CMS.
57. Cowley to Wright, 1 August 1879, C.1/O.1 (A103), CMS.

58. Adams to Cowley, 27 May 1879, C.1/O (A103), CMS.
59. Cowley to Wright, 1 August 1879, C.1/O.1 (A103), CMS.
60. Cowley to Wright, 1 August 1879, C.1/O.1 (A103), CMS.
61. Adams himself doubted these charges. Adams to Cowley, 27 May 1879, C.1/O (A103), CMS.
62. Cowley to Wright, 2 July 1880, C.1/O.1 (A104), CMS.
63. See Chapter Seven of Whitehouse-Strong, "Because I Happen to Be a Native Clergyman."
64. Machray to the "Parishioners of St. Peters' Parish and Mission" [1881?], C.1/O.1 (A109), CMS.
65. See Chapter Seven of Whitehouse-Strong, "Because I Happen to Be a Native Clergyman."
66. Machray to the "Parishioners of St. Peters' Parish and Mission" [1881?], C.1/O.1 (A109), CMS.
67. Cowley to Wright, 12 December 1879, C.1/O.1 (A104), CMS.
68. Machray to Secretary, 12 November 1879, C.1/O.1 (A104), CMS. See also Machray to Wright, 25 August 1879, C.1/O.1 (A103), CMS.
69. Machray to Fenn, 28 January 1880, C.1/O.1 (A104), CMS.
70. Cowley to Wright, 29 October 1879, C.1/O.1 (A104), CMS.
71. Cochrane to Cowley, 26 August 1879, C.1/O.1 (A104), CMS. Note also Resolutions of the Corresponding Committee of the Diocese of Rupert's Land, 19 February 1880, Minutes of the Finance Committee, CMS, 1877-1885, Typescript (P.338), AEPRL; and Machray to the "Parishioners of St. Peters' Parish and Mission" [1881?], C.1/O.1 (A109), CMS.
72. Machray to Secretary, 12 November 1879, C.1/O.1 (A104), CMS. See also Machray to Fenn, 28 January 1880, C.1/O.1 (A104), CMS. The CMS left Cochrane's case in the Bishop's hands, see Cowley to Wright, 29 October 1879, C.1/O.1 (A104), CMS.
73. Cowley to Wright, 12 December 1879, C.1/O.1 (A104), CMS.
74. Cowley to Wright, 23 January 1880, C.1/O.1 (A104), CMS.
75. Machray to Fenn, 28 January 1880, C.1/O.1 (A104), CMS.
76. Cowley to Wright, 5 November 1880, C.1/O.1 (A104), CMS.

77. Young to Wright, 5 February 1880, C.1/O (A104), CMS. The issue of standards and expectations of English-born clergymen being applied to native-born proselytizers is discussed in Chapters Four, Five, and Six of Whitehouse-Strong, "Because I Happen to Be a Native Clergyman."
78. Cowley to Wright, 23 January 1880, C.1/O.1 (A104), CMS. Refer also to Resolutions of the Finance Committee of the Diocese of Rupert's Land, 8 January 1880, C.1/O.1 (A104), CMS.
79. CMS to Machray, 20 January 1880, C.1/L.4 (A77), CMS.
80. The Bishop noted that this evidence would be required of an English Clergyman in a similar situation. Bishop of Rupert's Land to the "Parishioners of St. Peters' Parish and Mission" [1881?], C.1/O.1 (A109), CMS.
81. Machray to the "Parishioners of St. Peters' Parish and Mission" [1881?], C.1/O.1 (A109), CMS.
82. Cochrane to Cowley, 30 September 1880, C.1/O.1 (A104), CMS.
83. Cochrane to Cowley, 30 September 1880, C.1/O.1 (A104), CMS.
84. Cowley to Wright, 5 November 1880, C.1/O.1 (A104), CMS.
85. Cowley to Secretaries, 31 December 1880, C.1/O.1 (A109), CMS.
86. Cowley to Wright, 5 November 1880, C.1/O.1 (A104), CMS.
87. Cowley to Secretaries, 31 December 1880, C.1/O.1 (A109), CMS.
88. Cowley, "A Report on St. Peter's Mission" [c. 1880], C.1/O.1 (A109), CMS.
89. Gilbert Cook as paraphrased by Cowley in "A Report on St. Peter's Mission" [c. 1880], C.1/O.1 (A109), CMS.
90. Cowley to Secretaries, 31 December 1880, C.1/O.1 (A109), CMS.
91. Machray to Secretaries, 29 December 1880, C.1/O.1 (A109), CMS.
92. Machray to Secretaries, 29 December 1880, C.1/O.1 (A109), CMS.
93. Cowley to Secretaries, 31 December 1880, C.1/O.1 (A109), CMS.
94. () in original. Cowley, "A Report on St. Peter's Mission" [c. 1880], C.1/O.1 (A109), CMS.
95. Cowley, "A Report on St. Peter's Mission" [c. 1880], C.1/O.1 (A109), CMS.
96. Cowley, "A Report on St. Peter's Mission" [c. 1880], C.1/O.1 (A109), CMS.

97. Cowley to Secretaries, 31 December 1880, C.1/O.1 (A109), CMS.
98. ( ) and underlining in original. Cowley, "A Report on St. Peter's Mission" [c. 1880], C.1/O.1 (A109), CMS.
99. Cowley, "A Report on St. Peter's Mission" [c. 1880], C.1/O.1 (A109), CMS.
100. Cochrane to Cowley, 30 September 1880, C.1/O.1 (A104), CMS.
101. Cowley, "A Report on St. Peter's Mission" [c. 1880], C.1/O.1 (A109), CMS.
102. Cowley to Secretaries, 31 December 1880, C.1/O.1 (A109), CMS.
103. At a public meeting in the afternoon, only four parishioners raised their hands in favour of Cook. Cowley recorded that fifty-six parishioners attended a similar meeting that morning. Although Cowley did not provide figures for the attendance at the afternoon vote, an estimate of fifty parishioners is used for the above calculations. Cowley, "A Report on St. Peter's Mission" [c. 1880], C.1/O.1 (A109), CMS.
104. Machray to Secretaries, 29 December 1880, C.1/O.1 (A109), CMS.
105. Cowley to Secretaries, 31 December 1880, C.1/O.1 (A109), CMS.
106. Cowley to Secretaries, 18 March 1881, C.1/O.1 (A109), CMS.
107. Graham to Superintendent of Indian Affairs, 10 August 1881, File 9375-2, Volume 3658, RG10. See also Cowley, "A Report on St. Peter's Mission" [c. 1880], C.1/O.1 (A109), CMS.
108. Graham to Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, 20 June 1881, File 9375-2, Volume 3658, RG10.
109. Cowley, "A Report on St. Peter's Mission" [c. 1880], C.1/O.1 (A109), CMS.
110. Cowley to Secretaries, 31 December 1880, C.1/O.1 (A109), CMS.
111. Dewdney to Macdonald, 18 December 1880, File 9375-2, Volume 3658, RG10.
112. [?] to Dewdney, 4 January 1881, File 9375-2, Volume 3658, RG10.
113. Ross to Graham, 26 March 1881, File 9375-2, Volume 3658, RG10.
114. Graham to Superintendent of Indian Affairs, 14 April 1881, File 9375-2, Volume 3658, RG10.
115. Ross to Graham, 15 April 1881, File 9375-2, Volume 3658, RG10.
116. Cochrane to Graham, 5 April 1881, File 9375-2, Volume 3658, RG10.

117. Graham to Superintendent of Indian Affairs, 14 April 1881, File 9375-2, Volume 3658, RG10.
118. Pinkham to Graham, 5 April 1881, File 9375-2, Volume 3658, RG10.
119. Deputy Superintendent General of Indian Affairs to Macdonald, 27 April 1881, File 9375-2, Volume 3658, RG10.
120. Telegraph from [?] to Dewdney, 28 April 1881, File 9375-2, Volume 3658, RG10.
121. Cowley to Secretaries, 31 December 1880, C.1/O.1 (A109), CMS.
122. Cowley to Secretaries, 31 December 1880, C.1/O.1 (A109), CMS.
123. Monkman as quoted in Cowley, "A Report on St. Peter's Mission" [c. 1880], C.1/O.1 A109), CMS.
124. Machray to Secretaries, 29 December 1880, C.1/O.1 (A109), CMS.
125. Cowley to [?], n.d. May 1884, C.1/O.2 (A112), CMS.
126. Machray to Secretaries, 29 December 1880, C.1/O.1 (A109), CMS.
127. Machray to Secretaries, 29 December 1880, C.1/O.1 (A109), CMS.
128. Memorandum, 30 January 1882, File 19,418, Volume 3707, RG10.
129. Resolutions of the Corresponding Committee of the Diocese of Rupert's Land, 9 September 1879, Minutes of the Finance Committee, CMS, 1877-1885, Typescript (P.338), AEPRL. In the Canadian north-west, ¢1.00 was valued at approximately \$5.00 in 1870s and 1880s. See McLean to Cowley, 31 May 1872, C.1/O (A100), CMS; and Annual Letter of Mackay, 6 December 1886, C.1/O.2 (A114), CMS.
130. McColl to Dewdney, 13 May 1881, File 9375-2, Volume 3658, RG10.
131. Cowley to [?], n.d. May 1884, C.1/O.2 (A112), CMS. See also Cowley to Fenn, 28 April 1885, C.1/O.2 (A113), CMS.
132. [?] to Indian Commissioner, 5 August 1889, File 60,470, Volume 3824, RG10.

