The Canadianisation of a Scottish Church: The Reverend William Proudfoot and the Canadian Frontier

by Stewart D. Gill

In reference to the Presbyterian aspect of the Scots experience in Canada, Professor John S. Moir has written that "of the endless themes begging for investigation only a handful have been examined".[1] One of the themes which has been written about at a considerable length is that of the Canadianisation of the churches in Canada, however, it is the kind of controversial subject which begs constant revision.[2]

Professor Stanford Reid has emphasized the "Scottish Protestant Tradition" in Canada, especially in the Presbyterian church, as being essential in shaping the Scotch-Canadian.[3] He goes so far as to suggest that "since the Scottish Protestant tradition in the past has made men strong to do great things, perhaps it is time that Scots began to look back to the rock whence they have been hewn to renew their strength and the spiritual vitality upon which their forefathers drew with such effect".[4] Professor Moir, however, has suggested that perhaps we have hidden ourselves in the rock of Scottish tradition for too long and should be more aware of the distinctive Canadian features within churches.[5] This paper is an attempt to look at the extent to which one man and the Canadian frontier may have had an influence in creating a Canadian church out of a "Scottish tradition".

One cannot deny that the religious experience has been important in the creation of the Canadian, however, as the young professor, Solly Bridgetower, expresses in Robertson Davies' Leaven of Malice:

> Why does a country like Canada, so late upon the international scene, feel that it must rapidly acquire the trappings of older countries - music of its own, pictures of its own, books of its own, (to this one could add a religion of its own) - and why does it fuss and stew, and storm the heavens with its outcries when it does not have them? 6

The simple answer is the desire for a national identity, and a sense of belonging and history. "For does not the strength of a state much consist in the quantity and quality of its national feelings so thickly generated, and so genially nourished, as by imagination bringing back the very dead - the good and the great of former ages - and brightening up from oblivion the incidents, events, changes, revolutions, customs, manners, morals, poetry, and religion that constituted the life of our ancestors, and gave them a distinctive character among nations?"[7]

Confederation did create Canada as a "supreme act of faith" but it also created the role of nation builder for the historian, that few have resisted.[8] Unfortunately, the study of nationalism is like a muddy river, and even with a pure source it quickly tends to become silted in the mainstream of nationalist thought.

The Reverend William Proudfoot, a missionary of the United Secession Church of Scotland in south-western Ontario, has been portrayed as an example of a Scottish immigrant, in mid-nineteenth century Upper Canada, who was aware of a developing sense of Canadian identity.[9] This interpretation of Proudfoot has grown out of his call for a native ministry and the creation of a Canadian church as expressed in a letter which he wrote, in 1846, to David Anderson, one of the deputies of the United Secession who visited Canada during the summer of 1846:

> I should not be surprised if you return home without knowing that Canadians have a national character of their own. England, Ireland, Scotland, Germany and France, and the United States have each contributed a portion of its own national character to the Canadian, and the compound made of these elements is unlike them all. Now to full efficiency in Canada a minister must be a Canadian. An imported preacher is a foreigner, and never will enlist in his favour the sympathies of the general community.
>
> It has been a great hindrance to our success that we have kept up the Scotch character. We are too Scotch - our habits, our brogue, our mode of sermonising are all too Scotch. The thistle is everywhere seen; we have effected no lodgement in the public mind... As at present constituted our mission is a foreign affair. And it will be so till we employ the country-born, divest it of Scotch character and make it Canadian.
>
> I beg that you will also take into consideration that

> the connection of Canada with Britain is merely a question of time. The whole course of events since I came to the country and especially since the rebellion has been towards a separation from the Mother country and what will become of the principles of the Secession if that event should take place and we have not a native ministry. 10

He was not the first British clergyman to voice an opinion on the need for a native ministry or British clergy who were willing to adapt to the highly fluid society of Upper Canada. By and large, as a response to the lack of a supply of British missionaries, the Anglicans and other Presbyterian bodies had voiced similar concerns about theological education in the colonies and had reacted, as would Proudfoot eventually, by setting up Canadian seminaries.[11]

The creation of an independent Canadian school of divinity is an important step in defining the creation of a Canadian church, however, it is only a symptom of a developing sense of independence and part of a process that can be divided into three themes. First, the idea of Canadianisation is conceived and then the idea of Canadian ecclesiastical independence is received or accepted by the church. These are really an interpretation or manifestation of the third factor which is to believe in, and become a "Canadian" churchman or a member of

a "Canadian" church. John Moir describes the process as "psychological Canadianism", and it is, in reality, a search for identity.[12]

The first manifestation of the idea of Canadianisation in Canadian churches usually came about in the call for a seminary for the education of native clergy. The problem of recruiting and educating native ministers was one which was foremost in Proudfoot's mind. Within a month of arriving in Canada he was already writing of his solution for the problems faced by Presbyterians:

> The only legitimate way of curing the evil (as far as I see) is to educate a race of ministers so far above the common level as that they shall give a tone to the public mind and thus by the goodness of the article beat out of the field all half-bred adventurers. (The Methodists.) 13

Initially, until 1836, he held out some hope that the church in Canada could be served by an increase in the recruitment of Scottish missionaries but increasingly he became more disillusioned as the number of ministers willing to leave Scotland remained small.[14] A feeling of superiority among Scottish theologians had persuaded them to dismiss the idea of educating youths from the colonial backwoods for the Presbyterian ministry

and the Church of Scotland was especially dogmatic on this point by refusing to recognise any minister not trained in a Scottish university.[15]

In 1844, at the May meeting of the Missionary Synod, the Committee of Education finally recommended the creation of a Canadian divinity school. Proudfoot was appointed as the first professor and, with some apprehension, he accepted, fearful that a refusal would hold up the creation of the school.[16] Based upon his own theological training in Scotland, he expressed the view that the new Divinity Hall provided as good if not better training than that given anywhere, including the home of the secession.[17] It is obvious, however, from his letter to David Anderson in 1846, that the effect of the new Hall was not like the coming of spring after a long Canadian Arctic winter, and it was not the church's deliverer from its overt Scottishness.[18]

In 1849, at the Synod meeting it was decided to take advantage of the change in status of King's College, in Toronto, whereby it became a provincial university, to allow the church's students to attend the university for a liberal arts education.[19] Proudfoot, it was argued would then be free to concentrate solely

upon the teaching of theology. The prospect of a less arduous schedule did not appeal to the reverend professor who opposed the move from London to Toronto on several grounds.

Through the Draper Bill, which initiated the creation of the University of Toronto, he saw the Anglicans maintaining an unfair advantage over all other denominations, in their possession of Upper Canada and King's College. "The whole of the difficulty," he argued, "has come out of the Episcopalian sect believing that the University was made for them and not for the country... and this bill (the Draper Bill) is so framed as to secure to them all that they have got and send the other denominations to seek."[20] Rather meekly, the Church of Scotland also opposed the creation of the "secular" university, expressing no faith in an educational institution created on a non-religious basis.

He opposed the move to Toronto partly because of the expense that would be incurred in moving, but also out of a concern for the welfare of his London congregation which would be without his ministry. The health of his students was also uppermost in his mind, as classes would commence to meet in August which was a particularly unhealthy month in Toronto. His principle

reason for not moving was a general unwillingness to uproot himself from a daily routine, which is not unusual for a man in his sixty second year.[21]

While in London there were never more than four students enrolled in the school at any one time and, consequently, the college could not fill the requirements of the growing mission in Canada. After the move to Toronto there was no great increase in enrolment and, therefore, in the 1855 session there was only one student of the fourth year in attendance, two of the third, three of the second, and four of the first.[22] In 1856, there were thirteen students enrolled but not one of those in first year courses was a Canadian. On a comparative basis, however, the Hall graduated twenty six students in the period 1844 to 1861 while Queen's only produced fifteen ministers for the Church of Scotland in twenty five years.[23] Unfortunately, nativeness, like successful churches, cannot merely be counted in terms of numbers but to what extent did the graduates conceive of themselves as being Canadian and did this show forth in a spirit of independence?

The Church in Synod, after Proudfoot's death in 1851, had no conviction that the next Professor of Theology should be

one of their own number. The spirit of independence that had flowed through Proudfoot did not touch the governing body of the church but rather, they thought, that it would be in the best interests of the Canadian church to consult with the Scottish Synod and, on their recommendation, appoint an influential person from Scotland.[24] Dr. John Taylor, minister of Auchtermuchty, was judged "a person peculiarly fitted, from his many and varied attainments, to discharge the onerous and very responsible duties of this important office."[25]

Although the Canadian church did not appoint a Canadian or Scottish-Canadian professor, the creation of Divinity Hall to train a native ministry can be seen in the light of the kindling of an awareness of the necessity to be independent. Without financial self sufficiency, however, the church could hardly claim to be independent of the mother church. At the 1844 meeting of the Missionary Synod, Proudfoot presented a letter from Dr. McKerrow of the United Associate Synod in Scotland outlining new plans for the financial support of the church in Canada.[26] The Scottish Church had provided grants directly to Canadian ministers but, with the new plan, the money would be paid to the Canadian Synod and distribution of the funds was placed in their power.[27] By 1855, the Canadian Synod could finally call itself self-supporting and while it expressed its thanks to the

the Scottish church it also conveyed its reluctance to accept further financial aid from a mother which it had outgrown.[28]

One of the best expressions of a developing sense of autonomy was William Proudfoot's Presbyterian Magazine which was founded in 1844 to give expression to the Canadian church's views. In the first edition the editors presented their reasons for publishing in the belief that the United Secession in Scotland approached closer to the Apostolic Standard than any other church and that they had a duty, not only to remain faithful to the truth of the gospels and the "iteration of the great principles of the Christian Faith" but also "to indoctrinate the numerous young persons in their Churches, that their faith may not be the faith of habit and prejudice, but of enlightened conviction."[29]

The principle of voluntarism was also expressed in the first edition of the magazine in the sense that the church should remain independent from all outside influences. Voluntarism, as Proudfoot understood it, "is one of those simple but powerful principles which bring about vast revolutions." To be sure, the principle of voluntarism is the key to understanding the secessionists in Upper Canada and the final test as to what extent Proudfoot was "Canadianised" and his church was equipped

for the conditions that it met on the frontier would appear to lie in the attitudes, like voluntarism, with which they tackled problems.

If Proudfoot conceived of his church as having to be different from its parent body to be effective in North America and the church responded by adopting measures which asserted its independence from the Scottish church was it merely an outward recognition of the need for change or was there a transformation of the spirit into a belief that the Atlantic did make a difference and that a new set of values were required? Was Proudfoot outwardly attempting to be Canadian while his heart and soul were still spiritually Scottish?

The issue upon which the church took its strongest voluntarist stand was over the clergy reserves but as this has been well documented elsewhere attention will be given to other issues.[30] The secessionist, United Presbyterian Church, according to John Moir, led the way in supporting a provincial secular system of education devoid of religious teaching.[31] Proudfoot, in a letter to the Warden of the London District, responded to the latter's assertion that religion and education were inseparable in the following fashion:

> A common school is a school for all. A school which the children of all may attend. But the children of all cannot be sent to it, if any particular system of belief is to be taught. Religion in general is professed by nobody. Every person who makes a profession of religion (is) professing the religion of a sect. And the religion of that sect is the whole of religion to him.
>
> I agree that there is a knowledge and a principle necessary to man's acting his part as a rational and accountable being, but I deny that knowledge and principle ought to be taught at a Common School. At a Common School, education, in the sense in which you understand it, ought not to be given, but the means of "acquiring it", which you say is not education but which I maintain is all that can be taught satisfactorily to the children of all denominations, and all that ought to be taught at schools supported out of the public funds and intended to be a public benefit. 32

In the letter, Proudfoot took the voluntarist stand of secessionist church in his view that the state should be responsible for public education but that there could be no common religion. He was fearful that Egerton Ryerson and his Methodist cohorts intended that religion should be taught in all common schools and that they ought to direct the superintending. God, Proudfoot would have insisted, did not intend to lead every man by the same road in Canada, and, although critical of some denominations, especially the Methodists, he justified denominationalism since he believed that it was best for churches to

maintain, and contend for the truths which they had attained. In time, he argued, according to the orderings of Divine Providence, circumstances would occur which would "bring together all who love the truth, and remove whatever of blindness may adhere to them."[33] There was no room in Proudfoot's mind for subservience to a state's political or religious system, especially in matters of public education.

It was a common saying amongst seceders that "the Church of Christ ought to be the freest society on earth." This was indicative of the democratic spirit embodied in the Secession Church and one which had an effect upon Proudfoot. In Scotland, secessionists while not identifying themselves with any political party or condoning any attempt to overthrow the government "whenever it thought that great principles were endangered, such as the existence of national or personal freedom, or the maintenance of national purity, then it let its voice be heard with clear strong accent not only in Church Courts, but through its representative men on political and public platforms."[34]

Proudfoot expressed his political views openly in newspaper articles, letters and in his diary and soon after his arrival in Canada he emerged as one of the leaders of the radicals in south-western Ontario. He was never a fence sitter but always

managed to remain aloof from partisan politics and from such a position could be critical of all sides. A good example of his vitriolic prose can be found in the draft of an article which he wrote for the London Inquirer:

> To hear many talk one would be led to suppose that the curse of a family compact is peculiar to Canada - that it has been engendered and reared up to maturity by causes which exist no where else. But the fact is, that there has ever been, and is, and ever will be, a family compact in every country. It is observed with characteristic sagacity by Jefferson "The parties of Whig and Tory are those of nature. They exist in all countries, whether called by these names, or by those of aristocrats and democrats - cote droit and cote gauche - ultras and radicals, serviles and liberals. The suckly, weakly, timid man fears the people, and is a Tory by nature; - the healthy strong and bold cherishes them, and is formed a Whig by nature." The Reformers must lay their account with the determined hostility of that faction, the great enemy to improvement any where. All sorts of working above ground and under will be resorted to by them. There cannot be a greater delusion than to suppose that they will abandon one iotta of their exclusiveness, till it is wrenched from them. Hitherto they have contrived to spread the belief that they only are attached to British principles and that all that differ from them are rebels while it is well known that in most instances they are profoundly ignorant of it, and that they affect attachment to it, only that they may enjoy the advantages of exclusiveness. Were the government of Britain to touch their emoluments they would curse it to its face.
> Reformers beware of them. 35

Perhaps not surprisingly, the article never appeared in print because, according to the editor, it did not express enough praise for the governor.

He did not approve of many of the government's policies and while he would not actively promote rebellion, at the same time, his rhetoric did little to discourage those already set on such a course in 1837. In the insurrections of that year several of his congregation and friends had to flee Canada, and his nephew, James Aitchison, was sent into exile.[36] The free thinking and independence that residents of the south-west demonstrated distinguishes them from the rest of the province and it is not surprising that the strongest roots of Ontario Grittism were dug deep in the soil of the early American and, among British immigrants, Scottish settlers.[37] Among the Scottish settlers, however, a distinction must be drawn between adherents of the Church of Scotland and the secessionists. Peter Russell has suggested that the reaction of the Kirk's clergy to the conditions that they encountered on the frontier was to turn them towards conservatism.[38] He writes:

> These Clergy (the Church of Scotland) saw the emigrants, especially their Scottish countrymen, in a crisis of cultural transmission. The sense that the settlers (or more often their children) were about to slip out of civilised ways produced a pressing sense of the need not only to organise congregations, but to found librarries and promote schools. It was that emerging program of state-funded cultural inststutions which drew the Church of Scotland clergy and laity to the provincial executive which shared their goals, if not their ideas of the necessary means. 39

While Proudfoot and the secessionists were no less interested in the well being of their Scottish flocks, the idea of voluntarism was always predominant. In terms of social control one of the prime concerns of all churches was the debilitating effect of drink. Russell portrays Proudfoot as a vigorous promoter of temperance societies in order to demonstrate that he was in sympathy with his Church of Scotland contemporaries who emphasized the importance of controlling moral and social decay.[40] Contrary, however, to Russell's portrayal, he was no ardent supporter of temperance societies and recorded in his diary a dispute that he had with one of his parishioners expressing his contempt for such organisations:

> I insisted that the temperance society is founded upon an insufficient basis, a basis upon which a moral action should not be left to rest - the will is that the subscriber pledges himself upon his honour. Now I maintain that if it is a moral duty it should rest on the word of God, but the society pledge itself to be temperate only on the fear of man. I insisted moreover that the church ought to have taken up the subject and that the gospel is able to accomplish that and every other morality and that it is wrong to overlook "the gospel". Further, that the order in which God acts is first to awake the church and that then the rod of his strength goes out of Zion and subdues the people but the temperance society on the wordly principle of honour would do what God does by the gospel. I found it difficult to make him comprehend that I was no advocate for the drinking of ardent spirits,

> and he and the family appeared to think that I was a friend to intemperance. - From this I see that it is useless to attempt to make country people understand nice distinctions, I got nothing but suspicion for my pains. I might have known this before. 41

Proudfoot did not represent the consensus of opinion in the United Secession Church in Canada or Scotland, where the temperance movement did not get underway until he had left for the colonies.[42] It was during the 1830's that the movement gained momentum under the leadership of John Dunlop in the west of Scotland.[43] Proudfoot's congregation in Scotland was in Pitrodie, in the eastern half of the country, and since he departed for British North America in 1832 it is possible that he had not much knowledge of Dunlop. It is not surprising, therefore, that he saw the societies in Canada as American imports and, like revivals, he believed they should be dismissed as "more inclined to affect the emotions than win the heart and mind for Christ."

In contrast to the Church of Scotland, the secessionist church was most successful on the frontier and was at its strongest in south-western Ontario. In the North American context the debate over the influence of the frontier on the development of society has a long history, starting with Frederick Jackson

Turner's proposal that new settlers' ideas were tested on the frontier and by a process of Darwinian selection the strongest, or best adapted, to a frontier situation survived.[44] S.D. Clark suggested that the thesis could be applied to Canada; while Kenneth McCrae, a disciple of Louis Hartz, attempted to show that the ideas of settlers were modified by the Canadian frontier experience.[45] Professor J.M.S. Careless, in contrast, has stressed the importance of cities in the development of Canada and played down the influence of the frontier.[46] He has stressed the interaction of the metropolis with its agrarian hinterland as the true instrument of change, while Michael Cross, in the 1960's, disputed both the frontier and metropolitan theories, to suggest that far from the frontier promoting radicalism, as Careless and the frontierists basically argued, in its isolation social and political conservatism were born.[47] Peter Russell has recently followed Cross's thesis and applied it to the Church of Scotland on the frontier.[48]

According to Russell, the frontier in Upper Canada, before 1840, shaped the Church of Scotland clergy and threw them into the Conservative family compact camp.[49] For the established clergy the problem of social control was uppermost and the ans-

wer appeared to lie in attempting to maintain the Scottish character. The clergy, therefore, promoted the idea that ethnic reality could primarily be found in the Church of Scotland. Even Proudfoot could not deny the fact that the Presbyterian church, of whatever ilk, had a limited appeal, restricted to those from Scotland and, to a lesser extent, Northern Ireland.

Although Proudfoot was responsible for initiating the idea of a school to raise up a native ministry, at no time did he deny the ideology or theology of the Secession church. While he conceived of a Canadian church and this idea was received by the secession synod and a Canadian divinity school was created and financial autonomy was gained, the principles still at work were those of the Scottish Secession. He was aware of the necessity of reaching outside of a Scottish community while also conscious of his own limitations to do so, in his retention of Scottish ideas and accent.[50] He believed in the necessity of a Canadian church but, having examined his ideas for the new church it can be stated that, he, like the Church of Scotland clergy he accused of being more interested in setting up "the Kirk in the Colony as to make Christians", was concerned with the establishment of the secession.[51]

The secession, with its voluntarism and ideas of democracy, was most suited for the pioneering period of south-western Ontario. By the 1840's, however, Canadian society became more integrated and consolidated, as Professor Careless writes, "as frontiers of settlement were filled in, pioneer conditions passed away, and the organizing role of towns and the business community expanded."[52] As society matured so did the Secession Church which became more open to the idea of union with other churches, in particular the newly formed Free Church.[53] Proudfoot was in the forefront of the movement for union and although it was ten years after his death before it took place, through his Divinity Hall he helped ensure that his church was able to evolve and merge into the mainstream of Canadian Presbyterianism. One man could not make a Canadian church out of a "Scottish tradition" but the Reverend William Proudfoot attempted to point the way, because, in his view, the church was not built upon nationalism but on the Rock of Ages.

NOTES.

1. John S. Moir, Enduring Witness: A History of the Presbyterian Church in Canada (Toronto, 1974), p. xii.

2. George Brown, "The Early Methodist Church and the Canadian Point of View", Canadian Historical Association Report, 1938 (Toronto, 1938); N.G. Smith, "Nationalism in the Canadian Churches", Canadian Journal of Theology, IX, April, 1963; articles in John Webster Grant, ed., The Churches and the Canadian Experience (Toronto, 1963); John S. Moir, "The Canadianization of the Protestant Churches", Canadian Historical Association Papers,1966; W. Stanford Reid, "The Scottish Protestant Tradition", in Reid, ed., The Scottish Tradition in Canada (Toronto, 1977).

3. W.S. Reid, "The Scottish Protestant Tradition", in ibid.

4. Ibid., p. 134.

5. J.S. Moir, "The Canadianization of the Protestant Churches", Canadian Historical Association Papers, 1966.

6. Robertson Davies, Leaven of Malice (Toronto, 1964), p. 173.

7. Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, Vol. XXII, November, 1827, p. 552.

8. This is best expressed by what could be called the Toronto School of historians who have produced numerous biographies and histories of "national" significance, eg. Harold A. Innis, The Fur Trade in Canada (Toronto, 1977), Donald Creighton, The Empire of the St. Lawrence (Toronto, 1956), John A. Macdonald (2 vols., Toronto, 1974), J.M.S. Careless, Brown of the Globe (2 vols., Toronto, 1974).

9. N.G. Smith, "Nationalism in the Canadian Churches", Canadian Journal of Theology, IX, April, 1963, p. 120.

10. William Proudfoot to David Anderson, 1846. Presbyterian Church in Canada Archives (P.C.C.A.), William Proudfoot Letters.

11. J.S. Moir, Enduring Witness, 63, 86, 87.

12. J.S. Moir, "The Canadianization of the Protestant Churches".

13. William Proudfoot Diary, September 19, 1832. William Proudfoot Papers, D.B. Weldon Library, Regional Collection, University of Western Ontario.

14. A particular problem was the recruitment of Gaelic speaking ministers and this led to the enlistment of William Fraser from Nova Scotia. See the manuscript, the diary of the Reverend William Fraser, in the United Church Archives and printed in the Transactions of the London and Middlesex Historical Society, Part XIV, 1930.

15. George Patterson, History of the County of Pictou (Montreal, 1877), p. 343.

16. Proudfoot Diary, joint entry for May 22-24, 1844. Proudfoot Papers, U.W.O.

17. William Proudfoot to David Anderson, 13 July, 1846. P.C.C.A.

18. Ibid.

19. Minutes of the Tenth Session of the Synod of the United Presbyterian Church in Canada, Wednesday 6th June and Thursday 7th June, 1849. United Church Archives.

20. On the University Question see J.S. Moir, Enduring Witness, pp. 114-119.

21. Notes of journey to Toronto, 2 August, 1850, Proudfoot Papers, U.W.O.; Proudfoot to R.H. Thornton, 19 June, 1850, Proudfoot Papers, P.C.C.A.

22. Rev. Robert Small, History of the Congregations of the United Presbyterian Church From 1733 to 1900, vol. 1, (Edinburgh, 1904) p. 164; Minutes of the Nineteenth Session of the Synod of the United Presbyterian Church in Canada, Appendix II (Toronto, 1855), p. 153.

23. J.S. Moir, Enduring Witness, p. 117.

24. Rev. John McKerrow, History of the Foreign Missions of the Secession and United Presbyterian Church (Edinburgh, 1867) p. 215.

25. R. Small, History of the Congregations of the United Presbyterian Church, pp. 163, 164.

26. Minutes of the Third Session of the Missionary Synod of Canada, 2 October, 1844; United Church Archives.

27. Ibid.

28. Minutes of the Synod of the Nineteenth Session of the United Presbyterian Church in Canada, 8 June, 1855; United Church Archives.

29. The Presbyterian Magazine, vol. I, No. I, January, 1843, p. 1. The success of the church did not lie with the magazine because within one year it had been discontinued and Proudfoot commented: "It was too dear, and many of the articles were too heavy."

30. J.S. Moir, Church and State in Canada West (Toronto, 1959); Alan Wilson, The Clergy Reserves of Upper Canada; A Canadian Mortmain (Toronto, 1968).

31. Moir, Enduring Witness, p. 122.

32. Proudfoot to the Warden of the London District Council; Miscellaneous Proudfoot Papers, U.W.O.

33. The Presbyterian Magazine, vol. I, No. I, January, 1843, p. 4.

34. Rev. David Woodside, The Soul of a Scottish Church or the Contribution of the United Presbyterian Church to Scottish Life and Religion (Edinburgh, n.d.) p. 203.

35. Draft of article for London Inquirer in the Miscellaneous Proudfoot Papers, U.W.O., dated 1838.

36. F. Landon, An Exile from Canada to Van Diemen's Land (Toronto, 1960); Proudfoot Diary, entries from 14-18 January, 1839 concerning appeals to the governor for the release of James Aitchison, U.W.O.

37. Colin Read, The Rising in Western Upper Canada, 1837-8 (Toronto, 1982).

38. Peter Russell, "Church of Scotland Clergy in Upper Canada: Culture Shock and Conservatism on the Frontier" Ontario History, June 1981, pp. 88-111.

39. Ibid., p. 93.

40. Ibid., p. 105.

41. Proudfoot Diary, 14 November, 1832, Proudfoot Papers, U.W.O.

42. Stewart Mechie, The Church and Scottish Social Development, 1780-1870 (London, 1960), pp. 81-99.

43. Ibid. For temperance movements in Canada see William H. Elgee, The Social Teachings of the Canadian Churches (Toronto, 1964), pp. 135-159.

44. Frederick J. Turner, The Significance of the Frontier in American History (Fascimile of Original: Ann Arbor, 1966). Presented to the American Historical Association in 1893 the paper revolutionised American history and led Turner to elaborate the thesis in The Frontier in American History (New York, 1928).

45. S.D. Clark, The Developing Canadian Community (Toronto, 1948); Kenneth D. McRae, "The Structure of Canadian History" in Louis Hartz, The Founding of New Societies: Studies in the History of the United States, Latin America, South Africa, Canada, and Australia (New York, 1977).

46. J.M.S. Careless, "Frontierism, Metropolitanism and Canadian History" Canadian Historical Review, XXXV (1954), pp. 12-19, The Union of the Canadas: The Growth of Canadian Institutions, 1841-1857 (Toronto, 1977).

47. Michael S. Cross, "The Dark Druidical Graves: The Lumber Community and the Commercial Frontier in British North America to 1854" (Ph.D. Thesis, University of Toronto, 1968) Microfilm copy P.A.C. For coverage of the main frontier themes in Canadian history see Cross ed., The Frontier Thesis and the Canadas: The Debate on the Impact of the Canadian Environment (Toronto, 1970)

48. Peter Russell in Ontario History, June 1981.

49. Ibid.

50. William Proudfoot to David Anderson, 13 July, 1846.

51. Proudfoot Diary, 19 September, 1832; U.W.O.

52. J.M.S. Careless, The Union of the Canadas, 1841-1857, p. 150.

53. James A. Thomson, "Proudfoot and the United Presbyterians: Research into the Proudfoot Papers" (M.Th. Thesis, Knox College, 1967)