Ordained in 1853, James Settee was the second native to take holy orders through the auspices of the Church Missionary Society in the North West of British North America. While much has been written about Henry Budd, the first native ordained by the CMS, relatively little attention has been paid to Settee. This oversight has much to do with the fact that, unlike Budd, Settee retained much of his native identity and lifestyle. The contrasting perception of the two men is evident in the biographies written by Archdeacon John Alexander Mackay in Bertal Heeney’s *Leaders of the Canadian Church*, published in 1920. Budd, Mackay observed, possessed “qualities that were remarkable in a native.” He was “a man of fine appearance,” “a good English Scholar,” and “methodical and thrifty.” His mission stations were always a “model of neatness” and “no European missionary kept things in better order.” Setee, in contrast, was described as “a typical native” who preferred itinerating. “This nomadic kind of life,” MacKay remarked, “seemed to suit him better than steady settled work.” Mackay concluded that, unlike Budd, Settee “could not be credited with much foresight or good management in temporal matters.” Because Setee “always looked upon the bright side of things” and was “always
ready to believe the best and not the worst of others,” Mackay concluded that he sometimes condoned “what deserved disapproval.” Although Mackay did not doubt Settee’s commitment and faithfulness, he clearly viewed Settee in a much different light than Budd. Whereas Budd was upheld as a model missionary, Settee remained too much the native to receive the same unqualified praise. The contrast that Archdeacon Mackay drew between Henry Budd and James Settee reveals a great deal about the standards and expectations that Anglo-Canadian missionaries used to judge native missionaries and their work. The more Europeanized the native missionary, the more highly he was regarded by the CMS, its British agents, and the early chroniclers of the church’s growth and development in Canada’s North West. The contrasting assessments of the careers of Henry Budd and James Settee reveal, however, that the native agents of the CMS were not all the same. The purpose of this essay is to explore the life-world, motivations, and actions of James Settee and how these informed his relations with his fellow natives and his British co-workers in the mission field. It is argued that tensions that arose between the objectives and assumptions of the CMS and its British missionaries, and Settee’s empathy for the natives among whom he worked, and his differing approach to evangelization greatly hindered the effectiveness of the CMS’s mission in the Canadian North West and the implementation of its Native Church policy.

The Church Missionary Society was founded on 12 April 1799. Most of the founders were members of the Clapham Sect, a group of activist Church of England evangelicals who were committed to the abolition of the slave trade, social reform at home, and world evangelisation. Convinced that “it is the duty highly incumbent upon every Christian to endeavour to propagate the knowledge of the Gospel among the Heathen,” the Society overcame opposition from the church hierarchy and dispatched its first missionaries to West Africa in 1804. The CMS began work in Canada’s North West in 1822 when Rev. John West was invited to Rupert’s Land to serve as a chaplain to the Hudson’s Bay Company. Responding to criticism in England that the Company had done little to Christianize the indigenous population, and seeking to encourage industry, repress vice, and inculcate morality among its workers, the Hudson’s Bay Company agreed to pay the salary of a missionary to the settlement at Red River. West’s plans, however, soon exceeded the limited objectives of the Company. Rather than remain at Red River and minister to the Company’s employees, West travelled widely and developed a plan to induce natives
to embrace not only Christianity, but also a settled way of life. The key to this plan was the establishment of schools for native children who West believed were more malleable than adults. “The children,” West wrote in his journal, “may be educated and trained to industry upon the soil,” “recovered from their savage habits and customs,” and “enjoy the blessings of civilization and Christianization.”

Critical of the moral standards and materialism of the fur trade, and preoccupied with the conversion and “civilization” of the indigenous peoples of Red River, West soon alienated leaders of the Hudson’s Bay Company who viewed his agenda as serious threats to their interests. While on furlough in England in 1824, West was notified that the Hudson’s Bay Company no longer required his services. His successor, Rev. David Thomas Jones, shared West’s commitment to work among the indigenous peoples, however, and continued to recruit native youth for the Red River School, including James Settee. Jones hoped that Settee and the other native pupils attending the school would grow up to spread Christianity among their own people.

Settee was born sometime between 1809 and 1812 near Split Lake in what is now north central Manitoba. His parents were of mixed Swampy Cree and English descent. After attending the Red River School for four years, Settee was baptized by David Jones in 1827 and became a protégé of another CMS missionary, Rev. William Henry Cockran. When Settee completed his education, he began to work alongside Cockran as a native catechist and school teacher at St. Peter’s, Dynevor, and Netley Creek. He married Sarah (Sally) Cook in 1835. In 1841 Settee was sent out to minister among a band of Plains Cree and Assiniboine in the Beaver Creek and Moose Mountain region of Saskatchewan. The mission was not a success; as a northern Swampy Cree, Settee lacked both bonds of kinship and proficiency in the local dialect. The Settees then taught school at The Pas before relocating to Lac la Ronge in 1846. The mission appeared to flourish under Settee; one hundred native children and adults were baptized in July 1847. Impressed by the gains made at Lac la Ronge, Settee was dispatched to Potato Lake where he laid the foundations for Stanley Mission. He was superseded at Stanley Mission by Rev. Robert Hunt and relegated to a secondary role. Settee’s position began to change after the appointment of David Anderson as the first bishop of the newly established diocese of Rupert’s Land in 1849. Anderson’s appointment coincided with the CMS’s adoption of the Native Church policy. According to this policy, developed by CMS Secretary Henry Venn, the
objective of the society was to build up a self-governing, self-supporting, and self-propagating Native Church. Leadership within this Native Church was to pass on as quickly as possible to locally raised native clergy, freeing British missionaries to move on to other fields. Bishop Anderson believed that the use of ordained and lay native agents was essential to the successful evangelization of the indigenous peoples in his vast diocese. Shortly after his appointment, Anderson wrote CMS authorities that “a native agency” that included “individuals belonging to different tribes and speaking different languages” was required to “meet the inquiring spirit which exists among the widely-scattered population that wanders over the immense territories of the Hudson’s Bay Company.” Anderson and CMS officials were convinced that native agents would be more readily accepted than British missionaries by indigenous peoples because of their racial affinity and kinship with them, their ability to speak native languages, and their superior knowledge of their “habits” and “character.” They also believed that native agents were more suited than missionaries from Britain to the demanding physical and psychological challenges of life in the Canadian wilderness. “The character of the work is so different” from that in England, the Diocese of Rupert’s Land synod resolved, that, “there is much doubt and anxiety in appointing English clergymen for our new settlements.” Suitably trained native agents could assist British missionaries in the important work of translating the Bible and prayer book into native languages. It was in light of the Native Church policy that Settee was identified as a suitable candidate for ordination and was enrolled at St. John’s College to study theology in 1853 and was ordained to the diaconate in 1855. After his ordination, Settee recalled “the early part my life” in his journal when he was “first taught to remember my Creator” and “to worship him through Jesus Christ our Saviour.” He recorded his thanks that he had now been called “to bear witness to the death and resurrection of Christ and to preach salvation to my Indian brethren through faith in the name of the Lord Jesus.” In 1855 Settee was sent to work under Rev. William Stagg at the Fairford mission in the Swan River District. Priested by Bishop Anderson on 1 January 1856, Settee began work among the Plains Cree of Qu’appelle. Due to his Swampy Cree background, Settee was not well received and was forced “by the hostile feelings of the Plains tribes” to leave the region in 1858. Despite this rebuff, he returned to the area in 1861 and 1865. In the following years, Setee carried out an itinerant ministry and served missions at Scanterbury, Mapleton, Netley Creek, Nelson River, and
Prince Albert. He returned to The Pas in 1883 and managed to restore the Anglican flock there after some natives had followed Rev. Joseph Reader to the Plymouth Brethren. Reflecting on his ministry later in life, Settee gave thanks to the God for the “expansion of our Native Church” and for the opportunity to have been called to “preach Jesus the Lord and to point to every sinner the way of life.”

Although he was released from the CMS in 1884 due to age and ill health, Settee continued an active ministry among his native brethren until his death in 1902.

Although the CMS was officially committed to the establishment of a self-governing, self-sustaining, and self-propagating Native church, this policy was not successfully implemented in the Canadian North West. The failure of the Native Church policy in the Canadian mission field was largely due to the unwillingness of the CMS to adjust its agenda to suit the social and cultural realities encountered in Rupert’s Land and the inability of its British agents to overcome the racial and social assumptions and attitudes they carried with them. The purpose of the CMS was to bring salvation to the non-Christian peoples of the world whom they believed were doomed to damnation unless they accepted Christ as their saviour. Hand in hand with the acceptance of Christianity, however, the CMS sought to bring the blessings of civilization to the primitive peoples of the world. For the CMS, Christianization and ‘civilization’ were inseparable, and true conversion required not only an acceptance of Christianity, but also changes in the everyday life patterns of indigenous peoples. This agenda was evident in a letter written by James Settee’s mentor as a youth, Rev. William Cockran, to the Secretaries of the CMS in 1836. “I thought of making the red men Christians,” Cockran observed, but the notion of “Christian & Englishmen were so closely united in my imagination, they appeared as one.” “Consequently,” Cockran continued, “I expected that when the red man became a Christian, I should see all the active virtues of English Christians immediately developed in his character.” Cockran thus strove “to make the red man not only a Christian but an Englishman” and “pressed the necessity of industry, cleanliness, taste, good order & all the other moral virtues, which make the Christian shine among a perverse generation.”

Judged by British standards, however, the native peoples of the Canadian North West were invariably found wanting. According to William Cockran, the Cree and Ojibwa peoples among whom he evangelized lived in “a barbarous state” and were trapped in “the mire of poverty, ignorance and vice.” British missionaries attributed the natives’ destitution to a lack of foresight and self-control. “If they possessed the
virtue of economy to the same degree as the Europeans,” William Cockran observed, “many of them might make their stock last the whole winter.” According to Cockran, natives lived for the moment and squandered their resources. “As long as he has anything remaining,” Cockran lamented, “he must make a feast for all his friends, & send gifts to all his cousins.”

Cockran interpreted this apparent lack of concern for the future and the ease with which natives gave away the fruits of their labour as a sign of “carnality” that offended God and required correction. British missionaries, such as Cockran, saw private property as an essential foundation of civilization. The failure of the native to accumulate personal possessions was thus interpreted as evidence of backwardness and indolence. Cockran insisted that the natives’ “waste of time and property is grievous to all who have imbibed Christian principles” and that only a concerted effort by the missionary to instil values of industry and discipline could overcome such “evils.”

“The miserable heathen of Rupert’s Land,” Cockran concluded, “have not only to learn to serve God in spirit and in truth; but they have every other habit to learn which is conducive to the welfare of man.”

Despite the long apprenticeship he served under William Cockran, there is little evidence in Settee’s subsequent career as a catechist, teacher, and clergyman that he accepted his mentor’s low assessment of his fellow natives or his conviction that conversion to Christianity required the total abandonment of one’s native identity and reconstruction as a model Englishman.

British missionaries like Cockran took for granted that the supposed superiority of their civilization would be self-evident to Aboriginal people. Convinced that all human beings were inherently rational, it followed that the natives of the Canadian North West would want to “better” themselves. Initially, British missionaries believed that all that was needed to achieve the conversion and civilization of indigenous peoples was to hold up a mirror in which they could compare their own institutions and beliefs to those of Christianity and a civilized way of life. Since natives simply lacked knowledge of the ways of higher civilization, all that was needed to secure their transformation was proper guidance through preaching, catechesis, schooling, and instruction in such practical arts as farming, spinning, and weaving. The British agents of the CMS were genuinely surprised when natives did not recognize their superiority, immediately embrace their message, and abandon their traditional beliefs and way of life. In a letter to the Secretaries of the CMS, William Cockran warned prospective missionaries to the Canadian North West: “The missionary in
entering his work has too high notions of the human character: he
supposes them to be misled by ignorance. To his utter astonishment he
finds them wedded to their old customs, and ready to oppose those who
propose innovation. This is his daily experience." The frustration that
accompanied such resistance simply reinforced the British missionaries’
negative views of native society and culture and strengthened their
conviction that the natives were doomed to extinction unless they
embraced the blessings of Christianity and civilization. British missionar-
ies failed to recognize that natives found their assertions of superiority,
expectations of deference, and demands for change simply incompatible
with their view of the world.

The resistance encountered by the CMS’s British missionaries in
Canada’s North West added urgency to the efforts to deploy native agents
in the field. The attitudes and assumptions that shaped the responses of
British workers to native peoples generally also informed their response
to, and relationships with, the CMS’s native agents, however. British
missionaries tended to view native agents as of inferior status and less able
to perform the duties and responsibilities required of a worker in the
mission field effectively. In 1850, Rev. John Smithurst advised Henry
Venn that the prospects of calling forth a cohort of capable and independ-
ent native agents in Rupert’s Land were not bright. “A native,” Smithurst
wrote Venn, “does well enough under the guidance of a European but
when left to himself sinks into an indolent bitterness and does next to
nothing.” Smithurst ascribed such behaviour to the “generally unstable”
nature of the “Native Character” and warned the CMS that “trusting” a
“Congregation to a Native minister must be done with great caution.”
Such perceptions often led to tensions between British and native agents
in the field. Native missionaries often complained that British missionaries
and CMS authorities did not treat them with proper consideration or
respect. For example, James Settee accepted that his duties often required
him to perform manual labour, but he resented British missionaries who
treated him like a “common labourer.”
While serving as a catechist under
Rev. Robert Hunter, he complained that he spent much of his time fishing
or cutting wood simply to survive “the scarcity of provisions.” Because he
was expected to “answer for all purposes, teacher, farming, fisherman
according to the circumstances of the times,” Settee was kept away from
what he regarded as his principal duty as a CMS agent – instructing “our
Heathen brethren” in “the word of God.” Such treatment also affected the
standing of indigenous missionaries among their fellow natives. Native
society revered its elders and holy men and treated them with respect. The paternalism and disrespect shown by British missionaries towards native workers in the field raised doubts about their spiritual authority and knowledge and thereby limited their influence among their own people. This was often misinterpreted by the CMS as a sign that natives preferred to be ministered to by British missionaries. Such was the experience of James Settee when he was posted as a teacher at Fort Ellice in the early 1840s. The CMS established the mission in response to a request from the local natives for spiritual guidance. John Smithurst believed that Settee was “well suited to the undertaking” because he was a Cree and would have “many opportunities of saying to them a great deal on the subject of religion.” By 1844, however, there were only three native children attending the mission school. William Cockran attributed the failure of the school to the “prejudice” the natives held against Settee. “They suppose,” Cockran wrote to the Secretaries of the CMS, “that as Mr. Settee is an Indian it is impossible that he can be so well informed to teach them.” “If we are desirous that they should know the white man’s religion,” Cockran advised the CMS, “we ought to send a white man amongst them, who could teach them it more perfectly.” Cockran’s assessment of the situation reflects his own high regard for the abilities of British missionaries and his low estimation of the potential of native agents. A more likely explanation for the native’s ‘prejudice’ against Settee and the failure of the school is to be found in the fact that the natives of Fort Ellice were Plains Cree. As a Swampy Cree, Settee spoke a different dialect and did not share ties of ethnic affinity or kinship with the local natives. As well, his humiliating subservience to Smithurst, the menial labour he was constantly called upon to perform, and the CMS’s refusal to provide gifts diminished Settee’s status among Plains Cree of Fort Ellice.

The different status given to native workers was starkly evident in the discrepancy between the compensation they received compared to that given to the CMS’s British missionaries. The CMS provided British catechists in the Canadian North West with an annual base salary of £120, while British clergy received £200. In addition, British agents of the society received paid furloughs, pensions, extra supplements if they were married and had children, and access to free education for their children at the CMS school in England. Generally speaking, the CMS’s native agents received a “usual” stipend that was half that of its British personnel; they were rarely provided with paid leaves, pensions, or extra allowances to support children or assist with their education.
argued that these differences in stipends and benefits were justified on the grounds that once a mission was “euthanized” and became a Native church, its personnel must be compensated at a level that local members could sustain; it was further reasoned that native agents should not be remunerated as much as its British missionaries because it would place them too far above the natives among whom they ministered and create a barrier to effective evangelization.\textsuperscript{29} James Settee often complained about such injustice and expressed frustration with the “scarcity” of supplies provided to support his family and work in the mission field.\textsuperscript{30} Settee observed that teachers sent out from England would not “content themselves on those terms.” Dispirited by such treatment, Settee and several other native catechists notified the CMS in 1846 that they were ready “to give notices.”\textsuperscript{31} Settee also resented the close supervision and control that CMS officials and British missionaries exercised over his work. Notions of superiority and continuing doubts about the abilities of its native agents ensured that the CMS always placed workers such as Settee under the authority of a British missionary. Even though men from Britain were often less experienced and ill suited to work in the Canadian North West, it was unthinkable to the CMS that they should be placed under the direction of a more capable (but less formally educated) native already in the field.\textsuperscript{32} Settee’s exasperation with such paternalism explains, in part at least, his preference for the freedom that came with itinerant work.

James Settee considered all native peoples as “bone of my bone and flesh of my flesh,” and he brought a degree of empathy and understanding that was rarely evident among his British counterparts in the CMS.\textsuperscript{33} While Settee had no doubt that the native peoples of the North West needed to be provided with the saving message of Christianity and rescued from their “dark ways,” his attitude towards them and his approach to evangelization differed significantly from the British missionaries he served alongside in the mission field.\textsuperscript{34} Settee brought to his work an understanding and appreciation of native culture and society that greatly facilitated his work. Unlike the British missionaries with whom he worked, he did not reject all aspects of native society and culture, nor did he uncritically extol the virtues of European civilization. Indeed, Settee was often critical of what he witnessed among European traders and settlers. He lamented their greed and selfishness, denounced their immorality and use of alcohol, and chastised their lack of consideration for others.\textsuperscript{35} For Settee, traders and settlers were often poor examples of Christians, a fact that was readily
pointed out by the natives among whom Settee evangelized. Always patient, slow to judge, and tenaciously persistent, Settee had a capacity to develop lasting relationships, even among those who opposed his message—a matter of some concern to his CMS superiors and British co-workers. While Settee accepted that the Cree and Ojibwa among whom he worked needed to adapt to the forces that were transforming the North West, he insisted that such change must be gradual and selective. For Settee, accepting Christianity and adopting aspects of European lifestyles that were conducive to native well-being did not mean that one had to reject one’s native identity entirely. Settee sought to create an independent Native Church that would not only help indigenous peoples to adjust to change, but would also serve to maintain their language, distinctiveness, and interests in the face of European settlement and development. The end result, Settee hoped, would be a new indigeneity that was Christian centred. Settee’s empathy and advocacy allowed him to find acceptance and to make inroads where his British counterparts found mostly rejection and frustration.

Convinced of the superiority of western civilization, British missionaries assumed that all they would have to do in order to Christianize and ‘civilize’ native peoples would be to point out to them the inferiority of their traditional practices and beliefs and then provide the required instruction for their transformation. The most efficient means to achieve this end, the CMS’s British agents believed, was to target native leaders who would then direct their subjects to follow their example. Given their assumptions about their own status and position, British missionaries expected that they would be well received by native chiefs who would then direct their people to follow their instructions. Such an approach reflected an ignorance of native concepts of leadership and authority and the relatively egalitarian structure of native society. The authority of chiefs was non-coercive and persuasive and did not include the hierarchical chains of command and obedience to which Europeans were accustomed. Without the support of the group, the chief had little if any power. Unlike his British counterparts, James Settee understood the nature of leadership within native society. He appreciated that his standing among the natives was predicated upon his ability to earn their trust and respect and to persuade them of the truth of his message rather than any claims to superiority based on the presumed status or authority of his position. For Settee, the most important part of his work was to establish relationships. Whenever Settee visited his fellow natives, he
entered their realm as an equal and did not make any claims to special authority or demands for special treatment. Upon visiting a village or camp for the first time, he honoured native traditions of hospitality and respect and sat down with the local chief and elders around the fire, offered them a gift of tobacco, explained who he was and why he was there, and requested permission to call upon members of the community. Among his own people, the Swampy Cree, Settee usually received a hospitable reception. While the chief and elders sometimes raised objections to the ‘white man’s religion’ and asserted the validity of their own beliefs and practices, they usually acknowledged Settee’s right to visit and be heard and the freedom of others to make their own decisions.

Typical was a visit Settee made to Beren’s River in June 1856. When he arrived at the fort, Settee went “from tent to tent, speaking with every heathen on the truth of the Christian religion.” That evening he “sent the calumet and tobacco” to the native camp he intended to visit and word that he had “a message to deliver from the King of kings and Lord of Lords.” When Settee arrived at the camp the next day, he met with the chief and elders and shared a meal with them before addressing the people “on the plan of salvation for nearly two hours.” Settee recorded in his journal that the people listened intently and “every eye was directed to me.” When he finished speaking, Settee “called upon the old men to say what they had to say.” Settee appreciated that within Cree culture it was important to allow others, especially elders, to respond and to be heard. Such an approach confounded British missionaries who believed their role was simply to bring natives the saving Word of God and that the role of native proselytes was simply to receive God’s Word. The first speaker expressed his approval of Settee’s message and promised to become a “praying man.” Settee noted in his journal that, “the rest of the old men consented to become Christians and give their children for instruction” if “our society sends a teacher to Beren’s River.” During this visit, Settee also met with a disciple of a prophet who claimed that “god spoke to him from heaven, and told him the changes that would take place among the Indian family.” The prophet had claimed that “god would rain down heaven cloth, cotton, lead and iron, tea, gold and silver and make the Indians richer than the white man” and that “the white man will beg his bread from the Indian.” Settee proceeded to correct the disciple by explaining that God would not send down cloth and iron and food from heaven, but that “God would send down his Holy Spirit to us and enlighten our dark minds that we might see the exceeding value and true in Christian
religion.” According to Settee, the disciple confessed before the others that, “he had gone wrong as he had no one to guide him the right way.” The key to Settee’s effectiveness was his understanding of native rules of hospitality, his appreciation of the egalitarian nature of native society, and his recognition of the importance of the powers of persuasion.

Not all visits were as “satisfactory” as this one to Beren’s River, of course. Settee often faced opposition from Cree spiritual leaders and medicine men and from those attached to traditional beliefs. That such professional rivalry should develop between missionaries and natives who both claimed access to the sacred and performed similar functions is hardly surprising. Rather than simply belittle and dismiss such figures as ignorant and superstitious, however, Settee made a point of meeting with them and trying to persuade them of the truth of Christianity. On a subsequent visit to Beren’s River, for example, he heard that a medicine man was teaching the effects of different roots. He immediately went to his tent and “spoke to him of the Great Physician of souls telling him that he was the greatest Physician the world ever knew.” Later that year he “visited a notorious conjurer” and attempted to convince him “to forsake his dreams” and to convince him that they were “lies” and that “they all came from the Father of lies the devil.” Settee’s British counterparts tended to write off native spiritual leaders and healers as beyond redemption, avoided direct contact with them, and made every effort to ridicule and discredit them among their band and kinsfolk. While Settee certainly insisted upon the truth of Christianity, rejected the efficacy of traditional native religion, and warned of its evil roots, he operated within native norms of hospitality and recognized that he had to make his case directly through persuasive argument rather than authoritative declarations and dismissive attacks. Settee’s approach earned him grudging admiration and respect from some traditional spiritual leaders and healers, a few of whom eventually embraced Christianity. Settee developed a friendship with Spread Wings, for example, an old Cree chief and conjuror at Swan River. The two men met often. Each time Settee tried to convince the old man of the merits of Christianity; each time Spread Wings would listen politely, challenge Settee’s assertions, and then promise to go away to think the matter over further. Despite Spread Wings’ prevarication and his fondness for alcohol, Settee always made time for him, treating Spread Wings and his family with kindness. Occasionally Settee’s persistence paid off. On 23 November 1855, he baptized Sahwayas, “the greatest conjuror in this quarter,” and his whole family. After numerous encounters, Settee
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recorded in his journal that “the power of the gospel” had finally “reached his heart.” “He could no longer resist it,” Settee observed, “and he came forward and boldly confessed his faith in the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ.”

Settee had a more difficult time among the Ojibwa or Saulteaux with whom he did not share the same linguistic and ethnic affinity. He often complained that the “prejudice of the Saulteaux to the Christian religion is a great hindrance” and that they delighted to argue and to disrupt his addresses whenever they could. Even among the Saulteaux, however, once Settee had made contact with particular individuals and families he made it a habit to call on them frequently, always bringing a gift, usually of tobacco or game, sitting down with them to smoke, drink tea, and gossip before sharing the Gospel message. These visits were never rushed and he always took the time to answer questions and listen to objections. Through such perseverance and reciprocity Settee established a network of lasting relationships, some of which eventually led to an acceptance of Christianity. Because of Settee’s indefatigable patience and persistence, he was often referred to as “the pest” or “the man who talks too much” by the natives among whom he laboured. There is every indication that these were names of affection more than derision and that many natives admired his commitment.

Settee’s acceptance by the natives among whom he ministered owed a great deal to his appreciation of the system of generosity and reciprocity that governed personal and communal relations in native society. While Europeans stressed the individual accumulation of property, status was gained in native society by sharing and providing mutual assistance. The giving of gifts was an essential feature of social relations in native society. Natives expected the same sharing and reciprocity of the missionaries as they did of any ally, trading partner, or member of their extended family. Just as one should provide for one’s children, share with one’s family, and support one’s needy relations, missionaries were expected to provide gifts as a sign of affinity with and attachment to the people they wished to evangelize. Not to do so would be regarded as highly anti-social and an act of bad faith. British missionaries interpreted the native’s expectation of gifts as ‘begging’ and dismissed it as an unseemly part of aboriginal nature. Much to consternation of CMS authorities, Settee was always ready to share what he had with the Christian and non-Christian natives whom he encountered and to come to the aid of those in need. This was not a one-way process. Settee was often the recipient of gifts of food,
labour and transportation from his fellow natives, a sure sign that he had successfully integrated himself within a network of traditional relationships.\footnote{By honouring the norms and expectations of his native culture, Settee often found himself “embarrassed with debts” and forced to appeal to his superiors for more resources. These appeals were usually refused. Even worse, his requests seemed to confirm already existing assumptions about inherent weaknesses within the native character and doubts that native agents possessed the basic abilities required to carry out their “spiritual and temporal” work successfully. Because native missionaries were often regarded as improvident by CMS and Diocesan authorities, the Diocese of Rupert’s Land resolved in 1860 that “it not receive any order for supplies from a native labourer, unless countersigned by the European missy. in charge of the District.” Such regulations seriously hampered the missionary efforts of the society’s native agents. Unable to purchase necessary supplies as needed and forced to submit requests to British superiors for approval, native missionaries like Settee suffered not only from a loss of status and authority, but also found their ability to respond to particular situations and to take initiative greatly hindered. Such policies reflected a profound ignorance of the importance of gift giving and exchange in establishing and maintaining relationships with indigenous society and thus greatly hampered the work of native missionaries.}

The most important relationship among aboriginal peoples was the extended family. All members of the extended family had important roles to play to ensure the survival of the group. These roles were grounded in the conviction that kin should provide for one another. In times of need or crisis, persons unrelated by blood or marriage would be incorporated into the family. The effectiveness of missions thus depended to a considerable degree on the ability of a missionary to be accepted as part of the extended family. James Settee’s familiarity with aboriginal notions of family served him well in the mission field. While serving as a catechist at Fort Ellice in October 1842, for instance, Settee travelled to the Cree living at Beaver Creek and announced to the chief his intention to share “the knowledge of the True God” with his people. The chief welcomed Settee but cautioned him that: “My children shall be taught to read and write but not baptized, when they have learned to read and to understand this new religion they will know how to act for themselves.” Settee readily accepted these terms and proceeded to tell the chief that he had gone to school with a local Cree boy, Joseph Harbidge, who had died while at the
CMS school at Red River. “I come to you,” Settee stated, “in his stead, to be the son of the person, who lost his child.” Harbidge’s father was present and immediately adopted Settee. “You are one of us,” the chief exclaimed, “and you shall go and winter with us, and when you return to your praying father, he shall not be ashamed of you, for you shall have a good horse to ride upon.” To be made a member of the extended family, one had to demonstrate that one could contribute to its well-being and would not be a burden. Because Settee knew how to survive on the land and was willing to share his resources, many bands welcomed Settee into their extended family. Few British missionaries could claim the same level of acceptance.

Settee made effective use of his native background and familiarity with aboriginal languages, cultures, and worldview to present Christianity in ways that were accessible and applicable to the indigenous peoples he served. British missionaries often struggled to make Christian concepts and ideas comprehensible and relevant. Convinced that God’s Word would act on their souls, British missionaries felt little need to explain Biblical passages or engage natives in conversation about the meaning of Christian beliefs and doctrines. Many British missionaries believed that the most effective means of evangelizing natives who had never heard the Word of God before was to stick entirely to the Bible and to read passages of scripture to them verbatim and without comment. James Settee questioned the efficacy of such an approach, given that native proselytes and converts were not familiar with the people, places, and events of the Bible, let alone basic Christian concepts. When meeting with individuals or groups, Settee preferred to give a simple talk about a particular text or theological concept using terms, ideas, and analogies with which natives were familiar and then engage his listeners in conversation. On 8 August 1861, for example, Settee recorded in his journal that he had a long conversation with Young Thunder and some other natives at Fort Perry about the story of flood in the Bible. He noted that “the Indian has a long tradition of this flood and it is remarkable that in many points it agrees with the sacred word of the bible.” After reading the account of the flood in Genesis, Settee used his knowledge of the Cree story to point out similarities and differences and to teach the natives about the “the coming Judgment which will be far more awful and terrible than those before mentioned and that all unbelievers and those that hate God shall be confounded and tremble with great fear. But all good Christian Indians and white men shall rejoice of the coming of their saviour and God.” After this explanation, Settee observed that Young Thunder and the others “said that they believed what
they had heard from the Word of God.”

The CMS regarded the education of native children as essential to the type of transformation they sought to affect in the Canadian North West. Native children were widely regarded by British missionaries as wayward, undisciplined, and in desperate need of direction and instruction in the values of both Christianity and “civilization.” By educating native children, the CMS also hoped to reach their parents and to accelerate the emergence of a new order in the North West. The curriculum offered at mission schools included not only instruction in the Gospel, but also skills which would benefit them in “civilized” society. Boys were to be instructed in farming and husbandry and girls in the domestic arts. James Settee believed in the importance of educating native children; he largely rejected, however, the model of education adopted by British missionaries and its emphasis on corporal punishment, order, regularity, and discipline. Such practices were foreign to him as a native. Within native society, education did not take place within a formal setting in specific blocks of time, but rather it occurred within the extended family on a continual basis. The games children played were modelled after the life, customs, and values of the community. The stories told by elders were an integral part of the educational process and taught moral behaviour and spiritual values. Children often learned by imitating the activities carried out by adults. Rather than resorting to physical punishment, native children were shamed into proper behaviour, but without breaking the child’s spirit in the process. The aboriginal approach to education frustrated British missionaries. William Cockran complained that, “Indian customs and habits are all at variance with the injunction ‘bring up a child in the way he should go.’” As a result, he found the native children he was supposed to teach were “of a roving disposition,” averse “to close application, either in study or work,” and “impatient of restraint.” Given the different attitudes toward children and approaches to education, it is not surprising that many natives proved hesitant to surrender their children to CMS missionaries. In an 1838 report on the state of education in the Canadian North West, David Jones and William Cockran lamented that, “We have not found, among the people generally, that avidity to avail themselves of the means of instruction of their children which we could have wished.” Natives appeared more willing to send their children to mission schools with native teachers. James Settee’s approach to education was more flexible than that of the British missionaries. He eschewed rigid routine and repetition and varied the school day depending on the weather, the
availability of game, and the movements of the band. He appreciated the importance of traditional knowledge and incorporated hunting and fishing skills into the instruction he provided. He adopted the techniques of native storytelling to teach stories from the Bible. He stressed co-operation rather than competition in the classroom and never resorted to corporal punishment to discipline students. Settee’s patience and kindness earned him the admiration of his students and their bands, if not the number of converts he desired.

Settee showed a similar pragmatism in his attitude towards agriculture. The CMS believed that natives needed to be taught agriculture as soon as possible so that they could abandon their nomadic lifestyle and be fixed upon a private plot of land which they would work to provide for their individual family needs. While the CMS regarded the expeditious introduction of agriculture as essential to establishing industry, private property, western conceptions of time, individualism, and proper gender relations among native peoples, Settee recognized a number of serious shortcomings in the plan. Not only were many areas not suitable to farming, but the importance Europeans attached to private ownership and residence upon an enclosed piece of property that one worked to sustain oneself also conflicted with native notions of freedom, the collective title to and use of the commons, and the sharing of the fruits of one’s labour with one’s band. Such sweeping changes could not be introduced overnight without destroying the very foundations of native society. Settee thus introduced agricultural selectively and gradually, believing that, in time, farming could contribute to the revitalization of native society. When he felt it appropriate, he suggested that natives plant a few potatoes or other crops to supplement their traditional diet and compensate for the decline of game or the fishery. While Settee always planted a garden at whatever mission station or school he served, he preferred the freedom that came with an itinerant ministry and took great satisfaction from fishing and hunting and living off the land. Settee’s attachment to the land is evident in the many passages found in his journals that speak eloquently of the beauty and sacredness of nature. In one such passage, Settee wrote: “The sun rose beautiful; the birds began to sing sweet and harmonious notes; the waves murmured gently on the sand beach . . . and all nature appeared happy.” Unlike most of the British missionaries with whom he worked, however, Settee showed a remarkable openness to and understanding of the culture, traditions, and life ways of the people among whom he ministered.
While the CMS deliberately recruited and trained native agents because of their familiarity with the culture and life-ways of indigenous peoples, this very knowledge was often a source of suspicion and discord. Rev. Abraham Cowley, for example, complained that native missionaries were too comfortable in “the Indian mode of speaking” and too tolerant of habits that violated Victorian notions of propriety. In 1851, Rev. Robert Hunt informed the Secretaries of the CMS that he had “uncovered a stink of moral pollution” at the Stanley mission school where James Settee and his wife, Sally, served as teachers and catechists. Hunt claimed that the students at the school were engaged in a variety of sexual “abominations” that arose “from the indiscriminate manner in which both sexes, married and single, old & young have been accustomed to live together in crowded tents.” Hunt blamed the Settees for the moral impropriety he found rampant among the students at the school. “Constant residence among the Indians and familiarity with heathen practices,” Hunt concluded, “had slanted the moral feelings of Mr. and Mrs. Settee.” Hunt charged that the Settees had done little to “introduce a new state of things” because they were either resigned to such behaviour or unwilling to cause offense by making it an issue. Prior to his ordination, Hunt cautioned the CMS that Settee “has not the moral sense, or moral courage necessary for the oversight of persons or property, or to raise the moral tone of a community of Indians by firmly and constantly as well as kindly opposing moral wrong or pecuniary injury done to the Society.” The Settees, however, charged that Hunt failed to understand native culture and customs and that the actions that caused him such concern needed to be handled in a way that was sensitive to native feelings and practice. Hunt’s solution was to expel offenders from the school, supervise and control students more “efficiently,” separate the sexes, and chastise native parents and elders. The Settees appreciated that in Cree society, sexual experimentation among youth before marriage was common. Only patient and persistent instruction, example, and the use of the traditional Cree disciplinary practices, such as shame, could change such behaviour, rather than the harsh measures advocated by Hunt. Appalled by his lack of tact and sensitivity, Sally Settee confronted Hunt, denied his “authority in this matter” and advised native women “not to attend Mrs. Hunt’s class for spiritual instruction.” Despite Hunt’s warnings, Bishop David Anderson proceeded with James Settee’s ordination. He explained to Henry Venn that he found Settee to be “active,” “zealous,” “earnest,” and “a favourite with his countrymen.”
It is significant that Robert Hunt did not attribute what he perceived to be the immorality of the students at the Stanley Mission School to James Settee alone, but also blamed his wife, Sally. Hunt’s criticism of the Settees was based on the Protestant ideal of the godly family. For British missionaries like Hunt, the godly family was based on specific gender relations. In the godly family, the husband had complete authority over his wife and children. The ideal wife was unselfish, modest, industrious, even-tempered, and submissive. To CMS authorities, Sally Settee did not possess the qualities associated with the ideal wife. She was often described as obstinate, domineering, and intemperate and thus incapable of fulfilling her duties as a missionary wife and the keeper of a godly home.

In a letter to the CMS in 1863, Rev. William Stagg observed that, “Poor Mr. Settee is a good Christian man . . . but his family are a great hindrance to him in his work. His wife is not in subjection and his sons are not steady.” Archdeacon J.A. Mackay concurred and suggested that Settee’s “deficiency in the ability to rule his own house” rendered his work for the CMS “a total failure.” The Bishop of Rupert’s Land, David Anderson, became so frustrated with Sally Settee’s tendency to “deny” the “authority” of the CMS and the diocese that he considered suspending James Settee unless he divorced his “quarrelsome” and “worthless” wife.

The understanding of family and gender relations conveyed by British missionaries was very different from the understanding native peoples had of themselves and their relationships with their spouses. As a Swampy Cree, James Settee appreciated the important contributions that women made within the native subsistence economy as gatherers, small game hunters, and finishers of furs. He acknowledged the traditional autonomy that native women enjoyed, particularly within the family where many decisions effecting daily life and the future were made. He regarded his wife as someone to be consulted with and not dictated too. James Settee’s status as a man, moreover, did not depend on European notions of patriarchal authority, but rather derived from his ability to support his family, share generously with others, and persuade through example.

CMS authorities doubted the ability of native wives, such as Sally Settee, to make a significant contribution to work of evangelization. Derek Strong Whitehouse has concluded that attitudes about gender and race placed Native women “in doubly subordinate positions” and constrained the roles and activities that were open to them in the proselytization of Christianity. James Settee, however, regarded his wife as a partner who made an essential contribution to both the welfare of his family and the
work of the mission. Sally Settee assumed an active role in teaching at mission schools alongside her husband, led Sunday school classes, catechized native girls and women, conducted mother’s meetings, cared for the sick, and frequently managed the mission while her husband was away. James Settee often acknowledged her many contributions to the work of the mission in his journals, noting especially her influence among Native women who were “very fond of talking with one who speaks their language.” The negative attitudes voiced by British missionaries toward the indigenous wives of its native agents seriously undermined the success of the CMS’s Native Church policy. Not only did it threaten to disrupt the family lives of its native missionaries, but it also undermined the Society’s efforts to find acceptance within a culture defined by a very different set of gender norms and family relations.

Although the Native Church policy committed the CMS to establishing indigenous Churches that were self-governing, self-sufficient, and self-propagating, its treatment of its native agents in Canada’s North West ensured that this objective was never achieved. Placed under the supervision of British missionaries who questioned their skills and suitability, native workers such as Settee were constrained in their ability to exercise autonomy or leadership in the mission field. The poor treatment of Settee and other native agents by the CMS, moreover, did not commend mission work to many Christian converts, precluding the creation of self-propagating Native church. The inroads that the CMS hoped to make among the indigenous peoples of northwest British North America by the use of native catechists, teachers, and clergy were seriously impeded by the social and racial assumptions that informed the objectives of the CMS and the worldview of its British agents. Convinced of their own superiority and the righteousness of their cause, the representatives of the CMS refused to adjust their policies and tactics to better reflect local conditions or to defer to the superior knowledge of indigenous culture and society possessed by native workers in the mission field. Such attitudes undermined the effectiveness of workers like Settee and limited the prospects of creating a native church. By the 1870s, as the number of settlers arriving in Rupert’s Land grew and the pace of change transforming the North West increased, CMS officials and local church authorities essentially abandoned the Native Church policy. Natives were now to be subsumed within a settler-dominated church. The natives affiliated with that church, however, were largely a result of the efforts of native workers such as Settee to whom they remained closely attached. When Chief
Henry Press and the Council of St. Peter’s Reserve learned of plans to remove Settee from the mission at Netley Creek in 1877, they wrote to Archdeacon Abraham Cowley to voice their “regret” at losing his “services.” The Chief and Council insisted that “we cannot spare to lose him” and it would be “impossible” to find anyone who has “laboured” more faithfully “among our race.” While men such as Settee enjoyed a measure of success, opposition to Anglo-Canadian missionaries remained high. In 1871, James Settee reported to the CMS that, “the Indian tribes in general were always under the impression that the foreign were usurpers and destroyers of their race and Country.” “Your committee,” Settee continued, “knew that this spirit by the Indians would stand against their Missionaries, & such has been the case.” Settee acknowledged that he had “had heaps of these reproaches made to me by my countrymen” over the years. By retaining much of his native identity, demonstrating a sensitivity to indigenous society and a willingness to accommodate indigenous ways, Settee contributed to the establishment of a community of native Anglican Christians in northwestern British North America – a community that is now largely served by its own priests and bishops and only recently has come to resemble the self-governing, self-sustaining, and self-propagating native church originally envisioned by the CMS.
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