Document generated on 01/30/2025 6:17 a.m.

Historical Papers
Communications historiques

Church and State in Maritime Canada, 1749-1807

J. M. Bumsted

Volume 2, Number 1, 1967

Ottawa 1967

URI: https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/030667ar
DOI: https://doi.org/10.7202/030667ar

See table of contents

Publisher(s)

The Canadian Historical Association/La Société historique du Canada

ISSN

0068-8878 (print)
1712-9109 (digital)

Explore this journal

Cite this article

Bumsted, J. M. (1967). Church and State in Maritime Canada, 1749-1807. *Historical Papers / Communications historiques*, *2*(1), 41–58. https://doi.org/10.7202/030667ar

All rights reserved © The Canadian Historical Association/La Société historique du Canada,1967

This document is protected by copyright law. Use of the services of Érudit (including reproduction) is subject to its terms and conditions, which can be viewed online.

https://apropos.erudit.org/en/users/policy-on-use/

This article is disseminated and preserved by Érudit.

Érudit is a non-profit inter-university consortium of the Université de Montréal, Université Laval, and the Université du Québec à Montréal. Its mission is to promote and disseminate research.

https://www.erudit.org/en/

CHURCH AND STATE IN MARITIME CANADA, 1749-1807

J. M. BUMSTED
Simon Fraser University

The last half of the eighteenth century was a critical period in the formation of Maritime Canada, a time of initial organization, settlement, and expansion. By the early years of the nineteenth century, many of the basic patterns of development and conflict had been set. The Maritime provinces were founded in an era in which religion was still considered a matter of critical importance, the state assuming that an establishment church was an essential component of the well-being of the body politic, and the church in turn depending upon state support. Since the state was not a neutral observer in religious matters, an understanding of the connections between it and religion is particularly crucial, for a good many of the significant issues in the area were inextricably interwoven in the relationship.

In Maritime Canada the years from 1749 to 1807 constituted a period of Anglican Church supremacy. From 1749 — when the appointment of Governor Edward Cornwallis signalled the creation of a full-British colony in Nova Scotia — to 1807 — the last year in which Bishop Charles Inglis retained full personal direction of the Church of England — Anglicanism was not only the established faith in Nova Scotia and the provinces of Prince Edward Island, Cape Breton, and New Brunswick subsequently created from it, but it had succeeded in maintaining its position of dominance despite a relative failure to maintain popular support among the inhabitants. A good deal of confusion has persisted over the legal position of the Anglican Church in the Maritime provinces. But at the initial creation of each of them, Crown instructions to the governors directed provision for glebe lands for the Church of England, insisted on the reading of the Book of Common Prayer "as by law established," and in a variety of other clauses indicated the privileged and established position of the Church of England.[1] Such instructions were not considered incompatible with a

[1] For a compilation of pre-revolutionary instructions, see Leonard W. Labaree, ed., *Royal Instructions to British Governors, 1670-1776,* 2 vol. (New York and London, 1935), especially vol. II, 482-512 ("Religion and Morals"). The 1769 instructions to Governor Walter Patterson of the Island of St. John are fairly typical of the entire period under discussion in this paper and are reprinted in their entirety in Frank MacKinnon, *The Government of Prince Edward Island* (Toronto, 1951), pp. 319-343, particularly 339-341. Instructions are to be found scattered throughout the Public Record Office Colonial Office Series, and are collected in the State Papers Series at the Public Archives of Canada, Ottawa. Only minor alterations were required with the appointment of a resident bishop replacing the Bishop of London in 1787; see, for example, the 1787 instructions to Governor Thomas Carleton in C. O. 189/2, 224-230.

direction to the governors to permit "a liberty of conscience to all persons so they be contented with a quiet and peaceable enjoyment of the same, not giving offense or scandal to the government."[2] A grant of liberty of conscience to all did not mean that the Anglican Church could not and did not have a special status. Whether governor's instructions embodied the fundamental constitution of a colony or province was never entirely clear, since imperial law was itself never clear (had it been, there might have been no American Revolution).[3] But the legal establishment of the Church of England did not rest solely on such instructions, since enabling legislation to this end was passed by the legislature of every province by the beginning of the nineteenth century. Nova Scotia's first statute of establishment came in 1758, New Brunswick's in 1786, Cape Breton's in 1791, and Prince Edward Island's in 1802.[4] Beyond instructions and legislation, the Church of England enjoyed an officially privileged position through its intimate connection with the sources of money and power in both England and America.

Despite the undisputable fact that Anglicanism was by law established, the Church of England enjoyed no position of absolute exclusiveness in any Maritime province. Indeed, Bishop Inglis considered the establishment only "nominal," because the legal provisions were not sufficiently favorable to the Church.[5] Not only was liberty of conscience granted to dissenters (with occasional exceptions, particularly regarding Roman Catholics), but it was coupled with the accepted principle that dissenters would not be directly taxed for the support of the established church.[6] Government did aid the Church out of public revenue, but except in educational matters this was usually done within the province only by the granting of glebe lands from the public domain. Glebes were only potential revenue and they were small; no large clergy reserves existed anywhere in the Maritimes to

[2] The 1769 instructions to Governor Patterson were the only set for a Maritime province which specifically excluded "Papists" from the grant of liberty of conscience.

[3] Leonard W. Labaree, *Royal Government in America: A Study of the British Colonial System before 1783* (New Haven, 1930), pp. 1-18; J. E. Read, "The Early Provincial Constitutions," *Canadian Bar Review*, XXVI (1948), 520-532.

[4] C. O. 219/5, 48-50; C. O. 190/2, 15-16; C. O. 219/1, 101-102; C. O. 228/3, 40. I have examined the C. O. series in microfilm copies at the Public Archives of Canada.

[5] Charles Inglis to Governor Sir John Wentworth, April 14, 1800, "Memoirs of Bishop Inglis, Nova Scotia. Brief Notes or Memoirs of the Public and Various Other Transactions. Taken to assist my memory, and begun January 1775" (typescript, Public Archives of Canada, hereafter referred to as "Inglis Memoirs"), III, 45.

[6] This reservation was written into the Nova Scotia Act of 1758, and Prince Edward Island passed a special act to this effect in 1790 (C. O. 228/2, 92). The acts of Cape Breton and New Brunswick did not contain such a provision, but there is no evidence that direct ecclesiastical taxes were ever collected from dissenters in those provinces.

cause public outcry.[7] Dissenters fought, occasionally with success, for grants of glebe land for their clergymen and even for a share of the glebe set aside for the "orthodox" (i.e., Anglican) minister.[8] Anglican clergymen could be paid out of the British government's civil list, which was a sort of indirect taxation.[9] But in the Maritimes, dissenters were never faced with the collection of distinct ecclesiastical taxes which went to the established church, as was the case elsewhere in North America.[10]

The relative mildness of the establishment in the Maritimes was a product of Anglican Church weakness in the early years. Politicians successfully exploited the church for the advantage of the state, and refused to permit it to become oppressive upon those who were not its adherents. But as time went on, the establishment strengthened, and a number of points of friction emerged between the Church of England and dissenters. Its legal position, therefore, not only greatly influenced the development of Anglicanism but created political tensions and problems for the state and had repercussions for religious dissent both Protestant and Catholic.

Relationships between church and state hardly remained static and unchanging in the years 1749 to 1807. The process of settlement alone was sufficient to produce continual flux and alteration, but this was heightened and exaggerated by the great upheaval within the British Empire which dominated many of these years. Three distinct periods in the relationship of church and state in the Maritimes between 1749 and 1807 can be distinguished. The first, from 1749 to 1775, was an erastian period in which religion and clergymen served fundamentally as servants of the state. Anglican missionaries especially were directed by the politicians for what were essentially political ends. Religion may have been cynically used by the state for its own purposes, but curiously this was a time of minimum religious friction. The second period, from 1775 to 1787, was a transitional period of some confusion, during which large numbers of Loyalist Anglican ministers and communicants flooded into the area. Their arrival, the shock waves of the catastrophe which had produced them, the creation of new provinces in their wake, and a rapid growth of evangelical pietism

[7] One of the recurring themes of the correspondence of missionaries to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and that of Bishop Inglis, was the inadequacy in size and revenue of glebe provisions. See, for instance, "Inglis Memoirs," II, 151.

[8] For example, see John Eagleson to William Morice, 16 January, 1775, in Transcripts of Papers of the Society for the Gospel in Foreign Parts, B. 25 (Nova Scotia, 1760-1786), 550-551, in Public Archives of Canada. Further reference to these documents will be: SPGFP, B. 25.

[9] Parliament also made grants for the building of Anglican churches in British North America.

[10] Especially in Virginia, Massachusetts, and Connecticut.

quite apart from political developments all combined to produce an extraordinarily changed and complex religious picture by 1787, when Charles Inglis arrived in Halifax as the first Anglican bishop of British North America. The third period, from 1787 to 1807, was the Inglis years. The bishop successfully resolved many of the most pressing problems which had grown up since the beginning of the Revolution, and he strengthened (or so it seemed) the political position of the Church everywhere. The new strength proved the Church's undoing, however, for it was not matched by corresponding gains in popular support. In 1750 the Church had been a political asset to the state; by 1800 there was increasing evidence that it was becoming a political liability. Inglis fought valiantly to prevent this from becoming apparent and as of 1807 appeared in large measure to have been successful. But his victories were illusory, and the weaknesses of the Church of England would ultimately overwhelm it, at least in terms of its established status.

In the years before 1775 the relationship between the Church of England and the state can quite properly be described as erastian. All Anglican clergymen in the Maritimes were missionaries of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, all schoolmasters were supported by the SPG.[11] Their ecclesiastical superiors were three thousand miles away. Besides administering to Anglican communicants, the SPG missionaries were charged with converting dissenters, both Protestant and Catholic, and Indians. From the point of view of the SPG, these activities had many spiritual justifications. But the SPG to some extent, the missionaries themselves to a considerable degree, and the government of Nova Scotia almost entirely, saw the missionaries' activities in political terms. Adherence to the Church of England was considered one of the means of assuring loyalty to the British Crown and Constitution. Those Protestant dissenters predominately from New England were to be converted as part of the overall government plan of undercutting New England principles of republicanism and democracy.[12] Protestant dissenters from Europe, especially the Lunenberg Germans, were to be converted and educated to assimilate them into British America and to prevent further ethnic divisions beyond those already present with the Acadians, who were never totally removed from the colony.[13] The

[11] The generalizations in the following paragraph are based largely on SPGFP, B. 25. For a more detailed analysis of the early church in Nova Scotia, see C. E. Thomas, "The First Half Century of the Work of the S.P.G. in Nova Scotia," *Nova Scotia Historical Society Collections,* XXXIV (1963), 1-31; Reginald V. Harris, *The Church of St. Paul in Halifax, Nova Scotia, 1749-1949* (Toronto, 1949), pp. 21-35.

[12] The overall plan is discussed in D. C. Harvey, "The Struggle for the New England Form of Township Government in Nova Scotia," *Canadian Historical Association Annual Report* (1933), pp. 15-22, and John B. Brebner, *The Neutral Yankees of Nova Scotia* (New York, 1937), pp. 211-217.

[13] The definitive work on the Germans is Winthrop P. Bell, *The "Foreign Protestants" and the Settlement of Nova Scotia* (Toronto, 1961).

French and other Catholics were to be converted to assimilate them and to assure their loyalty, particularly important since Catholics were held to maintain allegiance to a foreign power (not only the Pope, but before 1763 the Bishop of Quebec and all he represented).[14] Missionary activity among the Indians was, before final peace with France, designed to counter French influence among the savages and later to assure continuing amicable relations with the red men.[15]

The erastian nature of the Church relationship in Nova Scotia was considerably enhanced in 1769 by the establishment in the province of a committee of corresponding members of the SPG which was charged with making regulations, reports, and recommendations regarding missions in the area. As the men on the spot, the committee was bound to have an extraordinary influence on both the missionaries and the SPG, and it exercised for several years what amounted to supervisory functions over the Society's activities in the Maritimes. The members of the committee were "His Excellency, the governor, Chief Justice Belcher, and Mr. Sec'y Bulkeley."[16] Holding the chairmanship of the corresponding committee contributed significantly to the governor's claims to being "Head of the Church" in Nova Scotia, an assertion charged against several governors, particularly Legge and Parr.

Although the SPG missionaries were not numerous and always considered themselves grossly undersupported financially, they were on the whole better off than their competitors. This was their greatest asset in their missionary activities. New settlers, in process of establishing themselves and attempting to eke out a marginal living from the soil and sea, were in no position to support clergymen from their own limited resources. Only the SPG missionaries, paid by the Society in England, were assured of a regular income, and they could promise new communities that their religious service would be at no cost to the settlers.[17] As Joseph Bennett wrote to the Society in 1765 while reporting the ordination in New England of two dissenting ministers for service in Nova Scotia:

> I am Certain though the two Clergymen I mentioned shou'd Come down from New England they will not stay as the people are not as yet

[14] The governor's instructions in Nova Scotia from 1749-1764 stressed conversion and denied authority to the Bishop of Quebec. Labaree, *Royal Instructions*, II, 498-499; see also William Tutty to SPG, September 29, 1749, "Letters and Other Papers Relating to the Early History of the Church of England in Nova Scotia," *Nova Scotia Historical Society Collections*, VII (1889), 97-104.

[15] Labaree, *Royal Instructions*, II, 505-506. The major SPG missionary to the Indians was Thomas Wood, who succeeded his friend Father Pierre Maillard as missionary to the Micmac Indians; see Thomas, "The First Half Century," 13-15, and Rev. Angus A. Johnston, *A History of the Catholic Church in Eastern Nova Scotia* (Antigonish, 1960), I, 63-76.

[16] SPGFP, B. 25, 377-382.

[17] See, for example, Joseph Bennett to SPG, July 28, 1763, SPGFP, B. 25, 87-88.

> in a capacity to pay them, and wou'd much rather attend a Church minister who wou'd be no Expence to them than a Dissenter whom they must Support.[18]

Bennett's analysis was echoed by most other missionaries and was substantiated by the dissenters of Cornwallis, who in 1769 petitioned the New England Puritan churches for financial assistance for their minister, arguing:

> For As there is Now A Church in Building in this town And A Church minister provided free of any Expence to all proselites.... If we now part with our Minister ... we of Concequence In A Few years Shall all be Churchmen or Nothing (i.e.) in point of Religion, as it Seams we Shall be in no Condition to Recettle Another Minister.[19]

Most dissenting congregations failed to support their own ministers, and by the Revolution all but a handful had left, most returning to New England.[20] This was a matter of some importance, for Puritan ministers were staunch supporters of the rebels and their absence certainly aided in keeping Nova Scotia quiet during the critical years.[21]

The relative weakness of the dissenters before 1775 assured that there would be no open campaign against the Church of England in Nova Scotia, although most dissenters were not in principle opposed to a church establishment, and the only sect with a firm anti-establishment tradition (the Separate Baptists) had lost all its clergymen by 1771.[22] No trouble could be expected on the Island of St. John, which had no resident Anglican clergyman to oppose before 1777.[23] In Nova Scotia Protestant dissenters regularly appealed to the government for financial assistance, occasionally with success. The dissenters' church in Halifax was given land by the government and assisted from public funds in the building of its meetinghouse.[24] Other ministers received land from the government and many assumed the use of the glebe lands in their communities.[25]

18 Joseph Bennett to SPG, June 14, 1765, SPGFP, B. 25, 167.

19 S. A. Green, ed., "Letters from Congregational Churches in Early Nova Scotia," *Massachusetts Historical Society Collections*, 2nd Ser., IV (1888), 68-69.

20 Maurice W. Armstrong, *The Great Awakening in Nova Scotia 1776-1809* (Hartford, 1948), pp. 38-55.

21 Armstrong, *The Great Awakening*, 55-56. The Massachusetts Loyalist, Peter Oliver, called the Congregational clergy of New England the "Black Regiment," and credited them with a iion's share of stirring rebellion in that area; Douglass Adair and John A. Schutz, eds., *Peter Oliver's Origin & Progress of the American Revolution* (San Mateo, Calif., 1961), pp. 44-45.

22 G. E. Levy, *The Baptists of the Maritime Provinces, 1753-1946* (Saint John, 1946), pp. 10-14; Armstrong, *The Great Awakening*, p. 60.

23 A. B. Warburton, *A History of Prince Edward Island* (Saint John, 1923), pp. 385-389.

24 Walter C. Murray, "History of St. Matthew's Church, Halifax, N.S.," *Nova Scotia Historical Society Collections*, XVI (1912), 137-170, especially 151-155.

25 Armstrong, *The Great Awakening*, 49-50.

Beyond the difficulties faced by all denominations in the Maritimes, the Roman Catholics operated under the additional handicap of legal disabilities. The same act which established the Church of England in Nova Scotia required "Popist priests" to depart the province by March 25, 1759, on pain of perpetual imprisonment.[26] Communicants suffered under civil restrictions, being forbidden from sitting in the Assembly, after 1758 from holding land, and after 1766 from teaching school.[27] Although Nova Scotia's restrictions were a matter not of imperial policy but rather of legislative enactment, governor's instructions in 1769 for the Island of St. John specifically excluded "Papists" from the grant of liberty of conscience.[28] Priests did remain after their technical exclusion, but they did so at the sufferance of the government, and like their parishioners were in no position to criticize it. Before Catholics could begin to battle the Church of England, they had to gain legal recognition, and this was not accomplished before the Revolution.

Despite the relative absence of actual conflict arising out of church-state relationships in the Maritimes, portents of future trouble were certainly present. On March 26, 1775, a young Nova Scotian named Henry Alline discovered his "call to preach the gospel."[29] He would be the instrument of the awakening of a native Protestant dissent in the area which was much more potentially dangerous to the Church of England than dissent in its New England Puritan form could ever have been. Within the Church itself there was the beginning of resentment at being used a pawn by the state. A stronger and more numerous clergy would not take kindly to this and would object to the governor's pretensions as "Head of the Church." Indeed, unchallenged erastianism was about dead in Nova Scotia. On June 30, 1775, the corresponding committee of the SPG recommended that "for the best service of the Established Church in this Province, in avoiding all Controversy with the Inhabitants of different persuasions, and provoking them to disgust and Animosities by continuing Missionaries however highly worthy," all SPG missionaries would be recalled to Halifax.[30] A month later the committee met to note that "by the Intervention of too powerful a Cause," its intention to avoid conflict and controversy with dissenters was frustrated, and unless supported by the Society the committee could be of no further use.[31] The SPG did not support it, and the committee, although not formally dissolved until 1777, ceased to function on the eve of the war.

[26] C. O. 219/5, 50.

[27] Johnson, *A History of the Catholic Church,* I, 77-85.

[28] MacKinnon, *Government of Prince Edward Island,* p. 339.

[29] Henry Alline, *The Life and Journal of the Rev. Mr. Henry Alline* (Boston, 1806), p. 36.

[30] SPGFP, B. 25, 575-576.

[31] SPGFP, B. 25, 577-578.

The next dozen years saw extraordinary changes in the religious situation in the Maritimes. From the standpoint of the Anglican Church, the great event was the enormous Loyalist immigration to the area, which brought dozens of ministers (mostly former SPG missionaries from the rebellious colonies) and large numbers of potential communicants. Most of the new clergymen were tenaciously committed to a strong Church of England connection with the state, and their coming should have significantly strengthened the position of the Church. But except in the newly created province of New Brunswick, where the legal position of the Church was firmly assured by strong legislation, Anglicanism failed to demonstrate appreciable immediate benefits from the Loyalist migration.

A number of factors combined to prevent the expectable gains by the Church of England. The coming of the Loyalists, while adding greatly to the number of missionaries in the Maritimes — especially in Nova Scotia — created certain difficulties as well. Although the new clergymen were staunch supporters of the Crown, the Church of England, and the church-state connection, it is doubtful whether all of the immigrants shared the ministers' interpretation of church establishment. Most of the Loyalists were not upper-class Tories — as were their clergymen — and were probably not communicants of the Church of England.[32] The average Loyalist, having previously abandoned his worldly possessions and currently engaged in a life-and-death struggle to make a go of his new situation, was doubtless out of sympathy with a clergy which thought itself entitled to "a large, decent house, well furnished," and a family "elegantly dressed, without attempting to rival people of fashion."[33] The immigrants' lack of resources, the problems of settlement, the bleakness of much of the country, and the lack of sympathy with — perhaps even resentment against — the demands of the Anglican missionaries, all combined to prevent the clerics from gaining much if any financial support from their parishioners. Most were forced to rely on the government and the SPG for financial assistance, but by 1784 Thomas Wood noted: "I see the Societys funds are nearly exhausted, & the replenishing them will be precarious. I have reason indeed to dread our whole fabric is tottering."[34]

[32] The old myths about the Loyalists die hard, and more detailed studies such as that of Esther C. Wright, *The Loyalists of New Brunswick* (Fredericton, 1955) are needed. Miss Wright demonstrates quite convincingly that the New Brunswick Loyalists represented a cross-section of the population of colonial America rather than its upper classes. No detailed statistical work on religious affiliation has been done, but the reports of the SPG missionaries, the Bishop of Nova Scotia, and the writings of dissenting evangelists would seem to indicate that large numbers of Loyalists were not committed communicants of the Church of England.

[33] William S. Bartlet, *The Frontier Missionary: A Memoir of the Life of the Rev. Jacob Bailey, A.M.* (Boston, 1853), p. 218.

[34] Thomas Wood to SPG, January 29, 1784, SPGFP, "C" Series (A-167), Box 2, p. 6 (Public Archives of Canada).

The plain reality was that, for existing resources, too many missionaries were all loudly demanding a support in keeping with their stations. The result was an unbecoming and divisive scrambling for places and emoluments, in which the immigrant clergymen fought the pre-revolutionary missionaries and the government which had long been in alliance with them. The old missionaries naturally resented the demands, complaints, and presumptions of the newcomers, and the newly arrived in turn despised the old hands. Mather Byles wrote in 1779 that he had been promised a post at Halifax, but was "violently opposed, and rather roughly treated, by Mr. Bennett, who resolutely claims it as being what he pleases to call his 'Birth-Right,' he being the Senior Missionary of Nova Scotia."[35] On the whole, the government supported the older missionaries, leading Byles to comment that "Sycophants are not wanting to compliment a Governor, who acts entirely under their Influence, with the absurd Title of 'Head of the Church'."[36] The Loyalists turned to the SPG for support, and Byles for several years served as a clearinghouse for Loyalist correspondence with the SPG "to the no small Mortification of some who think themselves equally entitled to their Confidence."[37] This was hardly a wise move on the part of the SPG, for Byles had an extraordinarily high opinion of his own abilities and a malicious tongue and pen. He quickly fell out with kindly Jonathan Breynton, long-time rector of St. Paul's of Halifax (whom he called "Dr. Benevolente Muckworm") and before long with almost everyone else in the province.[38] He was ultimately transferred to an unsuspecting parish in New Brunswick.

Infighting was hardly confined to battle lines pitting Loyalists versus veteran Nova Scotia missionaries. Competition among the Loyalists themselves was intense, each clergyman attempting to pull any strings available to him to gain sufficient patronage "to support himself with decency and to practice hospitality."[39] Some went to the government, and their competitors turned to the "Protection of their Venerable Patrons," the SPG, the only agency "that act upon the true principles of loyalty, and from where one may expect justice."[40] This was bound to lead to conflict between the Society and the government over the direction of the activities of the Church, particularly when the immigrant missionaries charged that the governor had adopted "extravagent Sentiments" of his ecclesiastical power, "his being 'Head of the Church'; 'the best

[35] SPGFP, B. 25, 686.
[36] SPGFP, B. 25, 758.
[37] "Copies of Letters and Diaries of Rev. Mather Byles, D.D. jr., a United Empire Loyalist who came to Halifax, N.S. in 1776..." (Public Archives of Canada), vol. I, p. 9.
[38] "Copies of Letters and Diaries of Rev. Mather Byles," p. 32.
[39] Jacob Bailey to SPG, October 14, 1782, SPGFP, B. 25, 754.
[40] J. W. Weeks to SPG, November, 1780, SPGFP, "C" Series (A-167), Box 2, p. 25.

Judge of the Situation of Affairs'; his having . . . all Benefices absolutely and entirely in his Gift."[41] Such conflict, which had long been simmering in Nova Scotia, reached its peak in the Shelburne glebe case.

Soon after the settlement of Port Roseway (or Shelburne) in 1783, the community found itself with two competing Anglican clergymen, both claiming to be the authorized minister.[42] One, the Reverend George Panton, had apparently been invited by a number of the leaders of the Port Roseway venture. The other, Dr. William Walter, claimed his invitation from a sizeable number of the settlers. Both gentlemen had their supporters and both appealed to the SPG and the governor for backing. While Walter was in England in 1784 on business which included pressing the claims of Loyalists missionaries in general and his own in particular, the governor divided the township into three parishes and inducted Panton into what his opponents considered to be the best living of the three.[43] In England, Walter had complained to the SPG of "the State of the Chhes . . . while under the Care of a Gentleman who is totally regardless of their Interest."[44] He returned to Nova Scotia with what he considered to be support from the Society only to discover that behind his back he had been outmanoeuvred by the governor. Outraged and encouraged by his brother-in-law (who happened to be Mather Byles), Walter protested vociferously, denying the governor's authority to locate parishes and to induct ministers until one was presented to him by the parishioners. By questioning the governor's authority and insisting "on the Privilege and Right of the Parishioners by Law to chuse their own minister," Walter opened himself to all sorts of attack.[45] His enemies doubted the validity of the appointment of a Church of England minister which relied on "the Votes and Subscriptions of a Number of Persons, neither Communicants nor professed Members of the Church," since this had a "dangerous Tendency, as Opening an Avenue for a Majority of *Sectaries* to introduce Clergyman of Obvious Principles equally dangerous to the Church and Government."[46] This was little more than New England Congregationalism ! The dispute continued for some months, until Panton (who apparently never sought

[41] Mather Byles to SPG, May 7, 1782, SPGFP, B. 25, 745.

[42] The following paragraph is based on the SPG papers, especially SPGFP, B. 25, 771-900. The only published discussion of the case is [W. O. Raymond] "The Founding of the Church of England in Shelburne," *New Brunswick Historical Society Collections*, III (No. 8), 278-293.

[43] William Walter to SPG, November 5, 1784, SPGFP, B. 25, 781-782.

[44] William Walter to SPG, January 17, 1784, SPGFP, B. 25, 771.

[45] William Walter to SPG, December 9, 1784, SPGFP, B. 25, 809. Early in 1785, Governor Parr protested to the SPG that Walter's disposition towards the authority of Government countenanced a spirit of popular opposition, and added, "I consider the matter of some importance to the future Prosperity of the Church in this Province." SPGFP, Box 25, 297.

[46] Vestry of St. Patrick's Parish to Governor John Parr, December 15, 1784, SPGFP, B. 25, 823.

the controversy) retired in hopes that Walter would do likewise. He did not, and two competing parishes survived in Shelburne for a number of years.[47] In the end, the SPG failed to support Walter. The secretary of the Society called him "ungrateful" and wrote that it was thought he "had more sense than to oppose the Governor."[48] But the questions regarding authority and patronage which had been raised in Shelburne were important ones which would have to be resolved, as would the unseemly scramble for positions among the missionaries. The best solution was undoubtedly the appointment of a resident bishop, and such a step was under discussion in England beginning in 1784.

While the establishment was engaged in internal struggle, it had little time to devote to countering the growing influence of evangelical Protestantism, which had begun its development with the itinerant preaching of Henry Alline.[49] The "New Lights" had no particular respect for learning and ecclesiastical authority; what mattered to them was an individual's conversion, usually produced in waves of local revival by enthusiastic, itinerant preachers like Alline. The evangelicals typically ministered to no settled church and travelled widely the length and breadth of the land encouraging people to demand, "What must I do to be saved ?". Religious zealots themselves, such men cared little for money or creature comforts, and they made few financial demands on their adherents. Ideally suited for a newly settled country, they made extraordinary gains. While the Anglicans prided themselves that (as Jacob Bailey put it) "though always obliged to officiate twice and often three times a week, besides distant excursions, yet I never appear without shaving and clean linen," the New Lights preached dozens of times weekly under any and all conditions of personal hardship and disadvantage.[50] Alline died in 1784, but his converts preached on and proliferated, and were joined in the mid 1780's by Methodist missionaries from the United States and Britain.[51]

Fortunately for the church-state establishment, the message preached by the New Lights and evangelicals, while enthusiastic, anti-authoritarian,

47 Raymond, "The Founding of the Church in Shelburne," pp. 290-293.

48 William Morice to Jonathan Breynton, February 25, 1785, SPGFP, "C" Series (A-167), Box 2, p. 11. Morice added that "as a private person I have a regard for him [Walter], but the public step he has taken is not approved here, & he has no authority from hence."

49 For the growth of evangelical pietism during the Revolution, see Armstrong, *The Great Awakening*, pp. 61-87.

50 Jacob Bailey to Samuel Peters, April 29, 1785, reprinted in Bartlet, *Frontier Missionary*, p. 206. Also compare Bailey's "particulars ... for a clergyman in Nova Scotia" (Bartlet, p. 218) with Joshua Marsden's questions to be asked of a Methodist missionary "when entering upon his mission" (Joshua Marsden, *The Narrative of a Mission, to Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and the Somers Islands*, 2nd ed., London, 1827, p. 24).

51 Goldwin S. French, *Parsons and Politics: The rôle of the Wesleyan Methodists in Upper Canada and the Maritimes from 1780 to 1855* (Toronto, 1962), pp. 29-36; Armstrong, *The Great Awakening*, pp. 119-129.

and potentially levelling, was so exclusively spiritual and pietistic that it was no immediate threat to the status quo. Most of the evangelicals agreed with the Methodist William Black who asked rhetorically, "What have the ministers of Christ to do with the administration of civil government ? Christ's kingdom is not of this world. We are neither magistrates nor legislators."[52] Although the revival in the Maritimes has been seen as an extension of the Great Awakening of 1740 in New England, this was not really the case.[53] The growth of evangelical pietism in the Maritimes began as a completely indigenous development which owed something to broad eighteenth century currents, but was not directly influenced by New England revivalism. This was a boon to the establishment, for the Separates and Separate Baptists (the New England equivalents of Alline and his followers) had developed a rather sophisticated doctrine of the separation of church and state, which they employed in attempts to overthrow the Puritan standing churches of New England and the Church of England in Virginia.[54] During the revolutionary period, the government could not afford to alienate dissenters, and the New Lights — who never bothered the government and may have redirected potential political discontent into religious channels — were left pretty much alone, opposed only by a few Congregational ministers.[55]

During the uncertainty of the revolutionary years the Catholics made gains too. In 1784 the previous disabilities on adherents of the "popish Religion" were repealed in favor of a rather demeaning but not impossible oath of allegiance.[56] That same year a church was erected in Halifax, and in 1786 Catholics were, in Nova Scotia, granted the right to school and schoolmasters.[57]

From the standpoint of the Church of England, the situation in the years 1775 to 1787 was not entirely one of unrelieved gloom. The first missionaries to the Islands of St. John and Cape Breton took up their posts at this time (Theophilus DesBrisay at Charlottetown, 1777,

[52] Matthew Richey, *A Memoir of the Late William Black, Wesleyan Minister* (Halifax, 1839), p. 310. The Baptists used the same text — "Christ's kingdom is not of this world" — to argue for separation of church and state in New England! See William G. McLoughlin, "The Balkcom Case (1782) and the Pietistic Theory of Separation of Church and State," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd Ser., XXIV (1967), 270.

[53] Armstrong, *The Great Awakening in Nova Scotia* and S. D. Clark, *Church and Sect in Canada* (Toronto, 1948), pp. 3-44, both see the Nova Scotia revival as an extension of New England's.

[54] McLoughlin, "The Balkcom Case," pp. 267-283; C. C. Goen, *Revivalism and Separatism in New England* (New Haven, 1962); Wesley F. Gewehr, *The Great Awakening in Virginia, 1740-1790* (Durham, 1930).

[55] Maurice W. Armstrong, "Neutrality and Religion in Revolutionary Nova Scotia," *The New England Quarterly*, XIX (1946), 50-62.

[56] C. O. 219/17, 75-78.

[57] Johnston, *A History of the Catholic Church*, I, 101-105; Rev. John E. Burns, "The Development of Roman Catholic Church Government in Halifax from 1760 to 1853," *Nova Scotia Historical Society Collections*, XXIII (1936), 89-95.

and Ranna Cossitt at Sydney, 1785).[58] This was an obviously essential preliminary to the meaningful establishment of the Church in these provinces. New Brunswick's early legal enactments regarding church-state relationships were also heartening. The New Brunswick assembly produced a reasonably straight-forward act of establishment for the Church in 1786, which included a provision for the licensing by the governor of every clergyman intending to officiate in the province.[59] By "giving a restraining power over unsettled and itinerant preachers," Governor Carleton argued, the law "must also help to secure its [the Province's] political quiet."[60] It would certainly hamper the expansion of the evangelists. Finally, discussion of the appointment of an Anglican bishop for British North America, which had begun in 1784, had by 1786 progressed to a point where it was certain that such a post would be created. On August 12, 1787, Charles Inglis was consecrated as Bishop, an event which clearly would mean a new era in both religious affairs and church-state relationships.

Inglis stepped ashore at Halifax on October 15, 1787, to begin a lengthy term as Bishop of Nova Scotia, his diocese at its inception encompassing all the Maritimes (including Newfoundland), plus Quebec.[61] Probably more biographical studies have been done of Charles Inglis than of any of his contemporaries in British North America, and most of them have been particularly laudatory of his role as builder of the Anglican Church in Maritime Canada.[62] Yet there exists a good deal of evidence to suggest that, by and large, his activities were more dis-functional to the Church than constructive. In a brief space, only a sketchy outline of the relative failure of Inglis as Bishop can be offered.

Inglis saw his immediate task as one of strengthening the position of the Church of England, and he moved at once in this direction. One of his first achievements was legislative support for a public grammar school which he called the "first step" toward "the establishment of a College, without which, Church matters must be in an imperfect state."[63] He also desired "the proper establishment of the Church in this province by an act of the Legislature," but realizing the difficulties of this, settled

[58] "The Reverend Ranna Cossitt, 1744-1815, First Rector of Saint George's, Sydney," *Canadian Church Historical Society Journal*, V (September, 1963); Warburton, *History of Prince Edward Island*, pp. 389-390.

[59] C. O. 190/2, 15-16.

[60] An "observation" in Carleton's handwriting on the manuscript copy of the act; C. O. 190/2, p. 15.

[61] Reginald V. Harris, *Charles Inglis: Missionary, Loyalist, Bishop (1734-1816)* (Toronto, 1937), pp. 74-75.

[62] In his bibliography, Harris lists ten "principle sketches and biographies;" Harris, *Charles Inglis*, p. 182. Since that time (1937) very little has appeared. Almost without exception, biographies of Inglis have been by denominational historians, usually clergymen.

[63] "Inglis Memoirs," I, 46.

for pressure to increase glebes and to remove from the governors of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick their control over ecclesiastical patronage.[64] He argued that the parish had the right of selection and presentation of a clergyman to the governor, and the governor only a formal power of induction. These were not "the rights of the people" as advocated by William Walter, for Inglis emphasized that "the elections will not be popular" since parish "in the law . . . meant the Church Wardens and Vestry."[65] Inglis won these and other points, and succeeded in asserting his episcopal authority over the church and the government.

Had the Bishop been satisfied with such victories, all might have been well. But Inglis insisted on implementing in any way possible his basic Loyalist-Tory philosophy: "the principles of the Church of England [are] the best security for the attachment of these provinces to the parent-state of its constitution."[66] At the beginning, Inglis counselled the need for "time, patience and zeal, our exertions tempered with caution and prudence."[67] But he soon forgot his own advice. This was not surprising, for Inglis had a long record of public controversy. While in New York, he had published pamphlets on theological questions and had debated in print with Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Paine.[68] He had won his bishopric only after a rather nasty exchange of pamphlets with one of his chief competitors.[69] In the Maritimes, his pugnacity led him to produce issues with dissenters where none had existed before. He opposed the New Brunswick marriage act of 1787, and forced one which put marriages entirely in the control of the Anglican clergy and the governor.[70] This led the Methodist leader William Black, about as unpolitical a pietist as was conceivable, to circulate petitions for repeal.[71] He argued a narrow interpretation of the Nova Scotia marriage acts, succeeded in persuading a reluctant governor not to grant licenses indiscriminately, and insisted on taking a Baptist minister to court in 1801 for performing marriages without a license. The result was legal victory for the dissenter; it was, he wrote afterwards, "still doubtful whether the issue of the marriages would legally inherit," but added ruefully that this "was

64 "Inglis Memoirs," I, 46, 31-170, *passim.*
65 "Inglis Memoirs," I, 84.
66 "Inglis Memoirs," I, 60.
67 "Inglis Memoirs," I, 35.
68 A complete bibliography of Inglis' published works is in Harris, *Charles Inglis,* pp. 148-150. Inglis' answer to Hamilton appeared in the *New York Gazette* in 1774; his reply to Paine was published at Philadelphia in 1776 as *The True Interest of America Impartially Stated....*
69 For the pamphlet war with his competitor, Dr. Samuel Peters, see Harris, *Charles Inglis,* pp. 63-68.
70 "Inglis Memoirs," I, 171-178. The 1791 act finally passed is in C. O. 190/2, 225-227. For a discussion of the New Brunswick marriage act and its meaning, see W. Stewart MacNutt, *New Brunswick, A History: 1784-1867* (Toronto, 1963), pp. 91-93.
71 MacNutt, *New Brunswick,* p. 104.

but a feeble restraint on such as had little or nothing to leave to their children."[72]

Inglis' narrow denominational conception of an institution of higher learning and his opposition to efforts by other denominations to establish educational facilities turned the question of higher education into a running sore for the Church and the government. There is no evidence that he advocated liberalization of the rules of King's College, although he acquiesced in the decision of the Archbishop of Canterbury to insist upon subscription to the 39 Articles only at graduation rather than matriculation.[73] This was "necessary and prudent," as "three fourths of the inhabitants are Dissenters, and against these, the statute as it first stood virtually shut the door of the Seminary."[74] With the college closed to dissenters, moreover, Inglis could no longer have continued to argue, as he did in objecting to Catholic attempts to establish a school in Halifax: "Our seminaries are as open to them as to any other inhabitants and no tests are required at the admission of scholars that would interfere with their particular tenets."[75]

By the turn of the century, Inglis clearly felt himself on the defensive, arguing that "an Innovation acts like a wedge; only introduce it once, and by a little perserverence and force, it will find its way and rend everything before it."[76] Within his own Church, he became increasingly reactionary, influenced by the French Revolution and the gains of levelling enthusiasts closer to home. Although he had earlier supported ministerial presentation by the parish, he thought "in these times of Democratic rage and delusion" it was best to leave presentation and selection in the hands of the governor.[77] This decision ultimately produced the great schism in St. Paul's of Halifax which benefited only the Baptists.[78]

[72] "Inglis Memoirs," III, 44-60, especially p. 60. For discussion of the court case, see Isaiah W. Wilson, *History of Digby County* (Halifax, 1900), pp. 112-113.

[73] In the first history of King's College, T. B. Akins wrote of Inglis' opposition to the college statutes adopted by the board of governors in 1803 and indicated that Inglis had opposed a number of reactionary statutes, including the one requiring subscription to the 39 articles upon matriculation. *A Brief Account of the Origin, Endowment and Progress of the University of King's College* (Halifax, 1865), pp. 17-20. Later historians of the college have been more circumspect, but still give the impression that Inglis was liberal in his attitude toward the statutes. As his letterbook and memoirs make quite clear, however, his opposition to the statutes of 1803 was grounded in belief that the Church of England was not given sufficient preference. He did not object to the rule requiring subscription to the 39 articles upon matriculation, although he was willing to accept the amendment to graduation when it was made. "Inglis Memoirs," III, especially 83-98.

[74] "Inglis Memoirs," III, 173.

[75] "Inglis Memoirs," III, 62.

[76] "Inglis Memoirs," III, 46.

[77] "Inglis Memoirs," II, 102.

[78] The documents relating to the dispute and schism, which ultimately led the party supporting presentation by the parish to join the Granville Street Baptist Church in Halifax, are reprinted in George W. Hill, "History of St. Paul's Church," *Nova Scotia Historical Society Collections*, III (1883), 13-69.

He opposed open pews on a variety of grounds, but largely because they were too democratic.[79]

The charges of foreign influence and levelling tendencies were ones which he levelled broadside at all he considered to be threats. In 1793 he contented himself with disparaging the evangelicals, but by 1800 he considered they were "engaged in the general plan of a total revolution in religion and civil government.... And it is a certain fact, that 'The Rights of Man,' 'The Age of Reason,' 'Volney on the Ruine of Empires,' 'A False Representation of the French Revolution' with scandalous invectives against all the crowned heads in Europe, and against the British Administration in particular, have been secretly handed about by professed New-lights."[80] He entered into public controversy with the Roman Catholic Vicar General Edmund Burke largely because Burke was a proponent of democracy and "other dangerous tenets, which are inconsistent with our constitution in Church and State; which have often deluged our country with blood, and must produce incalculable mischief in this young Community."[81]

Perhaps attack was preventative defense and had some effect in resisting the danger from dissenters, which Inglis admitted numbered three-fourths of his diocese. But the failure of the dissenters to produce an open and concerted offense against the "constitution in Church and State" was less because of Inglis' activities than because of their own weaknesses. In the first place, the dissenters were badly divided denominationally. Protestants and Catholics distrusted one another. The Presbyterians were split into feuding factions. Among the evangelical sects, the Methodists, New Lights, and Baptists objected more to each other's theology than to the Anglican establishment, which was seldom a competitor outside the larger communities.[82] The evangelicals, potentially the largest and most aggressive force in the Maritimes, remained out of political activities, partly because of their pietistic orientation and partly because of the American connections many of their missionaries retained.

[79] "I never knew an instance before this," wrote Inglis, "in Europe or America, where the pews were thus held in common, and where men — perhaps of the worst characters — might come and set themselves down by the most religious and respectable characters in the parish. This must ultimately tend to produce disorder and confusion in the church and check the spirit of true devotion and piety .... the greatest disorder must be the consequence, if this mode be continued, when the country becomes populous." Wright, *Loyalists of New Brunswick*, pp. 237-238.

[80] Richey, *William Black*, pp. 298-299; I. E. Bill, *Fifty Years with the Baptist Ministers and Churches of the Maritime Provinces* (Saint John, 1880), p. 191.

[81] "Inglis Memoirs," III, 132.

[82] Many examples of this evangelical disagreement are given in Richey, *William Black*, Marsden, *Narrative of a Mission*, and the autobiography of Joseph Crandall, diary of Joseph Dimock, and journal of Edward Manning (manuscripts at Maritime Baptist Historical Collection, Acadia University Library, Wolfville, Nova Scotia).

By the early nineteenth century, however, evangelical Protestantism was losing its American ties, constructing formal organizations, and becoming more concerned with affairs of this world.[83]

In 1807, when Inglis suffered a severe illness and turned more and more of the direction of the church over to others — particularly his son John — the dissenters had not yet evidenced any sort of united front against the Church. Nevertheless, the weaknesses in the Anglican establishment were fairly obvious. Inglis had not succeeded, in the last analysis, in strengthening the Church of England in the Maritimes. It was not so much a failure to take an active hand in ecclesiastical affairs outside Nova Scotia, although it was true he did not. Church-state relations in Prince Edward Island and Cape Breton — where dissenters clearly predominated — were probably better off for his lack of attention, and New Brunswick managed quite well without much interference. Where Inglis did press his hard line, it created enemies and issues. Not satisfied to have a quietly privileged and favoured church, Inglis advocated what amounted to a policy of "thorough." He did not gain terribly much by this, but he succeeded in publicizing the special status of the Church of England, and by attempting to employ the state for the ends of the church (although it must be admitted he never saw any distinction between the two), he politicized the establishment unnecessarily. One of the major grievances of the "liberal" opposition in the Maritimes would be the religious policy of those in power.

The emphasized connection — even unity — between the Church of England and the state would not have been so potentially disastrous had not Inglis also failed to construct a Church with a firm and broad popular support. This failure was attributable to a variety of factors which are in much need of further study.[84] Inglis was not entirely to blame for the inability of the Church to escape from its financial reliance on government grants and SPG support. But he must be charged with the failure of the Church of England in the Maritimes to learn anything at all from the successes of the evangelicals. To expect open alliance with the Methodists — which some Methodists favored, at least in the 1790's — would be too much.[85] To expect the Church to adopt an evangelically oriented message might also be chimeric, although this did happen in Britain. But Inglis could have insisted that his clergymen travel more widely and make themselves more accessible to the people, both socially and geographically. He could have, in a word, demanded that his clerics act more like the missionaries they continued to claim to be.

[83] French, *Parsons and Politics*, p. 54; Levy, *Baptists*, pp. 69-85; Armstrong, *The Great Awakening*, pp. 131-138.

[84] The best available analysis is in S. D. Clark, *Church and Sect*, especially pp. 64-83.

[85] "Inglis Memoirs," I, 105-107.

The Church of England was in no immediate danger of disestablishment when Inglis went into semi-retirement in 1807, but by its failure to gain, by its inability to capitalize on half a century of opportunity and privilege, it had already forfeited a large measure of its justification for established status. A good many battles would be necessary over the next half century before Church and state would be separated, but by the beginning of the nineteenth century Inglis had put the Church on the defensive, and the ultimate outcome could never be in doubt.