

In 1807 the name of the pupil of St. Andrews and of Aberdeen had obtained a renown which these institutions acknowledged by conferring on him the degrees of Doctor of Laws and of Doctor of Divinity. In 1812 he was appointed Rector of Toronto, and in 1818 he was called to the Legislative Council, having previously been made an Executive Councillor. In 1825 he was made Archdeacon of York, and in 1839 Bishop of Toronto, a diocese till very recently comprising the whole of Western Canada; and at his advanced age, says the biography we have been condensing, he discharges his pastoral duties with an energy and activity seldom equalled.

It is evident from the political position which he had occupied, that he had not only been of great service to the conservative party, but that, moreover, he was for a very long time the soul of that party, the leaders of which were his very pupils. In 1836 he had resigned his seat in the Executive Council, and in 1840 when the British ministry adopted the measure for uniting the two provinces of Upper and Lower Canada,—a measure, says the same writer, *which he wisely always resolutely opposed*,—he also vacated his place in the Legislative Council.

When Mr. Draper's bill was brought before Parliament the Bishop declared it *little better* than that of Mr. Baldwin's, and remonstrated against it. In his memorial to Lord Metcalf, dated 6th March, 1844, he seemed, however, to anticipate that sooner or later the endowment would have either to be, as he thought, altogether diverted from its original object, or split up, and viewing the latter course with less regret he threw out the following suggestions:

"If there could be the slightest assurance that under the Charter, as it stands, the University would be upheld by the Government, and suffered to continue upon a footing resembling in practice, though it does not in theory, any of those seats of learning which are the glory of the mother country, I should of course not desire to suggest any change; but it is impossible not to despair of this, when I recollect what took place only a few months ago.

"I see but two methods by which anything like a satisfactory result could be secured.

"The first is, by endowing Colleges out of the portion of the Clergy Reserves which are placed at the disposal of the Government (or other lands under their controul) for the several bodies of Christians it may be thought proper and desirable to assist in this manner, leaving, or I should rather say restoring, the present University to what it was originally calculated to be, and without breaking in upon its endowment.

"The second is by appropriating to the Church of England the same portion of the endowment as the Imperial Parliament assigned to her out of the Clergy Reserves—that is to say, five-twelfths—and applying the remaining seven-twelfths in endowing Colleges for such other religious divisions of the population as may by the Government be thought best.

"The members of the Church of Scotland might in this plan be liberally assisted; and as to any other denomination of Christians, it would rest with the Government to determine what they should receive, and to what extent. Of course, in the event of such division, it would be necessary to grant separate charters to each College, entirely free from any political influence, and in entire connexion with its respective Church or denomination.

"The different religious Societies in Canada have already shewn their sense of what no wise and good man doubts (for all history and observation confirm it), that the only satisfactory foundation a College can rest upon, is that of a known and certain religious character.

"It cannot be denied that it would be a great evil thus to split up an endowment, which, if left entire, would for many years to come yield as large a revenue as could be advantageously employed, or would indeed be required, for maintaining one good University upon an efficient and liberal scale. But it would be a less evil to

encounter than that which we have so lately been threatened with. It is unhappily too evident, that to preserve the institution in its integrity, as a means of diffusing the blessings of true religion and sound learning, and giving an enlightened support to the cause of order and good government, requires a degree of wisdom and firmness which we may look for in vain. The next best measure to be hoped for, then, is the being secured in some smaller and less adequate provision; which, being enjoyed in peace, and dispensed upon rational principles, may form at least a foundation of such an institution as may command the confidence of parents, and gradually entitle it to the favour and respect of the enlightened portion of mankind.

"It is not in the nature of things that confidence and respect can ever attend a seat of learning, where, if a Church is spoken of, it must be a Church without government; and where, if religion is taught, it must be religion without doctrine.

"Above all things, I claim from the endowment the means of educating my clergy. This was my chief object in obtaining the Charter and endowment of King's College, as appears from my original application; and it was fully recognized by the Imperial Government, as is evident from the tenure of the Charter, and was indeed the most valuable result to be anticipated by the Institution. It was on this account that one of the great Church Societies in England granted us a Divinity library, and the other promised to increase it when the University was in full operation. To deprive the Church of this benefit, would be to aim a deadly blow at her very foundation, and to cut off the principal advantage we had in view in seeking for the establishment of a seat of learning in Upper Canada. This is a point which never can be given up, and to which I believe the faith of Government is unreservedly pledged."

On the 18th of March, 1845, Mr. John Hiliard Cameron, who appeared at the bar of the House on behalf of King's College, took the same high ground which Mr. Draper himself had taken against Mr. Baldwin's measure. To the great merriment both of the regular opposition and of that section of the conservative party who were against the measure, he concluded his address by returning to Mr. Draper the last sentence of his eloquent peroration already quoted, and the House was once more called upon "for the sake of religion, on every constitutional principle, by every patriotic feeling; in the name of God, *your Queen, your Country, to reject this bill.*"

But it was settled that no kind of anomaly would be wanting in the discussion of this great question. While Mr. Draper was apparently risking his term of office to pass a measure *little better* than that of Mr. Baldwin's, in the eyes of many of his friends, and while the inspector general, Mr. Robinson, and Mr. Sherwood, solicitor general for Upper Canada, had tendered their resignation rather than vote for the ministerial bill, Mr. Baldwin and some of his friends finding that on their side of the question it was not so good a measure as they wanted, announced their determination of voting against it. The Lower Canadian members of the opposition, who, from the beginning, had no inclination to interfere, could all be set down as voting against it, and there the fate of the government appeared to be sealed. But the hopeful expectations of the opposition vanished in a moment, and early enough in the debate it was generally understood that, by some mysterious process, several of the conservative members, who intended to vote against the bill, had become reconciled to its provisions. The vote was taken in the deep silence which characterises our mode of voting by yeas and nays on momentous questions, when not a breath but the mournful voice of the clerk is heard within the walls of the house. The vote was 45 to 34, and the second reading was declared carried. Of the