

colonial type. General Simcoe, indeed, held a citizen of the new Republic in such undisguised abhorrence, that the British Government abruptly recalled him, to avert a precipitation of the war which broke out at a later date. The new Lieutenant-Governor, and every succeeding one, found a little compact body of loyal councillors, to whose advice they implicitly yielded. The settlers who slowly colonized the young province, had enough to do, at first, in their own struggles with the wilderness, without troubling their heads about colonial administration; and thus there grew up, by the most natural process, a little Canadian aristocracy, the members of which regarded all beyond their privileged pale very much as the old Norman did the Saxon churl. They intermarried and shared among themselves—at first justly enough—all patronage and privileges. It was, in truth, the very realisation of Carlyle's ideal perfection of human government: *la carrière ouverte aux talents*: according to him "our ultimate political evangel, wherein alone can liberty lie."

Such was the natural origin of "the Family Compact," an aristocracy very memorable in later years of Canadian history. Of this Dr. Strachan was the moving spirit. Appointed Rector of York in 1812, he became by Royal warrant a member of the Executive Council in 1818; in 1825 he was made Archdeacon, and in 1839 consecrated Bishop of Toronto, with a diocese extending from the Ottawa westward to Rupert's Land, and northward to the Arctic circle. He had set before his mind the clear aim of establishing in Canada a church supported by tithes and landed endowments after the model of the Church of England in its palmiest days of dominancy and privilege. Richelieu and the Bourbons had found no difficulty in establishing a Gallican unanimity of faith and worship: why might not a corresponding Anglican uniformity be the crowning triumph of British supremacy? Of the very limited powers of an English bishop of that day,

and the easy relations of dean and prebend, archdeacon, rector and vicar with their episcopal head, he knew absolutely nothing by personal experience. He appears to have conceived in his mind an ideal not unlike that which an old Archdeacon of Huntingdon framed, after that memorable visit to Presbyterian Scotland in 1617, in which, with grief of heart, Dr. Laud declared that he found there "no religion at all that he could see!" In carrying out his ideal of a "religious unanimity in the future generations of Protestants who shall occupy these fine and extensive countries," he received hearty support from men who still dreamt in this nineteenth century of an absolute and willing conformity to the Church of England.

The ministers of religion were scarce, and the poor emigrant craved its rites and consolations in any acceptable form. We have heard an old clergyman tell of a Scottish grandame bringing her grandchild to the font. The good man was the sole Protestant minister of a region as large as an English diocese. She had overcome her sectarian prejudices, and watched with interest the novel baptismal service, till he came to make the sign of the cross on the infant's brow, in token of its faithful Christian service hereafter. The Presbyterian prejudices of the old Scottish dame could stand it no longer, and seizing the clergyman by the wrist, she exclaimed: "Na! na! I'll no ha'e the mark o' the beast on my bairn!" With such a community, conciliation was a very needful means towards success. But in carrying out his schemes, conciliation or concession formed no part of Dr. Strachan's plan. His first enthusiastic biographer says of him: "Matters of principle did not, in the Bishop's opinion, admit of conditions, and hence he was always ready to contend for what he believed to be 'pure,' being comparatively indifferent whether the strife was peaceful or the reverse. There was little moderation in his character, and, on