

defined religious principles, and that as trustees of this royal grant, they could not surrender it or the endowments which accompanied it without knowing what would be substituted for it. This refusal was communicated in a reply which discussed at full length the university question as it existed at that day, and which stated and defended the ecclesiastical position in the most explicit manner. They were, however, willing to concede four points :—

1. That the Court of the King's Bench shall be the visitor instead of the Bishop of Quebec.

2. That any clergyman of the Church of England may be appointed president instead of the Archdeacon of York.

3. That no test or condition of church membership be required of members of the council.

4. That the council prescribe the conditions for degrees in divinity.

This offer of compromise was not acceptable to the House of Assembly, and twice during the next three years a bill was introduced to provide for the amendment of the university charter. Owing to the intense political excitement of the time the progress of the first bill, introduced in 1833, was very slow, and it was still in committee when the session closed. A second bill was, in 1835, passed in the House of Assembly and rejected by the Legislative Council. A copy was forwarded to the Colonial Office by Sir John Colborne, with an expression of opinion that "no law for the amendment of King's College charter will be enacted by the Provincial Legislature, but that it might be so modified by the interposition of His Majesty's Government as to leave in essential points no just ground for dissatisfaction on the part of either House." He also forwarded a strong recommendation that the Government sanction the immediate opening of the college. The reply of Lord Glenelg was "that the Government had referred the matter to the discretion of the Provincial Legislature, and that the decision of such a question by His Majesty's advisers in England would be condemned with plausibility and not indeed without justice as a needless interference with the internal affairs of the province."

Sir John Colborne had accompanied his recommendation by a suggested form of charter to be enacted by His Majesty's Government in England; this Lord Glenelg rejected as one that "could hardly fail to give umbrage to the House of Assembly as contrary to the whole tenor of the resolutions of the representatives of the people." The reply completely disappointed the hope expressed by Sir John Colborne in his speech from the throne when proroguing the House "that such a revision of the charter may take place as will accord in essential points with the opinions of the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly."