

required to subscribe the Thirty-nine Articles. When its contents were made known in the Province, great indignation was excited which found a vent in addresses from the popular Branch of the Legislature and public meetings. It was urged that the representations, on the faith of which the Charter had been granted, were erroneous; that its provisions were unsuited to the state of the Province, and inconsistent with the intentions of the endowment. The justice of these remonstrances seems to have been admitted with very little contestation. They found an echo in the House of Commons. The Lieutenant Governor was instructed by the Secretary of State to endeavor to obtain from the College Council a surrender of the Charter; and, finally, the Local Parliament was invited by the same authority to amend it, in terms which imposed no limits on its discretion. It was not, however, till 1837, that an Act passed for this purpose, in which both Branches of the Legislature concurred.

4. During the whole of this period the Charter, in so far as the object of Education was concerned, was practically in abeyance. A considerable expenditure of funds took place, which was the subject of much criticism at the time; but the University was not opened for instruction till the year 1843, when it was organized under the provisions of the Act of 1837.

8. By this Act the preferences which the Church of England enjoyed under the Royal Charter were altogether abolished. That it did not, however, in its operation, give satisfaction to the Province, is proved by the fact, that between the years 1843 and 1850, no less than four sweeping measures of amendment were introduced into Parliament, two by Conservative, and two by Liberal Administrations; of these four measures that of 1849 alone passed into a law.

9. The main cause of this dissatisfaction was undoubtedly the attempt which was made, notwithstanding the tenor of the Act of 1837, to keep up a connexion between the Church of England and the University in various ways, and chiefly by the establishment of a Divinity Professorship, and of Chapel Service. Whether these measures furnished a reasonable ground for such dissatisfaction, is a question on which I do not feel called to offer an opinion. The only point for which I now contend is, that the charge against the good faith of the Canadian Legislature, which is insinuated in the parallel that has been instituted between a supposed confiscation of the property of Trinity College, Dublin, and the Acts of the Local Parliament on the subject of King's College, cannot, on a fair construction of those Acts, be made good. If in this parallel, the special privileges conferred on the Church of England by Royal Charter be referred to, I have shewn that these privileges, which were never acquiesced in by the popular Branch of the Legislature, were actually abolished with the consent of the Crown, which granted them before the University, as an Educational Institution, came into operation. And if allusion be made to any supposed