

distinguishing the ad-
 he who might
 stimulating
 of honourable
 to fulfil the in-
 preamble to this
 he declares it
 ely, the edu-
 the Christian
 the various
 e which are
 United King-
 college was
 personal pro-
 gives weight
 e opinion that
 not a mere
 residence and
 would be oc-
 rsuits. It is
 nts that men
 eir profession,
 ther pursuits
 means of man-
 g such a sti-
 inducement,
 eeing such a
 you will have
 rs and teach-
 ne; and you
 cable will be
 memorable de-
 church estab-
 in 1641 :
 learning, no
 orance; and
 tructure can
 usion." To
 possible when
 iversity pur-
 end, is one
 l.
 rees in divi-
 nd in arts,
 ough no reli-
 required of,
 ed or matri-
 e, or admit-
 ty therein,

et as to divinity, " any persons admitted, within
 our said college, to any degree in divinity, shall
 make such and the same declarations and sub-
 scriptions, and take such and the same oaths
 as are required of persons admitted to any de-
 gree of divinity in our University of Oxford,"
 shows clearly that among the objects for which
 this institution was erected—and, consequently,
 among the use for which the endowment was gi-
 ven—was the establishment of a professor of
 Church of England divinity for the instruction
 of such as should desire to graduate in that fa-
 culty; and though the amended charter did
 away with those provisions which gave to the
 government of the college an exclusive religious
 cast and character, and did away with all tests
 for degrees, it neither abrogated the power of
 granting degrees in divinity, or prescribed any
 other course of study in that faculty than that
 which the original charter obviously intended;
 nor did it alter the powers of the College Council
 to make statutes for the performance of divine
 service, and the studies, lectures, and exercises
 necessary to obtain a divinity degree. Though
 no test but that of qualification was to be required
 for any degree, yet, it is obvious, the charter con-
 templated no divinity but the Church of England,
 because such being its first intention, no change
 has been directed or made by the act of amend-
 ment. This object will, of course, be defeated
 by the proposed bill as far as the new University
 is concerned; it will also be defeated as regards
 King's College, because the means of effecting it
 are taken away.

Again, the erection of buildings suitable to the
 design of the charter, was clearly an object of
 the endowment. The amended charter is clear-
 ly consistent with this design; it does nothing—
 contains nothing to interfere with it. Collegiate
 buildings fit for the residence of President, Pro-
 fessors, Tutors, Scholars, and Students, where do-
 mestic discipline could be duly enforced, were,
 evidently, contemplated—not mere halls and lec-
 ture rooms, such as a University, strictly speak-
 ing, would require—but a College for actual re-
 sidence. But this bill entirely defeats this ob-
 ject, and deprives King's College of the means
 granted, among other things, for the express pur-
 pose of effecting it.

To say that the mode of employing this en-

dowment, designed by the bill, is a better mode
 than that proposed in the original charter is, I
 apprehend, not an argument to be relied upon as
 a justification for taking away either the powers,
 privileges, or property which have been given to
 King's College. It proves too much, and, there-
 fore, proves nothing; for if that be a sound rea-
 son for revoking a grant from the Crown, made
 for one purpose, it ought to have equal force to
 revoke any grant of which a majority of the Le-
 gislature for the time being shall adopt a similar
 view. And how can it be said that if it be com-
 petent for a majority to adopt and carry out their
 own views this year, or this parliament, it will
 not be equally competent for a majority next year
 or in another parliament, again to change that
 which their predecessors had adopted? Independ-
 ently of the mischief which such a course must
 produce to the education of the youth of the coun-
 try, from the want of confidence which would
 exist as to the character and stability of its edu-
 cational establishment, such a course would be
 not constitutional legislation but arbitrary ty-
 ranny—the worst abuse of power which could be
 inflicted on this or any country. I have already
 argued that any attempted distinction between
 property obtained by grant from the Crown or
 from other sources, is not sustainable; I refer to
 it, that in considering this part of the question it
 might be borne in mind. The right thus to inter-
 fere with vested privileges and interests is also a
 widely different thing from the right to see that
 they are not abused or diverted from their origi-
 nal ends. If the right, asserted by this bill, to
 alter and take away, exists, with regard to the
 charter of King's College, so does it exist with
 regard to those of Queen's College, Victoria
 College, and Regiopolis College. Either these
 corporations have assented to the proposed chan-
 ges or they have not. If it has been felt neces-
 sary to apply for, and obtain their assent—or, if
 it has been given voluntarily and is relied upon
 as fortifying this proceeding—then is the injus-
 tice greater to King's College, which has not as-
 sented, though it has the most to lose. Such an
 assent, too, would prove the opinion of these cor-
 porations that without it their charters could not
 be touched. If they have not assented, then is
 this bill only the more an invasion of vested
 rights.