

et as to divinity, "any persons admitted, within our said college, to any degree in divinity, shall make such and the same declarations and subscriptions, and take such and the same oaths as are required of persons admitted to any degree 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 given—was the establishment of a professor of Church of England divinity for the instruction of such as should desire to graduate in that faculty; 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 contemplated no divinity but the Church of England, because such being its first intention, no change has been directed or made by the act of amendment. 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 clearly consistent with this design; it does nothing—contains nothing to interfere with it. Collegiate buildings fit for the residence of President, Professors, Tutors, Scholars, and Students, where domestic discipline could be duly enforced, were, evidently, contemplated—not mere halls and lecture rooms, such as a University, strictly speaking, would require—but a College for actual residence. But this bill entirely defeats this object, and deprives King's College of the means granted, among other things, for the express purpose 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, therefore, proves nothing; for if that be a sound reason 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 Legislature for the time being shall adopt a similar view. And how can it be said that if it be competent 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! Independently of the mischief which such a course must produce to the education of the youth of the country, from the want of confidence which would exist as to the character and stability of its educational establishment, such a course would be not constitutional legislation but arbitrary tyranny—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 interfere 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 original 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 changes or they have not. If it has been felt necessary 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 injustice greater to King's College, which has not assented, though it has the most to lose. Such an assent, too, would prove the opinion of these corporations 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.