was a step in the right direction. It was apparent to him that it would promote the best interests of the University and best secure the usefulness the country expected to secure from it. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. H. S. MACDONALD raised the question as to whether this Bill should not originate by resolution, as some of the clauses involved the expenditure of public money.

Hon. Mr. WOOD said this was a similar point to the one raised last night. The salaries of the various offices provided for in this Bill were a charge upon the revenue. The fact that the money was derived from a special fund made no difference; it was still a charge upon the general revenue.

Hon. Mr. CROOKS said the Bill did not in any way affect the revenues of the country. It merely proposed to settle the question with reference to the mode of dealing with a fund which represented a public trust. The University endowment constituted in no sense a portion of the revenue of the country. In no sense was it a public fund.

Attorney-General MOWAT thought that May was clear upon the point. He laid it down as a rule that every grant of public money must originate by resolution, but bills were often introduced in which incidentally authority was given to apply money for particular purposes. This money used for the University was already appropriated for the uses of the University, but all that was proposed was to change the mode of application. It was only when additional money was required that the Bill had to be introduced by resolution.

Hon. Mr. WOOD contended that the University fund was a public fund just as much as the consolidated revenue fund, and money taken from this fund was just as much a charge upon the revenue as money taken from the consolidated fund. But he agreed with the Treasurer that the Bill was perfectly in order. It was the usual practice to introduce bills in this way that only incidentally involved the expenditure of money.

Mr. SPEAKER observed that the 51st section of the Bill, to which objection had been taken, did not in his opinion propose to impose any burden upon the public revenue, and with regard to the 52nd section, no sum of money was mentioned, the space being left blank. He therefore ruled that the Bill was in order.

Mr. LAUDER would have been pleased had the Treasurer given some further reason why such a radical change was proposed in the constitution of the government of the University. He would like to know if this Bill had been submitted to the Senate of the University. He certainly thought it should have been submitted to them, and they should have an opportunity of expressing their views upon it. He thought the Treasurer should have explained in what respect the present Senate had failed before he proposed such radical changes.

Mr. BETHUNE said that the governing system adopted when this University was founded had never been intended to exist for ever. It had been supposed that a number of graduates would in time arise who would feel sufficient interest in the institution to look after its welfare. The Government appeared to be of opinion that that time had now arrived, and voluntarily gave up the power of appointment which they held, in order that it might be invested in the graduates. This was a very proper measure, because a number of graduates had been sent out from this University who reflected great credit upon it, and it seemed to him that they were much more likely to see that their *alma mater* was well governed than would any persons appointed by the Crown. The change was not at all a radical one. The hon. member for South Grey must surely have heard many complaints as to the improper working of the Senate. He had been told that many members of the Senate seldom if ever attended, and that it was difficult to get that intelligent interest in the working of the institution which was necessary to its success. Some members of the Senate would perhaps be desirous to maintain the power at present in their hands, but if the wishes of every person were to be consulted, no legal change would ever be made. As far as he could see, the measure appeared to be founded to a great extent on the principles under which some of the English universities were worked.

Mr. DEROCHE said it had been remarked by the member for South Grey that the graduates of the University had not sought for this measure, but that was a mistake. They were anxious for just such a change. A University Association, composed of the graduates, had been formed in 1866 to bring about the very object sought for by this Bill. And last year another association was formed for the same object. For his own part he entirely approved of the elective system. He believed the graduates were the best qualified to guard the interests of their *alma mater*.

Mr. HODGINS said that as one of the graduates of the University who had taken an active part in endeavouring to secure a measure of this sort, he entirely approved of it. The member for South Grey, who was bound to oppose every Government measure, had paid little attention to the University, or he would have known that what the graduates were striving to obtain was merely a restoration of the powers granted them under the original charter. The charter of the University of King's College granted governing powers to the graduates. In 1849 Attorney-General Baldwin, in his University Reform Bill, conferred upon the graduates the powers conferred upon them by the original charter. It was therefore no new principle that was proposed in this bill; it simply restored the power contained in the original charter and in the Act of 1849. In 1853 Parliament saw fit to model the University on the basis of the University of Toronto, which at that time had no convocation. Subsequently convocation powers were conferred upon the graduates of that University; and our own University Association has been agitating the matter and were pleased that they were now about to secure their object. This same Association had secured the honour to our University of being recognized as one of the universities whose graduates could obtain degrees at the University of London.

Hon. Mr. CROOKS observed, in answer to the member for South Grey, that this Bill had been submitted to several members of the Senate and others interested in its well-being, and they had all approved of it. It was, of course, a Government measure, and the Government had conceived it to be their duty in the interests of the University itself to bring down such a measure. Its object was simply to remedy defects which experience had pointed out. It was not necessary to say anything either in condemnation or approval of the present Senate. He considered that experience had proved that an elective body, responsible to its constituents, was more active and zealous in the discharge of its duties than a nominative body. A Bill similar in principle was introduced last session by a private member, Mr. Cumberland, and a sort of promise was then given that during the recess Government would consider the matter and prepare the Bill.

Mr. LAUDER said he had no objection to allowing the graduates power to regulate the conferring of degrees and the standard of examination, but he did object to an irresponsible body being allowed the control of the University fund, without any responsibility to the Government or the House.

Attorney-General MOWAT said the hon. gentleman mistook the provisions of the Bill. It did not increase the powers of the Senate. The hon gentleman had not examined this Bill in reference to the existing Act. The Senate at present were responsible to the Government; their acts had to be sanctioned by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. Under the present Bill that power was still reserved to the Governor in Council. He agreed with the hon. gentleman that it would be improper to confer the power to control the fund on the Senate without the sanction of the Governor in Council.

The Bill was then read a second time.

LAW OF SLANDER.

Mr. BETHUNE moved the second reading of Bill to amend the law of slander. The subject he proposed to redress was the slander of women. As far back as 1843 this matter had been brought under consideration, but had failed in passing into law. As the law now stood, it was necessary that a woman should prove that she had incurred damage from the slanderous words spoken against her. The amendment proposed by him was in the following words:—

"In any action for slanderous words spoken of any woman, imputing to her any immoral or unchaste conduct, it shall not be necessary to allege in pleading, or prove at the trial, that any special damage resulted to her from the utterance of such words; but she shall recover such damages as may be assessed, without such averment or proof of special damage."

He saw no reason in principal why there should be any difference in the punishment of spoken and written slander. The present state of the law was such as to make it impossible for a woman to obtain redress, even when a separation from her husband was the result of slander.