

and nays could be recorded on the single nomination; citing, in support of his request to that effect, an extract from Bourinot, showing that, although not usual, it had been occasionally done in both the House of Commons of Great Britain, and the House of Commons of Canada. Upon this point the Vice-Chancellor declined to rule; and my name was at once moved by Prof. Galbraith, and seconded by Prof. Dale. Anxious to avoid the appearance of a personal collision with my old friend, the Vice-Chancellor, but at the same time determined to maintain the right of his opponents to place themselves on record in the Senate's minutes, I then proposed that the Senate should itself affirm the point which the Vice-Chancellor evaded, viz., the right of the minority to have the yeas and nays recorded on the single nomination; but my motion was not seconded, and, after some desultory conversation upon the point, it was thought that it would expedite business to allow my nomination to stand, and take the vote. This decision is, in my humble judgment, to be regretted; not only upon personal grounds, but because I think it would have been well to have established a precedent for recording the vote upon call and single nomination. I understood from yourself, sir, that there would be no difficulty whatever about the matter, and other friends and supporters of Mr. Mulock's to whom I spoke upon the subject that evening likewise concurred in the view that a record of the vote would be quite right and proper, and, therefore, it was with a great deal of surprise and disappointment that I heard Mr. Mulock decline the responsibility of allowing it. That responsibility I had no hesitation in proposing in my motion that the Senate should assume, as a simple act of right and courtesy.

Now, as to the reason for the selection of my name: The opinion of the university professoriate was undoubted, and the verdict of convocation pronounced; but still, in view of the fact that the Senate is a large body, composed of very heterogeneous elements, and the focus of many divergent corporate interests, it was idle to expect that any candidate uniting only the interests first named would be elected; but it was urged that my acceptance of the nomination would contradict the false statement widely

disseminated during the late campaign that there was discord between the Arts and the Medical Faculties, and that opposition to Mr. Mulock was enmity to the Medical Faculty. Earnestly desiring to disabuse the public of that view, I consented to allow my name to be proposed, but only *in extremis*; i.e., when it appeared that the minority were in imminent danger of having their rights denied them. To be charged, therefore, with "good-naturedly allowing oneself to be used for a purpose," and that purpose by implication a sinister one, seems to me sufficient excuse to warrant my trespassing at this length upon your space and upon your readers' patience; for I would like all to understand that, as those who know me know, I am not careful to conciliate, except upon just and reasonable grounds, either Mr. Mulock's friends or his opponents. I trust, Mr. Editor, that, being thoroughly acquainted with the facts and the equity of the case, you were not of those who viewed my course of conduct either "with surprise" or "with regret."

I. H. CAMERON.

Toronto, Nov. 18, 1892.

[Whatever may have been Mr. Cameron's motives, he was quite within his rights in becoming a candidate for the Vice-Chancellorship, and he is under no obligation, therefore, to offer any apology for his action; but we think that, in the above letter, he has scarcely described, with fairness, the attitude of the Vice-Chancellor when asked to rule whether the yeas and nays could be recorded if there was but one nomination. First, Mr. Cameron says, "Upon this point the Vice-Chancellor declined to rule"; again, that he (Mr. C.) "proposed that the Senate should itself affirm the point which the Vice-Chancellor had evaded"; and, again, that "it was with a great deal of surprise and disappointment that I heard Mr. Mulock decline the responsibility of allowing it." These various statements are, in themselves, conflicting; the first two are to the effect that the Vice-Chancellor declined to express an opinion, and the last that he ruled against Mr. Cameron's view, while the word "evaded" is an ungenerous and inapt expression under the circumstances. The facts are as follows: When the Vice-Chancellor was asked whether,