

of equity and justice he approached the electors at that time, and with what facility he "pitches promises and pledges to the wind" to accomplish his end, now! In that circular Dr. Cranston propounds the doctrine that no member should be allowed to monopolize the honour longer than *one* term or five years. We not only gave him that but *two* terms as well, and now he is clamouring to hold the office *fourteen years continuously*. Every sentiment of honour as a gentleman, every feeling of respect for the dignity of manhood, every desire for the esteem of his brethren in the profession should have made him desist from being a candidate in this election, when he knew he had made the statements detailed in that circular. He may plead that he had forgotten: Very well, then let him retire now and not force a contest on the electors; and I shall be greatly surprised if his friends do not compel him to do so. If he does not, it is impossible to understand how any member consistently, and, with proper respect to himself, can vote for him after the exposure made herein. Why, as a matter of fact, I can name a dozen men in the rural portion of the division, any one of whom would make a better representative—at any rate a more energetic and progressive one—and why we should tie up this distinction to one man for fourteen or fifteen years, when there are others equally able who desire it, is an anomalous proposal I defy anyone to justify.

(4.) Passing on we will discuss another point. Dr. Cranston states the city members of the division have no right to have a representative selected from among their number, and why? Because Sir James Grant represents the College of Ottawa—and an able representative he is—and therefore the practitioners here are forever disqualified from choosing a representative from among themselves. What brilliant argument! The idea is so puerile and absurd that it needs no consideration. Pray what has the Ottawa College to do with the Bathurst and Rideau Territorial Division? As for Dr. Logan, the homœopathist, residing in Ottawa, the physicians here are quite willing for Dr. Cranston to secure the distinguished honour of having him practice in Arnprior, and to stay there—away into the dim future. In regard to returning officers and examiners being appointed in Ottawa these are matters totally in the hands of the Medical Council, and outside the gift of the members of the Bathurst and Rideau Division. Doubtless these arguments, preposterous though they be, have been clothed in fictitious garments and trotted around the division to do duty, and it is another link in the chain of evidence showing the *honourable* means taken to influence the thoughtless and uninitiated in this contest.

Again I wish to draw your attention to another fact under this head. There have been only *three* members elected to represent this division in the Medical Council since its inauguration twenty-five years ago, and these were: Drs. Grant, Mostyn and Cranston, being *two* from the rural portion of the division and *one* from the city. This certainly does not exhibit the grasping tendency on the part of the physicians here, which my opponent tries to make out, but it emphasizes the reasonableness of the request by the members in the city, that it is only fair for our *confreres* in the rural portion of the division to allow us to choose the representative on this occasion.

Likewise we are grandiloquently informed by Dr. Cranston, who has shown himself such a perfect disciple of equity, justice and consistency, that there never was an understanding between the city and country that they should represent the division in turns, and he appeals to the books of the Association for verification, when he must be aware that this, like many other unwritten laws of fair play, could not possibly be reduced to writing. In answer, I hope the Doctor will pardon me if I tell him plainly he never would have been a member of the Council but for this arrangement. Thus Dr. Sweetland, who assisted in the election of 1880, informs me as follows:—"The agreement that the city and country should represent the division in turns was then entered into as solemnly as words of honourable men could make it." Truly the memory of some men eager for office is a most uncertain particle, but it is an insult to the members of the profession throughout the rural portion of the Division to expect them to forget also. That they do not, I shall presently show.

Developing his tactics, and continuing his aim, our consistent friend asks what the physicians here have done to merit consideration from their brethren outside of the city. It should be the aim of all to bind us together even in closer union, if possible, to cement every tie of unity, that we may work harmoniously together for our own good, the good of the profession and that of the public, but here we find Dr. Cranston forcibly endeavouring to produce disunion, disintegration and enmity. That he will ignominiously fail is certain, and I leave him to be answered by every well wisher of the success of the Bathurst and Rideau Association by the simple but most effectual plan of omitting his name from the voting paper.

(5.) Hurrying on, we will consider another topic—who is going to win in this contest? It is difficult to perceive how Dr. Cranston has the hardihood to allow this election to continue and not to withdraw, after the publication of his solemn declarations and promises made in 1880, but as he has not done so at the time of writing, it is incumbent upon me to continue and completely expose his position. Now, I wish to draw your attention to the subtle manner in which he endeavours to delude the electors and, if possible, coerce those who signed his nomination into voting for him. If he was dealing with the ignorant and unlettered, and not with his peers in position, education and intelligence, we might comprehend him doing this, but to delude and coerce the members of the medical profession is a task slightly beyond his power. He says, in the first place, that "requisition or nomination papers, couched in the following terms, were *forwarded*" to him—trying to give the impression that the practitioners throughout the Division, voluntarily, and without any effort on his part, drew out these papers, signed and sent them to him. The implied idea is ludicrous in the extreme, and is the very reverse of what actually occurred. In the next place, he prints in full his nomination paper, exposing to view the promise of support, as much as to say: "Now, gentlemen, I have you. I know many of you signed under a misunderstanding; perhaps misleading and erroneous impressions were given to get you; but that is nothing, and I am going to *make* you vote for me by publishing your promise." How honourable it is for a professional man to thus attempt to force his brethren into supporting him! Surely he must believe the physicians in this Division are a lot of ignoramuses if he thinks they can be deceived, deluded or driven.

The Doctor asks this question: "Does Dr. Rogers imagine that the gentlemen who signed this paper are so weak-kneed and unprincipled that they will pitch pledges and promises to the wind?" The elegance of the diction therein is only equalled by the absurdity of the question, under the circumstances. The majority of the members who signed Dr. Cranston's nomination did so under the impression, or statement, that there was to be no other candidate, in some cases they were told the physicians in the city did not desire the honour; many who signed are young practitioners, ignorant then of the particulars of this election, others signed thoughtlessly and without consideration, and *not one who signed his paper knew of his promises and pledges made ten years ago, when he first sought the position*. Is a man "weak-kneed and unprincipled," when he finds he has been hoodwinked into signing a certain promise through misrepresentation, or by a misunderstanding, if he repudiates that promise? Does Dr. Cranston not know that a pledge of this kind, in order to be binding, all the facts in the case must be known, because the "right of choice" is part of every man's prerogative? It is the law of honour, as well as the law of the land, that misstatements on vital points nullify any contract, written or verbal. Again, he says he has seventy-two names on his nomination. Granted, but how did he get them there, and is it likely he will receive their votes? How many who signed have already written to him withdrawing their support? He carefully avoids telling that, but he practically admits one has, and let me quote what he says to the Doctor: "It has been explained to me by several medical men, that it was understood the representation was to be held alternately by the city and the rural portion of the Division. Again, I think it very premature to circulate your nomination papers when you did, before we knew who were to be the candidates."

Here we find the whole story told in exceedingly small space, and it vividly portrays the means used to prevent