

5^m 746/5

To the Members of the Bathurst and Rideau Medical Association:

GENTLEMEN,—My esteemed friend Dr. Cranston has issued an extensive circular in reply to my printed letter to you of the 20th ultimo, which he kindly characterizes as a "most unfair and misleading production," thus compelling me to answer in order to place the facts fully before you, and in doing so, if I use plain language, and strip bare the naked truth in regard to the means he has used in the attempt to secure this election, I trust he will pardon a necessity which he himself has created.

Let it be granted that the present representative believes in the adage that "all is fair in love and war," then I shall admit the methods used by him were possibly correct, but in that case he should not howl because I claim the privilege of following the same maxim, when I see such clear evidence that this is his watch-word.

A fair fight in a clear field should unquestionably be the guiding principle of every honourable and professional contest, but let us stop and enquire how far this idea has governed the conduct of the Doctor in this election.

Last summer the meeting of the Bathurst and Rideau Association was held in Arnprior, and the President was given clearly to understand in various ways, that as he had occupied the position two terms he should retire, and also that it was now the city's turn to choose the representative. It was understood by the practitioners from Ottawa that this principle would be carried out, and that Dr. Cranston would not again seek preferment. Believing this we considered, in any case, the fight should not be started until the first of the year, and the members in the city were trying to arrange between Dr. Powell and myself that one or other should retire, and thus avoid an election, which always tends to shake the harmony of the Division. Thus matters drifted along, and we saw no necessity to hurry, because it had been so plainly understood the representative should be chosen from the city on this occasion, that we never dreamt of Dr. Cranston moving in the matter—at any rate no one here thought he would stoop to take the advantage he did.

Now let us see how Dr. Cranston acted:—Knowing the city members felt they should have the representation this time, and being sure they would bring out a candidate, he sent around nomination papers away back last October, but he did so stealthily, not openly, and *he took good care the members in the city should not know what he was doing.* Everywhere, throughout the rural portion of the *Division*, members were importuned to sign his nomination, and they were told it was really a matter of form, because no one was going to oppose the present member. Thus Dr. Cranston, by writing letters and personal interviews and getting his acquaintances to work, succeeded in having these nomination papers *quietly* passed from hand to hand and signed by members without proper consideration and also under the impression or statement that there was to be no opposition. *The Doctor did not bring out a circular and openly state to all the members in the Division that he was a candidate before he did this;* Oh no—that would spoil his game, that would allow other aspirants to do the same and thus give the electors a free choice, and so for nearly two months this quiet work went on—private letters were written by Dr. Cranston urging the members to sign his nomination, and is it any wonder under these circumstances, under this species of misrepresentation, the majority in the rural portion of the Division signed for him? It must be remembered that misrepresentation can be made quite as effectually by withholding essential facts as by falsity of statement. Now I ask was this a straightforward, honourable and equitable method to endeavour to secure the intelligent support of the members of the Division? Can any one characterize it otherwise than an election "trick," worthy only the high attainments of a ward politician? When Dr. Cranston knew there was going to be opposition should he not, and likewise any one acting for him, have informed those members who were asked to sign that such would be the case? Certainly there can be but one answer to this question. What is Dr. Cranston's answer to this? He says the law requires every candidate to have his nomination signed by twenty members. That is quite true, but does the law require a candidate, or his friends, to make wrong representations or to attempt by this or any other means to blindfold the electorate, to work secretly and secure the signatures of the majority of the electors, and then when they repudiate and denounce the means used, that the candidate shall turn round, and with the greatest *sang froid*, tell them if they withdraw from him they are "weak-kneed and unprincipled"? Unprincipled! How lofty is the principle of a man who solemnly agrees not to again seek election if successful in 1880 and then "pitches promises and pledges to the wind" in 1890!

Again, many of those who signed Dr. Cranston's nomination are young practitioners who knew nothing about the election of representatives to the Council, and being asked to sign by an older physician, and not being informed that there would probably be other candidates in the field, with no knowledge whatever of the conditions in the premises, they put down their names with perfect indifference, simply, they supposed, as a matter of form. In these cases are such men honourably bound to carry out an arrangement made under a misunderstanding, and made when they were ignorant of the particulars of the pending election? Not by any means. I grant if the names of all the candidates, and all the circumstances of the contest are before the electors, a promise then given of support is binding. I also ask, where a member signs for a candidate and believes, or is informed, by implication or otherwise, that no one else is going to run, and who thus makes a promise under false impressions or representations, is he honourably bound to vote for that candidate? Most undoubtedly not; and I venture to assert that many of the members throughout the Division will resent this secret method used by my opponent, and will vote against him when the time comes. With feigned child-like innocence the Doctor says he only acted the same as candidates in other divisions have acted. I challenge him to name an instance, where a candidate in a Division attempted to *quietly* secure the signatures to his nomination paper of a majority of the electors, before bringing out a circular announcing himself an aspirant for the position. But, supposing that it was done anywhere else, does that make it right? The whole principle is wrong of endeavouring to lock up the vote in a division by any secret method of procedure. In an election held among professional men everything about it should be upright, honourable, and free from any appearance of trickery, in order that the electors may have perfect freedom of voting for whom they choose.

(1.) A few words now respecting these resolutions which I am forced to repeat in order to make myself clear.

"Moved by Dr. H. P. Wright, of Ottawa, seconded by Dr. W. J. Anderson of Smith's Falls, and it is hereby

Resolved,—That considering how few honours there are in the gift of the medical profession, and that of a Representative of a territorial division in the Council of the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario being one of the greatest, and considering that the present member has held the position of Representative for the Bathurst and Rideau Division two terms, or nine years in all, it is the opinion of this Association that this distinction should now be given to some other aspiring member of the Division.—Carried."

"Moved by Dr. J. Sweetland, seconded by Dr. H. Hill, and

Resolved,—That this meeting desires to express its warm approbation of the candidature of Dr. A. F. Rogers as Representative in the Council for this Division, as we believe he would make a most energetic and progressive member, and further, because the rural portion of the division has had the representation now for ten years, or two terms, and it would be only paying a just compliment to the city members of the division to allow them to choose the Representative on this occasion.—Carried.

"I certify that the above is a true copy of resolutions unanimously passed by the Bathurst and Rideau Division Association at the meeting held the 15th January, 1890

(Signed) "H. B. SMALL, M.D.

"Sec. B. and R. D. Med. Assn."