

the books and pamphlets laid before us it is manifest to us that hydriodic acid is now well known and is accounted to be of varied excellence by American physicians—against whose competence no suggestions have been made.

On the other hand, expert opinion is offered of the worthlessness of hydriodic acid by gentlemen of the medical profession who do not know and have not used or tried the acid. Surely the better plan is to waive matters of personal etiquette and have the thing brought to a practical, satisfactory, as well as scientific test by skilled observers in applied medicine.

The broad distinction between the Washington case, 23 O. R. 299 (from which judgment the framers of the "rider" in this case appeared to have borrowed their language), and the present is that there he dared not or would not or did not deny what was charged against him—by his silence he in effect confessed its truth and admitted the falsehood (see page 310). The false statement there acted upon by the Council and confirmed by the Court as sufficient to be "infamous," was the representation that persons in the last stage of consumption were suffering from catarrhal bronchitis, and that he could cure them.

Now, I am far from belittling the importance of professional ethics in regard to physicians or other learned professions. There is no doubt that this man has grievously offended against their conventional rules, well recognized, though, it may be, not forming a written code, which obtains among the members of every learned and honorable profession. In two respects he has violated proper decorum: Modesty and propriety have been forgotten in his self-advertising and discreditable proclamation; and he has, in the second place, kept to himself and for himself this apparently valuable remedy, and has not made known the formula in order that its benefits may be shared in by the profession and the public.

But neither of these offences against the comity of the profession invites *per se* imputation of moral delinquency—which is, I think, contemplated by the terms infamous and disgraceful. Yet the obnoxious conduct is sufficient to put the offender practically outside of the professional pale, but whether it can call down the statutory punishment of exclusion from practice seems to me, as at present advised, to be answerable in the negative.

To resort to the advertising question the English rule against it, even in the most marked form, is exceedingly strict; not so in America and Canada, where a moderate and limited use of