

was not a registered practitioner. Dr. H. O. Martin was connected with the Toronto office for a short time.

After considerable evidence had been taken, both professional and lay, Mr. Walter Nesbitt, counsel for the prosecution, completed his case against Dr. Anderson, of London, by putting in the evidence of Dr. Martin, who was with the "eminent physicians" for a short time subsequent to their prosecution in the police court here. It is now for the committee to consider the evidence, a verbatim report of which has been made by Mr. Alex. Downey, and report its finding to the Council.

The case against Dr. McCully, whose name is familiar to almost every medical man on account of the disgraceful means of advertising used by him, was then taken up. Dr. McCully with his counsel, Mr. Walter Cassels, Q.C., were present, and made a vigorous fight to maintain his professional existence. He is accused of "infamous and disgraceful" conduct by inserting advertisements in the newspapers containing scandalous and defamatory statements regarding the medical profession, and various institutions connected therewith; by publishing the details of his professional practice, the names of his patients, the particulars of their diseases, and statements regarding alleged cures by his treatment, thereby deluding the public by representing that he was and is better qualified for the practice of the medical profession than other registered practitioners, and that he had cured patients whom other registered practitioners had failed to cure, and by guaranteeing cures in cases, whether they were curable or not, giving his assistants instructions to deceive and defraud patients who might apply for treatment. The rest of the charges also contain a number of specific cases in which cures were guaranteed for incurable diseases.

Dr. Brent, of 380 Wellesley street, who three years ago discontinued the practice of his profession to accept a position in the Toronto postoffice, was called upon by Mr. Nesbitt to give evidence for the prosecution. Dr. Brent said that in the fall of 1884 he was assistant to Dr. McCully.

"Dr. McCully's directions were that we should take all the cases we could get and charge as much as possible—the tariff, if possible, more if we could get it, and if not take less. First, we were

to find out what a person was worth and charge accordingly. Cures were to be guaranteed in all cases unless it was apparent that the person was actually dying. The first duty was to make an examination of the patients to find out what their standing was as regards wealth."

"Do you know of any cases in which money was extorted?" Mr. Nesbitt asked.

"I remember a case in which a tumour was removed. It afterwards turned out to be a cancer and the patient died. The body was not allowed to be removed from Dr. McCully's house until the charges for services were paid."

"You left his employ?"

"Yes, because I was disgusted with the way his business was conducted. I considered his place a sort of bleeding establishment."

"By the use of the knife?"

"No, by the use of the pocket. I thought the business was scandalous."

He considered Dr. McCully's methods unprofessional and disgraceful, and said that he ought to be ostracized.

Dr. Brent was submitted to a close cross-examination by Mr. Cassels.

Mr. John Ross Robertson said that he had given instructions, after examining McCully's advertisements, that no more advertisements of that nature should be accepted for publication in *The Telegram*.

Dr. I. H. Cameron was asked his opinion of the conduct of a professional man who inserted such advertisements as those of Dr. McCully.

"It is not the conduct of a professional man," replied Dr. Cameron. "It is the conduct of a charlatan and a quack. I would say it was infamous. It is set down in our code of ethics as being highly reprehensible."

Dr. Cameron said that from a professional standpoint Dr. McCully's advertisements were inconsistent with professional dignity, while from a public standpoint the publication of the particulars of diseases was indecent. Such advertisements were designed to gull the public. In cross-examination Dr. Cameron expressed the opinion that any advertising by doctors was, to say the least, unbecoming from a professional point of view. Among the witnesses called on Saturday were Rev. D. J. Macdonnell and Rev. Dr. Parsons,