

with Dr. Ferris that it would be a fair test to submit the preparation to be applied in a hospital.

Dr. Henderson says the claims the accused makes are objectionable unless they were proved to be true, and further that the accused's own experience and the testimony of laymen are not proper tests or proofs.

The accused then put in a Presbyterian and a Methodist clergyman and an old resident of Castleton (where the accused practised), who proved that he had a good reputation for honesty, integrity, and truthfulness. These witnesses also spoke generally of the benefits they and their families had derived from the use of "Grippura."

Upon these materials the committee of inquiry reported on 5th February, 1905, that they had failed to arrive at a conclusion, and asked leave to consider further the evidence, exhibits, and the case generally. In submitting this report, the chairman said that all agreed that it was disgraceful conduct and came under the statute . . . that, although from all the facts the advertisements and statements were such as were very misleading to the public, and had the effect of taking money out of the people's pockets, yet the committee had never recommended that any man should be struck off for advertising alone—there has always been something more in connection with it. . . . He did not feel that the case was sufficiently strong to bring in a verdict against the accused. . . . It is a very difficult case. . . . The accused firmly believes he is doing what is right. He thinks he is sent to help poor suffering humanity for consideration. If the consideration was not there, I don't think he would do it. . . . We do not want to report a man where the evidence is, in our mind, not quite strong enough. . . . If counsel says this evidence is not sufficient, we will try to get some more.

It was then referred back to the committee to take further proceedings if the accused did not stop advertising.

The second notice of proceedings to erase the name was served on 27th April, 1906, alleging that the appellant had been guilty of infamous and disgraceful conduct in a professional respect, and giving in the notice, as particulars, these: "That he did infamously, improperly, and unprofessionally, advertise and distribute advertising circulars claiming to have discovered a remedy which would cure La Grippe or influenza in a few hours (and assist in curing a number of