

orable Council, I beg leave to submit myself to your mercy in this case; and I undertake and agree not to offend in the future; and I beg of this honorable Council to pardon my transgression in this case and not have my name erased from the Medical Register, as I am old and have no other means of making a living for myself and helpless family but my profession. That is all I have to say. I submit myself to the mercy of the Council, considering that I have not long to serve now. I have served somewhere about near fifty years, and this is the first charge ever brought against me either as to character or anything else. I was unfortunately advised into this or I would not have done it. Besides, part of those charges are not true. I have never read the thing, more than it was read to me.

Dr. McCullough now retired from the room.

Dr. DAY—As chairman of the Discipline Committee, I have rendered you the report, and the findings of that committee on the report. We have found him guilty in the particulars which are there stated; and it is not for me, as a member of the committee, to say anything at all in the matter. The Act says we shall report our findings to the Council. I simply have my vote as a member of the Council, but as a member of the committee I do not wish to say anything. If I were to it might be looked upon that, having heard the evidence, I might possibly be prejudiced; and it is possible that might be the case. Therefore, I prefer not saying anything on the subject, only that the findings of the committee as reported to you were perfectly just. The committee did not come to any conclusion, I think, that was not absolutely and fully justified by the evidence taken. That evidence is here, and upon that evidence we find what we have reported; and it is for you to say in what way Dr. John Robert McCullough shall be dealt with. It is not for me to say any more than my report to the Council. Dr. Rogers is the only member of this Council who has had the perseverance to read over the evidence on the enquiry, and he tells me he has done so, and that evidence is before you.

Dr. CAMPBELL—The Council has hitherto taken a very lenient course in connection with offenders of this description; and it becomes a great question for us to consider whether the time has not come for us to be more pronounced in our judgment and more severe in our sentence. There comes a question whether leniency after a while does not become a fault and whether the effect is not to harden the offender and encourage others. I am disposed as much as anybody can be to take into consideration the age and circumstances of the offender in this case, but, on the other hand, we have to consider the character of the offences he has committed. I do not know that the evidence goes into that fact, but I remember advertisements and handbills from this party, very many years ago, very similar to those that have been referred to in the evidence taken before the Discipline Committee, some of which I see are now at the other end of the room (refers to Exhibits). They all shew, not that he was guilty of unprofessional conduct in the mere matter of offending against the Code of Ethics, by speaking improperly of his colleagues in the medical profession—that might be an offence that I think your committee could condone,—but the offence of which he has been guilty is one for

which, had he been prosecuted in a court of law, I think he would unquestionably have been condemned for fraud. The entire list of his advertisements and his handbills are loaded with mis-statements. He starts out here on one of them—I do not know whether the one exhibited in the corner of the room or not—that “Dr. McCullough, the famed European physician, who has had experience of upwards of forty years in the practice of physic, surgery, midwifery, etc., in the hospitals of the chief cities on the European continent, formerly of the British Navy, and so on and so on”; while all the evidence that he could produce in the register was his license from the old Provincial Examining Board in 1851, and a certificate that he was a surgeon in one of the branches of the United States Army, apparently, and a graduate of a military Board at Albany in 1863. If he had been a European physician of such eminence as he says he would have put in all such qualifications as he had in Europe. But it cannot be shown he was ever in a college or hospital in Europe. In registering with the college he simply registered under the old license of 1851, and with certificates from two or three military organizations. The statement contained in that advertisement, therefore, was evidently an absolute lie. Then he goes on to assure the people that he can cure all diseases. That is repeated frequently in his bill. “Dr. McCullough treats and cures permanently all chronic diseases, etc., such as consumption in its first and second stages, hemorrhage of the lungs, and so on.” And that is repeated over and over. Then he says: “All diseases of the urinary organs permanently cured.” Any man who ever had any knowledge of medicine at all, and he must have had some, must have known he was telling a lie. The whole case is one of wilful fraud; and I think that the findings are supported by the evidence of witnesses who were examined before the Discipline Committee as reported here. I have not gone over all the evidence; it would be impossible; life is too short. But I have seen enough of the evidence before the Discipline Committee to convince me that it establishes conclusively that he had been practising very peculiarly; while, in addition to that, the character of the bills he issued in regard to female diseases is most objectionable; they say he cures all stoppages of the menstrual discharges, difficult menstruation, polypus of the uterus, etc.; “sterility cured; the childless wife becomes a joyful mother”—all this kind of thing is contained in the bills that he issued broadcast. It is a disgrace to humanity that such things should be made public. I am not prepared to make any motion in reference to it just now, but I call the Council to consider seriously whether leniency in a case like this may not be a mistake.

Dr. Rogers moved, seconded by Dr. Rosebrugh, that the report be received and referred to Committee of the Whole. Carried.

Council in Committee of the Whole.

Sir James Grant in the chair.

Dr. ROGERS—I asked to go into Committee of the Whole on consultation with the Chairman of the Discipline Committee, because it would give the members of this Council greater ease in discussing this important matter of the unprofessional conduct of Dr. McCullough. I quite agree with every word that my friend, Dr. Campbell, has said respecting the heinous-