

them when what he advertises is no good." Page 65. And again, "It is misleading to the public because I don't think he can accomplish what he claims." Page 66.

He places no value on the lay testimonials, and says medical people are best able to judge, and he agrees with Dr. Ferris that it would be a fair test to submit the preparation to be applied in a hospital. Page 67.

Dr. Henderson says: "The claims he makes are objectionable unless they were proven to be true," page 72, and further, that the accused's own experience and the testimony of laymen are not proper tests or proofs. Page 73.

The accused then put in a Presbyterian and a Methodist clergyman and an old resident of Castleton (where the accused practiced), 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 Enquiry reported on the 5th July, 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 that the Council 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 him. . . . It is a very difficult case. . . . He firmly believes he is doing what is right. He thinks he is sure 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 minds not quite strong enough. . . . If Council 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 the 27th of 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