

82. You prescribe the books yourselves?—Yes.

83. You are aware that there are persons carrying on business as herbalists without much knowledge of it?—I am aware of that.

84. Is it true that sometimes these persons carry on business of an objectionable character?—I suppose that is true of every business. It applies to ours as well; but I do not think you will find so large a proportion in our business as in others.

85. Do all the herbalists hold certificates—those that are in business?—Not all that are in business. There are a number that are unregistered.

86. What do you suggest in order to bring these people into line, so as to bring about some sort of responsibility?—We suggest that every one shall become a member of our association, but we have certain qualifications. There are some that we would not permit to join.

87. You think that some law should be made to prevent them becoming practitioners?—I think the public should be protected against persons having no knowledge of the business.

88. Under what Act is your association constituted?—It is registered under the Unclassified Societies Act.

89. You say that you object to the formula being disclosed?—Yes, I think it is unfair to ask for that.

90. In what way would you suggest that the public should be protected against what you know to be worthless nostrums being put on the market, and people being deceived as to their effect?—My view of it is that a sample of each medicine or preparation should be submitted to the Board, in order that it might have an analysis made of it, and if on the basis of the analysis it was considered that the medicine or preparation was injurious, then the Board should prohibit the sale of it as worthless.

91. Then, you would place in the hands of the analyst or the Board the right to say whether a so-called medicine was a valuable one or not?—Yes, providing there was a Court of Appeal, of course.

92. *Hon. Mr. Fowlds.*] And that the Supreme Court—is that satisfactory?—Yes. It is a little costly, but you cannot have everything.

93. With regard to the question of supplying the formula, it seems to me that to analyse all the samples submitted by all the chemists and herbalists and others prescribing medicines throughout the colony would require an enormous staff of analysts, all of which could be avoided by the deposit of the formula. It is a very simple thing to analyse a medicine or chemical when you know the ingredients, but not when you start to find them out, and I think the binding of the Board to secrecy in the matter of disclosing the formula would be enough?—We are all members of a union. A man may be a member of the Board this year and not the next year, and unless he was an honourable man the door would be open to him to use this formula to his own advantage.

94. But suppose a penalty were put in the Bill to provide against his using his knowledge, either as a member of the Board or on his retiring from it?—Yes, if you knew that the person was using the knowledge obtained, but he might use it in a way that you would not know.

95. *The Chairman.*] The difficulty would be to bring it home to him?—Yes.

96. *Hon. Mr. Fowlds.*] Do you think there is much greater safety to the owner of the formula in leaving it to the Board to get the preparation analysed?—Certainly, I should consider it very much so. But there would be another objection, and this would apply to patent medicines. I have had a great deal of experience with patent medicines. There are some that are really good, while there are others that are worthless, and the proprietors of those that are really good would object to depositing the formula; consequently you would not only lose the use of these medicines, but the Government would lose the Customs duties levied upon them.

97. *Mr. Hornsby.*] You say it would be unfair to part with the formulæ of these patent medicines: are you not aware that in Germany, the United States especially, and in other countries as well, every medicine made up, whether patent or prescribed, has to have on the outside of the bottle the whole contents stated?—Yes, I am aware of that.

98. Now, if it is not unfair in Germany, the United States, and in the other countries, why should it be unfair in this country?—I should consider it very unfair in this country.

99. But if they have carried on for very many years under a law of this kind in other countries, and they seem to think it is all right, because there does not appear to be any drop in the number of these medicines, the proprietors of which appear to do well and are flourishing, why should it not be practicable here for the protection of the public?—It may be practicable, and the objections I have raised may not have much in them.

100. You know the British Pharmacopœia, and that there are thousands of remedies to be found there; also another work, where there are 5,000 formulæ advertised?—Yes.

101. I put it to you as a man of the world as well as a professional man, is it not a fact that the general public do not bother their heads as to how these preparations are made up, so long as they get cured?—That is a fact, no doubt.

102. With regard to the admission of herbalists, I suppose you are aware of the fact that I am endeavouring in this Bill to give the herbalists of this country a standing they never had before?—Yes; and I think they are very grateful on that account.

103. When this Bill passes, if it does pass, you will have a standing in the community which you never previously had. You know that when the Pharmacy Bill was passed those chemists who had been in practice for years did not have to pass an examination, but that those who afterwards came in had to be examined?—Yes.

104. Then, you would not object if this Bill dealt with herbalists in the same way, so that they would not be called upon to pass an examination?—No.

105. That would tend to protect you?—Yes—that is, an examination on the lines which the rules of our association provide.