He is qualified by the Government—that is, certificated by the Government—and justified in his vaccinating. I do not feel it is right to attack him for that, but rather to attack the system under which he is appointed.

11. Did not you say that the profession had better wash their dirty linen before they attempted to wash other people's?—I do not wonder; I suspect I did.

EXHIBIT I.

In the Supreme Court of New Zealand, Wellington District. } No. 6306.

Between OLIVE ROBERTS, an infant, by Walter Roberts, her father and guardian *ad litem*, plaintiff, and WILLIAM CROTHERS FITZGERALD, defendant.

STATEMENT OF CLAIM.

THE plaintiff, by Thomas Young, her solicitor, says,—

1. The plaintiff is an infant of tender years living with her parents in the City of Wellington.
2. The defendant is a chemist and druggist carrying on business in the City of Wellington.
3. The defendant undertook to vaccinate the plaintiff on or about the 4th day of November, 1898 (*sic*), but so negligently and unskilfully treated the plaintiff that the plaintiff was infected with a loathsome disease, and her health and constitution have been greatly impaired thereby:

Wherefore the plaintiff claims to recover the sum of £600 as damages.

EXHIBIT J.

ROBERTS *v.* FITZGERALD.—STATEMENT OF DEFENCE.

1. THE defendant is a Public Vaccinator for the District of Wellington duly appointed under the provisions of "The Public Health Act, 1876"; and on the 4th day of November, 1897, he vaccinated the plaintiff.
2. The defendant was not guilty of the alleged or any negligence, and the plaintiff was not by the operation in the preceding paragraph mentioned injured as alleged or at all.
3. The act of vaccinating the plaintiff was done by the defendant under and by virtue of "The Public Health Act, 1876," and not otherwise; and no notice in writing of the plaintiff's intention to commence this action, or of the supposed cause of action relied upon by the plaintiff, was given to the defendant before the said action was commenced, as required by the statutes on that behalf.
4. Save as herein is expressly admitted, the defendant denies the several acts and matters complained of by the third paragraph of the statement of claim respectively.

EXHIBIT K.

AMENDED STATEMENT of EXPENSES in VACCINATION CASE, Roberts *v.* Fitzgerald, in Supreme Court, from 27th July to .

	£	s.	d.
Fyffe, Dr.	5	5	0
Cleghorn, Dr.	25	0	0
Jellicoe, E. G.	275	13	11
Izard, C. H.	159	2	0
Faulke, Dr.	2	12	6
Needham	2	0	0
Reuter's telegrams	12	13	0
Tong	5	5	0
Typewriting and shorthand	36	16	10
"	1	8	7
Dunn	0	10	6
Bassett	14	14	0
William (clerical assistance)	1	0	0
Faulke, Dr.	19	8	0
Petherick	1	0	0
Wyatt	2	0	0
Rawson, Dr.	8	0	0
Wilford, Dr.	11	1	0
Millington, Dr.	3	3	0
Young (clerical assistance)	1	1	0
Stuart (auditor)	2	2	0
Certificate of death	0	2	6
Osborne (witness)	0	15	0
Chapple, Dr.	2	2	0
Roberts	60	0	0
Tringham	11	17	0
Books	7	6	7
Plan of room	3	3	0
Fyffe, Dr. (witness's subpœna-fee)	1	1	0
Ewart, Dr. "	1	1	0
Chapple "	1	1	0
Carried forward	£678	5	5

	£	s.	d.
Brought forward	678	5	5
Rawson (witness's subpœna-fee)	1	1	0
Faulke "	1	1	0
Translation of French book on vaccination	1	10	0
Further claims unpaid—			
Cleghorn, Dr.	50	0	0
Witness Bradley and wife	2	0	0
	£733	17	5
Items for which no vouchers appear—			
Trip to Blenheim (W. C. Fitzgerald)	5	0	0
Telegrams	0	5	6
Rodgers, solicitor, Blenheim	1	1	0
Algar (witness)	0	5	0
Fee paid witness	1	0	0
Telegrams	4	0	3
Cabs, &c.	7	1	9
Postages	3	4	5
Paid for private information	5	1	0
Books delivered back to Sydney and Blenheim	0	15	11
Stationery	1	0	0
Algar (telegram and delivery)	0	11	0
Second trip to Blenheim	4	15	0
	£767	18	3
Omitted, Skerrett and Wylie, unpaid claim	2	2	0
Final total	£770	0	3