devices by chiropractors, deceiving or de-
lating at the end of that year and who
may claim no privileges under the pro-
cense. 53 Atty. Gen.
visions of 147.24 (8), which was enacted after
his license terminated. 44 Atty. Gen.
precede enrollment in a school of chiropractic
methods such as naturopathy. 39 Atty. Gen.
tramic code is approved. 147.185 (7),
the medical profession. Kuechler v. 
Grayson, 5 W 238, 192 NW 1015.
Since the statute does not define "chiro-
practic," the state board of examiners may do so
by rule, and the rule stated in the adminis-
trative code is approved. 147.185 (7), 1957, does not require approval by the board
of all practices taught by schools; the board
may restrict the practice by rule. State v.
Grayson, 5 W 203, 92 NW (2d) 272.
One licensed only as a chiropractor who
uses electrotherapy violates the medical prac-
tice act. 21 Atty. Gen. 1464.
One licensed to practice chiropractic is not
thereby authorized to treat the sick by other
methods such as naturopathy. 39 Atty. Gen.
308.
An unlicensed person may not give steam
baths and rubdowns in premises carrying the
sign "Chiropractic Clinic" used by a former
chiropractor occupying the premises. 44 Atty.
Gen. 38.
One who was licensed to practice chiro-
practic in 1925 and who permitted his license to
lapse at the end of that year and who
made no attempt to renew it during the year
following cannot be reinstated in 1958 under
147.23 (7). Stats. 1953, by paying up the regis-
tration fees for each of the last 30 years; and
he may claim no privileges under the pro-
visions of 147.24 (8), which was enacted after
his license terminated. 44 Atty. Gen. 50.
Under 147.23 (3), Stats. 1963, preliminary
education consisting of 2 years of college must
precede enrollment in a school of chiropractic
in order to permit taking of an examination for a li-
cense. 53 Atty. Gen. 50.
Chiropractors are required to exercise care
and skill in diagnosis, and are liable for mal-

446.01 History: 1969 c. 336 s. 164; Stats.
1969 s. 446.01.

446.02 History: 1969 c. 336 s. 164; 1969 c.
392 s. 69g; Stats. 1969 s. 446.02.

446.03 History: 1969 c. 336 s. 164; Stats.
1969 s. 446.03.

446.04 History: 1969 c. 336 s. 164; Stats.
1969 s. 446.04.

446.05 History: 1969 c. 336 s. 164; Stats.
1969 s. 446.05.

446.06 History: 1969 c. 336 s. 164; Stats.
1969 s. 446.06.

446.07 History: 1969 c. 336 s. 164; Stats.
1969 s. 446.07.

447.001 History: 1969 c. 336 s. 692; Stats.
1969 s. 447.001.

447.01 History: 1969 c. 129 ss. 2 to 4, 6, 7;
1969 c. 102; Ann. Stats. 1889 ss. 1410v, 1410w;
1889 ss. 1410q, 1410r; Stats. 1889 ss. 1410e, 1410f;
1889 ss. 1410g, 1410h; Supl. 1885 c. 129 ss. 1, 5;
1885 c. 129 ss. 1 to 3, 6, 7; 256 NW 922.

447.02 History: 1885 c. 129 ss. 2 to 4, 6, 7;
1889 c. 102; Ann. Stats. 1889 ss. 1410v, 1410w;
1889 ss. 1410q, 1410r; Stats. 1889 ss. 1410e, 1410f;
1889 ss. 1410g, 1410h; Supl. 1885 c. 129 ss. 1, 5;
1885 c. 129 ss. 1 to 3, 6, 7; 256 NW 922.

447.03 History: 1885 c. 129 ss. 1, 5; Ann.
Stats. 1889 ss. 1410g, 1410h; Stats. 1889 s. 1410h;
The state board of dental examiners had no jurisdiction to relieve, from the operation of the statute, a dentist who fails to register his license, or to determine whether such employment is for purely vocational purposes. 

The use of a picture of a dental plate company to evade the purpose of 18 USCA, sec. 420f, and 152.02 (1), Stats. 1943, constitutes immoral and unprofessional conduct on the part of the dentist within the meaning of 152.06 (5), and justifies suspension or revocation of his license. 32 Atty. Gen. 663.

Employment by a dentist of persons merely to distribute handbill advertising does not constitute employment of "cappers" or "street-sellers" to obtain business. 25 Atty. Gen. 385.

A scheme pursuant to which a licensed dentist is paid $1 for signing an authorization whereby a mail order dental plate company may make and ship through the mail or in interstate commerce a denture for a customer of such company without any professional services being rendered by the dentist and for the sole purpose of enabling the dental plate company to evade the purpose of 18 USCA, sec. 420f, and 152.02 (1), Stats. 1943, constitutes immoral and unprofessional conduct on the part of the dentist within the meaning of 152.06 (5), and justifies suspension or revocation of his license. 32 Atty. Gen. 663.

A dentist may not engage in diagnosis except as may be necessary to perform services which he is authorized by the statute to render. Rust v. Board of Dental Examiners, 216 W 257, 256 NW 919.

A conviction on a federal charge of introducing mislabeled drugs into interstate commerce is not a ground for revocation of a license for the particular offense does not include moral turpitude. Lee v. State Board of Dental Examiners, 29 W 260, 300 NW 922.

A conviction for the sole purpose of enabling the dental plate company to evade the purpose of 18 USCA, sec. 420f, and 152.02 (1), Stats. 1943, constitutes immoral and unprofessional conduct on the part of the dentist within the meaning of 152.06 (5), and justifies suspension or revocation of his license. 32 Atty. Gen. 663.

A dentist may not engage in diagnosis except as may be necessary to perform services which he is authorized by the statute to render. Rust v. Board of Dental Examiners, 216 W 257, 256 NW 919.

A conviction for the sole purpose of enabling the dental plate company to evade the purpose of 18 USCA, sec. 420f, and 152.02 (1), Stats. 1943, constitutes immoral and unprofessional conduct on the part of the dentist within the meaning of 152.06 (5), and justifies suspension or revocation of his license. 32 Atty. Gen. 663.
services in the capacity of a dental hygienist. 28 Atty. Gen. 130.

Unlicensed persons may take dental X-ray pictures provided they make no attempt to diagnose or treat dental disorders by the use of X-ray or otherwise. 41 Atty. Gen. 234.

On the status of dental hygienists under 152.07 (1) (7) and of public health dental hygienists under 152.07 (8), Stats. 1953, see 44 Atty. Gen. 296. See note to 447.05, citing 53 Atty. Gen. 158.

447.09 History: 1885 c. 129 s. 6; 1887 c. 103; Ann. Stats. 1889 s. 1410; Stats. 1893 s. 1410; 1903 s. 411 s. 5; Supp. 1896 s. 1410; 1909 c. 528; 1913 c. 545; 1913 c. 772 s. 40; 1915 c. 436 ss. 6; 7; 1923 c. 448 s. 92a; Stats. 1923 s. 152.08; 1933 c. 189 s. 8; 1961 c. 409; Stats. 1961 s. 152.09; 1969 c. 85; 1969 c. 336 s. 119; 1969 c. 392 s. 691; Stats. 1969 s. 447.09.


447.11 History: 1961 c. 400; Stats. 1961 s. 152.51; 1969 c. 336 s. 120; Stats. 1969 s. 447.11.

447.12 History: 1961 c. 400; Stats. 1961 s. 152.52; 1963 c. 542; 1969 c. 336 s. 121; Stats. 1969 s. 447.12.


Editor's Note: The following cases, decided before the enactment of ch. 459, Laws 1953, had to do with competency, as witnesses in legal proceedings, of doctors licensed in other states but not in Wisconsin: Rocking v. Windsor S. Co. 131 W 532, 111 NW 685; Will of Williams, 208 W 528, 41 NW (2d) 191; Merritt v. Komaikeski, 308 W 417, 41 NW (2d) 620; and Landrath v. Allstate Ins. Co. 208 W 464, 48 NW (2d) 486. See also State v. Law, 150 W 313, 136 NW 803, 137 NW 497.

On exercises of police power generally see notes to sec. 1, art. 1; and on legislative power generally see notes to sec. 1, art. 4.

The jury is not bound by the declaration on a card signed by a sick child's mother, supported by the testimony of one accused under sec. 1493h, Stats. 1917, that the treatment of the child by the accused was gratuitous and that a charge was made for the medicine furnished, but could find that the card and the sale of the medicine were a subterfuge to avoid the prohibition of practicing medicine without a license. Till v. State, 172 W 266, 177 NW 589.

The burden is upon one charged with practicing medicine without a license to show that he has license, if he relitigates as a defense. Piper v. State, 205 W 55, 201 NW 162.

The evidence in this case sustained a conviction on the charge of unlawfully and willfully assuming the title of "doctor." Nickell v. State, 205 W 614, 238 NW 505.

It is a violation of 147.14 (3) for a person not licensed to practice medicine or optometry to cause the letter "M.D." to be appended to his name on the door of his office and to supervise the business of examining and treating eyes. The state may prove the commission of the offense on any date substantially corresponding with the date charged. Hawkins v. State, 266 W 629, 298 NW 511.

447.15, Stats. 1929, making previous internship a condition of being licensed to practice medicine, is a legal sanction of the performance of such duties as are usually and ordinarily performed by interns; and the performance of such duties does not constitute unlawful "practice of medicine," or representation that the interne is authorized to "practice" medicine. Nickley v. Eisenberg, 206 W 269, 293 NW 426.

The holder of the degree of "doctor of chiropractic" conferred by a school in another state is not entitled thereby to describe himself as such in his practice. On entering the state to practice, he becomes subject to its laws, including 147.14 (3). State v. Michaels, 226 W 574, 277 NW 167.

In a prosecution for using and assuming the title of "doctor" the defendant's application for extra gasoline-ration coupons, on which the defendant's profession was stated as physician, made 2 months before the facts occurred on which the prosecution was based, was admissible as showing a general and continuing intent to do the very thing the defendant was accused of doing. State v. Neukom, 240 W 172, 14 NW (2d) 34.

When a physician exercises that degree of care, diligence, judgment, and skill which physicians in good standing of the same school of medicine usually exercise in the same or similar localities under like or similar circumstances, having due regard to the advanced state of medical or surgical science at the time, he has discharged his legal duty to his patient. Ahola v. Sincock, 6 W (2d) 332, 94 NW 387.

If the trial court determines that a consultation was made by a claimant with a physician for the bona fide purpose of treatment, the fact that the claimant also desired to utilize the physician as a witness on the trial in relation to his injury will not preclude the physician from testifying as to the patient's report of his subjective symptoms or from testifying medical conclusions upon such report. Ritter v. Coca-Cola Co. 24 W (2d) 157, 129 NW (2d) 439.

The law has long permitted calling as an expert witness any person whose training, experience, and method within his particular discipline are acknowledged to be sound and trustworthy. Casinieri v. Herman, 29 W (2d) 437, 137 NW (2d) 73.

The mere giving of the drugs used in surgical anesthesia under the direction and in the presence of a duly licensed physician is not practicing medicine or surgery. 5 Atty. Gen. 800.

A physician located in an adjoining state