

In the course of time a very great quantity of legislation has been passed, so that in many instances an express statutory rule has been laid down. Doubts as to the exact meaning of such legislation there may be, just as there were doubts as to the exact custom; but in all but a comparatively small number of cases the law is clear. Sometimes difficulty arises in the interpretation of language employed,* and the Judge must do the best he can to determine its exact meaning. Sometimes it is not quite certain what the common law, *i.e.*, the custom, was; and the Judge must do his best to find out. But once the meaning of legislation is determined, the custom clearly made out, the duty of the Judge is plain. He cannot change one jot or tittle of the law so determined. He may like it or dislike it; it may seem to him wise or unwise, just or unjust, reasonable or ridiculous; his duty is to apply it, and that only.

Law is man-made, not in the sense of being made by the Judge deciding a case, but in the sense of having been made for him by man. The lawyer, then, is interpreting the work of man, the mind of a community, recent or long past.

Let us take now the two professions and compare them. A medical man is attending a patient. He examines him to discover accurately his exact state, to apply the proper remedy, *i.e.*, to remove some obstacle to the proper and normal operation of organs or to strengthen some operating cause. He has been taught certain supposed "laws of nature," perhaps verified by high authority. These he believes *sub modo*, for he knows there may have been a mistake, and it is not only his right but his duty to suspect their complete accuracy. He must observe and again observe and ever observe; and if he finds that the "law" has been in fact wrongly formulated, the circumstance that it has received the assent of the most eminent authorities, nay, of all, is of no avail. No authority can make, unmake, or modify a law of nature. Sulphuric acid has the same effect on calcium carbonate in Fiji as in Potsdam, and it is just as unsafe to trifle with typhoid or explosives in Togoland as in Toronto.

No medical man will rise in indignation and condemn the "law of nature" which he has found and which, as he thinks,

*In every language there must be ambiguity except in the very simplest conception. No matter how careful a legislator or a Judge may be, he cannot express his meaning with perfect clearness without a multitude of words and sometimes not even then. The cumbrousness of statutes and judgments is explained by this fact. If anyone thinks he can express without ambiguity any enactment in fewer or simpler words, let him try it—not simply talk about it.