

by the other extreme of profuseness of illustration, not conducive to perspicuity. Such being the case, a court refuses to reconcile contradictions among those who are supposed to know the merits of the case.

The late Lord Campbell said to three intelligent physicians, "you may go home to your patients, and be more usefully employed there than you have been here!" An equally learned judge said of another doctor, who was well qualified to give good evidence, "you might as well have staid at home and attended your patients." A Vice Chancellor of the Empire stated "that his experience taught him there were very few cases of insanity, in which any good came from the examination of medical witnesses. Their evidence sometimes adorned a case, and gave rise to very agreeable and interesting scientific discussions; but, after all, it had little or no weight with a jury." All judges do not sneer in the same manner, nor indulge in irony and sarcasm at the expense of the medical profession, but the weight given to a physician's or a surgeon's testimony is not commensurate with his capability to give intelligent and experienced medical opinions. I can see, however, indications of a better understanding between medicine and law. The study of the obsolete is giving place to the practical, and metaphysical distinctions, to pathological conditions, in considering many of the exciting causes of human conduct, coming under the head of jurisprudence. It will be seen how medicine and law are considered from different stand-points, and as a consequence the conclusions are diametrically opposite to one another. Medicine holds that all insane persons are afflicted with bodily disease. Law says this is not always the case. Medicine draws a necessary line between idiocy and insanity—the one being congenital, and the other pathological. Law says they are