

J. H. Balfour-Browne, in the last edition of "The Medical Jurisprudence of Insanity," says: "That medical testimony, when received, should be received as of very *inferior worth*." Medical witnesses are said to be "rash," and "to have expressed crude generalizations with an imperturbable effrontery," and that alienist physicians ask to be believed, "with an implicit faith, which is only compatible with the grossest ignorance; lawyers should assert the utter uselessness of the evidence of scientific witnesses in relation to questions of insanity." Lord Campbell says that "hardly any weight should be given to the evidence of skilled witnesses." Judge Davis declares in cases of insanity, "men of good common sense would give opinions worth more than that of all the experts in the country." A book might be filled with such choice quotations. If those who have made this branch of medical research a life long study, are such ignorant and unreliable witnesses, what shall be said of the intelligent thousands and tens of thousands in general practice?

It is also to be remembered, in cases of damage for malpractice, that each surgeon may have a mode of treatment distinct from any other, but sufficiently practical to be approved of in general practice, by any intelligent physician or surgeon. This treatment may be denounced by some one who is not able, from experience, to test its value, and an unlettered jury may decide the merits of the case in its professional aspects, by considering one method as only worthy of consideration, and give a verdict accordingly, to the astonishment of those best capable of judging. Next to the inscrutable ways of Providence stand the verdicts of juries, in their uncertainty and unforeseen results. This selection, by non-professional men, of one method of treatment, to the exclusion of all others, has been seen by me on several