

hypotheses of all kinds, the medical witness is apt to have unpleasantly forced upon him a display of how little he knows under a cross-examination, and thus what would have been received as competent testimony, if it had been confined to sure opinion, is marred and rendered subject to doubt by the witness pretending to know too much. In the plethora of opinion lies one reason for so much contradictory evidence. It is well never to say more than the question covers, and to be guarded in even doing that, if the interrogation happens not to be relevant to the case at issue.

Another reason is in supposing ourselves as being witnesses for one side only, because we happen to be subpoenaed by one of the parties. The prosecutor or defendant, who calls a medical man, expects him to give *ex parte* evidence. He is paid a miserable pittance to cover railway and hotel expenses; is his testimony not bought and paid for, to be used on the disburser's behalf? This feeling, often involuntary, gets hold of the witness, and, immediately the examination begins, he is on the alert against the wiles of the opposite lawyer, and often unconsciously is put upon the defensive to the injury of the truth. We have all felt this tendency. This position is not intentional, but the badgering of an indiscreet lawyer, may drive a medical witness to defend opinions which may give a coloring to a case not intended at the outset. This bias has to be guarded against. The witness is in court to tell *all*, and *only* the truth, as far as in him lies. It is not for him to think of the result, consequent thereon, to any party. In giving evidence it is not safe to weigh what will be the consequences flowing from its acceptance. "Let justice be done though the heavens fall." Unfortunately medical witnesses, giving opinions based on experience, are looked upon with suspicion by the courts.