

character of bodily injury or disease should be established. How can this be established except by the opinions of medical men? We trust our lives and the lives of our families to these medical men. Why should we not trust our private rights of a civil or criminal character, to the same judgment? It is of the greatest importance to the man who is prostrated by disease to have honest and careful opinions regarding his position and treatment. We accept these opinions from our attendant physician. Why should we impute wrong motives to medical men, when only a few hundred dollars are at stake, instead of a life? Why should we harshly criticise or ridicule the evidence of those who are highly respectable members of the community and well-known reputable men in their profession, when we trust them in the ordinary business transactions of life, and in whose hands we are willing in time of trouble to place our physical and mental safety? Under such circumstances, it seems reasonable that the evidence of such men ought not to be lightly treated, nor should their opinions be looked upon as of less weight or value than the evidence of any other witness.

It is true there is a rare specimen of the medical expert witness who sees nothing but that for which he is paid to see. He is a partisan of the worst description, and doubly dangerous, because he knows he is beyond the reach of the law as regards perjury. Not content with giving an opinion which is measured by the money of his employer, he is ready to invent all kinds of reasons, theories, and excuses to controvert well established principles or clearly proved facts. Instead of answering a question, he proceeds to deliver a lecture from the box. It is almost impossible, from such a witness, to get a definite answer to any question however simple. This specimen of the medical expert is the most dangerous of expert witnesses. His glibness is equalled only by his moral obliquity. His readiness in explanation is largely the result of an unscrupulous, scheming mind. Falsehood under oath is a matter of no moment to him. He may at times, accidentally tell the truth, but it may be safely conceded that he should on all occasions be discredited. The man who wilfully admits nothing except that which tells in favour of his client, is dishonest and should not be believed. Such evidence, fortunately, is very rare in our courts, and it would not be fair to condemn the whole medical profession by reason of the crookedness of one or two individual members. No continued