

when he had the power—his descendants for fifty generations have suffered violence and oppression at the hands of the disciples of the religion of love: the Roman Catholic tortured the heretic in Bohemia and Spain and England: and the heretic triumphing, revenged himself on his fellow by retaliation on the innocent fellows of his torturers: the Episcopalian persecuted the Scottish Presbyterian, the Presbyterian persecuted the Baptist in parts of New England: the Baptist (it is said) drove out the Quaker from Rhode Island (or tried to). And if the Quaker has never persecuted anyone, it must be remembered that he has never had the power. Even in the non-Christian land,

“For the love of Him, nation hates nation so  
That at His shrine, the watchful Islamite  
Guards Christian throats.”

The fate of John Hus or John Wiclif was no worse than that of Servetus, the philosophic physician and brilliant scholar, or of Campion, the enthusiastic Jesuit and pure-minded Christian. Even in our own day I am not sure that the *odium theologicum* has much decreased. It is true that there is no longer the stake or the rack, but would the spirit shown by some at least of those who have taken part in the controversy now or but lately going on disgrace Torquemada or Claverhouse?

In law, too, there is the same divergence. It is true that the lawyer has not but one collection of little pamphlets to look to for his ultimate and inexpugnable authority—but his authorities are all well known, numerous as no doubt they are. They are authorities some of which at least are binding, although some are more commentary than text. “If it is law it will be found in our books. If it is not found there, it is not law,” said Lord Chief Justice Camden. And yet it is not the common, but rather the unusual case that lawyers or judges agree. Take for an example the latest case of my own which went to the Privy Council. In the interpretation of an Ontario statute upon the subject of insurance, I decided at the trial the meaning of certain words in an Ontario Statute in a certain sense—the Court of Appeal unanimously supported that judgment—in the Supreme Court two judges thought I was right, but three thought I was wrong—the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council thought the