

to have it altered. But let him try in the proper quarter and in the proper way; get at the Legislature, the only efficient power. It is as idle for a doctor or other person dissatisfied with a rule of law to gird at the Judge or at the lawyers as it would be for a lawyer to make it a reproach to the medical profession that arsenic is poison or smallpox infectious. The remedies are different. In medicine, apply other laws of nature; in law, get the law changed.

Another distinction between law and medicine is often lost sight of. The object of the profession of medicine is to cure the individual, to make or keep someone well (I am not losing sight of public hygiene—that is but a means for keeping individuals healthy, applied *en bloc* instead of individually.) It is to the doctor a matter of perfect indifference what may be the moral character, the disposition, the past, of the person committed to his care; he may be a Bill Sykes, a Seth Pecksniff or a Ned Cheeryble; the most hardened ruffian or a model citizen; he may have been injured in trying to murder or to burglarize, or in an heroic attempt to save life. The doctor's skill and care are given to one as to the other, and no distinction is made. Perhaps the doctor would be filled with disgust and righteous indignation, or with sincerest admiration, if he were to allow himself to contemplate his patient; but he does not; his business is to cure bad or good, vicious or virtuous, the most despicable or the most admirable.

I have just read an account of a soldier who deserted again and again in the face of the enemy. At length he was condemned to death. In despair he tried to kill himself, but succeeded only in blowing away a part of his face and jaw. He was put in the doctor's care to be guarded against infection, to be treated with all skill, to be nursed back to strength, and then to be stood against the wall and shot.*

With the individual as an individual, the lawyer has nothing to do; it is when he comes in contact with others that the lawyer's study begins. What are his rights? That means what is he entitled to receive at the hands of others? What is he entitled to keep from others? What may he do to others? Next, what are his duties? That means, what must he do to or for others, what must he refrain from doing to others? Rights and duties are the whole of the law.

* General Sutherland, one of the leaders of the American Sympathizers in 1838, was condemned to death by a court martial in this city. While in the old Toronto gaol on the north-west corner of King and Church Streets, waiting for execution, he opened an artery in an attempt which nearly proved successful, to commit suicide. He was discovered in time, the hemorrhage stayed and his life saved. Ultimately he was set free and allowed to return to the United States; but his attempt at suicide had nothing to do with the Royal clemency. Our Canadians would have joyfully hanged him, but the Home Government was more merciful. I have told the story of this General in an article in the *Canadian Magazine* for November, 1914, "A Patriot General."