

has previously made medical jurisprudence his study—will not protect him from embarrassment in the witness-box. I have seen such exhibitions as tend to degrade our profession in the eyes of the court. For, believe me, the profession as a body is more or less judged by the shortcomings of the individual members.

Medical men are too often found ranged on opposite sides called for the purpose of contradicting each other—a degrading position, and one that should be avoided as much as possible. The attorney calls upon him, reports the case from his own stand point; the medical man forms and gives a hurried opinion, based, perhaps, on partial information;—it suits the ideas or interest of the attorney who books him as a witness, and when on the stand he finds himself led by subtle questioning to make unguarded statements, which upon mature reflection and further information he would wish unsaid. Another medical man is called, who having made himself master of the subject, in the interest of truth and justice, finds himself in the unpleasant position of being compelled to expose errors of opinion. Hence doctors get the credit of differing when no difference of opinion should exist. This difference of opinion, too often places upon the court and jury who are not educated upon medical subjects the responsibility of deciding who is right and who is wrong. Here the evidence of the expert would largely assist in arriving at a proper conclusion.

In this connection, let me say a few words upon the subject of prosecutions for malpractice. Many years ago I suggested that a committee of five medical men of standing be appointed in each province, to whom all cases of threatened prosecution for malpractice be referred by the accused.

If this committee reports favourably, let him defend it, if adversely, let him make the best compromise he can. I also suggested that in such cases he should in a measure be tried by his peers. In other words, one or more medical men should be on the jury. I think if this could be accomplished, it would lessen litigation and advance the cause of justice. For often we see verdicts given for want of proper knowledge, devoid of reason and common sense.

When I last had the honour of addressing you, I alluded to the injurious effects of the high pressure system of education upon the rising generation, particularly upon those who are to become the mothers of our future race; my remarks met with adverse criticism from some of the editors of our local newspapers, displaying the erudition we should look for from such a source. I have nothing to detract from that which I then said, but would supplement an earnest