

from time to time, is not only temporarily suspended, but deprived of the right to practice at all. In a case tried last July in England, a solicitor in a certain town had been the proprietor of a house used for an immoral purpose, of which he received the rent. That was considered a stain upon his character as a gentleman, and for that he was suspended from the roll and excluded from practice. So that we have at least the example of the legal profession, who have a code even stricter than ours, in insisting upon a high standard of honorable conduct in the profession.

Legal etiquette prescribes certain technical acts which a lawyer must not do. An eminent American lawyer, whom I had the pleasure of meeting, mentioned to me for example that he may not conduct a "speculative suit;" that is, he may not conduct a suit in which his pay is to depend on the success of the suit,—a palpable restriction on his liberty. Liberty is a blessed word, but compulsion is, under certain circumstances, often a more blessed word. The reason for this rule is that if a lawyer undertakes such a suit he becomes personally and financially interested in the result, and may be tempted not to give the court all the aid which is his duty, or may in the end lose the relations of harmony and respect which are indispensable between the Court and the lawyers, who are officers of the Court and are bound to help Justice to duly balance its scale.

In the same way "champerty" is a legal offence. So, too, no respectable lawyer will give separate advice upon a case which is already in the hands of a colleague. As between advocate and advocate, harmony, courtesy, and the forms of friendship must prevail; and at any time they must in the interest of the client be able to come together and to seize the earliest opportunity of avoiding litigation by compromise or mutual settlement, where it is possible and right. The etiquette of the bar is very strict, and is closely observed.

Legal etiquette is, like medical etiquette, a code of honor and of duty by which the public benefit; and those who depart from it or deride it,—"legal shysters" I think they are called in the United States,—are not, any more than medical quacks, those of whom their country or their profession have most reason to be proud.

I will pass at once to the consideration of our code of medical etiquette. I will ask you to consider whether you are of the opinion that it is safe or wise to cast aside the precedents of past experience and to substitute individual judgment for settled rules. If man were a purely abstract and perfectly moral intelligence, no doubt few words would suffice to legislate for his daily needs. Enough to say, "Do unto others as ye would they should do unto you."

But medical men are not pure creatures of perfect and abstract morality any more than other men. They have, indeed, certain advantages from the outset. From the very beginning of their professional life it is impressed upon them by their teachers that their profession is *a mission and not a trade*; a mission involving frequent self-sacrifice and a steadfast regard for interests other than their own. In this they are greatly helped by the force of precedent, by the example of those around them, and of the leaders whom they most respect. But even these are inadequate. Without the aid of the written as of the unwritten law, even the best of men are apt to decide *wrongly in their own favor*, on a doubtful question of ethics, and often in matters and cases where there are settled instructions in the code which would guide them rightly.

Let me read to you a few of the rules of our College of Physicians, which command with us a universal adhesion and respect. I do so only as an example of the conclusions to which many years of observation of the impingement of the forces of modern life on professional duty have led some of our wisest heads. I will refer only to a few as follows:—

"No candidate shall be admitted to examination who refuses to make known, when so required by the president and censors, the nature and composition of any remedy he uses."

"That the practice of medical authors frequently advertising their own works in the non-medical journals, and especially with the addition of laudatory extracts from reviews, is not only derogatory to the authors themselves, but is also injurious to the higher interests of the profession."

Again, "No fellow, member, or licentiate of the college shall officiously, or under color of a benevolent purpose, offer medical aid to, or prescribe for, any patient whom