

At the annual meeting in 1906 the Committee reported that the adoption of such a code was not only advisable but under existing conditions of very great importance, that unless the public had confidence in the integrity of the administration of justice there could be no lasting permanence to republican institutions, that with the influx of increasing numbers who seek admission to the profession mainly for its emoluments, have come new and changed conditions. Never having realized or grasped that indefinite ethical something which is the soul and spirit of law and justice these men not only lower the morale within the profession but debase our high calling in the eyes of the public.

It was considered that the adoption of a code by the American Bar Association would tend to develop uniformity of practice between the various States.

Another reason given for the adoption of a code was that many men depart from honourable and accepted standards of practice early in their legal careers as the result of ignorance.

In 1907 the same Committee presented a report recommending that Sharwood's well-known and instructive essay on Professional Ethics, first published in 1854, should be reprinted and issued in a volume supplementary to the Annual Report. The Committee was directed to have the proposed canon of professional ethics prepared by 1st May, 1908, to transmit a copy to each member and to the Committees, of the respective State Bar Associations for criticism and suggestions, and that the final report should be ready for submission at the 1908 meeting, when it was adopted in its present form.

The Law Society of Upper Canada considered a code of professional ethics several years ago at the suggestion of the late Mr. Justice Rose, with the approval of Dr. Hoyles, Principal for over twenty years of the Law School at Osgoode Hall. The matter was considered by the Legal Education Committee, of the Benchers, but was not favourably entertained at that time. The late Mr. Christopher Robinson, K.C., was one of the principal opponents. He took the position that legal ethics could not be taught in that way, that it was merely a matter of mental and moral education, and not one that could be reached by the adoption