

his defiance is "on what compulsion must I?" "It is not so written in the Code."

It is the natural and inevitable consequence of any written code to divide sharply what is forbidden from what is not—and what is not forbidden too often is considered to be allowed. Anyone who is accustomed to refer to a written Code for the rule to direct his conduct will be apt to believe that it is complete, and will generally give himself the benefit of any doubt or on omission.

Again, unless I am quite in error, any attempts to particularize would be dangerous. Let me take two examples.

A well-known compilation by a Bar Association of the highest rank, both as to members and otherwise, has it: "His," i.e., the lawyer's, "appearance in Court should be deemed equivalent to an assertion on his honour that in his opinion his client's case is one proper for judicial determination." That I make bold to deny—while the lawyer may not bring into Court a dishonest claim, or set up a dishonest defence (because he is an honest man, and the law compels no man to dishonesty), the client is entitled to the services of his lawyer to enforce any claim or defence which is not dishonest; the client is entitled to the full and candid opinion of his lawyer, but when that is given, he is entitled to have his case put to the Court whatever may be the lawyer's opinion on the law. Neither Court nor client is at all concerned with the opinion of counsel—the client demands, the Court enforces the law, as it is found to be—that is the duty of the Court, the right of the client. Counsel makes no assertion by implication of his own opinion when he argues the case of his client; and it would be unjust and improper to consider that counsel when arguing is representing that there was in his opinion doubt as to the law.

[The Rule as to Champerty is discussed and not wholly agreed in as an ethical is anything but a legal rule.]

\* \* \*

I know it will be answered *interest reipublicae ut sit finis litium*. But that does not mean that it would be for the advantage of people at large, that there should be no law suits—so long