

sufficient importance, because a doubt may arise whether it is necessary or desirable to perpetuate the title in this new country. It is certain that the Crown has freely availed itself in the past of the services of gentlemen who were not Queen's Counsel, notwithstanding the great range of selection afforded by the long list of those who were. For example, Mr. T. K. Ramsay was not a Q.C. while conducting the Crown business for years in the leading city of Montreal. We might mention many similar cases. In some instances lawyers who were not Queen's Counsel have even been appointed to the Bench, and the title was somewhat superfluously conferred simultaneously with the judicial appointment,—the two announcements appearing in the same issue of the Official Gazette. It is therefore a title of no absolute necessity—perhaps of no practical utility—and might without injury be suffered to become extinct, like the title of Serjeant-at-law in England. Sir Oliver Mowat, apparently, does not favor the abolition or disuse of the title, but unless some check can be devised that will prevent its being conferred so frequently as a mere acknowledgment of election services, a doubt will obtrude itself as to the value of the institution.

---

A word may be added as to the number of Queen's Counsel. There have been 481 appointed since confederation. Numerous and loud have been the complaints on this score. It must not be supposed, however, that there are that number living. The hand of death is ever at work thinning the ranks. Our system of administering justice is largely the cause of the number of appointments. There is no distinction here between barrister and attorney. The bar is scattered over a vast area, every city and town having its own group of attorneys who are also barristers. The system in England is just the opposite. Bench and bar have their centre in