But it would be matter for regret if the bar or the judges generally began to measure judicial proficiency by the progress of the clock.

The question of sons practising before their fathers is one which we have heard discussed very frequently in this province during the last thirty-five years. The objection often seems to have considerable force in a country where there is no distinction between barristers and attorneys, and where a counsel who is also attorney of record may have an interest in the costs. A recent issue of the *London Law Journal* refers to the same subject. "The time-honoured question," it says, "whether a barrister is entitled to practise before his father has again been raised—this time in the House of Commons—but without any satisfactory result. Mr. Asquith was asked whether there was any rule to prevent barristers whose fathers are chairmen of quarter sessions from practising at such sessions, and his answer was in the negative. The question whether such a rule ought not to exist might advantageously occupy the attention of the General Council of the Bar; for it is derogatory to the dignity of justice and injurious to the interests of the profession that the practice that prevails in certain quarters should be allowed to continue. No general rule could be framed to prevent a barrister from appearing in a professional capacity before his father. A large number of judges of the High Court have sons at the Bar, with whom it would be manifestly unjust to interfere. The evil lies in a barrister localising and practising regularly in a Court always presided over by his father; and it ought not to be difficult for the representative body of the Bar to put an end to this."

The Chicago Legal News has some pleasant words about the Chief Justice of the United States. "Chief Justice Melville W. Fuller," says our contemparary, "spent several