

EDITORIAL NOTES.

Queen's Counsel.

The Law Journal (Eng.) joins us in advocating the abolition of Queen's Counsel. It says: "It is fully within the competence of the bar, by arrangement among themselves, to provide under what circumstances any member shall be allowed to advance himself to a position in which he shall be entitled to lead his seniors in point of standing. It is an example of the want of independence of the bar that the question of precedence should have been left to the crown to decide instead of being retained under the control of the bar itself. The Lord Chancellor would probably be glad to be relieved of a troublesome and disagreeable duty, and if the bar were to lay down for itself the circumstances in which any of its members may anticipate his seniority, there is no doubt the courts would fully recognize the arrangement. No regret would be felt at the abolition of the anomalous dignity of Queen's Counsel, which is a comparatively modern institution, originating not in any consideration of merit or convenience, but purely in court favor; and the opportunity might be taken of reviving, in a new form, the ancient order of serjeants, if the crown should be graciously pleased to place that title at the disposal of the bar."

The Statutes.

Everyone is presumed to know the law, therefore there is no use in printing the statutes. This may be unanswerable as a deduction of pure reason from an indisputable premise; and it is not the part of an editor to plead ignorance. Nobody requires the statutes, we therefore admit, but the symmetrical appearance of the library depends upon its possession of another volume of statutes, and its appearance (that of the library, not the statutes) is important.