

interest in the state, could the Federal Supreme Court honestly say that the decision in *Crane v. Campbell* (245 U. S. 304, 38 S. Ct. 98, 62 U. S. (Lied.) 304) did not sanction the statute? The Bolshevik hates a church as heartily as the prohibitionist does a distillery. A confiscation of all church property would bring forth an anguished wail for constitutional protection, yet where is the distinction in principle between that and the legislation for which prayers of thanksgiving have been offered? 'Spirits and distilled liquors are universally admitted to be subjects of ownership and property.' License Cases, 5 How. 504, 12 U. S. (L. Ed.) 256. What greater sanctity can any piece of property in the United States claim? This time when an imported horde of anarchists is clamoring for an opportunity to pillage seems ill chosen for the breaking down of the constitutional protection of property rights."

---

#### SOME MATTERS OF PRACTICE.

A valued correspondent calls our attention to some matters of interest connected with professional matters which it is well to refer to. He notes the practice of many barristers who, acting as counsel for the Crown, sign indictments under the impression that their signatures thereto are essential. This would appear to be an improper practice and probably may have grown out of the former practice of Crown counsel, when submitting an indictment to a grand jury, of signing to the left in the margin, as an indication to the jury that the form of the indictment had been approved, but not as being essential thereto. He also refers to the too common practice of practitioners describing themselves in affidavits as barristers instead of solicitors. This is a small matter, but it is well for our brethren to be particular even in small matters. In the same connection it may be noted that in some offices suit papers are endorsed with the name of the firm as barristers, instead of solicitors for the plaintiff or the defendant, as the case may be.