

Crown Office Act and the Orders in Council made under it many grants formerly made under the Great Seal are now made under the Wafer Great Seal.—*Law Journal (Eng.)*

NOT LONG AGO a man who manifested his disapproval of a performance at a place of public amusement in Kansas City, Mo., by hissing, was arrested at the instance of the manager and arraigned before a police magistrate on the charge of disorderly conduct. We are told that the judge promptly discharged the accused with the remark that "If a man has the right to applaud in a theater, he certainly has a right to hiss." This seems to be sound sense, and ought to be equally good law. Applause is the usual mark of approval and its antithesis, the hiss, is the customary way of indicating disapproval of a play, act or scene. The audience is not permitted to give articulate expression to its pleasure or displeasure—no one can get up in the auditorium and give his ideas of the play or the players without imminent danger of being ejected for having disturbed the peace and enjoyment of the remainder of the audience. The spectators are the critics for whose benefit the performance is given, and if the management permit applause on the part of those who are pleased, they should also permit expressions of disapproval by those others who do not like it.—*Albany Law Journal.*

ONE OF THE most novel and curious actions at law we have come across in some time originated not long ago in Stroudsburg, Pa. Among the residents of that city is the Rev. E. L. Dixon, who, in a public prayer, invoked the divine vengeance upon a brewery that had been erected in that town. In his prayer the Rev. Dixon, after calling down curses upon the aforesaid brewery and its proprietors, according to newspaper reports, specifically urged God to strike it with lightning. Sure enough, not long afterward, during a violent storm, a bolt from heaven struck and partially wrecked the building; thereupon the owners brought suit for damages against Mr. Dixon, claiming that through his intercession and appeals the divine wrath had been brought down upon their property. The clergyman, in his answer, it is understood, puts forth the claim that he should not be held responsible for an act of divine providence, and this is the novel question with which the court will be compelled to wrestle. Such a plea would seem to indicate a woeful lack of faith in the power of prayer, yet perhaps it was the only plea he was able to make under the circumstances. The trial of this novel suit, if it ever comes to trial, ought to prove decidedly interesting. The Good Book tells us that all that one needs in order to have his prayers answered is faith. Did the Rev. Dixon possess it, and was that faith potential in calling down the divine vengeance upon the brewery referred to, or was its destruction so soon after the prayer a mere coincidence—one of those strange correspondences with which the busy world is filled? Here is a question which is calculated to cause the average juryman's hair to turn gray.—*Albany Law Journal.*