

a question, whereupon the counsel requested him to answer his own question. The cross-examination continued on this novel plan, the witness alternately asking and then answering his own questions. It is safe to say the genial professor now believes that cross-examination is not necessarily a cross-harrowing of the witness, and that there is such a thing as a courteous cross-examiner.—*Case and Comment.*

SIMON MAGUS AND HIS FOLLOWERS.—The Supreme Court of Nebraska has recently rendered a decision embodied in a peculiar opinion, and arising on a peculiar state of facts. A law prohibits the practice of medicine without a certificate from the State Board of Health. One Ezra M. Buswell, who had never had a medical education, and had received no certificate, was accused of violating the law. He was a believer in "Christian science," and testimony was introduced to show that persons came to him afflicted with various infirmities. He would put his hands upon them and urge them to believe that they were cured, and after prayers and exhortations the afflicted persons would sometimes declare that they were cured, and depart satisfied with the treatment. The defendant did not deny that he had applied the principles of "Christian science" in treating sick persons, but defended himself on the ground that his doings were simply religious acts, and that no law could be passed interfering with the enjoyment of liberty in religious matters. The Supreme Court met the defendant on his own ground, and the opinion is largely made up from quotations from the Scriptures to show that the use of the power of healing by faith for money was even in Bible times condemned. Several verses are quoted from the eighth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, in which Simon is rebuked for endeavouring to purchase the power of healing which the Apostle Peter possessed. The incident of the receiving of a reward by Gehazi from Naaman and his consequent punishment are quoted from the fifth chapter of the second book of Kings, and a reference is also made to the disapproval of Balaam's plan of profiting by the use of the divine power. It had been shown that the "Christian scientist" frequently received compensation for his treatment of a diseased person. The Supreme Court held that neither the pretence of worship nor the performance of any other duty should exonerate the defendant from the punishment attached to the violation of the law.—*Albany Law Journal.*

ERRATA.

Pp. 628, 629—For "Ont. Rules 309, 314," read "Ont. Rules 427, 429, 444," p. 633. For "Ont. Rules 618," read "Ont. Rules 880-881."