

had happened. Owen Riley was called as a witness, having previously pleaded 'Guilty' to the charge of burglary. He said that the defendant had shot him from inside the kitchen door, and that there was a light in the room. Counsel for the defence submitted that even on the assumption that Higgins had shot Riley intentionally he could not be convicted, as he was acting reasonably in defence of his life and property when a felony had been committed. Mr. Justice Grantham ruled that there was no evidence against the prisoner of shooting with a felonious intention. He said that the prosecutor, having, by his own account, broken into the house and searched it for what he could steal, the prisoner, coming into the room as he did, was entitled to shoot at him. He therefore directed the jury to acquit the prisoner, who was thereupon discharged.

We notice a statement that the Georgia House of Delegates has voted down a proposition to increase the salary of the judges of the Superior Court from \$2,000 to \$2,500. The motive for this misplaced economy does not appear. It can have no connection, we presume, with the fact that lynch law has so largely replaced the ordinary methods of justice in the Southern States.

A peculiar question of the law of assault is before the Supreme Court of Massachusetts. The defendant is a milkman who had been accustomed to leave milk at an early hour at the plaintiff's house. At intervals he had entered the plaintiff's sleeping-room for the purpose of collecting his bill while his debtor was in bed. The evidence does not show that the plaintiff was reluctant to settle the claims against him. The method of collection was merely a usage to which he submitted. But after a while he grew tired of it, and notified the milkman to discontinue the practice. One morning, however, the defendant, wanting his money and not finding the