

441; *Gaskins v. Atlanta*, 73 Ga. 746. This duty is owed not only to the public using the streets, but also to persons not on the highway.

The stage, then, was all set for a tragedy—the plaintiff John Young, lying in his bed about seven in the morning of the 8th March, with the light which hung over his bed for reading purposes turned on, noticed a sparkling which indicated, as he thought, that the lamp was going out: he then took hold of the oscillating lamp with his left hand, and knew no more till some time after. His mother came into his room and saw his hand blazing and also his head where it came in contact with the iron bedstead—then his hand dropped from the lamp, and the blazing ceased. Medical aid was sought at once. Dr. Parfitt was in attendance without delay, and other surgeons were sent for. Mrs. Parfitt saw about 7.35 a.m. the guy wire at E. steaming, and at about 7.45 the tree (C. on the plan) smoking or steaming—throwing off a white vapour. At this time . . . Briddick had not cut the guy wire E.; this he did later, and the danger was over.

Experts called for the defence gave evidence that the injuries to the plaintiff John Young were, in their opinion, caused by a low tension current of 110 volts. . . . In addition to the evidence of the electrical experts called for the plaintiff, whose evidence I believe, and who testified that the current causing the injuries was not a low tension current of about 110 volts, and consequently a current which, without negligence on the part of the defendants, might have been looked for, but that it was a current of high tension which should not have been in the house at all, the plaintiffs called Dr. Parfitt, who testified that the condition of the lad indicated and would prove that the current was of high tension. The heart of the patient was beating full and regularly immediately after the shock, but his breathing had been temporarily suspended. The witness said that high tension currents (when they do not kill) arrest the breathing, but do not stop the heart. I accept this evidence. If I am to be permitted to use knowledge obtained from scientific and medical treatises—as to which *Wigmore on Evidence*, secs. 1690, 1700, 2566, may be consulted—the evidence of Dr. Parfitt will be found to be supported by authority. . . .

[Quotations from *Tousey's Medical Electricity* (Phila. and London, 1910), p. 346; *H. Lewis Jones's Medical Electricity*, 4th ed. (1904), p. 251.]

On all grounds, then, I find the contention of the defendants that the current which did the mischief was the ordinary 110 volt current, disproved.