

show you a fine stroke." He immediately took his gun, levelled it, deliberately took aim at Mr. Scull, who imagined him in jest, and shot both the balls through his body. He then went up to the dying man, who was still sensible, and said to him, "Sir, I have no malice or ill-will against you; I never saw you before; but I was determined to kill somebody that I might be hanged, and you happen to be the man; and I am sorry for your misfortune." Mr. Scull had just time left in this world to send for his friends and make his will. He forgave his murderer, and, if it could be done, desired he might be pardoned. Bruluman died on the gallows, exulting in the success of a scheme by which he deemed himself not guilty of his own death, though he effectually shortened his own life.—*The Green Bag.*

GENERAL NOTES.

NEW COMPETITORS.—A New York judge, says a contemporary, has appointed three women lawyers receivers of insolvent estates. What is going to become of the men if this sort of thing continues?

JUDICIAL KNOWLEDGE.—A Federal judge lately charged a jury in a liquor case as follows: "In later years there seems to have been a disposition to deny or ignore judicial knowledge as to what constitutes intoxicating liquors, and the courts have manifested a desire to disavow any judicial knowledge on this subject. At the same time some of the courts have not hesitated to impute to juries an extensive knowledge and information in this regard. This court, however, will follow the precedent established by the decision of Chancellor Walworth upon this subject, and will assume judicial knowledge concerning intoxicating liquors..... In a trial in the state of Wisconsin, where this question arose in 1883, the trial judge declared that a man must be almost a drivelling idiot who did not know what beer was, and that it was not necessary to prove it to be an intoxicating liquor. Later the Supreme Court of that State, in passing on the charge of the trial judge, declared that his rulings in the case upon this question were not only clearly correct, but if his peculiar manner gave them force and emphasis it was not only proper but commendable. This court, therefore, will neither stultify itself nor impeach its own veracity by telling you that it has not judicial knowledge that the liquor commonly known as 'whiskey' is an intoxicating liquor, or that the drink commonly called a 'whiskey cocktail' is an intoxicating drink."