rages has been alluded to, but of the civil remedies we have heard nothing. Probably the latter were not worth discussing, or possibly the parents of the fiends have made some settlement with the injured parties. This is quite a different thing from accidents arising from the rough-and-tumble games, characteristic of Anglo-Saxons, and which have something to do with the aggressive and dominant spirit that has carried that race to the front of the nations of the earth. Claims in connection with such mishaps do not often come into court. We notice, however, in this connection, the case of *Markley* v. *Whitman*, decided by the Supreme Court of Michigan in April, 1893 (54 N.W.R. 763). It appears that certain students engaged in a game of "rush" by which they form in a line, each one in the rear pushing the one in advance of him, and so on through the line until the one to be "rushed," and who is ignorant of what is coming, is rushed upon by the one in his rear. It was held that the game was a dangerous one, and the student who is "rushed" and unintentionally injures an unsuspecting fellow-student, who is not participating in the play, is guilty of an assault, and liable for damages; and that it is no defence that he was pushed by the others, or that he did not anticipate the consequences, or that the person injured was a fellow-student and not a stranger.

RIGHTS AND REMEDIES IN A FORECLOSURE ACTION.

(WALKER V. DICKSON, 20 A.R. 96.)

In law, no less than in other branches of science, we have our specialists, whose opinions are valuable in the ratio of the ability and knowledge they bring to bear upon a constantly recurring subject-matter.

If there be any one in Ontario whose opinion upon matters incidental to an action of foreclosure or sale might be taken to be conclusive, we should have thought that man was the Chancellor. But the Court of Appeal seems to have decided otherwise.

Walker v. *Dickson* is a noteworthy case in more respects than one. It introduces to us a species of mortgage which, if not absolutely unknown heretofore, is certainly a rare curiosity, and it places a much narrower construction upon the rule for avoiding