was any reasonable prospect of securing a customer, his time and his method of procedure were his own. He might travel on foot, on horseback, by trolley, train, or automobile. He might write, telephone, or telegraph. He was wholly free as to time, place or weather. Under such circumstances, where one accepts an invitation to ride an injury received is not "occasioned by the nature of the employment."

The danger incident to the use of an automobile is not a "causative danger" "peculiar to the work," but is a risk which is common to all persons using one. The injury can not be said reasonably to have been contemplated as the result of the exposure of the employment. [Cases cited.]

It becomes unnecessary to decide whether Hewitt was an employee within the meaning of the workmen's compensation act.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION—INJURY ARISING OUT OF EMPLOYMENT—PLAYFUL ASSAULT OF FELLOW WORKMAN—*Federal Rubber Co.* v. *Havolic et al., Supreme Court of Wisconsin (Feb. 1, 1916), 156 Northwestern Reporter, page 143.*—The industrial commission awarded compensation to John Havolic, which was confirmed by the circuit court, whereupon the employer appealed to the supreme court. Havolic was an employee of the rubber company, and in the room where he worked was a compressed-air system with hose and nozzles, with which in his work he had nothing to do. At the close of the day's work he took down a nozzle and proceeded to blow the dust from his clothes. This was forbidden by a rule, but the practice was common, and there was proof that it was acquiesced in by the foreman. While the employee was so engaged, another workman took the nozzle from his hands and as a practical joke applied it to Havolic's body, causing injuries which necessitated treatment in the hospital for several weeks and a disability of 17 weeks. The court left undecided the question whether an injury arising while cleaning the clothing might have been considered as arising out of the employment, but held that the result of such "inexcusable and revolting horseplay" could not by any means be so considered, and reversed the judgment.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION—INJURY ARISING OUT OF EMPLOYMENT—TAKING POISON BY MISTAKE FOR MEDICINE—*O'Neil* v. *Carley Heater Co. et al., Court of Appeals of New York (June 16, 1916), 113 Northeastern Reporter, page 406.*—The proceeding of Mary E. O'Neil for compensation for the death of her husband was opposed by his employer, the company named, and its insurer. The company was installing machinery for another company, and an employee of the latter told O'Neil, who was suffering from some illness, to take some Epsom salts, and informed him where a large quantity of these were stored in the factory. O'Neil by mistake