

the only means by which this very important branch of the law can be brought into harmony with the views which have come into vogue since its foundations were laid—a remark which, it may be observed in passing, is to some extent applicable to our own country as well as to the United States, to which the article has a more special reference, though the doctrine of assumption of risks has, so far as the English colonies are concerned, been deprived of much of its sting by the well-known case of *Smith v. Baker* (1891) *L.C.* 325, whilst the “Workmen’s Compensation Act” has done away with a few of the more odious results of the defence of common employment.

We have recently given the profession in this Dominion the benefit of the learned writer’s views on a recent judgment of the Court of Appeal for Ontario, touching on another point in the law of Master and Servant. (See ante, p. 587). Letters received show that his very able criticism has, in the opinion of at least some of the leading members of the profession, seriously impaired the value of the decision referred to.

ENGLISH CASES.

EDITORIAL REVIEW OF CURRENT ENGLISH DECISIONS.

(Registered in accordance with the Copyright Act).

FRAUD—JUDGMENT OBTAINED BY—PRACTICE—ACTION TO SET ASIDE JUDGMENT OBTAINED BY FRAUD.

Cole v. Langford (1898) 2 *Q.B.* 36, was an action brought to set aside a judgment in a previous action which had been obtained by false and fraudulent evidence. The action was undefended. The motion for judgment in default of defence was heard before a Divisional Court (Ridley and Phillimore, JJ.), who, after hearing argument, held that there was jurisdiction to entertain the action, and judgment was granted as prayed; Phillimore, J., referring to *Priestman v. Thomas* (1884) 9 *P.D.* 210, where similar relief was granted.