

To the Ontario lawyer the publication of this great work will prove an inestimable boon. We have no modern book dealing with our own statute (R.S.O., c. 160). Mr. G. S. Holmsted's treatise on was published in 1893; but many important amendments have been made to the statute since then, and numerous cases interpreting its provisions have come before the courts.

The present English Act of 1897 is materially different from our own, so that modern English text books and cases are likely to mislead the unwary practitioner who consults them. Hence the publication of the present work is very opportune and we can heartily recommend it as a valuable, if not indispensable, addition to the library of the practising lawyer.

The reader is warned by the author that, as a general rule, no cases are cited which are of a later date than those collected in the volumes of the General and American Digests which were published in the spring of 1902. This disarms criticism as to the absence of cases, and may be the reason for the non-appearance of *McHugh v. G.T.R.* (1900) 32 O.R. 234 (a); (1901) 2 O.L.R. 600, upon the effect of the maxim, "actio personalis moritur cum personâ"; and of *Roberts v. Taylor* (1899) 31 O.R. 10, and *Fahey v. Jephcott* (1901) 2 O.L.R. 449, on the effect of disregard of statutory directions. But this hardly explains the absence of any reference to the important case of *Cameron v. Nystrom* (1893) A.C. 308 (b), on the subject of common employment.

While this method of dealing with cases has advantages, it is not one to be imitated, unless the starting point for the reader's independent investigation is brought up much closer to the date of publication of the book than is the case in the present instance, where a book published in 1904 does not, except in regard to the English Workmen's Act of 1897, which is made an exception to the

---

(a) It may be noted that this case merely illustrates the application of the Fatal Accidents Act. The plaintiff was, as it happened, a servant; but this fact is not perhaps a differentiating element in such a sense that it must be deemed improper to omit the case in a work dealing with the relation of the master and servant. The effect of damage acts of this description is adverted to generally in ss. 716, 844; but the topic as a whole was doubtless regarded by the author as being outside the scope of the treatise.—Ed. C.L.J.

(b) This was an action brought against a person who was not the master of the plaintiff. The reader will find the general rule applicable under such circumstances referred to in ss. 490, 491. In note 2 to that section it is stated that such cases are discussed in the third volume, and the reason for this arrangement is also stated.—Ed. C.L.J.