

tarily, only because he continued in the employment of his employer with knowledge of the defect, negligence, act or omission, which caused his injury.*

3. An action will now lie against the representatives of a deceased employer.

4. Contracts surrendering the benefits of the Act are void† unless made in pursuance of a request in writing by the workman, and unless it be shown that the employer undertook to make, so long as the workman continued in his service, an adequate contribution to the insurance of the workman, and has duly fulfilled such undertaking. On an application by a workman or the employer of a workman (a) in any coal mine, metalliferous mine, factory, or workshop, or (b) in any other employment, a Secretary of State in the former case, and the Board of Trade in the latter, may decide whether a proposed contract is good, and not that contract alone but other similar contracts shall be governed by the decision without further proof.

5. The benefits of the Act are extended to seamen, except that if a seaman is injured elsewhere than in a port of the United Kingdom, (a) the employer is not liable unless the injury arose from a defect in the condition or equipment of the ship, existing at the time when she last proceeded to sea from a port in the United Kingdom, and the defect or failure to discover it arose from the negligence of the employer or some person entrusted by him with authority on that behalf, and (b) it shall be a valid defence for the employer to show that the ship or its equipment was in accordance with the rules of the Board of Trade at the time of last proceeding from a port in the United Kingdom.

That the new Act will not itself be affected by the involuntary legislation which suitors initiate, cannot of course be affirmed, but it appears to be a well-drafted and comprehensive measure, framed with an intelligent appreciation of the defects of the existing law.

2 Essex Court Temple, London.

A. WOOD RENTON.

THE CURRICULUM OF THE LAW SCHOOL.

At last the Law School, so long in contemplation and the theme of such manifold discussions, is about to become an accomplished fact. The learned Principal, after a tour of investigation among similar institutions in the United States, and with such assistance as he has been able to avail himself of, has the satisfaction of seeing the institution over which he is to preside assume definite form. A curriculum and course of instruction for the school have been drawn up, submitted to the Legal Education Committee, recommended by that committee for the consideration of Convocation, and finally approved by that body and issued for the information of those interested in the school.

We are glad that the scheme is at last practically in operation, and that the Law Society is for the future to be something more in relation to legal education

*This provision gives legislative validity to the decision in *Thrussell v. Handyside*, 20 Q.B.D. 359.

†C.P. *Griffiths v. Lord Dudley*, 9 Q.B.D. 157.