Washington Law Review

Volume 28 Number 3 *Washington Legislation—1953*

8-1-1953

Editor's Notes

Hugh McGough

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.law.uw.edu/wlr

Recommended Citation

Hugh McGough, Editors Notes, *Editor's Notes*, 28 Wash. L. Rev. & St. B.J. viii (1953). Available at: https://digitalcommons.law.uw.edu/wlr/vol28/iss3/2

This Editors Notes is brought to you for free and open access by the Law Reviews and Journals at UW Law Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Washington Law Review by an authorized editor of UW Law Digital Commons. For more information, please contact cnyberg@uw.edu.

WASHINGTON LAW REVIEW

AND

STATE BAR JOURNAL

VOLUME 28

AUGUST, 1953

NUMBER 3

CONTENTS

WASHINGTON LEGISLATION—1953
CIVIL RIGHTSJohn B. Sholley
Racial Discrimination
CORPORATIONSJ. Gordon Gose
Corporate Charitable Contributions
CREDITORS' RIGHTSWarren L. Shattuck
Labor Liens-Restaurant, Hotel, Tavern, Etc. Employees 1
CRIMINAL LAWJohn B. Sholley
Subversion
DOMESTIC RELATIONSJohn W. Richards
Family Desertion—Non-Support
EVIDENCE John W. Richards Copies of Business and Public Records as Evidence 1
Copies of Business and Public Records as Evidence
PROPERTY
Alien Land Law 1
Survivorship in Joint Tenancies
SALESRobert M. Taylor
Bulk Sales Law
Motor Vehicles 1
SOCIAL LEGISLATIONJohn B. Sholley
Unemployment Compensation
Workmen's Compensation
Compensation for Civil Defense Workers
Public Assistance
STATE GOVERNMENT
Legislative Procedure
TAXATIONAlfred Harsh 1
TORTSJohn W. Richards Survival of Actions—Death of Tort-Feasor2
DEPORTATION AS A DENIAL OF SUBSTANTIVE DUE PROCESS
WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION—EMPLOYEES IN DUAL
ACTIVITY
RECENT CASES
BOOK REVIEWS 2

Subscription price, \$1.20 per annum; single copy, 50 cents. Published quarterly in February, May, August, and November by the Washington Law Review Association, 205 Condon Hall, University of Washington, Seattle 5, Washington. Entered as second-class matter February 27, 1937, at the Post Office of Seattle, Washington, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

EDITORIAL BOARD OF THE LAW SCHOOL

Hugh McGough. Editor

ROBERT S. MUCKLESTONE, Associate Editor Myron J. CARLSON, Contributions Editor DALE RIVELAND, Revision Editor MICHAEL MINES. Business Manager

Alan F. Austin IOANNNE BAILEY ROBERT F. BRACHTENBACH ROGER I. LEWIS NEWMAN L. DOTSON GEORGE K. FALER

Eugene A. Greenway GORDON TAYNES IVOR LUSTY

JAMES F. MCATEER THOMAS E. SMAIL, IR. WILLIAM S. STINNETTE PHILIP A. TRAUTMAN

WILLIAM E. LOVE, Faculty Adviser JOHN W. RICHARDS, Faculty Business Manager

EDITOR'S NOTES

Professor Milton D. Green, faculty adviser of the Law Review for the past six years, has left Condon Hall to become Dean of Washington University Law School in St. Louis. When Professor Green was appointed to the Review in 1948, his position was "Editor-in-Chief." He immediately renounced the title, became "Faculty Adviser," and for the first time put editorial policy in the hands of the students. Since that time, the editorial board has consisted of a practically autonomous group of students. Unquestionably, the value of the Review as an educational tool has been multiplied by the reform. The increased student interest has added to the quality of their articles. Professor Green instituted a change for which we and the future members of the board owe him thanks.

The comment on employees in dual activity is one of a contemplated series of articles on various phases of the Workmen's Compensation Act. It is hoped that they will be of some aid to the proposed committee which is to redraft the Act. The maze of inconsistency and confusion resulting from much legislative patchwork and no comprehensive revision, anything but alleviated by the reshuffling of the RCW compilers, is illustrated by the recent cases of Latimer v. Western Machinery Exchange, 40 Wn. 2d 155 (1952), reversed on rehearing, 142 Wash. Dec. 693 (1953) and Pink v. Rayonier, 40 Wn. 2d 188 (1952), reversed on rehearing, 142 Wash. Dec. 705 (1953). The earlier cases were unanimous departmental opinions. The same judges wrote the en banc decisions, also unanimous, which reversed the earlier decisions. The court was dealing with an anomaly, employers with no employees. At present, such self-employers are eligible for benefits under the act, contrary to the prior interpretation by the Department of Labor and Industries. Such eligibility, however, does not of itself preclude an action in tort against a third person employer covered by the Act, contrary to the assumption of appellant, respondent and the court in the departmental hearing of the above cases.

Hugh McGough