

stantly. When I want an argument I go to the American reports, and very frequently I find in the judgments what I want. But of course I don't cite the cases as authorities.' From this it was an easy stage to citing the decisions as on the same footing as a view expressed in a work by Lord St. Leonards or Mr. Dart would be cited in the Chancery Division—that is to say, as the opinion of lawyers of exceptional learning and experience. But latterly it would appear that the practice has arisen of citing the decisions of American and English courts indiscriminately as if they were equally binding on questions of English law. This is, of course, an error; but we conceive that the error lies in the mode of citation, not in the citation itself. Most English lawyers know that there are probably no decisions upon which more anxious deliberation is bestowed than those of the Supreme Court of the United States, and the opinion of that court on a point not yet covered by English authority is entitled to, and would doubtless receive the most respectful consideration from any of our judges. The matter to which the observations of the Court of Appeal were addressed was, we conceive, merely the citation of American authorities as binding on English Courts. It may be remembered that in *Steel v. Dixon*, 17 Chy.D. 825, in which an important and novel point on the law of suretyship arose, Lord Justice Fry (then Mr. Justice Fry), while holding that the point was governed by the principle established by the well known case of *Dering v. Earl of Winchelsea*, 1 Cox 318, added, that in coming to this conclusion, as he did upon principle, he was much strengthened by the American authorities to which his attention had been called by counsel, and he mentioned Mr. Justice Story's *Equity Jurisprudence*, and read passages from the judgments of American courts. We can hardly suppose that the learned Lord Justice has completely altered his estimate of the weight which is to be attributed to American decisions."

THE BEST HUNDRED LAW BOOKS.—A writer in the *Irish Law Times* suggests that it would be a very useful thing if some one would prepare a concise and comprehensive list of good law books, including such works as would be most necessary for the general practitioner. "The list," he adds, "should, according to my view, include the leading and most reliable standard works on the different branches of international, constitutional, criminal, property, commercial and maritime law, the best books on practice and specialty subjects, and to be brief, the best of the many treatises which exist, but are only to be accidentally met with—not always when they are wanted—on the miscellaneous subjects turning up from day to day in the course of business. Such a list need not necessarily contain, or be confined to, a hundred books, but that seems to be the fashionable number in those matters, and in the present instance is not, perhaps, too ample, though it may be the reverse. If you think my hint worth any consideration, you may be kind enough to initiate a list, and you could hardly be troubled with very much discussion on the subject of it. Before concluding, you will let me add that I feel a difficulty such as Byron had in offering a translation of the 'Romaic expression of tenderness' occurring in 'Maid of Athens.' Many of