

---

Correspondence.

---

*To the Editor of the Canada Law Journal.*

DEAR SIR,—I observe that you have referred lately to a remarkably able work of Mr. Dicey's on the "Conflicts of Law," I do not think the work is sufficiently appreciated. It is without doubt the ablest work upon the subject of which it treats in the English language, and the day is probably not very far distant when it will be quoted in our courts on a similar footing as "Preston on Conveyancing."

While referring to this matter, will you also allow me space to refer to "Pollock & Maitland's History of English Law" and "Maitland's Domesday Book and Beyond"? I suppose the every-day lawyer would not take a great deal of interest in such works and yet no person can appreciate and understand the history of English law, its development and present status, without reading just such works as these, and certainly Pollock & Maitland's publication is one that should be read by every person whose aim is to be anything better than an office lawyer. I am not overlooking the fact that the lawyer who is busy in court day by day has but little spare time, and might, perhaps, doubt the utility of his wasting much of his valuable time upon works of this character, and yet, the curious person will, if he reads Pollock & Maitland, see that the case of *Queen v. Millis*, 10 Clark & Finelly 534, was improperly decided. The Court went astray because it misapprehended the legal effect of some old cases referred to by the respondent's counsel. See note 1, p. 370, vol. 2, Pollock & Maitland.

W. H. McCLIVE.

St. Catharines.