ascertained either by a special contract between them or by an application of the ordinary rules which govern all other classes of bailments. As, however, this special liability of carriers still exists, its logical consequences should be admitted, and it seems more consistent with general principle to hold with Martin, B., that a carrier is liable as carrier so long as he holds goods under the original bailment for the purposes of carriage than to decide with Bramwell and Channell, BB., that a carrier's liability is divided into two parts, although there is but one contract, and that the carrier is liable as an insurer while the goods are actually been carried, but is only liable as an ordinary bailee after the carriage is over; especially as it may be that a deposit of the goods after the transit is over is as necessary an incident of their carriage as the placing them in a truck upon the railway. As the case stands at present, however, the opinion of the majority of the learned judges constitutes an authority in favor of their view of this question.—*Solicitors' Journal.*

A WORD ABOUT LAW LIBRARIES.

BY F. W. HACKETT.

It is said that a distinguished professor once commented as follows upon a grammar in which the author had made an ostentatious parade of learning: "I do not like to see a man put all that he knows into one book." No doubt many a man can do this, and the result would not be an inconveniently bulky volume either; still, it must be admitted that our indignant critic's position was well taken. Let us reverse the process, however, and we do not find so much to condemn. A man may acquire all his book-learning from a single work, and, if he only pursue his study with dilligence, his attainments may by no means be despised. Indeed, there is an oriental saying: "Beware of the man of one book."

Frequently one most thoroughly enjoys a book when absent from home, or at some point where reading matter is inaccessible, and where the volume that engages the attention is almost the only one at hand. It is not so much that you must read that, or nothing at all, as it is that there is nothing else to divert the attention. Every one must have felt the difficulty of confining himself to the perusal of a single volume while in the midst of a large library. The influence of the surroundings is distracting. The temptation is almost irresistible to "browse around," to take down this or that book, as fancy dictates, and glance over a few pages, till a new train of thought, or a more engaging title draws off the attention in another direction. Magazines and newspapers, when found in connection with a general library, have much to answer for in seducing readers from the enjoyment of more solid reading.

It is especially true in law studies that long continuous study, and a careful reviewing of a few books, will make a good and accurate lawyer, so far as a knowledge of the books will make a lawyer at all. Many a leader at the bar, distinguished for profound legal acquirements, has astonished the world by the scantiness of his law library. Where a man is carrying the contents of his books in his head the number of volumes need not be large. Judge Marshall studied but few text-books, but those he mastered. His opinions are remarkable for an almost entire absence of authorities.

To day, it is not considered absolutely necessary for a student to read Coke on Littleton. But, in old times, no one was thought fit to enter upon practice without a painstaking and protracted seeking of these fountains of the law. The anecdote will bear repetition of the student who had been set to work upon Coke, and had read it four times. Upon asking his preceptor, a most eminent lawyer, "What shall I take up now?" the reply was, "Read Coke again." There was a grim humor about the advice, but, if faithfully followed, we do not believe the student's time was misemployed. If law treatises were read for their freshness, our young friend had already studied Coke four times too many. But to master a tough subject, to comprehend a proposition that fairly makes your head ache, is to train the intellect and to develop the lawyer. An esteemed judge, of deservedly high reputation for his ready knowledge of common law and his acute and logical opinions, once remarked that the only books he ever studied were Blackstone, Kent, and Chitty on Pleading. "They were all that were put into my hands," said he "but I read them over and over again." * * * * *

It is by no means a misfortune to a young practitioner that he has not easy access to a large or a complete law library. Of course, if there is one in his town, he ought to avail himself of its advantages. At a certain stage, in almost every case, the more thorough the search into the authorities the better. But there is great profit in arguing out a case upon general principles, and prosecuting the line of argument as far as one can without seriously feeling the need of authority. When the point has been well thought upon, the decisions may be looked up to more advantage. Where counsel are well aware that every report and treatise is close at hand for reference the temptation is strong to do nothing in the way of original reasoning, but simply to hunt up and classify what the judges have hitherto said upon the subject. To be sure, dissecting an opinion, comparing it with the case at bar, and determining just what it is worth, as authority, requires the best talent of the lawyer. Not seldom, too, in the pressure of a large practice, a point must be set up and sustained in a hurry, and the ready lawyer knows just what books to consult, how to find the cases bearing upon the question, and how to "eviscerate" (as Choate would say) their meaning.