

There is much common sense in some of the remarks contained in an address recently given to students of a law class in the Michigan University. What was there said is largely true here. The lecturer was of the opinion that it was a mistake for students to desire to go to large offices in cities for their legal training, in that there is much more practical and helpful education and experience to be gained in the office of a good reputable country practitioner than in the offices of the leaders of the Bar; and education, let it be remembered, is not merely book learning. Practitioners in large cities very commonly find that the most useful students are not town bred university men, but country boys who have commenced their studies in localities where it was a necessity to read up and find out the law and work out questions of practice for themselves, rather than to take the easy way, too common, for example, in Toronto, of asking others what they should do under certain circumstances. Theoretical knowledge and law schools are all right so far as they go; but they do not go all the way.

Although in some of the older commentaries on the common law as well as in some of the ancient reports (e.g. Y.B. 1 Edw. II. [Seld. Soc.] p. 33) the Latin term 'causa' is used to denote 'consideration,' it must not be confounded with the 'causa' of the civil law. In that system of jurisprudence while the term 'causa,' according to some writers (see Rogron "Code Civil," in *Codes Français Expliqués*, p. 209), means more than the mere motive which would induce a man to bind himself by an agreement, yet it is undoubtedly something less than 'consideration' in the common law. Under our system 'causa' invariably connotes a valuable inducement for a promise. The civilians, on the other hand, will enforce a promise without inquiring into the value of the inducement for it; and when we meet with the expression 'without cause' in their law it does not mean that there was no consideration for the promise, but that the consideration has failed,—for instance, to quote an example found in the books, if one gives a promise to pay 100 aurei, at the end of six months, in consideration of a sum intended to be lent, and the money is never lent, the promise cannot be enforced because the agreement is sine causa. In the case of *Thomas v. Thomas*, 2 Q.B. 851,