

their attaining 21, and as to £50 on their attaining 25, and the balance of £100 to be paid James on his attaining 30 and the balance of £50 to John and Frederick on their attaining 30. James survived the testatrix and attained 21, and received the first installment. He died before attaining 25. The point submitted for Joyce, J. to decide was whether the legacies were vested or contingent. He held that they were vested, and, there being no gift over, the balance of the legacy to James with the interest which had accrued thereon was immediately payable to his personal representative.

WILL—CONSTRUCTION—POWER OF SALE—POWER GIVEN “TO MY TRUSTEES”—EXERCISE OF POWER BY SURVIVING TRUSTEE—MARRIED WOMAN’S PROPERTY ACT, 1882 (45-46 VICT. C. 75) s. 5—(R.S.O. C. 163, s. 7)—REVERSIONARY INTEREST IN LAND.

*In re Bacon, Toovey v. Turner* (1907) 1 Ch. 475. Two points were involved, First, whether a power of sale given to two or more trustees to whom the legal estate in the trust property was devised before any of the Acts giving statutory powers of sale to trustees, could be exercised by surviving trustees, or a sole surviving trustee. Eady, J., held that it could, and that the contrary rule never applied except to a bare power. The second point was whether a married woman who before the passing of the Married Woman’s Property Act, 1882, was entitled to a reversion in land, which after the passing of the Act, but before her estate fell into possession, was converted into money, was to be deemed to have acquired such property after the passing of the Act so as to make it her separate property under that Act, and this question the learned judge answered in the negative he holding that the conversion of the land into money gave her no new title.

PRACTICE—ADMINISTRATION—CONCURRENT ACTIONS—CONDUCT OF PROCEEDINGS.

*In re Ross, Wingfield v. Blair* (1907) 1 Ch. 482. There were several concurrent actions for the administration of a deceased person’s estate, and the question was as to which of the plaintiffs should be given the conduct of the proceedings. Eady, J., decided that, although the general rule in such cases is, that the plaintiff who first commenced proceedings is the person entitled