more than $200, and, if the claimant is right in his contention, she would have to abandon all excess over that sum in order to have an issue tried in that Court, which involves determining whether the claim set up by the claimant is legal and binding upon the moneys attached, and in the end it may be found that such claim has no foundation in law.

No qualification of or exception to the general jurisdiction conferred by Rule 920 is provided for, and it must therefore have been intended that in all cases of County Court attachments the County Judge would be empowered to determine whether a debt was attachable to the extent of satisfying the judgment, whether it exceeded $200 or not.

Being of opinion therefore that the County Court has jurisdiction to try this issue, and there appearing to be no good reason for transferring it to the High Court, the motion must be dismissed with costs.

JULY 9TH, 1904.

DIVISIONAL COURT.

SMITH v. CLARKSON.

Staying Proceedings—Action Trivial or Frivolous—Account—Previous Accounting before Surrogate Judge—Mala Fides—Insolvency of Plaintiff—Security for costs.

Appeal by plaintiff from order of ANGLIN, J., ante 593, staying the action unless the plaintiff should give security for costs.

F. E. Hodgins, K.C., for appellant.

W. E. Middleton, for defendant.

The judgment of the Court (MEREDITH, C.J., MACMAHON, J., TEETZEL, J.) was delivered by

MEREDITH, C.J.—It is clear that the Court has inherent jurisdiction to dismiss an action which is absolutely groundless.

The accounts which plaintiff brings his action to have taken have already been approved by the Judge in the proper Surrogate Court, and no ground whatever is suggested upon which they can be impeached, neither fraud nor mistake being shewn, and the accounts as so approved would be binding upon plaintiff in this action.

It was urged by Mr. Hodgins that the Surrogate Judge had no jurisdiction upon an appointment to pass the accounts to fix the trustee's remuneration, but with that we do not