

v. *Grant*, and whether the decision in that case does or does not in fact conflict with the recent decision of the Court of Appeal in *Hall v. Prittie*, 17 Ont. App., 306, we think it is quite plain that the latter, at all events, is in entire conformity with the well-settled principle of law: that in order to constitute a good equitable assignment, there must be a specific designation of the fund intended to be affected; and although, as Lord Hardwicke said in the leading case of *Row v. Dawson*, 1 Ves. Sr., 332, in order to constitute a good equitable assignment of a *chose in action*, "any words will do, no particular words being necessary thereto," yet the words employed must at least clearly indicate the *chose in action* intended to be assigned; or to use the words of Sir John Leach, V.C., in *Watson v. Duke of Wellington*, 1 Russ & My., 602, "in order to constitute an equitable assignment there must be an engagement to pay out of a particular fund" (p.605). The authorities are too numerous and too unanimous on this point to leave any room for doubt.

#### MEETING OF THE COUNTY JUDGES.

The seventeenth annual meeting of the County Judges of Ontario was held last June, but no official report of the proceedings was published.

These meetings, which are held annually at the expense of the Judges themselves, are productive of much good; and, while there are doubtless many and sufficient reasons why full reports of these meetings should not be made public, there were on this occasion, as on others, some matters discussed of general interest, which we have obtained leave to refer to, and to mention the conclusions arrived at by the Judges then present.

At the request of the Inspector of Legal Offices, a discussion took place regarding various questions relating to the Surrogate Court.

In reference to the practice of having a separate order approving of the Bond in Administration matters, it was considered that one order might be made to embrace the approval of the Bond and the grant of letters of Administration.

As to whether a charge should be made for the order for inventory, the conclusion was reached that the order was expedient and proper, and that it should direct that a full inventory be filed within sixty days. It was also considered that the words, "Of or about the value of," etc., used in the present affidavit of value, were too vague.

It was thought that orders requiring only trifling alterations should not be charged for; a very sensible conclusion, which possibly may enable certain of the "deceased," who would like to take their worldly goods with them, to rest more easily in their six feet of freehold.

The Judges were of the opinion that the Registrar is only bound to prepare papers when brought in by the parties themselves, or where the amount is under \$400.00; in all other cases the papers for Probate should be presented through a solicitor, since the preparation and proof leading to Probate and Grant, being often difficult and important, should not be entrusted to incompetent or irresponsible persons.