Canada Law Journal.

VOL. XXI. SEPTEMBER 1, 1885. No. 15.

DIARY FOR SEPTEMBER.

1. Tues.....Ct. of App. Sittings. Long vac., H. C. J., ends. Solicitors' Ex. Beauharnois, Governor of Canada, 1726.
2. Wed.....Barristers' Examination.
3. Thur.....Divisional Court Sittings, Chan. Div., H. C. J.
6. *Sun* .....*14th Sunday after Trinity.*
7. Mon.....Trinity Term Law Society begins.
8. Tues.....County Court Sittings (York) begin.
10. Thur.....Sebastopol taken, 1855.
11. Fri. .....Peter Russell, President, 1796.
12. Sat. .....Frontenac, Governor of Canada, 1672.
13. *Sun.* .....*15th Sunday after Trinity.* Quebec taken by British under Wolfe, 1759. O'Connor, J., C.P., 1884.

TORONTO, SEPTEMBER 1, 1885.

WE understand that Mr. Thomas Hodgins, Q.C., is preparing, and will shortly issue, an edition of the Franchise Act, with notes similar to the "Manual on Voters' Lists," published by him a few years ago.

WE have much pleasure in publishing in this issue a learned and exhaustive paper by His Honor Judge Senkler, of St. Catharines, on the Jurisdiction of the Courts of General Sessions of the Peace in the Province of Ontario. It is a very valuable summary of the learning on the subject. The paper was read before the Board of County Judges at their last meeting.

A CORRESPONDENT calls attention in a letter which we publish elsewhere to what he considers a serious abuse, viz., allowing barristers and solicitors to practise as such whilst holding office as police magistrates and justices of the peace. These fountains of justice should be kept free from even the appearance of pollution, and the subject is one worthy of consideration by those in authority. If the objections alluded to are well taken let police magistrates be properly paid and retire from all professional business. It might also in connection with the above be considered whether these magistrates should have the power to try some of the very important cases which now sometimes come before them. We should be glad to have the views of correspondents on this subject.

ASSIGNMENT OF CHOSE IN ACTION—RIGHT OF SUIT.

Prior to the 35 Vict. c. 12 (O.), now R. S. O. c. 116, ss. 6-11, a difference prevailed at law and in equity in this Province as to the effect of an assignment of a chose in action. At law, except in the case of negotiable instruments, an assignee of a chose in action could not in general sue for its recovery in his own name. An exception existed where the chose in action was a debt, and the debtor had expressly assented to the assignment (*Surtees* v. *Hubbard*, 4 Esp. 204). Privity between the debtor and assignee was absolutely necesssary, otherwise no direct liability from the former to the latter was created (*Price* v. *Easton*, 1 N. & M. 303). Theoretically, at law, a chose in action was not assignable. The inconveniences resulting from this theory, were, however, to some extent surmounted even at law, by the right which the assignee had, to use the name of the assignor as plaintiff in any action he might desire to bring for the recovery of the chose in action assigned.

On the other hand this theory of the common law was never adopted in equit