

have been made and proved, under the particular circumstances of this case, to warrant the interference of a Court of Equity, to place the fund in a different situation from that directed by the testator, we think but little doubt can be entertained. The legatee for life was the first object of his bounty," &c. Again on page 32, of the same decision, the Court says "But no case has been found where, without an allegation of danger or misconduct, a legatee for life, as in this case, has been decreed to give security on the application of those having an interest in remainder. If there be such a case it has escaped our researches". Again on page 33. "It is true that where the bequest to the legatee for life, is of a sum of money the reason for requiring security from the legatee for life may be stronger, than in the case of a bequest of specific chattels; but we do not think that the Court ought to exercise an arbitrary power of requiring security in such a case, where the