MIDDLETON, J.

FEBRUARY 9TH, 1911.

RE LENZ.

Will—Construction—Avoidance of Intestacy—Indication of Intention to Dispose of whole Estate—Residuary Estate— Division into Shares—Deduction of Insurance Moneys from Shares—Testacy or Intestacy as to Insurance Moneys.

Motion by the executors of the will of C. F. Lenz, deceased, under Con. Rule 938, for an order declaring the true construction of the will.

F. R. Martin, for the executors.

E. D. Armour, K.C., for two sisters of the testator.

I. F. Hellmuth, K.C., for the infant son of the testator.

J. Bicknell, K.C., for the widow.

Middle Mi

It is said that the Court leans against intestacy, but that statement is often rashly made and without considering its necessary limitations. When there is in truth an intestacy, the Court must not invent a will merely because it may suspect that, if the events that have come to pass had been present to the testator's mind, he would have provided how his estate should then be dealt with. If he has not made provision for all contingencies, his silence involves intestacy. The warning of Romer, J., in In re Edwards, [1906] 1 Ch. 574, against the undue extension of the rule, is salutary. With the view of avoiding intestacy, you are not to do otherwise than to construe plain words according to their plain meaning. When a man makes a will, he intends to die testate only so far as he has expressed himself in his will. When an intention is clearly