SUTHERLAND, J.

JANUARY 17TH, 1913.

## RE GOLD AND ROWE.

Deed-Construction-Grant "in Fee Simple",—Habendum Bar of Entail—Act respecting Short Forms of Conveyances -Act respecting Assurances of Estates Tail.

Application by Mary T. Gold, the vendor, under the Vendors and Purchasers Act, 10 Edw. VII. ch. 58, for a declaration that a deed of the 8th December, 1906, from W. S. Gold to his wife, the applicant, was sufficient to bar the entail created by the will of David I. Pool will of David L. Reed.

Eric N. Armour, for the purchaser, Frederick T. Rowe. J. A. McEvoy, for the vendor.

SUTHERLAND, J.:—One David L. Reed was the owner of the perty in question and distributed in the state of the perty in question and distributed in the state of the perty in question and distributed in the state of the perty in question and distributed in the state of the perty in question and distributed in the state of the perty in question and distributed in the state of the perty in question and distributed in the state of the perty in question and distributed in the state of the perty in question and distributed in the perty in the pe property in question, and died on the 27th September, 1887, having previously model in having previously made his last will and testament, dated the 30th September 1995 30th September, 1885, wherein he devised and bequeathed the said lands to his grant said lands to his grandson "William Scott Gold and the heirs of his body." I state of his body. of his body." Letters probate were duly issued on the 7th October, 1887

On the 8th December, 1906, the said devisee, W. S. Gold, deed under the Act by deed under the Act respecting Short Forms of Conveyances, did grant unto the said did grant unto the said party of the second part (in fee simple) the said lands. The grant party of the second part (in fee simple) the said lands. the said lands. The grantee was his wife, Mary T. Gold. habendum in the said deed is as follows: "To have and to hold unto the said party of the unto the said party of the second part, her heirs and assigns, to and for her and their reto and for her and their sole and only use forever.

The vendor contends that the said deed was a sufficient to bar the enterly

The contention of the purchaser, on the other hand, is, of the R.S.O. 1897 ch 199 that R.S.O. 1897 ch. 122, an Act respecting Assurances of Estates Tail, sec. 29 appli Estates Tail, sec. 29, applies, and that the disposition of lands under this Act by contact the disposition of the lands under this Act by contact the disposition of the lands under this Act by contact the disposition of the lands under this Act by contact the disposition of the lands under this Act by contact the lands under the lands under this Act by contact the lands under the la lands under this Act by a tenant in tail could only be effected by some one of the arms. by some one of the assurances (not being a will) by Act, such tenant in tail could only be entered which such tenant in tail could, before the Ontario Judicature at 1881, have made the discount. 1881, have made the disposition, if his estate were an estate law in fee simple absolute. law in fee simple absolute. He argues that the words before simple," following the simple," following the grant in the deed as indicated, before, 1881, would be ineffective. 1881, would be ineffective without the use of the word to pass the fee; and to pass the fee; and, consequently, the deed in question cannot be said properly to be a