on production of a receipt for the money, seema to be exposing him to undue risk. If our view of the meaning of sec. 67 be the correat one-then, on registration of the discharge of the first mortgage the legal estate vested not in the mortgagor, but in the seoond mortgagee and could only be got out of him by the discharge of his mortgage or a resonveyance.

## RESTRAINTS ON ALIENATION.

(Conthibuted.)
In late issues, you deal with Restraints on Alienation, referring particularly to two recent cases of Re Goorlhue Trusts, 47 O.L.R. 178, and Re Ferguson and Rowley, 19 O.W.N. 16, hoth being decisions of single judges. As these cases deal with a somewhat confusing subject, it is worth while to try as shortly as possible to find out what they do decide.

Re Goodhue raises some difficult questions, and, taken by itself, the reasoning on which the judgment is founded is not an authority upon the subject of Restraints on Alienation, though the result may be. It deals first with the operation of a power of appointment, and considers whether the attempted exercise by the donee of the rower is valid. There are two grounds on which its invalidity is fairly apparent.

1. Some of the objects named in the exercise of the power are not within the class prescribed by the instrument creating it. To that extent, the exercise of the power was obviously inoperative.
2. Some of the beneficiaries meationed in the document exercising the power might by possibility fail to take vested interests within the period of a life in being when the power was created and twenty-one years thereafter. Obviously, therefore, under the decisions cited in the judgment, the appointers whose interests might not vest within the proper time, take nothing under the Rule against remoteness of vesting.

Those points being out of the way, the learned Judge then had to decide whether the beneficiaries who could take were entitled absolutely or were only life tenants. He held that they took absolutely. Having arrived at this result, it was then a proper

