

(2) \$10,000 towards encouraging those building C. S. churches, to be distributed in smaller or larger sums as may be wise, from \$100 to \$300 to each church.

(3) \$10,000 to be placed to the interest of Bobcaygeon to be used only for such purposes as will elevate the community spiritually.

(4) \$10,000 for the benefit of those who are endeavouring to uplift the needy in Chicago such as Miss Jane Addams, United Charities, and whatever may seem to require assistance.

(5) \$5,000 to be used for any necessary or uplifting purpose among father's kin.

(6) \$5,000 to be similarly used among mother's kin.

(7) \$50,000 will be held as a fund towards helping to supply such institutions as may in the near future be demonstrated to shew that God's people are willing to help others to see the light that is so real, near, and universal for all who will receive. These institutions may take the place of what at present are called hospitals, poor-houses, gaols, and penitentiaries, or any place that is maintained for the uplifting of humanity.

(8) \$10,000 as a fund to be used in lending to deserving people, men or women, to buy small homes or farms. This money can be lent at 6 per cent. or whatever is lawful on good security. The profits accruing can be utilised in such work as is helpful to men and women who are willing to know and experience the truth as revealed in the Bible and which has been unlocked through the revelation as given in "Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures" by Mary Baker Eddy.

(9) The whole of my estate must be used "for God only."

The validity of all the bequests, except 3, 5, and 6, was attacked by the appellant Mary Cameron: (1) and (2) as being contrary to public policy; (4) as not being a charitable bequest and being void for uncertainty; (7) as not being a charitable bequest and being void for uncertainty and offending the rule against perpetuities; (8) as not being a charitable bequest and being void for uncertainty; (9) as not being a dispositive provision or a declaration of trust, or, if one or other, as being incapable of execution on account of its indefiniteness and so void.

The objections to bequests (1) and (2) were not well-founded.

Bequest (4) was clearly a charitable one and valid.

Bequest (7) was valid.

As to bequest (8), the learned Chief Justice, with some hesitation, concluded that it was void for indefiniteness.

Bequest (9) was a valid declaration of trust as to the estate of the testatrix not effectually disposed of by her will, and the trust was a good charitable bequest for religious purposes.