to enable her to educate her children, it would hardly be contended that she was bound to spend the whole of it in their education. -

The testator declares that this property was given the better to enable Mrs. Lee to provide for her children - that is - he intended to increase the ability she already possessed. The ability she possessed to provide for her children, independent of this bequest, unquestionably was not out of property held in trust for them but out of property absolutely her own - The way to increase that power was by increasing her fortune. The property he gives if it is a trust, does not add to her power to provide for them, but is a distinct provision made by the testator. This might save her from the necessity of providing for them as the provision made by him would have been an ample one - but it would not enlarge her power to do so - She would not thereby [redacted] be [redacted] "the better enabled". - Her ability would remain the same -

I am therefore of opinion that the property bequeathed by the clause above mentioned became the absolute property of Mrs. Lee, and was not in trust for the benefit of her children and that the estate of Mr. Lee is not liable to account for any money received by him on account of the slaves sold by him as herein before stated. -

Frederick April 29. 1820. R. B. Taney

MdHS 1974 [1296-1068]