

sole the act dissolved him. *A fortiori*
it does not rest at present in Canon
Newland who as a clergyman of the
disestablished church is not the
"successor" of the "Perpetual Curate".
Must it be held then that the Perpetual
Curacy of Lower Tabaw was disestablished
and disendowed in order that Mr.
Richardson and his fellows to the
amount of £293.8.8 should hold their
land free of the title rent charge subject
to which they acquired it? That would
be an unforeseen result which would
have astonished the careful and accom-
plished lawyer by whom the Bill was
drafted. It was contended that the Church
of Lower Tabaw might be compensated
by a share of the £500,000 paid to
the Representative Church Body pursuant
to the 29th section of the act. To this there
are two objections. In the first place the
old endowment was not "the produce
of property or money given by private
persons out of their own resources;" and
in the second place it was not "property
vested in the Commissioners" by virtue of
the act, "in lieu" of which alone the
half million of money was to be paid.

Besides