

a trust, the
this court to
the statutes
adequately
is breach of
the Visitor,
doubt, a very
school, and
by proper
trust which
is not to be
along to the
formance of
not subject
* Though
here is not,
et is under-

this case,
I do not at
n had the
ber of the

member of
rehensive :
l, "and all
e, or shall,
esbyterian
Scotland,
ch connec-
n Church,
" &c., &c.
he is also
e govern-
e property

defendants
d brought
dismissed
not on the
n the cor-
bill was
ruled, in

their corporate capacity, with the management of certain property, *clothed with a trust for the maintenance of a school-master*, and for this purpose I represent the case thus, that the corporation have the power of nominating the master, and dismissing him at their will and pleasure. A corporation, as an individual, with such a power over an estate devoted to charitable purposes, would, in this court, be compelled to exercise that power—not according to the discretion of this court—but not corruptly. * * * My opinion is that this is a case in which the court will call upon individuals to answer."

Willis v. Child (13 Beav., 117), also relied on, was the case of the Ludlow School. A school-house was appropriated to and held by the plaintiff, and all had been settled years before under a scheme for the government of the charity settled by a previous decree of the Court of Chancery, reported in 3 M. and C. R. The case of Phillips' charity, ex parte Newman (9 Jur. 962), before Knight Bruce, Vice-Chancellor, was a petition under the Romilly Act by the schoolmaster and others. It appeared that a scheme had been settled some years before by the court to regulate the Sutton Free School, and the schoolmaster, besides a fixed stipend, had, after deductions, *one half of certain rents and profits*. After holding the office some time he was dismissed, and reinstated by an order of the court in 1839, in a case not apparently reported. After some years he was again dismissed, and again petitioned, and was again reinstated, the dismissal being irregular.

In the Fremington School case, ex parte Ward (10 Jur. 512), a dwelling and school-house had been devised to trustees to permit and suffer the schoolmaster to occupy while holding the office, and take the issues and profits, and also certain rents of other premises were to be paid to the schoolmaster. The Vice-Chancellor held that the master had "acquired, upon his appointment, a freehold, or an interest in the nature of a freehold and the revenues belonging to it, whether legal or equitable it is not necessary to inquire. Of course I do not say that he became an irremovable master. On the contrary, I assume the competency of the electors or a majority of them to remove him for a just cause. This power, however, they were, as I conceive, bound to exercise not otherwise than judicially."

In the Berkhamstead case also (2 V. and B.), the master was entitled to two-thirds of certain funds arising from rents under a previous scheme for the charity arranged by decree of the court. Lord Eldon said, "If, in the original instrument,