

sure was with the intention of the Donors. I
was told they meant it to accumulate, in
the ~~past~~ ^{future} view of the possibility of some
^ ^{great} damage (not covered of course by Fire Insurance
which had been effected). But this intention
is entirely barred by the wording of the Deed
giving the Incumbent no right to anything
but Interest. So that were a Cyclone to
strip the roof, or lightning to shatter the bell
gable, ~~the~~ on the roof want general stripping,
the Church Building Society as Tr^{ees} w^d have
to go to Chancery to obtain the release of even
the accumulated portion of Interest to meet
the claim. Such a state of things might just
as well be rectified at once, as at some future
day - & if this were effected, it w^d enable
me at the same time to effect some improve-
ments both by addition and removal, from
which the present Deed debar me, though
most ~~necessary~~ advisable for order & decency's
sake. The simple question then is, whether
I am correct in thinking that an unopposed
suit c^d be ~~not~~ carried through for not much more

than £15 (as you once led me to suppose) -
and, which is of equal moment, whether it
w^d not be perfectly fair to pay Chancery
out of the Fund, as it is solely for the bene-
fit of the Church, & merely (so far as any
great future repair is contemplated) carrying
out the Donor's intention - frustrated by the
~~the~~ insufficient wording of their own Deed. -

They meant no doubt that ordinary repairs
sh^d be provided for out of the Interest - but
they never meant I am sure that in case
of extraordinary repair the very accumulation
sh^d be tied up & incorporated with the principal.
Please forgive my giving you all this trouble
and my present haste & writing in this kind
I'm believe me

Yours affectionate Old Friend

T. W. Webb