

C 7288

we now take it for granted that a holder of stock is  
also held to be perfectly free to sell his claim without  
consent. but the law was at first looked upon  
not as so many shares of stock but as a  
fellowship of individuals who could not hand over their  
place to another without the consent of their  
fellows. So when the directors were asked to transfer  
shares from one to another they ans. that  
they did not. It was like disfranchising one  
party admitting another. parties were offered  
to give birth which when it met the old member  
present A.B. to cert proposing that he be admitted  
expressly himself willing to sell his share  
the admission. Even such an elementary  
thing as the equal distribution of cost of operation  
was a comparative novelty & had to be insisted.  
So when Govt was selected he had to take an oath  
that he had seen an impartial hand might  
manage matters etc. The running expenses  
were to be charged to profits divided pro-  
portionately to stock. This itself was such  
an new idea as friend T or less had to take an  
oath to effect it.