defendants, however, set up that the plaintids were not 1875. in a position to obtain the relief asked; the term limited by their declaration of copartnership, under the statute, having expired in July, 1871, the declaration filed by them under that Act having limited the existence of the company to five years from the sixteenth July, 1866, "or until dissolution by resolution in writing of twothirds of the trustees for the time being;" the bill in this cause having been filed on the 23rd November, 1871.

C. S. C.,

ving dis-

n of the

, it was

e lands.

that the

oleum

ick A.

etting

same ers, in

sty in

t suit

erest.

judg-

one estion

ıdant

r the

ewell from

et to

con-

the

the

n to

that t he

her The

Lindsay Pardee.

The cause came on to be heard before Strong, V. C., who upon this state of facts dismissed the bill with costs. The plaintiffs thereupon reheard.

Mr. Hector Cameron, Q. C., and Mr. Bethune, for the plaintiffs, asked, in the event of the Court thinking that the Company could not maintain the suit, permission to amend by making the individuals, composing the Company, plaintiffs.

Mr. Boyd and Mr. C. Moss, for the defendants.

Judgment.

SPRAGGE, C .- I have come to the conclusion, I confess very unwillingly, that the plaintiffs cannot succeed in this My brother Proudfoot has prepared a judgment, which I have read, and I agree with him as to the construction to be placed upon the instrument of association, and the term of the Company's proposed existence thereby declared, and the expiry of that term.

I agree also with my learned brother that the amendment asked for cannot be granted. The case of Clay v. Oxford (a) is a very clear authority against it.

Upon the question whether a right of suit exists in the corporators, or in creditors or elsewhere, or whether the land has revorted to the granters, I desire to express no