SEC. 1. lish statutes, and in fact when the bill of this act was introduced, the category was an almost verbatim copy of the English list. It will be well therefore to examine the decisions bearing upon the subject, which have been given in that country.

The true criterion to decide the question of trading is, not whether the party bought and sold to increase his income, but whether he did so with a view to gain his livelihood.

Must be buying and selling.

The general description of a trader cannot be satisfied unless there be both a buying and a selling, but a small amount of actual dealing is enough, if there be sufficient evidence to show an intention to deal generally. (*Patman* v. *Vaughan*, 1 T. R. 572; *ex parte Moule*, 14 Ves. 603; *ex parte Maginnis*, Rose, 84; *Cannon* v. *Denew*, 10 Bing. 292; 3 Mo. & Sc. 761;) and in another case it was questioned whether a person, who sold goods for another on commission, but did not buy, was a trader. (*Hernamaun* v. *Barber*, 23 L. J., C. P. 145.)—Lee, p. 489.

Trading must be public.

The rule as to occasional acts of trading is, that where it is a man's common or ordinary mode of dealing, or where if any stranger who applies may be supplied with the commodity in which the other professes to deal, and it is not sold as a favor to any particular person, there the person so selling is subject to the bankrupt laws as a trader; (*Patman* v. *Vaughan*, 1 T. R. 573.)

Thus a vintner, who before 6 Geo. 4, c. 16, sold only a few dozen of liquor to particular friends, could not be made a bankrupt, but if he desired to sell to every person that applied, that would subject him to the bankruptcy laws; (*Bartholomew* v. *Sherwood*, 1 T. R. 537, n., *ex parte Danbury*, 2 Dea. 72.) Whether or not a person is a trader does not depend upon his occasionally doing acts of trading, but upon the intention generally so to get his living; (*ex parte Patterson*, 1 Ro. 402; *Newland* v. *Bell*, Holt, 221; *ex parte Lavender*, 4 Dea. & C. 487.)

Dentists.

A person who manufactured artificial teeth for sale, but also practised as a dentist, was held to be a trader. (*In re Brophy*, 19 W. R. 176.) —Lee, p. 488.

Fisherman.

A fisherman buying fish of other boats at sea, and selling it on shore, is a trader, and, if such be the usual practice of a particular class of fishermen, one of them who is proved to have done so once will be presumed to have continued to carry on his business in the same manner till the time of his bankruptcy; (*Heanney* v. *Birch*, 1 Ro. 356; 3 Camp. 233; *Gale* v. *Halfknight*, 3 Stark, 56.)

A fisherman, owning fishing smacks, which he uses for fishing purposes only, is not a trader as a ship owner; (*in re Stubbs*, 22 L. T. 291.)

If a man purchase goods for his own use, that will not make him a trader, even though he afterwards sell such of them as he may not