sion Court against a township local board of health, sued as a corporation, for services performed in a small-pox epidemic.

It appeared that the physician had been appointed medical health officer of the municipality by the council, but that before suing the the board he had brought an action against the municipal corporation for his services, in which he failed.

Upon motion by the physician for a mandamus under s. 49 to compel the members of the board to sign an order upon the treasurer of the municipality for the amount of the judgment recovered;

Held, that, although it might be difficult to conclude that a board of health is constituted a corporation by the Act, yet the judgment of the Division Court practically decided that this board might be sued as such, and, not being in any way impeached, it could not be treated as a nullity. As there appeared to be no other remedy, the applicant was entitled to the mandamus.

Shepley for W. J. Derby.

Aylesworth for members of local board of health.

Div'l C't.]

March 8.

REID v. COLEMAN.

Partnership - Dissolution - Want of public notice-Credit given to firm after dissolution -No previous dealings with firm-Liability of retiring partner.

The plaintiffs received from their traveller an order for goods from the firm of C. Bros., hotelkeepers. Before they delivered the goods they became aware by means of a mercantile agency that a partnership had existed under the name of C. Bros., and that S. L. C. was one of the of the members of it, and they were at the same time informed that the partnership still existed. They shipped and charged the goods and also goods subsequently ordered to C. Bros. As a matter of fact, however, the partnership did not exist at the time the first order was given, S. L. C. having retired from the business, and the plaintiffs had had no dealings with the firm while it was in existence. No public notice was given of the dissolution; S. L. C. continued to live at the hotel except when he was absent on his own business; the lamp with the name of C. Bros. continued at the door; the liquor license

in the name of C. Bros. continued to hang in the har-room the bar-room; the letter-paper with the heading "C. Bros. pro-"C. Bros., proprietors," continued to be handed to customers to customers.

Held, that where a known member of a firm tires from retires from it, and credit is afterwards given to the firm but to the firm by a person who has had previous dealing previous dealings with it, but has become aware, as one of the and as one of the public, that it existed, and has not become aware become aware of his retirement, the retiring member of the c member of the firm is liable, unless he shews that he has simple. that he has given reasonable public notice not his retirement. his retirement; and, as such notice was not given here. S. I. C. given here, S. L. C. was liable, not only for the goods first order. goods first ordered, but for those subsequently ordered, no next ordered, no notice of the retirement having ever been given.

J. M. Clark for defendant, S. L. Coleman.

Div'l C't.]

[March 8.

Mendelssohn Piano Co. υ. Graha<sup>m.</sup>

Partnership—Agreement for participation of profits — Comment profits — Construction of — Relationship parties—Ioint parties—Joint business—Debtor and creditor.

The plaintiffs sued G. and W. for the price of and bods sold to the goods sold to the firm of P. W. G. & Co., hether the principal question in the action was whether W. was an actual W. was an actual partner in the firm; he evidence failing to the same that the same th dence failing to show that he was an ostensible partner, and as partner, and as such liable to third persons.

Held, that the true test to be applied to ascer heter tain whether a partnership existed was to determine whether mine whether there was a joint business whether the partial was a joint busine whether the parties were carrying on business as principals and as principals and agents for each other.

G. and W. did not intend to create a partner ship between them. G. was carrying on dealed, ness in the name of the same of ness in the name of P. W. G. & Co., as a dealer in pianos and occarrying on the pianos and occarrying occarrying on the pianos and occarrying occarrying on the pianos and occarrying occarr in pianos and organs, and, being in want as money, applied to W. S. money, applied to W. for a loan; he did not sure W. to become his W. to become his partner, nor did W gugget it, but G. proposition it, but G. proposed to give W. half the profit of his business if W of his business if W. would lend him

The money was advanced and the following reipt was given by ceipt was given by G.:-

Toronto, 13th February, 1888, rom W Toronto, 13th February, 1880 be "Received from W. the sum of \$500 to led for carrying on " used for carrying on the business of dealers pianos and organe: pianos and organs, in return for which I hereby agree to give the enial transfer of dealers of deal agree to give the said W. one half of the profit of said business. of said business, after all expenses have