

between the plaintiff, her husband and her daughter, indicating a joint interest in the business of this company and in the secrets concerning. All of them to take part in the management of the business. The case came to be judged again before the judge, and he decided that it was not true, as he had previously believed, that it was Miss Hénault who owned the business at the time when the transaction with Bourgeau took place, but that the plaintiff herself had a proprietary interest in the business and was registered as its sole owner at that time. The plaintiff and her husband, by their evidence, attempted to evade the effect of this registration by saying that their daughter, in running the business had become involved in debts and judgments were taken against her, and that in order to protect the name of the business, it was necessary that she should cease to do business and that somebody else should take it up, or that otherwise, the name itself would be lost, and the property, by the loss of the name, would become of little value, as it consisted in a secret process for dressing leathers.

It was clearly proved at the trial that the defendant's father had advanced to this business money to the extent of \$1,120. His books showed that; cheques produced showed it. It also appeared by the books that this debt had been written off by a credit of like amount for the painting. In the examination of Dastous, there came out an allegations that the defendant's father used to come to the place where these goods were being sold, from week to week, and take away with him the receipts in money which had resulted from the business, thus showing that the defendant probably had received sums of money out of the \$1,120 which were not credited to the plaintiff.

The judge seemed to be of the opinion that this position