

the evidence herein create a strong presumption that the said Lachance was a prête-nom for Mabel Tremblay;

“Considering that the defendants did nothing, when served with the present action, to inquire into the truth of the plaintiff's allegations as to the characters of the persons occupying said premises leased to Lachance, or the purposes and uses to which the premises and the common entrance and stairway thereto were put by Mabel Tremblay and other prostitutes with her, and the defendants continued to allow said premises to be used as a disorderly house up to the date of the trial of this action, without any attempt on their part to put an end to such illegal use or to eject the said Mabel Tremblay from said premises:

“Considering that it is impossible to believe that the defendants, who occupied retail stores on the ground floor under the premises complained of, did not know the character of the occupants upstairs and the presence of a disorderly house there; and their failure to investigate the matters alleged by plaintiff in his action shows a reprehensible indifference on their part:

“Considering that it is proved that the defendants, for some months before the institution of this action and until the trial herein, have allowed and permitted the dwelling adjoining the premises leased by them to plaintiff to be occupied and used for purposes of prostitution, and the entrance and passageway and staircase thereto to be the resort of loose, idle and disorderly persons:

“Considering that the defendants have failed to maintain the premises leased to the plaintiff in a fit condition for the use for which they had been leased and failed to give the plaintiff peaceable enjoyment of said premises, and the