

but in no one of them was the question of the ownership of treasure trove squarely at issue. Thus, in *Livermore v. White*, 74 Me. 456, the owner of a tannery had sold it and accidentally omitted to remove a few hides from the vats. These were found many years afterward by a labourer, and it was held that the case was not one of treasure trove, the hides not being either gold or silver, and the original owner being known. In *McLaughlin v. Waite*, 5 Wend. (N.Y.) 404 a lottery ticket was found, and the Court held that the principles appertaining to lost chattels did not apply, as the lottery ticket was of no greater validity than a mere chose in action, or evidence of the right of the real owner. In *Huthmacher v. Harris*, 38 Pa. St. 491, a person purchased, at an administrator's sale, a 'drill machine,' which was found to contain money and other valuables secreted therein by the decedent. The Court said: 'But the common law, which we administer, gave it always to the owner if he could be found, and if he could not be, then to the king, as wrecks, strays, and other goods are given "whereof no person can claim property." 3 Inst. 132. Huthmacher, therefore, held the unsold valuables for the personal representative of the deceased owner.' In *Sovern v. Yoran*, 1 Oregon 269, some packages of money were found under the floor of a barn. The property had been purchased at an administrator's sale, and the purchaser took steps in accordance with the law of the State of Oregon in reference to lost property to ascertain the true owner of the money by advertising the same. No owner having appeared within one year, as prescribed by the statute, the purchaser delivered one-half of the money to the county treasurer and the other half to the finders of the property. The administrator who had sold the property subsequently brought suit against the purchaser to recover the value of the property found. The Court held that the money was in the nature of treasure trove, but did not decide as to the ownership thereof, merely holding that the purchaser, having acted in good faith in reference to the matter, was not guilty of conversion. In *Warren v. Ulrich*, 130 Pa. St. 413, a roll of money was found concealed in a cesspool, and the administrator of a former owner of the premises brought an action to recover the same. It was held that the evidence was