

(Translation.)

BELLECHASSE CONTROVERTED ELECTION.

SUPERIOR COURT, }
 District of *Montmagny*. }

(The Dominion Controverted Elections Act, 1874.)

Election of a Member of the House of Commons of *Canada*, for the Electoral District of *Bellechasse*, in the Province of *Quebec*, holden on the nineteenth day of *March*, 1881.

ANTOINE MERCIER,
Petitioner.

vs.
 GUILLAUME AMYOT,
Respondent.

I, the Honorable *Auguste Réal Angers*, one of the Judges of the Superior Court of the Province of *Quebec*, and the Judge before whom the said Election Petition was tried and heard, on the twenty-seventh and twenty-eighth days of October, 1881, and judgment given on the twenty-seventh day of December of the same year, do certify that I determined that the said *Guillaume Amyot* had been duly elected, and that the said election petition was not founded on fact and should be dismissed with costs against the Petitioner, except the costs upon the preliminary objections, and upon the proceedings to replace the paper writings lost out of the Record, these costs being given against the parties respectively;

I further certify that copies of the notes of the evidence taken in the said case, and of the judgment rendered by me, are annexed to these presents, as well as a certificate from the Prothonotary of the Court, establishing that within the delay fixed by law, no proceeding to appeal from this judgment has been taken.

I do further certify that no corrupt practice was proved to have been committed, at this election, by or with the knowledge or consent of the said *Guillaume Amyot*.

That it was proved during the trial, that *Edward Murdoch Mackenzie*, Esquire, Notary, had been guilty of using undue influence by threatening the elector *François Roy*, but that it was not proved that the said *Mackenzie* was an agent of *Guillaume Amyot*.

I do further report that it was not proved, and there is no reason for believing, that corrupt practices have been carried on to any considerable extent at the said election.

I am of opinion that no act of the parties to the said Petition was of such a nature as to render imperfect the evidence taken on the circumstances attending the election, and that it is not desirable that a new trial should be holden with the object of ascertaining whether corrupt practices have been engaged in to a considerable extent.

Given this 21st day of January, 1882.

A. R. ANGERS,
 J.S.C.

To the Honorable
 The Speaker of the House of Commons of Canada, *Ottawa*.