

---



---

THE DOMINION CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT.

Election of a Member of the House of Commons of *Canada* for the Electoral District of *Montmorency*, holden on the fifteenth and twenty-second days of February, in the year of Our Lord one thousand eight hundred and eighty-seven.

Between

EDOUARD CAUCHON AND JEAN DION,

(*Petitioners in the Court below*) *Appellants*;

and

CHARLES LANGELIER,

(*Respondent in the Court below*) *Respondent*.

The appeal of the above named Appellants, *Edward Cauchon* and *Jean Dion*, from the judgment of the Honourable Mr. Justice *Caron*, one of the Justices of the Superior Court of Lower *Canada* sitting for the District of *Quebec*, rendered in the said cause, on the 26th day of December, in the year of Our Lord one thousand eight hundred and eighty-seven, which said judgment is in the words and figures following, that is to say :—

(*Translation.*)

“ *Canada,*  
Province of *Quebec,* }  
District of *Quebec.* } ”

DOMINION CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT.

Election of a Member for the Electoral District of *Montmorency* to the House of Commons of *Canada*.

In the Superior Court, the 27th day of December, 1887.

*Present :*

The Honourable Mr. Justice L. B. *Caron*.

EDOUARD CAUCHON, Boatman, and JEAN DION, Labourer, both of the Parish of *Notre Dame de la Visitation du Chateau Richer*, Electors,

*Petitioners*;

*vs.*

CHARLES LANGELIER, of the City of *Quebec*, Advocate, Member elect,

*Respondent*.

“ Parties heard on the motion made on behalf of Respondent to the effect that inasmuch as a period of more than six months has elapsed since the presentation of the Petition in this cause and the trial thereof has not been commenced, all further proceedings therein be stopped and that it be declared that the said Petition has been abandoned; the said motion is granted, and it is, in consequence, ordered that the said Election petition be, and the same is hereby dismissed, the whole as prayed for, but without costs :”

Having come on to be heard before this Court this day in the presence of Counsel, as well for the Appellants as for the Respondent, whereupon, and upon hearing what was alleged by Counsel for the said Appellants, Counsel for Respondent not being called upon, this Court did order and adjudge that the said Appeal should be, and the same was quashed for want of jurisdiction.