

Samuel Boivin, also of the Parish of Saint Paul's Bay, Farmer.
Israel Gagnon, also of the Parish of Saint Paul's Bay, Farmer, and
Jean Gagnon, also of the Parish of Saint Paul's Bay, Farmer; the Honorable
 Mr. Justice *Taschereau* and the Honorable Mr. Justice *Gwynne*, dissenting as to the
 said *Joseph Israel Tarte*.

3. That corrupt practices have not nor is there reason to believe that corrupt
 practices have extensively prevailed at such election.

Certified,

ROBT. CASSELS, JR.

Registrar Supreme Court of Canada

The Honorable JOSEPH G. BLANCHET,
 Speaker of the House of Commons of Canada,
 Ottawa.

BELLECHASE CONTROVERTED ELECTION.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CANADA.

The Dominion Controverted Elections Act, 1874.

Friday, the Eleventh day of February, A.D., 1881.

PRESENT :

The Honorable THE CHIEF JUSTICE,
 “ “ Mr. Justice FOURNIER,
 “ “ Mr. Justice HENNY,
 “ “ Mr. Justice TASCHEREAU,
 “ “ Mr. Justice GWYNNE.

Election of a Member of The House of Commons for the Electoral District of
 the County of Bellechase, in the Province of Quebec, holden on the Tenth
 and Seventeenth days of September, 1878,

ACHILLE LARUE,

Appellant,

and

ALEXIS DESLAURIERS,

Respondent.

It appearing from the Record in the above cause transmitted to this Court that
 the Honorable Mr. Justice *McCord* rendered judgment in the said cause on the tenth
 day of May, 1880, which said judgment is as follows:—

“ Having heard the parties and their witnesses, examined into the evidence and
 “ documents filed and duly deliberated.”

“ Considering that it is proved that an agent of the Respondent committed
 “ corrupt practices at the said Election by treating voters on the day of polling on
 “ account of such voters having voted; that another agent of the Respondent also
 “ committed corrupt practices in the same manner, and that another agent of the
 “ Respondent committed corrupt practices at the said Election by paying for the
 “ conveyance of a voter to and from the poll on the day of polling.”

“ Considering that it is proved that the Respondent himself committed corrupt
 “ practices at the said Election; 1st. By giving money to a voter in order to induce
 “ him to endeavour to procure the return of the Respondent; 2nd. By threatening
 “ another voter with the loss of his place, and also promising to endeavour to procure
 “ for the said voter an employment in order to induce him to refrain from voting at
 “ the said Election; 3rd. By threatening a voter with a prosecution for damages in