disturb the settlement he has made with the municipality. Before concluding, I would say, with reference to one argument made before me, to wit, that this promissory note involved a loan of money made irregularly by the *tiers* saisi, that this note was not granted in order to the municipality's getting money. The contestation by the plaintiff is dismissed with costs.

De Bellefeuille & Turgeon for plaintiff. J. A. Ouimet for Tiers Saisi.

> [In Chambers.] MONTREAL, Jan'y 13, 1879.

CANTWELL V. MADDEN.

Effects under execution which have ceased to be in the possession of the Guardian—Order to seize in possession of third party.

The plaintiff, by petition, alleged that the defendant, who had been appointed guardian of effects seized in the cause, under execution, had left the country, and that the effects were now in the possession of one Warren, who pretended that he had bought them. Plaintiff asked for an order to the bailiff to remove these effects from Warren's possession, in order that they might be sold under the execution in due course.

Pagnuelo, for the petitioner, cited l'Ordonnance de 1667, Tit. 19, Art. 17; 1 Pigeau, p. 628; 4 Quebec Law Rep. pp. 47, 49, Moisan & Roche, and Gilbert & Coindet.

PAPINEAU, J., granted an order authorizing any bailiff of the Court to take and remove from the possession of said Warren the effects seized in the cause, "et pour ce d'employer et de se faire assister de toute la force nécessaire," a copy of the order to be served on Warren, with notice to him to appear and show cause why he should not be condemned personally in the costs of the petition and removal of the effects, &c.

Duhamel, Pagnuelo & Rainville for petitioner.

Keller & McCorkill for defendant, and Warren mis en cause.

AYLMER, October 7, 1878.

PHILION v. BISSON, and GRAHAM, opposant. Immoveables by destination—Opposition to annul by a hypothecary creditor of defendant.

The case came up on an opposition to a seizure, as of moveables in the possession of defendant, the proprietor of a steam carding mill, of "one ten-horse power steam enging with boiler, belting, shafting and chimney complete, and one machine called a picker, painted red."

Graham, a hypothecary creditor, by opposition à fin d'annuler, set up that the steam engine and machinery formed essential parts of a steam carding mill, and that by destination and actual use, and as a fixture of the mill, it was immove able.

The Court (Bourgeois, J.) held the seizure be an absolute nullity, the articles seized bein immoveables by destination. The principal difficulty was as to the right of the opposant who had a bailleur de fonds claim, to oppose the His Honor considered that he we seizure. entitled to oppose, and cited Guyot vo. Opposit tion, p. 424 : "La partie saisie n'est pas la seul qui puisse former opposition afin d'annuler cette voie peut aussi être employée par les cré anciers du saisi." Also 1031 C.C.: "Creditor may exercise the rights and actions of the debtor, when to their prejudice he refuses neglects to do so." Opposition maintained.

M. McLeod for opposant.

Aylen & Lawlor for plaintiff contesting.

COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH.

MONTREAL, December 18, 1878.

Sir A. A. DORION, C. J., MONK, RAMSAY, TESSIE and Cross, JJ.

BRUNEAU et al. v. MASSUE.

Appeal in Contested Election Cases—Constitution ality of Dominion Controverted Election Act.

Massue moved for leave to appeal from judgment of the Superior Court on an election petition under the Dominion Controverted Elections Act. His election as a member of the House of Commons for the County of Richelieu had been contested by the petition ers, Bruneau et al., and respondent had pleaded a declinatory exception, alleging that the Dominion Parliament had no right to impoupon the Superior Court the duty of tryin contested elections of members elected to the House of Commons. The exception was dis missed, and it was from this judgment the Massue asked leave to appeal.

Sir A. A. DORION, C.J., remarked that the Court had already decided in the case