With regard to Sect. IV, see 6 V. c. 15, s. 1, prolonging the term for registering the claims to which this Section refers, to 31st December, 1843, inclusive, and providing that such claims not then registered shall be inoperative only against subsequent *bonâ fide* purchasers whose claims shall have been registered before them, instead of declaring them "void and of no effect whatever" against *any* such subsequent purchaser and &c. as this Section does. The 7 Vic. c. 27 prolonged the period for registering until on or before 1st of November, 1844.

With regard to the Proviso to Sect. IV, see also s. 2 of the Act last cited, and the notes on Sect. II of this Ordinance.—With regard to S. IV, see also 16 Vic. c. 206 declaring *Bailleurs de fonds* bound to register, and fixing delays for such registration.—See also 1. L. C. Reports p. 435—Duchesnay & Bedard & Campbell, Oppst.—where this section is declared retroactive—and Vol. 2. p. 87. Girard & Blais & Oppsts.—See also 3. L. C. Reports p. 440. David & Hays & Hays & al: Oppsts. in which cause it was decided that no hypotheque attached to the Estate of an Executor, even of an old will, unless some *acte* be registered (such as an Inventory) establishing that the Executor assumed the trust. Where there are several mortgage creditors who do not register, and their debtors' land is sold, they will be collocated according to the dates of their Deeds, and in preference to mere chirographary creditors of the debtor.—(Bank of Montreal *v* Mack & Viger, Opposant—Superior Court, Montreal, No. 1849 of 1849.) —See as to the meaning of *bonâ fide* in this Sect., Stuart & wife v. Bowman.—3 L. C. Reports p. 309.—(Notice of unregistered right, and circumstances of fraud, will prevail against a registered title.)—And as to the meaning of "for valuable consideration," Holmes vs. Curtier & al. Superior Court Montreal, 5. L. C. Reports, where a *donataire à rente viagère* was held not to be such a purchaser or grantee.—Would it be held that a servitude acquired under a deed of date anterior to 1841 required registration.—? Sect. 4 differs considerably from sec. 1. In Dorion & ux. vs. Rivet. S. C. Montreal—1856, the question was raised, but not determined, the Judgment proceeding on another ground.

With regard to Sect. VI. see 12 Vic. c. 48. s. 3.

With regard to Sect. VII,—there can be no Sheriff of such a Judicial District, the Ordinance 3 & 4 V. c. 43. being repealed, sed.?

With regard to Sect. VIII, see, as to securities to be given by Public Officers, 4 & 5 V. c. 91, which repeals so much of this Ordinance as may be inconsistent with the said Act.—It does not, however, appear that by this Ordinance the Deputy Registrar is bound to give such security, (*see* Sect. VIII) the Registrar being responsible for his acts, (see Sects. VIII & IX) and the bond of the Registrar availing as to such acts:—but *Query*, as to the case in which the Deputy executes the office of Registrar (under Sect, VI) in consequence of the death of his principal?—The sureties under the said Act (see S. 1,) are to be approved by the Governor, or by the Principal Officers or persons in the department to which the party giving security is appointed, while this Sect. (VIII) requires that they be approved by the Justice before whom the recognizance is given.—See 14 and 15 Vic. reducing the amount of security to be given by Registrars, and 19 Vic. c. 102, also reducing it.

With regard to Sects. VI, VII, VIII & IX, all the provisions of the Ordinance which can be so applicable, appear to apply to Registrars for Counties as they did before to those for Districts.

With regard to Sect. IX. see 4 & 5 V. c. 91—s. 2 of which Act seems to require that the security be absolute when required only by the said Act; but s. 14 does not appear to change the *nature* of the security required, but only to subject it to the *formalities* prescribed by the Act, and to the penalties thereby provided in case of neglect.—? *Query*, as to the case of the *removal* of a Registrar, for which this Section does not expressly provide.

With regard to Sect. X,—*Query*:—Is it necessary that the "places of abode" of the witnesses to any Deed, &c., should be mentioned in it, as they must be in the memorial of it?—The hypothec under a Judgment rendered after 31st December, 1841 appears to date only from its registration: and see Sect. XXX, as to the lands which it shall affect.

With regard to Sect. X see 19 Vic. c. 15 providing for execution and signing of memorials when the memorialist does not know how to write.

With regard to Sect. XI, it appears that the execution of the memorial only need be proved, and that it is not necessary that one of the witnesses to the memorial should be also a witness to the deed or conveyance.

With regard to Sect. XII,—it would appear that to the cases mentioned in this Section, the provisions of Sect. XI would apply so far as to require that the instrument to which the memorial relates, or the Office copy, probate, &c., thereof, should be produced to the Registrar.