

- The ordonnance of 1731 is no part of the law of Canada: if there be but two witnesses therefore to a notarial *acte* who do not write, this does not vitiate it, if it be executed in a country parish, for the 166 art. of the *ordonnance de Blois*, requires written signatures by witnesses only, "*ès gros bourg et villes*" and they are not even there required "*à peine de nullité.*" *Ruel vs. Dumas et al.*, 1816, no. 234.
- The Court will ex officio notice the appointment of one of its own officers to be a judge in another district. *Fay vs. Miville.*
- A certificate of registry with an indorsment which refers to a bill of sale is no evidence of property in the indorsee. *Provost vs. Faribault*, 1818, no. 223.
- The signature of the drawer of any note of hand or of an indorser or of both, is well proved by one witness to either signature. *Hoogs vs. Blackstone*, 1818, no. 828.
- The Gazette of Quebec is authentic evidence of the publication of proceedings in the courts of the province, such as orders to call in creditors, sales by Sheriff, &c. *Huppé vs. Dionne*, 1818, no. 817.
- In an action for the use and occupation of a farm, the *quantum valebat* of such use and occupation per annum and the defendants possession may be proved by witnesses. *Langlois vs. Darbyson*, 1820, no. 1041.
- In an action for work and labour, proof that the plaintiff and other workmen employed by the defendant, were paid weekly and that the plaintiff had not been heard to complain of non payment, is a sufficient presumptive proof of payment against a stale demande. *Bonneau vs. Goudie*, 1819, no. 173.
- A defendant who does not appear admits by his default the character in which he is sued. *Auld vs. Milne*, 1819, no. 509.
- In an action *d'injure verbale* it is sufficient if the substance of the words laid is proved. *Hooper vs. Arnold*, 1819, no. 511.