quent Act, 44 Vic. c. 28. This statute, which, by the way, does not appear to have been alluded to either in the argument or in the judgments of the court, provides that "*prima facie* evidence of any proclamation, order, regulation or appointment . . . may be given . . . in all or any of the modes hereinafter mentioned, that is to say:—1. By production of a copy of the *Canada Gazette* purporting to contain a notice of such proclamation, order, regulation or appointment; 2. By the production of a copy of such proclamation, order, regulation or appointment purporting to be printed by the Queen's Printer for Canada."

A means, therefore, is provided whereby the existence of Dominion orders-in-council *may be proved*. It does not relate to Imperial orders-in-council, and does not provide that judicial notice shall be taken even of Dominion orders. Before, therefore, a judge can know anything judicially of a Dominion order-in-council its existence must be proved before him; for it can hardly be contended that a statute was passed providing an easy means of proving documents of which the judges had judicial notice before the Act was thought of.

But we think that the decision in *Re Stanbro.* although not supportable upon the grounds mentioned in the judgment, is good upon another ground. Under the Imperial Act 31 & 32 Vic., c. 37, "The Documentary Evidence Act, 1868," proof may be made of Imperial orders-in-council, "by the production of a copy of such proclamation, order or regulation purporting to be printed by the government printer, or, where the question arises in a court in any British colony or possession, of a copy purporting to be printed under the authority of the legislature of such British colony or possession." The order in question was printed under the authority of the Dominion parliament. It could, therefore, have been proved by the production of the volume of the statutes in which it appears, and that volume was produced. The Imperial Act, just quoted, was cited upon the argument of the case, but the judges seem to have overlooked it, or not perceived its applicability.