

provisions. The legislature, he added, cannot be said to be *inops consilii*, "but we may say that it is *magnas inter opes inops*." The reasoning of this case has a direct bearing on the Act of 1869, and in my opinion confined its operations to persons who had been and continued to be traders at the time it passed.

"We may infer that such was the opinion also of the Dominion Parliament, and that it led, among other things, to the Act of 1871, amending the Act of 1869, the first section of the later Act being as follows: "The first section of the said Act (that of 1869) is hereby amended by adding thereto the following words: 'And persons shall be held to be traders who, having been traders, and having incurred debts as such, which have not been barred by the Statutes of Limitations or prescribed, have since ceased to trade; but no proceedings in compulsory liquidation shall be taken against any such person based upon any debt or debts contracted after he has so ceased to trade.'"

"This is a very comprehensive and a very important provision, peculiar, so far as I know, to our law, and the true construction of which it is of great moment to ascertain. The section I have just cited is not declaratory in its form—it is professedly, as it is in fact, an amendment, but an amendment incorporated with the original section, and henceforth forming an essential part of it. Even in statutes distinct from each other, but on the same subject, the several Acts are to be taken together as forming one system, and as helping to interpret and enforce each other—being in *puri materia* they are to be read as one statute. The doctrine as to the retrospective operation of statutes, was fully considered by this court in the case of *Simpson's Estate*, 1 Oldright, 317, and had been previously reviewed in the case of *Wright v. Hale*, in the Exchequer, reported in 6 H. & N. 227. We held "that however it may be in the United States, where the constitution expressly condemns and forbids retrospective laws which impair the obligation of contracts, or partake of the character of *ex post facto laws*, there can be no doubt that the Imperial Parliament or Colonial Legislatures, within the limits of their jurisdiction, have a more extended authority; and where their intention is to make a law retrospective, it cannot be disputed that they have the power. That intention is to be made manifest by express words, or to be gathered clearly and unmistakably from the purview and scope of the Act. It is a question of construction; and, the Act being its own chief exponent, still the surrounding circumstances are to be looked at."