

of the oath is at an end. If this dogma be ill-founded in morals, then it must be admitted that, whether the person charged is allowed to be a witness or not is a mere matter of convenience. In the latter case, however, the French system is infinitely preferable to the disjointed and irrational one proposed here. It is worthy of note, that obviously, by the terms of the bill, and more particularly, by its terms as amended, Mr. Cameron and the majority of the House of Commons never contemplated for an instant upsetting the English idea that a man should not be compelled to criminate himself: on the contrary they re-affirm it.

The bill, "An Act concerning Insolvency," is a measure with the dangers of which we are familiar. Twice within the last thirty-six years, have laws of this sort been abrogated under a perfect storm of execration and abuse. It was a common joke after the old law was repealed, that there would be no new law on the subject till the insolvent interest became formidable. The authors of the present bill were aware of the suspicions naturally attaching to bankruptcy and insolvency legislation, and to disarm distrust, they have invented the novel device of prefixing a chapter of general remarks on its principles and provisions. There is no objection to a preliminary statement of principles, but the pompous exposition before us advances no principle about which any reasonable man ever had the least doubt. The principle it would have been interesting to have had laid down is as to whether it is intended by the bill to give a protection to the creditor, or a favour to the debtor. On this point the general remarks are ominously reticent. The only defensible principle of legislation as to insolvent estates, is to give the cheapest and most expeditious mode conceivable of paying the creditor what is due to him. It is sometimes said, that if the debtor gives up all his property, he has a right to be discharged from further liability. He has no such right. In giving up what will pay his creditor, he merely surrenders that which is not his. Another argument is, that if there be an insolvent act the creditor knew when he gave credit that the law would probably discharge his debtor if he became insolvent

This argument is almost facetious. It would justify the abolition of every civil remedy. But, in any case, if that be the justification, Mr. Billy's bill should not apply to any debt created before its enactment. Such a rider would considerably decrease the enthusiasm in favour of a new "Act respecting Insolvency." Lastly, there is the old argument of the favour to be accorded to trade and commerce, owing to its risk, which no prudence could foresee. Insurance and improved appliances have removed any shadow of reason for this plea, rather specious than real at any time.

An Act respecting the Electoral Franchise contains clauses more profoundly dangerous to society than either of the bills referred to. With his usual amiability, and good taste, the member for Ottawa County has thrown such a halo round the objectionable clauses as nearly to silence their most determined adversary. It is a subject, however, about which there can be no compromise. They are introductory of the greatest revolution ever proposed in the social order. To say that it is to go no further than giving the right to unmarried women to vote is a mere pretext. Every right must follow in the wake to all women, married or single. The next cry will be, "how can you refuse, to the mother of a family the right you grant to every shrewish old maid." There is no honest purpose to be served in disguising the issue. These clauses, if passed, would form a direct and an important step towards destroying the family, by changing the relation of the sexes, and thus overthrowing the headship of the husband. This is in violation of the experience of the world, civilized and uncivilized, in all ages; and it is in directly in opposition to the teaching of the New Testament—particularly if we leave unmodified the interesting and novel doctrine of *l'influence indue*, as preached by the Supreme Court. From the predications of that learned body, let us turn to one of St. Paul's. In the same chapter in which he commands wives to be in subjection unto their husbands, he gives this advice, which should be pondered over by those who have not so much the privilege of legislating as the responsibility of legislation: