

‘ the nominating of Commissioners in all bills imposing burthens
 ‘ on the people as being solely in the House of Assembly; that the
 ‘ nomination of the Honorable George Leonard, Joshua Gidney
 ‘ and James Hughson in the act mentioned of 1792 as Commis-
 ‘ sioners for the performance of the services therein allotted to
 ‘ them was irregular, and the money ought in that and in all such
 ‘ cases, as it has been in many instances in former appropriation
 ‘ bills, to have been granted “ to such person as the Lieutenant
 ‘ Governor or Commander in Chief for the time being should ap-
 ‘ point” —for the express purpose intended; that the appoint-
 ‘ ment of commissioners of public accounts is for a service of a
 ‘ peculiar nature within the province of the Commons, who
 ‘ have a right to be fully informed of all expenditures of public
 ‘ money; and lastly that Commissioners of American Claims
 ‘ were appointed for a service altogether new and unknown be-
 ‘ fore requiring an Act of Parliament to authorise it, and the no-
 ‘ mination of those Commissioners we suppose must have been
 ‘ made by direction of HIS MAJESTY through his Chancellor
 ‘ of the Exchequer, or at least with his approbation.

‘ III. Respecting the observations made in the answer to the
 ‘ third objection, we conceive that the recommendation by HIS
 ‘ EXCELLENCY in 1793, to provide for the pay of the Speaker
 ‘ and the Members of the Assembly, cannot be supposed to have
 ‘ been intended to justify or propose any unconstitutional mode;
 ‘ but rather ought then to have suggested the expediency of
 ‘ the measure which we now think indispensably necessary. For
 ‘ the Statute of the 6. Hen. 8. having been made long before
 ‘ the existence of the colonies, was part of the English Law
 ‘ which every Subject of the Realm must have brought with
 ‘ him on his emigration, and must continue to be a part of the
 ‘ law of this land, until some new law be enacted for the ex-
 ‘ press purpose of authorising the mode of providing for the ser-
 ‘ vice in question which is preferred by the Assembly and to
 ‘ which, in such case, we should have no objection.

‘ IV. As there can be no doubt of the continuance of the
 ‘ Royal Instruction, alluded to in the fourth objection, we have
 ‘ only to observe, on that head, that no part of that Instruction
 ‘ was dispensed with in the act “ to provide for the Support of
 ‘ a Light House.”

‘ V. The Council, in stating their fifth objection, supposed
 ‘ the naming of Courts of Oyer and Terminer to have been an
 ‘ oversight, and they acknowledge it had in former instances e-
 ‘ scaped their notice. The objection however, is certainly well
 ‘ founded.’