tional Act of 1791, to the expenses of the Colonial Government, any provision of the Bill of 1819, which might be supposed to affect that appropriation was a mere surplusage. No Act of a Colonial Legislature, (or even of the King's Ministers) can alter, repeal or suspend an Act of Parliament expressly made for a Colony. If the pretensions of the Colonial Executive had been well founded, there was no ground for alarm. By the above mentioned Bill, the expenses of the Government, as they stood in 1817, generally, were allowed by the Assembly, for the first time, after examination. The right of the Executive, if It had such a right, would still have remained good. The Act of Parliament would have supported itself against every thing; and it would have been quite time enough to appeal to it, when it could have been shewn that the Assembly had made the odious and pernicious use of its right, which the Council in its Report of the I7th March 1824, so unwarrantably seems to apprehend, in contradiction to the confidence reposed in the People of the Province and their Representatives by the King's Instructions of 1817, requiring an annual vote of the Colonial Expenditure, and indeed in contradiction to that confidence reposed in the Colony by the Supreme Author by of the Empire, when the present Constitution was granted.

MARTIN does not think it necessary to enter into a full discussion on the subject of the Revenue Act of 1774, at present; but should it ever be necessary for him to do so, he thinks he will be able to shew the right of His Majesty's Subjects in this Colony, by means of their Representativer, to provide by Bill for the application of every farthing raised in the shape of Revenue within this Colony, the amount of appropriations already made by Act of the Colonial Legislature, and the proportion awarded, or which may be awarded, to Upper-Canada, only excepted; and that the application of no part of that money is legal without their

consent

which st, and shed in

of the

s Pro-

in the e Prol'these

of that

om the

country

to him

l by an

r 1765, the 5th

ime, in

oclama-

that this

Law in

n so far re con-

Lawyer, d. The under-

of 1794, ews that

ots of its for, was Why

thought e, which

on the g a Receeds as

esponsa-

ed more
Statute,
t a moot
s of the
vernor's
nat these
now are
leceiver
by Acts
oroceeds
beyond
onstitu-

Martin is glad to have had the testimony of so respectable a writer as Denis, to the facts alledged by him in his statement of the proceedings on our Financiai Difficulties down to the close of the Session of 1824, "with a single exception," which Martin cannot help thinking had better not have been made. He is very willing that Denis and the Public should draw such inferences from these facts and ascribe such motives to Martin as they think proper.—8th January 1824.