

L. H. J. and of the Upper House of Assembly; Be it therefore Enacted by
 Liber No. 46 the Authority aforesaid, by and with the Advice and Consent aforesaid, That no such Member shall be obliged to serve in the Militia, or be enrolled or inlisted in any Regiment, Troop, or Company thereof; any Law to the contrary notwithstanding." These are all the Places of that Law in 1732, which we can find in any way referring to any former Militia Law whatever; and we think are so worded, as not to refer to any particular Law, but generally to "such as are now in force within this Province, relating to the Militia thereof." From which manner of wording it is plain, that the Legislature only intended this as a supplementary Law to such Laws relating to the Militia, as were at the Time of the making thereof actually in force, and to none other; and if those Laws of 1715 and 1722 were, long before the making of this, expired, as we hope is by the former Part of this Address to your Excellency sufficiently made out, then we clearly think this latter Law can be no supplementary Law to them: Nor can we think your Excellency's Part of this Question is in any manner strengthened by the Title to this Law of 1732; for besides that we conceive the Title to a Law is no Part of that Law, yet admit it were, it must be construed consistently with the different Parts of the Body of the Law it self; and then it will stand thus, A Supplementary Act to such Act for the ordering and regulating the Militia of this Province, for the better Defence and Security thereof, as is now in force," and leaves the matter as before; and there being no former Militia Law in force at the Time of making this last Act, it cannot be a supplementary Law to one having no Being: And we must beg leave to observe, that we cannot find that the legislative Power (that is in the year 1732) did not think the Act of 1715 was expired, but on the contrary looked upon it to be, as it really is, a perpetual Law, referred to it in several Places, and supplied some Defects in it; for besides that we have before shewn that it does not appear to be a perpetual Law, we not only think it strange, that had they looked on the Law of 1715 to
 p. 509 have been in force, they should not have recited it so, or in some Part or other of that long Law have referred to it in express Terms, but we also conceive that by the before recited Clauses of the Act of 1732, referring generally to such Laws relating to the Militia as were then in force, they seem cautiously to have avoided saying any Thing which might thereafter be taken as an Acknowledgment that any Law whatever relating to the Militia was in force, and choosing, from a Multiplicity of Business, or some other Reason, rather than at that Time to go into the Consideration, and perhaps a Dispute, on the Existence of any such Law, to refer the Determination of it to some other Season; and were we to admit they did think that some Law relating to the Militia was then in force, since there is none particularly named why must it be the Law of 1715 were there no