

in making this Charge. You have been pleased to recur to the Act of 1715 and argue your Construction of that Act too in your favour. We on the contrary have given our Construction and still think it the right One. We by no Means admit that the Tables of fees of 1747 or 1753 warranted this Charge; but on the contrary observe, that in most of the Tables there are Allowances for many Services without any Addition to the Article, if done by the particular Officer in whose Table such Article stands; on the whole of which the Construction must most clearly be that the Allowance is to be to such Officer for his doing such Service. And we have opposed too against you the evident Injustice of compelling any Man to pay twice for a Service performed but once, and have mentioned the Provision in a Bill passed both Houses in 1745 preventing this Abuse. You have brought to your Aid likewise the solemn Sanction of the late expired Regulation so deliberately enacted, reenacted and continued by several Assemblies at five different Times to strengthen you, not only with Regards to the Commissary's double Charge but also to evince the old Table, so loosely expressed, that not a few of the Officers themselves palliate their excessive Charges from the Doubtfulness of the Expressions, and from whence Bills of Costs in different Offices, in like Suits, and under similar Circumstances often materially differ, is well adapted to the Purposes of it, and is proved to be so by long Experience. We have asserted "the fact is too notorious to be denied that the Table of fees under the first Inspection Law was then adopted and hath been since continued not so much from the Impressions of the Propriety and just Proportion of the Reward to the Service, as from the Utility of that Bill in other Respects and the Necessity of agreeing to an imperfect Table of fees, or losing a Regulation of the Staple allowed on all Hands to be very beneficial to the people."

L. H. J.
Liber No. 54
Nov. 22

As your Reasoning was not forcible enough to convince the Judgment of the Lower House of the Legality or Propriety of the Commissary General's double Charges, so they could not alter their Determination with regard to them, and unhappily the Commissary General's Reward for doing nothing must be left to be decided by those who may happen to be charged something *by him* for his doing *Nothing for them*, on whose Fears possibly the Administration or Testamentary Bond taken according to your Remark with a very extensive Condition, how legal need not now be considered, may forcibly operate, or by legal Determination in which a Jury of the Country may possibly be of different Sentiments from your Honours.

Your Honours having enquired whether we choose that the Regulation of fees proposed by the Bill of 1745, which you have been pleased to allege, has been mentioned by Us, in Terms of so much Approbation, should now be established, and after desiring our ex-