

U. H. J.  
Liber No. 36  
Nov. 26

positively asserted that we proposed the Regulation of Fees contained in the Bill of 1745 should now be Established with respect to the Secretarys and Commissary Generals Offices to say nothing of the other Offices. Egregious Misrepresentation? in what part of our Paper was the Secretarys Office or any other except the Commissarys even mentioned, or with what degree of Propriety or Candour can our Proposition, respecting the Bill of 1745, be applied to the Secretary or any other Officer, than the Commissary? We modestly proposed you aver, an Addition of 25 Per Cent to the late  
p. 616 Regulation of Fees in those Offices; is such Language as this Suitable to the nature of our Intercourse? In the outset of the Conference we discovered that Pertinacity was included in your Idea of Dignity and we must now infer from your Expressions, that Misrepresentation and ill manners compleat it.

The want of Decency is as little proof of superior Probity as it is of superiour Sense. In your Paper of the 19.<sup>th</sup> Instant you alledge, in Answer to what we had urged in respect of the Commissary Generals Charge when Services are done by his Deputies that in the Year 1745 the Regulation of Officers Fees being a principal object of Attention, a Bill was framed for the Purpose in Consequence of an Agreement between Conferees and passed both Houses; that the double Charge Was then under Consideration, twice agitated and finally agreed to be abolished; to confirm your State you added an Extract from the Journals and Subjoined these words “this Extract needs no Comment.” The Sense of the two Houses “on this Point” is fully and clearly expressed, what point but the double Charge? Our Answer to you on this Head was that by the Scheme of the Bill of 1745 the Commissary General was to Charge no Fees, when the Services should be done by the Deputies; but it was no part of it that there should be an Enlargement of their Jurisdiction from £50. to £150. That the Inspection Act made no Provision against the Charge of the Commissary General in the above Instance, but enlarged the Jurisdiction of the Deputies to the Extent of £150. That no Inference could be drawn from the rejected Bill to prove a Charge under the Regulation of 1747 to be an Abuse, tho that Bill might be material to shew what was the true Construction of, and usage under the Act of 1715 and that the Omission of the Restriction  
p. 617 in the Inspection Act shewed, what the Legislature in 1747 intended should be the Operation of this Act, because it appears by the Journals that the Assembly in 1747 had the Bill of 1745 under their Consideration. We referred to the Practice before the Act of 1715, to the Terms of this Act as well as of the Inspection Law, and to the constant Usage under both, represented our Persuasion that the Income of the Commissary would be so much reduced by the New Table as to be below the Regard of a Gentleman, and pointed out for your reflection what would be the Consequence in regard to