

pauper Estates, and the Jurisdiction of the Deputies, if left to the Act of 1715. Then followed our Proposition in these words Do you chuse the Regulation of Fees proposed by the Bill of 1745, which you have mentioned with so much Approbation, should now be established? Be pleased to declare explicitly; We are willing to adopt that Regulation; Or do you mean to contend for the "Reduction in the Article of the double charge," on the Authority of the Bill of 1745, and your Persuasion that the Framers of it were particularly attentive to and careful of the Publick Convenience, and depart from it in the other respects? If you do all Prospect of an Accomodation is at an End; does a single Syllable occur, relative to the Secretarys Office, or to any other than the Commissarys? Was not the "Double Charge" the immediate Subject of Discussion? What is the Antecedent, to which the relative Expressions are Applicable? Did we not expressly mention our persuasion, that the Income of the Commissary General would be reduced by the New Table below the Regard of a Gentleman? What relation to, or Effect upon his Income could an Extent of the proposed Regulation of 1745 to the other Officers have? Can it be really imagined, when the general Question on the Conference was, to what Degree Fees of Officers should be reduced, and when we have only Contended for the Old Table with the Allowance of the Alternative to the people and You for a Reduction more Considerable, that we could mean to propose an Addition of 25 p Cent to the Fees of the Officers Settled by the Old Table? A general Expression occurring, that has been catch'd at, and the certain Rule of Construction sacrificed to the Favourite Purpose of venting Contumely in illiberal Language, and fixing an unmerited Odium. The Conclusion of our Paper, if farther Argument were necessary, demonstrates that it could not be our meaning to include the Secretary or County Clerks, whose names were not mentioned, or Officers hinted at in any former part of it, had such been our Meaning the Repet[it]ion of our willingness to prevent in future, Charges for Recording under the Table of 1747 that should appear to be Abuses, would have been extremely incongruous.

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

p. 618

It cannot but be expected that under the Alternative extended to all Persons, to Pay in Money or Tobacco very little if any Tobacco would be paid, unless it should happen to fall to or below the value of the Money. On this Supposition should the proposed Regulation of 1745 be established, instead of that of 1747. We are well satisfied the Income of the Commissary General under the former would be so far from exceeding his Income under the latter Regulation 25 p Centum, that it would rather fall Short of it in Consequence of the great Reduction, in the Article of Services done by his Deputies.

It is most probable that the Business in the Offices will be augmented with the increasing population of the Country; but with the Business so will the Trouble and every Expense increase.