

House (pp. 43, 44, 145, 146). To the seventeenth proposition of the upper chamber that provision be made for the payment of fees now due, the lower chamber agreed "when a reasonable Mode can be settled to ascertain what Fees are now due" (pp. 43, 44, 145, 146).

On November 6, after taking into their consideration these counter-propositions of the Lower House Delegates, the Upper House conferees decided to adhere to most of their original propositions. In regard to the clergy, however, they said that under certain conditions they were willing that the question of their pay should be included in the bill now under discussion (pp. 44-45, 152-153). In reply the conferees of the lower chamber informed those of the upper chamber that after what had passed between the two Houses at the last session of the Assembly in 1770, they were surprised that the Upper House members now made such different propositions regarding the payment of the fees of officers, lawyers and clergy, to which the Lower House was unwilling to agree. If the upper chamber still declined a conference on new table of fees the Delegates thought there was little chance of the passage of the bill now under discussion and the conference might as well be ended (pp. 45-46, 153-154).

To this message the conferees of the Upper House replied on the following day saying that what passed at the last session of the Assembly in 1770, not having been productive of any law or regulation, could not be considered as binding on both Houses now "for if considered as mutually obligatory the Conference must inevitably prove fruitless." The conferees of the upper chamber warned those of the lower chamber that they were unwilling to agree to any reduction in officers' fees. If, however, abuses had occurred under the old table of fees, they would consent to their correction (pp. 46-47).

Several days now elapsed before the conference met again on November 11. The conferees of the Lower House said that they did not agree with attitude of the Upper Chamber when they said that the propositions which they had made at the last session of the Assembly were not binding on them now. The Delegates, after pointing out some of the abuses in connection with charges made by officers under the old table, still insisted on having a new set of regulations. Only by comparing the new table with the old could abuses be corrected (pp. 48, 163-165).

The Upper House conferees still asserted there was nothing wrong in their changing their views. If, they said, a legislative body could not modify or reject a proposition previously made "how are they to be excused who have rescinded Regulations, to which they had recently given the most solemn Sanction?" The mere fact that a law, after being in force for a long time, was allowed to expire was, they maintained, no reflection on the members of an Assembly. The reason, they said, they had changed their attitude about the clergy dues was owing to the Governor's message of November 1 to them in which his Excellency had warned them that if no better provision were made for the clergy than had been proposed at the last session of the Assembly in 1770, he would not agree to the new law. Under such circumstances, the conferees of the Upper House asserted, there was no use standing by the former propositions which they had made about the clergy when they knew the Governor would not agree to them (pp. 48-52, 169).