

The conferees of the upper chamber still insisted that the old table of fees was primarily to be considered. The length of time it had been in existence proved its worth. If any reduction of fees was intended, the Upper House would not agree to a new table (*ibid.*).

In reply the Lower House Delegates at the conference maintained that the mere fact that the old table of fees had been in existence a long time was no proof that they were justified. They claimed that an examination of the circumstances attending the several re-enactments of the law relating to officers' fees would not disclose any "fondness" for them and that in 1769 they were continued for one year only with the intention of considering them more fully at the next session. This action, the Delegates said, showed that the old table of fees was looked upon as defective in many respects. The Lower House objected especially to charges made by the Commissary General for services performed by his deputies and for which the latter were paid. Unless this double charge was stopped, the Delegates said that they would not agree to any regulation regarding officers' fees (pp. 53, 178-181, 183).

The conferees of the Upper House claimed that if they agreed to this suggestion about the Commissary General it would reduce his income "below the Regard of a Gentleman." They still insisted that the fact the law containing the old table of fees had been in effect for so long was proof of its merit. "By what other Criterion," they said, "can we so safely judge of the Opinion and Sentiments of Lawmakers as by the Laws they themselves have ordained" (pp. 53-57, 188).

On November 22 in a lengthy reply the conferees of the Lower House further elaborated their position. They claimed that in defending the charges made in the Commissary General department the Upper House conferees had not attempted to justify such charges, but supported them on the "Construction of the Table and uniform usage and Practice." The Delegates criticized the Upper House for suggesting an increase in the fees of the Secretary and other officers. It was a proposal, they said, that must have come from the officers themselves. As there was no hope of an agreement being reached, the conferees of the Lower House said that they had been instructed by the lower chamber to break up the conference (pp. 57, 201-207).

When the conferees of the Upper House read the message of the Delegates, they felt it should be answered. Accordingly, they obtained permission of the Delegates for another meeting of the conference for the purpose of vindicating their conduct (pp. 57-58).

At this last meeting of the conference, on November 26, the conferees of the Upper House accused those of the Lower House of perverting facts and instead of using reason and argument to settle the differences between them had offered "professions for proofs, Evasions for Answers, Assertions to convince, and rudeness to conciliate." The Upper House members claimed that those representing the lower chamber had not made sufficiently plain the instances in which excessive fees were charged in some of the departments. They denied that they had asked for an increase in fees for the Secretary and other officers. In conclusion they said that while they had not wanted to give offence, they