

with their Abuses; we must understand the Subject, and have a fair Opportunity of judging upon it, before we bind ourselves by Concessions. The Matters you have represented to be Abuses in the Commissary's Office, are the Orders and Charges on Administrations, &c. granted by the Deputies. You asserted, that "there is an additional Order in this Office to almost every Act done therein, when the old Table made the Allowance *only* in Testamentary Causes;" and in order to correct this supposed Abuse, the new Table allows *only* in the single Instance of entering every Motion in Court and Order thereon, Five Pounds of Tobacco; mult not such an Alteration very much diminish the Fees of the Commissary General, when there can be no Pretence that it is necessary to prevent Abuse, since *besides* the Allowance for Orders in Testamentary Causes, the *only* Allowance you have acknowledged, the old Table most expressly gives a Fee for Orders in Four other Instances, exclusive of the general Article? Can this be directly denied to be an Attempt to reduce, under the Pretence of correcting Abuses?

As to the double Charge, as you call it, we may add to what we have already advanced, that it is not only consistent with constant Usage, but has been admitted to be regular in the various Instances, both at Law and in Equity, of Allowances made to Executors and Administrators, for their Charges and Disbursements. You have positively asserted, that we "proposed the Regulation of Fees contained in the Bill of 1745 should now be established with Respect to the Secretary's and Commissary General's Offices," "to say nothing of the other Offices."

Egregious Misrepresentation! In what Part of our Paper was the Secretary's Office or any other, except the Commissary's, 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 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 complete it.

The Want of Decency is as little Proof of superior Probity, as it is of superior Sense. In your Paper of the 19th Instant, you allege, in Answer to what we had urged, in Respect of the Commissary General's 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 Conferrees, 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, though 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 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 Pauper Estates, and the Jurisdiction of the Deputies, if left to the Act of 1715; then followed our Proposition in these Words, "Do you choose 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 Accommodation is at an end." Does a single Syllable occur relative to the Secretary's Office, or to any other than the Commissary's? 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 per Cent. to the Fees of the Officers settled by the old Table? A general Expression occurring, that has been catched 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 Offices hinted at, in any former Part of it; had such been our Meaning, the Repetition of our Willingness to prevent