

services for
s we were
ss was the
was saved
public had

made by
f the legal
eve them,
ing, for by
the money
y unlikely
Sheriffs to
uld do our
illegal fees
them. So
oing in the
etermined
he facts of
ess-serving
got them in

Column No. 1 in the foregoing table shows the amount charged by Lawyers for issuing and serving Writs of Summons in the H. C. J. and C. C.

Column No. 2 shows the Lawyers' legal fee for issuing a Writ of Summons.

Column No. 3 shows the Sheriffs' legal fee for serving a Writ.

Column No. 4 shows the amount of which the person served was robbed.

It will be observed that for every \$2 70 taken from the Sheriff for services in the H. C. J., \$3.67 is taken from the person served ; and for every \$1.55 taken from the Sheriff for services in the County Court, \$2.66 is taken from the person served. These astounding results are proven by the foregoing table. The six gentlemen referred to there who said they made the services for nothing, &c., made six services in the County Court for which they charged and collected \$9.50 belonging to the Sheriffs, and \$15.97 belonging to the persons served, in all \$25 27 that did not belong to them. The average was \$4.21 wrongfully taken from each ; some took more. Hardy, Wilkes & Jones pocketed \$1.55 belonging to the Sheriff, and \$4.10 belonging to the person served, in all \$5.65 that did not belong to them. Had any other class of men taken the same amount of money not belonging to them, even to appease the gnawings of hunger, every one of them would be serving a term in the Central Prison ; why should a different law be applied to these transgressors ? Had the Hon. A. S. Hardy been a man of high principle when he saw the unlawful charges made by his law partners he would have blushed and repudiated them, and would have used his official position to enact such laws as would protect Sheriffs and litigants from the gross wrongs practiced upon them. This was not done ; the determination was to punish me and to do it in such a way that the public could not see it ; with this object in view *Sec. 1 of Order VI. of the Judicature Act of 1881* was enacted. The Lawyers however act as if the section applied to all Sheriffs, as proven by the accompanying return, showing how the services and fees were divided between Lawyers and Sheriffs in 1888. Had the Government had the courage to have put the following rider on *Sec. 1 of Order VI.* it would have protected all other Sheriffs without any relief to me, viz : "Provided always that *Sec. 1 of Order VI.* shall only apply to the County of Wentworth during the incumbency of the present Sheriff."

Litigants.	Name of Court.
67	Sup.Ct.
90	C'y Ct.
80	C'y Ct.
10	C'y Ct.
79	C'y Ct.
20	C'y Ct.
18	C'y Ct.
97	