

First, you object to the fee of ten cents for each case called in open court, which was intended as a remuneration for court days. Certainly you will admit they should be paid for those services, and if so, how? unless by a fee on each suit; the manner proposed is in accordance with the practice of the Superior Courts, and I believe has the merit of being just to all concerned. If you take the average number of Division Court suits throughout the country for the last two years, you will find that it gives about ten cases to each court, this would allow the bailiff \$1 for his day's services, which no reasonable person would object to.

Again, as regards the fee on executions returned *nulla bona*; in many cases plaintiffs order executions to be issued to find out the true position of the defendant, as they are aware that under the present tariff it costs them nothing, and the bailiff must do so at his own expense and trouble, before he can make his return; therefore, I think you will agree with me, that every officer should be paid for his services, and if so, it is not too much. And generally we ask for a revision of the tariff, as it is not in proportion to sheriffs', or other officers, of like responsibility and capacities.

If Division Court officers employ their spare hours to advantage, should that prevent them being paid for their services as officers of the court? and, if so, the tariff adopted at the meeting of bailiffs in June last would be quite reasonable, in proportion to all other tariffs of fees where there is any amount of responsibility.

I agree with your remarks regarding the necessary disbursements bailiffs are required to make, and for which they are allowed nothing by the tariff; which prove the necessity of some alteration, and at the same time how unexpectedly a bailiff may get into trouble. You will see in the proposed tariff when a fee is asked a service has been rendered for it.

Hoping to hear from others more capable of writing on such an important subject,

I am yours respectfully,

A SUBSCRIBER.

Galt, Oct., 1866.

"NONE SO DEAF AS THOSE WHO WON'T HEAR."

—In the Crown Court, at the Leeds Assizes, on Monday, a man applied to be excused from serving on the jury. The learned Judge (Mr. Justice Montague Smith) asked him: What is your

reason?—Applicant: Well, I am rather deafish. —The Judge in a low voice: Oh, deaf. How old are you?—Applicant: Sixty-two —The Judge in the same low voice: And you are very deaf?—Applicant: Well, I can't hear half that goes on. —The Judge: Why you hear better than I do. But if you are sixty-two that will do. You should apply to the overseer to have your name taken off the list.—Applicant: I did not know that.—The old man was then sworn, and he stated that he should be sixty-three next birthday.—The Judge: How do you know that you are sixty-two? —Applicant: Why, my lord—why—why, my lord, from being—from being born, my lord (laughter).—The Judge: Oh, you remember that, do you? (renewed laughter). His lordship then told the applicant he was excused.—*Law Times*.

MISTAKEN IDENTITY.—A curious question of identity came last week before Mr. Cooke at the Worship-street police-office. Charlotte Amey, aged thirty-one, a seamstress, was charged with stealing Edward Corderoy, a boy of four years of age. Corderoy had been placed in charge of his aunt, a Mrs. Leader, a toy-maker, his mother being in service, and had been abducted by Mrs. Amey, as he was out walking with one of Mrs. Leader's workmen. After a good deal of trouble Mrs. Amey's residence was discovered, and there little Corderoy was found. The prisoner protested to the magistrate that the boy was hers, saying that she was separated from her husband, who had taken her child away from her, and that she had recognized him the moment she saw him. But the next day Samuel Amey, the prisoner's husband, appeared in court, leading in his hand a boy so exactly like Edward Corderoy that no person present could see any difference between the two children. He told the magistrate that his wife's story was true, that he had quarrelled with her, left her, and taken her child away with him. Mr. Cooke at once discharged Charlotte Amey, saying that the extraordinary likeness between the two children fully accounted for the mistake she had made.—*Law Times*.

APPOINTMENTS TO OFFICE.

CORONERS.

WILLIAM NOBLE RUTLEDGE, of Coldwater, Esquire, M.D., to be an Associate Coroner for the County of Simcoe. (Gazetted September 1, 1866.)

ADDISON WORTHINGTON, Esquire, M.D., to be an Associate Coroner for the United Counties of Huron and Bruce. (Gazetted September 1, 1866.)

ROBERT M. ROY, of Belleville, Esquire, M.D., to be an Associate Coroner for the County of Hastings. (Gazetted September 1, 1866.)

ALFRED LANDER, of Frankville, Esquire, M.D., to be an Associate Coroner for the United Counties of Leeds and Grenville. (Gazetted September 1, 1866.)

NOTARIES PUBLIC.

PETER CAMERON, of Toronto, Esquire, Barrister-at-Law, to be a Notary Public for Upper Canada. (Gazetted September 1, 1866.)

WILLIAM PENN BROWN, of the Village of Kincaidine, Esquire, Attorney-at-Law, to be a Notary Public for Upper Canada. (Gazetted September 1, 1866.)

FREDERICK JASPER CHADWICK, of the Town of Guelph, Esquire, to be a Notary Public for Upper Canada. (Gazetted September 1, 1866.)

JAMES YOUNG, of Carrying Place, Esquire, to be a Notary Public for Upper Canada. (Gazetted Sept. 15, 1866.)