

Attorney who made the above declaration was plaintiff's Attorney, served the Writ of Summons himself, and *charged* and *collected* \$4.95 more than his own legal fee. And this is the man who would have the public believe such services were made for nothing. Had the Sheriff made the service his fee would have been \$1.80. The Attorney took \$4.95 over and above his own legal fees, being within 45 cents of a sum equal to *three* Sheriffs' fees in addition to his own; in other words he pocketed \$1.80 that belonged to the Sheriff and \$3.15 that belonged to the litigant, and not to the Attorney or any other. I followed up the men who had spoken and written in defence of Process-serving by Attorneys and failed to find *one* who, as in the cases I have cited, failed to charge and collect a sum equal to from *one* to *two* Sheriffs' fees in addition to their own.

Now let us, for the sake of argument, assume for a moment that the services are made for "*nothing*," and see how it could be defended. Both Lawyers and Sheriffs are paid by fees for the performance of certain duties, and from these fees it is assumed they will obtain a fair and reasonable income. To the Lawyers belong the duty of *issuing* all papers in the Superior and County Courts, for which a tariff of fees is provided that, so far as I know, is fair and satisfactory; but no tariff of fees or provision is made to pay them for serving them, for the makers of the law never intended they should perform that duty. To the Sheriffs was assigned the duty of *serving* all papers issued out of the Superior and County Courts requiring a personal service, for which the Judges (who framed the tariff of fees for both Lawyers and Sheriffs) made a fair and satisfactory tariff of fees for such services. The Sheriffs, of course, employed Bailiffs equipped with horses and conveyances to perform the duty assigned them; but alas! comparatively little of these duties fell to their lot; the Process-serving Attorney, by himself, his Clerk, Division Court Bailiff, or any other he could find, had the service effected outside the Sheriff's Office, while the Sheriff had his officer under pay and ready to perform the duty. Now, assuming that all the services were made for *nothing*, (which I have shown to be untrue, and of which I shall give further proof), was the Sheriff not as effectually