

My next assailant was an old man named Francis Rye, of Barrie, to whom I give credit for having honestly fathered his letter over his own proper name "Alcoholic," as it is. His letter appeared in the *Globe* of the 16th February, 1877, just ten days after the publication of "Practicing Lawyer's" letter in the same paper. Mr. Rye discourses as follows: "I have never known a case of a solicitor charging his client with Sheriff's fees, or with a fee equal to what a Sheriff's fee would be for service of a Bill in Chancery or Writ of Summons where the Sheriff was not employed, and as to charging Sheriff's fees besides his own fees for the service—(*which would be a fraudulent charge*)—this, I need hardly say, is a practice entirely unknown to my profession." *The existence of such an officer as a Taxing Master appears to have been entirely forgotten by the writer of the article.*

If such a thing as charging a *client* with Sheriff's fees, or a sum equal to what a Sheriff's fee would be is entirely unknown to the profession, such a thing as charging a *defendant* with Sheriff's fees, or with a sum much larger than the Sheriff's fee would be, is not unknown to Mr. Rye, who, as it would appear from the receipted and taxed Bill of Costs in the cause *Watson vs. Servois*, which I hold in my hands, the Writ of Summons having been served by himself, he *charged* and *collected* \$2.73 more than his own legal fees. "*He seems to have entirely forgotten the existence of such an officer as a Taxing Master.*" Yes, good old Rye *charged* and *collected* \$2.73 more than his own legal fees. If the Sheriff had made the service his fees would have been \$1.80, therefore Rye pocketed \$1.80 that belonged to the Sheriff, and 93 cents that belonged to the litigant and not to the Attorney or Sheriff. Rye pocketed within 87 cents of a sum equal to *two* Sheriffs' fees in addition to his own. This is another example of the advantages to the public of having services made by the Attorneys!!!

During the debate on Mr. Sinclair's motion, one of the members arose and said, "I object to compelling people to serve Process through the Sheriff when the Attorney himself would serve them for *nothing*!!!—vide *Globe*, 11th Jan., 1877. Not many months after this declaration I obtained a *receipted* and *taxed* Bill of Costs in a cause in which the