

DIVISION COURTS.

arrive at the following results for the above six months :

Total number of suits entered	38,250
Total amount of claims therein.....	\$1,125,404

Doubling these we get for the *year*.

Number of suits entered.....	76,500
Amount of claims involved.....	\$2,250,808

From these figures we adduce the following :

Average number of suits for each County....	2,125
" " " Court.....	283
" amount of claims for each County....	\$62,523
" " " Court.,...	8,337

In sixteen Counties the number of suits is above the average (2125), ranging from 5550 down to 2152.

In the remaining twenty, the number is below the average, ranging from 1976 down to 562.

In twelve counties, the total of claims involved is above the average (\$62,523) varying from \$209,350, down to \$64,868.

In twenty-four Counties, the total claims is below the average, ranging from \$59,686 down to \$20,352.

While the average number of suits in each County is 2125, and the average of claims involved \$62,523, we see in one County as many as 5550 suits entered, claims to the extent of \$209,850 ; in another, only 562 suits, for \$20,352.

These are the extremes ; still the contrast is very great, even if we take, say, the highest three and the lowest three Counties, which are :

York	5550 suits.—Claims	\$209,850
Simcoe	4976 " "	149,730
Northumberland and Durham	3516 " "	110,394

Prince Edward...	904 suits.—Claims.....	\$22,970
Carleton	866 " " "	25,670
Peel	562 " " "	20,352

Our own County (York) stands, of course, at the head of the list, containing, as it does, the City of Toronto with upwards of 70,000 inhabitants, but, while it heads Simcoe, the second on the list, by less than 600 suits, we are surprised to find that County (Simcoe) with nearly 1500 more than the next below it on the list.

We see then, that even at the very lowest calculation, claims to the extent of at least *two and a quarter millions of dollars* are adjudicated upon in the Ontario Division Courts during the year. So much for figures.

On glancing at the report we find allusion made by the Inspector to the question of the differences in the taxation of costs existing between some of the Clerks of these Courts. Uniformity and certainty are very much to be desired ; but while a tariff of fees has been prepared by authority, there must of course be cases where questions of cost come up, for which no provision is made. In such cases, as well as in all others, there is an appeal to the Judge, and if, as we understand is the case, constant correspondence and communication is taking place between the County Judges, as well by letter as at their annual meeting in June, on all questions affecting the practice and conduct of their Courts, there is no doubt that in a short time, uniformity and certainty will be secured. The Inspector alludes to the "self-interest" of the Clerks in these matters as interfering with their understanding of the tariff, but where, we ask, is it otherwise, where officials are paid by fees and not by salary? The same accusation might be made against Sheriffs, the Clerks of the higher Courts, Bailiffs, &c., and it amounts simply to a charge of giving themselves the "benefit of the doubt." Every day, with each of these officials, a case arises where something or other has to be done for which no remuneration is provided.

The fact is that the remarks of the Inspector point to this, that the system of payment by fees is a most pernicious one, and the sooner it is done away with the better for all parties. No doubt the payment of all Division Court Clerks, for instance, by a uniform salary, would