remuneration as is paid for manual labour[7]. On this ground it has been held that a preference could not be claimed for the fees paid to an attorney-at-law for services rendered under occasional retainers, nor to the commissions of a selling agent, nor to the remuneration of an employé performing work of such a character that the amount stipulated to be paid for it would, in ordinary parlance, be designated as "salary"[8]. In the case cited the use of the word "wages" was treated as an element corroborating an inference which was also deduced from the collocation of the terms by which the preferred classes of claimants are described. See § 7(*f*), *post*.

In a New Jersey case also, the fact that the statute in question referred to "wages" as the subject-matter of the preference granted, and made no specific mention of "salaries," was mentioned as an element corroborating the inference drawn on independent grounds, that the statute did not cover the *officers* of a corporation[9].

(*d*) ——— *by the nature of the business or work with relation to which the services were rendered.* In some instances in which the word or words under review were clearly an apt description of employés of the class to which the claimant belonged, the specific ground upon which his right to the preference was contested was that his services were not rendered in connection with the kind of business or occupation to which the statute had reference[10].

---

[7] *Re Stryker* (1899) 158 N.Y. 526, Aff'g. 73 Hun. 327.

[8] *People* v. *Remington* (1887) 45 Hun. 329, Aff'd. 109 N.Y. 631 (memo.).

[9] *Weatherby* v. *Saxony Woollen Co.* (N.J. Eq. 1894) 29 Atl. 326 (see § 7 subd. (*b*), note 000).

[10] In *Schilling* v. *Carter* (1886) 35 Minn. 287, N.W. , it was held that farm labourers were not within a statute for the protection of "mechanics, labourers and others," the decision being based upon the ground that the context clearly indicated that only employés connected with "works, manufactory or business" were within the purview of the enactment.

By § 2 of New York Laws, 1897, ch. 415, (Labour Law), it is declared that, the term employé "shall be taken to mean a "mechanic, workingman, or labourer" who works for another for hire. It was held that firemen were not within the purview of the Act, as it was not applicable to persons holding the municipal positions which are included in the classified