

Having given the Attorneys' legal tariff of fees for *issuing* Writs of Summons in the Superior and County Courts, and the Sheriffs' legal tariff of fees for serving them, the public can readily see how much better the Process-serving Attorney himself could afford to deal out his charities with a liberal hand with his fees than the Sheriff could. The Process-serving Attorney might well, in order "to keep down the disbursements of the suit and save costs to the litigant," reduce his own fees to the full amount of the Sheriff's fees, which would save as much costs to the litigant as if the Sheriff's fees had been taken for that purpose, and the Process-serving Attorney would still have within \$1.70 of a sum equal to *two* Sheriffs' fees left to himself; this fact the Process-serving Attorney seems to have entirely overlooked or forgotten; it is to be hoped he will neither overlook or forget it in the future.

Before the close of the year 1877 I obtained the information asked for by Mr. Sinclair's motion on the 10th of January of the same year, but which the Legislature did not grant. The Return showed that in the preceding year, (1876), the number of Bills in Chancery and Writs of Summons issued out of the Superior and County Courts were as follows :—

Issued in Chancery Court.....	2,579
"      Superior Court .....	6,556
"      County Court... ..	11,245
<hr/>	
Total Bills and Writs issued in 1876.....	20,380

Had the Sheriff served one copy of each, their fees, exclusive of mileage, would be as follows :—

Bills in Chancery, 2,579 @ \$2.25.....	\$ 2,802 75
Writs in Sup. Court, 6,556 @ 2.70.....	17,701 20
"      County C., 11,241 @ 1.80.....	20,241 00
<hr/>	
	\$43,744 95

Of the 20,380 Bills and Writs the Process-serving Attorneys served the following number :—

COUNTY COURT.
\$ cts.
0 10
1 00
0 25
0 20
0 25
\$ 80