

In holding that the *fi. fas.* in the sheriff's hands cannot have the effect of keeping the estate out of the hands of the assignee, it follows, of course, that the attachments against the defendant as an absconding debtor cannot have that effect. The Absconding Debtors' Act, it is true, provides for a certain distribution of an insolvent's estate; but I think it could never be argued that the Legislature in passing the Insolvent Act, intended that it should be inoperative merely because one creditor, after an act of bankruptcy committed by his debtor absconding, should choose to take out an attachment against him as an absconding debtor, especially where, as in this case, no other creditor could adopt that proceeding, the defendant being now within the jurisdiction of the court.

The Insolvent Act does not contemplate any other equitable distribution of the insolvent's estate except under that act. And it even provides that any *general assignment* for the benefit of creditors (no matter how equitable) made by the debtor, except it be made under the provisions of that act shall not only be ineffectual but shall be an act of insolvency, rendering the estate liable to compulsory liquidation under the act (see sec. 3, sub-sec. 1.) * If the attaching creditor has a priority by virtue of his attachment, it will be the duty of the assignee to allow it to him under sec. 5, sub-sec. 4 of the act.

I therefore order that the sheriff do amend his return to the writ of attachment issued in this matter accordingly. The costs of the plaintiff's attorney to be costs in this matter.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Scatcherd's Cheap Law Bill.

TORONTO, Feb. 25, 1865.

TO THE EDITORS OF THE LAW JOURNAL.

Gentlemen,—Will you not again take up the subject of Mr. Scatcherd and his Law Costs bill or motion, and advise the profession in the matter?

Would it not be well for a meeting of attorney to be called, and a committee appointed, to draft a petition in the premises, and have it duly presented to the House of Parliament? Something should be done.

Yours truly,
AN ATTORNEY.

[In April, 1863, we fully expressed our views on Mr. Scatcherd's Cheap Law Bill. (See 9 U. C. L. J. 85.) Our remarks then made received the approval as well of the public as of the profession. Some one, unknown to us, did us the honor of having our remarks republished in the form of a circular, and mailed to members of Parliament and others.

We had hoped that even Mr. Scatcherd would by this time have seen the folly of his

pet bill. If he aspires to the dignity of half a statesman, we shall look for something better from him than this stupid piece of buncomb. It is a mistake to suppose that lawyers are especially interested in the death of such a measure. The persons really interested are the public. To cheapen litigation will be to make it more plentiful; and lawyers, like other members of the human family in the social scale, can prosper on "small profits and quick returns." If the bill, or anything half as absurd, become law, we venture to affirm that lawyers will have twenty suits for every one that is now entered in court. The profession, in a pecuniary point of view, will not suffer; but the public, whose interest it is that there should be little litigation, will be the real sufferers.

Some people are astonished that in Canada, with a population so sparse, compared with that of the mother country, suits are so plentiful—that while in some of the larger cities of England we read of two or three records at most entered for trial at an assize, we find twenty times the number in towns in Upper Canada, where the population is twenty times less than at home. The secret is, that in Canada a suit costs at least five times less than a suit in England. Then cheapen the suit in Canada by making it five times less than it now costs, and the certain increase in number is a mere matter of computation. Men of ordinary intelligence are alive to this state of things, and it is to be hoped that Mr. Scatcherd, if really in earnest, will some day or other acquire sufficient intelligence to realize the depth and breadth of his folly.—
Eds. L. J.]

INSOLVENTS.

Andrew Smith.....	Manilla.
W. H. Vantassel	Sidney.
Patrick Langrill	Toronto.
Daniel J. Woodward.....	Tp. Rawdon.
M. Elliott.....	Cainsville.
Jacob Bowman.....	Harrisburg.
Chas. F. Smith.....	Belloville.
P. F. Canniff.....	Thurlow.
D. L. Comins.....	Madoc.
George Baghurst	Montreal.
N. Bloodsworth.....	Cainsville.
Richard Benner.....	Hamilton.
Chas. Roy Lapense.....	Levis.
Wm. Dickson.....	Montreal.
Henry Murren.....	Montreal.
Henry Weeks	Woodstock.
John Weeks	Woodstock.
John Mathie.....	Lindsay.
James Ross	Tp. Whitby.
Wm. Wade Rutledge	Guelph.
Smart & Beamish	Port Hope.
D. N. Black	Stratford.
Duncan McNaughton.....	Chatham.
S. D. Merick	Easton's Corners.