

determining whether the compensation claimed is such as is prescribed by law we have found however that very many of the services required by law to be performed and which would naturally be presumed to be performed and for which fees were taxed have been as a matter of fact been entirely omitted. This we have discovered by a critical examination of the Journal and Docket of the court.

We find the principal error in the matter of Clerks fees. Where no services have been rendered we have allowed no fees; and where no compensation is expressly provided by law we have allowed none. We have not attempted to specify on the face of the bill the items of service actually performed which would in effect be a relaxation of every bill but we have carried out in pencil on the right hand margin of each bill the compensation given by law for the services actually performed in each case and have endorsed upon the back the amount of fees which we consider due each officer or person and made such observation as each particular case seemed to call for.

We particularly call the attention of the Board to one thing, the practice of paying over to the Clerk of the District Court the full amount of the bill of costs including fees of witness etc. A large proportion of the fees of witness allowed by the Board is never called for and remains in the hands of the Clerk by default and we would suggest that the bills of costs allowed by the board be paid over by the County Clerk to the persons actually entitled thereto and that such fees be retained in his hand until called for by the person so entitled.

We would further say that in our opinion the present allowance of fees for services in criminal matters is extravagant and would suggest to the Board the propriety of memorializing the legislature now in session for a reform in this respect.

All of which is respectfully submitted

Sam'l. A. Riggs

H. Franklin

L. Carpenter

Committee

On motion the report of said committee was accepted