and they can conduct speedy trials. It seems to me that practice should be followed. The fact that creditors are sometimes critical is something I think should not be taken into consideration.

Hon. Mr. LÉGER: The only feature you object to is the provision of Section 159 (*f*)?

Mr. Justice URQUHART: There is another clause in Section 159 (1) (*a*):—

> to hear and determine all matters in dispute arising out of the administration of an estate or in which any interest of the estate is involved or to which the trustee is a party, or in which the trustee is a claimant against any other person.

It quite often happens in bankruptcy matters that either a trustee is proceeding against some private person on behalf of the estate, or some such person is making a claim against the estate. It is often difficult for a judge to determine whether it is a matter of bankruptcy or a case that should be dealt with in the regular courts. The practice has been that where an outsider is involved, the matter shall be brought before the regular courts. There is a decision of the English courts to that effect in the case of Ellis *v.* Silber (1873), Law Reports, 8 Chancery, page 83, in which it is stated at page 86 as follows:—

> That which is to be done in bankruptcy is the administration in bankruptcy. The debtor and the creditors, as the parties to the administration in bankruptcy, are subject to that jurisdiction. The trustees or assignees, as the persons entrusted with that administration, are subject to that jurisdiction. The assets which come to their hands and the mode of administering them are subject to that jurisdiction; and there may be, and I believe are, some special classes of transactions which, under special clauses of the Acts of Parliament, may be specially dealt with as regards third parties. But the general proposition, that whenever the assignees or trustees in bankruptcy or the trustees under such deeds as these have a demand at law on in equity as against a stranger to the bankruptcy, then that demand is to be prosecuted in the Court of Bankruptcy, appears to me to be a proposition entirely without the warrant of anything in the Acts of Parliament, and wholly unsupported by any trace or vestige whatever of authority.

That is another phase of the section which I think should be left as it is.

The next subject about which I should like to speak is the proposed decentralization of the Bankruptcy Court. In Ontario we now have one bankruptcy office located in the city of Toronto. There are some receivers appointed under the Bankruptcy Act, but that is the only office of record that we have ever had. I would not like to see the process of decentralization invoked and forty-seven jurisdictions created. We have records for years, and those records will continue to build up. There is one place of record in the province where searches can be made. For instance, a person who is passing a title must search for bankruptcy against the man from whom he is buying. Having only one office also is conducive to uniformity of practice.

Section 160 of the act provides that the Local Registrars, forty-seven in number, shall be Registrars in Bankruptcy, and that the judicial powers of the Registrar are to be exercised by the Master of the court, but if there be no Master at that point, by the registrar if he is a duly qualified lawyer, or otherwise by the county judge. There is now power under the present act to appoint extra registrars in bankruptcy if necessary. I think it is in the public interest that there should be only one office of record for the province. This practice has been in vogue, as I said, since about 1920. If all offices were made offices of record it might require forty-seven searches to determine whether a man is bankrupt or not.