

bankruptcy matters, should be vested with the Registrar's judicial power as local Registrars. Further, action on petitions in outside districts would be delayed until the arrival of Judges on circuits.

I would ask you to bear in mind the importance of that consideration and just what would happen in the case of an estate where there was that delay. The creditors could not do anything until they reached Toronto or until the Circuit Court judge arrived. Where a petition was pending there might be rare doings in a considerable number of estates before the judge arrived on circuit or arrangements were made for an application in the Supreme Court at Toronto.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: That would not necessarily be the case. A petition could be filed in a town like Chatham and the hearing could take place in London or wherever there happened to be a weekly court, or in Toronto.

Mr. CRYSLER: That is right, but remember this much, especially in the worst type of bankruptcy—shall we say where the debtors are real swindlers upon their very face, if you file your petition in Chatham one day and the bankrupt gets knowledge of that, and you have to wait until only next day to act in Toronto, much may happen over night.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: It would not be compulsory for the petitioner to file his petition in the county town. He could use the same practice that prevails now and file in Toronto, and so get over that.

Mr. CRYSLER: I am not familiar enough with court practice to be sure of that point. Could anybody here help us? I am just doubtful.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: Here concurrent jurisdiction is intended, and the lodging of the petition could take place anywhere.

Mr. CRYSLER: Then what is wrong with the present situation where, along with the advantages we have in centralization, while the bankruptcy court is located in Toronto, by leave the parties can try the issues elsewhere; and they do where it is more convenient. The mere fact of the centralization of the Bankruptcy Court in Toronto does not by any means result in all legal proceedings being taken in Toronto; they are regularly taken elsewhere when it is more convenient to the parties.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: I wonder where the real objection lies. The practice works very well in Quebec, I understand, where they have decentralization.

Mr. CRYSLER: I do not know, sir. I have heard, in an unorganized way, of complaints in British Columbia, where apparently some persons want centralization. My knowledge there is very very sketchy, but I do know there are at least some individuals who would like to see a Judge in Bankruptcy designated. Against that, from what the Superintendent in Bankruptcy said this morning, there does not seem to us to be any general objection in those provinces.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: The specific point made is that you feel decentralization would bring about a conflict of decisions or some variation in practice?

Mr. CRYSLER: In the immediate future there would be a certain lack of uniformity of practice and probably you would never get quite such efficient practice as at the present time in the Bankruptcy Court in Toronto, where the officials, not necessarily because they are more competent than in outside points, but because they spend their whole time on the subject and specialize in bankruptcy work, become something of experts. We do not see that material advantages would be gained from decentralization, because, as I mentioned a moment ago, by leave issues can be and are tried outside of Toronto. There are seventeen official receivers throughout the province who have broad powers. Trustees operate all over the province, also with considerable powers of administration. To the best of our knowledge it is not very often that the outside points refer