

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Exactly.

By Mr. Elliott:

Q. Don't you think there should be some special provision in the wording of the law in these small estates—they are small estates—once the farmer gets into bankruptcy in aiding them to have the estate administered just as the estate of an intestate is administered, or more nearly so, or without the intervention of a regular custodian?—A. It is not done in Ontario.

Q. I have in mind the case of a farmer who wanted to make an assignment a short time ago and he wanted to make it to somebody in the vicinity of the property, and when he came in and found out he could only make it to some person who was authorized to take assignments.

The CHAIRMAN: That is a misinterpretation of the Act.

By Mr. Elliott:

Q. It may be, but of course there is a discretion as to whom you may appoint.—A. Not altogether, Mr. Elliott, I know of a case only this past week in which the trustee was the next-door neighbour of the farmer, and with the assistance of a local solicitor, and at a very reasonable cost, he seemed to have got along and done the work fairly well.

Q. He was not a regular—A. He was not a regular trustee.

Q. Don't you think that is the reasonable thing to do in most of these cases?—A. That is, to a large extent. The chief objection, if any, that I would have to limiting it to licensed trustees alone—just isolated cases like that where little estates of farmers and so on can be handled. The papers come into my office sometimes in an awful shape, but you get substantially the correct picture of the thing, we don't stand on too much technicality so long as all the detail is honestly done.

By the Chairman:

Q. One of the witnesses we have had here has recommended very insistently that all officers administering the Act should be directly responsible to Federal authority, the purpose being to have it centralized and direct; Have you any comments to make on that suggestion?—A. That undoubtedly creates a very difficult question of jurisdiction. Under the Act you place the administration under the Provincial Court and I don't know how you can deny the Provincial Court the right of having its own officers act in its own Court, and how the Dominion can check on it.

Hon. Mr. ELLIOTT: You have a conflict of authority there at once.

The WITNESS: You have a conflict of authority there. It may be you could divide the Registrar's duties into judicial and administrative; and that there might be some way of working it out so far as administrative duties are concerned. But you cannot appoint any superintendent to go into the Registrar's office acting as a court and say: You must not do this, or you must do that.

The CHAIRMAN: Well, gentlemen, are there any other questions?

Hon. Mr. ELLIOTT: I don't know whether you can give me this information or not, could you give the Committee an idea roughly of the value of the estates which go through your office in a year?—

The WITNESS: I had a card on my desk by Dunn's which I thought was in my bag and I find it is not, but it would—

The CHAIRMAN: I will see if I can help you, Mr. Reilly. The Dominion Statistician has told us that dividend sheets for 1931 yielded total receipts of \$10,522,604. I must qualify this statement by saying that the amount given is a minimum, because it only represents dividend sheets examined by the Statistic-