The great expense which such separation would entail on the Government seems to me to be an objection almost insuperable, and I am of opinion that the Insolvency Jurisdiction will be most conveniently and economically exercised by making the jurisdiction a part of that of the Supreme Court (as in Victoria) and treating the functions of the Commissioners as auxiliary thereto, instead of as independent thereof. The proceedings should therefore be initiated before a judge of the Supreme Court. In the case of compulsory sequestration it should be by rule *nisi* to shew cause why the estate should not be sequestrated. In the case of voluntary sequestration the Petition should be presented to a Judge as at present, and the order of Sequestration should be made by him. The Commissioner then acts upon the order which should have some further operation as will be explained under the answer to

Third Question.—As to the expediency of giving to the Resident Magistrate Jurisdiction?

I have already suggested in what manner the Government may clothe the Resident Magistrate with Jurisdiction without any provision to that effect. In the Act, if thought necessary, a limit may however be placed on his jurisdiction by a clause that whenever any Resident Magistrate shall have been appointed a Commissioner, he shall not act where the value of the estate exceeds a certain specified amount.

Fourth Question.—As to the proceedings?

The suggestions made in answer to other questions will, to some extent, shew considerable simplification and saving both of time and expense. The rest must be left to the rules of practice which the Judges should have power to make.

Fifth question.—As to the vesting of the estate of the Insolvent?

The clumsy and long exploded mode of causing the estate to vest in the Assignee is the great defect of the Debtors and Creditor's Act. It may be briefly described as requiring at least fourteen weeks time to do the work of one minute. In Dunedin the Judges have been unable to sit oftener than once in six weeks. There are usually from 60 to 70 cases, and the sittings sometimes lasts four or five days. The course at present is this, when the Petition is accepted by the Judge the first hearing is appointed. If the Petition is not presented until within fourteen days of the next sitting of the Court under the Act, the first hearing cannot be for more than six weeks. At this first hearing a day is appointed and advertised for a meeting of creditors to elect Assignees or Registrars, and at the second hearing (six weeks from the first) the Trustees so chosen (if any) are approved of or accepted, and if none be chosen, a very common case, the Court does its best to pick up men who will act. At this second hearing the Insolvent is ordered to convey to the Trustees, and a third hearing is appointed six weeks from the second, and at this third hearing the conveyance is made, or if previously made, the fact is made known to the Court. The Insolvent having complied with all orders of the Court, if there be no opposition, is discharged. Thus the shortest time to get the estate out of the Insolvent is fourteen weeks, and it may extend to nearly twenty weeks. Now by making provision for an Official Assignee it may be effected by the last stroke of the Judge's pen, in signing the order of sequestration. Not even is a vesting order (as suggested) necessary. The legal operations of the order of sequestration is prescribed by the Act. The course of proceeding should be this: The Insolvent presents his petition to a Judge of the Supreme Court; if approved of, the acceptance is endorsed on the petition, and upon that endorsement the order of sequestration is drawn with by the proper officer. This order operates at once (by a clause in the Act of course) to vest the Insolvent's estate real and personal in the Official Assignee named in the order; it should operate also to protect the Insolvent from arrests (except by a Judge's order), and if he be in custody he may move at once for his discharge.

Sixth Question.—As to the expediency of appointing Official Assignees?

I consider the appointment of Official Assignees, coupled with the immediate vesting operation of the order, as the most successful improvement in the Insolvent law ever devised, and chiefly for two reasons; First,—It makes it the sole business of a responsible officer to administer the estate, and to give him title at the instant. I think, however, that the creditors should have power to elect a trade Assignee, or perhaps two trade Assignees in large estates, to act with the Official Assignee. In England the Official Assignees are appointed by the Lord Chancellor, and in Victoria they are appointed by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. But I think there is some inconvenience in either the Governor or the Judges exercising the appointment, as in cases of default, the Government will always be called upon to pay losses. I would therefore suggest that the several Chambers of Commerce should be empowered to elect fit and proper persons to be Official Assignees, and upon a certificate of such election being presented to the Judges with an affidavit of execution the formal appointment, or acceptance of the appointment, should be made by a Judge's order. The Judge should be empowered to take security by bond to the Registrar. The advantages of this course would be considerable. The Judges would be relieved from anything like patronage. The best choice would probably be made; for the mercantile body would have a strong interest in selecting competent and trustworthy men. If the best choice should not be made, neither the Government nor the Judges would be chargeable with the mistake.

Seventh Question.—As to the speedy and just administration of the Estates?

I submit that this question is answered by the observations already made on the appointment of official Assignees, with the check of a trade Assignee, aided of course by the vigilance of the Commissioner. The immediate vesting of the Estate is also an enormous saving of time and a prevention of all opportunity of any improper dealing with the Estate. The Act should also require the perpetual co-operation of the Insolvent, and there should be some specific punishment for neglect to afford such aid.

Eighth Question.—With regard to the custody and security of the Estate and the money arising therefrom?

The Act may require that the Official Assignee, so soon as he shall have collected a certain sum (in Victoria £20) shall open an account in some Bank in the name of the estate and of himself and his co-trustee; but I do not think the Treasurers should be made the recipients of the moneys in the first instance. The case differs materially from that of the Administrators of the Estates of intestates. The Administrator is an officer of the Government, and every security should be taken not only against his defaults, but also against that of the Treasurers and Sub-Treasurers. But if the Chamber of Commerce