

Bank of Montreal

Established 1817

Capital Paid Up\$16,000,000.00
 Rest 16,000,000.00
 Undivided Profits 1,232,669.42

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

H. V. Meredith, Esq., President
 R. B. Angus, Esq. C. R. Hosmer, Esq.
 E. B. Greenshields, Esq. A. Baumgarten, Esq.
 Sir William Macdonald C. B. Gordon, Esq.
 Hon. Robt. Mackay H. R. Drummond, Esq.
 Sir T. Shaughnessy, K.C.V.O. D. Forbes Angus, Esq.
 David Morrice, Esq. Wm. McMaster, Esq.

SIR FREDERICK WILLIAMS-TAYLOR, General Manager.
 A. D. BRAITHWAITE, Assistant General Manager

Bankers in Canada and London, England, for Dominion Government.

Branches established throughout Canada and Newfoundland; also in London, England; New York, Chicago, Spokane and Mexico City.

Savings Departments at all Canadian Branches. Deposits of from \$1.00 upwards received, and interest allowed at current rates.

A general banking business transacted.

C. SWEENEY, Supt. of British Columbia Branches Vancouver.
 W. H. HOGG, Manager, Vancouver.

THE Merchants' Bank of Canada

ESTABLISHED 1864

HEAD OFFICE, MONTREAL

Paid-up Capital - - \$7,000,000
 Reserve Fund - - \$7,248,134

President.....Sir H. Montagu Allan
 Vice-President.....K. W. Blackwell
 E. F. Hebden, General Manager
 T. E. Merrett, Superintendent and Chief Inspector

211 Branches in Canada, extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific

Agents in Great Britain: The London Joint Stock Bank, Ltd.; The Royal Bank of Scotland
 New York Agency.....63 and 65 Wall Street

General Banking Business Transacted
Savings Departments at all Branches

Deposits received of One Dollar and upwards, and interest allowed at 3 per cent. per annum.

VANCOUVER, B. C.

Granville and Pender Streets G. S. HARRISON, Mgr.
 Hastings and Carrall Streets FRANK PIKE, Mgr.

Give us a bill providing for the elimination of these liabilities and establishing a reasonable scale of compensation and the insurance companies, with their expert knowledge gained after many years of experience, may be left to deal with the matter in a manner satisfactory to all concerned.

Yours truly,

W. WYLLIE JOHNSTON.

A Correction and a Statement.

Vancouver, B. C., May 17, 1915.

The Editor,
 British Columbia Financial Times,
 Vancouver.

Dear Sir:—I notice from the issue of your journal of even date that it is proposed to discuss the pros and cons of the proposed Workmen's Compensation Act as introduced by the Hon. The Attorney-General, at the last sitting of the Legislature.

I observe that the following statement in your article is made:

"Steam Railway Companies, for all their operations, shall be individually liable for accidents to their employees in terms of the new Act, and also at Common Law, except that certain grounds of defence shall be taken away, such as continuance in employment after knowledge of defect or negligence, negligence of fellow workman, and contributory negligence."

and I would like to point out to you that this statement is not correct, as the proposed Act includes railways under Schedule No. 2, and Clause 98 of the Bill distinctly states that Part 1 of the Bill, which refers to compensation and the manner in which it shall be paid, shall apply to all the industries mentioned in Schedules No. 1 and No. 2. Only such industries as are not included in Schedules No. 1 and No. 2 remain outside of the proposed Act, and it is quite evident that if this Act is put in force any industries not included in the Schedules in question will quickly apply for admission, as the usual Common Law defences, such as assumption of risk, etc., it is proposed to take away from them.

Your readers might be interested to know that in Ontario the railway companies were so strongly opposed to the insurance feature of the Compensation Act which has recently gone into force, and on which Act the proposed B. C. Act was modelled, that they were successful in being grouped in a schedule of industries which were made individually liable to pay compensation, their argument being that they were quite capable of adjudicating their own losses without the necessity of an expensive commission, and presumably this is the reason why the railway companies are placed in a special group under the proposed Act.

It seems to me that the time is ripe for amending the present laws so that the workmen shall have more adequate protection, to say nothing of overcoming the useless waste of time and money which invariably takes place at the present time on account of the several possible remedies of recovery which an injured workman now has under the existing laws.

The compensation features of the proposed Act seem to me to be very reasonable, both from the standpoint of the employer and the employee, with the possible exception that the employee should not be restricted as to compensation for the first two weeks, and I think that the rule as it applies in Great Britain, where the workman is compensated

(Continued on Page 12)