

ECONOMY: Lack of in Employers' Liability Insurance, 60, 61; lack in individual liability system of, 46; of operation under a collective liability system, 48.

EFFICIENCY: Brandeis, Louis A., on, 74; of European systems, 32; of German system, 32, 86; of Washington system, 33.

EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY INSURANCE: Accident prevention under, 34, 57; Board of Trade statistics re efficiency of in England, 33; complicated by periodical payments, 61; defined, 58; difficulty of determining risk, 59, 60; disadvantages of, 58; *discussion* of, 57; driven out of business by State competition, 41, 50; has no accompanying advantages, 62; lack of scientific basis of rating under, 49; no guarantee against insolvency, 62; not productive of expert inspection, 34; origin of, 58; prejudicial to interests of community, 46; under English Act, 51, wastefulness of, 60, 61; distinguished from accident insurance, 5.

ENGLISH ACT: Analysis of, 50, 52; a series of compromises, 51; chief exponent of individual liability system, 44; complexity of, 50; contribution of workmen under, 28; extends personal liability of employer, 41; not permanent, 41; periodical payments provided for under, 43; premium rates before and after introduction of Act of 1907, 37; results anticipated of English Act not realized, 37; three weeks waiting period, 28; violates principles of natural justice, 44; workmen first charge on employers' insurance dues under Acts of 1897 and 1906, 45.

FARM LABORERS: Liability to injury, 22; *see* AGRICULTURAL LABORERS.

FAULT: Eastman survey into relative proportion of, 30; German statistics re proportion of, 29, 30; principle of compensating, regardless of, 19.

FELLOW-WORKMAN: *See* COMMON EMPLOYMENT.

FIRE-WASTE, 74.

FIRST AID FUND: Advocated by Washington Industrial Insurance Commission, 32, 35, 75, 76; as a buffer fund for waiting period, 32; recommendations in Ontario, 72; an avenue for workmen's contribution, 31.

FRIEDENSBURG, Dr. Ferd., 24, 25, 34, 41, 47, 86.

FRIEDENSBURG PAMPHLET: *Discussion* of, 86.

FRIENDS: Methods of collecting in Germany, 52; recommendations for Ontario, 69.

GERMAN SYSTEM: Analysis of German Act, 52, 53; cited as the type, 11, 47; cost of administration under, 32; current cost plan of, 12, 39, 66, 67; Dawson on current cost plan of, 69; difference between German and Washington systems, 43; employers divided into groups under, 46; England lacked facilities of Germany, 44; results of expert medical attendance under, 35; Friedensburg pamphlet on, 86-90; Friedensburg recognizes advantages of, 47; increased contribution by employers opposed by workmen, 28; inspection under, 31; recommendations for employers' associations in Ontario similar to those under, 71; statistical comparison of Germany with United States, 73; statistics of rates under, 68; success of current cost plan in preventing accidents, 67; supervised by state, 41; tendency towards State liability system, 41; thirteen weeks' waiting period under, 28.

GREAT BRITAIN: *See* ENGLISH ACT.

INDIVIDUAL LIABILITY SYSTEM: Condensed summary of, 10; defects of, summarized, 45; does not insure solvency, 45, 46; English system chief exponent of, 44, 50; involves circularity of obligation, 46; general summary of, 14; gives rise to insurance system, prejudicial to interests of community, 46; militates against employment of older and maimed workmen, 46; not adapted for extension to farming, 46; not compatible with a current cost plan, 39, 46; not conducive to accident prevention, 17, 46; not permanent, 40, 41, 42; not productive of expert inspection, 34; periodical payments not facilitated by, 46; productive of litigation, 45, 46; requires setting up of reserves, 46; violates principles of natural justice, 41, 46; Washington Commission re, 45; wasteful, 45, 46; *see also* ENGLISH ACT.

INSPECTION: Collective liability system productive of expert inspection, 34; not facilitated under individual liability system, 34; under Norwegian Act, 55.