

to our banks from senseless runs on the part of ignorant depositors is very much less. Of course, any bank would be in danger from a run of its depositors caused by something really calculated to excite distrust generally in the minds of its depositors, but such an affair as that at Hamilton or such as those frequently occurring in the foreign section in New York, or Chicago, based on an absurdity or something of no consequence, is not nearly so likely to be dangerous. The "Bankers Magazine," quoted above, says further, about the Canadian policy regarding savings banks:

"The branch system tends towards economy, and it is comparatively easy for the Canadian banks to establish agencies in very small places to gather up the odd dimes and dollars. Perhaps, also, the fact that there are in Canada only a small number of chartered banks, of large capital and well-known standing, makes it easier to attract and retain the confidence of the savings depositor than it is in the United States, where there are so many banks, representing varying degrees of strength." This presents the case very concisely. There will always be apt to be more runs by bank depositors in the States than there are in the Dominion. Even the bank examiners in the States do not know, sometimes, whether the banks they have just examined are worthy of confidence or not. And when this is so the best informed of depositors can know but little of the real position of the banks. But nearly everybody, from one end of Canada to the other, knows well that our own great banks are strong and powerful. If a run took place for example at a city branch of the Bank of Montreal it would be an easy matter for the head office to transfer to the threatened point enough cash to pay off every dollar of deposits it owed to its depositors there. The strength of our banks lies in the fact that their liquid resources are concentrated while their liabilities are scattered. The former can be thrown at once wherever the greatest need for them exists; while it is not to be expected that any unrest among depositors would make its appearance at more than one or two branches.

REFORM IN SPELLING.

Two distinguished British scholars have accepted membership on the simplified spelling board to testify their sympathy with the new movement to improve English. One is Dr. J. A. H. Murray, the senior editor of the great Oxford dictionary of the English language, of which the associate editor is Henry Bradley, who joined the Simplified Spelling Board some weeks ago. The other is Prof. Joseph Wright, editor of the English Dialect Dictionary. In announcing these elections, Brand Matthews, chairman of the board, said:—

"Professor Skeat, the editor of the English Etymological Dictionary, became a member two months ago. The Simplified Spelling Board now contains the editors of the three chief English dictionaries, Webster, the Century and the Standard. The adherence of the foremost linguistic authorities of both branches of the English-speaking race, ought to be re-assuring to those who have dreaded that the recommendations of the Simplified Spelling Board might work harm to our noble tongue or to its etymology. It serves to show that those who know most about English spelling believe that it ought to be improved."

WILL HE WORK.

ADVICE TO YOUNG MEN.

A young man was recently applying to a well-known employer for a position, says H. J. Hapgood in a recent magazine article. He was in the midst of rather a glowing description of his peculiar qualifications for the place, when the employer interrupted him, "Never mind about all this. There is just one thing I want to know. Will you work?"

Will he work? Not merely has he ability; but does he know how to use honestly, energetically and persistently what ability he has? This is the great question. The answer decides the employment of every new man and the promotion of every old one and it applies with equal force to all grades of service, from the laborer to the general manager.

A Chicago employer who engages each year a large number of young college men invariably gives preference to those who have earned the money for their education. He does this, because he has learned that a man who has made his way through college unaided, possesses the capacity for hard work which is so necessary in business. His preference in this respect was originally based upon the case of a young man who entered his employ several years ago and is now one of his most trusted lieutenants.

This man went from the farm to a New York university with less than ten dollars in his pocket and no idea where to find more. He was slow to learn and decidedly unattractive in appearance, but he knew how to work. Before the end of the first month he was on a self-supporting basis. At the close of his freshman year he was actually making money. By working from 12 to 14 hours a day continuously for four years he maintained a fair rank in his class, earned every dollar of his expenses, and on commencement day had in the bank a cash balance of five hundred dollars.

Every man who intends to make himself of