

there were some fifteen wounded officers present with a large company of friends who had come to do them honor. It was the first time that I had met so closely so many French officers, and I was quite delighted with them. Most of them were quite young fellows, and most of them really handsome. There were just one or two—a colonel and a major—who were older. How can I describe the ineffable charm of their manners? They were all gay, they all chatted each other, they all seemed quite free from care. But when a foreigner, like myself, spoke to them, they immediately became the serious, dignified, courtly gentlemen that might have appeared in the drawing-rooms of Versailles in the days of Louis XIV. Slight, muscular, alert, they suggested the swiftness and endurance of the greyhound.

I have described the wounded officers as gay, and so they were. But one could not help noticing in the expression of their pale faces the mark of the terrible strain through which they had passed. There wasn't a murmur; I never even heard an allusion to what they had suffered; but their faces spoke what their tongues refused to mention. One and all they discussed the future with confidence. I didn't meet a human being in France who entertains the least doubt as to the necessity of continuing the fight to the bitter end and as to the certainty of final victory. The strain is terrible in France, but France is bearing it with universal fortitude.

I paid a visit to the hospital at Montone. It is one of the monuments to the outbursts of devoted affection to France which this war has created in so many English minds. It was in a splendid and spacious new hotel, with marble floors, great halls, beautiful and spacious grounds. An Englishman named Cochran had contributed thousands of pounds of his private fortune in installing it, and all the nurses—or nearly all—were English women—those quiet, silent, unobtrusive women who are the flower of the earth and ideal nurses. Here the patients were nearly all from the ranks. Most of them were sunning themselves on one of the numerous verandahs; but some were still confined to bed. Again there was the same sweetness of manners, which is such a charm in all the population of France without distinction of class. Many of them were playing cards on their quilts—horribly stained cards I must say which forced me to send them some new packs a few days later. Cards, I may say, are now rather a dear luxury in France. They have gone up several times in price, and as there is a heavy tax upon them, the Government takes enormous precautions to see that they are not passed from hand to hand. The clubs at Monte Carlo and elsewhere, where there are little games of bridge, are compelled to return one or two cards from each pack so as to make them useless for further play. One pathetic figure of a man in the hospital at Montone, who looked like an artisan, still haunted me. He was playing patience all by himself, and evidently had been badly wounded. But he looked so patient and he smiled so sweetly on us as we spoke with him, and he so lonely that I could have broken down with pity, with sympathy and with affection.

Lord Waterman, once an active politician, but now compelled to live on the Riviera because of his health—is one of the guardians of the hospital. He has just lost his eldest son, but though you could see heavier lines on his worn face, he went through the day's work for these French soldiers as though nothing had occurred to darken his own innermost life.

I have been reading in the papers on the morning of the day on which I write these lines, of the departure amid joyous songs and cheers and careless and fearless farewells of the new conscription of eighteen to the training barracks. It is but one of the many signs of that cheerful, indomitable spirit with which the Frenchman or the French woman confronts the difficulties of life. But I protest that what most brought home the spirit of France to me was a visit to a Cinema show in Paris. In the midst of other films there came one which professed to give a picture of the soldier who is back with his family on a few days leave. It was a screaming bit of farce from the first picture to the last. There was the crowd of relations, more or less absurd, hugging the returned hero until he was almost suffocated. Above all, there was the mother-in-law, that classic and inevitable figure of all the farces from the beginning of time, fussing, interfering, domineering, foolish, and of course led about by everybody, and then overcome and compelled to leave her daughter and her son-in-law without her untimely intrusions. Not a tear, not a moment of sentiment, still less of sentimentality, from the first moment to the last; and the audience just screaming with laughter from the first film to the final. It was very silly, and very undignified and frivolous even; but what a lesson in the courage with which France can laugh at everything; can laugh even when its heart is full and the widows' weeds proclaim to everybody how many homes have been darkened by heroic deaths of the loved ones in the trenches.

To possess a disposition to see the favourable rather than the unfavourable side of things conduces more to happiness than to be heir to ten thousand a year.—David Hume.

A THIRD RECRUITING SERMON

Preached in the Blessed Sacrament Church, Ottawa, Jan. 30, 1916, by Rev. Dr. John J. O'Gorman, P. P.

"Fight ye to-day for your brethren." (1 Mach. v. 32)

No apology is required for one more sermon on the duty of enlisting in the Canadian Overseas Force. Canada's relation to the Great War is so fundamental, so many-sided, so far reaching, that there is no one man who has an adequate comprehension of everything it means. Hence it is a question which must be approached from many many sides, and studied earnestly and honestly by many minds. The moral and religious aspects of this question are a fit subject for pulpit treatment. There are some who would confine pulpit preaching to pious platitudes, who would permit us to teach the principles of Christianity and make such application of them as is found in classic sermons, but who prevent us endeavoring to apply these principles to the questions of the day. These people would minimize the function of the Christian religion. Religion is no mere academic theory or emotional excitement. It is the greatest force in this world. There is no question whose moral and religious aspects do not fall under the guidance of religion. Certainly purely political questions, which involve no moral principle, are not for the pulpit. But most of the problems which agitate society have a pronounced moral bearing, and the Christian teacher must face them and attempt to solve them, whether the problem be the citizen's duty in war time, or prohibition, or divorce legislation, or school regulations. It is perfectly true that the individual priest or bishop will not always be successful in his solution of the problem, but his individual contribution towards its solution will be supplemented and corrected by the actions of other priests and bishops, and in this way, falling an official pronouncement, the Catholic attitude to the problem will be determined. If it should happen, as in the case of duty in war time, or prohibition, or French bishops and priests consider them unwise and unjust, and English bishops and priests consider them wise and just, then the average citizen will conclude that the question is a purely racial one which cannot be solved by theology. The question as to along what lines the relations of Canada and Britain should develop is indeed one which is not for the pulpit. On the other hand, however, as Canada is officially and effectively participating in this war, it is within the province of a bishop or priest to urge the members of his flock to fulfil their war duties. For one cannot be a good Christian if one is a bad citizen. He who is disloyal to his country is disloyal to the Church. He who is only partially patriotic is only partially religious; for patriotism is a virtue. At all times and in all places the Catholic Church has loyally and enthusiastically supported the legitimate authority of the State, and neither sneers nor slanders will cause her to change her conduct. She practises herself what she teaches to her children: "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God, the things that are God's." (Mark xii: 17.)

That it is Canada's duty in the present crisis to fight with the Empire in defence of her national rights and liberties as a British self-governing Dominion is the teaching of every Catholic Canadian bishop. Thus, for example, the Archbishop of Montreal, in his Laval University address, defended and defined Canada's relation to the war as follows: (I summarize somewhat his remarks.)

"England did not wish for war. Her reason for entering it was to avenge Belgium and to safeguard justice, liberty, right and honour. Canada is not an independent State, nor is she neutral. She is an autonomous Dominion in the British Empire, and since Britain is at war, there result for us sacred obligations. While Canada is not attacked directly she is attacked indirectly. She is menaced, and therefore must be defended. Were England defeated, Germany's first prey would be Canada. Hence we must do our utmost for the fate of Canada is dependent upon the success of the British arms. The Bishops of Quebec, at the very beginning of the war, in a joint Pastoral letter, taught that it was the duty of Canada to aid England."

In this Laval recruiting speech of Mgr. Bruchesi, there is no politics, but there is patriotism, Canada's duty to participate in this war is longer debatable. It was decided a year and a half ago by the Canadian Parliament.

The further question, however, yet remains. How is this general duty of the Canadian nation to participate in this war to be determined for and applied to the individual citizen? There are some, second to none in their loyalty and purity of purpose, who maintain that till the State calls its citizens to the colours by conscription, the duty of becoming a soldier is not sufficiently precise to oblige the individual; that while voluntary enlisting is desirable and patriotic and praiseworthy and meritorious, it is not, strictly speaking, a duty. This is a respectable opinion, one which may be safely defended and followed. However, it appears to me that while this theory meets ordinary requirements, it falls short in the present extraordinary circumstances of indicating the full duty of the citizen.

For it will be admitted that there is contained fundamentally, at least,

in the natural law an obligation of defending one's country, when the latter is in dire need, and we are in a position to do so. When a country is defending herself as Canada is today, by a just defensive war, and the peril, as is the present one, is grave, the citizen, who is in a position to do so, is bound by the natural law, that is by those obligations arising from the very nature of things, to fight for his country. Now when the Sovereign power is not in a position to call upon him by conscription to perform this duty, it is the duty of the citizen to act without waiting for official compulsion. Here is a case for the well-known principle: The safety of the State is the supreme law. This is all the more certain when, as in the present case, the Government urges him in every possible way, apart from compulsion, to perform this duty. An official call has gone forth for half a million men, that is, for all our available able-bodied unmarried men, and for such married men whose duties permit them to go. The Government has not yet indeed passed a law compelling individuals to become soldiers. It has based its general call to the colors on the fundamental natural obligation binding the citizen, who is in a position to do so, to defend his country when the latter needs him. Hence, I have maintained and do maintain, not as a defined article of faith but as a reasoned and reasonable moral opinion, that by virtue of the natural law which imposes upon citizens, who are in a position to do so, the obligation of defending their country when the latter is fighting for her liberty and existence, and by virtue of the just action of our Government in calling for half a million men, which is practically the whole available manhood that our country can spare the able-bodied Canadian citizen who is not detained by a more urgent duty is in conscience bound to enlist.

Do not tell me that a law must have a sanction, and that there is no sanction to enforce the obligation of enlisting. It is true that he who is in a position to enlist, and refuses to do so, is not fined, is not imprisoned. But who will say that he is not punished? What greater punishment could there be than to be stigmatized as a shirker? That is the common sense of the community calls the citizen, who though able and free to enlist will not do so, a shirker, is to my mind an additional proof that there is a duty to enlist. There can be no shirker unless there be a duty which has been shirked. Since there are shirkers, it shows that the common sense of the community recognizes the duty of voluntary enlistment. No imprisonment can be a greater punishment than that meted out to the shirker. For the shirker the whole world is a prison. No matter where he goes he will be known and treated as one who forfeited his own self. Were a Canadian shirker after the war to go even to Germany, he would be treated by the very Germans as a man who was no man.

If enlisting at present cannot be said to be a duty because we have no conscription law, then it would be a praiseworthy counsel of perfection, like going to a mission, among the heathen Chinese. For the Chinese people to the Christian faith is admirable, praiseworthy, meritorious and heroic. But it is not the duty of any Canadian citizen. No Canadian citizen is a shirker because he declines an invitation to go to China. Who will then say that when one's country is in dire peril, as Canada is to-day, that no citizen has an obligation of enlisting as a soldier, because the Government, for excellent reasons, has not passed a conscription law? While it would be wrong to call a counsel a command, it is equally objectionable to hold that there are no obligations without formal laws. On this point let me quote the words of the late Cardinal Manning: "The notion of obligation has been so identified with laws, canons, vows and contracts, that if these cannot be shown to exist no obligation is supposed to exist. It is true that all laws, canons, vows and contracts lay obligations upon those who are subject to them. But all obligations are not by laws, nor by canons, nor by vows, nor by contracts. There are obligations distinct from and anterior to all these bonds. Faith, hope, charity, contrition, piety, all bind the soul by the most persuasive and constraining obligations. The law of liberty binds by love, gratitude and generosity. Compared with these it may be said that all bonds are as the spider that may kill to the spirit which gives life."

The Bishop of Northampton has applied this doctrine to the duty of voluntary enlisting in a sermon he preached last April on Our Heroic Dead. He said:

"The moral obligation of the individual citizen is equally imperative whether his country's call reaches him as a compulsory law or as a freeman's opportunity. The voluntary system does not mean liberty to give or withhold service. It is not a trap to catch the young, the thoughtless, the adventurous, the brave, and screen the shirker, the money-grubber and the craven. If it worked in so ignoble a fashion it would break down in a month amidst the execration of mankind. Its success depends upon the universal recognition of a universal duty, to place our all at the disposal of our country—our manhood, our wealth, our industry, our talents, our health, our limbs, our life itself. Is it the spontaneous mobilization of an entire people:

the self confidence of a race which knows that its slacks and shirkers will always be a negligible quantity. Thus, from the moral standpoint, the main difference between a voluntary and a compulsory system appears to be this: under conscription the legislator decides for each citizen what form of service he shall render; under the voluntary system the decision rests with the citizen himself. It leaves him to weigh before the tribunal of his conscience, whatever pleas withhold him from the post of danger: the plea of age; the plea of health; the plea of domestic ties, the plea of necessary employment, in the public interest. Such a decision is always momentous even for the bravest. But for a true man and a true Christian it will never hang long in the balance. Unless the plea for exemption is clear and peremptory, he will find his place in the firing line." (Quoted in The Month, June, 1915)

These words, be it remembered, were spoken in England some months before the Derby scheme went into force. What this Catholic Bishop said of England, a Catholic priest can say of Canada.

Hence I conclude that the duty of enlisting, for the Canadian, especially for the unmarried Canadian, who is in a position to go, is a strict obligation, or is on the eve of becoming one.

Those eligible Canadians who have not yet become soldiers, have not failed to do so for lack of courage to perform a patriotic duty. They wait because they do not yet see their slacks. It is not patriotism our slacks lack, it is imagination. They are willing to defend Canada were she attacked; and they will not defend Canada, now when she is attacked. Their imagination cannot look through a telescope and see that Canada's first line of defence is in Flanders, and that it is being shelled daily. Were the Germans to land half a million men at Quebec, these slacks would swamp the recruiting offices. But it would be too late. If Canada's first line of defence in Flanders were definitely broken, her second line of defence on the shores of the St. Lawrence would be very insecure. But these unimaginative slacks say: The German cannot break through the French and British lines on the West. It is difficult to be certain of this when we remember that during the past year, Germany with a small part of her forces was able to prevent the French and British armies from dislodging her from one inch of French and Belgian soil, while at the same time the main German and Austrian armies won back Galicia, conquered

Conrad, Lithuania, Poland, Serbia and Montenegro, and opened up communications with rich and fertile distant Asia Minor and Mesopotamia. I am not a pessimist, but I do not want to salute the spiked helmet in my own country. France cannot defeat Germany. The soldiers of the British Empire must. France at a terrible and irreparable loss has checked the German advance. We must drive it back. If ten thousand Canadian soldiers turned the scale last spring when the Germans were about to capture the rest of Belgium, and probably Calais, who will be bold enough to say that Canada half million men will not be just what is required to break the western deadlock and save Hibernia-British and Latin civilization from being trampled under by Prussian Kultur? If Germany breaks through the Western lines and destroys the British and French armies, an attack on Canada would be an almost inevitable result. In that case the United States with who will depend not defend us. It is idle to depend upon the British Navy as if its power were something preternatural or miraculous. It was made by men, and can be destroyed by men. A new type of submarine might render it obsolete any day. This is not probable but it is possible, and more improbable things have happened in this war. If the Germans can smash through the Allied Western Line, there is nothing impossible in their landing half a million men in Quebec. It would not be pleasant to have them repeat in Quebec the procession of 500,000 soldiers that they led through Brussels. Were they to get that far, I fear the most we could do would be to entrench west of the Great Lakes. I do not believe for a moment that all this will happen. It will not happen because the Germans will not break through our Western lines. But they will be prevented from doing it not by our talk, but by our soldiers. Men, if you would defend Canada, come to Flanders!

Be not terrified at the cost of the sacrifice it entails. Let our motto be that of Judas Machabees: "They came against us with an insolent multitude, and with pride, to destroy us, and our wives and our children and to pillage us. But we will fight for our lives and our laws." (1 Mach. III: 20) The man who would not fight for Canada as he is to-day, would not defend a Garden of Eden. Let us do our share in winning this war, and then those of us who survive will be in a position to help in remodelling Canada after our ideals in the reconstruction period.

Let those who are prevented by a more urgent duty and those who are fearful stand back, but let the soldiers of Canada come forward: The Machabean leader, we read in Holy Writ, "appointed captains over the people, over thousands, and over hundreds, and over fifties, and over tens, and he said to them that were building houses or had betrothed wives or were planting vineyards, or were fearful that they should return

every man to his house." And Judas said: "Gird yourselves, and be valiant men and be ready against the morning, that you may fight with these nations that are assembled against us to destroy us. For it is better for us to die in battle than to see the evils of our nation. Nevertheless, as it shall be the will in heaven, so be it done." (1 Mach. III: 56-60.)

If it is your duty to enlist, you are nevertheless free to choose your regiment; and the Catholic recruit is making a wise use of this liberty in choosing a regiment which has a Catholic chaplain. There is nothing bigoted nor narrow about such an advice. It is Catholic common sense, and does not be too thin-skinned to follow it. Catholics are found in every regiment which has been raised in Canada since the war began. In those raised outside of Quebec, Catholics have been usually in a minority, as they form a minority in the Canadian provinces apart from Quebec. This is especially true of Ontario and the Western Provinces. For while Catholics form 29 per cent. of the population of Nova Scotia, 41 per cent. of the population of New Brunswick, and 44 per cent. of the population of Prince Edward Island, in Ontario and the Western Provinces, the averages run only from 19 per cent. to 12 per cent. Hence as there has been no attempt made thus far to group Catholics, they have been a minority in every regiment raised in Ontario and the West. As a result, very few of these regiments have Catholic chaplains. The Catholics in such regiments are indeed visited from time to time by a Catholic chaplain, but this is only moderately satisfactory. It appears to me that it would be a wise thing that in each division one battalion of these being recruited should have a Catholic chaplain in order that the Catholics of the district might join, if they chose, that battalion and thus know that in enlisting they would be put to no religious inconvenience. These regiments would not be exclusively Catholic regiments but they would be regiments with a large number of Catholics attracted there by the presence of the Catholic chaplain. If a Catholic soldier has a right to a dentist and a barber who will think him unreasonable if he seek also a Catholic chaplain?

It was with a great deal of pleasure that the Catholics of this part of Canada learned of the authorization granted to Lt. Col. Trihey to form an Irish Overseas unit at Montreal. I know of more than one person who is waiting impatiently for his battalion to be allowed to begin recruiting, to be able to volunteer. I am glad to be able to announce that on Feb. 15, this Irish Canadian Regiment will begin recruiting. You will hear very shortly of the appointment of its chaplain. To the men of the parish who are about to enlist, I would say, join the Irish Regiment. Irishmen have been found in every regiment that has left Canada, as they are found in every English and Scotch and Colonial regiments in the British Army. There is no reason why they, who add so much to the glory and fighting ability of other regiments, should not have the satisfaction of having several regiments of their own. This will be realized in Col. Trihey's regiment, and there is no doubt that this Irish Canadian unit will acquire the same fame as the Dublin Fusiliers or the Connaught Rangers.

But it is for no mere earthly fame that we are fighting. It is for liberty, for justice, and hence for God. Are we not soldiers of Christ? Does not our regiment form one vast religious order? Men, who, like all religious, are obliged to forego the pleasures of family life; Men, who like all religious are required to leave all; Men, who, like all religious, are required to obey from morning till night a severe rule; Men, who unlike most religious, are called upon to expose, perhaps daily, their very lives in the performance of their duty! Why, these things form the very essence of the most heroic practice of Christianity. They are the very conditions which Christ laid down for His disciples.

He that loveth father and mother more than Me is not worthy of Me." (Math. x: 37.) "Every one of you that doth not renounce all that he possesseth cannot be My disciple." (Luke xiv: 33) "Fear ye not them that kill the body, and are not able to kill the soul." (Math. x: 28) "For whosoever would save his life shall lose it; but whosoever shall lose his life for my sake, he shall save it. For what a man profits, if he gain the whole world and lose or forfeit his own self." (Luke ix: 24, 25) These words are for him who is tempted to be a shirker. On the other hand the Christian soldier, no matter what may happen, has his consolation in these words of Him for whom he fights: "Every one that hath left house, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife or children, or lands for my name's sake, shall receive a hundred fold, and shall possess life everlasting." (Math. ix: 29.)

If you still hesitate, read the First and Second Books of the Machabees. You fathers, remember Machabees who led his sons to battle; you mothers, remember her who encouraged her seven sons to advance to an heroic martyrdom. You young men, imitate Judas the Hammerer, even him who said "If our time be come, let us die manfully for our brethren, and let us not stain our glory." (1 Mach. ix: 10.)

Erratum.—In Rev. Dr. O'Gorman's sermon on "Religious Motives for Enlisting," which appeared in our

Your Savings

The War has already brought great changes. National leaders in all countries are urging the practice of Thrift. The Prime Minister of Great Britain said recently: "There remains only one course . . . to diminish our expenditure and increase our savings."

What are you going to do with YOUR SAVINGS? You cannot keep your cash in a stocking. You must either put it in a Bank; invest in a Bond or Stock; or purchase Life Insurance with it. Some men will do all three.

By Putting YOUR SAVINGS INTO LIFE INSURANCE

You will be practising Thrift in its best form. You will be making definite provision for your family. In the event of your early death, they will receive many times more than you have paid in. If you live, you will be adding each year to the value of your security.

Let us sell you a Policy in the Capital Life Assurance Company. We have all kinds, at all prices, with valuable privileges and perfect security always.

Write us, giving the date of your birth

The Capital Life Assurance of Canada

Head Office - Ottawa

Issue of January 22, the word "anale" was misspelt. The sentence should have read: A regiment of the most splendid non-Catholic chaplains in the world could not shrive, house or anele a single Catholic soldier.

FROM GLORY TO GLORY

A mighty mass of ice translucent lay, Like heaped-up emeralds, upon the shore Of our great, frozen river—prized no more Flung from the store-house, soon to melt away.

Each block, square cut, showed no bright color-play, Its own pale native hues were all it wore.

Yet oh, how lovely!—then, the great ice-floor Beneath caught down the blue, as souls that pray Catch Heaven's own reflex, "Tis enough," I said.

And bore away the lesson, Hours had sped Ere my return; the crystal blue had rolled Into the sunset and the ice was gold. "O lower life," I cried, "sullen and dumb! Put on, at last, that dazzling life to come!"

—CAROLINE D. SWAN

DEPLORABLE IGNORANCE

The Protestant bishop of Carlisle in England recently stated that Catholics purchased indulgences and paid well to have their sins forgiven. When he was challenged for proof of his statement he replied that he himself had often given money to poor persons who pleaded with tears for money with which to purchase indulgences.

Father Vaughan, the well-known English Jesuit, was asked by some non-Catholic friends what he thought of the statement of the Protestant bishop. Father Vaughan said he presumed that the bishop knew what he was talking about; but, if his Lordship's statement was true, then he (Father Vaughan) had a good deal of money owing to him. He had been hearing confessions ever since the year 1881, and in many countries and on many continents, but up to date, he had received not even so much as a trumpery shilling for all the thousands of absolutions he had pronounced. It was too bad. Some of his brother priests heard more than 20,000 confessions in the year, and ought, in consequence, to be nearly as wealthy as the Lord Bishop of Carlisle himself, only they were not. Being only Catholic priests, they could not cry out with cabinet ministers: "It is my salary and I mean to stick to it."

Father Vaughan said that he had often given to his penitents, for their penance after confession, some indulgenced prayers to say; but in spite of the bishop's contention, not one of them had, as yet, paid him any fee for the indulgences gained. Why did they not hurry up? "I rather fancy," continued Father Vaughan,

"that the ladies and gentlemen who pleaded with tears for his Lordship's money with which to buy indulgences went and spent it on 'a planetary indulgence' in the tap room nearest the episcopal palace."

We can only wonder at the simplicity of the bishop of Carlisle if he really believed the statement he made. Father Vaughan's caustic comment should spur him to make inquiries from authentic sources before committing himself to paper on a matter of which he seems to be sorely in need of information. The pity is that educated persons of which this Protestant bishop is an example, trouble themselves so little to learn what is the teaching and practice of the Catholic Church before assailing it with charges learned from lying beggars.—True Voice.

FATHER FRASER'S CHINESE MISSION

Taichowta, China, Dec. 11, 1915. Dear Readers of CATHOLIC RECORD:

It may be a little surprise to you to learn that it takes \$100 a week to keep my mission going. I am glad when I see that amount contributed in the RECORD, but when I see I am sad to see my little reserve run diminished and the catastrophe arriving when I must close my chapels, discharge my catechists and reduce my expenses to the few dollars coming in weekly. I beseech you to make one more supreme effort during 1916 to keep this mission on its feet. You will be surprised to learn what a great deal I am doing with \$100 a week—keeping myself and curate, 80 catechists, 7 chapels, and free schools, 8 churches in different cities with caretakers, supporting two big catechumenes of men, women and children during their preparation for baptism and building a church every year.

Yours gratefully in Jesus and Mary.

J. M. FRASER.

Previously acknowledged.....	\$6,618 50
Reader, Charnwood, P.E.I.	1 00
Subscriber, Lake Verde.....	5 00
John Dray, Little Bona.....	1 00
A Friend, Melrose.....	1 00
John Murphy, Melrose.....	1 00
R. G. McLean, Sydney.....	1 00
Kentville.....	1 00
Friend of the Chinese	
Missions.....	5 00
Lochiel.....	1 00
Jno. J. Gibbons, Lucknow	1 00
A Friend, New Glasgow.....	1 00
J. Doherty, Holmesville.....	2 00
St. Joseph's Convent,	
Mabou, N. S.....	5 00
Parishioners, Mabou, N. S.	70 00
Rev. J. F. MacMaster,	
Mabou, N. S.....	25 00
J. Macatomey, Steelton	2 00

THE Thornton-Smith Co.

Mural Painting and Church Decorating

11 King St. W. Toronto

Capital Trust Corporation, Limited

Authorized Capital \$2,000,000.00

President, M. J. O'Brien, Renfrew; Vice-Presidents: Hon. S. N. Parent, Ottawa; Denis Murphy, Ottawa; R. P. Gough, Toronto; A. E. Corrigan, Ottawa. Directors: A. E. Provost, Ottawa; Hon. R. G. Beazley, Halifax; W. P. O'Brien, Montreal; E. Fabre Sarvey, K.C., Montreal; Hugh Doherty, Montreal; E. W. Tobin, M.P., Bromptonville; Hon. Wm. McDonald, Cape Breton; Edward Case, Winnipeg; T. P. Phelan, Toronto; Michael Connolly, Montreal; W. J. Poupore, ex-M.P., Montreal; Lt.-Col. D. B. Street, Ottawa; J. J. Lyons, Ottawa; Gordon Grant, C.E., Ottawa; C. P. Beaubien, K.C., Montreal.

Offices: 29 Sparks St., Ottawa, Ont.

Managing Director: B. G. Connolly. Assistant Manager: E. T. B. Pennofather. Our Booklet, entitled "The Will That Really Provides" sent on request.

"THE MAKING OF A WILL is one of the most simple and at the same time one of the most important duties of every man and woman. There are reputable lawyers and trust companies who will see that a will is properly made and that an estate is properly administered. Endless troubles and worries are caused by neglect to make a will. It is a matter for to-day."—Judge Lennox.