

JULY 8, 1916

T. P. O'CONNOR'S
LETTERPOLITICAL INTRIGUE RAMPANT
IN ENGLANDCABINET SECRETS BETRAYED TO THE
PRESSSpecial Cable to the CATHOLIC RECORD
(Copyright 1916, Central News)

London, July 1.—Once more the whole Irish scene has undergone a transformation. Last week Ireland held the centre of the stage and acute anxiety existed as to the decision of the Nationalist conference in Ulster where a formidable body of opinion, including a large majority of the priests, were known to be in uncompromising hostility to the proposed settlement and already four bishops had declared publicly their condemnation of the confidence of all Irishmen. However, in Mr. Devlin's courage, persuasiveness, tenacity, and his strong hold on the affection, confidence and trust of Ulster made them certain he would win, as he did quite triumphantly.

The final stage so far as Irish Nationalists are concerned, was reached when Mr. Redmond was authorized at a meeting of the Irish Party last Monday to announce their acceptance of the Lloyd George scheme. Then there came a new transformation for the vehement campaign carried on by the Ultra-Unionists reached the cabinet and made the situation of every Unionist Minister difficult and wavering. Lord Lansdowne, and Walter Long were known to share the views of Lord Selborne and ready to follow him in resignation, but the position still is uncertain of Bonar Law and Austen Chamberlain, while Arthur Balfour, in spite of his old record as a coercionist Minister, has recently, consistently supported the settlement. But Bonar Law and Mr. Chamberlain would find it difficult to remain in the majority if the Tory party voted against the settlement.

Thus the position still remains uncertain. Some respite has been obtained by postponement of the Tory meeting till next week, and active efforts are being made by Mr. Lloyd George to keep the cabinet together. I still believe he will succeed and that the Home Rule Ministry and Home Rule Parliament will come into existence within a few months from now; but at the moment the situation is very difficult.

We are passing through one of the most extraordinary phases of Parliamentary life in England that has ever been seen. The most remarkable characteristic is the feverishness one finds everywhere, and feverishness is not a usual quality with Englishmen or indeed English women. Nor is political intrigue an art in which they shine, and which they usually love. But intrigue is more rampant today than at any moment since the days of the Stuarts and the first Hanoverian kings. And on top of all is the strange new part which journalism is playing in this grim and world-wide tragedy.

To realize what is going on one has but to take up the newspaper any day, and you will find strange and unprecedented things. One of the strangest of these things is that some papers profess to give—and as a matter of fact do give—full reports of the substance at least of the discussions at Cabinet Councils. In one case there was what professed to be the substance of a confidential report by the Army Council—the highest military authority in the country, next of course to the Cabinet. What is perhaps more reasonable is that you find different newspapers, giving, according to their color and to their tendencies, what are plain by different views. And this has led to the almost shocking scandal of these Ministers giving to each other the lie in public and making terrible charges of the violation of the oath of secrecy which is supposed to bind all Cabinet Ministers with regard to the Cabinet secrets. And finally the climax came when the Government itself had to issue an ordinance that any revelation of the Cabinet discussion would be regarded as a violation of the Defense of the Realm Act—the most stringent war measure that has ever been adopted in so liberty loving a country as England.

What is the secret of all this? Of course the first great cause is the absence of any great victories in the field. This is always the fate of a war Ministry, whatever the age, whatever the country. Abraham Lincoln had to pass through criticism as violent, through hours as dark as those which now huddle around Asquith. The second cause is the uneasy sense that bad blunders have been committed—in Gallipoli, in Mesopotamia, in the diplomacy in the Balkans, which gave Bulgaria to Germany, and Greece and Roumania to neutrality. The third reason is undoubtedly the personality and the power of Lord Northcliffe. And there is a fourth cause intimately associated with this—namely the spirit of the soldiers, especially in the region of the War Office. And fifthly, associated also with the other two, the strong resolve there is in many quarters, especially in high social circles, to plant conspiracy as a permanent institution in Great Britain.

The importance of Lord Northcliffe is that he controls so many newspapers, in whole or in part. He is the chief owner of the Times, of the Daily Mail, of the Weekly Dispatch, and a brother, Harold Harmsworth, now Lord Rothermere, has another daily paper or two in Leeds and in Glasgow. I am bound to add the two brothers do not see eye to

eye on everything—I believe they are in accord with each other as to their attitude to the war policy of the government. The Times reaches the official and the diplomatic as well as the man in the street, and the man in the street is against the government, as the poll of nearly eight thousand for Mr. Kennedy Jones in Wimbledon proved, as well as the return of Mr. Pemberton Billing for such a stodge Tory constituency as East Herts.

In addition to all these there is the tremendous and incessant agitation in high social circles. The conspirators count many important forerunners. They have, for instance, Lord Milner, who, in spite of his South African record, still exercises great influences, especially in military circles. They have in the War Office itself Captain Amery—a tiny little man scarcely five feet high, but with the energy of a forty horse power dynamo. Captain Amery is in addition an active Parliamentarian and an active journalist. In the House of Commons he may be trusted always to say the bitterest thing—though in private he is quite pleasant. When Asquith was announcing to a thrilled and alarmed House of Commons the prospect of a break-up of the Ministry, Captain Amery shouted out a word of insult—and there was a tremendous howl from the Liberals who resented this attack on their leader and on the decorum of a solemn situation. Then, of course, there are ladies great and small whose violent partisanship for husband or brother or son lead them to additional vehemence, and always indiscreet tongues; and things are said and then repeated with a virulence that a barbed tongue can give; and of that personal and family venom of allusion which is again one of the weapons and the weakness of a feminine campaign.

The truth is that great principles are fighting out perhaps one of their last fights, and that this accounts for the fierce and continuous movement of rival forces behind the scene. On the one side are those who honestly fear the Prussianization of England, and have opposed conscription as the beginning of that disastrous process. They do not fear without reason, for one hears from military circles some wild proposals for dealing with strikes, conscientious objectors and pacifists, which are just in the spirit of Prussianism. On the other side there are zealous conscriptionists who on the one hand are convinced that without conscription it is impossible to win the war as decisively as necessary; and on the other hand have always held that conscription must come and ought to come. Of these conflicting forces, Asquith and Lloyd George have been forced by circumstances into the rival camps.

Thus it is that these two distinguished men are not divided by personal antagonism in the least—for personally they have always gotten together—but are being ranged against each other by the two contending forces. Mr. Asquith, cool, cautious, with a nerve that is rarely lost, who can sleep his eight hours every night after ten minutes over a book—who has a splendid art of managing men, who is acceptable to a large number of Englishmen because he is so essentially English in his characteristics—Mr. Asquith has nearly every Liberal member of the Cabinet with him. Mr. Lloyd George, impulsive, resolute, even obstinate, of reckless courage, shrinking at no peril even to his life—as he proved during the terrible South African controversy—is regarded as the man to press things forward. He has been in favor of conscription for years, and announced his views upon it at an early stage of the war. He has been in favor of conscription for years, and announced his views upon it at an early stage of the war. He has been in favor of conscription for years, and announced his views upon it at an early stage of the war.

The position of the Unionist members of the Cabinet between these two policies is rather delicate. On personal grounds most of them are rather more favorable to Asquith than to Lloyd George. For the moment the divisions have been patched up, and they may remain patched up; but such differences of principle are nearly always accompanied by personal animosities, as an Irish politician who went through the Parnell split can testify, and thus the situation remains obscure. And the tragedy of it all is that the spirit of the people in England grows in intensity and ferocity; and never was there a more violent feeling against even a whisper of peace, except a peace on conditions that Germany will never accept till she is thoroughly beaten. I dwell in a sentence on this last act as the controlling one of the whole situation. This minister may go or that; there may be more shuffling, but the people remain steady, determined, irconcilable, ruthless. Zepelin and submarines have done their work in producing this temper. It cannot be changed.

How the habitual borrower does admire that virtue, patience, in the lender!

A little wrong, a trifling injustice, an insulting word, a piquing of our self-love and personal vanity, stirs us more effectively and interests us more really than the chances of being lost or saved. . . . And yet we dream that we are serving God!

THE POPE

AND THE COMING PEACE
CONGRESS

There is considerable discussion going on in Italian reviews and periodicals concerning the part which the Holy See should take in the congress of nations which will probably be held at the close of the war for the purpose of discussing peace proposals and readjusting political conditions in Europe. Some time ago it was currently reported that a pace had been entered into between the Allies that in the event of such a congress taking place, the Pope should not be admitted to participate in its deliberations as it would only bring up the question of the Temporal Power, a reconsideration of which Italy would not consent to.

This report, whether well founded or not, has aroused considerable discussion in Italy. The Catholic publications taking part in the discussion, assert that the question of the Temporal Power need not be brought up, and that the part which the Holy Father ought to take in the coming congress should not be made conditional upon his temporal sovereignty, but on the great moral power which he could exercise and which is a vital part of his spiritual sovereignty. Nor could the Italian government, with any degree of consistency, protest against the Holy Father's participation in these peace deliberations because of the Law of Guarantees which assures the Pope the fullest liberty in the exercise of his spiritual jurisdiction. Any protest which would directly contravene the assurance given in the Law of Guarantees that the Supreme Pontiff is free to exercise his spiritual sovereignty without interference on the part of the Italian authorities.

It must be very evident to every intelligent student of history that the power of the Pope is immense in maintaining and enforcing the moral law of nations. Since the beginning of the war, the Holy Father has lost no opportunity to bring about an amelioration of the conditions endured by this world conflict. He has succeeded in obtaining better treatment for the prisoners of war of all nations, has effected an exchange of many of them, and has aroused the whole Christian world to a realization of the duty of praying for a cessation of hostilities. While doing this, he is patiently awaiting a favorable opportunity to intervene in an effective way in the interests of peace and harmony, and the immense influence which his position as the head of a world-wide spiritual organization enables him to exercise over the faithful in all the warring nations must be recognized when there is question of permanent peace proposals. The Italian government would make a great mistake by opposing the intervention of the Supreme Pontiff and his participation in any movement for peace. In fact, the exclusion of the Pope from the congress by the action of Italy would be harmful to the state, as it would be an evident proof of the fact that Italy was ignoring the "modus vivendi" which has existed, for nearly half a century, between the Quirinal and the Vatican.—St. Paul Bulletin.

THE BAD LITTLE
HYPHEN

Until quite recently the hyphen had been regarded as a mild and inoffensive punctuation mark. It has now assumed a sinister or threatening character. With certain hysterical persons the hyphen has suddenly developed a bad reputation and threatens the destruction of our liberties. It is associated with plots and conspiracies to overthrow the entire fabric of government. These hysterical persons have invented the term "hyphenated" for those Americans who use the hyphen as a convenient indication of either the land of their nativity or ancestry.

The terms Anglo-American, Irish-American, German-American, or other similar hyphenated words, mean nothing other than that the person to whom they are applied is either a native of a particular country, or, as is the case with all Americans, that his ancestors came from some particular European nation. The hysteria which uses the hyphen as a convenient indication of either the land of their nativity or ancestry.

The argument is absurd and ridiculous. When a man pledges his love and loyalty to his wife he does not denounce or forget his mother. When a man becomes an American citizen he does not change his human nature. It is natural for him to have an affection for his birthplace. He may disapprove of its form of government, its laws and social customs, but he can not hate its soil. As well might the plant hate the soil in which its seed took root. There are ties of blood, there are friends and dear ones in the land he has left behind him. He would make a poor American citizen and his loyalty to this country would be very questionable if he could easily forget the ties of blood and friendship.

The history of the United States proves that those who were true patriots in their native lands made our best adopted citizens. The

thousands of Irish-born citizens who shed their blood on every battlefield for the Stars and Stripes were willing when in their native land to die for her freedom. The German blood that flowed so freely to preserve the Union came from the same hearts that so loved the Fatherland that they were exiled for attempting to establish free institutions on German soil. The hyphenated citizen has proven his loyalty to America in every crisis, and treason is no less an enormity in his mind than in the mind of a native citizen. His nativity did not prevent Benedict Arnold from becoming a traitor. The army of Washington contained many patriots who owned England as their native land. It is a singular and significant fact that all the denigratory talk about hyphenated citizenship should be directed principally against Americans of one racial origin. It is natural that Americans of German blood should feel a pride in the glorious achievements of Germany, hemmed in on every side, yet victorious on land and sea. We can not blame them if they glory in being of the same blood. It is strange that there is no denunciation of those Americans who have for years past boasted that they were of the dubious Anglo-Saxon race. No doubt in the minds of these men it is a crime for the Irishman to wear the shamrock on the 17th of March, and it is treason for the children of sunny France to celebrate the anniversary of the fall of the Bastille.

The law under which the foreigner has become a citizen of the United States does not demand that all social and family ties be broken by the change of political allegiance. He may have a father or mother, or both, or perhaps a sister or brother, living in the foreign land. Neither the spirit nor the letter of the law demands that he forget these ties of blood that bind him to those he has left behind. Some of the framers of our naturalization laws, themselves of foreign birth, have experienced the longing that exists to again see the country they abandoned. We should not make the man who chose our country as his home feel ashamed to admit that he was born abroad. He had nothing to say about what country he preferred to be born in, but he did choose our country for his future home. Only the renegade would say that all citizens of foreign birth are traitors.

The hysteria about hyphenated citizens smacks too much of a recrudescence of Know-Nothingism, our first hyphenated organization. It is an unwholesome indication of an opinion in the minds of many that they constitute a kind of aristocratic citizenry. There is danger that this stirring up of enmity among Americans of diverse racial origin will not stop until there is an attempt to couple religious with racial divisions. The memory of such action is still vivid and there is a small element in American life who even impugn the loyalty of the hyphenated Catholic American. Without questioning the sincerity and pure motive of the vast majority of those who are just now pleading for unalloyed Americanism we can not forget the words of Dr. Johnson, "Patriotism is the last resort of a scoundrel."—Father O'Reilly in Syracuse Catholic Sun.

JUST PRICE VERSUS
MARKET PRICE

In sending the following article to The Citizen, Major (Rev.) J. J. O'Gorman, C.E.F., now "somewhere in France," writes, "Enclosed is an extract of an article which I think would be suitable for your Fifth Column. The reform indicated, though apparently very radical, has been taught for seven centuries by Catholic teachers, and which was to a certain extent put into practice in the middle ages. It was copied out for me from the Irish Theological Quarterly by an invalided soldier, Corp. Bowers of the 4th Middlesex. He wrote it with his left hand as his right was smashed by shrapnel. He is a good social worker. Father Kelleher, the author, is one of the leading Catholic authorities in Ireland on the ethical aspect of economic questions."

"To the thirteenth century scholastic it was not a matter of argument or proof, it was simply part of the habitus mental attitude to regard the rate of exchange in buying and selling as a social and ethical question. As social it had to be regulated by the community itself through its laws or binding customs. As ethical it was required to be fixed in accordance with some recognized ethical or moral standard.

"The modern concept of just price, on the other hand, disregards the social and ethical character. The community as a whole is in danger, it will take steps to secure that they shall be saved from the grinding necessity that compels so many of them to work for a remuneration insufficient to provide them with the means of enjoying a reasonable human existence. The time does certainly appear ripe for a large scheme of economic legislation. The material interests of society demand it no less than the claims of equity and humanity. We may reasonably hope that if the policy is begun in time of war it will not be reversed, but rather developed and perfected after the restoration of peace.—Ottawa Citizen.

He who made man must have all man has—and more.—Newman.

highly incongruous to imagine merchants thinking simply of a just or fair price. It is not thus that modern fortunes are made. In studying the rate of supply and demand, the abundance or shortage of yields, the prospect of the coming season, etc., they have one clear object in view: to find out, as they would put it themselves, how best to make their business prosper; which means how to make the greatest profits, which again, in respect to prices, means how to determine those which shall be most advantageous to themselves. We may call these prices "commercial value" or "exchange value" if we will. It makes no difference. The solitary pertinent fact is that the merchants aim at finding out the most they can get for their goods, and fix the price at that. Of course the amount that people will be prepared to pay for any class of goods can be estimated beforehand with surprising accuracy. It depends on a variety of economic factors, all objective and definite in themselves, which merchants are able to calculate. But that is no reason for holding that what people will be prepared to pay is an objective standard. In a precisely similar way the amount that a starving man would be prepared to pay for a loaf of bread would be determined by a very definite and calculable economic fact, viz., the amount he had in his pocket. But surely if as a result of the calculation of such a simple fact one were to charge him ten pounds for the loaf, we would have no hesitation in agreeing that he had been charged a subjective price.

"The first step in the return to sounder views must be the abandonment of the principle of market prices as they are to be seen working out in practice in Liverpool or any other business center in England or America. By defending this principle we are setting up a justification of usury, sweating, and all the lamentable and disgusting social conditions to which Socialism and syndicalism are only the natural, though ineffective and unreasonable answers. We cannot find a case of sweating or oppression of the poor that is not a direct product of the principles underlying the modern market prices. To cry out against the current price of milk, or accepting the market prices generally is like condemning petty thefts and howling before wholesale robbery. If we are to cry out against the purveyors of milk for exacting from their customers profits which at most will be reckoned by hundreds of pounds in the year and which at best will afford them middle class affluence, what are we to say of the purveyors, for instance, of spirits and beer, the distillers and brewers whose profit amount to many thousands of pounds annually, and have raised them into the ranks of the aristocracy and provided them with coronets and fancy trees?"

By far the most vigorous and effective protest has come from Pope Leo XIII, in his famous vindication of the right of the living wage. In these fearful days there is a regular flood of complaints against the scandal of profit-mongering; it is felt so highly iniquitous that a few selfish individuals should be enabled to make huge fortunes out of the necessities of a people organized to save the nation in time of war. The system of profit-mongering breaks down in time of war, it can scarcely be resumed in time of peace. If it is iniquitous to exploit for profit people when organized for war, it is hard to understand how it can be lawful to exploit them for profit when organized for peace. Even in the daily and weekly press the suggestion is frequently put forward of returning to the long discarded principles of the Middle Ages.

"The state, if it would, could do much to control the working of economic forces and to prevent them from sustaining the scandalous and equitable practices in which they have been working out up to the present. But the trouble is that the exercise of social authority has hitherto been directed mainly by the classes which possess economic advantages, and which, no doubt, from the most upright motives (so easily is self-interest confounded with principle) would most uncompromisingly resent any suggestion to interfere with the free exercise of economic forces. We may look on it, therefore, as one of the few indirect benefits accruing from the present disastrous conflict, that the public conscience appears to be awakened to the necessity of taking these matters seriously in hand. Already the (British) government has put forward a plan for preventing rent raising during the war, and schemes are being suggested for restraining profits within reasonable limits. The principle of a minimum wage has been already accepted in certain industries and surely it is not too much to hope that as the nation expects all its workers to fight and risk their lives for it when in danger, it will take steps to secure that they shall be saved from the grinding necessity that compels so many of them to work for a remuneration insufficient to provide them with the means of enjoying a reasonable human existence. The time does certainly appear ripe for a large scheme of economic legislation. The material interests of society demand it no less than the claims of equity and humanity. We may reasonably hope that if the policy is begun in time of war it will not be reversed, but rather developed and perfected after the restoration of peace.—Ottawa Citizen.

He who made man must have all man has—and more.—Newman.

LAWLESSNESS AND
THE COURTS

Open contempt of the rightful authority of the State is fast becoming a common phenomenon in certain uneasy sections of the country. New York, in particular, has harbored for some years vociferous crews of brainless agitators who form a perpetual incitement to lawlessness. The plan of these propagandists is simple. In common with other criminals, they find that certain laws are obnoxious. They propose to destroy these laws by repeatedly violating them. When brought to book, they will justify their course by flouting the authority of any court before which they may be arraigned. It is probably true that the majority of these agitators, parasitic males and unsexed women, are mere seekers after notoriety. Others, however, are anarchistic, both in sentiment and method. Both must be rigorously suppressed, if law and order are not to become mere empty symbols.

It is not pessimistic to say that these chronic violations of particular ordinances are but symptoms of a deeper disorder in the public and private life of a rapidly growing group of our people. Authority is not a welcome word with the populace, nor even with the young. We fly to the defense of our "rights"; but we suffer the rights of the community and the inalienable rights of God to be flouted without concern. Popular religion, rejecting the supernatural, engages itself with the things of time. Popular sentiment views capital punishment as murder, and regards the criminal as an innocent victim of circumstances. Popular education centers on the development of individuality, and fails miserably in developing the far more important sense of obligation. And all alike, religion or what passes for religion, morbid sentiment and disorderly education, are but integral parts of the cult of a lawless god, whose name is Self.

Judge Cropsey of the Supreme Court of New York, has recently said that the faith of our people in the integrity of the judiciary is being undermined. The statement is undoubtedly correct. When belief in God, the source and centre of all authority, has been rejected, men easily lose their faith in those tribunals which administer justice in His name. Yet some degree of this loss of faith in the honesty of our courts, may be traced to the apparent unwillingness of certain inferior courts to deal sternly with cases involving open and persistent contempt of authority. This weakness does not in itself invalidate the authority of a legal tribunal; but no judiciary, high or low, can retain the respect of the community, as long as it tolerates contempt from the criminals brought within its jurisdiction.—America.

THE REAL MENACE

Several representative gatherings of Protestants, notably the general synods of the Methodist and Presbyterian churches, have lately passed strong resolutions calling for some action on the part of the church and civil government to control the terrible ravages of divorce. The realization is coming to them that the very foundation of society is crumbling, that disregard for the sanctity of marriage is the real American menace.

Some of the ministers admit that it is wrong to marry any of the couples whom they unite in the holy bonds, but excuse themselves on the plea that they might as well do it or the parties would go somewhere else and be married. As a consequence they ask for more state legislation on the marriage question. The Catholic Church, conscious of her supreme

THOMAS SIMPSON,
applying to the British
Parliament in 1760 for a
charter for the Equitable
Society, based his petition
on the following grounds:

"The great numbers of
His Majesty's subjects
whose subsistence principally depends on the
salaries, stipends and
other incomes payable
to them during their
natural lives or on the
profits arising from
their several trades,
occupations, labor and
industry, are very desirous of entering into a
society for assuring the
lives of each other in
order to extend, after
their decease, the benefit of their present incomes to their families and relations, who may otherwise be reduced to extreme poverty and distress by the premature death of their several husbands, fathers and friends."

THE
Capital Life Assurance Company of Canada
HEAD OFFICE - OTTAWA

THE THORNTON-
SMITH CO.Mural Painting and
Church Decorating

11 King St. W. Toronto

Divine power, legislates on all things concerning marriage as a sacrament without asking police protection. The Church knows and all Catholics know that if Catholics go "somewhere else" to get married the result is a life in adultery and eternal damnation if God does not give them the grace of repentance. A church that is afraid to enforce the laws of God for fear of driving people away ought to close up shop.

For the Catholic the last word was spoken when Christ laid down the solemn edict: "What God hath joined together let no man put asunder." Statistics prove that there is a divorce for every four marriages in the United States. Many and various explanations have been given. The chief reason lies in fact that the world has ceased to recognize the sanctity of marriage. It has been brought to the level of a civil contract. We rarely see Catholics in the divorce court. They are human and have their domestic trials. When unfortunate circumstances bring them to the awful condition that demands a legal separation there is not a new consort waiting for them in the parlor of a minister or the office of a Justice of the Peace.

In no country in the world is marriage held in such contempt as in the United States. In no civilized country is there such a number of divorces as in divorce granted for such trivial reasons. We have set the pace for the world and still have a very safe lead. When the Reformers destroyed the sacramental character of Christian marriage they opened a floodgate of immorality. While we commend the belated zeal of our separated brethren, there is a tragic humor in the cry for more stringent divorce laws by those whose church must derive its origin from Henry VIII., or Martin Luther.—N. Y. Catholic Sun.

FATHER FRASER'S CHINESE
MISSIONTaichowfu, 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 it is less I am sad to see my little reserve 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, 30 catechists, 7 chapels, and free schools, 8 churches in different cities with caretakers, supporting two big catechumenates 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...	\$7,492 25
L. K. (K. C.) Ingersoll.....	1 00
A. M. K. Rathwell.....	1 00
Miss M. A. Feeney, Port Robinson.....	1 00
M. E. G. Kingston.....	2 00
A. Friend, St. Catharines.....	2 00
The Diocese of Toronto.....	80 00
Thos. O'Regan, Lakeland.....	2 00

The Benefits
of Life
Insurance

No Better Statement

Than this of the true purpose of
Life Insurance has ever
been issued

The impelling motive for taking out a policy is the same now as it was in Simpson's day, but the facilities are greater.

Are you "extending the benefit of your present income to your family?" If not, you are to blame for neglecting to shield them from the chance of "extreme poverty and distress."

Send us your date of birth. We can fit you with a policy.
Licensed by Dominion Government—Premiums cannot be raised once policy issued.
Surrender and Loan Values in the contract.

THE
Capital Life Assurance Company of Canada
HEAD OFFICE - OTTAWA