

475 Stores In Largest Chain.

One of the largest chain store propositions on this continent is a string of 475 dry goods stores, doing an annual business of \$63,000,000. The offices of this concern are in New York.

MOVIES IN INDIA HAVE GREAT INFLUENCE ON THE PEOPLE

Mrs. A. G. Bisset, of Rangoon, Served on Board of Censors For Many Years.

IS VISITING OLD HOME

Wife of A. G. Bisset of the National Bank of India in Burmah.

India, the nation, the beautiful and mysterious star of the Orient, whose light is kept unclouded by the wonderful foresight of the British Government, is a subject which one discusses with delight with Mrs. A. G. Bisset, wife of A. G. Bisset of the National Bank of India, located at Rangoon, Burmah. Mrs. Bisset, who was formerly Miss Beatrice Cron of this city, but who has spent the past seven years in India, is now the guest of her mother, Mrs. Margaret C. Cron, Wortley road. She will be joined in the spring by her husband, who has a year's furlough. Mrs. Bisset is also a cousin of Mrs. Bryden Campbell, Richmond street north.

Mrs. Bisset, by reason of her husband's business connection, comes into contact with the business life of India. She tells of the recently organized Union Club of Rangoon, whose membership includes prominent businessmen of every nationality, including Chinese, Brahmans, Mohammedans, Indians, Americans and British. The club, which is but a year old, is somewhat of the nature of the Rotary and Kiwanis clubs of this country, and is doing a great deal toward breaking down the prejudices among the men of India. Such clubs, however, are few as yet, and Rangoon is specially favored in having one.

On Board of Censors. Mrs. Bisset has taken an active interest in the affairs of Rangoon. The only woman member of the Burmah board of film censors for a number of years, she has had the opportunity of finding out just what sort of films are being shown in India. Moving pictures are exerting an extraordinary influence on the people of India, says Mrs. Bisset. For this reason the films have to be very carefully censored. But the majority of movie films are such that much has to pass the board, which should not be feared. The life depicted in the average movie is not a true picture of the life in America, and yet the Indians accept it as such.

Mrs. Bisset went to India originally to work among the Anglo-Indian girls in connection with the Y.W.C.A., and since her marriage has continued to be interested in the work. For many years she was a member of the Rangoon Y.W.C.A. board.

Britain Needed. Mrs. Bisset believes that Britain is doing a wonderful work in India. She points to the great canals with which British engineers have irrigated the famine areas of India. She tells about the great Indian medical service, with its hospitals scattered throughout India, in which some of the most brilliant medical men of Great Britain are at work. These hospitals are accessible to Indians and Europeans alike, and are controlled by the British government. She mentions the numerous Dufferin hospitals for Indian women, named after Lady Dufferin, in which the Indian women are treated without loss of caste. They live in Purdah, having their own food prepared for them and being waited upon by their own servants.

She mentions the splendid system of public works carried on by the British government, the construction of bridges, and canals, the preservation of forests and so on. And she points to the development of Indian resources by the British government, the opening up of the oil, rice and timber industries. Lastly, she refers to the great civil and military services of the British government, carrying out law and order in the country, and concludes with the thought that India couldn't very well get along without Great Britain at the present time.

It is estimated, from the increased interest in wireless in the past five years, that in another five years the radio audience of the United States will grow to 20,000,000 individuals.

BACK ACHED TERRIBLY

Mrs. McMahon Tells How She Found Relief by Taking Lydia E. Pinkham's Vegetable Compound

Chatham, Ont.—"I took Lydia E. Pinkham's Vegetable Compound for a run-down condition after the birth of my baby boy. I had terrible pains and backache, and was tired and weak, not fit to do any work and care for my three little children. One day I received your little book and read it, and gave up taking the medicine I had and began taking the Vegetable Compound. I feel much better now and am not ashamed to tell what it has done for me. I recommend it to any woman I think feels as I do."—Mrs. J. R. McMahon, 153 Harvey St., Chatham, Ont.

Lydia E. Pinkham's Vegetable Compound, made from roots and herbs, has for nearly fifty years been restoring sick, ailing women to health and strength. It relieves the troubles which cause such symptoms as backache, painful periods, irregularities, tired, worn-out feelings and nervousness. This is shown again and again by such letters as Mrs. McMahon writes, as well as by the women telling another. These women know, and are willing to tell others, what it did for them; therefore, it is surely worth your trial.

Women who suffer should write to the Lydia E. Pinkham Medicine Co., Cobourg, Ontario, for a free copy of Lydia E. Pinkham's Private Text-Book upon "Ailments Peculiar to Women."



LADY HANSON.

widow of the late Sir Charles Hanson, former lord mayor of London, is dead. She was born in Halton county, Ontario.

PERSONALS

Mrs. William Agranove spent last week-end in Toronto.

Dr. and Mrs. J. G. Hunt are spending a few weeks in Bermuda.

Miss Pope, Ridout street, entertained at the tea hour this afternoon.

Mrs. E. Firth Buller has returned home after an enjoyable visit in Peterboro.

Mrs. E. Wilson, Raymond avenue, has returned home after visiting in Kansas City.

Mrs. J. H. Kinder of Strathroy is visiting Mr. and Mrs. Charles Turner of Victor street.

Miss Lillian M. Cattanach of Somers is in the city the guest of Mrs. H. G. Collamore, 8 Erie avenue.

Mrs. L. G. Hatheway is entertaining at bridge and Mah Jong tomorrow afternoon at her home on Windward avenue.

Mrs. (Col.) Rance of Clinton and Mrs. Herbert E. Paul of Morrisburg are visiting Mrs. Bartholomew, Hayman Court.

Mr. Hersey Dorman has returned to Chicago after spending the holiday season with his mother, Mrs. Thos. Hammond, Brick street.

Mrs. Russell Coleman has returned to Seaford after spending two weeks with her parents, Mr. and Mrs. Josiah Smith, Mount Pleasant avenue.

Mrs. J. S. Niven, who is visiting her daughter, Mrs. Torrance Beardmore in Rosedale, Toronto, is expected home the end of the week.

Mrs. Hugh Shuttleworth entertained at a luncheon this week in honor of Mrs. Saskin, a guest at the home of Rev. W. Beattie and Mrs. Beattie.

Mrs. E. McCormick and Master Jack McCormick have returned to Detroit after spending a few weeks with relatives and friends in the city.

Miss Elizabeth Fisher of Toronto, daughter of Justice R. G. Fisher and Mrs. Fisher, has returned home after visiting at the home of Mr. and Mrs. Hugh Shuttleworth.

Mrs. Howard White left this week for Chicago to join Mr. White, who left the city some time ago. Mr. and Mrs. White will take up their residence in Clyde avenue.

Miss Matthews of Toronto, daughter of B. C. Matthews, president of the Toronto Business Men's Conservative Club, will accompany Mrs. Meighen to London tomorrow.

Mrs. Vivian C. Reeve, formerly Miss Wanda Jones, will receive for the first time since her marriage, Thursday afternoon, January 17, at her residence, 915 Waterloo street.

Miss Pauline Ward, who has been visiting her parents, Mr. and Mrs. William Ward, King street, returned to Montreal this week, where she has accepted an appointment on the staff of the Royal Victoria Hospital.

Mr. and Mrs. Israel Taylor, Wellington street north, are leaving later in the month for St. Petersburg, Fla., where they will spend some time. At present Mr. Taylor is in Bermuda attending an Imperial Life conference.

Mrs. Arthur Linnell, the out-going matron of Forest City Chapter, C.E.S., entertained the past matrons at the tea hour yesterday, the guest of honor being Mrs. Elizabeth Taylor of Preston, past worthy grand matron of Ontario.

Mr. and Mrs. G. I. Letteney of Digby, N. S., who has been visiting Mrs. F. M. Letteney, Maitland street, left yesterday for California, where they will remain until May. They were accompanied by Mrs. Arthur Starr of Halifax, N. S.

Miss Margaret McConnell is returning to King's Hall, Crompton, Quebec, after spending the holidays with her parents, Mr. and Mrs. J. E. McConnell, Richmond street north. Miss McConnell spent last week-end in Toronto, the guest of Miss Isabel Ross, St. George street.

Mrs. E. B. Smith, Ontario provincial commissioner of Girl Guides, Miss Beth Pennington and Miss Doris Auden, provincial secretary and treasurer, and Mrs. C. H. Hill, local commissioner, were in Hamilton yesterday for the meeting of the executive of the provincial council, which was held in the Y. W. C. A.

Mrs. William Hendrie of Hamilton entertained at a luncheon yesterday at "Gateside" in honor of the provincial executive of the Girl Guides. The guests were: Mrs. E. B. Smith, Mrs. C. H. Hill, Miss Beth Pennington, Mrs. Allan McLean and Miss Doris Auden, all of London; Miss Watt of Brantford and Mrs. H. B. Greening.

One of the outstanding events of the week will be "Op. O' My Thumb" to be presented at the Central Collegiate Institute tonight by the Players' Club of the Western University, before the London Drama League. Miss Helen Berdan plays

GIRLS' CANADIAN CLUB TO HEAR PROF. DORLAND

Will Give Series of Five Lectures During Winter—Discuss Canadian Poets.

Prof. A. G. Dorland, of the Western Ontario University, has promised to give a series of five lectures to the Girls' Canadian Club, beginning on the evening of Jan. 23, the lectures to take place on the third Wednesday of each month. The subject of Prof. Dorland's lectures has not yet been announced, but will probably be on some outstanding Canadian subject.

Following their regular supper meeting last night at the Y.W.C.A. residence, King street, an hour was given over to the study of two distinguished Canadian poets—Bliss Carman and Robert Service. A very interesting paper on the life of Robert Service was read by Miss Phyllis Kennedy, while Miss Marie Ball read selections from his poetry. Miss D. Squires spoke about Bliss Carman and read a number of his poems. The president, Mrs. Freida Stephens, was in the chair.

HYDRO DISTRICT LINE CONSTRUCTION IS RUSHED

Special to The Advertiser.

Lambeth, Jan. 9.—Construction work on the new hydro distribution line serving the country south of the highway and bordering the 7th concession has been going on steadily despite the cold weather of last week.

All of the poles have been erected, and until the storm struck this district Saturday evening the linemen were at work stringing the wires.

Due to the fact that all of the homes using the service require to be wired, it is not expected that the power will be turned on until the winter has passed. All of the farm-houses in the district are stated that they will take advantage of the service.

Serpent Trimming. London, Jan. 9.—The python and alligator shoes and wrist bags and other ornaments so common today have been developed into a fantastic notion. This is a serpent of gleaming metal cloth or a small stuffed alligator, either real or artificial, posed effectively on the popular black plush hat.

Brocaded Evening Cloak. New York, Jan. 9.—A magnificent evening cloak shown here today is of black brocaded velvet, very sombre in appearance and lined with gray crepe de china. The magnificence obtains in a wide collar of iridescent beads.

Is Terribly Wrong. In every other way this woman is a fine, right-thinking, unselfish character. And yet it seems to me she is terribly wrong in this. In the first place she is giving her children an exaggerated idea of the value of money. She is teaching her daughters to think of material things as extremely important. What is going to happen when they discover that they cannot continue having the luxuries they have learned to expect? Will the mother not receive what must be the worst blow of all—the blame of her children—when they discover how she has misled them?

And will they not, in one sense, be right in blaming her? It seems so to me. There is certainly nothing to be ashamed of in having less money than the next person. Neither is it

terribly wrong. In every other way this woman is a fine, right-thinking, unselfish character. And yet it seems to me she is terribly wrong in this. In the first place she is giving her children an exaggerated idea of the value of money. She is teaching her daughters to think of material things as extremely important. What is going to happen when they discover that they cannot continue having the luxuries they have learned to expect? Will the mother not receive what must be the worst blow of all—the blame of her children—when they discover how she has misled them?

And will they not, in one sense, be right in blaming her? It seems so to me. There is certainly nothing to be ashamed of in having less money than the next person. Neither is it

terribly wrong. In every other way this woman is a fine, right-thinking, unselfish character. And yet it seems to me she is terribly wrong in this. In the first place she is giving her children an exaggerated idea of the value of money. She is teaching her daughters to think of material things as extremely important. What is going to happen when they discover that they cannot continue having the luxuries they have learned to expect? Will the mother not receive what must be the worst blow of all—the blame of her children—when they discover how she has misled them?

And will they not, in one sense, be right in blaming her? It seems so to me. There is certainly nothing to be ashamed of in having less money than the next person. Neither is it

terribly wrong. In every other way this woman is a fine, right-thinking, unselfish character. And yet it seems to me she is terribly wrong in this. In the first place she is giving her children an exaggerated idea of the value of money. She is teaching her daughters to think of material things as extremely important. What is going to happen when they discover that they cannot continue having the luxuries they have learned to expect? Will the mother not receive what must be the worst blow of all—the blame of her children—when they discover how she has misled them?

And will they not, in one sense, be right in blaming her? It seems so to me. There is certainly nothing to be ashamed of in having less money than the next person. Neither is it

terribly wrong. In every other way this woman is a fine, right-thinking, unselfish character. And yet it seems to me she is terribly wrong in this. In the first place she is giving her children an exaggerated idea of the value of money. She is teaching her daughters to think of material things as extremely important. What is going to happen when they discover that they cannot continue having the luxuries they have learned to expect? Will the mother not receive what must be the worst blow of all—the blame of her children—when they discover how she has misled them?

And will they not, in one sense, be right in blaming her? It seems so to me. There is certainly nothing to be ashamed of in having less money than the next person. Neither is it

terribly wrong. In every other way this woman is a fine, right-thinking, unselfish character. And yet it seems to me she is terribly wrong in this. In the first place she is giving her children an exaggerated idea of the value of money. She is teaching her daughters to think of material things as extremely important. What is going to happen when they discover that they cannot continue having the luxuries they have learned to expect? Will the mother not receive what must be the worst blow of all—the blame of her children—when they discover how she has misled them?

And will they not, in one sense, be right in blaming her? It seems so to me. There is certainly nothing to be ashamed of in having less money than the next person. Neither is it

terribly wrong. In every other way this woman is a fine, right-thinking, unselfish character. And yet it seems to me she is terribly wrong in this. In the first place she is giving her children an exaggerated idea of the value of money. She is teaching her daughters to think of material things as extremely important. What is going to happen when they discover that they cannot continue having the luxuries they have learned to expect? Will the mother not receive what must be the worst blow of all—the blame of her children—when they discover how she has misled them?

And will they not, in one sense, be right in blaming her? It seems so to me. There is certainly nothing to be ashamed of in having less money than the next person. Neither is it

terribly wrong. In every other way this woman is a fine, right-thinking, unselfish character. And yet it seems to me she is terribly wrong in this. In the first place she is giving her children an exaggerated idea of the value of money. She is teaching her daughters to think of material things as extremely important. What is going to happen when they discover that they cannot continue having the luxuries they have learned to expect? Will the mother not receive what must be the worst blow of all—the blame of her children—when they discover how she has misled them?

And will they not, in one sense, be right in blaming her? It seems so to me. There is certainly nothing to be ashamed of in having less money than the next person. Neither is it

terribly wrong. In every other way this woman is a fine, right-thinking, unselfish character. And yet it seems to me she is terribly wrong in this. In the first place she is giving her children an exaggerated idea of the value of money. She is teaching her daughters to think of material things as extremely important. What is going to happen when they discover that they cannot continue having the luxuries they have learned to expect? Will the mother not receive what must be the worst blow of all—the blame of her children—when they discover how she has misled them?

And will they not, in one sense, be right in blaming her? It seems so to me. There is certainly nothing to be ashamed of in having less money than the next person. Neither is it

terribly wrong. In every other way this woman is a fine, right-thinking, unselfish character. And yet it seems to me she is terribly wrong in this. In the first place she is giving her children an exaggerated idea of the value of money. She is teaching her daughters to think of material things as extremely important. What is going to happen when they discover that they cannot continue having the luxuries they have learned to expect? Will the mother not receive what must be the worst blow of all—the blame of her children—when they discover how she has misled them?

And will they not, in one sense, be right in blaming her? It seems so to me. There is certainly nothing to be ashamed of in having less money than the next person. Neither is it

terribly wrong. In every other way this woman is a fine, right-thinking, unselfish character. And yet it seems to me she is terribly wrong in this. In the first place she is giving her children an exaggerated idea of the value of money. She is teaching her daughters to think of material things as extremely important. What is going to happen when they discover that they cannot continue having the luxuries they have learned to expect? Will the mother not receive what must be the worst blow of all—the blame of her children—when they discover how she has misled them?

And will they not, in one sense, be right in blaming her? It seems so to me. There is certainly nothing to be ashamed of in having less money than the next person. Neither is it

terribly wrong. In every other way this woman is a fine, right-thinking, unselfish character. And yet it seems to me she is terribly wrong in this. In the first place she is giving her children an exaggerated idea of the value of money. She is teaching her daughters to think of material things as extremely important. What is going to happen when they discover that they cannot continue having the luxuries they have learned to expect? Will the mother not receive what must be the worst blow of all—the blame of her children—when they discover how she has misled them?

And will they not, in one sense, be right in blaming her? It seems so to me. There is certainly nothing to be ashamed of in having less money than the next person. Neither is it

terribly wrong. In every other way this woman is a fine, right-thinking, unselfish character. And yet it seems to me she is terribly wrong in this. In the first place she is giving her children an exaggerated idea of the value of money. She is teaching her daughters to think of material things as extremely important. What is going to happen when they discover that they cannot continue having the luxuries they have learned to expect? Will the mother not receive what must be the worst blow of all—the blame of her children—when they discover how she has misled them?

And will they not, in one sense, be right in blaming her? It seems so to me. There is certainly nothing to be ashamed of in having less money than the next person. Neither is it

terribly wrong. In every other way this woman is a fine, right-thinking, unselfish character. And yet it seems to me she is terribly wrong in this. In the first place she is giving her children an exaggerated idea of the value of money. She is teaching her daughters to think of material things as extremely important. What is going to happen when they discover that they cannot continue having the luxuries they have learned to expect? Will the mother not receive what must be the worst blow of all—the blame of her children—when they discover how she has misled them?

And will they not, in one sense, be right in blaming her? It seems so to me. There is certainly nothing to be ashamed of in having less money than the next person. Neither is it

terribly wrong. In every other way this woman is a fine, right-thinking, unselfish character. And yet it seems to me she is terribly wrong in this. In the first place she is giving her children an exaggerated idea of the value of money. She is teaching her daughters to think of material things as extremely important. What is going to happen when they discover that they cannot continue having the luxuries they have learned to expect? Will the mother not receive what must be the worst blow of all—the blame of her children—when they discover how she has misled them?

And will they not, in one sense, be right in blaming her? It seems so to me. There is certainly nothing to be ashamed of in having less money than the next person. Neither is it

terribly wrong. In every other way this woman is a fine, right-thinking, unselfish character. And yet it seems to me she is terribly wrong in this. In the first place she is giving her children an exaggerated idea of the value of money. She is teaching her daughters to think of material things as extremely important. What is going to happen when they discover that they cannot continue having the luxuries they have learned to expect? Will the mother not receive what must be the worst blow of all—the blame of her children—when they discover how she has misled them?

And will they not, in one sense, be right in blaming her? It seems so to me. There is certainly nothing to be ashamed of in having less money than the next person. Neither is it

terribly wrong. In every other way this woman is a fine, right-thinking, unselfish character. And yet it seems to me she is terribly wrong in this. In the first place she is giving her children an exaggerated idea of the value of money. She is teaching her daughters to think of material things as extremely important. What is going to happen when they discover that they cannot continue having the luxuries they have learned to expect? Will the mother not receive what must be the worst blow of all—the blame of her children—when they discover how she has misled them?

And will they not, in one sense, be right in blaming her? It seems so to me. There is certainly nothing to be ashamed of in having less money than the next person. Neither is it

terribly wrong. In every other way this woman is a fine, right-thinking, unselfish character. And yet it seems to me she is terribly wrong in this. In the first place she is giving her children an exaggerated idea of the value of money. She is teaching her daughters to think of material things as extremely important. What is going to happen when they discover that they cannot continue having the luxuries they have learned to expect? Will the mother not receive what must be the worst blow of all—the blame of her children—when they discover how she has misled them?

And will they not, in one sense, be right in blaming her? It seems so to me. There is certainly nothing to be ashamed of in having less money than the next person. Neither is it

CHILD SHOULD BE EDUCATED ACCORDING TO FAMILY MEANS

Only Short-Sightedness Induces Parents To Bring Up Boys and Girls With a False Idea of the State of the Family Finances.

WILL LEAD TO DISCONTENT AND SELFISHNESS

By JULIA HOYT.

The question of educating a girl of moderate means is an interesting one. Naturally she should be given as good an education as the parents can afford, but from her youth she should be made to understand the sacrifices that are perhaps being made to give her this education. The parents should encourage her to think seriously what work she intends to do when old enough.

It seems very short-sighted kindness on the part of parents to bring up a child (boy or girl) with a false idea of the state of the family finances. To bring children up to expect things that they will eventually have to learn to do without is storing up unhappiness for them.

Such a case is rather well known to me and I wait in dread for the day of awakening to arrive. A very charming woman in New York has two little daughters. She has only the money that she earns, and works herself to the bone in order to give her daughters the clothes and advantages she thinks they should have. She has sent them to a school which is attended almost entirely by children of the rich people, and to the same sort of dancing school. In every possible way she is trying to give them all that their friends have, and trying to keep from them the knowledge of her hard work and the fact that they will have to earn money in a few years. Her idea is that during these years when they cannot work they should have nothing but enjoyment, and feel no difference between themselves and their friends.

Is Terribly Wrong. In every other way this woman is a fine, right-thinking, unselfish character. And yet it seems to me she is terribly wrong in this. In the first place she is giving her children an exaggerated idea of the value of money. She is teaching her daughters to think of material things as extremely important. What is going to happen when they discover that they cannot continue having the luxuries they have learned to expect? Will the mother not receive what must be the worst blow of all—the blame of her children—when they discover how she has misled them?

And will they not, in one sense, be right in blaming her? It seems so to me. There is certainly nothing to be ashamed of in having less money than the next person. Neither is it

terribly wrong. In every other way this woman is a fine, right-thinking, unselfish character. And yet it seems to me she is terribly wrong in this. In the first place she is giving her children an exaggerated idea of the value of money. She is teaching her daughters to think of material things as extremely important. What is going to happen when they discover that they cannot continue having the luxuries they have learned to expect? Will the mother not receive what must be the worst blow of all—the blame of her children—when they discover how she has misled them?

And will they not, in one sense, be right in blaming her? It seems so to me. There is certainly nothing to be ashamed of in having less money than the next person. Neither is it

terribly wrong. In every other way this woman is a fine, right-thinking, unselfish character. And yet it seems to me she is terribly wrong in this. In the first place she is giving her children an exaggerated idea of the value of money. She is teaching her daughters to think of material things as extremely important. What is going to happen when they discover that they cannot continue having the luxuries they have learned to expect? Will the mother not receive what must be the worst blow of all—the blame of her children—when they discover how she has misled them?

And will they not, in one sense, be right in blaming her? It seems so to me. There is certainly nothing to be ashamed of in having less money than the next person. Neither is it

terribly wrong. In every other way this woman is a fine, right-thinking, unselfish character. And yet it seems to me she is terribly wrong in this. In the first place she is giving her children an exaggerated idea of the value of money. She is teaching her daughters to think of material things as extremely important. What is going to happen when they discover that they cannot continue having the luxuries they have learned to expect? Will the mother not receive what must be the worst blow of all—the blame of her children—when they discover how she has misled them?

And will they not, in one sense, be right in blaming her? It seems so to me. There is certainly nothing to be ashamed of in having less money than the next person. Neither is it

terribly wrong. In every other way this woman is a fine, right-thinking, unselfish character. And yet it seems to me she is terribly wrong in this. In the first place she is giving her children an exaggerated idea of the value of money. She is teaching her daughters to think of material things as extremely important. What is going to happen when they discover that they cannot continue having the luxuries they have learned to expect? Will the mother not receive what must be the worst blow of all—the blame of her children—when they discover how she has misled them?

And will they not, in one sense, be right in blaming her? It seems so to me. There is certainly nothing to be ashamed of in having less money than the next person. Neither is it

terribly wrong. In every other way this woman is a fine, right-thinking, unselfish character. And yet it seems to me she is terribly wrong in this. In the first place she is giving her children an exaggerated idea of the value of money. She is teaching her daughters to think of material things as extremely important. What is going to happen when they discover that they cannot continue having the luxuries they have learned to expect? Will the mother not receive what must be the worst blow of all—the blame of her children—when they discover how she has misled them?

And will they not, in one sense, be right in blaming her? It seems so to me. There is certainly nothing to be ashamed of in having less money than the next person. Neither is it

terribly wrong. In every other way this woman is a fine, right-thinking, unselfish character. And yet it seems to me she is terribly wrong in this. In the first place she is giving her children an exaggerated idea of the value of money. She is teaching her daughters to think of material things as extremely important. What is going to happen when they discover that they cannot continue having the luxuries they have learned to expect? Will the mother not receive what must be the worst blow of all—the blame of her children—when they discover how she has misled them?

And will they not, in one sense, be right in blaming her? It seems so to me. There is certainly nothing to be ashamed of in having less money than the next person. Neither is it

terribly wrong. In every other way this woman is a fine, right-thinking, unselfish character. And yet it seems to me she is terribly wrong in this. In the first place she is giving her children an exaggerated idea of the value of money. She is teaching her daughters to think of material things as extremely important. What is going to happen when they discover that they cannot continue having the luxuries they have learned to expect? Will the mother not receive what must be the worst blow of all—the blame of her children—when they discover how she has misled them?

And will they not, in one sense, be right in blaming her? It seems so to me. There is certainly nothing to be ashamed of in having less money than the next person. Neither is it

terribly wrong. In every other way this woman is a fine, right-thinking, unselfish character. And yet it seems to me she is terribly wrong in this. In the first place she is giving her children an exaggerated idea of the value of money. She is teaching her daughters to think of material things as extremely important. What is going to happen when they discover that they cannot continue having the luxuries they have learned to expect? Will the mother not receive what must be the worst blow of all—the blame of her children—when they discover how she has misled them?

And will they not, in one sense, be right in blaming her? It seems so to me. There is certainly nothing to be ashamed of in having less money than the next person. Neither is it

terribly wrong. In every other way this woman is a fine, right-thinking, unselfish character. And yet it seems to me she is terribly wrong in this. In the first place she is giving her children an exaggerated idea of the value of money. She is teaching her daughters to think of material things as extremely important. What is going to happen when they discover that they cannot continue having the luxuries they have learned to expect? Will the mother not receive what must be the worst blow of all—the blame of her children—when they discover how she has misled them?

And will they not, in one sense, be right in blaming her? It seems so to me. There is certainly nothing to be ashamed of in having less money than the next person. Neither is it

terribly wrong. In every other way this woman is a fine, right-thinking, unselfish character. And yet it seems to me she is terribly wrong in this. In the first place she is giving her children an exaggerated idea of the value of money. She is teaching her daughters to think of material things as extremely important. What is going to happen when they discover that they cannot continue having the luxuries they have learned to expect? Will the mother not receive what must be the worst blow of all—the blame of her children—when they discover how she has misled them?

And will they not, in one sense, be right in blaming her? It seems so to me. There is certainly nothing to be ashamed of in having less money than the next person. Neither is it

terribly wrong. In every other way this woman is a fine, right-thinking, unselfish character. And yet it seems to me she is terribly wrong in this. In the first place she is giving her children an exaggerated idea of the value of money. She is teaching her daughters to think of material things as extremely important. What is going to happen when they discover that they cannot continue having the luxuries they have learned to expect? Will the mother not receive what must be the worst blow of all—the blame of her children—when they discover how she has misled them?

And will they not, in one sense, be right in blaming her