

LVY STORE

Carpet
Department.Large line of High
to select from, in all
colors and styles, repre-
sents the best of the
world.RUGS
DESIRABLE RUGS ARE
varieties here. Colors
are copies of the choicest
Persian Rugs. All sizes.AND LINOLEUMS
of an Oilcloth demands
be well seasoned be-
fore use. We take particular
only those we know are
reliable.just received, which we
to show you. Colors
to suit the most fastid-
ious.from 45c square yard to
\$1.00.Our Linen Section
of all Linen
socks, 25c, 27c, 28c per yd.,
the 25c per cent. more
marked.in Table Napkins.
10c, 12c and 14c each.ation Given to Mail Order
GILVY & SONS,
and Mountain St.

Truth Tells

in everything else, if
only a repair we
all you so, if a new
we give a guaran-
tee for 5 years, according
to experts are at your
out extra cost. Can
you?REED & CO.,
Sphaltes, &c.,
112 STREET.CELEBRATED
RAISING FLOUR

and the Best.

or the empty bag
RY St., Montreal.

H BELLS.

ARCH BELLS
and Peals,
the BELL FOUNDRY
Baltimore, Md.LL COMPANY
N.Y., and
NEW YORK CITY.

CHURCH BELLS

ELL FOUNDRY Estab. 1857.
and Chime Bells.
W. VANDERBILT & CO.
New York, U.S.A.

COURT.

EBEC,
sal.land, of the city
Montreal, wife
erty, of Desire
of the same place,
the present.

Plaintiff.

Defendant.

ation as to pro-
stituted in this
bruary, 1903.HOSSAID,
for Plaintiff.Commercial
History
Of
Ireland.

BY "CRUX."

TILL proceeding along the lines that have been traced for some time past, we will, in view of the present momentous questions that are on the tapis in the Imperial Parliament, take some extracts from another exceedingly important essay that came from the versatile pen of Davis. It may be that all which will follow, or, at least, the greater part of it, has no application to-day; but it is well to know the commercial history of the land, just as it is to have a clear and exact idea of every other phase of its history. Besides, the Irish Land Purchase Bill, now under consideration, includes a multitude of questions that may be traced back to the varying conditions of trade, manufacture, taxation, and landed rights during different periods since the Act of the Union. Under other circumstances, it is not probable that I would ask the readers to peruse the essay that I now reproduce; but, the new and surprising, as well as hopeful, appearance of affairs at home, justifies an excursion into that domain.

What follows, until the end of this paper, is taken, word for word, from an editorial written by Davis, and included in what Duffy called the "Essays."

While the Irish were excluded from English law and intercourse, England imposed no restrictions on our trade. The Pale spent its time tilling and fighting, and it was more sure of receiving blows than bread. It had nothing to sell, why tax its trade? The slight commerce of Dublin was needful to the comforts of the Norman Court in Dublin Castle. Why should it be taxed? The market of Kilkenny was guarded by the spears of the Butters, and from Sligo to Cork the chiefs and towns of Munster and Connaught—the Burkes, O'Loghens, O'Sullivan, Galway, Dingle, and Dunbar, carried on a trade with Spain, and piracy or war against England. How could they be taxed?

Commercial taxes, too, in those days were hard to be enforced, and more resembled toll to a robber than contribution to a state. Every great river and pass in Europe, from the Rhine and the Alps to Berwick and the Blackwater, was affectionately watched by royal and noble castles at their narrowest points, and the barge anchored and the caravan halted, to be robbed, or, as the receivers called it, to be taxed.

At last the Pale was stretched round Ireland by art and force. Solitude and peace were in our plains; but the armed colonist settled in it, and the native came down from his hills as a tenant or a squatter, and a kind of prosperity arose.

Protestant and Catholics, native and colonist, had the same interest—namely to turn this waste into a garden. They had hardly corn enough for themselves; but pasture was plenty, and cows and their hides, sheep and their fleeces, were equally so. The natives had always been obliged to prepare their own clothing, and, therefore, every craught and digger knew how to dress wool, and skins, and they had found out, or preserved, from a more civilized time, dyes which, to this day, are superior to any others. Small quantities of woollen goods were exported, but our assertion holds good that in our war times there was no manufacture for export worth naming.

Black Tom Wentworth, the ablest of despots, came here 210 years ago, and found "small beginnings towards a clothing trade." He at once resolved to discourage it. He wrote so to the King on July 25th, 1689, and he was a man true to his emitties. "But," said he, "I'll give them a linen manufacture instead." Now, the Irish had raised flax and made and dyed linen from time immemorial. The saffron-colored linen shirt was as national as the cloak and birch; so that Strafford rather introduced the linen manufacture among the new settlers than among the Irish. Certainly he encouraged it, by sending Irishmen to learn in Britain, and by bringing French and Flemings to work in Ireland.

Charles the Second, doubting to punish us for our most native loyalty to him and his father, resorted to a series of acts which

export of Irish wool, cattle, etc., to England or her colonies, and prohibiting the direct importation of several colonial products into Ireland. The Chief Acts are, 12 Charles II., C. 4; 15 Charles II., C. 7; and 22 and 23 Charles II., C. 26. Thus were the value of land in Ireland—Protestant and Catholic alike—stricken by England. Perhaps we ought to be grateful, thought not to England for these acts. They plundered our pockets, but they guarded our souls from being Anglicised. To France and Spain the produce was sent, and the woollen manufacture continued to increase.

England got alarmed, for Ireland was getting rich. The English lords addressed King William stating that "the growth and increase of the woollen manufacture in Ireland had long been and would be ever, looked upon with great jealousy by his English subjects, and praying him, by very strict laws, totally to prohibit and suppress the same." The Commons said likewise; and William answered comfortably—"I shall do all that I can to discourage the woollen manufacture in Ireland, and to encourage the linen manufacture there, and to promote the trade of England."

There was nothing left but to send the wool raw to England; to smuggle it and cloths to France and Spain, or to leave the land unstocked. The first was worst. The export to England declined, smuggling prospered, "wild geese" for the Brigade, and woollen goods were run in exchange for claret, brandy and silks; but not much land was left waste. Our silks, cottons, malt, beer, and almost every other article was prohibited. Striped linens were taxed 30 per cent., many other kinds of linen were also interfered with, and twenty-four embargoes in nineteen years straightened our foreign provision trade. Thus England kept her pledge of wrath, and broke her promise of service to Ireland. A vigorous system of smuggling induced her to relax in some points, and the cannon of the volunteers blew away the code.

By the Union she was so drained of money, and absentee rents and taxes, and of spirit in every way, that she no longer needs a prohibiting code to prevent our competing with her in any market, Irish or foreign. The Union is prohibition enough, and that England says she will maintain.

Whether it be now possible to create home manufactures, in the old sense of the word—that is, manufactures made in the homes of the workers—is doubted. In favor of such a thing, if it be possible, the arguments are numberless. Such work is a source of ingenuity and enjoyment in the cabinet of the peasants; it rather fills up time that would be otherwise idled, than takes from other work. Our peasant's wives and daughters could clothe themselves and their families by the winter night work, even as those of Norway do; of the peasants possessed the little estates that Norway's peasants do. Clothes manufactured by hand work are more lasting, comfortable, and handsome, and are more natural and national than factory goods. Besides, there is the strongest of all reasons in this, that the factory system seems everywhere a poison to virtue and happiness.

Some invention, which should bring the might of machinery in a wholesome and cheap form to the cabin, seems the only solution of the difficulty. The hazards of the factory system, however, should be encountered, were it sure to feed our starving millions; but this is dubious.

A Native Parliament can alone judge or act usefully on this momentous subject. An absentee tax and a resident government, and the progress of public industry and education, would enable an Irish Parliament to create vast manufactures here by protecting duties in the first instance, and to maintain them by our general prosperity, or it could rely on its own adjustment of landed property, as sufficient to put the people above the need of hazardous purity of content by embarking in great manufactures.

A peasant proprietary could have wealth enough to import wrought goods, or taste and firmness enough to prefer home-made manufacture.

Remember that the above was written in 1843—sixty years ago. Just read over the Land Bill of to-day, and all the speeches of Irish representatives for the past ten years, and judge of the keen observation and forethought of the "Nation's" poet.

SYMINGTON'S
COFFEE ESSENCE

SYMINGTON'S COFFEE ESSENCE is a superior. It contains no sugar and keeps better than all other essences. It is a pure and healthy beverage.

Seeking
For
Unity.

(By An Occasional Contributor.)

In your issue of last week you quoted some passages from that strange and grandiloquent letter which Rev. Jenkins Lloyd Jones, minister of All Souls' Church, Chicago, published in the New York "Herald." You treated the effusion in a very sensible manner, for to my mind the most sensible way to treat an unsensible work, is by simply ridiculing its bombast. But there are a few passages in Mr. Jones' letter which deserve attention, for they have an undercurrent of thought, and, while that thought may be almost buried in adjectives, still it is one that prevails amongst Protestants of all denominations, and should be turned, for their benefit, in a right direction. I will take the remaining portions of that peculiar letter and comment upon each separate paragraph.

After telling us that "holiness is wholeness," and that, "it comes to its wholeness only in the community"—meaning, I suppose, that the individual cannot possess it in its entirety—he continues to develop that same proposition, as follows—

"There is moving power, culture, helpfulness in the pure notes of the soloist whose voice gives adequate expression to the heart; but mighty deeds are inspired, communities acquire added momentum, the city is defended and the nation is saved under the mighty inspiration of the great chorus that rolls from the throats of the unnumbered multitudes. Witness the power of the old chorals of the Reformation, the battle hymn of Luther and the Marseillaise. These represent not only the mighty harmonies of the state, but the great harmonizing power of Religion."

Now, I would be exceedingly thankful for an explanation of the foregoing. I do not quite grasp its meaning, therefore I am not able to fully appreciate its worth. I have an idea of the meaning of each word, but when it comes to the combination of them I am at sea; I find it a hard hunt to discover the idea that these words are intended to convey. However, I must try. As far as my humble brain will allow I find that the writer wishes to tell us that the individual voice from the heart is a great motive power, while the voices of a multitude inspires great deeds. As an illustration of the latter he refers to the hymn of Luther and the "Marseillaise." These two hymns represent the harmonies of state and religion.

Well! After all that, how much further are we advanced? It simply reduces itself to this that a single voice can do a good deal, while a chorus of voices can do much more—at least in producing effects. That is an axiom that did not need such a long string of words to convey. About Luther's hymn I am not going to trouble myself, for it did not effect anything like what the writer represents. As to the "Marseillaise," it was in the soul of Rouget Delisle that it found its source, and he gave it forth, as an individual to the world; it was when seized upon by the multitude and chanted by the thousands that it awakened the spirit of revolution, the thirst for blood, the madness and the fury of the misguided and half-intoxicated, or wholly crazy mob. There may have been "holiness," and "helpfulness," and "culture," exemplified in the composer; but there was certainly neither religion, nor its harmonies in the frantic crowd that went wild to the strains of that hymn. To say the least the example is badly chosen, if the writer intended to illustrate anything at all. But let us pass on to the next paragraph—

"The main universal element in literature is represented by the prayers of the ages. If the selection be high enough, Catholic saint, ostracized heretic, persecuted infidel, Protestant believer and Pagan confessor all join in other chorus."

Rev. Mr. Jones has got at his dictionary of adjectives again. But, in this instance, he has made a poor use of them—in fact, they are all misplaced. Why not have said: "Pagan infidel," instead of "Pagan confessor"; "Protestant heretic," instead of "Protestant believer," and why not have applied the terms "ostracized," "persecuted," and "confessor" to the "Catholic saint?"

Could we have a better example of a man, who has read a certain amount, has retained a great deal of it, and is absolutely unable to arrange the matter in any kind of order in his mind? In a word, all that display of adjectives misapplied and of figures of speech that are faulty,

merely serves to show how vain are the efforts of the most gifted to make headway when they are lacking in the great and all-necessary quality of faith. Observe this in the following paragraph—

"This cry, enforced by science, literature and travel, is bringing in a new Catholicism. The age of schism is gone or going. The sects in religion are doomed. The provincial appeal of the denominationalist falls upon unresponsive ears, aye, fails of clear utterance on the part of him who leads in the task of sect building."

What an actual amount of truth in this one passage, and still how very, very far the writer is, from the understanding of that truth. Could he see the situation as Leo XIII. sees it, and use the same expressions—coming from a Protestant—those expressions would have a force that cannot be well estimated. But the "Catholicism" to which he refers is far different from the "Catholicity" to which the Pontiff has reference—yet both are of the same opinion that "the sects in religion are doomed," that the building of denominations is an industry that has seen its day and is passing away. If Mr. Jones could only realize how fully Catholicity does realize his ideal, it is quite possible that he would accept its solution of a problem that is beyond his powers of demonstration. Then he closes with a still more significant passage, which runs thus—

"We talk much of the combination of trade and the trusts of capital. But they are only the reverse side of the shield—the worldly and oftentimes wicked perversion of the great law of brotherhood. A great Catholicism, a church of humanity, of which the Church of Rome in its mighty achievements is a feeble prophecy, is the obverse side of this shield. The word in religion, as in statesmanship, to-day is not clanishness, nor partisanship, nor patriotism, but cosmopolitanism. Universalism of some kind or other, in time and eternity, is the demand of the heart and the head, the necessity of science, the dream of the sage, the promise of the bard, the inspiration of the prophet, the gospel of the living God, as revealed in the slowly unfolding pages of history and reflected in the ever clearing and climbing life of the soul of man."

This is all of the same piece. Here is a man who has, of himself, conceived a vague idea of a general coming together of all men "in the one fold, with the one Shepherd," yet he is not certain when, how, or in what manner that result is to be obtained—nor if it ever will come to pass. Yet is not this the exact, but, in her case reasoned and positive, teaching of the Church of Christ? Our Holy Father, in accordance with the promise that Christ made when on earth, looks forward to a time when error shall have run its course when the world shall behold "one, universal fold," one Church absorbing all the others, one of which "the Church of Rome in its mighty achievements is a feeble prophecy" or a powerful prophecy, as we consider it, one that will be nothing other than the Church of Rome to the attainment of its ultimate end.

He says that "universalism of some kind or other, in time or eternity, is the demand of the heart," and so forth. Well, that is the exact truth; and that object can only be attained the one Catholic institution that possesses all the elements of union or unity, and that can satisfy all the cravings of the human heart. The difference between Rev. Mr. Jones and the Catholic is simply the difference that exists between the Indian (no offence intended) and the learned astronomer, when they both contemplated the heavens; both see the same system, both feel the existence of a Supreme Power over it all, and while the latter can grasp and understand the relations between that Power and nature, the former has but a vague and more instinctive than rational conception of some Supreme Being.

Rev. Mr. Jones has decidedly the elements within him which might eventually, if directed properly, lead him into the one, only, universal, Catholic and Apostolic Church—wherein there would be no need of any mass of adjectives nor any bewildering combination of phrases to explain and to convey to the mind the solemn Truth which he is now vainly seeking to grasp.

WALTER G. KENNEDY,

DENTIST,

708 Lagachetters (Palao St.)

Two Doors West of Beaver Hall,

MONTREAL.

A pure hard Soap.

SURPRISE
SOAP
MAKES CHILD'S PLAY
OF WASH DAYROYAL COMMISSION ON
UNIVERSITY EDUCATION
IN IRELAND.

A Blue Book has just been issued giving the final report of the Royal Commission on University Education in Ireland. This Commission was appointed on July 1st, 1901. The scope of Commission was described in the following terms:

"To inquire into the present condition of the higher, general and technical education available in Ireland outside Trinity College, Dublin, and to report what reforms, of any, are desirable in order to render that education adequate to the needs of the Irish people."

The Commissioners selected included such well known names as Lord Robertson (chairman), Viscount Ridley, Mgr. Healy (Bishop of Clonfert), Professor Sir Richard Jobb (Cambridge), Professor S. H. Butcher (Edinburgh), Professor J. A. Ewing (Cambridge), Professor John Rhys (Oxford), Mr. J. Lorrain Smith (Queen's College, Belfast), Mr. W. J. M. Starkie (Commissioner of National Education in Ireland), Mr. Wilfrid Ward (Royal University of Ireland), and Mr. R. H. F. Dickey. Out of these, Dr. Healy, Messrs. Starkie, and Wilfrid Ward are Catholics. It is worthy of note that as many as six out of eleven Commissioners have felt themselves constrained to add important qualifications before they saw their way to sign the report.

When we remember that in virtue of its terms of reference the Commission was excluded from taking Trinity College, Dublin, into the scope of its inquiry, we can realize the difficulty the members encountered in elaborating a scheme adequate to the requirements of the Catholics of Ireland. In fact, outside the reconstitution of the Royal University as a teaching university with a Catholic College at Dublin capable of attracting students from all parts of Ireland, the Commissioners have little else to recommend.

To summarise their conclusions, we may state, first of all, that, in the opinion of the members of the Commission the present arrangement, by which the degrees of the Royal University are obtainable by examination alone, has lowered the ideal of university life and education in Ireland, and should consequently be abolished. The members of the Commission further decided that the system by which, in making appointments to the Senate and all the offices of the Royal University, Dublin, account must be taken of the religious profession of the persons to be appointed with a view to maintain the even balance between the churches is educationally indefensible.

"3. That the system by which an indirect State endowment for certain colleges is provided by means of fellowships in the Royal University held by professors in these colleges, who act as university examiners, must be condemned.

"4. That the Royal University should be converted into a teaching university.

"5. That the present Senate of the Royal University should be superseded by a governing body constituted on an academic basis in the manner explained in Section VI. of this report.

"6. That the reconstituted Royal University should be a Federal University with constituent colleges.

"7. That the constituent colleges should be Queen's College, Belfast, Queen's College, Cork, Queen's College, Galway, and a new college for Roman Catholics to be established in Dublin; and constituted on the lines suggested in Section VI. of this report.

"8. That the endowment and equipment of the new college in Dublin should be on a scale required by a university college of the first rank, which is intended to draw its students from all parts of Ireland.

"9. That the Catholic University School of Medicine should be absorbed into the new college in Dublin.

"10. That the present government and constitution of the Queen's Colleges should be remodelled on the lines suggested in Section VI. of this report.

"11. That the colleges should be accorded a large measure of autonomy, so that each may be enabled to develop freely on its own lines, while at the same time conforming to the common standard of culture prescribed by the university.

"12. That a liberal increase should be made in the endowment and equipment of the Queen's Colleges at Cork and Galway, we are unable to recommend that any addition should be made to the present endowments of these colleges, until in altered circumstances they give evidence of increased utility.

"15. That the degrees of the reconstituted university should be open to women on the same terms as to men.

"16. That attendance at lectures in one of the four constituent colleges of the reconstituted university should be required from all candidates—without distinction of sex—who seek the advantages of university training, due exception being made in the case of matriculated students at present engaged in a course of extern study.

"17. That halls of residence, for men and for women students, should be provided, in connection with the two colleges, in Dublin and in Belfast."

As we have already stated, six out of eleven Commissioners make observations when signing the report, which are set out in appended notes. Mr. Dickey is the only member of the Commission who refused to sign the report. He condemns the federal scheme, which he thinks must be inadequate as long as Trinity College, Dublin, remains a separate university. Again, Lord Robertson is not prepared to recommend the establishment and endowment of a Catholic College. And Viscount Ridley does not hesitate to affirm that if the Commission had been permitted to consider the position of Trinity College, a more satisfactory solution might have been arrived at. Mr. Starkie argues strongly in favor of a national university for Ireland, in which Irish boys of all denominations, during their formative years, might associate together.

Mr. Wilfrid Ward points out in his qualifications the double character of Trinity College, Dublin. As he expresses it, this establishment is "de jure" undenominational. But all Irish Catholics are aware that "de facto" Trinity College is absolutely denominational; in fact, that it is a regular hot-bed of Protestantism and Orangeism, into which no self-respecting Catholic would care to enter.

It is a matter of doubt at the present moment, what course the Government is likely to pursue in consequences of this report. It is generally admitted that a mistake was made in the beginning, when Trinity College was excluded from the purview of the Commission. In our opinion, much good would have followed had the exact position of this establishment been plainly put before the country.

The Government claims to be determined to remedy the inequalities under which the Catholics of Ireland have labored, so far as regards university training. The Catholics of Ireland constitute 75 per cent. of the total population of the country. If, then, the members of the Government are really anxious to come to the assistance of the Catholic youth of Ireland in this matter, they must pay no heed to the conclusions of the Commission. The one essential thing is to frame a scheme which will prove acceptable to the Catholic Bishops of Ireland, the divinely-constituted guardians of the faith of the Irish people—London University.