

Good enough in design, but infamous in execution; for the one purpose was to make all the children Protestants.

And then came—what to my mind is the crowning iniquity of all—the English effort to crush the industrial and commercial enterprise of Ireland. In 1665 and 1680 laws were enacted absolutely prohibiting the importation into England, from Ireland, of all cattle, sheep and swine, of beef, pork, bacon and mutton, and even of butter and cheese.

In the amended Navigation Act of 1663 Ireland was deprived of the whole Colonial trade; and in 1696 it was provided that no goods of any kind could be imported directly from the Colonies to Ireland. At a blow her shipping interest was annihilated.

The wool trade began to grow, but in 1698 it was stopped by Act of Parliament.

The linen trade sprang up next, and gave great promise; but was soon killed off by the imposition of disabling duties, and by the exclusion of that trade from the Colonies, and by the imposition of 30 per cent. on all taken into England.

All this must not be put down to the score of English spite or arrogance. According to the maxims then prevailing, the policy pursued was quite natural. A selfish despotism in regard to all matters of religion, social life and commerce, was held to be the only true national policy. And England was moved, not by hatred to Ireland, but by mistaken views of her own true policy. It would be easy to point out a thousand other wrongs which England did to Ireland. But I have said enough for my purpose, which was to show that we may fairly see that the Irish Catholics have some ground for complaint against the Orangemen. They say: You Orangemen represent, and by your procession proudly commemorate, all the tyranny and outrage of the past. You revive the memory of wrongs which we would fain forget; you bring the bitternesses of the old world and past time to this new world, when we would bury them in oblivion.

And I am not quite out of all sympathy with that sentiment. I am sure England has done wrong to Ireland, and no Englishman would undertake to justify all his country has ever done. I am intensely an Englishman, but I am also a man; and while I am proud of her virtues, I am sorry for all her sins. Whatever blunders have been made in the past, England now is making a magnificent effort to be, not only just, but generous to Ireland. Why keep up the memory of wrongs? Why not let the dead past bury its dead, and cultivate faith and hope and love for all the future? I do not mean that Protestants shall shake hands all round with Catholics and be on easy terms of brotherhood. The Catholics are too bigoted, too intolerant for that. But this question of Orangeism, as I understand it, is one of Catholic and Protestant, and much more. It is taken, by the Irish Catholics at least, as meaning much more—whether the Orangemen mean it as more or no.

What if the English should take it into their heads to celebrate the exploits of Claverhouse in Scotland? Would any sane man applaud the foolish act? The Scotch would bear it probably, and treat the thing with contempt; but none the less would it be an act of folly and worse.

What if the Episcopalians should undertake a public demonstration in commemoration of the passing of the Act of Uniformity, the Five-Mile Act, the grubbing out of Puritan's ears, and such like things? It would be perfectly legal that demonstration; that is to say, there is no law against it, and they would have to be protected in the streets or elsewhere.

But from the point of view of the Orangemen.—What is the practical good of this public demonstration? Surely there is no glory to be got out of it. Everybody—except the Mayor of Montreal—knows of their existence, and the procession is not needed to prove that fact. And some hundreds of men marching through the streets under military protection can scarcely be said to be achieving glory and honour. The right to march will be asserted, and what is that worth to any man, woman or child in all this Dominion. I fail to see where the glory comes in, or how it is going to help the cause of liberty and progress in any way. I am a Protestant. I believe in liberty—in progress—in equal rights, and when they are denied to me by those in power, I shall constitute myself the chief authority and take those things which pertain to me as a man. And it seems to me that there is much better work to be done in the Province of Quebec than this wrangling over a procession.

There is the question of education—very important and very pressing. Half the energy spent over this procession spent in that direction would have done great and lasting good.

There is the question of taxing our vast ecclesiastical institutions and buildings.

Also this of the quasi established Roman Catholic Church with the poor untaught but tithed *habitant*. I should like to see more Protestant force going in those directions; and I venture to hope that after this twelfth is over we shall hear no more of processions. Whether the Orangemen intend it or not—and I believe they do not—the Roman Catholics take it as an open glorification of all the things they have had to suffer. Those old time and old-world feuds should be buried; the memory of them should

be put away. We have plenty of differences without going to the past for some more. We have work to do that processions cannot help, but may greatly hinder. At home, England has long been trying to repair the wrongs Ireland had suffered at her hands. The Irish have freedom of worship; the Church of the minority has been disestablished; political and civil rights have been restored to them; just land laws have been enacted, and every possible effort made that the Irish may forget the past and enter upon an era of peace and prosperity. We in this New World should emulate the spirit of the Old, and seek to establish the nation in righteousness. If we must have a public demonstration, it would be far better to make it in commemoration of the great day in English history that witnessed the adoption of the bill for Catholic emancipation. I am prouder of the 13th of April, 1829, than I am of the day when the Battle of the Boyne was fought and won by William, Prince of Orange.

ALFRED J. BRAY.

THE TURKS AND THE EASTERN QUESTION.

IV.

Of course the Eastern question had its origin in British interests. That is a wide and most indefinite term. I know of no place to which you could go on the fate of this earth, except, perhaps, here in Canada, and not find a British interest in some form or other. It is to be presumed that the North Pole will be found some day, and that a Scotchman will be found somewhere in the neighbourhood, and the Scotchman will undertake some small matter of commerce with those who have found him in his remote wanderings, and that little transaction will at once create a British interest at the North Pole, for which England would fight any day. Of course the Eastern question had its origin in trade. Long before we had any territorial footing in the Mediterranean, that spirit of trade and navigation, which belongs so emphatically to the British Isles, had led us into commercial intercourse with the shores of Turkey. Those who embarked in that trade required protection for their properties and their persons from a violent and despotic Government, from dishonest local authorities, and from a fanatical population. England was not slow that engagements should be entered into on the part of Turkey giving the required protection under the name of capitulations. That is just like her. She never fails to protect her merchants. She asks for free trade, but insists upon freedom of trade anywhere. If you want to raise British interests in Canada, if you want forms of treaty altered, if you want civil and religious liberty here, if you want to see justice administered, and men free to criticise public institutions without danger to life, make it a commercial matter, show that it will develop trade, will increase population and wealth, and England will help you. She will do all you ask. Britain demanded and obtained by treaty legal security for justice and friendly treatment of her merchants wherever the Sultan's power extended. The charter of the Levant Company, though it originated in the year 1581, dates really from the reign of James I. and Charles the Second. That trade, so protected, took root, and gradually spread far and wide. It came to mean the transit trade with Persia, the British trade in grain and other important articles of produce in the Danubian provinces. The shipping employed for these trade purposes must of necessity thread its way through the narrow and well fortified channels of the Bosphorus and Dardanelles. A large proportion of British trade with Hungary has to pass the same way, so that there was great and pressing reason for Britain taking an interest in the right of way. A hostile power on the Bosphorus or the Dardanelles would close great markets and imperil the shortest route to India perhaps in the end. That power of barring a way to commerce made Turkey sacred in the eyes of Britain. The British Government lost no opportunity of cultivating friendly relations with the Sultan. Its whole endeavour was to keep peace on the Levant. In 1806 we made the Turks break away from what seemed a dangerous subserviency to France; and in 1827 we joined the Czar of Russia and the King of the French in founding a constitutional monarchy in Greece, free from the rule of the Turk, the aim of which was to bring the Turks into an arrangement which should close a breach in their dominions favourable to the aggressions of Russia. For Russia has always been considered as aggressive in temper and spirit. It would be difficult to say how or why, but such is the political notion. France is not quoted so; Germany is not quoted so; England is not spoken of, yet there is more show of reason to speak so of either, or all, than of Russia. And so the English Government has come to accept it as a policy that Turkey is to be guaranteed against Russian aggression. But it could only be that between Russia and Turkey there should be bitter enmity and constant strife. I do not claim for the Russians that they are in any special manner or degree a religious people. There are certainly among them large numbers of persons who take a deep interest in ecclesiastical affairs. There is a national Church there which has had a great history and wielded a great influence in the development of the nation, but it cannot be said that they are in any way a deeply religious people. But they have a conscience for religion, and they have a strong sentiment of sympathy with their co-religionists. That sentiment of sympathy has been the cause of strife between Russia and Turkey. The two peoples hate each other, and fear each other. The Turks rule the Christians subject to their sway in fearful forms of tyranny. The terrible contest known as the Crimean war, in which Turkey, in alliance with England, France and Sardinia, engaged with Russia, had its origin in a small squabble between the Greek and Latin Churches in Palestine respecting the "holy places" at Jerusalem. There were certain chapels in or near Jerusalem which had been visited for ages by pilgrims of each communion, and used by the priests for getting money. The disputes related to points of privilege and precedence. France was the professed champion of the Roman Catholics—while Russia's Czar, as head of the Greek Church, held himself in duty bound to secure the rights of the Greek Christians. France got all she wanted, for she threatened to send a fleet to the Dardanelles. Russia at the same time required that Turkey should define by treaty, or convention, or by a simple note, what was conceded, and what were the rights of Russia and the members of the