

apostatized, had not England, Scotland, France? "I do not believe that the Irish nation will ever follow their fatal example," he added "but I do believe it would be nothing short of criminal rashness to expose it to the danger or temptation of doing so. I can find no evidence of a Divine promise made to any nation any more than to our own guaranteeing to it the indefectibility of its faith in all circumstances. Neither can I see any solid grounds for believing in a special exceptional Providence which would save Irish multitudes any more than Irish individuals from renouncing their allegiance to the Church in a paroxysm of passion, either in retaliation for some imaginary interference with their political freedom or to avenge an insult or an affront which they had rashly assumed had been offered to them by the Holy See.—Yet we know, although Dr. Nulty does not recall it to us, that pressure of the closest nature has been brought upon the Pope to persuade him to subject the faith of the Irish people to such a trial.—Advantage has been taken of the Pope's helpless state to importune him in this matter and, apart from all considerations except those that are worldly, how could the Pope be better situated for the purpose in question?—A feeble old man enduring imprisonment; subject to endless anxieties; weak in his physical health; and, as delicate old men are commonly, longing for rest and freedom from harassing cares; troubled, moreover, with regard to those who are dependent upon him, and desirous, if possible, to make such terms for them as would ensure their welfare and safety—not to speak of the great interests of the Church which he has at heart, for in considering only the worldly aspect of the matter we can hardly make any mention of them. Such an old man and so situated is addressed by one of the greatest Powers of Europe or the world, and humbly asked to interfere in its internal policy, and on its behalf control a people whom it is unable to subdue to its will. And can we believe that the Pope would be asked to do this without the expectation of reward? England, we are told, is so powerful in the counsels of Italy that the bare will of the Prince of Wales made known at the Quirinal has sufficed to preserve intact, and in the very teeth of Italian laws, certain ecclesiastical establishments in the Eternal City, and what, therefore, might not a complaisant Pope expect from her good offices? But Leo XIII., in spite of all his trials, in spite of the great temptations placed before him, and in the midst of his difficulties, has first of all considered the interests of his faithful Irish children, and done that which was necessary to make himself acquainted with what were their true wants, and how their cause might justly be decided. He rejected the ambassadors of England, and summoned to his side the bishops of the Irish Church, that from their lips he might learn the truth and, on the accurate information they of all men could the best supply him with, take steps for the guidance of the Irish people and instruct them how to act. "By citing," says Dr. Nulty, "the representatives of the various shades of opinion in the Irish episcopate he has shown his determination to ascertain with precision and certainty the intrinsic merits of the questions on which they may be divided, and he has chosen the simplest, the easiest, and most infallible method possible for ascertaining the truth, not only on these questions, but on every disputed question of faith or of doctrine that can ever possibly arise. He has shown, too, that he has totally discarded the dubious, the suspicious, the prejudiced and misleading channels through which information on Irish public questions may hitherto have reached him. Henceforth he is determined to believe nothing of us except what we tell him ourselves through the bishops that will represent us. Of his own proper accord, and without a suggestion from any quarter, he has chosen the readiest and the most effective method possible, for ascertaining the whole truth on every Irish question with clearness, precision, and infallible certainty." And Dr. Nulty adds that the Irish bishops go to Rome substantially united on every question, even on those that relate to politics.—Dr. Delaney, of Cork, for example, whose directions to honour the Prince of Wales were even resisted in so meek and unexpected a quarter as the convent of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd, substantially agreeing with Dr. Croke, of Cashel, whose name was cheered by the crowd in honourable position between those of the Mahdi and the Czar. The end of the bishops is evidently the same, although they may differ as to the means of bringing about that end. But all will be laid truly and clearly before the Pope by the bishops, the friends of the people and of the national cause, and he will decide without fear or favour—of which, indeed, we have received a sure earnest in the delegates he has chosen and those he has rejected. There is no room, then, for anxiety as to the attitude of Rome towards Ireland. There is no danger that a trial will arise to the faith of Ireland from the action of the Pope towards the national cause, and all these rumours that reach us as to the choice of bishops, and the consultation of English authorities may be treated with contempt. The Pope has already publicly recognised the dignity and independence of the Irish people, and his whole line of action will be consistent with what he has done. The cause of Ireland is in good hands, and we may leave it there with confidence.

WE may take some credit to ourselves because EUROPE AGAINST early in the dispute between England and Russia ENGLAND. we gave it as our settled conviction that not only

was the boldness of the Russian demands due in great part to the support of Germany, but that the cause of offence which had set Berlin, or Varzin perhaps more properly, in opposition to London, was to be found in the liberal policy, or advancing democracy, of the English Government. And by the arrival of the last English papers we find that we have been very remarkably borne out by both the English and the German Press.—The London Times, for example, declares that the attitude of Germany in the impending war would be little short of openly hostile. "Both at Berlin and St. Petersburg," it says, "the impression is that the attitude of the German power towards this country will be one of neutrality, and scarcely of benevolent neutrality. To attempt to localise in Asia a conflict between England and Russia would be to cripple us where we are naturally strongest—on the seas. To keep Turkey rigidly in the position of a neutral would be, as is indeed avowed, with the object of excluding the British fleet from the Black Sea, and allowing the Russian Government to organise its forces for service in Central Asia from the base." According to the correspondent of the Times at Paris, moreover, the task of preventing the Turkish Government from coming to England's assistance, if it were undertaken by Germany, as the Times suggests, need be no very difficult one. The correspondent narrates a conversation which he had held with a certain Turk, a personage, he says, "whose words have great weight as indications of the ideas of his Government," and who expressed a mistrust of England and a feeling of mortification and anger at the manner in which she had treated his country, infinitely preferring the methods of Russia, who had dismembered the Turkish Empire after an open war and defeat. England, on the contrary, had invidiously offered to introduce the Turks into Egypt under her own protection, and to show them to a subject nation as obeying a people that was not Mahomedan "It was done" he added, "and she knows it well—to prevent us from going there while pretending to invite us. In the same way, she has asked us to go to the Soudan, but has refused to allow us to enter Egypt. She has requested us to return home by the back-stairs. We have replied that we will only do so by the front door. She brings forward the question of the Suez Canal, but she cannot pretend to protect it against all Europe. What we proposed was to protect it for all Europe. That should deprive her of all pretext for remaining there."—The title of *Perfidie Albion* then, has for the Turk an especial meaning and one that may also prove to have some significance for England herself.—This Turkish authority further referred to the position of the Afghans who he said, were already virtually assimilated to Russia.—"The English," he said, "do not know how to assimilate these countries, which are in their nature and in the manners and customs of their inhabitants so much like Russia. And everything leads to the supposition that war will not break out, because England has not with her the most indispensable element in the strife—that is to say, the Afghan element—and this will relieve us from the necessity of pronouncing for one or the other, or showing to what side we should lean were we compelled to indicate our opinions."—The decision, we need hardly say, was not one flattering to English pride.—But to return to Germany—as we said, we, from the first, believed that the part we understood her to be acting against English interests was provoked by the Liberalism of the Gladstone Cabinet and perhaps by the still more advanced Liberalism that must hereafter obtain—and we find so much stated in plain terms by an Austrian paper, the *Neue Wiener Tagblatt*, which is quoted by the Vienna correspondent of the Times, thus—"One cannot understand the sympathy felt for Russia in German Governmental circles, as the overgrowth of Russia would certainly put Germany in peril. Nevertheless, it has become evident that Germany is on the side of Russia. England's sin is doubtless that of her Liberal Cabinet, which has not allowed her to be carried along by the Reactionary currents of Continental policy."—But as to the opinion of the German Press, the following passage taken from the Berlin correspondence of the Times will suffice to illustrate it.—"Here are a few straws showing which way the wind is at present blowing here. In an article entitled '1855 and 1885' the *Kreuz Zeitung* remarks:—'Certainly we are on a very good and friendly footing with England. But then these relations must always be of a somewhat platonic character, seeing that England can neither injure nor benefit us very much. But Russia is our neighbour, with whom we have to reckon, for in every great crisis of our existence much must depend on her attitude. How, then, can it be doubted, how is it possible to weigh for a moment, what our place would have to be if, in the event of a collision between England and Russia, we were compelled to declare for one or the other?' Another Conservative organ, the *Reichshote*, writes:—'We Germans have no interest at stake in the quarrel, and therefore we can maintain a purely observant attitude. But this much we may say, that if England's supremacy on the ocean and in the world's markets be not sooner or later broken Germany