

occupations. When I converse with the poor Irish laborers and others, whose names are now Mason, Barber, Carpenter, Baker, Wall, Brick, Smith, Talor, Wood, Bush, Banks, Waters, Tregeagle, Pine, Ash, Herring, Trout, Salmon, Pike, Snipe, Sparrow, Partridge, Woodcock, Plover, Hen, Peacock, Black, White, Grey, Brown, Green: when I tell these poor fellows that their names are in reality such as O'Shaughnessy, O'Doherty, O'Donohoe, O'Flaherty, McMahon, McDermott, &c., &c.: and when I further state that their names have been changed into the names of some great English families, or into the names of trades, and birds, and beasts, and stones, in order to make them forget who were their fathers, to efface the memory of the plunder of their estates, their eyes flash and their bosoms beat high, as they thus get even a historical glance at their ancient pedigree, their family injustice, and their ignoble surnames. The whole case of Ireland, as contrasted with Oude, is, therefore, one of spoliation and injustice, now admitted in Parliament by almost unanimous consent: the lands of all Catholic Ireland were confiscated, leaving to each Catholic, as a maximum of possession, half an acre of bog and an acre of arable land; while in reference to the Catholic religion it was felony in a Priest to say Mass, felony in a schoolmaster to teach even the alphabet; thus extirpating by past legislation all property, education, and religion in this country. I thank the Whigs for having brought forth this scathing verdict of the Conservative Cabinet; thus in the end of ages pronouncing from their own lips the injustice of their Conservative ancestors; and at the same time writing a true epitaph on the tombs of our martyred fathers.—The same confiscation in principle is still carried on in Ireland, in a silent though not less efficient manner, in the persecution of the poor. Within the last ten years seventy-five out of every one hundred cabins of these poor (see police report) have been levelled to the ground: the aged have perished in the diseased lanes and alleys of the crowded town, or died in the poorhouse; while their orphan abandoned children fled to America to escape the horrors of fame, or the terrors of extermination. And how grievous is it to see, that while the Oude rebels are caressed, the fathers, the brothers of the brave Irish soldiers in the service of England cannot receive from the same Legislature which protects the Mahomedan enemy, any favorable change in the laws, which give power to a vindictive landlord over their life and death in the home of their ancestors, the birth place of their children.

May 27. D. W. C.

MR. S. O'BRIEN'S ADDRESS TO THE PEOPLE OF IRELAND.

PART X. FOREIGN RELATIONS.

It is supposed by some persons that if this country possessed a Parliament competent to legislate for Ireland, but were not represented in the British Parliament, it would exercise little control over the foreign policy of the empire.—Never was a notion more unfounded. At present the opinion of a majority of the Irish members with respect to foreign affairs may be disregarded by the British Government—even in reference to such a contingency as the occurrence of a war; but, if an Irish Parliament were to sit in Dublin, it would be extremely dangerous for Great Britain to undertake a war without the sanction and approbation of the people of Ireland. It would be necessary to satisfy the Irish legislature that the war was just and necessary before it could be proclaimed. Otherwise the Irish Parliament would decline to give that co-operation which would be almost essential to the success of military operations. It would say to the British Minister, "You may go to war if you please, on your account, but we will give you neither money, nor men, nor moral support, unless you prove to us that the war in which you are about to engage is one which is compatible—not alone with the interests of England—but also with those of Ireland, and with the obligations which are due to justice and humanity. I admit that this check upon rash undertakings would be very distasteful to the British Cabinet, but it would be extremely advantageous to the empire at large. It is easy to imagine cases in which such a check would save Great Britain from defeat and disaster—if not from utter ruin. Perhaps some of my readers will mock at me if I contemplate the occurrence of calamities which have not actually taken place: but nevertheless I will bring forward, by way of illustration of my argument, one of the most recent wars in which Great Britain has been engaged—that with Persia. I affirm with confidence that there were not, at the time when hostilities commenced, in both Houses of Parliament twenty men who understood the grounds upon which Great Britain had become involved in war with Persia. Even still the great mass of the population of these realms is utterly ignorant of the motives of a war which might have been most fatal in its consequences to the British empire. Ministers continually declined to give any information on the subject until after the war was concluded, and even to this hour no satisfactory explanation of its objects has been afforded to the public. Though I have watched the progress of public affairs with considerable vigilance since my return to Ireland, I confess that I share, to a great extent, the general ignorance which prevails upon this subject; but, in so far as I have had opportunities of forming a judgment respecting it, it seems to me to have been an act of wanton and arbitrary caprice for which no adequate justification is to be found in the relations that subsist between Great Britain and Persia. However this may be, it is certain that, by the renewal of peace with Persia, the imperial power and influence of Great Britain escaped, through mere goodluck, from the most formidable peril to which they have been exposed during the last forty years. The great bugbear of a certain class of politicians is the disposition imputed to Russia to make aggression upon the eastern empire of Great Britain. Now, there is no part of the whole world, in which Russia—if that power

really desired to come into collision with England—ought to select a battle-field so readily as the provinces of Persia, which are contiguous to the Caspian Sea; and that is precisely the ground to which the British army would have been attracted if this war had proceeded beyond the occupation of one or two ports in the Persian Gulf. A march upon Teheran would have cost countless sums of money; even if opposed only by the difficulties offered by nature; but it is possible that this march might have been effected, and that the Persians might have been defeated by the British in every regular engagement that might have taken place between them. But it is not difficult to predict what would have been the fate of a British army if it had been encountered by an auxiliary force of fifty thousand Russians in the central provinces of Persia. It is not difficult to predict what would have been the fate of the Eastern Empire of Great Britain if the revolt of the Bengal army had taken place simultaneously with such a collision. It appears now, from the investigations which took place at the trial of the Emperor of Delhi, that the aggression of the British Government upon Persia was one of the causes which excited the indignation of the Mahomedan portion of the Bengal army; so that this expedition was in every sense one of the most hazardous adventures in which Great Britain was ever engaged. It may be very proper for a great nation to incur danger—aye, even the most extreme danger in defence of its honor or its interest—but at least it ought to know what are the objects for which such hazards are incurred. This is not the first occasion in recent times on which war has been undertaken without the knowledge of the British Parliament, and this abuse of the prerogative which belongs to the Crown, under the British Constitution, of plunging the country into a most perilous war by the mere fiat of a minister, has fully convinced me that a law ought, without delay, to be passed for the purpose of enacting that henceforth neither war nor peace shall be made without the concurrence of Parliament; and that no treaty shall be ratified until after it shall have received the sanction of both houses of parliament. If a Parliament were to sit in Dublin its power of withholding supplies of men and money would operate as an additional check upon rash collisions with foreign powers. On the other hand, as the Irish people naturally love fighting, there would be no reason to apprehend that they would be slow to assist England in a quarrel in which her cause was just. I shall epitomise in the following proposition, my views as to the foreign policy which your representatives—whether sitting in the British House of Commons or in a Parliament in Dublin—ought to uphold:— 1. They ought to compel the British Government to abstain as much as possible from interfering with the internal concerns of other nations—and to discourage similar interference on the part of other powers. 2. They ought to condemn and repress all wars of aggression undertaken either by Great Britain or other Governments without a clear and adequate justification. 3. They ought to prepare their own country for effective defence against foreign aggression. 1. "The Sovereign people" of the United States of America—seated on their Transatlantic throne—proclaim and act upon the principle of non-intervention in regard to the affairs of Europe, whilst they protect with jealous pertinacity the rights of their own citizens in every quarter of the world. Far different is the conduct of their kindred at this side of the Atlantic. England meddles with the internal affairs of every State, great or small, in the world—in so far as her influence or power permits such intervention. Nor is her intervention governed by any fixed principle. At the same moment she supports a despot in one country, and encourages revolt against despotism in another. She lures to their ruin a discontented population, and assists in rivetting their fetters when they are committed to a hopeless struggle. Her habit of intermeddling with the concerns of other nations justifies similar intrusion on the part of other Powers, until at length the independence of minor States is entirely destroyed, and their internal policy is dictated by a conclave of foreign potentates. It would perhaps be chimerical to hope that foreign intervention in the domestic concerns of other nations can ever be wholly suppressed; but at least non-intervention is the policy which a people who value highly their own independence ought to encourage as well by their example as by their moral influence. It is a policy which, in extreme cases—such, for instance, as the intervention of Russia to suppress the last revolt of Hungary—they are justified in enforcing even by the use of the sword. 2. It seems to be a truism to declare that a nation which professes to be influenced with a high moral principle ought to abstain from wars of aggression for which no legitimate motive can be pleaded. Yet we have seen in recent times how little moral principle avails to restrain the promptings of self-interest, pride or lust of aggrandisement. About twenty years ago a war was undertaken against China, because the government of the country refused to permit the introduction of opium from British India into the Chinese Empire. Pretences were, indeed, afforded by the violence of the Chinese for retaliatory violence; but, substantially, the war was undertaken by Great Britain in order to force the introduction, by an illegal and immoral traffic, of a deleterious drug, which practically acts as a poison, into China, in defiance of the wishes of the rulers of that country. The success of that war—which resulted in the acquisition of a large amount of money by way of indemnity and in a cession of territory—has encouraged Great Britain to renew hostilities with China, in the hope that this renewed invasion will be attended with further cession of territory, and with augmented plunder. I shall not recapitulate the pretexis upon which this war has been undertaken. It is enough to say that it has been decided, on the authority of some of the first jurists of the United Kingdom, that they are not sanctioned by the law of nations. As long as these marauding expeditions are attended with success the British public generally look on with silent complacency or undisguised exultation. The moralists of England are dumb. But if any reverse occur, then philanthropists are found ready to question the original rectitude of the proceeding. Then statesmen find that a national defeat is an excellent basis upon which to found a "party motion" in Parliament. Let us take an example drawn from recent history.

Not many years ago an expedition similar to that which lately invaded Persia was sent from India into Afghanistan. Few could guess what was the object of this expedition, but in both cases the city of Herat—a town distant many miles from the British frontier—was the pivot upon which operations depended. Some imaginary interest of Great Britain—some imaginary apprehension of Russian intrigue in Central Asia—was alleged as a ground for invading Afghanistan—a country whose inhabitants had never even the semblance of an injury to the people of the United Kingdom. The expedition cost an enormous sum of money, and even if it had been followed by a permanent occupation of Afghanistan, the fruits of the acquisition would never have compensated the outlay which it cost; but England rang with shouts of triumph when it was told that Cabul had fallen—that Ghuznee and Candahar had been won by the valour of the British troops, amongst whom, by the way, the most prominent chiefs were, as is usually the case in every field of British victory—Irishmen. A reverse came. The noble mountaineers of Afghanistan did not tamely acquiesce in the continued occupation of their country by a foreign force, and the destruction of Varas with his legions—an event so famed in Roman story—was not more complete than was the utter annihilation of a British army in the Alpine defiles of the Kyber Pass. Then an enlightened public began to enquire what were the motives which justified this attack upon an unoffending, if not a friendly people; and the verdict of history has already pronounced its decision to the effect, that the ignominious expulsion of the British armies from Afghanistan was but a just retribution which was merited by a just invasion. It may not be improper to remark here that, in this expedition, the Sepoys learnt to practice under the sanction—if not under the direction of British officers—atrocities similar to those which they have since perpetrated at Cawnpore; nay, even more aggravated in ferocity. It is now admitted by those who partook in the retreat of the British army from Afghanistan, that by the British soldiery, whether European or native, neither sex nor age was spared. They resolved to ruin the country which they could not subdue, and accordingly wreaked their vengeance upon this people—not alone by incendiary conflagration of private houses—but they even destroyed the most splendid monuments of Eastern art; and the destruction of the Bazaar of Cabool will be ever cited as a proof that human nature is the same in all ages—that the instincts of the "moral and civilized" Anglo-Saxon are the same as the barbarous Hun or Dane. In the results which this "moral training" of the Sepoys produced at Delhi and Cawnpore we see a natural if not a just retribution. Be assured, my fellow-countrymen, that sooner or later similar retribution will follow such acts of unjust violence as the invasion of China and the occupation of Oude! It is in vain, however, to reason upon such matters. The lust of conquest too common to all nations, and extension of empire is ordained by Providence as the penalty of their decay and dissolution. *Mole ruit sua* "It falls by its own weight" was a prediction which foretold the fate of the Roman Empire. *Mole ruit sua* "It will go to pieces by its own extension," is a prediction which foretells the future fate of the British Empire. Even at this moment, if a blow were to be struck at the heart of this Empire, where are the forces by which it is to be repelled? The flower of the British navy is engaged in a predatory war in China. The flower of the British army is falling in India under the combined vengeance of a deadly climate and of an exasperated foe. If a modern Ulysses were lying in wait—watching for an opportune moment to avenge an unatoned—injury he could not suggest a course of action more insidiously destructive than that which British statesmen are now adopting of their own accord. "Ioc Ithacus vult et magno mercator Atreidæ." Beware! O ye rulers of an Empire on which the sun never sets, lest "the augurality" of the British people hereafter prove himself to be such an Ulysses! A more profound dissembler than Napoleon III. The world has not yet seen in ancient or modern times. Never was he more profuse in expressions of fidelity to the Republican Government of France than on the eve of the coup d'état, by which a military despotism was substituted for Republican Constitution which he had sworn to maintain. The contingency of an invasion of England by Napoleon III. is so probable an event, that you, my fellow-countrymen, ought to consider maturely what course you ought to adopt in case of its occurrence. I shall speak my own sentiments on this point with the same freedom which I have used in discussing all the other topics which have been noticed in this address. 3. It has always seemed to me that in all countries great or small, the population at large ought to be taught the use of arms, so that they may be able to defend their constitutional rights against an internal oppressor, and to protect their homes and altars from a foreign foe. In early times this obligation was enforced by law in England. In the present day the British Government dares not entrust arms to the population at large; and whilst in Prussia every young man, living under a Government which we are taught to despise, is compelled to serve for three years in the army, the British Government fears to train the masses of our population to the use of arms—even under the menace of a foreign invasion. The Colonels of the French army have openly declared their desire to visit the British metropolis with avenging brands in their hands. The Press of France, silenced by the Emperor upon almost every other political question, is loud in repudiating the alliance with England. Louis Napoleon has undermined the influence of England in Europe, by leading her on from humiliation to humiliation. He could concentrate within a week 100,000 men for the invasion of England from a single point or despatch from a dozen separate ports 200,000 men to occupy the southern counties of England. Nor is a pretext wanting for the immediate commencement of hostilities. The unwarrantable seizure by the British Government of the Island of Perm which lies at the mouth of the Red Sea, affords at least as justifiable an occasion for hostilities as the retention by Russia of the Island of Serpents at the mouth of the Danube, afforded at the close of the Crimean War. The European powers are nearly unanimous in desiring that France should construct a ship canal at the Isthmus of Suez, and—with such an undertaking in view—it is extremely natural that Europe should look with jealousy upon the establishment of another Gibraltar—upon the fortification of another Malta—at the point which commands whatever intercourse may hereafter take place with the East through the Channel of the Red Sea. Surely under such circumstances it is time for you to think of the guardianship of your own shores. I have been charged by British Statesmen with having sought armed assistance from France in 1848. The charge was false, though it received a certain sanction from the language of M. Lamartine. I invited in 1848 the sympathies of the French people for the cause of Ireland. I invite them still. The French people know perfectly well how to distinguish between the Irish and the English nation. The reception which has recently been given in France to a memoir of Robert Emmet, beautifully written by a grand-daughter of the celebrated Madame de Staël—the Countess de Haussouville—indicates the feeling of France towards Ireland. This sort of sympathy I cherish, but I have no desire to see a French army within the shores of this Island. If we cannot acquire and maintain our national rights by our own vigour and public spirit, we shall never acquire or maintain them by the aid of a French army. I am inclined to think that there is in Ireland a considerable section of the population who would prefer to live under French rule rather than under the Government of Great Britain, but I do not participate in this sentiment. I admit, indeed, that the treatment which the Catholics of Ireland would

have experienced from France, in comparison with that which they experienced from England during the operation of the penal laws would have been greatly in favour of French rule. But it is not so now. The constitutional government of Great Britain is greatly preferable to the arbitrary despotism which now prevails in France. Liberty of speech is wholly unknown in that country, and a police espionage pervades the whole of society. With me, at least, no amount of material prosperity could compensate this deprivation of liberty. I am, therefore, little disposed to wish that my country should be converted into a French province. Do not imagine that a French army would aid you to acquire national independence. Wherever the French arms have been borne—whether into Spain into Italy, into Belgium or Holland, they have been carried for the extension of French power, not with a view to the liberation of oppressed nationalities. I confess, therefore, that I would earnestly wish to see 300,000 Irishmen under arms when the French colonels prepare to pay their promised visit to London. I believe that the people of Ireland, if properly organised and animated by a noble spirit of self-relying patriotism, would be able to protect this island against every external foe. Perhaps the Irish people if armed might, in the event of hostilities with France, call to mind the precedent set them by their fathers in 1782, and might say—"We will protect your Empire in the hour of its utmost need, but as a preliminary we require the restitution of a Parliament to Ireland with unrestricted powers of self-government." Such a demand—such a compact would be perfectly legitimate, and would entitle you to thanks such as the "volunteers" of 1782 received, not only from their own countrymen, but from the British Government. But what avails it to speak of 1782 to a people whose spirit is thoroughly provincialised—"Your hour is past, Your dream of pride is o'er; The fatal chain is round you cast, And ye are men no more." If you were animated with a truly national spirit, it would not be necessary to wait for the contingency of a French invasion to enable you to recover your national rights. In the course of a single year you could prove to England, even without striking a blow, that those rights could not be withheld with impunity. Every petty colony of the empire now regulates its own affairs. Ireland alone submits with placidity to a system of government which leaves the regulation of its internal concerns to a Parliament which acknowledges little sympathy with the wants, the interests, or the feelings of our population. There is another contingency connected with our foreign relations which deserves your early and anxious consideration—that of a war between England and the United States of America. Before another decade of ten years shall have expired the United States unless broken to pieces by internal dissension, will surpass Great Britain in point of power and resources—that is, they will possess a larger population (of course excluding India)—a more extended commerce—and an immeasurable greater extent of productive territory. Now, although the commerce which subsists between the United States and England has strengthened their international relations by the bonds of a common interest, yet the history of mankind shows that even mercantile intercourse of the closest and most extended character does not always afford a guarantee for the continuance of peace. Nay more! Mercantile intercourse often generates jealousias which terminate in war. England is quite aware of the danger which would result from a collision with the United States; and whereas it was formerly the practice of English politicians to speak in terms the most disparaging of their Transatlantic rivals, it is now their habit to lay hold of every topic which can generate sympathy between what they are pleased to call the two branches of the "great Anglo-Saxon race." Now they coax those whom they formerly bullied. But the motives which have produced this change of language are perfectly well understood in America, and as long as England yields every contested point to the Republics of the West, there will be no collision; but if ever the interest and the will of these sturdy Republics shall clash with the interest and the will of the people of England, a struggle even more tremendous than that to be apprehended with France would menace with dissolution the empire of Great Britain. British commerce would be cut up in every quarter of the world by American privateers. And whilst the Americans would thus indemnify themselves for the losses sustained by them through the war, several millions of people in England would be reduced to starvation by the stoppage of the supplies of cotton and bread stuffs which England now draws from America. In the event of such a war the Government of the United States would say to you—"We do not desire to conquer Ireland. Our system of Government does not admit of conquest, because each of our states possesses sovereign rights which are limited only by the requirements of federative co-operation; and, if we were to annex Ireland, we should begin by bestowing upon her the right of self government which has been denied to her by England. We do not even wish to introduce upon your soil a single stranger. The Irish emigrants, whom England has compelled to leave their homes with a shout of exultation hissing in their ears. "The Irish Celts are gone! gone with a vengeance! The Lord be praised!" These emigrants are prepared to re-establish for you the nationality of your country. Fifty thousand Irish volunteers are ready to start on a month's notice on their journey homewards. They have been trained here to the use of arms, as a portion of our militia, and we propose to provide shipping, suitably equipped, to convey them to the shores of their native land. We are further prepared to admit Ireland into the great confederation of our public, or to guarantee protection to you if you prefer that she should be an independent kingdom. In return we only ask that you will take no part in the war in which we are engaged with England." I need not pursue this train of suggestion, but as the contingency which I have contemplated is an event that is by no means improbable, you ought to consider how you will act when it shall occur as you are fully competent to form an opinion upon this point for yourselves, I shall not offer any speculative advice in regard to it, but I think it fair to tell the British Government that, as far as I can learn the sentiment of the Irish people, fifty thousand Irishmen landing in arms in their native country, under the protection of the American flag, will not be treated as foes by their fathers and brothers who have remained in Ireland. By some this warning will be considered as menace of an enemy—but a friend could not offer more timely information, and he would still further show his friendship to the British nation if he were to advise them to bear in mind this contingency in all their dealings with the people of both Ireland and America. I have now brought to a conclusion this exposition of my opinions. The form in which I have addressed you has compelled me to treat every subject in a cursory and summary manner, but I trust that my observations upon passing events will not be wholly unproductive of useful effects. I feel certain that they will not be considered by you as intrusive, because I have been invited in many ways and from many quarters to make known to my fellow-countrymen the views which, after an absence of several years from my native country, and after reflection forced upon me by a very painful experience, I now entertain respecting the political and material condition in which I have found Ireland. I have written with a freedom which I well know will necessarily displease some of my readers, but I have desired to serve rather than to please you. I enjoy an advantage which few public men possess. Not being desirous to obtain a seat in the British Parliament, I am not compelled to consult the prejudices of electoral bodies, which impose upon their members one set of opinions at Belfast, and another at Cork. Not

being desirous to obtain anything from either of the great parties, I have no party rule in regard to them. By the misgovernment of one party I was led into proceedings which nearly cost me my life, and gave occasion to my expatriation. By the other a solicitation offered by a large and influential body of my countrymen in favour of my restoration to Ireland was refused in terms which were not only highly offensive to myself but also extremely insulting to those by whom it was presented; I therefore owe little either to Whigs or to Tories. My party is—the Party of my Country—if such a party is to be found in Ireland. My allegiance is primarily due and is given to my Fatherland. It matters little to me by what name those who may nominally rule it be called—provided that it be virtually governed by Irishmen acting in Ireland for the benefit of Ireland; I entertain no hostility to any external nation. I do not hate Russia nor France—I do not even hate England, though it has done far more injury to Ireland than either Russia or France have ever inflicted upon us. I wish well to every section of the human race—including the Hindoos and the Chinese—but my affections and the loyalty of my heart are reserved for Ireland. Let it not be supposed, however, that I arrogate to myself the possession of an exclusive patriotism. Far otherwise. I am convinced that many who differ widely from me are animated by a sincere desire to promote the welfare of this country. I claim for them as for myself unlimited toleration in regard to all honest differences of opinion with respect to politics and religion. If, therefore, I have said a word which has hurt the feelings of any fellow-countryman (except an anti-Irish Irishman) I am sincerely sorry that I have been unable to express my own convictions without giving offence to others; I solicit his forgiveness, and ask him indulgently to impute such offence to my want of skill in composition rather than to a desire to offend. Whatever may be the result of this appeal to your judgments and to your hearts, I shall still venture to subscribe myself Your tried and faithful friend, WILLIAM S. O'BRIEN. Cahirmoyle, May 24, 1858.

IRISH INTELLIGENCE.

Twelve new Queen's Counsel have been made in Ireland. Of this number ten are Conservatives and two are Liberals. The office of Clerk of the Hanover, vacated by the death of Mr. John O'Connell, was on Saturday conferred by Lord Eglintown upon Mr. Ralph S. Cusack, barrister, and chairman of the North Union Board of Poor Law Guardians, and an ultra-Tory—the great guiding spirit of the Registry Courts O'CONNELL'S ASSETS.—A curious motion which came before the Court of Chancery yesterday brought to light for the first time the pecuniary position of the late Daniel O'Connell at the time of his death, 11 years ago. It will sound strange that the recipient of almost countless tributes—commencing at 50,000l., and scarcely ever falling below 10,000l. annually—should have died in straitened circumstances. The gross amount of the assets is not equal to two years of Mr. O'Connell's income while a practitioner at the bar. These facts transpired in the following brief arguments in the case of "O'Connor v. O'Connell." "Mr. Hickson, Q.C., for the petitioner, whose demand was that of an owner of a life annuity of 60l., payable out of the property of the deceased, stated the facts of the case, and the result of the accounts as taken before the Master. The annuity payable to Mr. O'Connell, the petitioner, a nephew of the late Mr. O'Connell, had been given for value, and, having been allowed to fall into arrear, 545l. was now the amount due; and the report also found that portions of the estate had devolved upon the late Mr. Maurice O'Connell, who, although he had paid off some of the liabilities, had in other respects misapplied the property. Other funds had been also transferred to Mr. John O'Connell, whose death occurred within the last few days; and now the position of the assets was that a sum of 5,300l. stock represented the value of a leasehold property formerly the estate of the deceased, as since sold in the Encumbered Estates Court; while 1,500l. Government Stock, with 30 shares in the National Bank, and sums of 600l. and 1,100l., had been previously disposed of. Upon the frame of the decree which now was to be pronounced by the Court, a question arose as to whether it ought to provide that a sum should be set apart sufficient to produce upon investment an annual income equivalent to the petitioner's annuity, as when the prior incumbrancers were paid in the Encumbered Estates Court, an application would be made to have the fund then transferred to this court to be administered in accordance with its decree in the present suit, which ought, therefore, to follow the usual precedent, as the petitioner had no wish to part with the life annuity, and had refused to accept a sum of money by way of repurchase. "Mr. D. Sherlock, Q.C., appeared upon the other side, and mentioned that although different questions had arisen upon the settlement of the notes of the decree, now, however, in consequence of the death of the late Mr. John O'Connell, the position of whose circumstances parties were aware of, the only matter to be decided was as to the petitioner's annuity. The Encumbered Estates Court, if the case were disposed of there, would follow their ordinary practice, and make the party ascertain the value of the annuity, and take a sum in gross, or else they would purchase a Government annuity, and thus the balance of the fund might be set at liberty to be allocated among pious creditors. "Mr. Leahy, for a legatee, also argued that if the decree were as now sought by the petitioner, much inconvenience would arise, his client having been paid a legacy of 1,500l., which, in the event of the fund now realized not being distributed, might be required to be brought in if unpaid creditors so insisted. "The Lord Chancellor, observing that the question was one of practice, which it was desirable he should consider further, reserved his decision." Our readers have all been made aware by the public prints that the untimely death of the late Mr. John O'Connell has left his family in an unprovided state, and that a national subscription has already been opened to meet the claim which no emancipated Catholic in England or Ireland can fail to acknowledge. The National Rent paid to the great Liberator in his lifetime was not spent according to the intentions of the donors. It was paid to O'Connell as a debt due to him for the sacrifices which he made in our cause, and to replace those private means which his professional exertions would have brought him had he not neglected his own interests to promote those of Ireland and of his fellow-Catholics. But, instead of accumulating these funds for himself and family, O'Connell spent them back upon the people and the people's cause with a generosity that surpassed the ample dimensions of popular gratitude. The great Liberator died poor, and his favourite son, the companion of his labours and associate in his sacrifices, has been called away, leaving his family without provision. By a spontaneous movement, pervading all classes and all parties, the public has been summoned to discharge a portion of the vast debt still due by it to the Liberator's memory. The subscription will, we trust, be not only large, but general. Public gratitude will pay the O'Connell Tribute in 1858 with as much zeal and liberality as in the first years after Emancipation. The Catholics of Scotland and England, who shared with those of Ireland the fruits of their Liberator's labours, will not be behindhand in this proof of their memory of benefits conferred. Many of us are too young to have contributed to the O'Connell Rent of former days. The opportunity is now given, and it will not be neglected.—Tablet.