

there is a public opinion in England to leave them for generations in the possession of the same soil. When we add to these advantages the employment of the laboring class in all the departments of trade and commerce, the social happiness, and the just laws and practices in England, as compared with Ireland, cannot be over-estimated.

The English Parliament would be inclined to grant a just bill of tenant right to Ireland, if they could be convinced of the peaceful, constitutional, temperment of the people. But, the enemies of Ireland have ever adopted the perfidious scheme of representing this country as a state of anarchy, bordering on rebellion; through the periodical literature, and through the emissaries of the Church Establishment, this sentiment has been zealously encouraged. If an agrarian outrage take place, Ireland is described as a nation of savages; and if a Bible-reader be inconvenienced in the streets, while he slanders our creed, Ireland is again branded as a race of ferocious idolaters. And thus, the mind of England is for ever kept in a state of boiling excitement in reference to our social, loyal, and religious character. Modern events at home, too, have tended to increase rather than allay those English apprehensions; and hence the concession which Parliament makes in England, under similar agricultural claims, is refused to Ireland from two causes,—viz., first, from their ancient feeling of penal exclusion, and again, from their real or pretended fear of a successful Irish revolution, as the result of our growing power and increasing population. Be this as it may, there is one point on which I may say, the House of Commons is agreed: and this point is, that the agricultural and tenant case of Ireland can be made an instrument of torture to the people in the hands of a vindictive landlord; hence, it is admitted to be a policy (under given circumstances) of great social hardship, and an injustice which requires a speedy redress, by a cautious, but still satisfactory, and a liberal legislation.

If the success of our petition (for such it is,) has not hitherto been so prominent as the friends of the people could desire, this fact, so far from leading to relaxed exertions, should, on the contrary, rather stimulate them to renewed efforts. The cause is admitted to be just; we have numberless friends in Ireland and England favorable to the concession of the public claim, and it requires some unforeseen event at home, some unexpected change in our foreign policy, to alter the temper of the House of Commons to grant the prayer of the Irish tenantry. According to the opinion of those most competent to decide, the war in India is far from being concluded; further drains will be made from Ireland in the blood and the resources of her sons; and before this Eastern revolt shall be finally crushed, England will owe a large debt to this country, for the bravery, the fidelity, and the loyalty of her children. France, too, may at no distant period, present new difficulties to the English throne: her arsenals are crowded with daily increasing instruments and munitions of war: her harbors bristle with cannon: her camps are constructed for powerful armies: her whole coast is surrounded with war-steamer, dancing on the French waters in formidable profusion. No one can tell what may be the coming discrepancies, the jealousies, the quarrels between England and her present faithful ally. Ireland has a right to take advantage of these present and probable future circumstances to press her just claims on England. The rivers (as so they can be called) of blood which she has spilled, and, if necessary, will again cheerfully shed in the cause of England, deserve beyond doubt, the recompense of her brave sons being placed on an equality with their companions in arms: and equally merit for their parents, their kindred at home, the common justice of being permitted to live in their own country, protected from the unrestrained license of vindictive bigotry and landlord cruelty. If the tenant right question be left to the apathy which has of late mesmerized our council, the bill for the protection of the poor will never be passed into law, and the struggles of past years will (as Lord de Grey said,) "furnish fresh matter for the contempt and the mockery of England, against the dissensions and the fickle character of the Irish."

If, therefore, during the approaching recess, county meetings were held, attended by Members of Parliament, addressed by the popular leaders, and supported by the friends of the measure of all classes: and, if an aggregate meeting, concentrating the views of the entire people, were held in Dublin, at which meeting the clergy and the aristocracy might re-unite their influence, of late so much divided, this movement and this union would lay the foundation stone of a new and powerful combination which must ultimately succeed. Concomitantly with the county meetings, a petition should be signed by at least one million Irishmen. And for fear that this idea might have the appearance of being a threat, under present circumstances: in order to crush the least suspicion that the idea had the least symptom of such folly as a threat, the petition, so signed, should be worded with the most unfeigned declarations of sincere devotion to the Throne and to the Queen. As it is intended to gain the advocacy of the English Parliament, without which the Bill could not, of course, succeed, everything that could awaken old prejudices, or excite ill will, must be carefully avoided; and the reason why I should desire such a number, and such a class, to attach their names to this petition is, to demonstrate that the universal feeling of Ireland is in favor of the measure.

One honest man at the head of this movement would, through a few faithful, persevering advocates in the House of Commons, succeed in passing the measure. The avowed justice of the cause, the abuses of the present policy, the growing number of our friends, and the events likely to disturb the future of England, could not fail to present such a combination of favorable premises, as must necessarily eventuate in the complete success of the question. No Member could refuse to support a Bill presented under such constitutional moderation: and no Parliament, having a character for justice, could with-

hold its assent to claims put forth in the humble, earnest, loyal requests of a whole, a universal people.

May 20. D. W. C.

MR. S. O'BRIEN'S ADDRESS

TO THE PEOPLE OF IRELAND.

PART IX. COLONIAL POLICY.

Though I am one of those who wish that the representatives of the people of Ireland should legislate in Dublin rather than in London, I am far from thinking that they or you ought to cherish a sentiment of indifference with respect to the colonial policy of the empire. No portion of the inhabitants of the United Kingdom is so much interested as the Irish in all questions connected with colonization.—Since the year 1841 above two millions of the children of our soil have left their native land to settle in distant regions. A large majority of these were involuntary emigrants. Flight or Death! Such was the alternative presented to them by the British Government during the famine. Flight or poverty—is the alternative which stimulates emigration.—Now, although coerced or involuntary emigration is greatly to be deprecated, it is satisfactory to know that in many cases this emigration has been productive of an advantageous change in the pecuniary circumstances of the emigrants, and has greatly tended to extend the power and influence of the Irish race in distant portions of the globe. When I was in Australia I met many hundred Irishmen who had resided in that country more than a competence—and in a few instances some who had acquired enormous wealth, though they had left Ireland unprovided with capital and impelled by a desire to escape indigence. In Victoria, two Irishmen—Catholics—Mr. O'Shaunessy and Mr. C. G. Duffy, have for a second time been called to the direction of the Government of that Colony, now the most prosperous of the dependencies of the British Empire. If half the number of those who have emigrated to the United States of America had gone to Australia, there would now be a large numerical superiority in favor of the Irish race in the population of that magnificent territory, which is destined to be hereafter the most favored portion of the globe. Not having been in America, I cannot estimate with perfect accuracy the degree of prosperity which has been attained by Irish emigrants in that quarter of the world; but it is manifest from many indications that the "Irish Element" has become a very important "element" in the social and political condition of the United States. The Irish hold in their hands the balance of parties in that Republic, and though ebullitions unfriendly to our countrymen sometimes break forth, yet upon the whole, I am inclined to think that the Irish who have emigrated to America hold, as a minority of the people, a position much more advantageous than that which is occupied in England by those who have emigrated to "the sister kingdom," or by those who enlisted in the military service of Great Britain, or even by those who have obtained the miserable underpaid "situations" which are reserved by the Patronage Secretary of the British Government for the constituents of those Irish members who give a blind indiscriminate support in Parliament to the Ministry of the day. In Canada, likewise, the Irish occupy a very important position. The Catholic emigrants of Ireland, when united with the Catholics of French origin, constitute a majority which ensures great political influence to the Catholics. Wages being high in Canada, and it being very easy to acquire a proprietary right in land, it would seem that the pecuniary circumstances of many a poor Irish emigrant must have been much improved by his emigration to Canada. Hitherto the Cape of Good Hope has not attracted many settlers from Ireland, but it is a very fine colony. It is favored with a delightful climate and a very free system of constitutional self-government. It may, therefore, become hereafter a favorite field for emigration.

Influenced by an appreciation of these results, I avow myself to be a friend to colonization. Let me not be misunderstood. I deplore and condemn as much as those who altogether discountenance emigration, that ruthless system of extermination which has been called "improvement" by many of the organs of anti-Irish opinion in England and by a few in Ireland. I dare not mention the number of thousands of heathens that have been made desolate by eviction in a single year in Ireland. Were these details to be submitted to a disinterested enquirer, he would exclaim that an evil demon—not a cabinet Christian statesman—had governed the country in which such deeds had been perpetrated—such miseries had been endured. Yet, these "clearances" are by some called "improvement." When I was in exile in Van Diemen's Land I was shocked on learning from the newspapers that the expulsion of many thousand families from their homes had been cited by an English Chancellor of the Exchequer as a proof of the "improvement" of a particular district in Ireland; and, since my return I have been told that great "improvement" has taken place in districts in which I have seen in the course of a morning's drive a hundred ruined cottages which twelve years ago were occupied by a population as capable of performing all the duties of life, and of enjoying all the blessings of life as any *Dives* who "is clothed in fine linen and fares sumptuously every day." "Did a Russian army land here last year, leaving behind it ruin and desolation?" would be the natural enquiry of any foreigner who witnesses this sort of "improvement." I am not prepared to deny that a dishonest tenant may be justly ejected for non-payment of rent—I am not prepared to deny that in the case of small holdings an amicable arrangement, by which the holders who could not obtain employment in this country have been enabled to emigrate with a view to improve their condition, may have often been beneficial to all parties;—but to exterminate indiscriminately masses of people in obedience to some fanciful theory of improvement—or even for the sake of augmented gain—is a system of "predial outrage" for which I can plead no apology.

I am fully convinced that if Ireland were to enjoy the inestimable advantage of possessing a good domestic Government, this island would sustain a population of ten millions more easily than it now sustains six millions. If the rents of the absentee proprietors were spent in Ireland—if our waste land were reclaimed—if the construction of railways and other public works were carried on in proportion to the wants and resources of this country—if the laws relating to land were modified so as to encourage the application of capital to the soil—if domestic manufactures were promoted—if a shipping interest were created—if the fine arts were cultivated, honored, and rewarded—if the literary works of Irish authors were published in Ireland instead of being printed as they now are for the most part in England—if there were an Irish army and an Irish navy—if there were Irish arsenals and Irish dockyards—if the situations of emolument which are now enjoyed by Englishmen and Scotchmen in Ireland were occupied by Irishmen, a hundred modes of employment would be thrown open to the youth of Ireland which are now, comparatively speaking, closed against them; but even then the time would soon arrive when the annual increase of the population would require a larger field for the development of its energies than could be found within the narrow precincts of this island; and the natural resort of this increasing swarm would be to the boundless territories which in Australia and America are but partially occupied. I confess that to found an Irish colony in another hemisphere seems to me to be an enterprise which would tend greatly to augment the dignity and influence of the Irish race, as well as to increase eventually the prosperity of the mother country. Colonization of this kind ought, under the most favorable condition of Irish affairs, to be encouraged as a healthy and legitimate outlet for an increasing pop-

ulation; but the present emigration is almost the only alternative which can protect large masses of the Irish people from falling into a state of pauperism. Take, for instance, the case of a small farmer who holds, five, ten, or fifteen acres of land at a moderate rent. If he have four or five sons, what is to present their prospect in life through at least three-fourths of this kingdom. Five acres of land may give a sustenance to one family, but it would not sustain five families, even if not rent were paid by its possessor. Ten acres, of middle quality, held at a moderate rent, is perhaps the least amount of land that will enable a small farmer, under the present system of culture, to live in a state of decent comfort. If an attempt be made to subdivide such a farm amongst five children it is manifest that their social rank will be reduced to that of day laborers. Under such circumstances it seems to me that it is for the interest of the whole family that one or more of the sons seek independence in some new field of adventure. Many a young man of this class who has gone to America or to Australia, is now wealthy enough to buy an estate in Ireland, and if that attachment to their native country which is so deeply felt by Irish emigrants be intensely strong in him, he is able to return to spend the evening of his days in the home of his youth—not as a decried laborer, but as an opulent proprietor. Such are the considerations which have for many years induced me on general principles to advocate colonization, but no one more ardently than myself desires that a time may arrive when, during at least one generation, all classes of Irishmen may be enabled to find profitable occupation within the precincts of our own beloved island.

In regard of Colonial Administration, it is scarcely necessary for me to say that an Irish Independent Party, in and out of Parliament, ought to vindicate for the Colonies the employment, in its most unlimited sense, of that constitutional right of self-government of which Ireland was robbed by the Union. Cases may be imagined in which this right may be abused by its possessors, but except for the protection of an oppressed minority from aggravated injustice, the right of a body of emigrants who found a colony to govern themselves ought never to be violated. If a Colonial Legislature commit mistakes, as will often happen, the colony itself ought in all ordinary cases to apply a remedy to the evil from which it is itself the sufferer.

ANNEXATION.

Extension of Empire resulting from colonization—that is, from the emigration of a portion of the increasing population of a peopled kingdom to territories which are, comparatively speaking, unoccupied, is a legitimate mode of national aggrandisement. It is conformable to the primordial command "Go forth and multiply and replenish the earth." It is followed by an extension of moral influence and an increase of material prosperity. It is attended with results equally profitable to the mode of extending empire, which is called by English writers "Gibbering;" when they speak of the rapacity of other nations, and by the gentler name of *annexation*, when they are compelled to find a name for British usurpation. The people of England declaim against the disposition which has been shown by the Governments of Russia, of France, and of the United States to encroach upon the possessions of their weaker neighbors. A glance at the map of the world will show to what an extent they have themselves forborne from seizing the possessions of unoffending nations.

Attila, and Tamerlane, and Genghis Khan, and other "uncivilized" conquerors, left their homes with the avowed intention of subjugating all whom their arms could subdue. Hypocrisy and perfidy were not, in their case, added to the crimes of robbery and massacre. But in the present age the most cruel injustice is cloaked under pretexts of regard for religion and humanity. The modes in which *annexation* is effected are various. At one time, as in New Zealand, missionaries are sent to convert the natives. They obtain a moral influence over them—then induce them to make improvident grants or sales of land, and as soon as they have firmly established their ascendancy among this people, an English Company or the British Government steps in and usurps possession of the whole territory. In other cases, as in that of Borneo, an English officer, accompanied by a party of volunteers armed with the superior weapons which modern "civilization" has given to Europeans, sets out on a buccannering expedition, plants himself in a country in which the native inhabitants are engaged in dissension with each other—professes to be the arbitrator between them, and availing himself of the influence thus acquired, ends by monopolising to himself the government of the country. For a short season he is called *Rajah*; but finding that his sovereignty can be maintained only by British cannon, he makes over or sells his rights of Royalty to the British Government, and a new territory—one of the largest and most fertile islands of the globe—is annexed to the British Empire. In other cases, as in that of Hindostan, a company of English merchants submissively ask leave to trade with the wealthy cities of a highly civilized people. They are permitted to establish "factories," and for a time this intercourse is found to be beneficial to the natives as well as to the foreigners. But woe to the Eastern nation that admits a company of European merchants within its borders! No sooner is their mercantile position established than they begin to intrigue for extension of their influence. By cajolery or force they obtain concessions which give them a permanent footing in the country. Then follow treaties of doubtful import with Native Princes. Imputed violations of such treaties are alleged as pretexts for war. War is followed by concession of territory. New relations are formed with contiguous States. The aid of the foreigner is lent to the weak or to the oppressor, and the scale being thus turned in their favor, he is rewarded for his intervention by additional cessions of territory. Such has been the process of annexation in the East. If an impartial and skilful writer were to analyse and describe the titles by which Great Britain holds possession of its various dependencies, he would produce a curious and interesting volume. Commencing with Ireland, and ending with Oude, he would be compelled to exhibit a continuous development of fraud, perfidy, hypocrisy, and cupidity—mingled, I admit, with many traits of resolution and daring intrepidity. It is not my intention to undertake this task. I shall merely cite two or three instances, by way of illustration.

In the year 1844, a volume of papers relative to the occupation of Scinde was laid before Parliament. This was a selection made for the express purpose of justifying the *annexation* of that country. It was, therefore, an *ex parte* statement in favor of England, in which the case of the Native Princes or Ameers was not set forth as it would have been stated by an advocate pleading their cause. I read that volume with attention, and I came to the conclusion that never had treachery, ingratitude, and unjust violence been exhibited under a guise more repugnant to every sentiment of honor than in the conduct of the British Government towards the Ameers of Scinde. It is now stated by persons who are called "authorities" in reference to the affairs of India, that this *annexation* does not pay its own expenses. The wrongdoer has been disappointed in the harvest of his wrong. So may it ever be!

About the time of my visit to India, a country called Berar, nearly as large as Ireland, with a population of more than four millions of persons was seized by the British Government in violation of the most solemn treaties, and in violation of the principles of inheritance that are recognised by the laws and customs of the inhabitants of India. I pass by the case of the *Rajah* of Satara, and of minor principalities which have been annexed in a similar manner, and come to the *annexation* of Oude, which appears now, beyond all question, to have been the main cause of the mutiny of the Bengal army. The rulers of Oude have been for more than half a

century the most faithful adherents of British power in India. Their services at critical moments have been of such an unusual character, that they have forth the most extravagant expressions of gratitude and laudation on the part of the Chief Governors of India.—They have been rewarded for their fidelity by the title of King instead of Nabob. They had lent large sums of money—amounting, it is said, to three millions sterling—to the East India Company in the hour of its utmost need. But, alas! these services could not protect them from British avarice. It was easier to confiscate the territory of an ally than to pay the debt which was due to him.—Accordingly pretexts were invented to justify this confiscation.—The interests of *humanity* were pleaded, and the Ruler of Oude was deprived of his kingdom on account of the internal misgovernment which was alleged to exist in his country. After having seen recently the ingenuity with which the most atrocious falsehoods have been fabricated for the purpose of bringing the inhabitants of Hindostan into disrepute, it is difficult for us to believe any statement which rests solely upon the assertion of British writers; and the fact that the whole population of Oude have risen in arms to vindicate the rights of their ancient dynasty, is itself a *prima facie* evidence that the charge of misgovernment was an exaggeration, if not a falsehood. But let us admit that Oude was misgoverned by its native rulers. Is internal misgovernment a legitimate ground for the confiscation of an independent kingdom, in defiance of obligations founded upon treaties, and upon acknowledged service? If internal misrule could justify the invasion of a foreign potentate, there has scarcely been a period of ten years during the last three centuries when the Catholic powers of Europe would not have been justified in treating Ireland from the dominion of Great Britain. If internal misgovernment be a sufficient plea for foreign intervention, the Emperor of France, or the Emperor of Russia, or the Republican Government of the United States would, at the present moment, be entitled to say to England—"We require no other evidence than the report of your own commission upon the employment of torture in India, to prove that you have outraged the first principles of humanity, in your treatment of the natives of India, and we will rescue them from the intolerable oppression to which they are subject under your rule." In the case of Oude, if the King, who, till recently, was upheld by British authority, had forfeited by misconduct all claim to continuance of such support, the natural and legitimate remedy would have been to place in his stead some member of the royal family of Oude, whose character would have formed a guarantee that he would govern his subjects well and wisely. It appears from a speech made last year in the House of Commons, by the present Chancellor of the Exchequer, that such a person was to be found, and that his claims to the throne were at least equal to that of the reigning sovereign. I quote from the speech of Mr. Disraeli, as reported in the *Times* of the 28th July, 1857.

"There was another reason why the Government of India ought to look with much indulgence on the personal conduct of the Sovereign of Oude, because the Government of India changed the line of succession in Oude, and placed the father of the late king on the throne instead of the prince who by custom and by law ought to have succeeded. Of that prince I had some knowledge by the information I had received years ago from men most competent to speak of him. He lives in a distant eastern city upon a pension allotted to him by the Indian Government, and he was recommended to me long before the question of Oude ever interested the public attention as, without exception, a man of the most immaculate character that ever existed in the East—a man most enlightened and amiable, and more competent, perhaps, to be a benevolent and judicious prince than any that ever existed."

If the Emperor of France or the Emperor of Russia had treated the Kingdom of Oude as it has been treated by the British Government, the inhabitants of that country, whether Sepoys or simple citizens, would have been extolled by the English people as heroes and patriots nobly engaged in resisting an unjust aggression. Now they are branded as Rebels and Traitors; and the power which justified its usurpation of Oude as a vindication of the rights of humanity has, in this early stage of the struggle, evinced its *humanity* by pillaging and consigning to utter ruin one of the most splendid capitals of the East—whilst it has evinced its *justice* by confiscating the *private* property of every landowner in Oude (except six favored chiefs) without any inquiry as to whether such landowners took part in the rebellion, were neutral, or were opposed to it. I am little disposed to pay homage to any English statesman, but I offer the humble meed of my admiration to Lord Ellenborough for the manliness with which he has unequivocally condemned the proclamation of Lord Canning, by which this confiscation has been announced to the world. Shame upon his colleagues who, participating to a great extent in his sentiments, have shunned full participation in the responsibility of avowing his act as their own. Had they boldly upheld and defended him they might have lost office, but they would have preserved character—they might have been defeated at a general election, but they would have left in the history of England the record of an act which would have proved that, in this corrupt age of Mammon worship, there were, at least, a few statesmen who prefer the claims of justice to the emoluments of office—the redress of a wrong to the plunder of a province.

Let me entreat you, my fellow-countrymen, as you value the honor of the Irish nation, to give no countenance to this iniquity. Ask your consciences whether you are justified in sending your sons to ravage and subjugate a country to which the Government that employs them as its stipendiaries has no rightful title. Such a contest is not legitimate war. It is murder. It is rapine.

It is not easy to say how the British Government can now honorably extricate itself from the maze of iniquity in which it has become involved in the East. Perhaps you will be able to determine this question when you shall have considered what advice you ought to give to a repentant robber who had succeeded in plundering a helpless family. I shall quote the words of the present Chancellor of the Exchequer, rather than speak my own sentiments on the occasion:—

"You ought to have a royal commission sent by the Queen from this country immediately to inquire into the grievances of the various classes of that population. You ought to have a royal proclamation to the people of India, declaring that the Queen of England is not a Sovereign who will countenance the violation of Treaties—that the Queen of England is not a Sovereign who will disturb the settlement of property—that the Queen of England is a Sovereign who will respect their laws, their usages, and, above all, their religion. Do this—do this not in a corner—but in a mode and manner which will attract universal attention, and excite the general hope of Hindostan, and you will do as much as all your fleets and armies can achieve."

It is never too late to redress injustice, but as I entertain no hope that injustice will be redressed in the case of Oude, I can only exhort you to avoid participation in its guilt. One consolation at least will result to the friends of humanity from this struggle. The progress of *annexation* will henceforth be slower than it has hitherto been. *Annexation does not pay.* The annexation of Oude has already cost ten millions sterling, and will probably cost many millions more before it can be completed. Nor, even if the conquest be perfected, will it be possible hereafter to misgovern India with impunity. It may be possible to overrun provinces with fire and sword, but 180,000,000 of men cannot be permanently coerced merely by the physical force of an European army. The correspondent of the *Times* has recently told you that an English army cannot march a quarter of a mile without native assistance. Under the burning sun of India every ministering office that is essential to the existence of the European soldier—not to say

to this military operations—must be performed by natives. Their services at critical moments have been of such an unusual character, that they have forth the most extravagant expressions of gratitude and laudation on the part of the Chief Governors of India.—They have been rewarded for their fidelity by the title of King instead of Nabob. They had lent large sums of money—amounting, it is said, to three millions sterling—to the East India Company in the hour of its utmost need. But, alas! these services could not protect them from British avarice. It was easier to confiscate the territory of an ally than to pay the debt which was due to him.—Accordingly pretexts were invented to justify this confiscation.—The interests of *humanity* were pleaded, and the Ruler of Oude was deprived of his kingdom on account of the internal misgovernment which was alleged to exist in his country. After having seen recently the ingenuity with which the most atrocious falsehoods have been fabricated for the purpose of bringing the inhabitants of Hindostan into disrepute, it is difficult for us to believe any statement which rests solely upon the assertion of British writers; and the fact that the whole population of Oude have risen in arms to vindicate the rights of their ancient dynasty, is itself a *prima facie* evidence that the charge of misgovernment was an exaggeration, if not a falsehood. But let us admit that Oude was misgoverned by its native rulers. Is internal misgovernment a legitimate ground for the confiscation of an independent kingdom, in defiance of obligations founded upon treaties, and upon acknowledged service? If internal misrule could justify the invasion of a foreign potentate, there has scarcely been a period of ten years during the last three centuries when the Catholic powers of Europe would not have been justified in treating Ireland from the dominion of Great Britain. If internal misgovernment be a sufficient plea for foreign intervention, the Emperor of France, or the Emperor of Russia, or the Republican Government of the United States would, at the present moment, be entitled to say to England—"We require no other evidence than the report of your own commission upon the employment of torture in India, to prove that you have outraged the first principles of humanity, in your treatment of the natives of India, and we will rescue them from the intolerable oppression to which they are subject under your rule." In the case of Oude, if the King, who, till recently, was upheld by British authority, had forfeited by misconduct all claim to continuance of such support, the natural and legitimate remedy would have been to place in his stead some member of the royal family of Oude, whose character would have formed a guarantee that he would govern his subjects well and wisely. It appears from a speech made last year in the House of Commons, by the present Chancellor of the Exchequer, that such a person was to be found, and that his claims to the throne were at least equal to that of the reigning sovereign. I quote from the speech of Mr. Disraeli, as reported in the *Times* of the 28th July, 1857.

"There was another reason why the Government of India ought to look with much indulgence on the personal conduct of the Sovereign of Oude, because the Government of India changed the line of succession in Oude, and placed the father of the late king on the throne instead of the prince who by custom and by law ought to have succeeded. Of that prince I had some knowledge by the information I had received years ago from men most competent to speak of him. He lives in a distant eastern city upon a pension allotted to him by the Indian Government, and he was recommended to me long before the question of Oude ever interested the public attention as, without exception, a man of the most immaculate character that ever existed in the East—a man most enlightened and amiable, and more competent, perhaps, to be a benevolent and judicious prince than any that ever existed."

If the Emperor of France or the Emperor of Russia had treated the Kingdom of Oude as it has been treated by the British Government, the inhabitants of that country, whether Sepoys or simple citizens, would have been extolled by the English people as heroes and patriots nobly engaged in resisting an unjust aggression. Now they are branded as Rebels and Traitors; and the power which justified its usurpation of Oude as a vindication of the rights of humanity has, in this early stage of the struggle, evinced its *humanity* by pillaging and consigning to utter ruin one of the most splendid capitals of the East—whilst it has evinced its *justice* by confiscating the *private* property of every landowner in Oude (except six favored chiefs) without any inquiry as to whether such landowners took part in the rebellion, were neutral, or were opposed to it. I am little disposed to pay homage to any English statesman, but I offer the humble meed of my admiration to Lord Ellenborough for the manliness with which he has unequivocally condemned the proclamation of Lord Canning, by which this confiscation has been announced to the world. Shame upon his colleagues who, participating to a great extent in his sentiments, have shunned full participation in the responsibility of avowing his act as their own. Had they boldly upheld and defended him they might have lost office, but they would have preserved character—they might have been defeated at a general election, but they would have left in the history of England the record of an act which would have proved that, in this corrupt age of Mammon worship, there were, at least, a few statesmen who prefer the claims of justice to the emoluments of office—the redress of a wrong to the plunder of a province.

Let me entreat you, my fellow-countrymen, as you value the honor of the Irish nation, to give no countenance to this iniquity. Ask your consciences whether you are justified in sending your sons to ravage and subjugate a country to which the Government that employs them as its stipendiaries has no rightful title. Such a contest is not legitimate war. It is murder. It is rapine.

It is not easy to say how the British Government can now honorably extricate itself from the maze of iniquity in which it has become involved in the East. Perhaps you will be able to determine this question when you shall have considered what advice you ought to give to a repentant robber who had succeeded in plundering a helpless family. I shall quote the words of the present Chancellor of the Exchequer, rather than speak my own sentiments on the occasion:—

"You ought to have a royal commission sent by the Queen from this country immediately to inquire into the grievances of the various classes of that population. You ought to have a royal proclamation to the people of India, declaring that the Queen of England is not a Sovereign who will countenance the violation of Treaties—that the Queen of England is not a Sovereign who will disturb the settlement of property—that the Queen of England is a Sovereign who will respect their laws, their usages, and, above all, their religion. Do this—do this not in a corner—but in a mode and manner which will attract universal attention, and excite the general hope of Hindostan, and you will do as much as all your fleets and armies can achieve."

It is never too late to redress injustice, but as I entertain no hope that injustice will be redressed in the case of Oude, I can only exhort you to avoid participation in its guilt. One consolation at least will result to the friends of humanity from this struggle. The progress of *annexation* will henceforth be slower than it has hitherto been. *Annexation does not pay.* The annexation of Oude has already cost ten millions sterling, and will probably cost many millions more before it can be completed. Nor, even if the conquest be perfected, will it be possible hereafter to misgovern India with impunity. It may be possible to overrun provinces with fire and sword, but 180,000,000 of men cannot be permanently coerced merely by the physical force of an European army. The correspondent of the *Times* has recently told you that an English army cannot march a quarter of a mile without native assistance. Under the burning sun of India every ministering office that is essential to the existence of the European soldier—not to say

to this military operations—must be performed by natives. Their services at critical moments have been of such an unusual character, that they have forth the most extravagant expressions of gratitude and laudation on the part of the Chief Governors of India.—They have been rewarded for their fidelity by the title of King instead of Nabob. They had lent large sums of money—amounting, it is said, to three millions sterling—to the East India Company in the hour of its utmost need. But, alas! these services could not protect them from British avarice. It was easier to confiscate the territory of an ally than to pay the debt which was due to him.—Accordingly pretexts were invented to justify this confiscation.—The interests of *humanity* were pleaded, and the Ruler of Oude was deprived of his kingdom on account of the internal misgovernment which was alleged to exist in his country. After having seen recently the ingenuity with which the most atrocious falsehoods have been fabricated for the purpose of bringing the inhabitants of Hindostan into disrepute, it is difficult for us to believe any statement which rests solely upon the assertion of British writers; and the fact that the whole population of Oude have risen in arms to vindicate the rights of their ancient dynasty, is itself a *prima facie* evidence that the charge of misgovernment was an exaggeration, if not a falsehood. But let us admit that Oude was misgoverned by its native rulers. Is internal misgovernment a legitimate ground for the confiscation of an independent kingdom, in defiance of obligations founded upon treaties, and upon acknowledged service? If internal misrule could justify the invasion of a foreign potentate, there has scarcely been a period of ten years during the last three centuries when the Catholic powers of Europe would not have been justified in treating Ireland from the dominion of Great Britain. If internal misgovernment be a sufficient plea for foreign intervention, the Emperor of France, or the Emperor of Russia, or the Republican Government of the United States would, at the present moment, be entitled to say to England—"We require no other evidence than the report of your own commission upon the employment of torture in India, to prove that you have outraged the first principles of humanity, in your treatment of the natives of India, and we will rescue them from the intolerable oppression to which they are subject under your rule." In the case of Oude, if the King, who, till recently, was upheld by British authority, had forfeited by misconduct all claim to continuance of such support, the natural and legitimate remedy would have been to place in his stead some member of the royal family of Oude, whose character would have formed a guarantee that he would govern his subjects well and wisely. It appears from a speech made last year in the House of Commons, by the present Chancellor of the Exchequer, that such a person was to be found, and that his claims to the throne were at least equal to that of the reigning sovereign. I quote from the speech of Mr. Disraeli, as reported in the *Times* of the 28th July, 1857.

"There was another reason why the Government of India ought to look with much indulgence on the personal conduct of the Sovereign of Oude, because the Government of India changed the line of succession in Oude, and placed the father of the late king on the throne instead of the prince who by custom and by law ought to have succeeded. Of that prince I had some knowledge by the information I had received years ago from men most competent to speak of him. He lives in a distant eastern city upon a pension allotted to him by the Indian Government, and he was recommended to me long before the question of Oude ever interested the public attention as, without exception, a man of the most immaculate character that ever existed in the East—a man most enlightened and amiable, and more competent, perhaps, to be a benevolent and judicious prince than any that ever existed."

If the Emperor of France or the Emperor of Russia had treated the Kingdom of Oude as it has been treated by the British Government, the inhabitants of that country, whether Sepoys or simple citizens, would have been extolled by the English people as heroes and patriots nobly engaged in resisting an unjust aggression. Now they are branded as Rebels and Traitors; and the power which justified its usurpation of Oude as a vindication of the rights of humanity has, in this early stage of the struggle, evinced its *humanity* by pillaging and consigning to utter ruin one of the most splendid capitals of the East—whilst it has evinced its *justice* by confiscating the *private* property of every landowner in Oude (except six favored chiefs) without any inquiry as to whether such landowners took part in the rebellion, were neutral, or were opposed to it. I am little disposed to pay homage to any English statesman, but I offer the humble meed of my admiration to Lord Ellenborough for the manliness with which he has unequivocally condemned the proclamation of Lord Canning, by which this confiscation has been announced to the world. Shame upon his colleagues who, participating to a great extent in his sentiments, have shunned full participation in the responsibility of avowing his act as their own. Had they boldly upheld and defended him they might have lost office, but they would have preserved character—they might have been defeated at a general election, but they would have left in the history of England the record of an act which would have proved that, in this corrupt age of Mammon worship, there were, at least, a few statesmen who prefer the claims of justice to the emoluments of office—the redress of a wrong to the plunder of a province.

Let me entreat you, my fellow-countrymen, as you value the honor of the Irish nation, to give no countenance to this iniquity. Ask your consciences whether you are justified in sending your sons to ravage and subjugate a country to which the Government that employs them as its stipendiaries has no rightful title. Such a contest is not legitimate war. It is murder. It is rapine.

It is not easy to say how the British Government can now honorably extricate itself from the maze of iniquity in which it has become involved in the East. Perhaps you will be able to determine this question when you shall have considered what advice you ought to give to a repentant robber who had succeeded in plundering a helpless family. I shall quote the words of the present Chancellor of the Exchequer, rather than speak my own sentiments on the occasion:—

"You ought to have a royal commission sent by the Queen from this country immediately to inquire into the grievances of the various classes of that population. You ought to have a royal proclamation to the people of India, declaring that the Queen of England is not a Sovereign who will countenance the violation of Treaties—that the Queen of England is not a Sovereign who will disturb the settlement of property—that the Queen of England is a Sovereign who will respect their laws, their usages, and, above all, their religion. Do this—do this not in a corner—but in a mode and manner which will attract universal attention, and excite the general hope of Hindostan, and you will do as much as all your fleets and armies can achieve."

IRISH INTELLIGENCE.

It is confidently asserted that the Rev. Dr. Flannery is likely to be Coadjutor Bishop of Killaloe.—*Limerick Reporter.*

THE REDEMPTORIST FATHERS.—The foundation-stone of the Redemptorist Fathers' cathedral will be laid on Sunday next by the Right Rev. Dr. Ryan, the venerable Bishop of this diocese. An open-air sermon will be preached on the occasion by the Right Rev. Dr. Moriarty, Bishop of Kerry, and contributions received towards the erection of the edifice. The Redemptorist Fathers are now six years in this city, and during that period the blessings conferred by their labors on the people of Limerick, as well as throughout Ireland, are incalculable. Their indefatigable zeal has already attracted the attention and enlisted the praise and wonder of the Catholics of Ireland. A convent has just been completed, which has cost about £3,000, and a chapel where the Fathers officiated heretofore, and still continue to do, until the cathedral is ready to accommodate the large crowds of people who every evening visit their altar. This is the first public appeal the holy Fathers have made to the people since the commencement of their mission, and, judging from the esteem in which they are held, as well as from the large subscriptions already handed in, there is no doubt of its success.—*Munster News.*

The fund for the establishment of the Christian Brothers in Kilkenny progresses steadily, and the success of the project is now beyond a doubt. This week it is the intention of the committee to appeal to the rural districts, and we earnestly hope that there will be a ready and generous response.—*Kilkenny Journal.*

THE REBELLION IN TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN.—A visitation commenced in Trinity College on Monday, for the purpose of hearing the appeal of two of the junior fellows of the institution, who have been censured by the board, and threatened with suspension, if not expulsion, for writing on the reform of the University in one of the Dublin papers. The visitors are the Archbishop of Dublin and Vice-Chancellor Blackburne, who have decided on permitting only gownsmen to be present. The clause in the statutes on which the board ground their censure is only rendering liable to censure the fellow or scholar who shall transgress the words of the oath, "Qui fores aliquem in jus vocare." The authorities construe this phrase "writing to newspapers," and it remains to be tried whether the visitors will bear them out in that rendering. A heavy bar is engaged for the Trinity College Board, and also for the implicated Junior Fellows. The investigation, speaking, examination and reading of documents continued till Tuesday evening, when the visitors adjourned the case till Tuesday, the 1st June.

THE COLLEGE RIOTS.—The trials of Colonel Browne and the policeman implicated in the riots of the 12th of March will positively come off at the Commission of Oyer and Terminer, which opens on the 17th of June next. It is stated that either the Attorney or Solicitor General will conduct the prosecution of the police in person. The judges on the rota are Justice Christian and Justice O'Brien, but it is said that strenuous efforts are being made to induce the venerable Baron Penfather to act in place of Justice O'Brien, as the latter is believed to have expressed an unwillingness to preside on the occasion.

An article on University Reform in the *Dublin University Magazine* for May has sorely irritated the Hebdmondal Board at Dublin. Taking a leaf from our neighbors across the Straits of Dover, an action for libel against the editor of the magazine was first thought of, but the idea was dismissed as untenable. The publishers, who are the College booksellers, were the next most obvious victims. They were summoned before the Board, and compelled to abandon the publication of the magazine—a loss which, estimating the profits at the small sum of £20 per annum, may be set down as a pecuniary mulct of £500.

On Monday morning the dead body of a farmer, named Greene, residing near the Glen of Aherlow, was discovered not far from his own house. He was at a fair on Friday, and had not returned, and it is supposed that having been waylaid on the way therefrom, he died from