

ed in blood as a warning to all audacious parsons.

"I admit," says a writer on this subject, whose language we adopt, "that no private right should be suffered to be a public wrong. That is an evil which the governing power in the state must have the power of remedying by the eternal law of self-preservation. But I require to have it clearly proved to me, that such an evil exists, and exists in such a degree as to admit of no other remedy than that which J. K. L. proposes, and which should never be resorted to, except in cases of the last necessity. Suppose Parliament, after due deliberation, came to the resolution, that it was rightful and fitting to deprive the Duke of Leinster of his possessions! I entertain no doubt of their competency so to do, as I entertain no doubt that an individual possesses the right to cause the amputation of his little finger, when such a step is necessary to the preservation of his life. All that I ask, then, is, not to sacrifice the property of the clergy, which they hold by the most ancient and sacred of all titles, to any less urgent necessity than would be sufficient to justify a similar measure in the case of any other subject."

But having thus far acceded to the implied principle of these radicals, who would rob Christ himself of his property, demanding only the impartial application of it, we are at issue with them upon a fact; where is the proof that the insurrections of Ireland are to be traced to the tythe system? We affirm, on the contrary, that among the various commotions that have taken place in that country for the last century, only one can be mentioned where the payment of tythes was the prominent grievance; and we challenge those who maintain the contrary assertion to bring forward their proof.

The first of that series of unhappy transactions, in modern times, occurred in 1760; this was a rising in

Munster; the grievances complained of were the inclosing of commons, the turning out of the old tenantry in order to throw many farms into one, and the encouragement given to grazing. The first employment of the *Levellers*, as these insurgents were called, was the levelling of fences and the houghing of bullocks. The first objects of attack were not the clergy, but the landlords. This commotion disturbed the south of Ireland for several years.

In 1763 and 1764 the appearance of the *Hearts of Oak* in the county of Armagh originated in a grievance connected with the system of road making. One of their first proceedings was to swear several gentlemen on the commons of Armagh, not to lay on more than a farthing an acre land rates towards the repair of high roads, and make no new levy for private roads.

In 1769, the counties of Down and Antrim were convulsed by the *Hearts of Steel*: these discontents had their source in the new letting of a great estate, the terms of which being the payment of large fines, a considerable portion of the tenants were unable to obtain renewals, and had recourse to violence against such persons as ventured to take their farms. This was purely a question between landlord and tenant.

In 1786 we come to a disturbance which commenced by assailing the property of the Church; this was the primary object of the *Right Boys*. It had required a period of twenty-six years since the Munster disorders in 1760, to convince the peasantry of any part of Ireland that their distresses were very intimately connected with tythes; that when we consider how comparatively easy it is generally found to contend with the clergy, and how probable it is that there were not wanting interested persons to suggest to them that a little effort would release the lands from this charge altogether, it cannot surprise us if the violence,