

838 Education

serm on
p. Norwich's
speech.

OBSERVATIONS, ETC.

1838

Houses of the Oireachtas

By the Same,

THE RIGHT AND DUTY OF THE CHRISTIAN MAGISTRATE TO SUPPORT BY A
LEGAL ENDOWMENT, THE TRUE PROFESSION OF THE GOSPEL :

A SERMON,

PREACHED AT

THE ANNUAL VISITATION

Held in the Cathedral of Derry, 9th October, 1834.

Published at the request of the Bishop and Clergy of the Diocese.

Also,

A LETTER,

Addressed to the Right Hon. Lord Morpeth, occasioned by his Lordship's
declaration in Parliament, that the only ground of an Established
Church rested on the opinion of the majority.

OBSERVATIONS

ADDRESSED TO

THE LORD BISHOP OF NORWICH,

ON

HIS LORDSHIP'S SPEECH AND PAMPHLET

ON THE

NATIONAL SYSTEM OF EDUCATION
IN IRELAND.

BY THE

REV. JOHN HAYDEN,

Rector of Lower Cumber, and formerly Domestic Chaplain to the late Lord Bishop of Derry.

DUBLIN

WILLIAM CURRY, JUN. AND COMPANY,

SAMUEL HOLDSWORTH, LONDON.

1838.

OBSERVATIONS

BY

THE LORD BISHOP OF NORWICH,

THE LORDS BISHOP OF BATH AND BAVILLETT

NATIONAL SYSTEM OF EDUCATION

Dublin: Printed by JOHN S. FOLDS, 5, Bachelor's-Walk.

DUBLIN

WILLIAM CURRY, JUN. AND COMPANY

PRINTERS, 11, PATERNOSTER-ROW, LONDON.

1838.

Houses of the Oireachtas

CONTENTS.

LETTER I.

Present state of the question of National Education in Ireland . . . 7

LETTER II.

The argument examined on which the Marquis of Lansdowne, Her Majesty's Attorney General for Ireland, Commissioners Blake and Carlile, and the Bishop of Norwich, mainly rely to justify the co-operation of the Protestant Clergy in a System of Education, which provides facilities for the teaching of Popery . . . 17

LETTER III.

Alarming objects authoritatively avowed by the National Board of Education, with some notice of the working of the System . . . 20

LETTER IV.

The Lord Bishop of Norwich's strange notions regarding the Roman Catholic religion.—The discarded Extracts.—His Lordship's attack on Dean Dawson.—Doctor M'Hale . . . 34

LETTER V.

True meaning of words in Reports and Proceedings of the National Board of Education.—Statistical jugglery of the Board.—Want of provision for instruction of Protestant poor.—Danger of Schism in the Church.—Archdeacon Hoare.—Liverpool Corporation Schools . . . 38

CONTENTS

Chapter I. The origin and history of the House of Commons. 1

Chapter II. The origin and history of the House of Lords. 15

Chapter III. The origin and history of the House of Burgesses. 35

Chapter IV. The origin and history of the House of Representatives. 55

Chapter V. The origin and history of the House of Deputies. 75

Chapter VI. The origin and history of the House of Representatives. 95

Chapter VII. The origin and history of the House of Representatives. 115

Chapter VIII. The origin and history of the House of Representatives. 135

Chapter IX. The origin and history of the House of Representatives. 155

Chapter X. The origin and history of the House of Representatives. 175

Houses Of the Oireachtas

OBSERVATIONS,

&c.

I.

Present State of the Question of National Education in Ireland.

TO THE LORD BISHOP OF NORWICH,

&c. &c.

MY LORD,

I had been proposing to myself an attempt to place fairly before the public mind, the exact state of the question at the present moment, of National Education in Ireland, and was considering the particular form in which to make my appeal to dispassionate people, when a copy of your Lordship's Speech, delivered, May 21st, 1838, on this subject, in the House of Lords, attracted my attention. The publication of your speech, therefore, affords me a desirable opportunity for drawing public attention to an important subject, in entering, without ceremony, on a correspondence with my betters.

It is not fair to take your Lordship's speech as any elaborate expression of your opinions—possibly intended only as an offering or earnest of political gratitude: it is not distinguished for eloquence or argument, but it is on the subject of National Education in Ireland, an English Bishop's speech. And when we know to what slender

props men will cling in their extremity, we can well conceive the eagerness with which the Commissioners of National Education grasped at a defence by the Lord Bishop of Norwich.

When so much has been already written and spoken on this subject, some explanation is due why a person so obscure and insignificant as myself should trespass further on the public time and patience. It so happened that the Clergy of Derry and Raphoe, in making their propositions for a modification of the National System of Education, had, at the first, been censured by some of their brethren as deserting, in their eagerness to conciliate, the ground of principle; and latterly they have been represented by others, besides your Lordship, as remaining hostile to the National System, after all they asked had been conceded. It is not, therefore, unbecoming in one of those who had originally advocated the Derry and Raphoe propositions, to seek an opportunity of disabusing the public mind, and answering this latter charge, which, whether founded in misapprehension or misstatement, is as injurious as undeserved. That others better qualified have not before undertaken this task must have arisen from an old and not unlikely cause, *quia prudentissimus quisque negotiosus maxime erat*. And now with this explanation, and a faithful promise not to wound your Lordship's more fastidious taste by "Irish declamation," nor to offend your common sense by claiming your assent without advancing sufficient reasons, I venture to solicit your dispassionate perusal of the following pages, which probably may satisfy the public that the charges brought in your Lordship's pamphlet against the Irish Clergy, of bigotry, and puritanism, and fanaticism, and hypocrisy, and faction, are founded just as much in truth, as they are in charity.

I do not propose to discuss the question how far the Clergy of Derry and Raphoe were justified in making their

propositions for a modification of what we call, for brevity, the National System. I do not propose to say one word in their defence. This is a question beside our present inquiry, but it will help to preserve us from future misapprehension on this point, and to place the whole question before us, if I state exactly what these propositions were.

1. "The ordinary school business during which all the children of whatever denomination they be, are required to attend, and which is expected to occupy a competent number of hours in each day, is to consist of instruction in those branches which belong to a literary and moral education, embracing the reading of the Scriptures by those children whose parents or guardians consent to it."

2. "The concluding clause of the rule (regarding tuition, attendance, &c.) relating to extracts from Scripture, shall be expunged."

3. "The 2d, 3d, 4th, and 5th rules, (relating to facilities for peculiar religious instruction) shall be also expunged."

The Derry and Raphoe propositions therefore, were substantially these:—first, that the Scriptures should be freely read by all the children of such parents as might desire it.—Secondly, that all *peculiar* religious instruction should be confined to other places than the school-houses, and to other hours than the school-hours,—the very proposition which had been previously made by Mr. Wyse.

The rules of the Board have been so far modified by the Commissioners in their 4th Report, that the Protestant children are permitted to read the Scriptures in the school-room during school-hours, provided no objection be made by the parent or guardian of any other child in the school; but if such objection be made, that then an arrangement must be adopted, for the reading of the Scriptures separately; and for this purpose, Mr. Commissioner Blake suggests that they might be read behind a screen.

Your Lordship will perceive that permission is thus

vouchsafed to read the Scriptures, under a stipulation which, in the south and west of Ireland especially, would amount to an absolute prohibition; that the word of God would be read under marked discouragement; be thus made an occasion of daily producing interruption, inconvenience, and division, and that while the children of a school are known to be engaged, one in Arithmetic, another in Geography, another in History, all in their separate classes, in the same room together, from the Alphabet to Conic Sections, without the least inconvenience to each other, yet gratuitously, wantonly, and in total disregard of all order and regularity, the reading of the Scriptures is made a cause of separation in the school, and a portion of the children are withdrawn from the control and observation of the master, according to this notable scheme for a united (or rather disuniting) education. Your Lordship has not forgotten the decided testimony which his Grace the Duke of Wellington bore against this pretended enlargement of the rule for the reading of the Scriptures, in the debate during which your speech was spoken. I need not therefore dwell longer on this topic except to observe, that in England, where the children are for the most part of one denomination, and where therefore if a separation take place, during the reading of the Scriptures, that separation is not on account of *religion*, but on account of *convenience*, the Scriptures may with advantage be read in a separate room; but in no case, even there, unless where the school is very large, where there are two or more masters, and where the object of the practice cannot be supposed to be separation and division on account of religion.

The second proposition of the Clergy of Derry and Raphoe, was not only discountenanced, but the evil which they sought to remove was fearfully aggravated. Under the rules as they originally stood, the Roman Catholic

Catechism could not be taught during the ordinary school-hours, but by the rules as they at present stand, it may be taught in the school-room during* any of those hours, provided no parent or guardian of a Protestant pupil object, and in that case it is to be taught separately; and on the likelihood of any objection being offered in three out of the four provinces of Ireland, we need not speculate at this hour of day. If it was the design of the Government and Commissioners to *seem* reasonable, but really to most effectually destroy all faint hope of accommodation, they could not have hit on a more effectual expedient.

I am addressing a Protestant Bishop, and I put it to your Lordship, are we, the Protestant Clergy of Ireland, to take part in administering a system, in which all imaginable facilities are afforded to the inculcation of Romish errors, even the very same facilities (and greater in point of practice) which are afforded to the reading of God's Holy Word? It is not unbecoming to press this question on your notice. Have we not solemnly vowed "to be ready with all *faithful diligence* to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's Word?" and are we to be *ready* also to join a system which industriously instils these very doctrines into the youthful mind? Would consistency suffer this—would charity ask it at our hands? Are we the preachers and expounders of the Gospel in all the jealousy of its pure morality, to sanction by any implication the doctrines of the Church of Rome, and become "partakers of her sins?"—No, no, my Lord; we leave such

* The words of the report are, "the Scriptures to be read or *the catechism* learned, during any of the school-hours."—"The catechism." Many persons reading this *ingenuous* passage, and understanding, as people commonly understand, by the words "the catechism," that of the Established Church, have deluded themselves into the notion (more especially in England) that a great exclusive privilege was vouchsafed to Protestants. Who drew up this Jesuitical passage in the report? Was not the word "catechisms" rather difficult to avoid in this case?

a practice to latitudinarians in religion,—to the vilifiers of their own order, and the apologists of Peter Dens. Never were greater delusions entertained than these two—1st, That any system of National Education can ever be worked in Ireland free from monstrous abuses, without the co-operation and superintendence of the established Clergy. 2d, That such co-operation and superintendence can be obtained while the National Schools are used as seminaries for the teaching of Popery.

The pages of the Parliamentary Reports of the late Education Committees bear constant testimony to the fact, that in many of the National Schools little else is taught than the Roman Catholic Catechism—little other qualification is looked for in the masters, but a willingness and capability to perform this duty; and the Commissioners, instead of providing, by new rules, a remedy for this abuse, have now legalized the evil, by allowing the Roman Catholic Catechism to be taught during any of the ordinary school-hours, and have thus more effectually shut out all the approaches of an education that could inform or expand the mind. Is it possible that while an abandonment of principle is required, and gross abuses not only tolerated but sanctioned, that the Protestant Clergy could ever, without treason to their religion, connect themselves with such a system, or that speeches in Parliament, or letters artfully concocted, or cold and supercilious sneers at the zeal and labours of the Irish Clergy, can have any other effect than to deepen their aversion to it, and to increase their fears of it as an engine of evil? And surely a most humiliating exhibition offends all public principle and decency at this very moment—a Protestant archbishop providing facilities for the teaching of Popery, and a Presbyterian divine openly confessing that he is “*accessory*”* to the inculcation of Romanism.

* Com. Rep. p. 104.

I will, in a separate letter, examine the arguments in detail by which the advocates of the National Board attempt to justify the Protestant members of it, in affording facilities for the teaching of Popery, and by which they labour to fasten the charge of inconsistency (!!) on the Protestant Clergy in not sharing their labours; but as your Lordship indulges in such sweeping accusations of bigotry and faction, and vain aspirings after civil and religious ascendancy against the Irish Clergy, I beg to call your especial attention to the sacrifices which so many of us were willing to make (and which, with the experience of the past, it is doubtful that we were justified in offering to make) in order to obtain such a modification of the National system as would permit us to co-operate with it. These sacrifices were of a serious and painful nature.

1st. We are fully impressed with a conviction that the Scriptures are the only solid basis of moral improvement for young and old; and when any of the clerical body consented, therefore, to co-operate with a system which might afford, in many cases, a merely secular instruction, it was from the hope that as it would qualify, so it might eventually lead the Roman Catholic child to read the Scriptures for himself.

2nd. Many of the Clergy are in the habit, for the advantage of the aged and infirm, and to give to their labours a more missionary character, suited to the circumstances of Ireland, of occasionally using the ordinary school-houses for the purposes of divine worship, and this privilege, which the Clergy highly appreciated, they knew, at the time they made their proposals for a modification of the National system, they should be called on to forego, the moment they consented to connect their schools with the National Board.

3rd. It was the custom of the Clergy to examine in their schools, on appointed days, the youth of their flocks

in the Catechism, and as they would not ask for themselves a privilege (to which, as the Clergy of the Established Church, they were yet justly entitled) which they could not conscientiously concede to others, this privilege also they were persuaded to forego.

4th. It is the custom of the Clergy, when visiting their schools, to examine the several classes, and to avail themselves of that opportunity both to inform the minds and (in cases of the children of a different faith) to abate the prejudices of the rising generation. The Clergy were aware, when they made their propositions to the Government, that this, a very sacred and a very interesting privilege, would be denied them, the moment they should connect their schools with the National Board.

These sacrifices (sacrifices which I do not now undertake to justify) testify how desirous were many of the Clergy to meet the views of the government in any way which the clear imperative dictates of conscience did not forbid. And I need not say that they might have reasonably looked for a more favourable consideration of their proposals, than was manifested by a change which has aggravated the evils against which they protested. They asked for the free use of the Scriptures in the National Schools, "without restriction and without compulsion," and they are offered them under every conceivable discouragement, while the reading of them is virtually rendered contingent on the will of the Roman Catholic Priests. They begged that their conscientious objections against being made parties, in any sense, to the inculcation of error, should be respected: and new and more offensive privileges are conferred on the teachers of Romanism in the National Schools. In a word, we asked the government for the Scriptures, and they gave us the Roman Catholic catechism instead; for bread, and they gave us a stone; for a fish, and

they gave us a scorpion. Your Lordship having, in the letters you have published, adopted all the sentiments and accusations of your correspondent, will permit me to ask you where, in all the proceedings to which I have referred, has our conduct been marked by intolerance and faction? You exclaimed, no doubt, with much oratorical animation, speaking of the Bible, "and do not thrust it *forcibly* on the prejudices of the people." Now, wherever your Lordship's speech circulates, will it not be believed that the design of the opponents of the National Board is to *force* the Bible on the Roman Catholic population, and a Bishop's authority will be cited for this charge, while the most important of those petitions to which you referred, that from the Lord Primate and the Clergy of the diocese of Armagh, contained these very words—"That in demanding now, as heretofore, that the free and unrestricted use of the Bible, as the standard of revealed truth, shall be permitted to all who are desirous of exercising their Christian right of access to it, *your petitioners do not insist upon the reading of the Scriptures by those who reject their paramount authority.*"

Your Lordship's desire to make a short-lived impression in debate, led you to convey a meaning at variance with facts. We have reason to complain of your Lordship. You charged the Irish Clergy rashly in your speech—you wronged them deliberately when you published that speech to the world. "If we cannot compel the Roman Catholic to read the Bible," you exclaim, "let us show, in our own persons, by our conciliatory spirit, by our Protestant Christianity, that we have read the Bible ourselves, and that we wish to practise its precepts." I humbly think that even an indifferent observance of the precepts of the Bible would have saved us from the injurious insinuations of your Lordship's speech;

but where, I may ask you, does our Protestant Christianity require us to join in a system which inculcates the doctrines against which we have solemnly protested? Where, my Lord? It is easy for men high in office to gain an ephemeral popularity among those who mistake indifference for charity, with the aid of a little feeble declamation; but the Protestant Clergy have not so learned their Bible, as to confound all distinction between right and wrong, truth and falsehood. And be assured that this matter is of more practical importance than probably has ever entered your Lordship's conceptions. We have always some great panacea in prospect as a remedy for Irish evils. It has been in turn, Catholic Emancipation; Extinction of Tithes; Poor Laws; Repeal; Municipal Corporations. The payment of the Roman Catholic Priests by the State bids fair for a high place among the political nostrums.

The Government of the country is spoken of as likely to endow two opposing systems of religion; and how the abettors of the National System, which affords facilities for the teaching of Romanism, can consistently oppose the payment of the Roman Catholic Priests, we are at a loss to discover. Let but the Protestant Clergy sanction, or acquiesce in, the teaching of Romanism in the National Schools, and they never afterwards can raise their voices against the funds of this Protestant empire being devoted to the purpose of giving consequence and *consistency* to Romanism in Ireland, preventing the occurrence of such changes as we have witnessed in Birr*—changes which the temper and spirit of the times, and the spread of the Scriptures, render every day more probable.

* The English reader may require to be told that a flock, consisting of 2000 souls, left, along with their priest, the Church of Rome. They *paid* the priest, and would have the priest they preferred.

II.

The argument examined, on which the Marquis of Lansdowne, her Majesty's Attorney-General for Ireland, Commissioners Blake and Carlile, and the Bishop of Norwich, mainly rely, to justify the co-operation of the Protestant Clergy in a system of education which provides facilities for the teaching of Popery.

MY LORD,

The Clergy of Ireland look upon the teaching of the intolerant and unscriptural tenets of Popery in the National Schools as the *sting* of the system, and therefore we find the Marquis of Lansdowne, in the House of Lords, her Majesty's Attorney-General in the House of Commons, with Commissioners Blake and Carlile, labouring (*Commons' Rep. p. 105*) to justify the Government in affording, and Protestant Clergymen in taking part in a system which does afford facilities for the teaching of Romanism. They put forward the following argument in various forms, as their great ground of defence—that the cases of gaols and hospitals, and the National Schools are, as regards affording religious instruction, perfectly analogous, and that the Established Clergy are not more identified as co-operating parties in the one case than the other. Your Lordship has adopted this argument in your pamphlet, and placed it before the public in the following words:—"The Board is as really a civil body as a gaol committee, and yet Clergymen who act under the one refuse to perform the self-same functions under the other." Now, my Lord, as this is the great argument on which the supporters of the Board and the accusers of the Protestant Clergy have taken their stand, I am excused in begging your Lordship's especial attention to the answer. In the case of a Roman Catholic inmate of a prison

(and so far as the application of the argument is concerned, it is equally true of the inmate of an hospital) you deal with one from whom you have taken all access to his pastor. In the case of a child at a National School, you deal with one who has unrestrained access to parent, and pastor, and place of worship. Again, religious liberty would be invaded, and where you could only legally impose *civil* restraint, you would deprive a prisoner of his *religious* liberty, if, by denying (not by refusing to supply) him all opportunity of pastoral instruction, you took from him the means (the only means of which you suffer him to avail himself) of publicly serving God. And to see that this is an exact and just distinction, *you have only to conceive the prisoner replaced, as regards his personal liberty, in the same situation as a child at school, and then you would not think of following him out of the prison, and supplying him with facilities for instruction in a religion which you believe unscriptural and idolatrous.* Where now, my Lord, is the redoubted analogy on which such high authorities have so confidently relied? You see what puny sophistries even distinguished statesmen, and astute lawyers, and learned divines, may gravely advance, when once they take in hand to defend a sinful compromise. Your Lordship need not be told that though the government of a country may be too often guided by views of political expediency, in disregard to the claims and interests of truth, it is not to be expected that the great body of the Clergy will sit so loose to their principles. They, from the very nature of their professional inquiries and pursuits, must be always alive to the duty which they owe not only to the practical but the abstract principles of their religion. They weigh principles and systems and opinions daily in the balance of the sanctuary, and never did a Government read history to so little purpose, as when

they for a moment supposed that (notwithstanding some painful instances to the contrary) any considerable number of the PROTESTANT Clergy could be brought to overlook even the nice distinctions of right and wrong in religion, for any temporary object.

Another argument which the advocates of the Board have sometimes dwelt on as a justification of teaching Romanism in the National Schools is, that as equal facilities are afforded to the two denominations, none can justly complain being all in this respect on a level.

If the standard catechisms of the Churches of England and Rome were of the same spirit, then there would be (putting for the present the claims of the *Established* Church out of sight) no doubt much force in the argument; but one of the principal grounds of objection to the catechisms of the Church of Rome rests on this difference in spirit between them. The catechism of the Church of England contains the simple elementary truths of Christianity in language as meek as the doctrines it teaches: and so far from being characterized by any hostility to other forms of faith, it is often condemned as too general and vague, and, what is to the present purpose, it has often been cited (as what, in such a case, will they not cite?) by Romish controversialists, to prove that it was compiled with a design of admitting the real presence in the Romish sense, and as not denying a greater number of sacraments than two. The argument derived from supposing that equal facilities for religious instruction being afforded in the National Schools to persons of all denominations, all are placed on a perfect level, cannot be safely urged till the catechisms of the Church of Rome are purged of the uncharitable dogma of exclusive salvation, and pre-occupy the young mind only with such lessons of simple truth and Christian love as the catechism of the Church of England inculcates. The Board's

notions of *equality* are founded upon the laws of a kind of Irish reciprocity. Supposing that the two denominations enter the controversial arena (for such an arena their rules make their schools) on a perfect equality, is to suppose that men are on equal terms in a contest—the one provided with no arms but such as God and nature gave him, the other having a poisoned dagger in his hand.

I need not remind your Lordship of the many proofs which the late Parliamentary inquiry furnished of the almost exclusive employment of the National schoolmasters in teaching the Roman Catholic catechisms and other formularies; and I think it is plain, from the evidence referred to, that so long as the rule to which we object exists, little chance can be afforded that the interests of a liberalizing education can be promoted. To be sure your Lordship is of opinion that if we would only reflect that the National Board calls itself a *civil* body, our objections would be removed, and we ought to connive at all injuries done to our faith. What a strange infatuation must possess men, on other occasions astute enough, to suppose that a thinking body of men could be duped and misled by a mere name, and that the word *civil* would operate with such a potent charm as not only to change our minds, but the nature, constitution and operations of the Board itself.

III.

Alarming objects authoritatively avowed by the National Board of Education, with some notice of the working of the system.

MY LORD,

When the objects deliberately avowed by the Commissioners of National Education are taken into calm

consideration, perhaps your Lordship may abate somewhat of your surprise at the opposition it encounters from the Protestants of Ireland. In fact, from the moment that these objects were developed, the opposition to the system has taken every day deeper root, and I think before I close this letter, I shall be able to satisfy even your Lordship that the National Board is a subject of just alarm to the entire Protestant community. We owe Mr. Colquhoun a deep debt of gratitude for having so ably brought this subject before the public mind, in his evidence before the Lords' Committee. The occasion did not permit his confirming all his statements in detail, (his cross-examiners, it appears, showed no disposition to press him to his proofs), and I therefore have undertaken the task of proving, from the Reports of the Commissioners themselves, the nature and number of those objects contemplated and avowed by the Commissioners with regard to education in Ireland.

The first object avowed by the Commissioners is to obtain such an amount of funds as would place *the whole education of the country in their hands*, and preclude all hope, on the part of the friends of Scriptural education in Ireland, that they could ever put down the evil, or compete with it. Now, my Lord, for our proofs.

The Commissioners in their Second Report have published an estimate of the probable expenses of their establishment, for a given number of years, and of the permanent income which they would afterwards require. We are to be sure to bear in mind, and make due allowance for the fact, that at this time they were no doubt desirous to lend the Government a helping hand with the APPROPRIATION CLAUSE, by showing the extent of the educational wants of Ireland—but making all due allowance for their friendly feelings in this respect, what does your Lordship think of the Commissioners submitting that their objects required for the sixth year in progressive

increase, the sum of £324,000, and that after that period the sum required might gradually diminish to £200,000 per annum, and this latter sum not to be dependent on the annual bounty of Parliament, but a permanent charge on the consolidated fund. The Commissioners have attached to their 1st, 2d and 3d Reports, in order to vindicate and recommend their system, an appendix containing the evidence of two of their body, Messrs. Blake and Carlile, before a Parliamentary Committee, in 1834; and as at this time, they conceived that they were sailing before the wind, they delivered their sentiments with suitable spirit and candour. Mr. Blake is asked—

“Do you think that those funds should be given annually, so that they should be a permanent charge on the Consolidated Fund?—I think that they should be a permanent charge on the Consolidated Fund.”—(*App. p. 96-7.*)

Only think, my Lord, of the English people pledged on the faith of the nation to the payment of £200,000 per annum, for the teaching of Popery in Ireland.

Your Lordship may not be aware that there is in Ireland a Board of Education, consisting of nine members, appointed by act of Parliament, and nine by Government, all for the most part the highest Dignitaries of the Established Church, and who have under their control the Royal and Diocesan Schools, not very rich or numerous in Ireland, but whose constitution is of a decidedly Protestant character, and particularly useful by affording a superior academical education, in encouraging the gentry of Ireland to educate their children in their native country. We have lately heard loud complaints from the Commissioners of the severe pressure of business and the urgent necessity for an increase to their numbers; but, my Lord, it was very remarkable what a devoted and patriotic spirit animated

the Commissioners when they thought they could relieve the Board of Education of their estates and functions together. Hear Mr. Blake.

“You think that the management of the estates and the financial transactions, which at present devolve on that Board, would not involve you in such an additional labour as would preclude the possibility of such an arrangement?—I should say, certainly not. From what I know of the duties of the Commissioners of Education, I do not think the duties would be so onerous as that we should not be able to perform them with ease.

“Do not you think it highly advantageous that the whole system of education should be under one body?—I think it is desirable.”—(*App. p. 94-5.*)

Imagine, my Lord, the just indignation of the Protestants of Ireland, at the proposal that the houses, the funds, all means of instruction, in the Royal and Diocesan Schools in Ireland, should be taken out of the hands in which an act of Parliament had placed them, and turned over to Doctor Murray and Mr. Blake, to extend and deepen the influence of a system to which they are in heart and conscience averse.

One of the greatest blessings conferred by the Kildare-place Society, was the expulsion, from the hearths of the poor, of the demoralizing books which had nurtured among them a spirit of guilty and wild adventure, and this great good was effected by selling to the public moral and entertaining works at a reduced price; but so blinded by a spirit of monopoly, and desire to extinguish competition, are the Commissioners of National Education, that they will not serve the public with the public money; they charge an enormous sum for all their works, and absolutely check the circulation of that knowledge which they are appointed to diffuse. Are men who thus act pursuing the public good or the petty ends of a jealous monopoly?

They tell us, in their Second Report, page 19, that they contemplate a provision for the education of 570,000 children, and as they felt that this very statement necessarily implied a monopoly of the education of the poor, they allege that this is about the number which would require the aid of the National Schools. We can easily put this statement to the test. Lord Brougham, in a very able published speech, delivered May 21st, 1835, in the House of Lords, proves that a *ninth* of the population "as the proportion requires" of England and Wales, was not instructed. Accepting the authority of Lord Brougham, that a ninth of the population is the required proportion which should be under process of education, we take first the whole population of Ireland, as returned by the Commissioners of public instruction—7,943,940; a ninth, therefore, would be, 882,660: deducting from this number a seventh, for the difficulty of keeping up attendance to the extreme point—for those who are kept at home to take care of younger children, while the parents are engaged in their respective occupations—for those incapacitated by permanent bodily infirmity, or temporary illness, and for those engaged in herding cattle, or such other services as offer the humblest remuneration: deducting, I say, a seventh, in consideration of those four constantly operating causes, we will have as a School-going population, 756,566, but this number includes the children of all, rich and poor; and what is to be deducted for the children of the gentry, of shopkeepers, of the better class of tradesmen, of farmers, and of all who are unwilling to avail themselves of a gratuitous education? I answer, about two-thirds of the whole, leaving 252,188 for gratuitous education. The returns of the Commissioners of Education, in 1827, give us the total number of children educated gratuitously, in whole or in part, by the Societies, or individuals, at that time in Ireland, as

well *Roman Catholic*, (mark, my Lord, *Roman Catholic*,)
as Protestant, viz :—

In Association Schools,	12,769
In Erasmus Smyth's,	8,882
In *Kildare Place,	58,205
In London Hibernian,	37,507
In Baptist Schools,	4,377
In other Societies,	9,365
In Schools maintained by individuals,	13,686
In Christian Brotherhood,	5,454
Female Nunnery Schools,	7,136
Other Roman Catholic Schools, main- tained by subscription, in whole or in part,	33,529
Total,	190,910

Deducting this number from 560,549, the entire number at School, it appears that there were 369,639 in pay Schools. Suppose that taking into account the increase of population, as also the circumstance that the National Schools are acceptable to the priests, we add to the above 190,910, (*and in this is included the children educated by Protestant Societies*,) no less than 150,000, the National Schools could not be expected to educate more than 240,000. In seeking for funds for the education of no less than 570,000, I ask your Lordship, can it be supposed that the Commissioners designed any thing else than the total extinction of Scriptural Education in Ireland. But let the landlords of Ireland turn to the 99th page of the appendix to which I have already referred, and they will there find that the Commissioners avow it as one of their objects to obtain a power to compel landlords to sell them sites for School houses, and land for Agricultural Schools; and his Grace the Archbishop of Dublin has lent his

* I believe this is understated.

ingenious pen in an anonymous pamphlet, to justify this object, on the ground that sites for the National Schools should be provided, as lands may be taken for roads or other similar public purposes; not perceiving in their zeal a very obvious distinction. No landlord can object on conscientious grounds, that a road should run for public convenience through a portion of his property, nor oppose his selfishness to the public good,—but what, if a landlord, taking, as many of the landlords of Ireland do, a benevolent interest in the welfare of his tenantry, should feel a sincere conviction that this evil system of education dishonours the truth, and disseminates error, and besides adds to the dangerous, and as the National Board well knows and feels, the powerful influence of the Roman Catholic priesthood, are his conscientious convictions to be trampled under foot?

But another object avowed by the Commissioners, (*App. pages 101 and 2,*) is to invest the inhabitants of districts with power of levying an assessment after the manner of a land property tax, for the building and repair of school houses, and salaries of masters. How this power is to be exercised where the more extensive landholders are Protestants, but the Roman Catholics, barely qualified to vote, are in the same district numerous and zealous, and where the schoolmaster is the active and confidential agent of the priest, we can be at no loss to conjecture, especially as the Commissioners propose to fix a minimum, but not a maximum, for the assessment, and to form the districts themselves. But the Board, we find, (*App. p. 106,*) claim not only the power of removing schoolmasters, but local managers at their pleasure; and (*App. p. 95,*) the power of altering an act of Parliament at their pleasure also, nor would they submit “to so much positive enactment as the English Poor Law contains.” These are objects, we may say, on oath avowed by the

Commissioners themselves—objects sufficiently alarming, but rendered still more so by the steady perseverance with which, wherever possible, they have pursued them, and given them effect in the working of their system.

Suffer me, then, as the best comment on these objects, to call your attention to a few of these startling facts which the late Parliamentary Reports on the new plan of education supply. Turn, my Lord, to the return furnished by the Board, of the Schools connected with nunneries, monasteries, chapels, or on chapel grounds, and you will find two hundred and forty-six such National Schools in Ireland, for the *united* education of the poor. This is a return most certainly not swelled beyond the truth, for we find one of the Commissioners in, of course an undesigned mistake, returning Newry Nunnery School, as Newry High-street School. What could be expected in nunnery schools, where no admission could be obtained without first ringing a bell, encountering a porter, and undergoing an inspection through a door with a sliding panel, and even then obliged to wait a certain convenient time, before you were introduced to the school-room; and indeed when it was ascertained that the Rev. L. H. Robinson was a Protestant Clergyman, he was refused admittance altogether. A nun told the Rev. Robert Bell that she never made any difference in the school, as she taught the Roman Catholic Catechism to all alike, (*Lord's Rep. p. 1190.*) Mr. Stewart called up a Protestant child in the King's Inn-street School, and found it answer accurately in the Romish Catechism, and tell why the sign of the cross was made, (*Lord's Rep. p. 1189.*) A Protestant child at Lorrha School is left three weeks without a lesson, because he would not learn the Roman Catholic Catechism, (*Lord's Rep. p. 1242.*) All the Roman Catholic holidays are kept in the great bulk of the National Schools, and

such Protestant children as may attend them, are consigned to total idleness on those days, or to the sinful pastimes which distinguish Saints' days in Ireland. *The complete Catholic Directory*, with a becoming candour, gives many of the National Schools as Roman Catholic Institutions. The National Schoolmasters are appointed by the priests, and are dismissed by them at their pleasure; they are active agents for the collection of the Catholic Rent and O'Connell tribute; and when the Rev. Mr. Lloyd, the Rector of Fenner, complained that one of them presumed to write to him "for his generous and patriotic contribution to the O'Connell tribute," the friends of the master excused him on the ground that all the National Schoolmasters were obliged to take this duty in turn, (*Lord's Rep. p. 757.*) It would be an endless task to cite the twentieth part of the particular abuses of the system; in truth the abuses of the regulations of the Board, such as they are, appear, in point of fact, to be the rule, the observance of them, the exception. But all I have enumerated is but a trifle compared to the principle so injurious to the Protestant faith, on which the Board appears most systematically to have acted, in order to put down the Scriptural Schools in Ireland. Wherever Scriptural Schools abound, there they establish National Schools in opposition; but where no School of any kind exists, there they never think of supplying the want. This, my Lord, I feel to be a grave charge, and requiring ample proof. By turning to Lords' Report, pp. 1052-3-7, you will find the following extracts from the evidence given by Dean Murray.

"Wherever Scriptural Schools abound, there they plant National Schools; and where there are no schools at all, they never think of planting a school in that district."

"Suppose there are nine Scriptural Schools in a parish, as I have an instance here, the Board will plant three

National Schools in that same parish ; and to show that the parish was sufficiently supplied before, two of those schools have since died a natural death. And in another parish, where there is no Scriptural School, they will not establish any National School.”

“The only point I would wish to dwell upon is, that it was universally the case with respect to the diocese, that where the Scriptural Schools abounded, the National Schools also abounded; and that there are no National Schools in those parishes where there are no Scriptural Schools. Although the Roman Catholic Bishop lives in one of these parishes, they have not established a National School at all.”

But as another proof of the systematic direction of all the efforts of the Board to put down Scriptural education, I venture to request your Lordship’s attention to the never-to-be-forgotten case of Achill. There the Rev. E. Nangle had established Scriptural Schools. The district of Achill consists of three divisions, Achill, Achill Beg, and Coraan Achill ;—the population of the whole amounts, by the last census, to something above 5000. Mr. Nangle had in Achill 420 children, of a neglected and almost savage population, attending his schools. His Grace the Archbishop, in a speech of which an extract is given in the Commissioners’ Third Report, thus expresses himself—“Where schools on the Kildare-place plan, or on one intrinsically better, are found to work well, and to embrace the mass of the population, I should be truly sorry to see an inferior one substituted.” Yet when Mr. Nangle foresaw the consequences of National Schools being established in opposition to his crowded Scriptural Schools, we have the authority of the same report which contains the extract from his Grace’s speech for the following—“Mr. Nangle wrote to a member of the Board, requesting he would use his influence to prevent our granting aid for

the purpose, as our Schools would be opposed to schools which he had already founded there. Of course we would not listen to the desire, and the aid sought was granted." These two extraordinary paragraphs occur, I can assure your Lordship, in one and the same report. Well, the Protestants of Ireland are factious and impracticable, because they have no confidence in this Board. They are to tamely acquiesce in all the energies of a public body, possessing large public funds, being directed to the eradication of their religion. We are to witness without emotion the efforts of a devoted and holy man marred, as we read of his Scriptural Schools being brought down from 420 to 80; and that when late returns were made, there were only 243 children under instruction in Achill, including those in the Board's and Mr. Nangle's schools. The prominent National schoolmaster in Achill was the man that the Bishop of Exeter stated in his place in Parliament, had been dismissed from the coast-guard for treasonable or seditious language. The Board ordered an investigation into the truth of this charge, which investigation was not even a clumsy mockery; and with a most unheard-of deviation from duties such as theirs, they directed this man to bring an action* at law against the Lord Bishop of Exeter. The late parliamentary inquiry afforded the Bishop of Exeter an opportunity of establishing his charge, and of showing what kind of investigation the Commissioners had ordered at the first; and yet I think I may answer for a neglect of duty on the part of the Commissioners in two particulars. First, I fear they have not yet apologised (at least not publicly) to the Bishop of Exeter; and, secondly, that they have not dismissed the offending pedagogue.

* The Commissioners have rather a taste for these pursuits.—See 3d Rep. p. 48.

Of the temper with which the Commissioners are governed in the discharge of their public duties, I must afford your Lordship a specimen, in an extract from their Third Report—"The clergyman alluded to is the Rev. Mr. Nangle, whose name is mentioned in the *police reports and papers* which your Excellency lately caused to be transmitted to us; he is, as your Excellency is aware, *neither rector nor curate* of the parish." These words intimate that some one had put it forward as a point of importance, or that it was in some shape alleged, that Mr. Nangle was rector or curate of Achill; but I can assure your Lordship that there was not the slightest ground for the insinuation, unbecoming as it was, proceeding from men who were glad to get a clerical signature to an application for aid, without any nice inquiry into the local connexions of parties. But what shall we say of the allusion to the *police reports*? What meaning was intended to be conveyed? Was it that Mr. Nangle, as well as his servants, had been assaulted by others, or was it that he might be supposed a turbulent and seditious fellow, "frighting the isle from its propriety?" Think of a grave, learned, dignified body condescending to a course like this—a body, too, which edifies the public occasionally with such well-turned compliments to charity, that we would have almost hoped that they respected, if they did not practise the virtue. I must, before I conclude this letter, allude to the well-known case of Maloney, the persecuted schoolmaster of Curryglass, as illustrating in one example the general working of the National system. Maloney, previously to his appointment, waits on the priest, and is simple enough to believe that his being able to teach mathematics would recommend him to the reverend patron. The priest, however, sets no value on his scientific attainments, and merely asks him is he able and willing to teach the catechism.—(See *Lords' Rep.* 975, &c.) Maloney

undertaking this duty is installed into his new office, and being anxious to improve his scholars, he endeavours to procure the Scripture Extracts, and succeeds by writing for them to the Board, in the name (at his own consent) of one of the local committee of the school. The priest was determined to assist the notes of the Extracts, in neutralising their effects; and one day examining the children in the extract from Gen. 7th chapter, he asked a Protestant child how a pair of all living creatures could be contained in the Ark, when its magnitude was not sufficient for two whales. Maloney felt it his duty to counteract this effort, by asking the child why he did not tell the priest that there was no occasion to take the whales into the ark, as the water could not drown them. The next essay of the priest was in Acts, 20th chapter, where St. Paul reminds the elders of the words "of the Lord Jesus, how he said it is more blessed to give than to receive." In reply to an observation from Maloney, the priest told him that these words were not contained in the Gospels, for that the apostle had them by tradition. Maloney had by this time obtained and perused an Irish version of the Scriptures, and referred the priest to Gal. i. 12, where St. Paul says he received not the gospel of man, neither was he taught it, "but by revelation of Jesus Christ." The priest was silent, but it appears from that moment that Maloney's doom was sealed. He is required to dismiss his school three days in the week, and march with five or six children to chapel, to teach them their catechism, under the harassing orders of the priest. The master dares at length plead the regulations of the Board—the priest denounces him from the altar, and, of course, injures his school. Still there stood Maloney holding his ground in stubborn integrity. His moral character was unimpeachable—his literary attainments were only too high; how could the priest get rid of him? He adopted

rather a novel expedient; he wrote to the Board that Maloney had resigned; he appointed another master, and the village of Curryglass presented the singular exhibition of two National Schools opposite each other in the same street, and having painted boards with "National School" on each. Maloney wrote to the Board—denied that he had resigned—and offered to meet any charge against him. His memorial is unnoticed, and at length the curate of the parish applies for an investigation on his behalf. The investigation is promised, but the promise is never fulfilled. Meanwhile Doctor Finn, an inspector of the Board, arrives. He inspects Maloney's school; intimates his knowledge of his disagreement with the priest; investigates no charge; finds no fault, but recommends Maloney to be removed. Well, poor Maloney is sent adrift, and a man who had been dismissed for drunkenness and other immoralities, is schoolmaster in his room. Maloney had but little to sustain him in his trials; denounced by the priest, not espoused from a feeling of proper caution by the Protestant clergy, his only consolation seemed to be derived from Him who is ever a ready help in trouble, and his happiest hours appear to have been spent in the church at Tallow, whither (though 15 miles off) to avoid observation, he resorted. This poor man appears to possess qualities of no mean order, and I trust he now rejoices in the honest testimony which God has enabled him to bear to the truth, "by patience and comfort of his holy word." But why need I dwell on matters like this, identifying the Board with the flagrant abuses of the system? The whole administration of the system is a matter of alternate contempt and disgust. National Schools closed, and the children marshalled to grace the procession of Tyquin's, "the tithe-martyr's," funeral—the public money going, under pretence of education, to the purposes of the Roman Catholic religion—

National Schools made the theatres of political harangues, or of the more deadly instigation (as against the Rev. Mr. O'Croly) to public assassination. Similar abuses will never cease until such modifications of the system are adopted as will satisfy the conscientious objections of Protestants; such a change in the constitution of the Board as will lead the Protestants to think that they are represented there as well as the Roman Catholics, and then obtaining the cooperation of the Irish Protestant clergy, the system may confer benefits on Ireland commensurate, in some degree, with the evils it has inflicted, and the worse evils with which, I fear, it is fraught.

IV.

The Bishop of Norwich's strange notions regarding the Roman Catholic religion.—The discarded Extracts.—His Lordship's attack on Dean Dawson.—Doctor M'Hale.

MY LORD,

Much as the public had heard of your Lordship's "liberality," we certainly were not prepared for a declaration like this, speaking of the Scripture Extracts—"but this he would say, and he had examined them narrowly—that in these books were to be found every doctrine which a Protestant valued and believed, and he might add, *every doctrine which a Roman Catholic conceived to be essential to his salvation.*" Strange recommendation this, my Lord, of the Scripture Extracts to the Protestant community, that they are such perfect mirrors of Roman Catholic doctrine. How you will settle accounts with Doctor Murray and Mr. Blake, I cannot say. Possibly, after all, the favour with which you look on the

Roman Catholic system of religion, arises from your not understanding Roman Catholic* doctrines. Why, my Lord, the whole body of the Scriptures does not contain all that a Roman Catholic believes essential (and I beg to inform your Lordship that Roman Catholics do not admit the term "non-essential" as applied to matters of faith) to his salvation. What, my Lord, does your Lordship understand by the words, "all things delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred canons and general councils," or the words, "*et sine scripto traditionibus?*" I should be sorry to see the London "vicar apostolic" impose the penance on your Lordship of carrying down to the House of Lords the numerous ponderous tomes which contain only the written faith of the Church of Rome. But to return to the Extracts—why did not your Lordship notice the objections which were prominently put forward by Dean Murray and Doctor Elrington? and why not the whole† of the objection taken to what you undertook to defend, and did so strangely defend, by proving that the passage you would vindicate *was* erroneously translated? It is happy, however, for the interest of truth, that the Commissioners showed more deference to their arguments, than your Lordship's praises, by withdrawing their recommendation of the Extracts in question.

Your Lordship has afforded so prominent a place to your attack on Dean Dawson, for having questioned the propriety of closing the National Schools on certain days,

* Indeed his misapplication of the term "Catholic" exclusively to the Church of Rome, while it surprises one in a person so unsparing his charges of "ignorance and unorthodoxy" against others, leads one to think that his Lordship's appreciation of the liturgy of his own church is not very high.

† One part of the objection to the note in the Extracts on Gen. iii. 15, is, that the woman is made the *agent*, Christ the *instrument* of redemption. The objectionable words are, "It is by her seed Jesus Christ that the woman bruises the serpent's head."

all of which, with the exception of two, as your Lordship alleges, are holidays common to the Churches of England and Rome, that one would be tempted to suspect, if your Lordship were not so great an advocate for peace and charity, that the hope of lessening the Dean in public estimation had no small share in promoting the publication of your speech. If ever such a hope were entertained, never was hope so signally and deservedly defeated. Now, my Lord, if the days to which you refer are not kept as school holidays in the great bulk of the schools in England and Ireland, but only in those schools under the direction and management of the priests, is it not a just cause of complaint that Protestant children are obliged to consume those days in idleness, or tempted to abuse them in demoralizing pastimes?

“With the exception of two of these holidays (and here your Lordship’s orthodoxy or accuracy must be questioned) we have every one in our own Church.” This, no doubt, will be deemed a very triumphant retort by the priests, and a full justification for consigning to idleness, a number of children to whom their very poverty, and the consequent impatience of their parents to withdraw them from school, render the hours for learning more precious. But if your Lordship’s argument, that a service being appointed for any particular day, justifies the closing of the National Schools on such days, it would justify the schools being closed on no less than thirty-eight holidays, as there are special services (not including that for the 5th of November,) for no less than thirty-eight several days in our book of Common Prayer. And yet I think the “worthy Dean” would venture to condemn most ignorantly and unorthodoxly, as you conceive, the closing of the National Schools at those periods. Vain, my Lord, is the attempt to depreciate the Dean of St. Patrick’s. I have not the honour of his acquaintance, but his character is well known in Ireland, as a single-minded

man, of sound sense and well directed talents, devoted to the duties of his sacred calling, earning, and receiving too, the praises of all except of those in whose eyes a dislike to the principles, and an exposure of the abuses of the National System, is a crime which deprives its opponent of all claim to ordinary courtesy or fair dealing.

Your Lordship quoted Doctor M'Hale, the Titular Archbishop of Tuam's condemnation of the Extracts, as a portion of your defence; your Lordship observes, in language which shows that Irish declamation can bear to be transplanted, that he had assailed them "with all the magnitude of his talents and all the power of his eloquence." And is your Lordship so simple as to imagine that Doctor M'Hale was in earnest in his denunciations against the Board? What can he wish for which he has not obtained? Are not the National Schools in the Ecclesiastical Province of Tuam under the almost exclusive direction of the Priests? Can he not *now* have the Roman Catholic Catechism taught any hour of the day in his National Schools? Is not Priest Hughes (of pitch-fork notoriety) himself patron of eight? Did not the Board ally themselves with him, against the very principle laid down by the Archbishop of Dublin in Parliament, in order to extinguish Mr. Nangle's schools? Were not the Masters of the National Schools a species of lictors (*Lords' Report*, p. 384 410,) to the hierarchical usurper, bearing no idle fasces before him? What, my Lord, *can* he want,—*a pretence*, ay, a pretence to make his opposition plausible, and even his ingenuity cannot discover one which the public can comprehend. No doubt it served a temporary purpose to declare, oh! the Board must be right, for it is assailed by the opposite extremes (one extreme being the whole Protestant population) in Ireland. Doctor M'Hale is a Prelate of the Church of Rome, elected by his brethren, and never could have arrived at his present station without having wit enough

to understand how and when best to serve his friends. Be assured, my Lord, that however this fiery zealot may rave in public, a cooler current runs beneath the surface of his humour, nor is it creditable to the sagacity of a British senator, to be duped by his feigned hostility. I believe I have now noticed every point in your Lordship's speech, and I therefore propose to turn my attention to your correspondent "T."

V.

True meaning of words in Reports and Proceedings of Commissioners of National Education.—Statistical jugglery of the National Board.—Want of provision for instruction of Protestant poor.—Danger of Schism in the Church.—Archdeacon Hoare.—The Liverpool Schools.

MY LORD,

Your Lordship's correspondent "T." has one leading object in view,—to endeavour to diminish the effect produced by the publication of the evidence taken before the Parliamentary Committees of Inquiry on National Education in Ireland; and the expedient hit on is, to assure the public that though the evidence will appear "strange and inexplicable" to all persons entertaining favourable opinions of the Board, yet that this arises from the fact, "that the same words do not always signify the same things in the sister kingdom." That is, that the promise on the part of the Board to investigate complaints, means in Ireland, provided a priest is not to be displeased, (*Lords' Rep. p. 991, 1131.*) By the Scriptures being perfectly free, that they shall not be read during school hours—that the reading of the Bible is peculiar religious

instruction—that the promise on the part of the Board, (*see extract from Archbishop of Dublin's speech, 3rd Report of Commissioners,*) not to establish rival National Schools, where the population is already supplied, means in Ireland, provided the schools already in being, are not Scriptural Schools, (*Lords' Rep. p. 380, 786, 1052.*)—that but 40 Protestant clergymen of the Established Church having really joined the Board, means in Ireland, 140, (*Lords' Rep. 1402-3*)—that a grazier, who would be indignant if not addressed as an Esquire, means in the Board's returns, a Clergyman of the Established Church, (*Lords' Rep. 784*)—that though the Protestant Parochial *Clergy* are as numerous as the Roman Catholic, yet that a fair proportion joins the Board, if the former are to the latter as 40 to 1,397, (*see Commissioners' 2nd Rep. p. 12*)—that the absence of petitions against the National system proves that it is becoming popular with the Protestants, (*Com. Rep. p. 86,*) but that numerous petitions against it do not disprove this allegation—that the National Board succeeding in affording a united education, means, that compared with any other system, it has signally failed, (*Lords' Rep. p. 81*)—that giving children a love for the Bible, means keeping it out of their sight—that non-interference with the religion of children, means teaching the Roman Catholic catechism to all alike, (*Lords' Rep. p. 1190*)—that taking money for teaching, means refusing a salary, (*Lords' Rep. p. 966, 1127*)—that hearing one side means a fair investigation, (*Lords' Rep. p. 1134*)—that the names of Protestant children having been once on the roll, means that they are always attending the school, (*Lords' Rep. p. 1150*)—that Clergymen having petitioned against the Board, means that they applied for aid, (*Lords' Rep. p. 1404.*) No wonder that your correspondent “T.” should represent words in Ireland as not signifying the same thing as in the sister country—that with him they should be intended

to disguise our thoughts. Such are the miserable shifts that men will sometimes have recourse to, when they wish to close their own eyes, and turn away the eyes of others from seeing the evils and infirmities of which they are ashamed, but which they will not cure.

Stultorum incurata pudor malus ulcera celat.

Your correspondent betrays a full consciousness that as regards the education of Protestants, the Board has signally failed. The most ingenious sophistries had been employed to prove that the Protestants at large were favourable to the system, and that "one of its main objects," according to Lord Stanley's letter, "to unite in one system children of different creeds," had been accomplished. Now, however, it appears that we had altogether mistaken Lord Stanley, for the "first great object was not to establish a united system of education," and we are called on to believe that an enlightened government contemplated separate systems. My Lord, this new discovery shows us plainly what we are to think of all the representations which have been hitherto made of the great success of the Board, in uniting the several denominations at school.

"T." is a member, he informs us, of the Statistical Society. I wish he had been a little more particular in his statistical details, and told us what are those "many institutions founded during the last century for the special and gratuitous instruction of Protestants." My Lord, it is not fair to avoid details on a subject like this; your correspondent has greatly abused your confidence; some institutions for the education of Protestant poor have been suppressed within the period he mentions; and as the Commissioners of Irish Education Inquiry gave, in 1825, in their reports, a return not only of the Institutions for the Education of the poor, but of every indivi-

dual school in Ireland, returns which had been made on oath, it would have been easy for your correspondent, had he been a fair man, to have arrived at the truth; but as it is a subject of great importance to ascertain, if his statement be true, that the National Board supplies education to the poorer Protestants "in pretty nearly the exact proportion it is required," I will furnish your Lordship with data from which to judge. The Commissioners of Education Inquiry made the following return in 1827, (to be found in page 61 of their Ninth Report) of the Protestant children receiving gratuitous education in the various institutions—

CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOLS.	Of the Estab. Church.	Presbyte- rians.	Other Pro- testant De- nominations.
Association for Discountenancing Vice,	6,925	806	72
Board of Erasmus Smyth,	4,135	1,362	58
Kildare-place Society,	16,268	9,561	408
London Hibernian Society,	12,943	4,810	446
Baptist Society,	1,293	39	5
Sundry Societies and Institutions,	5,888	357	202
Total,	47,452	16,935	1,191

The total number of Protestants receiving, in the year 1827, gratuitous education in Ireland was, therefore, 65,578. A deduction is to be made of about 10,000 for scholars whose names are repeated in two establishments, but it is not unreasonable, considering the increase of population, to say that there are at this day, of Protestants requiring gratuitous education at least 65,578. All grants have been withdrawn from Protestant Charter Schools, the Foundling Hospital, Kildare-place Society, and Association for Discountenancing Vice; and therefore, making a deduction of about 5,000 for those educated by the Board of Erasmus Smyth, (the only Institution of any account that has kept its ground,) there are at least

60,000 poor Protestant children in Ireland, thrown for education on voluntary benevolence. To be sure, the National Board allege that they educate 14,000 Protestants, "*the exact proportion requiring aid,*" but, my Lord, a grosser deception was never before so shamelessly attempted, or so signally exposed, as this has been, in the Parliamentary reports. What must be the force of those conscientious objections which the Protestants of Ireland entertain against this system, when, eager as they are for education, they prefer all the difficulties of their situation, to crossing the threshold of the National Schools !

Your Lordship's statistical friend, but whom the public must now look on as a statistical juggler, and who has reasons, you will admit, for writing anonymously, enters into a laboured explanation of the reason why so many schools are under the patronage of the Roman Catholic priests, but the amount of the defence is, that "Protestants choose to stand off." Now the opponents of the Board have always represented this "standing off," (and it was for this object the argument was employed,) as a proof that the system was not popular among the Protestants in Ireland, and it was to meet this argument, that amusing statistical juggles were practised, and that graziers, and non-resident and dead clergymen, and (to use an Irish bull) clergymen that had never lived at all, were paraded as clerical favourers in the Board's returns; and when the complete exposure of these returns has been made, and the argument against the Board confirmed, your statistical friend turns round with a self-satisfied air, and assumes the very fact which the Board had all along denied. We derive this advantage, however, from the mode of argument employed, that from the pains now taken to show that the great object of the Government had not been (such a libel) to promote a united education of the poor, it may be taken as admitted that the Pro-

testants of Ireland are averse to the system, and that common sense and matters of fact may be in future spared much insult and perversion.

Your correspondent sneers at the expectation that the Bible will make men Protestants; "of this prejudice I must speak with all possible respect. I long had similar expectations."

A friend he was to Reformation,
Until it went, quite out of fashion.

The expectation that the reformed religion will spread, by means of the Bible, he ridicules as "a dear delusion," notwithstanding all that the Parliamentary Reports of the late Education Inquiry prove to the contrary.

Because iniquity shall abound the love of many shall wax cold. May God in his mercy save us from the evil influences of those men, who say that the reading of God's word will not now, as heretofore, lead men to the knowledge of the truth, and who admit that they have neither faith to attempt the removal of error, nor charity to hope it.

Your correspondent has indulged in a very violent tirade against the Irish Protestant clergy, living and dead, the Irish Protestant laity, Bible societies, Mr. M'Ghee, the Bishop of Exeter, and extempore speaking, and alleges all to the very last are much to blame as regards the National system, and very inimical to its success. On his gross ignorance of the history of the Protestant religion in Ireland, I deem it unnecessary to comment, as beside our present inquiries; but extempore writing, my Lord, seems fully as fatal to the Board, as extempore speaking, and I must attribute it to the great haste with which your correspondent wrote, that he has not pointed out the exact connection between extempore speaking and

the National system. Perhaps he has confounded the evils, as equally loose and liable to defects,

And oftentimes mistook the one
For the other, as *Great Clerks* have done.

To enter into a defence of the several parties attacked (the *lay* remonstrance to the Archbishop of Dublin can never be forgiven) would be but affording consequence to the splenetic effusions of a mortified partisan. Let him settle with Doctor Sadlier (who, in despite of the course he has pursued, is personally beloved) his attack on the Bible Societies. All the other living objects of his attacks will console themselves with the love and gratitude of all sound Protestants, under the little malice of an anonymous scribe.

But your correspondent professes to give *some* examples of the puritanism of the Irish Protestant laity, and “the *some*” of your Lordship’s brother, of the *Statistical Society*, dwindles down to the one objection which the Irish Protestants have, he alleges, to the decoration of crosses on their churches. It may be right to state to your Lordship, that very many of our churches are so decorated; and that an objection is never made to place a cross on a spire, or on any other place where it would be an ornament, though I am quite aware that it would be objected to where the mere object was to erect a cross without the end of ornament in view. There may be, and I doubt not is, a very marked difference in this respect between the Irish and English Protestant laity. Men are prone to run into extremes. The Protestant dissenter in England is looked on as the more prominent enemy to the Church, and therefore, avoiding this evil of dissent, the tendency of some customs of Protestants in England might appear Popish to an Irish Protestant, who, daily witnessing the superstitious uses to which things, harmless in themselves,

are applied, would, as a conscientious man, anxiously desire not to countenance or minister to, in his own practice, his neighbours' errors. And here, my Lord, I am tempted to indulge in a warning prophecy, which I trust may never be fulfilled. If your Lordship shares the views of your correspondent, as regards the welfare or the dangers of the Church, two opposite evils will prevail in your diocese. You will countenance (undesignedly, I am sure) Popery, and it will spread on the one hand, and you will provoke churchmen, by maintaining just grounds of offence, to swell the ranks of dissenters on the other. It has been somewhere observed of history, that by the track it has already made, it indicates what will be its future impression. There was a time in Ireland, before Bible Societies or popular preaching, great evils, as "T." alleges, existed—when there was little zeal among the clergy, and much real Popery under the name of Protestantism, among their flocks—and then it was that the Protestant religion in Ireland seemed to melt away like a vision, and Popery to settle down with a deeper darkness over the land. We were accused of having only the staff of a Church in Ireland; but we thank God fervently for it, a great change took place.

Bible Societies and Scriptural Schools were established. The clergy were awakened: evangelical, as distinguished not from moral, but almost heathen, preaching was employed; the people were interested and enlightened; the Spirit and blessing of God accompanied the means employed, and Protestantism, like a giant refreshed with wine, arose in its strength. From that hour true religion has progressed in Ireland. The Established Church can now reckon among her most faithful sons, entire congregations formed out of the ranks of Popery and dissent. I am no advocate for rebellion against Church authority, or for contempt of Church discipline or forms. God forbid; I have habitually revered both; but I ask, my Lord,

are we, with the knowledge of the past, to go back to the dark, and cold, and sickly, and all but expiring days of Protestantism in Ireland? No, no, my Lord, it was not with such views as your Lordship sanctions, that Dean Murray formed his large congregation of converted Roman Catholics in Askeaton, or that the clergy of the North of Ireland have conciliated the prejudices and won the affection of their dissenting brethren. Your correspondent speaks of the dangers which beset the Church in Ireland, and the various causes of schism within her. It is not from any of the causes which he enumerates, dangers to the Church in Ireland are likely to arise. I think it clear to demonstration that a perseverance in the present system of National Education will ultimately lead to a schism in the Church. If the men at present in power appoint to the highest offices of the Church, the abettors of this system, the circle from which a selection can be made must necessarily be narrowed, and instead of choosing from the general body of the wise and good, they will confine themselves to the few who may be either disposed towards this system at present, or who may be willing to barter principle for high station in the Church. What will be the necessary results? The whole of Ireland will present the afflicting spectacle which the diocese of Dublin presents at the present moment;—a discountenanced clergy and a distrusted diocesan,—a bishop and his clergy differing on one of the most important subjects of the Christian ministry,—a forbidden question starting up on every occasion, and mixing itself with every subject on which they can confer. “The curates and bishops seldom found together, unless in the prayers of the Church,” and the most devoted and conscientious of the clergy suffering (unless the bishop be more than man) for their attachment to principle. Is it a wonder if in such a case “Proprietary chapels, independent of episcopal control, would

be eagerly sought, and that it would be proposed that convocations should be formed, and bishops elected to be consecrated in Scotland or America?" And would not the guilt of schism lie at the door of those who tried to force on the Protestants of Ireland, a system of education, to which they prove themselves so irreconcilably averse.

Believe me, my Lord, that this is a most serious subject, and one which demands an instant remedy.

The Archbishop of Dublin, I sincerely believe, but for his station at the National Board, would have been eminently useful. We would have forgiven him some of his paradoxes. He probably would have improved in his orthodoxy: but see how his feelings and pride of opinion as a commissioner mingle with all he does. I feel too deep a reverence for the order to which his Grace belongs, and too lively a sense of duty to the Church of which I am a minister, to imitate your Lordship's and your correspondent's conduct towards the Bishop of Exeter, and avail myself of this opportunity to comment on the character in which, as regards his own clergy, his Grace appears in the parliamentary reports of the late education inquiry. But would his Grace but renounce his connexion with the National Board of Education, and sacrifice his unhappy predilections to the peace and interests of the Church, then would he find a body of zealous and devoted men, forward to obey him, with not only a glad, but a grateful mind.

Your correspondent complains that the opponents of the National System have never offered any plan of education as a substitute for the present. Need I refer your Lordship to my first letter, to show that a plan was offered and rejected, and a plan, too, so unobjectionable, on his own principles, that, ashamed to say it was rejected, he has thought it would serve his purpose better to say that the principle was fully adopted. So much for his honesty. But we will take another specimen:—A Mr.

M'Kay, a Presbyterian clergyman, headed some foolish gatherings of the people in a part of the North of Ireland, to whom he preached against the National System, challenging some of his brethren to defend it. I never heard, as has been stated by your correspondent, that any "atrocities" were committed by Mr. M'Kay, or his followers. Mr. M'Kay's iambics, however, are wedded to immortality in a parliamentary report and your Lordship's pamphlet; but your correspondent has carefully suppressed the fact that, so far from approving of his conduct, he was censured for his proceedings by the religious body to which he belongs. Your correspondent complains of the open violence of the Protestant population against the board, (and how this is reconcilable with the growing favour of the system I cannot tell,) and dwells upon it with as much seriousness as if it were really a grievance under which the Roman Catholics of the country laboured.

Your Lordship is aware how often the Roman Catholics are called the people of Ireland; the Protestants, a poor handful—a miserable minority; and that the miserable minority could so oppress the sturdy majority, or that the sturdy majority, backed by the government and the law, would tamely suffer such treatment, can only be told by the retailers of the American story of one soldier having surrounded three of the enemy. The outcry raised by a certain party in Ireland, is always in proportion to the injury and injustice they commit, and reminds one of the story of the man who, while inflicting the heaviest punishment on a prostrate adversary, within hearing of his adversary's friends, continually shouted murder, lest they would interfere and rescue his victim.

I have done with your Lordship's correspondent "T." and never would have noticed his lucubrations had they not been, as it were, vouched by you, and honoured by your Lordship's patronage and sanction. Men who write

anonymously afford no pledge to the public for the truth of their statements, and are justly regarded as disentitled to any notice. Your pamphlet contains an extract from some publication of Archdeacon Hoare's, which reprehends the clergy for not *visiting*, although they do not *patronise* the National Schools.

If the clergy did visit those schools, they could do no possible good; they would be looked on as spies; and their complaints, if they made any, would (as has been proved) be contemned by the board: they would lend themselves to the objects of the system; their flocks, not up to nice distinctions, would imagine that they were at heart interested for the success of the National Schools, and approved of the National system, while the next Report of the Commissioners would inform the public what an efficient system of watchful superintendence their schools enjoyed, and this very circumstance would be put forward as a ground for claiming an increase of funds. Let but the Protestant clergy of all denominations continue to act as they have heretofore done, persevering in the course which their duty to themselves, their flocks, and their religion points out, and soon it will be seen whether the people of England will pay £50,000 per annum (but for the petitions against the system it would have been this year £100,000) for the maintenance of pure Popery in Ireland. At all events, my Lord, the clergy will not be won by the arguments, nor will they emulate the pliancy, of Archdeacon Hoare. I see by the newspapers that he has gained, not his object, I hope, but his reward. The government has presented him, as "a staunch friend," with a valuable preferment. It will console him under some mortifications, and enliven his powers for another pamphlet,

"When in nice balance truth with gold he weighs,
And solid pudding against empty praise."

I cannot close this letter without some reference to the correspondence which your Lordship's Pamphlet gives about "the Liverpool schools," between a Mr. Otway, a gentleman having some situation under the Government, and the Mayor of Liverpool. It is not necessary to make many comments upon it. I believe Mr. Otway is a very young man. I should be happy to think him honest and well meaning too. I propose to put his honesty to the test. He appears to suppose it a monstrous thing that any one should have said that in the Liverpool schools, on the Irish plan, "even during the school-hours the children are instructed in their peculiar religious opinions, and that in the one room may be seen one set of children learning the Romish Catechism, &c." Mr. Otway further goes on to observe, that he is led to believe that the picture of the children "being instructed during school-hours by the Master (or even a monitor chosen by him) in their peculiar religious opinions, was not only overdrawn, but without any real foundation." Now, as the rules of the National Board absolutely *provide* that the Romish Catechism may be taught *during school hours*, it is not too much to request Mr. Otway, when he next writes for the public, to say now whether he thinks the National System so faultless, and the Irish Clergy so unreasonable, as he once supposed. The Mayor makes a merit of the teaching of Romanism in the corporation schools, and of requiring the attendance of the Roman Catholic children on Sunday mornings in the school-room, that they may be all sent to Mass. That some Protestants can reconcile a proceeding like this to their consciences, we are bound from facts to suppose; but that they possess consciences enlightened and guided by the Word of God, we confidently deny. I am very sure that a conscientious Roman Catholic would never, if he afforded funds for education, imitate such con-

duct, in a like situation. Far less discreditable would be the exclusion of all religious instruction from the schools altogether, than this system of hypocrisy or indifference. To *interfere to compel* children even to learn what we know to be truth, true toleration forbids, but to interfere to *compel* them (for it amounts to that) to imbibe what we know to be error, and to practise what we believe to be idolatry, shows such a disregard of all principle, truth, and consistency, that it makes one tremble for the moral effect which this example is calculated to produce upon the minds of the children when they once begin to reflect. They will naturally think that there is nothing real in religion—that the most opposite principles may both be sound—or that religion may be well enough in its place to keep the poor and illiterate in awe, but that it was not designed for the wealthy or the enlightened. The next step to having no religion at all, if it is not actually that state, is supposing that one religion is as good as another. Truth and experience will, I trust, work a favourable change; till then we must only pray that those who are exposed to temptation in these evil days, may be enabled to preserve a conscience void of offence towards God and towards man.

I now, my Lord, close this correspondence for the present, begging you to ascribe any undue freedom with which I may have written, to the strong interest which I feel in this subject, and the conviction that much is at stake. Apologetic statements of the truth make no impression in these days. We are obliged to call things by their plain names. Would your Lordship but review your opinions, bringing them to the touchstone of God's Word and your own conscience, I would have little doubt but that you would soon see, that a successor of those noble men who refused to circulate "The Declaration" at the

King's bidding, should not lend his name and talents to the support of a system which provides that Popery should be taught in Ireland, at the expense of the English people, and with the sanction of the Protestant Clergy.

I have the honour to be,

Your Lordship's humble Servant,

JOHN HAYDEN.